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Abstract

By the beginning of the 21st century, Australia had become one of the world’s top 5 providers of international education services along with the USA, the UK, Germany and France. Since 2001, China has provided the largest proportion of international students to Australia, a tenfold growth in numbers from 1994 to 2003. The overwhelming majority of Chinese and Taiwanese students studying in Australian universities use what are typically called “English names”. The use of such names differs from the practice in Hong Kong of providing a new born with what might be termed an official English name as part of the full Chinese name that appears on his or her birth certificate and/or passport. By comparison, these English names as used by Chinese and Taiwanese are “unofficial” names that do not appear on the bearer’s passport, birth certificate or university administrative procedurals or degree certificates. Their use is unofficial and largely restricted to spoken interactions.

Historically, English names used to be typically given to an individual by their English teacher; such classroom “baptisms” invariably occurred in Chinese or Taiwanese geographical settings. The term ‘baptisms’ and ‘baptismal events’ are drawn from Rymes (1996) and her research towards a theory of naming as practice. Noting that ‘serial mononymy is relatively uncommon in the literature on naming practices, Rymes (1996, p. 240) notes that more frequent are instances of individuals experiencing ‘a series of baptismal events in which [they] acquire and maintain different names for different purposes.’ Noting these cases among the Tewa of Arizona on Tanna in Vanuatu, Rymes (1996, pp. 241-2) observes that in both contexts, the acquired ‘names are traceable to a particular baptismal event.’ Outside the English language classrooms, the names were never used and were unknown to other teachers and fellow students. For the Australian university lecturers interviewed and observed for this research, the practice seemed variously perplexing, fascinating, duplicitous, patronising and misguided. It was characterised by strategies of resistance and reticence by both student users and their lecturers, as this study has chronicled and analysed.
Canagarajah (2011, p. 4/5) asserts the need for research to consider the dialogical aspects and interactive nature of what he describes as “translanguaging”, specifically how others might feel about ‘their codes being appropriated’ (p. 5). In other words, Canagarajah (2011, p. 5) comments that little is known of how the interlocutors ‘interpret and respond to these translanguaging displays.’ This research achieves just that in that it documents the resistance among Chinese and Taiwanese students to their lecturers’ attempts to use Chinese names to address the students on the one hand, and on the other hand, the lecturers’ resistance to the students’ attempts to use English names as their preferred forms of spoken address.

The study presents and problematises this cross-cultural and translingual tussle over language use and naming practices. It is a tussle, a tug-of-war (or words) between two heteroglossic forces (cf. Bakhtin, 1981) – one largely centrifugal, the other largely centripetal, neither completely homogenous. The two forces are represented, on the one hand, by the Chinese and Taiwanese participants, the vast majority of whom use “English names”, which at times might be characterised (centripetally) as neither English nor indeed as names. On the other hand, the second contrary, more centripetal or reactive force involves the two university lecturer research participants. What transpires is an intercultural dialogism between these two forces, whereby English (as product, as lingua franca) and the heteroglossic nature of naming (fluid versus fixed) emerge and erupt as contested and negotiated practices and phenomena.
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1. Introduction

‘...they are both forms of discourse and to that extent they produce rather than reflect their objects of reference’ (Bhabha, 1994, p. 32).

1.1 PARTICIPANTS, PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCES

This thesis begins in a fin de siècle moment at the close of the 20th century with the substantially increased flow of mainland Chinese and Taiwanese English language students into Australian tertiary institutes. Here, the students typically first enrolled in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) preparatory courses. These enrolments were undertaken before the mainland Chinese and Taiwanese students commenced university studies, having first achieved an appropriate score on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scale. In most cases, the goal was graduation leading to employment and Australian permanent residency status.

By the beginning of the 21st century, Australia had become one of the world’s top 5 providers of international education services along with the USA, the UK, Germany and France (Yao, 2004). Since 2001, China has provided the largest proportion of international students to Australia, a growth in numbers that rose sharply between 1999 and 2003, when Yao’s (2004) paper was written. The number of Chinese students studying in Australia in 2004 was more than tenfold that of 1994 and, in 2001, Yao (2004, p. 18) observed that the majority of Chinese students were studying in ELICOS (English Language Intensive Courses For Overseas Students) programs (some 10902 students), representing 40.6% of total Chinese student enrolments in Australia.

The overwhelming majority of Chinese and Taiwanese students studying in Australian universities use what are typically called “English names”. Of the twenty-three Chinese and
Taiwanese university students I observed in university classroom or language exchange settings and/or interviewed in semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions for this research, only three did not, or rather, did no longer use so-called English names. Importantly, the use of such names differs, for example, from the practice in Hong Kong of providing a new born with what might be termed an official English name as part of the full Chinese name that appears on his or her birth certificate and/or passport. By comparison, these English names as used by Chinese and Taiwanese are “unofficial” names that do not appear on the bearer’s passport, birth certificate, or, for our specific purposes, university administrative procedural or degree certificates. In this respect, their use is unofficial and largely restricted to spoken interactions.

I research and write as a former ESL, EAP, and IELTS preparation classroom teacher in two Australia major cities, a former academic skills adviser and IELTS examiner at an Australian university, and a former university lecturer-cum-tutor a graduate degree program that operated as both foundation and pathway studies. The latter is what Duff (2008) would term ‘academic discourse socialization’ for international students with existing university qualifications and from, normatively, non-English speaking or English as an Additional Language (EAL) backgrounds. It is from this graduate program that one-third of my research participants were drawn.

My unpublished minor thesis pilot study into the practice (Harris, 2008) found that 91% of Chinese questionnaire survey respondents and 96% of Taiwanese questionnaire survey respondents reported using English names that were not their birth or official names at the time of survey. The study surveyed in total 79 Chinese students and 27 Taiwanese. The only other significant figure from this survey of 10 nationalities was that 62.5% of Korean students reported using an English name. For Chinese and Taiwanese students in Australia, the practice is near ubiquitous.

Other theorists beside myself have researched the practice of, for want of a better term, ethnically Chinese people in different metropolitan settings across the world using what are known as English names in the Chinese mainland, in Taiwan and throughout the diaspora. This
research, like mine that I introduce here, comes from the fields of applied linguistics, anthropology and the teaching of English as a world, second or other language. These analyses and findings are presented later in the literature review. Much focuses on the names themselves, fascinating as they can be, and their derivation for the bearers, but without also considering the practice underlying these names. The practice is something I found to be unremarkably every day for most of my 23 student research participants, despite it being something on the contrary quite remarkable for many commentators and indeed for myself as researcher.

For these young Chinese people studying in Australia, the practice of English name use takes place in certain socio-historical moments and spaces, some fixed and some fleeting, and my approach to it strives to avoid the fixed lens of structuralist language analysis for a more cinematographic and fluid focus on the practice itself, as more process than product. On the one hand, my research differs from that of others because it is conducted on the practice of English name use among a selection of mainland Chinese and Taiwanese students using these English names in an Australian metropolitan university. On the other hand, my research proposes a way of problematising the term ‘English name’ as a function of a theoretical framework that proposes language as process, or languaging, over language as product. The term ‘English names’ with its chauvinistic and prefabricated understanding of language emphasises English as a product rather than as an ingredient in a repertoire-based and heteroglossic process. As a result, I would prefer an understanding that emphasises the practice’s heteroglossia, demonstrating as it does qualities of translanguaging and Rampton’s (1995, 2010) crossing within a heuristic of the latter’s contemporary urban vernaculars.

What’s in a name?

Alford (1988) examines the bestowal and adoption of later names (e.g. nicknames) in terms of ‘emergent identities and identity transformations’ and writes that ‘since the use of nicknames may supersede the use of other forms of address (e.g. kin terms, titles of respect, family names), the demands to produce role-appropriate behaviour may thereby be reduced’ (1988, p. 82). A
number of our Chinese and Taiwanese research participants as well as some researchers into the practice (cf. Liao 2000) termed these English names “nicknames”. Alford contends that nicknames typically represent the ‘emergent or achieved identity as opposed to ascribed or assigned identity’ (1988, p. 83) and the bestowal of nicknames has a corollary function of decreasing the significance of the role of the original name-giver in the recipient’s life. While it is important to emphasise that none of our participants referred to the practice as occasioning “name change” (i.e. an English name did not usurp a Chinese name, rather augmented it in certain circumstances), a key aim of my research is to determine the dialogic relationship between the practice of English name use among the Chinese and Taiwanese student participants and the processes of identity negotiation and cross-cultural performance within these Australian university settings and in interaction with university academic and administrative staff.

Classroom baptisms

Participant accounts (and the relevant literature) show that the English names were typically given to the person by their English teacher, who tended to be Chinese or Taiwanese, or were adopted in primary or secondary school English language classes as directed, in some cases suggested, by their English teachers. These classroom “baptisms” (cf. Rymes 1996) invariably occurred in Chinese or Taiwanese geographical settings, where English was often only hesitantly used. Participants note, for example, that outside the English language classrooms, the names were never used in interaction and were unknown to other teachers and fellow students. The practice was often that a student was first equipped with an English name by his or her teacher and then at some point later – perhaps when Alford’s (1988) emergent or achieved identity had usurped an ascribed or assigned one - the student chose their own English name from a Chinese-English dictionary, a Google search, a film, novel or comic, or a typically North American celebrity.

For some of the participants this classroom baptism was a largely mechanical affair that involved scouring the back pages of a dictionary or the results of a Google search, in one instance
recorded as a homework activity. For others it could seem an unwelcome and unnecessary ordeal, perfunctory at best but at worst, self-effacing and mandatory. That said, although the names may have seemed perfunctory to many students in such L1 Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese settings, they were seldom the sites of contest and conflict that they could become in Australia, particularly among some university lecturers and administrators. Consequently, a further aim of the research is to understand this cross-cultural contestation of language use and identity performance that attended the practice. Diao’s (2014) US research into the practice suggests it evidences a positioning of the United States by Chinese as a largely monolingual and monocultural society, in which people are unused to or unprepared to work with foreign names. It could be that a similar reading of Australia is at work here.

A tug-of-war, a tug of words

For the Australian university lecturers and professional staff I interviewed and observed, the practice could seem perplexing, fascinating, duplicitous, patronising and misguided. It was often characterised by strategies of resistance and reticence on both sides. However, such tension concerning language practices should excite a Bakhtinian-driven researcher. Holquist (1983 p. 307) well understands this with his description of ‘the combat zone of the word.’ After all, Bakhtin (1981, p. 293) describes the word as ‘half someone else’s’. Clearly when the words under investigation are normatively speaking “English names”, frequently names that native English speaking Australian interlocutors might otherwise associate with fellow Australian friends, family or figures, then the contestation over ownership of the word, the name, its use, and the identity achieved or aspired to is intensified.

With this in mind, we note that Canagarajah (2011, p. 4/5) asserts the need for research to consider the dialogical aspects and interactive nature of what he describes as “translanguaging”, specifically how others might feel about ‘their codes being appropriated’ (p. 5). In other words, Canagarajah (2011, p. 5) comments that little is known of how the interlocutors ‘interpret and respond to these translanguaging displays.’ My research achieves just that, arguably from both sides. That is, I present on the one hand the resistance among the students to the lecturers’
attempts to use their Chinese names to address them, and, on the other hand, I present the
lecturers’ resistance to the students’ attempts to use English names as their preferred forms of
spoken address. Moreover, across this impasse between students and teachers, I locate the
resistance of a small number of mainland Chinese student participants to the practice, siding in
effect with the lecturers in their refusal or reluctance to use (for themselves or others) English
names.

My research presents and problematises this cross-cultural tussle over language use and identity
work. It is a tussle, a tug-of-war (or words) between two heteroglossic forces (cf. Bakhtin, 1981)
– one largely centrifugal, the other largely centripetal, neither completely homogenous. The two
forces are represented, on the one hand, by the Chinese and Taiwanese participants, the vast
majority of whom use “English names”, which at times might be characterised (centripetally) as
neither English nor indeed as names. On the other hand, the second contrary, more centripetal
or reactive force involves the two university lecturer research participants. What transpires is an
intercultural dialogism between these two forces, for whom English (as product, as lingua
franca) and identity (fluid versus fixed) emerge and irrupt as contested and negotiated practices
and phenomena.

Stewart (1983, p. 270) describes Bakhtin as ‘the master of what we might call “unhappiness
conditions”’ (cf. Searle’s, 1969, ‘happiness conditions’ for successful speech acts); those
circumstances in which the utterance stands in tension or conflict with the utterances of others.’
In short, that this practice of what other researchers tend to term English name use, motivated
often from a user’s perspective by seemingly unremarkable, pragmatic reasons of convenience
or accommodation in terms of pronunciation and recall of Chinese names among non-Chinese
speakers, was capable of inspiring in some interlocutors and commentators reactions of
incredulity and hostility in part motivates my research. Nevertheless, this resistance to the
practices of the other is frequently two-way; Chinese or Taiwanese student resisting teacher or
teacher resisting Chinese or Taiwanese student. ‘Each word’, Bakhtin (1981, p. 293) writes,
‘tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life; all words and
forms are populated by intentions.’ In effect then what is observed is a recontextualisation of the word, of the utterance, leading to a simultaneous sameness and difference; the utterance in this instance being what centripetal or unitary linguistic discourses would term an English name.

1.2 POSITIONING

Writing at the end of the 20th century about the end of the 20th century, Bhabha (1994, p. 2) notes among critics and historians the move away from the categorical and conceptual singularity of notions like class and gender, and the replacement of these fixed and prefabricated categories for analytical purposes with discursively instantiated ‘subject positions - of race, gender, generation, institutional location, geopolitical locale, sexual orientation – that inhabit any claim to identity in the modern world.’ A subject position is understood as a discursive production of selfhood or identity. For example, Bailey (2007, p. 257) writes that ‘to speak is thus to position oneself in the social world, i.e. to engage in identity practice.’ Being discursively produced, subject positions are therefore emergent and dialogic, that is they ceaselessly and dialogically engage with the history of other representations of such subject positions, of other utterances that have been and that will come, and with the perceptions and positionings of the interlocutor/s engaged in dialogue. Describing Bakhtin’s preference for the communicative utterance as the fundamental unit of linguistic analysis, Holquist (1983, p. 311) writes, ‘utterances enact “addressivity”, awareness of the otherness of language in general and the otherness of given dialogic partners in particular.’ Produced discursively and dialogically, subject positions are therefore contingent and ephemeral, as indeed may be the identities enacted through and by them.

My thesis is about identity practice discursively realised and addressivity attempted in the modern millennial world, in Bhabha’s fin de siècle world, from which and in which I locate the origins of the thesis. Following Bakhtin (1981), I take the utterance as the unit of analysis. I aim to address Bhabha’s (1994, p. 2) rhetorical question: ‘How are subjects formed ‘in-between’, or in excess of, the sum of the ‘parts’ of difference (usually intoned as race/class/)?’ I consider such
subject formation as attempted and achieved through the language choices made and language practices undertaken by a selection of Chinese and Taiwanese graduate students at an Australian metropolitan university. Given the dialogic and discursive ontology of these achievements of subject formation, the thesis is also about the indexicalities of the language practices under investigation. I ask how a selection of Chinese and Taiwanese perform Chinese and Taiwanese identities in the early 21st century and how two university lecturers respond to these performances.

Linguistic ideologies

Indexicalities refer to the manner in which people’s language choices and practices wittingly or otherwise construct identity positions (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). The inherent political and sociohistorical associations of any linguistic form, in this case of any utterance, are understood as its indexical meanings (Peirce, 1955). In other words, such indexicalities are the links between language practices undertaken and the social meanings generated by these practices. These meanings are forged from linguistic ideologies, which, put simply, mean the attitudes and beliefs people hold towards languages and dialects, along with their attitudes towards the speakers of different language varieties. Bucholtz and Hall (2005, p 594) state that ‘associations between language and identity are rooted in cultural beliefs and values – that is, ideologies – about the sorts of speakers who (can or should) produce particular sorts of language.’ Writing of Bakhtin’s ‘critique of language as category’, as thing, Stewart (1983, p. 267) states that ‘Bakhtin assumes that the individual is constituted by the social, that consciousness is a matter of dialogue and juxtaposition with a social Other.’ Therefore, as I investigate how global processes locally shape identities in interaction (and those identities in turn shape global processes locally), what can also be seen is how entire macro-linguistic systems like languages and dialects are indexed to identity categories like gender, ethnicity, sexuality and class. In bearing witness to the centripetal and centrifugal heteroglossia between student and lecturer language use and ideologies, I

---

1 By way of clarification, this PhD thesis distinguishes between Chinese and Taiwanese participants because the Taiwanese participants themselves articulated such a distinction in terms of identity and origins.
analyse another tussle between these fixed macro-demographic categories (e.g. ethnicity) and the emergent micro contingencies of the interactional moment and the setting.

National as notional

Another category of difference typically, to use Bhabha’s (1994) expression, intoned; that is another fixed and pre-fabricated product of modernism and colonialism seemingly ill-suited and ill-fitting as race, class and gender to analysis of the practices and phenomena of a post-modern, post-analogue and post-colonial world, is that of national language. National language is understood here, according to linguist Max Weinreich, as being a dialect with an army and a navy. For Bakhtin (1981, p. 270), ‘unitary language constitutes the theoretical expression of the historical process of linguistic unification and centralization, an expression of the centripetal forces of language’ and, therefore, a ‘unitary language is not something given but is always in essence posited.’ As a result, I follow Widdowson (1994) in observing how the ownership of a normatively given and unitary language like English is contested and co-opted by speakers whose repertoire English enters, in the process emerging less national language than notional language. As a result of this, as a result of understanding language as ‘ideologically saturated’, ‘centripetal’ and ‘posited’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 271), Bakhtin again employs communication as the focus of his studies and therefore the utterance, rather than the sentence (a grammatical entity), as the fundamental unit of communication (Holquist, 1983). Indeed, I am aware that ‘even using the term “language” skews the position that Bakhtin took toward verbal behavior’ (Stewart, 1983, p. 266) and runs the risk of reifying product over process.

Transformation and transnational contact

The historical transformation that both underpins and is instantiated by – that emerges through – through the communication practices, the utterances that I investigate includes the transformative exigencies of globalisation, late capitalism, post-nationalism and lives lived online. Specifically, I aim to explore and explain the performance of post-modern, post-Cold War Chinese and Taiwanese identities, through documentation and analysis of one communicative
practice of twenty three Chinese and Taiwanese university students in one particular moment and movement of historical transformation – an early 21st century metropolitan university in Australia. The students are from disparate disciplines and provinces; half knew the others as recent classmates in Australia and half did not know anyone involved. Several expressed an interest in eventual permanent residency in Australia, but none expressed an outright commitment to this goal. As ever, there were contingencies.

For my purposes, communication practices refer to everyday language practices brought to prominence and increased frequency by processes of globalisation including transnational migration, language hybridization and online interaction. These practices are what Canagarajah (2011, p. 2), for example, describes as ‘transnational contact in diverse social, economic and cultural domains [that] has increased the interaction between languages and language groups...[and]...has involved people taking their heritage languages to new locales and developing repertoires that were not traditionally part of their community.’ In these transnational settings, not all of which need to involve migration or movement to geographically new locales but could instead involve the changing dynamics of domestic locales, participants ‘adopt creative strategies to engage with each other and represent their voices’ (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 2).

Contrasting what he considers to be the deliberate and calculated hybridisation employed by a novelist, for example, with the ‘unintentional, unconscious’ hybridization that occurs in what he terms non-artistic language use, Bakhtin (1981, pp. 359/60) argues that the evolution of all languages is driven by such means. What might be described therefore as the beneficent mutation and concomitant adaptation of languages in response to changes in the sociolinguistic environment, whereby certain forms – utterances – are favoured and flourish while others disappear. Why then, I ask, are the translingual practices employed by many young Chinese and Taiwanese flourishing? What does this practice tells us about the contested and dialogic “evolution” of something ever more tendentiously called and categorized as English?
The hyphenated form *trans-linguistics* was coined by Holquist (1983, p. 307) as synonym for the Bakhtinian term for the ‘teeming forces which jostled each other within the combat zone of the word’, otherwise known as heteroglossia. Accordingly, I investigate trans-linguistic communicative or language practices, that is heteroglossia: ‘the internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects, characteristic group behavior, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day, even of the hour’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 262-3). With such heteroglossia foregrounded, it is clear that the diversity of communicative practices available within a national language might well exceed those available between or among national languages.

### 1.3 Thesis Overview and Outline

It is my contention that the descriptor “English names” is both unhelpful and inaccurate when used to label and inform the practice undertaken near exclusively by the Chinese and Taiwanese participants. Inaccurate because frequently the names used are not normatively English (e.g. Yuki and other conventionally Japanese names often used by Taiwanese girls) and, indeed, evidence from social media (e.g. Facebook) suggests that Chinese living in, for example, Italy use quote-unquote Italian names. Inaccurate also because the names sometimes are not, again normatively speaking, names (examples from my research include Seven, Dr Galaxy, and BOP). Unhelpful, finally, because terming them English names reifies this practice as somehow English rather than, for example, as something Chinese or something transnational, a translinguaging event. The focus in other words is on the product and not the process. Consequently, in the interests of locating this practice within Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia, Li Wei’s (2011) *Translanguaging Space*, Pennycook’s (2010) *relocalisation*, Rampton’s (1995, 2010) crossing and contemporary urban vernaculars, and Blommaert’s (2003) *Late Modern Discourse*, and in response to the epistemological challenges posed accordingly, the best possible outcome would be to term the names as neither belonging to English nor Chinese language systems, but belonging to a process- and repertoire-based heuristic of languaging.
An introductory gloss of the four research questions pursued in this PhD study, which are provided formally in section 3.2, are firstly, what is it that the Taiwanese and Chinese participants are actually doing; secondly, how do they account for the practices they are undertaking; thirdly, how do some of their university lecturers account for and respond to the practice; and finally, what does it or can it mean for identity performance, language use and language-as-product, especially among young, mobile, and globalized Chinese and Taiwanese, in an early 21st century setting? Furthermore, I am interested in what it tells us about English, about capital L language, as contested and emergent, as process, rather than as fixed and formulaic product.

The thesis is structured as follows. Following this Introduction chapter, the Literature Review that comprises Chapter Two is divided into three broad sections with attendant sub-sections. The first section surveys conventional Chinese naming practices in terms of Confucian address forms and the semantics, grammar and processes of Chinese names and naming. What is evident from this review is that conventions of Chinese culture continue to cast a long and productive shadow over Chinese and Taiwanese subjects’ communicative practices, especially the importance of factors like relationality and contextuality. The first section also provides the theoretical foundation for understanding the pragmatic and phonological considerations that underpin the practice. The second section of Chapter Two surveys the existing research into English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese, with some discussion also of related studies among ethnic Chinese in Singapore and Hong Kong, both more normatively post-colonial settings.

Having established the context of the research, the third section of the Literature Review then introduces the theoretical framework for analysis and discussion of the data, drawn largely from the works of Bakhtin (1981), Blommaert (2003), Li Wei (2011), Pennycook (2010) and Rampton (1995, 2005), but including related research into translingual language use, language ownership, globalisation, deterritorialisation, and (re)localisation. Chapter Three provides the research
questions and the qualitative research design for the study, the latter comprising university classroom and language exchange observations and audio-recordings, Focus Group Discussions and semi-structured interviews and limited use of researcher field notes. Furthermore, Chapter Three provides the coding framework used for to present the data and the themes I arrived at through repeated reviews of the accumulated data.

Chapter Four, the Findings chapter, then presents the data from all sources as divided up into six thematic categories. I acknowledge that these aspects or themes have been chosen and labelled for exposition and analysis of the practice by me rather than the participants or existing heuristics. The raison d’être for the themes is a consequence of their frequency of mention or reference by the research participants. I therefore consider the themes to be emergent from the data and not a priori, predetermined categories. Chapter Five discusses the data in relation to previous research into the area and drawing upon the theoretical framework provided in Chapter Two. This chapter commences with a discussion of the data related to what might be provisionally referred to as the pragmatic, phonological and anthropomomastically Chinese elements of the practice. Next, the translingual and heteroglossic theoretical framework for analysis is revisited before the data are thematically analysed in light of this framework. Finally, Chapter Six concludes with a statement of how the research aims have been achieved, the implications of the findings, as well as providing reflections on the study and recommendations for further research.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The Literature Review is organised into three broad sections and performs three functions. The first section provides a sociolinguistic analysis of Chinese naming conventions and practices. What is evident is that conventions of traditional Chinese and Confucian culture continue to cast a substantial and productive shadow over Chinese and Taiwanese subjects’ contemporary language and identity practices, especially the importance of relationality and contextuality for naming and address practices and, indeed, for aspects of Chinese conceptions and performances of self (cf. Jiang Xinyan, 2006; Li Wei and Li Yue, 1996). This first section also provides the theoretical foundations for understanding the pragmatic and phonological considerations that for many participants and much of the literature are considered to influence the practice of English name use. Finally, this first section underscores that Chinese names are fundamentally written, character-based entities whose rendering in pinyin, or, as is typically the case in Australia, into the English alphabet, effectively resulting in misapprehension, mispronunciation and the absence of the glyphic name’s aesthetic and symbolic expression.

The second section of the Literature Review surveys current research into what is typically termed “English name” use, both in Chinese (including Hong Kongese) and Taiwanese geographical settings as well as off-shore in North America and the United Kingdom among diasporic and sojourning Chinese. The research findings are drawn largely from English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) university classrooms, graduate language studies classes in the USA and a multinational private company based in Shanghai. As far as I am aware, no research has been conducted into these practices within the context of Australian universities and across a diverse range of disciplines and in such depth as is undertaken in this thesis. Taking Diao’s (2014) recommendations to heart, I pursue further study among other areas ‘that are less concerned with language and identity but meanwhile are
extremely popular among transnational Chinese students (e.g. engineering, business), involving Chinese students from disciplines as diverse as commerce and business, engineering, architecture, and language studies. Moreover, it includes a mix of undergraduates and graduates from both Taiwan and mainland China. Again, in considering Diao’s (2014) concluding recommendations, I also include Chinese students whose names are and are not ‘phonologically transparent’ (p. 220), and who also discuss the negotiation of name choice practices outside of their specific academic communities.

Canagarajah (2011, p. 5) comments that little is known of how interlocutors ‘interpret and respond to these translanguaging displays.’ My study provides this perspective, highlighting the dialogic and heteroglossic essence of the practice, with the inclusion of university lecturer accounts of their experiences and negotiations of the practice. These two participants are convenors, content developers and lecturers on a tertiary graduate program on which I had also developed course content and curriculum, lectured and tutored for six years. As a consequence, there is a tangible sense in which my ‘membership knowledge of this reality [the graduate program] is crucial for the analysis. For, while the participants themselves might not be able to verbalise their orientation to this or that aspect of the interaction, the analyst can recognize and interpret it based on his/her shared understanding of the social world’ (Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008, p. 656). Indeed, one striking aspect of the research for me was how unremarkable the practice seemed to most Chinese and Taiwanese participants until I began to draw their attention to aspects of it in the course of observing, interviewing and discussing.

Finally, in the third section, the Literature Review introduces the theoretical framework or heuristic employed to analyse and discuss the data collected and to account for the phenomenon. The theoretical framework draws from work such as Blommaert’s (2003) Sociolinguistics of Globalisation (including his notion of Late Modern Discourse), Bakhtin’s dialogised heteroglossia (1981), Li Wei’s (2011) translanguaging space, Rampton’s (1995, 2010) crossing and contemporary urban vernaculars, Nononi and Ong’s (1997) ‘transnational publics’, and Pennycook’s (2007) theories of transcultural flows and (2010) relocalisation.
2.2 CHINESE AND CONFUCIAN NAMING CONVENTIONS AND PRACTICES FROM A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE.

A caveat on Confucian confusions and new Chinese subjectivities

Literature on Chinese naming conventions and practices from a sociolinguistic perspective tends to contrast their relative complexity with the perceived simplicity of Western models. Typically, this contrast is understood to hinge around two fundamental social differences observed between Western and Chinese social models. Firstly, that Chinese society is hierarchically oriented with social status and seniority both reflected in and reinforced by intricate naming conventions and address forms. Secondly, that Chinese society takes the family as its prototypical social organisation and, therefore, specific familial kin terms tend to be employed between family relations but also, more significantly, with non-kin interlocutors. Neither of these aspects is unique to Chinese culture but it is apparent in research literature and participant accounts that both exercise a strong influence over contemporary Chinese naming and address practices.

From these perspectives, the Chinese individual is understood conventionally and fundamentally as ‘a relational being’ and never as ‘an isolated, separate identity...[but rather one]...socially situated, defined and shaped in a relational context’ (King and Bond, 1985, pp. 31). Jiang (2006, p. 544) claims that ‘what distinguishes the Confucian notion of self from others’ is its emphasis on the relational nature of self... the concept of the relational self is an opposite of the concept of the autonomous self.’ An understanding that the self is relational is to argue that an individual is primarily identified by his or her social roles and relationships to others, so that his or her social roles and relationships are a fundamental constitutive part of his or her personal identity (Jiang, 2006). Invariably then the name/s used to refer to this individual or used by that individual underpin such heightened relationality and contextuality. That said, Jiang (2006, p. 544) states also that ‘the concept of the relational self, understood as such, is not incompatible with the belief that a person is autonomous in the sense that the self has a capacity to reflect and choose.
I acknowledge the findings of Zhu Hua’s (2015) study of a diasporic Chinese family resident in the UK, and the different family members’ use of interactional resources to perform desired cultural identities. In Zhu Hua’s (2015) discussion of Chinese address terms, especially the contrast drawn between Chinese and English address terms, the author observes that Chinese address forms, like Confucian social practices of which they are one example, are ‘very sensitive’ (p. 116) to ‘roles, status, degrees of intimacy and familiarity, age, gender and situational contexts.’ As a result, there is conventionally a preference among Chinese for pseudo-kinship name use, ‘contrary to the use of first name to address friends or colleagues’ (p. 116) that tends to characterise English practices. That noted, what is also apparent in Zhu Hua’s (2015) study is that the 40-something year old Chinese émigré parents’ preference for classically Chinese address forms to be used in English language family discussion of Chinese friends is contested by the practices of their teenage son, whose dominant language is English. Contrary to his parents, the son prefers to use English first names for Chinese and British-born Chinese family friends and peers indiscriminately, to both circumvent Chinese conventions of address and to perform his globalized identity as a Chinese-born, London-raised youth.

In my survey of Chinese naming and address practices and conventions of address, I also heed Gao’s (1995) concept of the ‘paradox of intercultural communication’. This paradox means that intercultural understanding is, on the one hand, premised on an understanding of measures of cultural difference and, let me add, of cultural homogeneity. However, on the other hand, the positing of such cultural difference runs the risk of perpetuating cultural stereotypes through articulation of such difference, and the reification of fixed demographic categories like culture, ethnicity and nationality. Therefore, cultural relativism invoked out of sensitivity might in fact further “otherise” a group. Accordingly, I acknowledge that relationality, as a concept underpinning intersubjective construction of selves in naming and address practices and address practices, is not a quality unique to Chinese culture and language; it is a question of degrees and not of absolutes, nor is it equally practised among all.
As much as possible, I strive to mitigate exoticisation and essentialisation of Chinese and Chinese-ness. Nononi and Ong (1997, pp. 8-9) in late 20th century representations of Chinese diaspora argue that much research persists in the assumption of:

‘intrinsic and timeless features of Chinese culture, which persist even in the midst of non-Chinese society. Even when cross-cultural borrowings and exchanges are acknowledged, the essentializing Orientalist binary opposition of East versus West is restored in such neo-Confucian triumphalist visions.’

What therefore ensues for Nononi and Ong (1997) is that as a consequence of such analyses, the geographical and geopolitical state of China (distinct from the nation and the multiple “locals” of globally dispersed Chinese) remains reified as the primal source and foundation of “Chinese culture”. What should concern research into processes and products of ‘Chinese transnationalism’ (Nononi and Ong, 1997) are the ‘new Chinese subjectivities found in the global arena’ (p. 4). Analytically, I walk a tightrope between new Chinese subjectivities and traditional Chinese discourses and practices, including accounts of Confucianism, across a heteroglossic sea filled with essentialisation and exoticisation. In other words, a by-product of my research is the problematisation of terms like Chinese and Confucianism.

‘More than 220,000,000 options for given names’

Claiming that early Western philosophers tended to be concerned with the etymological semantics of names, Li (1997, p. 490) believes that classical (i.e. Confucian) Chinese scholars were instead ‘keen on delimiting the kind of “referent” which would match the signifié designated by the míng [name] in question...what kinds of behavior, or referents, constitute the designate of the corresponding words in Chinese.’ A key point from this observation being that an etymology of a name for Chinese scholars was less important than its fatalistic, relational and auspicious qualities. A third key difference between Chinese and Western practices that has been observed (e.g. Xu and Nicholson, 1992) is that Western cultures have tended to have numerous different family names yet considerably fewer given names. However, the situation in China is the absolute reverse with some 500 family names servicing (the c. 1992) 1.1 billion Chinese people - more up to date figures not yet being obtainable. For Western names,
therefore, the family name might be considered ‘the discriminative part’ (p. 500) while given names are frequently common to different and unrelated people. Xu and Nicholson’s (1992) point nevertheless being that the Chinese have relatively few family names available but, theoretically, ‘more than 220,000,000 options for given names’ should two of the available 14,872 available Chinese characters be combined (p. 501). Therefore, contrastively, given names are considered discriminative for Chinese and the focus would be on the – at least in principle – substantial diversity of possible given names. As a result, uniqueness of given names is a constituent quality of Chinese names and naming.

2.2.1 Some differences between Western and Chinese naming practices

Qin (2008) also notes two differences between Chinese and North American terms of address forms. Firstly, Chinese tend to extend kinship terms to non-family members, whereas ‘[North] Americans use general social terms of address to address these non-family members’ and, secondly, Chinese tend to use titles to address superiors much more so than North Americans do. As ever, I am aware of the fraught nature of such generalisations across what are diverse populations. Nevertheless, two other factors that underpin conventional Chinese address practices are seniority/age and, due to Chinese social norms of humbleness and respectfulness, ‘more nonreciprocal exchanges of address are used in Chinese while there are more reciprocal exchanges in English [among North American interlocutors’].

Qin (2008) draws on Brown and Ford’s (1961) study, which advanced the semantic rules underpinning forms of address in American English. This study concluded that in American English the two most common forms of address are the use of the first name and of title plus surname. Moreover, it determined that the factors of status and intimacy influence the speaker’s choice of address form, leading Brown to devise the Invariant Norm of Address in 1965. The Invariant Norm of Address states what is described as a culturally universal rule that ‘the linguistic form used to an inferior in dyads of unequal status is used in dyads of equal status among intimates, and that the linguistic form used to a superior in dyads of unequal status is used in dyads of equal status among strangers’ (Qin, 2008, p. 410). Before embarking on the
specifics of Qin’s (2008) own research, the writer summarises three key assumptions integral to a comparison of Chinese and American English address forms. Firstly, the Invariant Form of Address, based in factors of status and intimacy, applies in both languages. Secondly, the usages of terms of address between Chinese and North American English vary substantially (especially use of kinship terms and titles) and Chinese norms of address are more complicated. Thirdly, such differences as outlined in assumptions one and two above derive from cultural, historical and social considerations.

It is also worth noting that Louie (2008, p. 213) states that ‘from time immemorial, Chinese given names have been composed of ordinary words taken from the written language’. This Chinese practice of using “ordinary words” for given names is an important consideration for my research, for example, given that Chinese and Taiwanese sometimes choose so-called “ordinary” English words from their repertoire to operate as English names. However, another caveat seems pertinent here in order to slightly problematise the disingenuousness of the phrase ordinary words. As Bakhtin (1981, p. 293) notes with reference to the stratification of languages, ‘there are no “neutral” words and forms-words and forms that belong to “no one”;...For any individual consciousness living in it, language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world.’ The point being that such “ordinary” words when functioning as names are also invested with the intentions, desires and ideologies of others.

2.2.2 A grammar of Chinese relationships

Gu (1990) presents the Chinese conception of politeness through four of his seven self-formulated ‘politeness maxims’ (p. 245), two of which are especially relevant to my discussion of Chinese naming and address practices. However, prior to elaborating on these maxims of politeness, Gu (1990) considers it important to briefly introduce the classical Confucian notion of lǐ, from which the modern conception of lǐmào (roughly equivalent to politeness in English and literally translatable as polite appearance) is derived. The notion of lǐ does not mean politeness as an Anglo-Celtic Australian might understand it, but refers to ‘the social hierarchy and order of
the slavery system of the Zhou Dynasty (dating back to 1100BC), which was regarded by Confucius as an ideal model of any society’ (p. 238).’ The restoration of lǐ for Confucius required zhèng míng (the rectification of names) so that, interpersonally, people understood ‘in contemporary terminology, sociological definitions and values of an individual’s roles and status. To zhèng míng is to put each individual in his/her place according to his/her social position’ (p. 238). At the core of modern lǐmào, and relevant to the discussion on Chinese naming conventions and address forms, remain the twinned Confucian concepts of denigration of self and elevation of other/interlocutor.

King and Bond (1985) conceptualize lǐ as ‘the grammar of relationships’ (p. 30) and the ideal Confucian society as ‘a massive and complicated role system...embedded in the doctrine of zhèng míng (rectification of names).’ For Confucianism, relationships are paramount and are configured in the ‘Five Cardinal Relations (wu lún), namely those between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend...[of which]...three belong to the family and the other two are based on the family model’ (p. 32). Friendship, in other words, is always conceptualized in familial, kinship terms (p. 38). An important aspect of the Confucian social contract and, therefore, the abovementioned ‘self-directed role’ an individual might assume, is that the notion of lǐ meant that each individual was required to perform his social role and failure to do so meant that his or her partner/interlocutor was not obliged to honour his or her own responsibilities. In a chapter titled, The family romance of Mandarin capital, Ong (1999, p. 143) analyses south-east Asian diasporic Chinese publics in which the ‘construct of family romance(s)...[means]...the collective and unconscious images of family order that underlie public politics’ and underpin Chinese capitalism.

Despite the prescriptivism of the Five Cardinal Relations, King and Bond (1985) emphasise that ‘nowhere does Confucius discuss relations among strangers’ (p. 39) so, conventionally, Chinese people have tended to be uncertain in such social situations involving non-kin and non-primary group members. In other words, Confucian principles have tended to be ‘particularistic, but not universalistic’ (p. 39), and considerations of key Confucian principles like status deference,
implicit in the five hierarchical *lun* or dyads, for example, are compromised in unmediated contacts with strangers. Accordingly, interactions with people from what are frequently termed egalitarian cultures like mainstream Australia (cf. Samovar et al., 2013), especially involving use of appropriate address forms and names, may cause uncertainty since equal relationships have little precedence in the conventional Chinese social experience.

**Denigration of self, elevation of other**

Li Wei and Li Yue’s (1996) paper titled 'My stupid wife and ugly daughter': the use of pejorative reference as a politeness strategy by Chinese speakers’ underscores the prevalence and persistence of self-denigration and “intimate other” denigration in contemporary Chinese communication practices, drawing its data from urban educated Chinese resident in Beijing. Li Wei and Li Yue (1996, p. 141) write that this practice ‘has alternatively charmed and shocked Westerners.’ Nevertheless, the authors argue that the key to understanding such public displays of denigration of self, friends and family among Chinese is an understanding of the considerably broader and multiple reference for the Chinese concept of self in contrast to the typical Western concept of unitary and bounded self. For Chinese, ‘self’ extends beyond the fundamental ego or I and includes close friends and family members, so the denigration of these people by the speaker in their presence equals the denigration of self. Discussing the pragmatic importance of choosing appropriate address forms when communicating, Li Wei and Li Yue (1996) assert that ‘amongst the aspects of assumed external context that are determinate of politeness in Chinese societies, the power-distance relationship between interactants is particularly important’ (p. 130).

**Interpellation through address**

Gu’s (1990) second specifically Chinese naming conventions-related maxim is the Address Maxim, whereby ‘to address one’s interlocutor is not simply a matter of uttering some sounds to draw the interlocutor’s attention’ (p. 248). Rather, terms of address acknowledge the interlocutor as a social being in a specific social role or position and the relationship between the speaker and interlocutor. Gu (1990, p. 249) lists nine considerations that determine appropriate
use of address terms: ‘(1) kin or non-kin, (2) politically superior or inferior, (3) professionally
prestigious or non-prestigious, (4) interpersonally familiar or unfamiliar, solidary or non-solidary,
(5) male or female, (6) old or young, (7) on a formal or informal occasion, (8) family members or
non-relatives, (9) in public or at home. Of these (1), (5), (8) and (9) are binary opposites, whereas
the remaining ones are scales.’ Having listed these nine, Gu (1990) suggests three differences
between Chinese and English conventions that tend to cause cross-cultural frustrations and
ambiguities.

Firstly, Chinese surnames are non-kin terms of public address whereas the so-called middle +
given name is a ‘kin familial address term’ (p. 250) for use between family members of the same
generation or in downward communication between older and younger generation members.
However, the given name alone tends to be used only between lovers and infrequently by
parents. Gu (1990) notes that Chinese intellectuals abroad, particularly in the UK and particularly
females, ‘will be considerably embarrassed’ (p. 250) when addressed by friends and colleagues
with the middle/generation+given name or, worse, the given name alone. Admittedly this
research is now over two decades old. Secondly, Chinese kinship terms enjoy a generalized usage
outside of familial relations. Thirdly, professional terms (e.g. teacher) are frequently perfectly
appropriate as address terms.

As is common practice in the literature on Chinese naming conventions and terms of address, a
contrast is drawn by Li (1997) between so-perceived typically Western operations and the
equivalent Chinese scenario. Western businesspeople typically transition from the use of title
plus first names to first names alone relatively quickly, as a reflection and reinforcement of a
closer acquaintance. Nevertheless, Li (1997) cites the literature on cross-cultural interactions as
describing this scenario as ‘more an exception than a rule’ (p. 502), so that in a classical
Confucian model, ‘the relationship between friends, the last of the Five Cardinal Relations...is
couched in kinship terms with a hierarchical flavor’ (e.g. older and younger brother). Therefore,
even with intra-cultural communication, Chinese businesspeople typically take more time and
require more prescribed stages to develop an intimacy that permits the use of less formal terms of address.

2.2.3 A grammar of Chinese names

A complexity of Chinese and Confucian address practices

Li (1997, p. 493) is hardly alone in describing Chinese conventions of (inter)personal naming as ‘slightly more complex’ than Western conventions. Noting that the Chinese personal name comprises a typically monosyllabic surname (xing) followed by a typically disyllabic given name (míngzi or míng), Li (1997) observes that a naming universal is most likely that a child’s name embodies his or her parents’ expectations for the child. As discussed earlier, Chinese parents (or indeed grandparents or, traditionally, soothsayers) might also choose the characters for their child’s name from the total stock of characters available. Therefore, Li (1997, p. 493) notes that ‘a Chinese full name has the linguistic status of a compound word’, whereby the name’s meaning might be deduced from the interaction of all its component parts and the full name will be used commonly in public, downward non-intimate interactions.

Bearing in mind the quality of relationality that applies to Chinese naming practices and the notion that such relationality predisposes an addressee or addressee to name changes and adaptations, Wang (2011) identifies nine different possibilities of ‘first naming address’ (p. 1228/9) in China and its varieties. Firstly, the use of a one-character first name and, secondly, the use of a two-character first name. Thirdly, Chinese people may address one another using the one-character first name plus the radical ér or ㄦ meaning ‘child’ or ‘son’. Fourthly, Chinese may address each other with a two-character first name comprising the ‘duplication of a one-character first name’ (e.g. Weiwei). Fifthly, Chinese people may append ā or ah or 阿 to a first name in order to produce a two-character diminutive. Chinese may precede a one-character first name with xiǎo or ‘小’ to produce a ‘little name’ or nickname, typically used before the family choose a given name for the new-born child.
Using the general heading terms of address, Chao (1956) discusses both the background to and usage of vocatives and designatives in mid-20th century colloquial Mandarin. Vocatives are terms of direct address employed when calling a person, that is a word used to identify the addressee, while designatives are used when speaking of people. For my research, Chao’s (1956) analysis of Mandarin vocatives is especially relevant, if somewhat classical and conservative. His 1956 classic analysis is referenced still by other researchers into Chinese naming and address practices, so I include discussion of it here. Specifically, Chao (1956, p. 217) presents the circumstances of actual use of vocatives in interpersonal relations, grammatical details of the terms, and more formal use. Chao (1956) notes at the beginning of the section on Chinese proper names that there are only several hundred patrilineal surnames inherited by a person and that a monosyllabic surname, that is the overwhelming majority, ‘is not a free form, but must be bound to something else to form an independent word’ (p. 221).

Secondly, all children are given two names upon or soon after birth: an official or formal name (colloquially known as a ‘school name’ (p. 221)), and a milk name or pet name used primarily during early childhood and mentioned above. In contrast to the bound status of monosyllabic surnames, monosyllabic milk or pet names (e.g. Treasure, Precious or a zodiac sign like Dragon) are free. Some milk or pet names may be disyllabic like Little Dragon or, designating birth order among children, Little Three. If the school or formal name, míng, has two syllables, it is a free form and might be used alone, though rarely for direct address (p. 221). However, if it is monosyllabic, then just like surnames comprising one syllable, it is bound and must be used with a surname first or with a kinship term. Chao (1956) notes that it was ‘a growing practice’ (p. 222) to bestow upon a child a monosyllabic or one-character given name.

Chao (1956, p. 222) then provides the example of a Chinese man named Wang Liang (surname + monosyllabic given name). His nephews and nieces would call him Uncle Wang, some people speak of him as Wang Liang, but he will not be called simply Liang since it is his only given name, and therefore not free. The exceptions to this rule are that his parents and a close family member older than him may call him by his given name alone. Indeed, the capacity and authority
to address a Chinese person by a monosyllabic name equates with substantial intimacy and familiarity.

An interesting example of this tendency against monosyllabic name use except for certain intimate or exceptionally downward circumstances is provided by, perhaps better, inferred through Diao’s (2014) Chinese research participant Anna. Anna acquired her English name from a foreign English teacher at her Chinese University, as was the practice, and also observed that the Chinese professors in her faculty used English names. Anna notes that when she graduated and began teaching at the Chinese university, her use of the name Anna obviated the need for her Chinese undergraduate students to (otherwise) address her disyllabically as Teacher Chen, according to dictates of convention, a situation ‘which would have made her sound old’ (Diao, 2014, p. 213). Accordingly, we witness the practice of English name use (undertaken in a mainland Chinese setting) permitting the side-stepping or suspension of two Chinese anthroponomastic norms (i.e. the use of a monosyllabic name in upward communication – pupil to professor and the proper address for a university professor) without compromising Anna’s (or her students’) Chinese identity as evinced through her and their adherence to Chinese interactional norms. As a result, following Blommaert (2005, p. 232), Anna performs not simply one identity with this language choice but mobilises instead ‘a whole repertoire of identity features.’

A name is like ‘wrapping paper’

Liao (2000) presents a sociolinguistic analysis of Taiwanese-Chinese personal names, nicknames and English names while commencing with a discussion of the various socio-historical conventions that influence Chinese naming and address practices. Liao (2000) cites Wang (1992, available in Chinese only), who asserts that while most non-Chinese tend to perceive names as symbols differentiating A from B, Chinese perceive names as fate. Fate that is that might be determined by both the form and content of the name; for example, by its semantics and the number of strokes required to form its characters. Citing Chiu and Huang (1986, available in Chinese only), who analyse Chinese naming and address practices as based on the classical
Chinese text, the *Yi Ching* or Book of Change, Liao (2000, p. 24) notes that for the Chinese certainly ‘the name is the fate of its bearer; the birth-sign is innate, what is changeable concerning one’s fate is the name.’

Yang’s (1996, available in Chinese only) Fortune and Life, written by a fortune-teller, describes a name as like ‘wrapping paper’ (Liao, 2000, p. 27), whereby just ‘as good packaging might influence sale of a product, so a good name will influence an individual.’ Accordingly, there are seven ways to ensure a propitious name including the meaning and aesthetics of the name, the indirect communication of that meaning through poetic words, an ease of articulation and recall, the avoidance of negative or inauspicious homophones, fashionable and contemporary, legally sanctioned, and relative few strokes. Recalling the anthroponomastic directives of the Yi Ching, Cheng (1999, available in Chinese only) emphasises five rules for parents when naming children including the avoidance of unusual characters (i.e. there are tens of thousands of Chinese characters and, hence, potential names, but many people tend to recognize only four or five thousand), avoidance of vulgar, blatantly meaningful or unlucky characters, intra-generational share characters are good but not so inter-generational sharing of characters, the melody of the three characters should not be falling or even but euphonically sing-song, and the two personal name characters should not contain any of six negative and unpleasant radicals.

Watson (1986) notes that uniqueness of names is important among Chinese and the prospect of sharing one’s name with another is so ‘extraordinary’ (p. 622) that in Taiwan at least it is legal grounds for name change should two people in the same city share names. Moreover, “inelegant” names or names shared with wanted criminals can also be changed’ (p. 622). Discussing the importance of ‘individuation of name’ (p. 88) in China, Sung (1981) outlines several legal grounds for name change in Taiwan. Firstly, should one study or work with another who bears the same name, one may apply for a name change. Secondly, should one share the same name as another in the same city or province for longer than six months, a name change is permissible. Thirdly, should one’s name be shared by a fugitive from the law, a name change is warranted. Finally, should a person’s name be ‘inelegant...vulgar or bad’ (p. 88), a name change
is permissible. As a result, we see a capacity for name change (and concomitant acknowledgement of the potency of names) in traditional social practices.

Names and feng shui

Watson (1986) also discusses the traditional Chinese belief that each person possesses a unique combination of the five fundamental elements of earth, wind, fire, metal and water. Therefore, a month or so after a birth, an infant is traditionally taken to a fortune teller and their eight-character horoscope or pa tzu is determined. Importantly, however, pa tzu is not inescapable destiny since a person’s fate may be altered and a key manner of altering fate is through (re)naming. Should the infant’s míng be elementally unbalanced, an appropriate radical may be added to a character and balance restored. In other words, ‘it is obvious that Chinese personal names do things: they not only classify and distinguish but also have an efficacy in their own right’ (Watson, 1986, p. 622). Most importantly, Watson’s (1986) analysis emphasises that it is the character-based written form of the Chinese name that is fundamental to meaning, fate and fortune. This allows for an important distinction to be drawn between the Chinese person’s name as written or character-based entity and as spoken utterance. Such a formal distinction, something entirely absent in and alien to an alphabetic language like English, permits me to reiterate the important fatalistic nature of Chinese names and the fundamentally written or character-based ontology of this fatalism.

Given that spoken Chinese produces numerous homonyms, the two-word or two-character name combination when spoken may fail to elicit the intended meaning and, therefore, ‘the intended meaning of a name (that is, the two-character míng) is only apparent when it is written’ (p. 623). As a consequence, a nickname, for example, formed frequently on the basis of the formal name comes to matter tremendously in everyday spoken interactions. ‘In the written form the meaning of this name is perfectly clear, but in the spoken form it can be misunderstood or misconstrued, sometimes with disastrous consequences’ (p. 623). The written characters when viewed may elicit comment on account of their beauty, elegance or auspicious combination yet when uttered, or ‘simply spoken, however, it is in a sense “just a name”’ (p.
623). In other words, in spoken form, the “name” loses its glyphic potency and may have its meaning confounded by homophones.

2.2.4 Romanised Chinese names: lost in translation

The Guardian newspaper (September 19 2014) carries the Reuters syndicated story of an Indian TV news anchor who was fired for referring to the Chinese president Xi Jinping as Eleven Jinping, ‘apparently confusing Xi’s name with the Roman numerals XI’, during a visit to India by the Chinese president to boost trade and economic ties and resolve a border dispute between the two counties. An official spokesperson from the Indian television network described the news anchor’s actions as ‘an unpardonable mistake’. This section of the Literature Review will discuss how the mispronunciation by a non-Chinese speaker using English of Chinese names Romanised may be entirely understandable and, as a consequence, pardonable.

Zhou (2010) states that Chinese people are accustomed to knowing each other firstly through their family names and only secondly through their given names. Xu and Nicolson (1992) state that Chinese work colleagues tend to address each other with family names, and that while the family name is patrilineal, given names may be chosen from any of the available Chinese characters. ‘The 11 most common family names, Chen, He, Hu, Li, Liu, Wang, Wu, Xu, Zhang, Zhao, and Zhu, account for about 40% of the Chinese’ (p. 501). That is that each of the eleven is shared by roughly 42 million Chinese as per 1992 statistics. However, it is important to consider when approaching these statistics Xu and Nicolson’s (1992) later observation that ‘a Romanised Chinese family name may actually correspond to two or more different family names in Chinese characters, e.g. Li to at least five, Wang to two, and Wu to seven’ (p. 502). In other words, these 11 most common may in fact number more than 20.

Xu and Nicolson’s (1992) contention is that when Chinese names are Romanised, it is this distinctiveness that suffers since although ‘many different Chinese characters are phonetically identical, the available phonetic transcription systems (e.g. Wade-Giles and pinyin) are unable to convey the original face of the Chinese language’ (p. 501). Expressed statistically, the 14,972
Chinese characters correspond to only 1,366 pinyin syllables so that each transcribed syllable might represent on average 11 different Chinese characters with each character having a different meaning. Xu and Nicolson (1992, p. 502) write that ‘without a cross-reference, one cannot usually retrieve the original Chinese name after it is Romanised.’ Such a point attaches greater importance to Watson’s (1986) assertion that when uttered and not accompanied by the written character, a Chinese name loses its essential talismanic quality as fortune or fate signifier or touchstone and becomes instead ‘just a name’ (p. 623).

Author Xu Zhao Ran states that the Romanised version of his name might indeed correspond to 1680 different name in Chinese characters since ‘Xu is the pinyin syllable corresponding to two common family names in Chinese characters (and 137 other characters not used for common family names), Zhao is the syllable for 42 different characters (including one common family name) and Ran for 20’ (1992, p. 502). Finally, the authors arrive at the kernel of their argument which is that when abbreviating Romanised Chinese names in a typical Western manner (i.e. initials = family name/Z. R. Xu), what transpires is that ‘one abbreviates the more discriminative part (given name) and retains in full the often undiscriminative [sic] information (family name)’ (Xu and Nicolson, 1992, p. 502). The equivalent action performed on Western names would leave biographical information amounting to Richard S or Janet P.

Tan (2001) discusses English naming practices among Singaporeans, observing that, unlike with Anglo-American naming and address practices, the surname always precedes the given names since this operates to reflect the primacy of the family in Chinese culture. Furthermore, Tan (2001) notes that all Chinese characters are theoretically available for use as given names whereas, typically in English, some words are ‘especially reserved for names’ (p. 47). From the perspective of this research, Tan’s point is understood as being two-fold. Firstly, meaning, what Tan (2001, p. 47) terms ‘the semantic transparency of Chinese-based given names’, is fundamental to name choice (in a manner in which it tends conventionally not to be in English cf. ‘Matthew means gift of God’, yet ‘how many of us know...that...?’).
Secondly, Tan notes that in mainland China, a subject’s official name is that which is rendered in Chinese characters whereas in Singapore it is the Romanised version of the name – transcribed into English, typically without tonal information, using the pinyin system – that is fixed and so constitutes the subject’s official name and, ergo, the subject. Tan (2001, p. 49) observes that the pinyin version of his name ‘looks totally alien to me.’ While I acknowledge that the language situation in the Commonwealth can be analysed as substantially different to that of Mainland China and Taiwan, Tan’s second reflection is of keen relevance to the research at hand since my logged field notes include the point made by a Chinese student that frequently, when meeting for the first time, Chinese people will both state their names as well as draw the characters in the air for the other/s to see. Subsequent discussion with participants confirms that a more common practice is the description of the Chinese character/s since the name as uttered (even by proficient or native Chinese speakers) and the name as rendered in pinyin or Romanised forms are inadequate for the essential task of identifying the characters and therefore properly apprehending the name’s full and auspicious, semantic and aesthetic significations. As a result, an issue I explore further, in line with Tan’s (2001) observation above and upon participant response, is the extent to which a Chinese name transcribed using pinyin into English – as is the practice – and without the accompanying Chinese characters, is so ‘totally alien’ to the Chinese subject and his/her Chinese interlocutors as to become, in effect, meaningless to the subject.

Summary of section 2.2

This section has highlighted tendencies and conventions in Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices that involve Chinese and Taiwanese in and might predispose them to name change, augmentation and accumulation. In doing so, it outlines the theoretical foundations for aspects of the accounts provided by my Chinese and Taiwanese research participants. I began with some contrasts between mainstream Chinese and Confucian and Western and Australian naming and address practices, before considering tendencies of Chinese naming and address practices and the fatalism and features of Chinese names as fundamentally written, character-based phenomena. I discussed the attendant issues of Romanisation into pinyin, often resulting in ambiguous pronunciation and alien transcription of Chinese names, as well as the
mispronunciation of such names by non-Chinese in turn yielding often undesirable, inauspicious and unrecognisable homonyms (not to forget termination of employment). Finally, I reported on research into the near ubiquitous use of first-name basis address in egalitarian, low context (cf. Hall, 1976) cultures like Australia, and its connotations of warmth, openness and equality might be assimilated by Chinese and Taiwanese without recourse to violation of Confucian, non-symmetrical naming conventions through the deployment of these so-called “English names”. More specifically, the section has outlined pragmatic reasons why so-called English names might provide a solution to the problem of relations with strangers outside of a Confucian framework and, indeed, outside of a Chinese cultural and linguistic context.

2.3 RESEARCH INTO PRACTICES OF ENGLISH NAME USE AMONG DOMESTIC AND DIASPORIC CHINESE AND TAIWANESE

Introduction: a practice both diachronic and synchronic

This section commences with a final commonplace of Chinese naming practices, the use of what in Chinese are known as yīngwén míngzi; that is, of English names or, as Duthie (2007) prefers, Western names. The issue over appropriate descriptor for this particular Chinese naming practice has been discussed and is at the heart of this research project, yet to term it an issue suggests that research and debate have been devoted to it. There is no evidence of this in the literature. To term them English names, acritically at least, when many are for example, normatively speaking, neither especially English (e.g. Yuki) nor especially names (e.g. Echo), operates to reify this product branded global English, its presumed ubiquity and monolithic spread. At the same time as privileging the product (an English name) over the process or practice, terming these language items English names works to effectively remove any Chinese-ness and, moreover, indeed worldliness from the practice and the names. The latter term, worldliness, is a key legacy of Edward Said’s (1983) work, which argues that readers, authors and texts cannot be meaningfully analysed without a fundamental awareness of the political circumstances surrounding their production and consumption. Clearly, the incorporation of such
worldliness into the analytical mix takes us beyond simplistic and nation-based notions of etymology (and indeed language). One issue at stake here is Widdowson’s (1994) ‘ownership of English’, and hence the relevance to this study of Widdowson’s comment that,

_You are proficient in a language to the extent that you possess it, make it your own, bend it to your will, assert yourself through it rather than simply submit to the dictates of its form’ (Widdowson, 1994, p. 384)_

The term **Western names**, as employed by U.S anthropologist Duthie (2007) might seem to work better since it does not privilege English, yet it still privileges the West, reifying these products of colonialism, imperialism, and homogeneity and, in turn, discursively constructing and othering the East, the Orient. Again, from the perspectives of both conventional practice and form, many of the names used by Chinese and Taiwanese are simply not Western names. Nevertheless, because of this reification of them as English and Western names, as part and parcel of a perceived global spread of English, presumed by many to flow unidirectionally from Kachru’s (1992) inner circle countries of native speaker, standard Engli

**shes outwards to the peripheries of the so-called non-native English speaking countries; because of this notion then encountered in the literature I find, for example, Heffernan’s (2010, p. 31) distinction between what he terms ‘English personal names and pseudo-names’, and Edwards’ (2006) concerns over appropriateness and implications of name choices. The descriptor therefore reifies such a notion of unidirectional spread and also the discourse of languages that considers them as primarily _a priori_ and discrete structures.

Most Chinese and Taiwanese people who have studied English at school or university, use social media sites like Facebook or LinkedIn, lived in Chinese metropolitan centres, and/or who work in an environment, typically a foreign multinational company, in which English is spoken or foreign capital is involved use or have used English names. Duthie’s (2007) fieldwork, for example, among Chinese business professionals in foreign-invested companies in Shanghai in 2001/2 demonstrates that the higher up one is in such a company, the more English language is used across various contexts (e.g. meetings, email, inter-cultural). Moreover, Duthie (2007, p. 9) reports that ‘a caller on the phone who introduced him/herself in Mandarin but with a Western
name would be assumed to work in a foreign-invested company, be in a relatively high position, be familiar with an English language work environment and speak good English.’ The steps through which English names are acquired, adopted, and adapted, and, moreover, the contexts and constraints of their use vary considerably.

Indeed, as the life narratives of Diao’s (2014) four participants demonstrate, the diversity of such contexts and constraints of use is matched only by the diversity of communicative and symbolic functions claimed for the practice by participants. For Chinese and Taiwanese, name use can be simultaneously a diachronic and synchronic phenomenon with multiple names often held throughout a lifetime and simultaneously across a series of different contexts. As the first section of the Literature Review has shown, this diachronic and synchronic multiple name usage is nothing especially uncommon for many Chinese and Taiwanese. However, most researchers are agreed that pragmatics alone cannot adequately account for what remains a ubiquitous yet often unsystematic and contradictory practice among Chinese and Taiwanese primary, secondary and tertiary students, academics and businesspeople, at home and abroad, in the absence of or indeed the presence of non-Chinese speakers and native English speakers.

McPherron (2009) describes a typical scene, in this instance in a Chinese university, of a Chinese student searching for his/her English name with an Oxford dictionary open and filling a blank sheet of paper with ‘dozens of names of different kinds: nouns, verbs, adjective words, are treated equally’ (p. 526), while another student wonders ‘can a verb be an English name? It’s informal. But at least it can be a unique name because it’s a verb’ (p. 527). Immediately, two aspects of the practice – for some at least – are evident: the quest for singularity or unusualness in name choice and the repudiation of conventional English language naming words as names. We recall these two aspects may be accounted for in Chinese conventions of naming and address practices. Nevertheless, the effort by some researchers to reduce this heteroglossic practice to measures of appropriateness and semantics as judged by unquestioned native English speaker norms and standards is greatly undermined by discussing the creativity, playfulness and innovation of the practice. For example and by way of comparison, analysing the
acceptance in standard English of the technical legal term depone, yet the non-acceptability of the Indian English term prepone, Widdowson (1994, p. 384) proposes that ‘innovation indicates that the language has been learned, not just as a set of fixed conventions to conform to, but as an adaptable resource for making meaning.’ For Widdowson then, prepone, in terms of its relationship to postpone, is derivationally equivalent to the standard terms predate and postdate; however, the difference in acceptability lies in the origins of prepone, ‘coined by a non-native speaking community, so it is not really a proper English word’ (1994, p. 384).

What is evident in Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008) use of a language ecology approach to analyse the multilingual interactions of Mayan, Mexican, Vietnamese, Chinese and Anglo-Saxon residents in the San Francisco market-place, engaged in everyday food shopping practices, is an extension of Widdowson’s (1994) approach. Using the notion of distributed symbolic competence, in which diverse linguistic codes are played with to achieve both communicative aims but also transformation of the communicative space or setting itself, Kramsch and Whiteside (2008, p. 664) demonstrate that ‘in today’s global and migratory world, distinction might not come so much from the ownership of one social or linguistic patrimony (e.g. Mexican or Chinese culture, English language) as much as it comes from the ability to play a game of distinction on the margins of established patrimonies.’

This section of the Literature Review primarily considers late 20th century and early 21st century research into English name use among Chinese, Taiwanese, and Hongkongese, both inside and outside L1 Chinese contexts and on the margins of established patrimonies. Sociolinguists and anthropologists have conducted research into English or Western name use among Chinese and Taiwanese professionals and tertiary and secondary students in mainland China (e.g. Duthie, 2007; McPherron, 2009; Gao, Xiu, and Kuang, 2010), Taiwan (e.g. Liao, 2000), Hong Kong (e.g. Li, 1997; Mathews, 2000), and Singapore (e.g. Tan, 2001). Additionally, research has been conducted into Chinese and Taiwanese migrants’ and ESL students’ use of English or Western names in Canada (e.g. Heffernan, 2010), Britain (e.g. Edwards, 2006) and the USA (e.g. Diao, 2008, 2014). We recall Canagarajah’s (2004) description of language school classrooms as
‘power-laden’ (p. 120) sites, in which the authority and power of the classroom teachers or
lecturers may intimidate students into not ‘presenting identities that are not institutionally
rewarded’ (p. 120).

Somewhat more tangentially, Li Wei’s (2011) use of *translanguaging* and moment analyses of
the social interactions of three Chinese youths in London, not specifically their use of English
names, nevertheless mentions the participants’ playful fusion of traditional Chinese honorific
prefixes with English names, and bilingual, homophonic punning on such names. These studies
are discussed in the sub-sections that follow, and organised according to the primary themes as
follows: convenience and catering theories (e.g. ease of pronunciation and retrieval); the
practice as an involvement strategy (e.g. mitigating hierarchical relations in Chinese workplaces
or Western universities); indexing of Westernisation or globalised identity, and theories of
imagined communities and imagined identities (i.e. ‘a desired community that offers possibilities
for an enhanced range of identity options in the future’ Norton, 2006, p. 4). Finally, the section
considers the issue of English language ownership (viz. the native speaker debate) and of
languages not as stable, discrete structures or systems, most markedly so of *lingua franca* like
English and for that matter Chinese, but of language instead as fluid repertoires and of
language as process.

2.3.1 On the acquisition and use of English names

Prior to a discussion of perceived functional accounts of the practice of English name use among
Chinese, Taiwanese, Hongkongese, and Singaporean subjects, I briefly summarise research into
how English names are typically acquired, adopted, and adapted. McPherron’s (2009) vignette
above, for example, presents one of the commonest sources for self-baptism: the back pages of
a Chinese-English dictionary. Duthie’s (2007) account of how Shanghai business professionals
working in foreign-invested companies in the early noughties acquired their English names is
typical of most research accounts. The participants predominantly acquired Western names in
foreign-language classes (i.e. English and sometimes German and French) at tertiary or
secondary level, irrespective of their teachers’ nationality, while some acquired theirs when
writing résumés, or once employed in foreign-invested companies. The majority chose their own Western names, typically from the lists provided on the final pages of Chinese English dictionaries.

Of these, Duthie (2007, p. 6) cites two criteria for Western name selection: ‘easy for Chinese speakers to pronounce, and good sounding (hao ting)’; both criterion clearly oriented towards Chinese contexts and interlocutors, redolent with Chinese anthroponomastic values. Moreover, disyllabic western names were also preferred, since in Chinese it is unusual to address a person using a one-character name (cf. Chao, 1956, section 2.2). Such criteria reflect the fact that Duthie’s (2007) participants’ so-termed Western names were intended for use by fellow Chinese in predominantly Chinese contexts. Most participants also sought aspirational Western names or those that semantically matched their Chinese names, while some chose Western names whose pronunciation matched their Chinese surnames given the differing word orders between Chinese and Western names. What seems evident, however, is these language items being employed as a resource among a repertoire according to users’ communicative and symbolic needs, rather than according to host language norms, more along the lines of Widdowson’s (1994) innovation-as-ownership ontology.

Liao (2000) notes of the Taiwanese undergraduate participants in her research that most acquired their English names from their first English teachers and, subsequently, as they familiarised themselves with more North American or Japanese popular culture, they tended to change those initial English names into ones derived from their favourite film characters, celebrities or sports stars. I suggest that the repertoire of the user has expanded and thus, to revisit and adapt Widdowson’s (1994, p. 384) earlier quote, he or she indexes greater proficiency with English, what we prefer to term an enhanced and expanded linguistic repertoire, through this capacity to ‘possess it [i.e. English], make it their own, bend it to their will, and to assert themselves through it’, rather than submit to its dictates and forms as mandated by their English teachers. Indeed, Liao (2000, p. 137) echoes Duthie’s (2007) analysis of her Shanghai participants’ use of English names, proposing three Chinese/Taiwanese anthroponomastic
principles that guide the use of English names among Taiwanese: (a) uniqueness, (b) non-homophony with negative connotation words, and (c) ease in writing, recognition and pronunciation. One particular Liao interviewee claimed it was fashionable in Taiwan for Taiwanese to invent their own English names in order that they be unique because certain English names like Judy and Mary ‘were too common and thus indecent and inelegant [tsu-su]’ (Liao, 2000, p.165).

Recall Li’s (1997) discussion in section 2.2 of the Literature Review that Hong Kong business people ‘borrow’ a Western identity through use of an English name so that ‘the adoption of a Western-style English name is consistent with the traditional Chinese practice of selecting a hào² for communication with peers and friends.’ Certainly, what Duthie (2007) notes is the expansion of Western name use from a professional or workplace practice into a broader social practice done at home and when socialising. ‘Thirty-seven percent of interviewees call their spouse or significant other by their Western name...[and]...two chose Western names for their children’ (p. 10). According to one, ‘parents choose your Chinese name but English names are the identity you choose for yourself’ (p. 10). This then takes us beyond Widdowson’s (1994) language ownership into questions of identity work.

Similarly to Li (1997), Duthie (2007, p. 7) observes a relationship between the Western and Chinese names in terms of meaning and/or sound, similar to the ‘patterns employed when creating hào’ names: ‘Just as hào chosen by the referent are dependent upon acceptance and use within the community and consequently have an element of risk, Western names likewise involve social risk.’ Therefore, there is a question for the bearer of the Western name’s authenticity and legitimacy, of what might be termed ‘keeping it real’, whereby some Shanghai

² As attractive as it might be to follow Li (1997) in associating the relatively recent Chinese practice of English name adoption with the tradition of hào names, contemporary Chinese practices do not seem to bear this out (cf. Diao, 2014). The practice of hào names would seem to be a largely anachronistic one in contemporary China (Li Wei, 2012, personal communication). Traditionally, a hào name was assumed by a young and cultured man for public use and presently might occasionally be used by scholars in written documents. Like much English name use, a hào was chosen by the individual and not bestowed by a relative; however, it would be too great a stretch to claim for it the status of primer for the subsequent widespread and non-gender specific practice under investigation here.
participants preferred to use common Western names and, therefore, seem ‘more real’, ‘more genuine’ (p. 7). The intention was to minimise social risk in a manner that suggests Bourdieu’s ideas of legitimate language use and exchange of social and linguistic capital.

The linguistic market, fertile mimesis and the Shanghai stock exchange

For Bourdieu (1991, p. 37), the dialogic environment for living interaction is ‘charged with value’ and represents ‘an economy of symbolic exchanges’ based around the fact that the message a person receives or apprehends may not be accorded the same ‘value’ and, therefore, meaning or signification as that intended by the sender. Bourdieu (1991) describes every instance of communication as a convergence of at least two different aspects: the ‘linguistic habitus’ (i.e. the socially learned and typically unconscious tendencies and dispositions) of the speakers, ‘which imply a certain propensity to speak and to say determinate things’, and the ‘linguistic market’, which determines the ‘value’ of utterances and the knowledge of which potentially predisposes the speakers to acts of self-censorship and equivocal linguistic performance. However, the linguistic market is never fixed and the arbiters of the values of appropriateness and legitimacy, for example, are increasingly less the traditional ones, native English speakers, but in the immediate case above are Shanghainese business people in non-state companies.

Bourdieu (1991, p. 38) describes style (i.e. the ‘individual deviation from the linguistic norm’) as a ‘being-perceived’ whose perception is relative to the subject that perceives the message (i.e. the receiver/s, an interlocutor). Therefore, rather than denotation being in evidence during interaction, whereby lexical meaning may be described as stable and universal, unitary and centripetal (cf. Bakhtin, 1981), processes of connotation are operational, which refer ‘to the singularity of individual experiences ... constituted in a socially characterised relations to which the recipients bring the diversity of their instruments of symbolic appropriation’ (p. 39).

As a consequence, in a linguistic market, all linguistic practices are typically evaluated against the socially constituted, legitimate (i.e. dominant or standard) practices. The point being that an utterance accorded value in one linguistic market (e.g. the Taipei domestic linguistic market) or
on one particular day of linguistic trading, may not have that same value in a different market or on a different day (e.g. Australian graduate university classroom). This applies as much to Bourdieu’s (1991, p. 38) notion of style as, for example ‘diction of a particular (social, sexual or generational) class compared with that of another class’, as to style when applied to “English” name choice and use by Chinese or Taiwanese. Indeed, the relative value accorded utterances made in different contexts (e.g. Tanzania versus the UK) is described by Blommaert (2003, p. 617).

Much the same thing in terms of negotiation and contest was evident with the Chinese butcher Felipe in the San Francisco multilingual marketplace where Kramsch and Whiteside (2008) conducted their research. Chinese butcher Felipe used (t)his Spanish name when interacting with Spanish-speaking customers, despite it producing in Conversation Analysis terms a ‘dispreferred response’ (p. 256) from customer Bela: ‘we share her expectation that a Chinese butcher should bear a Chinese name, not a Spanish one.’ However, Kramsch and Whiteside (2008, p. 260) represent interactants like Felipe as ‘performing [my italics] English, Maya, Spanish, or Chinese, rather than only learning or using these languages...[in order to]... signal to each other which symbolic world they identify with at the time of the utterance.’ As a result, according to Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008, p. 661) ecological reading of the multilingual interactions in the San Franciscan Vietnamese and Chinese grocery shops, the linguistic market is in fact fluid and contingent, and the value accorded this or that code (or utterance) is emergent and relational, that is ‘it depends on the other players in the game’ (p. 664). Because of this reliance on the linguistic and symbolic capital of the multilingual and transcultural participants, the ability to play with diverse linguistic codes and their indexicalities is defined as ‘distributed symbolic competence’ (p. 664). Accordingly, Chinese butcher Felipe ‘plays with the languages available...to align symbolically with the shifting centres of power’ (p. 661) in his shop at any given moment.

Bearing this discussion of Bourdieu’s legitimate use and linguistic markets in mind, Duthie (2007, p. 7) notes, in keeping with Chinese naming conventions, a fine line separates an “authentic”
Western name from a too common and hence vulgar one within the Shanghai market of symbolic capital. For example, she cites five participants who preferred conventional Western names like Peter and David since they seemed safe choices and, as one of the five remarked, ‘somehow that made it more genuine.’ However, highlighting the multiplicities of the practice, Edwards (2006) notes of her Chinese EFL students that ‘many students [differing from Duthie’s 2007 Shanghai-based business professionals] go to great pains to find a name which is less common than those frequently used in English, such as John, David, Peter, Jennifer and the like.’ Accordingly, we see the different value/s that one utterance might have in two different mainland Chinese linguistic markets. Yet Bakhtin’s (1981) invocation of the ceaseless, contextual and contingent linguistic stratification of any language through its inherent heteroglossia and the dialogism of its dynamic enactment would imply that Bourdieu’s linguistic markets are so multiple, myriad and momentary that to in fact label them a market and as functioning according to principles of capital seems to test the limits of the usefulness of the metaphor.

Translanguaging and metroethnicity

Contrasting the use of Western names among business professionals with those used by ‘many young people in Shanghai’ (p. 10), for example, one of Duthie’s (2007) participants remarks that the professionals’ Western names are fundamental aspects of their business lives, while the Shanghai youth simply use them as nicknames, copy Hong Kong and Taiwanese pop stars, and ‘think it’s cool’ (p. 10). A curious type of English language ownership and legitimate use is invoked here; a kind of so to speak ‘authentic non-native use’ and ‘inauthentic non-native use’ as orchestrated by non-native users. This is something along the lines of the previously discussed depone and prepone (Widdowson, 1994, p. 383), whereby ‘lexical innovation here, equally motivated by communicative and communal requirement, is generally dismissed as deviant or dialectical.’

Moreover, the notion of cool is used disparagingly by the Shanghai business person commentator. This suggests a kind of snobbishness concerning the relative statuses of business ventures and everyday popular culture and also a divide along employed adult-student youth
lines in terms of use and repertoire. However, this idea of cool also highlights a fundamental ambivalence among some Chinese and Taiwanese people concerning deeper ideological meanings or indexicalities of the practice. McPherron (2009, p. 530) notes the temptation among researchers to read and position English name use, particularly more creative examples, within ‘a theoretical or political frame of resistance’, but acknowledges instead the ambivalence with which his subjects frequently view their choice of name.

Arguably, this ambivalence is a function of the names operating for McPherron’s (2009) participants in mainland Chinese local settings. Such a local settings substantially lack the resistance (in volume and type) that can emerge once the language practice is “transported” across linguistic and cultural boundaries into local Australian university linguistic markets, for example, and the creative and centrifugal tendencies of the practice brush up against the conservative, centralising centripetal forces in the miasma of dialogised heteroglossia (cf. Bakhtin, 1981). Nevertheless, the creative aspects of the practice among McPherron’s (2009) participants refers back to the importance of Li Wei’s (2011) use of *translanguaging* and moment analyses to highlight the playfulness of much multilingual and translocal language practice. Like Maher’s (2005) research on Japanese youth playing with perceived notions of ethnicity and cultural essentialism, McPherron (2009) observes that for many Chinese students English names are cool; ‘students found pleasure and a sense of “coolness” in their English names’ (p. 525). Though McPherron (2009) does not mention Maher’s (2005) research, the latter’s findings seem apposite with observations that ‘Cool is the antithesis of the Whorfian doctrine. Cool actively disengages the naturalistic linkage between ethnicity and language (p. 91).’

McPherron (2009, p. 525) devises a list of five ‘types of English names’ used by his China Southern University research participants: those based on bearers’ Chinese names; those embodying bearers’ personality traits and aspirations; ‘playful creations of new words’; popular culture references; and those chosen from a list or given by teachers. For McPherron’s (2009) participants, coolness was an important consequence of this practice, but uniqueness
(frequently as a function of linguistic playfulness) was an important deciding factor in the name itself. Similarly for some of Duthie’s (2007) participants, singularity remained an important factor in Western name choice and she cites the example of the software sales manager participant whose adopted name was Beck. The choice was derived from his admiration for English soccer star, David Beckham, and Beck ‘removed the last part of Beckham to make it more his own’ (p. 7).

2.3.2 Catering or convenience accounts

Wang (2011) presents a function of English name use for Chinese, specifically during interactions with non-Chinese speakers, whereby non-Chinese typically experience substantial difficulty in correctly pronouncing Chinese names so that an undesirable hybridisation if not outright distortion occurs, ‘the result of which is that the pronunciation of the name belongs neither purely to Chinese culture nor purely to English culture’ (p. 1228). This sub-section of the review commences with my discussion of research into Wang’s (2011) third function of the practice of English name use among Chinese, Taiwanese and Hongkongese at home and abroad: the tendency among non-Chinese to mispronounce and not remember or recall Chinese names. Diao (2008) uses the emic term ‘catering’ (p. 19), provided by her participant Anna, for this position of Chinese self and foreign Other when interacting with non-Chinese teachers: ‘Perhaps Chinese just cater to the foreigners’ needs. I do think that you CANNOT REMEMBER the Chinese name, so when I introduce I simply do not tell you the Chinese name.’ In other words, two unspoken assumptions underpinning this catering are that, firstly, non-Chinese cannot correctly pronounce or retrieve Chinese names and, secondly, the failure to correctly pronounce such names can compromise their talismanic and aesthetic status, leading to embarrassment or loss of face for both parties.

Following Liao (2000, p. 137), this catering to non-Chinese, is referred to as a ‘convenience theory’. Duthie (2007) notes that the initial reasons given for Western name use among Shanghai business professionals working in foreign-invested companies echoed that of most research, with the most frequent response being for convenience when working with foreigners
in China so as to aid recall and pronunciation. One of Duthie’s (2007) female participants noted that her Chinese name sounded ‘ugly’ when mispronounced but she could not, on the other hand, continue to correct her boss’s mispronunciation. Another participant remarked that full three-character Chinese names, in contrast to a single-word English given or first name, were difficult to remember, even for Chinese, ‘because there are so many characters that can be used to create given names’ (p. 8), whereas ‘Western names tend to be pre-designated.’ Edwards (2006, p. 95) notes similarly that her Chinese participants ‘are nevertheless aware that native English speaking teachers are at best uneasy with, and at worst incapable of, using their Chinese names.’

However, Edwards (2006) also states that most of the EFL teachers she interviewed believed that ‘they did not find Chinese names difficult to pronounce’ (p. 95), leading Edwards to follow Diao (2008) in asserting that the teachers were in effect Othered by the Chinese students as ‘incapable of getting to grips with even the most basic aspects of Chinese culture’ (p. 96). Much like McPherron’s (2009) observation that there existed a temptation to read the practice within a heuristic of resistance to and compliance with native English speaker norms (as Edwards, 2006, indeed does), there is a concomitant temptation among some to dismiss the mispronunciation rationale for this practice in favour of something less conventionally pragmatic. For example, Edwards’ (2006) refers to Norton’s (1995, 2000) notion of ‘investment in the target language’ as to what ‘for the Chinese student the adoption of an English name is undoubtedly.’ Interestingly, what is evident is a twinned kind of dialogised heteroglossia at play here in which language (i.e. Chinese and English) emerges as contested. On the one hand, there is the tendency for some English teachers to resist the practice among their Chinese learners, while, on the other hand, those same learners can resist the attempts by English teachers to use their learners’ Chinese names.

A second consideration of mispronunciation of Chinese names is that Chinese people frequently utter their names when meeting other Chinese, but also may render the written characters for the name in the air or on paper, certainly describe them, since many Chinese characters sound
the same despite using different characters. Indeed, Chinese too may not fully appreciate the meaning of a Chinese name until the written characters for that name are also viewed. Indeed, unless the written Chinese characters are being read by, for example, an ESL or EFL teacher, there is likelihood that the Romanised name, as transcribed and subsequently pronounced or mispronounced, bears little resemblance to the actual Chinese name and its pronunciation. In which case, irrespective of concerns about homonymy with unfortunate or unfavourable words, the Chinese recipient, in the workplace or the classroom simply may not recognise his or her name being called.

Nevertheless, despite the near ubiquity of the convenience factor as rationale for Western name use, Duthie (2007) believes greater significance it at play, especially considering that Western name use still occurred in her fieldwork despite the absence of non-Chinese foreigners. Recall, after all, that the overwhelming majority of Chinese and Taiwanese people receive or adopt these names in school foreign language classes, typically if not near absolutely, in the absence of native or non-Chinese speakers of that foreign language. Duthie’s (2007) reasons for believing that greater significance may be involved are evidentially based. For example, she describes Xiaoping, a business professional who grew up in Scandinavia and had never used an English name abroad until his return to China in 2003, when ‘compatriots suggested he needed a foreign name’ (p. 8). Similarly, when Duthie (2007) writes that ‘there was clearly far more to Western name use than simply the presence of foreigners’ (p. 8), she describes another research participant who initially invoked a convenience theory for his workplace use of an English name, yet accepted that the only foreign colleague among them was a Chinese-speaking Korean; English was otherwise functionally absent in the workplace.

2.3.3 Involvement accounts

An important consideration behind the practice is the inappropriate formality of using full Chinese names or address form conventions in Chinese and Taiwanese workplaces, yet the excessive informality and intimacy of using Chinese given names alone. Contrasting Chinese state-owned companies with foreign-owned companies, Duthie’s (2007) participants discuss the
ease with which English name use allows for teamwork endeavours among employees and frank
discussion of opinions and participation with bosses; the latter two important practices of non-
state workplaces. State-owned businesses, however, tended to preserve the hierarchical
structures of greater Chinese society and, therefore, conventional terms of address and titles
marked for seniority and age were used.

A similar trend, in which the deployment of specific English words by L1 Chinese Taiwanese
speakers is understood to permit an easing if not obviation of formality protocols otherwise
unavailable to users in Mandarin is evident in Chen’s (2007) research on code-switching between
Mandarin and English on a Taiwanese university online bulletin board system (BBS). Chen (2007,
p. 25) noted her Taiwanese participants’ preference to code-switch from Mandarin into English
whenever they apologised for making a mistake, using the English word ‘sorry’. To express
apologies in Mandarin involves use of formal language, hierarchically marked as between ‘elders
or members from a higher social status’, so that ‘if adolescents post [Chen here gives Mandarin
expressions of apology] to peers, social distance will be built...[and]...saying sorry in English
might make posters feel less guilty.’ The use of English therefore allows for an obviation of
Chinese protocols on expressive language use (e.g. apologies, address forms) intrinsically marked
for hierarchy. For example, McPherron (2009, pp530/1) describes a research participant who
preferred his Chinese co-worker and friend, David, to address him as Harry. For Harry, ‘the
Chinese name always means something behind that, and that’s complicated...Harry is simple, we
are friends so you can call me Harry, we are equal.’ The argument is that English name use
promotes (and is a product of) an egalitarianism, otherwise absent in formal Chinese and
Confucian interpersonal communication and address forms.

Li (1997) argues that the commonplace use of Western names among Hongkongers when
communicating with Westerners, but also among themselves, in less than formal or classically
Confucian circumstances also represents a strategy of involvement (cf. Scollon and Wong-
Scollon, 1995), intended to facilitate and, indeed, markedly acknowledge, the process of
becoming more intimately acquainted. English names are described as used by Hongkongers as
‘lubricant[s] in speeding up the process of getting acquainted and developing intimacy, especially between people who perceive each other as equals’ (Li, 1997, p. 498). Accordingly, Li’s (1997, p. 505) argument is that to overcome this communicative disjuncture, Hong Kong business people ‘borrow’ a Western identity through the use of an English name whereby ‘the adoption of a Western-style English name is consistent with the traditional Chinese practice of selecting a hào for communication with peers and friends.’

Recall that in spite of the detailed prescriptivism of the Five Cardinal Relations, King and Bond (1985) emphasise that ‘nowhere does Confucius discuss relations among strangers’ (p. 39) so, conventionally, Chinese people have tended to be uncertain in such social situations involving non-kin and non-primary group members. Consequently, King and Bond (1985) explain that ‘mutual accommodation is probably required’ (p. 39), and an example of such accommodation and adaptation is the adoption of ‘a Western given name’ (p. 39), when interacting with Westerners. Concluding their chapter, King and Bond (1985) observe a ‘Chinese cultural dynamic’ (p. 42) at work outside kin relations whereby ‘this kind of highly personal relation construction constitutes an important cultural strategy for securing social resources towards self-advancement.’

From intra and inter-cultural communication perspectives, the adoption and bestowment of English names qualifies as a politeness strategy of involvement (cf. Scollon and Wong-Scollon, 1995). The authors note that such strategies of involvement have also been referred to in academic literature as solidarity politeness and positive face. For Scollon and Wong-Scollon (1995, p.35), any interaction is a potential threat to a participant’s (or, indeed, all participants’) face, where face is defined as ‘the negotiated public image, mutually granted each other by participants in a communicative event.’ This potential loss of face of one or all participants in an interaction is primarily mitigated by the speakers involved projecting the appropriate levels of independence and involvement according to the context, the subject under discussion, and the participants involved. Scollon and Wong-Scollon (1995, p.41) list ten independence strategies commonly employed in English that includes the ‘use [of] family names and titles.’ Politeness
strategies of involvement index assumptions about the interdependence and connection (e.g. shared in-group membership, for example) of the interlocutors. Scollon and Wong-Scollon (1995, p. 40) precede the list of ten typical discursive independence strategies with a list of ten involvement strategies commonly encountered in English. Their list includes the ‘use [of] given names and nicknames.’

It is relevant to compare Higgins’ (2009, p. 44) observation of the tendency among Tanzanian newspaper journalists to greet one another in the workplace in English. This practice recalls the pragmatics of Chen’s (2007) Taiwanese discussion board practices. Traditionally, Swahili or Tanzanian greetings last several minutes and involved ‘a series of ritualized question and answer sequences regarding the well-being of one’s family, one’s farm and one’s neighbours.’ English language greetings among the journalists are, on the other hand, seen to index the speakers’ identification as metropolitans engaged in fast-paced commercial life and, therefore, permit the ‘cutting short of niceties’ (p. 45). When one participant was interviewed about the extensive use of English greetings in the office despite all participants’ native competence in Swahili, he answered that ‘the deference system involved in Swahili greetings’ (p. 47) pragmatically instantiated traditional hierarchical distinctions among the interlocutors with which, in the newspaper offices as workplace, he was not comfortable; English therefore permitted the obviation of such traditional Swahili norms and values. Higgins (2009, p. 47) concludes that the participant was ‘clearly making use of a local resource to contextualize the situation as he desires.’

2.3.4 Processing fluency and discriminatory hiring practices

I now include two items of Australian research (supported by findings from comparable non-Australian studies) from disciplines outside of sociolinguistics or applied linguistics, but whose findings further impact on the issue of likely or anticipated mispronunciation and/or mis-recall by non-Chinese speakers as functions of Romanisation and/or pinyin-isation. The first from social psychology explores what its authors refer to as ‘the name pronunciation effect’ (Laham, Koval and Alter, 2012, p. 1), whereby ‘easy-to-pronounce names (and the bearers of those names) are
judged more positively than difficult-to-pronounce names.’ This effect is in turn understood to flow from ‘processing fluency’ (Laham, Koval and Alter, 2012, p. 1), whereby a cognitive process is subjectively judged easy or difficult.

The research comprised five individual studies in which names from ‘different nationalities’ (p. 2) were assessed by participants who identified as Asian or Australian. The research found that the name pronunciation effect operated independently of the length of the names, their orthographic regularity, unusualness, typicality or foreignness. Importantly, however, in claiming for the generalisability of their findings, the research refers to previous research (cf. Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1992), which found that within classrooms, students with easy-to-pronounce names received preferential treatment, ‘engendering self-fulfilling prophecy effects often detrimental to educational and social outcomes’ (p. 4). The point being not that it is Chinese names’ foreign-ness that might predispose non-Chinese Australians (and other Asians) to feats of mispronunciation, mis-recall or avoidance of use, but that through conventions of Romanization and pinyin-ization, the use of English alphabet letters like x, q or c to represent relatively common Chinese sounds that did not correspond with these Anglophone alphabetic letters.

The second piece of Australian research that warrants some consideration in light of the findings of this ‘name pronunciation effect’ study investigated the racially discriminatory practices of some Australian employers. Booth, Leigh, and Varganova’s (2009) research into labour market discrimination in Australia involved fake CV’s using ethnically and racially identifiable names being submitted for over 5000 jobs in Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney using a major online job-finding website found that Chinese applicants needed to send 50% more applications to receive an equivalent number of call-backs as Anglo-Saxon applicants. Specifically, they found that applicants using Anglo-Saxon sounding names (but the same fake CV as all other fictionalised applicants) received call-backs 35% of the time while those with Chinese-sounding names received call-backs only 21% of the time. Importantly, the researchers observed that their results could not be generalized onto individuals of the same ethnicity or race who used what the researchers termed anglicised names.
Nevertheless, such generalisation might be forged on a comparable study conducted among students at the University of Auckland Business School. This research from New Zealand (Wilson, Gahlout, Liu, and Mouly, 2005), which asked participants enrolled in Human Resource Management programs as part of an Executive MBA degree and senior undergraduates enrolled in HRM courses at Auckland University to evaluate a web-based employee selection system, arrived at equivalent Findings to the Australian study. Briefly, the New Zealand study sought to measure the effect of ethnicity as indexed through name on the participants’ perception of the candidates’ (a) suitability for the position and (b) likelihood of being short-listed. Of the fictional Chinese applicants produced for the research, half used ethnically Chinese names while half used anglicized names. All fictional candidates were more than sufficiently qualified and experienced for the positions so any judgments that candidates were unsuitable for the position was determined as based on ‘ethnic-schema’ bias (p. 70), involving what the researchers termed ‘ethnic penalty’ (p. 69). However, this ethnic penalty was substantially reduced for Chinese applicants who used anglicized names.

2.3.5 Westernisation, imagined communities, imagined identities and assimilation

In his research among Chinese, Japanese and Korean university students in Toronto, Canada, Heffernan (2010) sets out to test the hypothesis that ‘the tendency for Chinese and Koreans to adopt an English name is for pragmatic reasons’ (p. 25) using an administered survey. Heffernan (2010, p. 32) notes that the use of English names among friends of the same ethnicity as frequently as ‘ethnic names’ leads him to conclude that ‘obviously, the Chinese respondents are not favouring the English personal names because they find the Chinese personal names difficult to pronounce.’ Instead, he argues that the use of English names ‘signal[s] their [the participants’] affiliation with western culture.’ Affiliation with western culture is, however, a tricky proposition should one enquire into its meaning and significance. For example, one of Diao’s (2008, p. 28) Chinese participants, Jing ‘did have an English name... [but]...never used it in real life and thus found it “lucky” to “not have an English name.”’ Jing comments on other Chinese at the U.S university who did use English names as being ‘really westernized’.
Both examples given are taken from Chinese students attending North American universities. Jing’s two English names were based on her own Chinese name and that of her mother so that for Jing, as Diao (2008) observes, ‘an English name was something unreal that she only used “virtually online and in language classroom”, and had to be attached to her Chinese identity label (or her mother’s) to be associated with her.’ Edwards (2010, p. 96) proposes ‘compliance’ as one participant strategy underscoring her mainland Chinese EFL students’ adoption of English names, ‘compliance on their part with regard to British culture and learning English in particular.’ Indeed, one of the university teachers she interviewed viewed the practice as demonstrating their ‘embracing’ of British culture, along with their desire to ‘integrate somehow and not be different (p. 96).’

However, Jing’s descriptors quoted above, her use of ‘unreal’ and ‘virtual’, suggest some sort of imagined context/s of use for Chinese and Taiwanese practitioners: imagined communities and identities. Gao et al. (2010) refer to Norton’s (2006, p. 4) statement that ‘for many language learners, the community is one of the imagination... [that]...assumes an imagined identity.’

Looking specifically at what they term ‘English learning and identity construction in “English as a Foreign Language” (EFL) contexts or the “Expanding Circle” in Kachru’s terms’, Gao, Xiu and Kuang (2010) research into ‘Chinese learners of English... adoption and use of English names’ (p. 4) at a Chinese comprehensive university. The researchers initially use Norton’s (2006) notions of imagined communities and imagined identities to analyse the practice among Chinese EFL students, noting that on the basis of the participants’ sources for their English names (e.g. names of Western pop stars, sports stars, and literary figures), ‘various imagined identities were discerned, associated with different imagined communities’ (p. 6). The English names chosen were interpreted by Gao et al. (2010) as having ‘reified the learners’ imagined identities’ (p. 11).

For example, some Chinese students considered the English names to represent their actual selves, while for others they were simply devices used in English classes when taught by a native English speaker. For many, ‘the adoption and use of English names were often associated with explicit feelings of confusion and doubt about ownership’ (Gao et al., 2010, p. 9).
Indeed for many of the Chinese EFL students, greater participation in English classes and ‘greater understanding regarding the English speaking culture, however that was defined to them’ (p. 10) caused them to sense a threat from the so-called target language and culture to their native culture, their Chinese-ness. As a consequence, many stopped using English names or changed their existing ones to names closer to their Chinese names. Gao et al.’s (2010) transcripts of some of the interviewee comments show a number of students describing the practice itself and their choice of names as ‘weird’. The authors conclude that instead of viewing the practice as attempts by Chinese EFL participants to integrate into a specific target language or target culture community, that is into ‘a fixed “target culture” in opposition to [the] “native culture”, the ‘complex and dynamic nature of [their] identity work echoes that language learners are legitimate users of the language in their own right’ (p. 14). Indeed, observing that some participants’ English names were playful translations of their Chinese names, Gao et al. (2010, p. 12) suggest this embodied Lo Bianco’s (2005) notion that English had become a language of ‘post-(cultural-) identity’, through whose elements new identities beyond that of the dichotomised ‘native culture’ and ‘target culture’ were constructed. Thus, the imagined community associated with the practice would be in fact a deterritorialised (cf. Appadurai, 2006) and global one, what Diao (2014, p 212) refers to as ‘transnational’.

In the short story Jenny (1995) by Australian Chinese émigré writer Ding Xiaoqi, the idea of imagined communities is invoked by the eponymous protagonist when describing her decision to use an English language while still resident in China. This act of translanguaging, achieved through her use of the normatively English name Jenny in preference to her Chinese name, was done ‘not because she worshipped foreign things but because her real name was too nondescript. It could have been a man’s name’ (Ding Xiaoqi, 1995, p. 162). The short story was a required reading for the graduate university classes observed and recorded as part of this research and a presentation by a Taiwanese student on the short story (and its subsequent discussion by a class of Saudi, Japanese, Korean, Afghan, Taiwanese and Chinese) comprises a selection of the research data. For fictional Jenny, still resident in China but soon to sojourn in
Australia, the thought that people ‘in the future’ (p. 162) would address her as Jenny, excited her considerably more than her husband’s use of her full name Chen Ming whether they made love or fought. This husband did not know of the existence of her English name and his use of her full Chinese name, irrespective of context, made him ‘cold-hearted’ (p. 163) in her eyes. Nevertheless, the imagined community of Jenny’s desires was something she hid from others since ‘[Chinese] people would laugh themselves silly...[and]...everyone treats you as though you’re an absolute madwoman’ is Jenny’s explanation to the story’s narrator when asked why she did not publically use the name Jenny in China.

Like fictional Jenny when explaining her practice as not a love of things foreign, Duthie (2007, pp. 1/2) asserts that the business professional participants whom she interviews ‘are adamant that this [the practice of Western name use] is not a case of Westernisation, but rather, it is part of what it means to be modern Chinese.’ Indeed for Duthie (2007), the participants ‘are not to be confused with the transnational elites often discussed in globalisation studies’ (Duthie, 2007, p. 2). Rather, the participants’ use of Western names is evidence of them ‘actively renegotiating the boundaries and definitions of Chineseness’ and, moreover, of a ‘convenient marker of prestige’ (2007, p. 3) viz. the status associated with Chinese employed in foreign-invested corporations.

Accordingly, Western name use denotes a local identity that is complementary to the national Chinese objective of modernisation through globalisation. In other words, non-local names are used by practitioners, who may not have had any direct experience of Western contexts, but whose Western name use ‘make[s] claims on local status.’ The interaction and fusion of different flows of information, images, ideas, and people constructs ‘transnational publics’ (cf. Nononi and Ong, 1997, pp. 25-6) that offer alternatives to established and modernist discourses like state ideology for the performance of early 21st century identities. Through their transnational practices, Chinese draw from their participation in these proliferations of difference in the global economy. Duthie’s (2007, p. 4) observes that given the previously discussed late 20th century Chinese state objective of modernisation through globalisation, and the ‘adamantly patriotic’ (p.
2) status of the business professionals and the ‘patriotic duty’ (p. 2) of their business careers\(^3\), the use of Western names is best characterised as evidencing instead ‘a disassociation with Westernness and broadened definition of Chineseness.’

### 2.4 Theoretical Framing: Dialogised Heteroglossia and a Sociolinguistics of (Relocalised) Globalisation

Both Duthie’s (2007) reading of the practice among Shanghai business professionals and Gao et al.’s (2010) attempts to transcend the notion that “English speaking culture” and “Chinese cultures” constitute only one possible opposition of identity choices’ (p. 14) move away from conventional discussions of English language ownership that concern the tensions between the purported native culture and target culture, between native speakers and target language or non-native speakers. Widdowson (1994, p. 382) pronounces the native speaker, specifically in relation to English vocabulary, ‘irrelevant’, but nevertheless Edwards (2006) and McPherron (2009) illustrate that the myth of native speaker relevance as arbiter or gatekeeper remains. McPherron (2009) observes the difficulty in discussing Chinese EFL students’ choice of names without them deferring to his interpretations as the correct ones; thus, ‘the unique and creative English names chosen at CSU are constantly renegotiated in relation to perceptions of appropriateness’ (p. 527). Invariably, it is the author-researcher McPherron as native speaker who, frequently unwittingly, is the arbiter of appropriateness in such discussions.

For example, McPherron (2009) describes his Chinese research participant and ESL student, Nashville, who chose her name because she liked its pronunciation, its euphonism. The name, in other words, was a resource chosen from a repertoire or palette available to the Chinese EFL student, so that she might do things with language in the certain local contexts or settings where such a translingual practice was apt and productive. Upon meeting Nashville, McPherron (2009) states, ‘For our parents, loving our country was about self-sacrifice, but for us it is about self-development. We support our country by working within the new economy and making as much money as we can.’

\(^3\) Duthie (2007, p. 2) quotes a recent MBA graduate among her Chinese business professional participants who states, ‘For our parents, loving our country was about self-sacrifice, but for us it is about self-development. We support our country by working within the new economy and making as much money as we can.’
enquired, *a propos* her name, as to whether she liked country music, a style of music with which she was not familiar. Unsurprisingly, the name’s connotations or indexicalities, the utterance’s meaning, particularly because it was also the name of a musically influential city in the United States, differed according to setting and interlocutor. That an utterance’s meaning in any instant of communication might be the subject of negotiation and contest, that is a function of dialogism and heteroglossia, would not surprise Bakhtin although it might have momentarily derailed McPherron’s (2009) interaction with his student. After all, Bakhtin (1981, p. 271) describes language as ‘ideologically saturated’ and ‘as a world view’, wherein we might imagine that one’s person’s euphonic sound poem is another person’s country music capital.

However, learning about country music from McPherron (2009), Nashville realised she in fact did not like the music and, moreover, promptly changed her name because of what she had learned. Her decision to change her name, though probably easier than affecting or establishing a like for country music, saddened McPherron (2009) and this sadness of his might be analysed in a number of ways. Such an analysis is apt because it links to a central motif of my research, that of the semantic crossroads, if not the sociolinguistic ‘combat zone of the word’ (cf. Holquist, 1983 p. 307), where the centripetal forces of capital L language encounter the centrifugal forces of languaging. Firstly, centrifugally, McPherron (2009) had liked the name irrespective of whether its user enjoyed or appreciated country music. Perhaps this is a sentimentality, a kind of resignification that many language teachers can appreciate. An utterance is removed momentarily from its ideologically saturated state of denoting, in this case, the capital of U.S. country music redolent with its ‘southern drawl’ (Nagle and Sanders, 2003) comprising diphthongized or triphthongized short front vowels and songs of heartbreak and bad luck, and the utterance *Nashville* was instead resignified for the English teacher abroad by his Chinese student as sound poem or euphonic abstraction.

What this permits is that liminal and interstitial thrill of a language item drained for an instant of its seemingly inevitable semantic baggage and filled instead with the fresh air of resignification, thereby becoming as light as a balloon, baggage momentarily cast aside. What is evident here is
Bakhtin’s (1981, p. 272) observation that ‘every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal stratifying forces).’ This, Bakhtin (1981, p. 272) continues, is ‘the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school’, in which the analysis of any utterance, in this case the outcome of a translingual practice: an English name, ‘exposed it as a contradiction-riddled, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.’

A second consideration that may be surmised from McPherron’s perspective was that he was saddened because his observations about the name as normatively indexing some sort of affiliation with the country music capital of the world, Nashville, had inadvertently reinforced his greater influence in this heteroglossic and dialogic tug-of-war over meaning and legitimate use, his greater weight, as English language native speaker and North American national. So, while it may have saved his student from a possible future of distracting questions about whether or not she preferred Dolly Parton to Patty Loveless, McPherron was positioned, regrettably and unwittingly, as arbiter of appropriate and legitimate English language use, in this case, of the name Nashville, chosen for its local value of euphony but rejected for its international connotations of country music aficionado.

Nevertheless, what are also apparent in McPherron’s (2009) exchange are Bakhtin’s (1981) notions within the rubric of ‘dialogised heteroglossia’ (p. 272) of the addressivity and intertextuality of utterances whereby ‘the word is born in a dialogue as a living rejoinder within it’ (p. 279). There are two types of dialogism which the word as utterance likely encounters. The first is with ‘an alien word within the object itself’ (Bakhtin, p. 282), which is evident above in the semantic clash between Nashville as sound poem and Nashville as country music capital. The second is ‘the subjective belief system of the listener...sometimes crassly accommodating, sometimes provocatively polemical’ (p. 282), which represents the utterance’s ‘orientation toward a specific conceptual horizon.’ Accordingly, each word as utterance is directed towards an answer and anticipates an answer, ‘forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken’ (p. 280). Within such a dynamic, McPherron (2009) provided Nashville with what Bakhtin (1981, p.
describes as ‘a reading on his [sic] own word, within the alien conceptual system of the understanding receiver.’ Accordingly, McPherron (2009) functions not so much as oppressive gatekeeper for the unitary forces of language as system, but instead as index of likely future interactions.

Sharing with Widdowson (1994) a concern for enlightening the pedagogical practices of English Language Teaching as one goal of his research, McPherron (2009, p. 527) notes that ‘discussion of unique name choices [between teachers and students] can often lead to misinterpretations and even the silencing of the types of creativity and re-appropriations of English that communicative approaches to teaching English seek to encourage.’ In a similar vein, Widdowson (1994, p. 386) discusses the emphasis placed on the presentation of authentic English language use (referred to as ‘realia’) in ELT classrooms and the observation that, typically, authentic is – or perhaps was until 2009 or the time of his writing – understood as ‘language naturally occurring as communications in native-speaker contexts of use, or rather those selected contexts where standard English is the norm.’ However, such language is only authentic within the contexts of its use – ‘it is recipient designed and so culturally loaded’ (p. 386) – and tends to privilege native English speaker use and, therefore, native English speaker teachers. For Widdowson (1994, p. 387), the solution to this pedagogical bias is through a shift away from such so-called “authentic” contexts of use, which tend to favour the native speaker, to contexts of learning, which would invoke the norms and values, orientations and beliefs of the non-native speaker student.

With reference to received notions of legitimate and appropriate language use, Edwards (2006, p. 100) discusses the variety of English names chosen by the Chinese ESL students she studied, most specifically those who ‘translate or transliterate the concepts inherent in their names directly into English; for example, Sky, Ocean, Summer...Names which for native speakers usually belong to the offspring of celebrities if they belong to anyone at all.’ The humour of her observation regarding the names with which some British and North American celebrities infamously lumber their children is not lost on me, but, nevertheless, the names used by Western celebrities are at least analysed as belonging to them, if indeed belonging to anyone at
all. In other words, their use by Western celebrities is legitimate (cf. Bourdieu, 1991) if eccentric, but their use by non-Western EFL students is suspect, since they do not belong to them (in both senses of belong) and can be perceived as indexing instead inappropriate or non-proficient use (cf. Heffernan’s (2010, p. 31) distinction between what he terms ‘English personal names and pseudo-names’, and Edwards’ (2006) concerns over appropriateness of name choices). Again, we recall Widdowson (1994, pp. 383/4) on the relative statuses of prepone and depone. Upon providing this list of “celebrity offspring names”, Edwards (2006) raises this question of appropriateness and a teacher’s role to in effect police it.

2.4.1 Sociolinguistics of globalisation

Something akin to the gatekeeping function discussed in 2.3.6 with reference to McPherron’s (2009) anecdote about his Chinese student and participant Nashville seems evident in analysis of Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008) multilingual data recorded in San Franciscan settings involving Chinese, Vietnamese, Mayan and Spanish speaking immigrant shop owners and shoppers. Specifically, I consider the Chinese butcher who uses the archetypical Spanish name Felipe when interacting with his Spanish-speaking customers, and his conversation with Bela Chan, a fifty-something woman raised in a Maya-speaking family with a Chinese, Afro-Honduran and Mayan ancestry. No longer proficient in Maya having stopped using it many years earlier on account of its backward/Indian connotations in the San Franciscan setting, and barely competent in English, Bela Chan, a valued customer, uses Spanish in this marketplace. Having asked one of the Chinese butchers for his name, the butcher replies with Felipe, causing her to repeat his name as the next turn, indexing surprise, and following this with another turn in which she accepts his use of the name: in this second turn, ‘Bela accepts ‘Felipe’s’ unexpected Hispanic identity’ (p. 663-4).

Using an Applied Conversation Analysis, specifically the adjacency pairs of an ‘identification routine’ (p. 656), Kramsch and Whiteside (2008) argue that the butcher’s use of Felipe is expected to establish a felicitous environment that will facilitate future transactions (what should be a simple procedural matter, much like classroom introductions for example). Instead, Bela’s repetition of the name in reply to Felipe’s utterance (rather than producing an
unproblematic segue into transaction talk) is itself a kind of dispreferred response. What the authors claim is evident here through their Applied CA analysis of these ‘categorisation devices’ (p. 656) is Felipe and Bela’s ‘constructionist view of the social world that emphasises participants’ local, situated, ethnographic understanding of social reality.’ Similarly, McPherron’s (2009) reply to his student Nashville’s routine identification turn (presumably an utterance like “My name is Nashville”) we can infer was a dispreferred response along the lines of “Do you like country music?” or “Nashville?”, rather than the Chinese student’s preferred segue into a less problematic introduction or classroom routine. However, unlike in Felipe and Bela’s exchange, conversation repair and recovery seem not have occurred for McPherron and Nashville, teacher and student. Instead, it would seem that McPherron’s (2009) dispreferred response coupled with his status (or subject positioning) as English language native speaker gatekeeper trumped the identification routine.

What I see with Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008) analysis then is a complex web of linguistic play designed to articulate various subject positions for the players; linguistic play predicated on the relative positions of power (customer and supplier, in-group and out-group) that language choice (Chinese, English or Spanish) instantiates. ‘Each of their utterances is less the performance of a language than the enactment of a performative speech act that creates the very reality it purportedly refers to’ (p. 663). Accordingly, Felipe’s ‘unexpected Spanish identity’ (p. 663-4) is a deterritorialised, idealised, and emergent Spanishness; aptly for a globalised and transcultural, translingual setting and world. Felipe’s Spanish identity is less about the geographical location of nation-based culture and language and more about the geometrical space of deterritorialised, local identities. Unlike the case in which, for example, Felipe’s utterance was assessed using a modernist conception of unified and transcendental self (e.g. Spanish-speaking, Spanish born, Spanish passport = Spanish), there is nothing inauthentic about (t)his post-modern, post-colonial self, negotiating a multilingual and transcultural (literal) linguistic market and moment.
For Kramsch and Whiteside (2008, p. 665), such ‘subject positioning has to do less with the calculations of rational actors than with multilinguals’ heightened awareness of the embodied nature of language and the sedimented emotions associated with the use of a given language.’ Thus, returning to the gate-keeper positioning that seemed apparent (if unwanted) in McPherrron’s (2009) anecdote about his Chinese student called Nashville, in the Bela-Felipe exchanges, the gatekeeper function of the native speaker or of the most proficient or authentic speaker of Spanish (in a modernist conception of language as nationality-based structure) is elided since effective language choice and use is predicated on language play and not proficiency, on symbolic competence and not just communicative or pragmatic competence.

A further example of Bourdieu’s (1991) linguistic market and of Bakhtin’s (1981) heteroglossic centripetal and centrifugal forces at work in terms of relative value accorded utterances is provided by Blommaert (2003, p. 617) in his concluding section of A Sociolinguistics of Globalisation titled ‘Writing in/from the margin (of the world system).’ He provides an analysis of a piece of writing by a 16-year old Tanzanian girl, whom he met during field work in Dar es Salaam. The analysis takes from Eastman and Stein (1993) the notion of a ‘language display’, whereby the best linguistic resources available to the speaker/writer are deployed for the purposes of a specific communicative act. This is an approach that echoes the repertoire or resource based process-oriented understanding of (trans)languaging that is key to the approach to translingualism taken in this thesis.

The writing presented by Blommaert (2003) is by normative or native speaker standards riddled with grammatical errors and pragma-linguistic inappropriateness. These errors, however, gain significance once the writing ‘moves across a world system’ (p. 619) from its Tanzanian EFL context (wherein such a capacity to use English the way the girl does indexes success and prestige, for example, in much the same way the English name Nashville would in China) to a European one in which ‘the resources used by Victoria [the girl] would fail to index élite status and prestige.’ Thus the value of a linguistic item, in this case, ‘the indexicalities of success and prestige’ (p. 619), may only operate as such in one local setting, the linguistic market of Dar es
Salaam, Tanzania, ‘the periphery of the world system’, and this value differs substantially from that accorded to the item in Europe, ‘the core of the world system’ (p. 619). Nevertheless, this linguistic market, underpinned as it is by Bakhtin’s (1989) ceaseless heteroglossic currents of centripetalism and centrifugalism, coloured by addressivity and intertextuality, is in fact many markets, locally based but trading in global currencies and resources. What constitutes legitimate use in one market and moment may in the next market and moment index illegitimate or inauthentic use.

Discussing, for example, how names can acquire new meanings, different value, in different social contexts, Duthie (2007) refers to Rymes’ (1996) research into naming as social practice for a Los Angeles barrio gang member. Rymes (1996) specifically contrasts how nicknames function in a street gang context and within the culture of a secondary school. Within the gang context, nicknames ‘serve to reinforce a positive social identity; in another context [i.e. school], these names acquire new meanings, and are sometimes criminalized’ (p. 238). Importantly, however, within both contexts, names are more than Saussure’s arbitrary signifiers; they are demonstrated to index social relationship. Emphasizing the contextually bound nature of name usage, that ‘the meaning of these [gang] names is not isolable to the decontextualized utterance (p. 243), Rymes (1996) notes that when she asked her gang member participants to sign in for the various interview sessions she conducted with them, providing their given names and gang names in separate columns, they frequently laughed at the sight of both names used in the same context because, typically, only one name was ever used in one context. Different contexts of gang name use (e.g. reception among school principals, perception among mainstream media audiences) may be subject to new linguistic ideologies (cf. Silverstein, 1992) and, consequently, such names acquire meanings that are ‘perhaps undesirable to the name-bearer’ (Rymes, 1996, p. 237).

Concluding her paper and echoing Bloemmart (2003, 2005), Duthie (2007, p. 11) notes that Western name use among Shanghai business professionals involves ‘a process of re-territorialization’, whereby the deterritorialization of post-modern global culture (cf. Appadurai,
2006) involving ‘people, money, practices and ideas’ [being] removed from a territory and drift[ing] around the globe in fragmented form’ (p. 11) acquires a distinctly local flavour, ‘where foreign origins and local meaning become entwined’ (p. 11). Duthie (2007) therefore strives to accentuate the local meanings of the practice of Western name use among Shanghai business professionals at the beginning of the 21st century and, in doing so, problematises the association of particular practices with particular cultures, themselves mapped onto particular geographies. This translingual practice indexes a post-modern, globalised, ‘cosmopolitan’ or ‘transnational’ (cf. Diao, 2014, pp. 212-13) Chinese identity. As a result, the practice among Chinese speakers in characteristically Chinese or Taiwanese settings (e.g. mainland primary schools or Shanghai workplaces) I would suggest enacts a type of addressivity and intertextuality in which anticipated utterances and interactions are foreshadowed.

Diao (2014) investigates four Chinese graduate students each negotiating identity through use of two names – Chinese and English – in a United States university. Such negotiation and contestation over identity largely comprises the positioning of oneself (yet inevitably others) through language choices undertaken against the attempts by others to position the individual differently. Diao (2014) combines Bakhtin’s (1981) heteroglossia to analyse the multiple identities enacted through language use (i.e. the use of English names) and communities of practice theory to analyse their practices within the setting of a U.S academic community. Basically, Diao (2014) wants to learn how these four Chinese students choose which of the two names to use (and so negotiate the concomitant identities indexed) and how they then understood the meanings generated by such choices.

Diao’s (2014) Chinese participant Anna (discussed earlier) received her Chinese name from a foreign (i.e. non-Chinese) English teacher at her Chinese university as an undergraduate, associating it with interactions among foreigners. Furthermore, as only the younger professors at her undergraduate university used English names, Anna associated this practice with young people, later encouraging her own undergraduate students to refer to her by English name. However, in the United States, tension frequently arose when the university’s professors (and
her Portuguese boyfriend) preferred to use her ethnic Chinese name, whereas Anna preferred them to use her English name; although an important distinction Anna drew about the practice was between one professor who could not speak Chinese and one who could. The latter’s insistence on Chinese name use positioned him in Anna’s mind as ‘Chinese-minded’ (p. 213) while in other such contests, Anna typically surrendered to seniority and status and resigned herself to their use of her Chinese name.

Diao’s (2014) participant Jing, however, used only her Chinese name, insisting that non-Chinese adapt rather than Chinese students cater. Indeed, for Jing, the use of English names among her fellow Chinese students at the University positioned them as, on the one hand, “‘really westernized’” but, on the other hand, as ‘imagining’ [Diao’s italics] United States’ practices rather than actually knowing their tolerance for foreign names. Participant Hui initially used both English and Chinese names before reverting to the practice of solely using his Chinese name. Hui understood this as not being a decision motivated by him as an individual but more so by him as a member of a community of practice whose preference was for Chinese name use. Lastly, Diao’s (2014) participant Bo characterised English name use in China as largely a fashionable metropolitan practice, largely unknown in rural China. Having therefore chosen an English name when he relocated to a city in China, Bo subsequently resumed the practice of only using his Chinese name during a period of employment in Singapore. Like Hui, this practice was understood and analysed as motivated by the community in which he participated: ethnic Chinese working in Singapore. Diao (2014) concludes that while the four participants knew that in the specific academic community in which her study took place it was the norm among Chinese students to prefer practices of Chinese name use, all four operated quite differently. While for one an English name indexed youth and cosmopolitanism, for another it indexed a delusional type of undergraduate or neophyte fad and denial of ethnicity. Nevertheless, for the other two, perceived community practices dictated their own preferences. Accordingly, Diao (2014) highlights cosmopolitanism and community of practice as the two key theoretical perspectives underscoring her participants’ language choices.
Finally, Diao (2014, p. 220) describes her research as preliminary and restricted only to four students undertaking language education. In doing so, she suggests further study among other areas ‘that are less concerned with language and identity but meanwhile are extremely popular among transnational Chinese students (e.g. engineering, business).’ My research does precisely that, involving Chinese students from disciplines as diverse as commerce and business, engineering, architecture, and language studies. Moreover, it includes a mix of undergraduates and graduates from both Taiwan and mainland China. Again, in considering Diao’s (2014) concluding recommendations, this study also includes Chinese students whose names are and are not ‘phonologically transparent’ (p. 220) and who also discuss the negotiation of name choice practices outside of their specific academic communities. Diao (2014) moreover alerts future researchers to the importance of considering the typical practice of assigning Chinese EFL students with English names in light of ‘the construction of ideologies about a monolingual, monocultural Anglophone society’ (p. 220).

2.4.2 Language as local and the difference of the same

The idea of local as used in Duthie’s (2007) discussion of ‘reterritorialization’ above is, I suggest, not about geography inasmuch as it is about geometry. When emphasising a local perspective on language use and globalisation, it is important to understand that local need not refer either to a fixed place or context as per geography; a territory existing a priori. Rather it is an emergent and dialogical configuration of language types and users. Local, for Pennycook (2010, p. 4) for example, is understood as ‘the grounded and the particular.’ Blommaert (2003, p. 611) describes it as a ‘regrettable feature of much discourse on globalisation that it seems to present globalisation as a creation of worldwide uniformity...[whereby]...processes are often represented generically’, thereby evincing a failure to understand sociolinguistic globalisation as involving ‘niched sociolinguistic phenomena related to the insertion of particular varieties of language in exiting repertoires, and also with the language-ideological load both guiding the process and being one of its results’ (p. 610). What is also evident is a failure furthermore to acknowledge the ‘fantastic semiotic creativity, which allows language users opportunities to represent cultural, social and historical conditions of being’ (Blommaert, 2003, p. 611).
The repertoire approach to languaging and the attendant ideas of translingualism, more than the traditional understanding of languages as discrete and fixed systems, whose proficiency of use may be assessed outside of contexts and settings of use, allows for an analysis of globalisation and of language use that emphasises what users actually do with linguistic resources and how they do it, rather than evaluating what they are doing wrong with a capital L language. Recall, for instance, McPherron’s (2009) Chinese student ruminating on her choice of “English name”, and the ‘dozens of names of different kinds: nouns, verbs, adjective words... [that]...are treated equally’ (p. 526) as resources to be adopted and adapted according to needs. Importantly, for Blommaert (2003) and for this study of Chinese and Taiwanese translingual practices, this nuanced and ‘niched character of sociolinguistic globalisation’ (p. 613) demands the imperative to understand its instantiation and irruptions locally. Moreover, sociolinguistic globalisation emphasises the fact that such discursive practices and semiotic creativity do not occur everywhere equally, ‘but in particular different yet interconnected places and not in others, and this is a structural and systemic matter with deep historical roots, not a coincidental one.’

Li Wei’s (2011) translanguaging space is also a non-geographical understanding of space, coined to analyse ‘multilingual speakers’ creative and critical use of the full range of their socio-cultural resources...both going between different linguistic structures and systems and going beyond them.’ Specifically, Li Wei (2011) was documenting the multilingual and transnational practices of three Chinese youth growing up in Britain. Translanguaging space then is a transformative, fluid realm in which, as Li Wei (2011, p. 1223) argues, different values, identities, practices do not simply co-exist with one another, but instead they combine, or are combined, to create new values, identities and practices. Li Wei (2011, p. 1223) describes the dimensions of creativity and criticality as being intertwined, insofar as ‘one cannot push or break boundaries without being critical; and the best expression of one’s criticality is one’s creativity.’

In a 2003 commentary intended to develop a sociolinguistics adequate for the task of addressing the challenges and complexities of globalisation, Blommaert notes the need to move beyond
languages to language varieties and repertoires, in effect, to move from languages as systems and structures to languaging as process. Specifically with reference to English, Blommaert (2003, p. 609) counteracts the theories of, for example, linguistic imperialism, that English or American English eliminates local languages and varieties with its purported unidirectional and uniform spread. Instead, Blommaert argues that a sociolinguistics of globalisation should address the fact that English ‘enters the repertoire of language users as a resource that fulfills both pragmatic functions and metapragmatic ones.’ Such metapragmatic functions, for example, include the ‘distributed symbolic competence’ and subject positioning (Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008, p. 664) observed in the San Franciscan multilingual marketplace settings ‘that makes uttering Spanish or Maya words more than the sum of their grammars or of the communicative roles they perform’ (p. 663).

One task of such a sociolinguistics of globalisation is then ‘to discover what such reorderings of repertoires actually mean and represent to people’ (p. 609), and to describe in turn the ‘fantastic semiotic creativity’ (p. 611) that this ‘late-modern discourse’ (p. 611) both produces and is a product of. These are key aims of my research. Therefore, local and translingual events like Chinese and Taiwanese use of English names in and around an Australian university are to be understood both locally and translocally; a key point of Blommaert’s (2003) sociolinguistics of globalisation being that ‘some of the biggest errors (and injustices) may be committed by simply projecting locally valid functions onto the ways of speaking of people who are involved in transnational flows’ (pp. 615/6). What is evident with such transnational, linguistic flows is what has become known as a deterritorialisation of social identities and language use. With such deterritorialisation comes a movement away from ownership rights of particular languages, and this is where Widdowson’s (1994) *The Ownership of English* is relevant. Widdowson (1994) provides numerous instances of English lexis being repurposed to meet the communicative and communal requirements of stockbrokers and physicists, for example. Such inventions are an everyday and licensed occurrence by these ‘secondary cultures which are defined by their shared professional concerns’ (p. 383); however, such tolerance is not so readily extended, argues Widdowson (1994, p. 383) to primary cultures and communities, where the language is
used in the conduct of everyday social life.’ Indeed, such inventions are conventionally dismissed as ‘deviant’.

Pennycook (2010, p. 25) suggests a theory of practice for applied linguists that enquires of language users how it is they ‘know how to do what they do in the very specific contexts in which they operate, not as a theory of competence underlying performance [since this implies competence as assessed in relation to a pre-determined and/ or core language structure or system], but as a knowledge of everyday practice.’ Pennycook (2010) introduces his reworking of the postmodern concept of recontextualisation with his preferred term relocalisation – ‘the relocalisation of other’s expressions’ (p. 34) – or following on from the work of van Leeuwen (2008) in Discourse and Practice, ‘language practices are social practices in which other social practices have been recontextualized’ (p. 34). Van Leeuwen (2008) begins his first chapter titled Discourse as the Recontextualization of Social Practice with the Weberian (1977) notion of rationalization in which ‘social action is no longer oriented toward meanings, values, and beliefs, but toward strategies, no longer toward the questions “is it true?” “Is it good?” but toward the questions “Does it work?” “Does it achieve its purposes?” (2008, p. 3). Accordingly, I return to Bhabha’s (1985) term ‘fertile mimesis’, Foucault’s notion of ‘repeatable materiality’, a process by which ‘any change in the statement’s conditions of use and reinvestment, any alteration in its field of experience or verification, or indeed any difference in the problem to be solved, can lead to the emergence of a new statement, the difference of the same’ (Bhabha, 1994, p. 33).

In considering the research questions underpinning this thesis, I do not seek to determine whether these names are English names (or Chinese names), but rather whether the practice works, whether it achieves its purposes and what these purposes are. For Radhakrishnan (2005), the objective is not to simply replace the received notion of Global English with this or that Global Other language and thereby redress some sort of hegemonic or imperialistic sociolinguistic injustice. Therefore, the intention here is not simply to replace the questionable term “English names” with, for example, “Chinese names”, although that may redress an element of the chauvinism inherent in the former. Instead, Pennycook (2010, p. 111) observes
that ‘the use of different languages may be of less importance than the language practices we are engaged in’ while Canagarajah (2007, p. 99) maintains that ‘we have to focus more on communicative strategies, rather than on forms of communication.’ For Pennycook (2010, p. 68) with reference to a sign in front of a Kuala Lumpur building that reads *Pub dan karaoke* or the graffito on a Berlin monument that reads *LE KAPITAL C’EST FUN, LE COMMUNISME C’EST NUF*, ‘to ask what language these are in is perhaps to ask the wrong question...[since]...to render diversity contingent on the numerical representation of languages is to focus on languages as entities rather than on linguistic resources, on the quantitative strategy of language enumeration rather than the qualitative understanding of the traffic of meaning.’

2.4.3 Conclusion to the Literature Review

This Literature Review has surveyed research related to traditional Chinese naming and address practices in an effort to highlight, firstly, that the use of various names by and for a Chinese or Taiwanese individual throughout a lifetime and according to different interpersonal or relational contexts is the norm in contemporary Confucian Chinese society. This names and address form tend to index and instantiate relative status, seniority and intimacy of the interlocutors. With this relationality in mind, it is interesting to consider endemic triggers for or predispositions to such the practice of English name use in specific intercultural and classroom settings among Chinese and Taiwanese.

In the Literature Review I also attempt to demonstrate how such conventional Chinese or Confucian practices tend to make the Western or egalitarian norm of first-name basis practices between Chinese and Western non-Chinese potentially fraught in inter-cultural settings. This difficulty can be compounded further by the tendency for non-Chinese to mispronounce, not recall or mis-recall Chinese names, and to often not realise why for many Chinese the mispronunciation particularly produces undesirable outcomes. Accordingly, one initial assumption I make is that the translingual and dialogic practice under investigation will greatly obviate these issues, at least from a Taiwanese or Chinese speaker’s perspective. Therefore, I assume a pragmatic and intercultural aspect to the practice based on the several understandings
outlined above. This assumption is compounded by the notion that for Chinese and Taiwanese, it is the name as written characters that truly matters, that carries auspicious and semantic weight, and that any other spoken, Romanised or pinyin-ised representations of the name/s are mere palimpsests, scraped clean of essential meaning and signification.

Another assumption derives from this understanding that a Chinese name is predominantly a written and character-based entity. It follows from this that even among Chinese speakers, the name as spoken utterance is of ambivalent status, frequently requiring confirmation or clarification during interaction through recourse to the written characters. The argument then is that as a result of this observable practice, the trigger for use of another name drawn from the translingual repertoire available to a Chinese or Taiwanese and specific to intercultural and multilingual encounters is evident. The assumption is consistent with the relational elements of Chinese and Confucian address in so far as it claims that within the relational setting of an Australian tertiary classroom or campus, the appropriate address form advanced by most Chinese and Taiwanese students is an English name. While some lecturers and administrators request the opportunity to use Chinese given names as address forms in their classrooms and workplaces, according to Australian first-name basis interaction tendencies and believing this to be authentic equivalent, for Chinese and Taiwanese students such first-name spoken address tends to occur only in highly intimate contexts.

Before considering the potential for intercultural miscommunication between a Chinese or Taiwanese tertiary student and his or her non-Chinese interlocutor with reference to Bakhtin’s (1986) dialogised heteroglossia and Bourdieu’s (1991) linguistic market, I surveyed the current state of play of the field of research into the practice of “English” name use among Chinese and Taiwanese (and other diasporic Chinese). Accordingly, I conclude that there is more work to be done in an Australian context and using qualitative methods of data triangulation that consider both the Chinese and Taiwanese users’ multiple perspectives, but also those of the interlocutors and recipients. Moreover, in accommodating Diao’s (2014) recommendations, I research among participants from disciplines ‘that are less concerned with language and identity [as Diao’s
participants were] but meanwhile are extremely popular among transnational Chinese students (e.g. engineering, business).’ My research participants include students from disciplines as diverse as commerce and business, engineering, architecture, and language studies. My study includes a mix of undergraduates and graduates from both Taiwan and mainland China. Again, in considering Diao’s (2014) concluding recommendations, this study also includes Chinese students whose names are and are not ‘phonologically transparent’ (p. 220) and who also discuss the negotiation of name choice practices outside of their specific academic communities.

One interesting difference between Diao’s (2014) participants and those of this study (aside from inclusion or identification of Taiwanese) is that Diao’s (2014) participants did not use or soon ceased using English names upon joining the United States, postgraduate language study program. I infer that one reason for this is that these language students were more highly attuned to their linguistic practices than students of different disciplinary backgrounds. Nevertheless, the students tended to heed – Diao (2014) uses the term ‘surrender’ – their North American professors’ requests that they be addressed by their ‘ethnic’ or Chinese names and not use their English names. My students overwhelmingly resisted such inducement to ‘surrender’ and only three did not use English names or did so sparingly. In effect, we have different communities of practice operating in different locals. This highlights a welcome lack of homogeneity among and the presence of nuanced performances of globalised identities among Chinese and Taiwanese students sojourning abroad.

Finally, I observe, record and explore the reception of non-Chinese university lecturers to the practice among their Chinese and Taiwanese students. As the practice and their responses to it and experiences of it is discussed throughout the 90 minute focus group discussion, the lecturers’ understandings deepen and develop in line with greater reflection and exploration. In achieving this perspective and practices of the two university lecturers, I underscore the dialogised heteroglossia of capital L language in contest with small l languaging. Isolated instances of reception of and receptivity to the dialogic practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese, for example, are apparent in the literature viz. positioning of self and
Other in Diao’s (2014) case of Anna and her Portuguese boyfriend, who persists despite protest in using Anna’s Chinese (i.e. ‘exotic’, p. 25) name Min and some of her United States’ university professors. However, the investigation of such non-Chinese reception of and receptivity to the practice has not been accorded the systematic and sustained attention as is achieved in this research.

A second and similar instance of reception in Diao’s (2008/2014) research, also involving participant Anna, occurs ‘when her [Anna’s] professor positioned her based on her ethnic identity rather than her self-positioned identity’ (Diao, 2008, p. 23) through the professor’s continued use of Min when addressing Anna. Edwards (2006) refers to comments and anecdotes by fellow EFL teachers at Northumbria University on the subject/s, while McPherron (2009) refers to ‘interviews and informal hallway chats’ (p. 529) with Chinese and non-Chinese EFL teachers at China Southern University.

The review has identified the theoretical framework I use to analyse and discuss the findings within a heuristic of Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia, Rampton’s (1995, 2010) crossing and contemporary urban vernaculars, Blommaert’s (2003) sociolinguistics of globalisation, as an instance of his ‘late modern discourse’, and Pennycook’s (2010) concepts of relocalisation. Within such a heuristic, social identity is understood as an individual’s membership of a social community and social identity is determined by the extent to which individuals in that community participate in shared practices. As a result, what Rampton (2010, pp. 19-20) terms post-Labovian, “third wave” variationist sociolinguistics emphasises that the meaning of language items is rendered through linguistic styles that incorporate shared linguistic and social resources, in effect shared linguistic and social capital (cf. Bourdieu, 1991), within a local community. These practices can be what Canagarajah (2012, p. 2), for example, describes as ‘transnational contact in diverse social, economic and cultural domains [that] has increased the interaction between languages and language groups...[and]...has involved people taking their heritage languages to new locales and developing repertoires that were not traditionally part of their community.’ In these transnational settings, which need not require migration or
movement to geographically different locales, but could instead involve the changing dynamics of domestic locales, the participants ‘adopt creative strategies to engage with each other and represent their voices’ (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 2).

Clearly, other applied linguists and anthropologists have researched the practice of ethnically Chinese people in different metropolitan settings across the world engaged in something typically called ‘English name’ use. These various analyses and findings have tended to focus on the names themselves and their derivation for the bearers, but have tended to do so without considering the dialogized and relocalised practice that infuses these names. For young Chinese people studying in Australia, the practice of English name use takes place in certain socio-historical moments and spaces, some fixed and some fleeting. The freshness of my approach to the phenomenon is that I focus on process, on languaging within a dialogised heteroglossia, more so than on product. What I bring to the table with this research is a complex and multidimensional socio-historical perspective that is outside of conventional understandings of the practice that locates it within a heteroglossic matrix. In doing so, I strive to avoid deterministic essentialisation, even fetishisation, of national languages or cultures, while acknowledging that national languages and cultures are part of the heteroglossic mix. My focus therefore is on what is being done and why at particular and relatively representative points in time and space, in which specific interactants are involved in language displays that are flavoured with ideology and power. I seek to tease out the complex linguistic ideologies implicit in instances everyday language use.
3. Research design

3.1 Epistemological and theoretical frameworks

Watson-Gegeo (1988, p. 576) describes qualitative research as involving the identification of the ‘presence or absence of something and with determining its nature or distinguishing features.’ It is the presence (and, in a minority of cases for my research participants and settings, absence) of English name use among Taiwanese and Chinese undergraduate and graduate international students that I strive to articulate and analyse, determining how the research participants account for their practice, how the practice is accounted for by two university L1 English Australian lecturers, and what its numerous features and meanings might be in terms of early 21st century mobile and transnational Chinese and Taiwanese subjectivities.

The theoretical focus of the thesis is how identity construction (performance and perceptions) connects to language use: how social categories and identities are derived (by speaker/s and interlocutor/s) from language practices, and how participants’ language ideologies are therefore the foundations that underpin and infuse their language practices. Research into the relationship between identity and language practices in sociolinguistics has shifted from mid- to late-20th century studies, which correlated patterns of language use with discrete and pre-determined identity categories like class, ethnicity, and gender (cf. Labov, 1972), to more recent 21st century studies in sociolinguistic variation, which understand language use and variety as not simply reflecting membership of a priori social categories, but instead as indexing meanings (and, hence, subjectivities) that are specific to the local interactional setting and circumstances. Epistemologically, my research locates itself among such 21st century approaches to language use and identity presentation and performance, in which both are understood as emergent and contingent. Within such an epistemology, identities are considered discursively constructed through practices and, hence, may be fluid, fleeting, fraught and fragmented. Importantly, within this epistemology, capital-L languages like English are also understood as contested, emergent and fundamentally heteroglossic.
3.2 Qualitative Research Methodology and Ethnographic Methods

Researcher positionality and language ecology

My data are drawn from classroom observations and audio-recordings, language exchange meeting observations and audio-recordings, audio-recorded focus group discussions with student participants and lecturers who were themselves observed and audio-recorded in the above classroom settings, as well as a number of other Chinese and Taiwanese graduate and undergraduate students at an Australian university as selected by me. As a former university lecturer, academic skills adviser and ESL teacher with more than ten years of extensive experience working with Chinese and Taiwanese tertiary students, I have also logged field notes throughout the formal data collection process based on related observations, conversations, and reflections in the course of this employment. These field notes, comprising several thousand words, included the on-the-spot recording of relevant episodes and interactions that occurred as part of my university work, as well as my subsequent reflection on these episodes. They are employed sparingly throughout the thesis, but the process of recording them proved invaluable to me as a reflective practitioner. As a result, I ended up with a triangulation of sources: the student insights, the lecturer insights and the field notes, sieved through the theoretical framework employed. I worked on the graduate program as a curriculum designer, content provider and lecturer with the two university lecturers whose accounts of the practice of English name use among their Chinese and Taiwanese students are included among the data collected.

I acknowledge my previous involvement in the field, my incorporation of these logged field notes, and the significance of the involvement and the notes to the research at hand – although not claiming the project is properly ethnographic in its design or execution – with reference to Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008) discussion of a ‘language ecology’ approach to symbolic competence in multilingual settings. In other words, I share with the research participants (in two senses of the word share here: through experience as well as in dialogue) an understanding of the local and situated realities of the social world, which the naming practice at once shapes
and is shaped by. This is the result of a long-standing common membership of that shared social reality, albeit one in which various different roles are played by myself and the participants. Because of this, I added a more ethnographic research method to my toolkit of logging relevant events and incidents I encountered. Kramsch and Whiteside (2008, p. 656) write of a language ecology approach that,

…its constructionist view of the social world…emphasises participants’ local, situated, ethnographic understanding of social reality. The analyst’s membership knowledge of this reality is crucial for the analysis. For, while the participants themselves might not be able to verbalize their orientation to this or that aspect of the interaction, the analyst can recognize and interpret it based on his/her shared understanding of the social world.

Characteristics of qualitative research

The key characteristics of qualitative research for the purposes of this research project are those outlined by Denzin and Lincoln (2000, pp 4-5) when describing it as

…a situated activity that locates the observer in the world... [consisting]...of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible...[... turning]... the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to self...qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

In an effort, therefore, to collect data that is ‘locally situated, participant-oriented, holistic, and inductive’ (Richards, 2009, p. 149), because the language practices under investigation, and their attendant identity performances are situated and emergent, I use a qualitative approach to research methodology. Duff (2007, p. 3) further defines qualitative research as ‘not a unitary construct but a cluster or continuum of approaches that generally seek contextualized, naturalistic, holistic understandings and interpretations of phenomena that occur in particular types of contexts.’

Another objective is to achieve data triangulation (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) in an endeavour to minimise dislocation between the text/s under investigation (i.e. English name use) and the context/s in which such text/s are produced and which these texts, in turn, produce. In other
words, triangulation is employed to facilitate as far as possible the elicitation and collection of ‘thick description and participation’ (Lillis, 2008, p. 367) and, indeed, to facilitate a ‘dynamic interplay between emic and etic [which] is used as a productive heuristic’ (Lillis, 2008, p. 372), specifically, ‘the blending of distinct lenses and categories of description’.

Triangulation of research methods

Triangulation of research methods is achieved through a combination of the following data sources: classroom observation and audio-recordings, semi-structured focus group discussions (FGD) and talks-around-texts (i.e. around classroom and student exchange introductions) involving student and lecturer participants. Duff (2007, p. 4) provides a further description of triangulation as employed in classroom second language socialisation and academic discourse research as including the ‘perspectives of insiders, such as students and teachers, and those of outsiders, such as university researchers.’ Thus, the current research project includes those three perspectives: of students, teachers/lecturers and myself as university researcher and lecturer/academic skills adviser.

Focus group discussions in terms of duration and participant number facilitate rapport development and reciprocity between interviewees and the interviewer (cf. Bryman, 2008), but also among the interviewees or participants themselves, so that Bryman’s (2008, p. 437) ‘rich and detailed answers’ might be elicited, thereby giving ‘insight into what the interviewee[s] see as relevant’ and not just according to the agenda of the interviewer-cum-researcher, that is, of me. As a result, the data collected also features detailed participant personal narratives of target or primary language use. This was facilitated by the largely semi-structured nature of these lengthy discussions. I arrived at each focus group discussion with a prepared list of topics or questions to be covered, but this functioned largely as a safety net and roadmap, should dialogue founder. Dialogue seldom foundered and I seldom resorted to my “cheat sheet”; thereby allowing for a more natural development of dialogue and discussion – less call and response.
At the same time, I acknowledge Duff’s (in press, p. 20) warnings on the ‘social constructions’ that are ‘the narratives and other types of data produced by learners’. Hence, I understand the importance of obtaining as naturalistic-as-possible, primary, in situ linguistic evidence of the practice under investigation, as well as subsequent participant reflection on their output, since ‘how research participants represent themselves and their histories and experiences may depend to a great extent on their assumptions about what the researcher expects to hear’ (Duff, in press, p. 21).

Therefore, as far as possible, the focus group discussion and classroom/language exchange observation and audio recording participants were not made aware of my topic of investigation until the final minutes of data collection processes, when the requisite ethics permission and plain language documents were handed out. In the case of the classroom and language exchange meeting observations, ethics clearance having also been secured, the participants’ introductions using Chinese and/or English names were recorded and observed first and then afterwards, in a separate session (classroom participants) or the second half of the meeting (language exchange participants), the talk-around-texts was undertaken. In this way, the in-situ performances of classroom and language exchange introductions by the research performances was as naturalistic as possible with the researcher introduced as an interested observer simply investigating language practices within tertiary classrooms.

Participant representativeness and feedback

Duff (in press) suggests two trends in language socialisation studies related to identity whereby researchers, firstly, may include several examples rather than just one in order to obtain a measure of representativeness of the sources and the findings. I achieve this through the use of numerous participants in four separate FGD sessions and classroom observation and audio recordings of the same class on three different occasions. Secondly, the research participants (n = 27) themselves may provide feedback on the researcher’s interpretation of the data and, in doing so, offer alternative readings. Accordingly, in an effort to be ‘as transparent and ethical as possible about the research process’ (Duff, in press, p. 21), throughout this Research Design
section I attempt to provide the requisite justification for and explanation of the ‘theoretical, methodological, analytical, and representational decisions’ undertaken in the development and implementation of the research design. Moreover, I contacted several of the participants subsequent to the FGD and classroom observations in a member-checking capacity in order to obtain their follow-up commentary on some of my interpretation of some of the data and to request minor clarification of some terms used by the relevant participants.

Principles and levels of ethnography

With specific reference to the domain of academic writing but with a general applicability, Lillis (2008, p. 367) promotes the value of ‘cyclical talk over a lengthy period of time’ for facilitating the acquisition of both ‘thick description and participation’: ‘a wide range of data collected, over a significant period of time, and involving sustained engagement between researcher and participants’ (p. 371). This levels elicits aspects of and perspectives on the practice that are significant to participants (i.e. emic perspective) and generate further researcher questions and investigations. Lillis (2008, p. 372) emphasises the importance of, for example, field notes in order to ‘reinsert my (our) selves into the “field”- people’s ongoing lives.’ Lillis (2008), however, points out the established limitations of ethnography as method, notably ‘the need to avoid naïve or realist descriptivism or the parallel danger of reading micro data through macro social/critical theory’ (pp. 372-3). Hence, a grounded theory inductive approach to theory generation has been preferred. My data analysis is achieved using Grounded Theory insofar as, firstly, the research process operates from data to theory (Richards, 2003) and, secondly, a fundamental aim of the research is to generate theory from this data though an inductive approach.

Watson-Gegeo (1988) describes an ethnographic methodology as including techniques of observation, participant-observation (observing while interacting with those under study), informal and formal interviewing of the participants observed in situations, audio- or videotaping of interactions for close analysis, collection of relevant or available documents and other materials from the setting, and other techniques as required to answer research questions.
posed by a given study. My research approach is primarily qualitative, but given my closeness to the participants and the field through employment, there is an ethnographic element to it. In differentiating qualitative research from naturalistic and ethnographic research in ESL, Watson-Gegeo (1988) outlines several key principles of ethnographic research. Firstly, it is *group-orientated*. In this regard, my research is group-oriented and focuses on people’s behaviour in groups and on cultural patterns across that behaviour. Individual differences are also important for establishing variation in behaviours. However, most ethnographic studies are focussed on group rather than individual characteristics, because cultural behaviour is by definition shared behaviour (Watson-Gegeo, 1988).

Secondly, ethnographic research is considered by Watson-Gegeo (1988) to be *naturalistic*, which means observations are undertaken in the environments where the participants go about their everyday lives. I endeavour in part to observe, audio-record, and take notes on the practice *in situ*, variously as a “guest” in the classrooms of a graduate university program and of two university language exchange evenings, or as a participant-observer (i.e. lecturer, academic skills adviser) in other classrooms, consultation rooms and moderation or staffroom environs. Similarly, while the focus group discussions were primarily to obtain personal narratives and accounts of the practice from the participants, there was also the opportunity to observe their conduct in a largely English language setting and to audio record and observe the practice of English name use among them as they introduced themselves.

Thirdly, Watson-Gegeo (1988) describes ethnographic research as being *holistic*, insofar as it considers the larger system of which the behaviour or the practice (e.g. the classroom, the university, a mainstream Australian institutional setting) is part. For example, in discussing ethnographic research in ESL classrooms, Watson-Gegeo (1988, p. 578) suggests ethnographers ‘move from the micro-context of the interaction outward, these rings might include other interactions during the lesson, the lesson taken as a whole, the classroom with its characteristics and constraints, the school, the district (or other regional administrative level), and the society.’ This is akin to Said’s (1983) idea of ‘worldiness’, in which readers, authors and texts cannot be
meaningfully theorised without a base awareness of the political circumstances surrounding their production and consumption. I also acknowledge Canagarajah’s (2004) description of tertiary language schools (and we would add university classrooms, particularly for ESL and EAL learners) as ‘power-laden...medium[s] of ideological and social reproduction’ (p. 120), so that the practices I observe, audio record, request accounts of, and theorise are understood to shape and be shaped by a socially and ideologically dynamic environment.

Finally, ethnographic data collection begins with a theoretical framework that causes the researcher to focus on specific aspects of situations and kinds of research questions. In other words, theory underpins observation and interpretation in ethnography (Watson-Gegeo, 1988). The researcher is neither a blank slate nor an impartial observer, since as Watson-Gegeo (1988, p. 578) emphasises, ‘observation...not guided by an explicit theoretical framework...will be guided only by the observer’s" implicit ontology’, by which Watson-Gegeo (1988) means the researcher’s acknowledged or otherwise values, attitudes, and assumptions about how the world “works” and it components connect and intersect.

3.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What naming practices are Chinese and Taiwanese students engaged in when they use and request others to use English names in an Australian university setting?
2. How do the Chinese and Taiwanese student-participants account for these naming practices?
3. How are these naming practices accounted for by two classroom lecturers, who teach a number of the Taiwanese and Chinese student participants?
4. What insights into Chinese identity practices and performances, in light of the intercultural and dialogic interaction among teachers, students, and the researcher, do these naming practices offer?
3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

In order to address the four research questions presented above, I collected data from four separate sources during fieldwork specifically conducted at a Melbourne metropolitan university between July 2009 and June 2010. Additionally, participant observations and logged field notes were undertaken during my employment at the university as a lecturer and academic skills adviser from the commencement of the project in October 2008 until the termination of such employment in July 2014. Following the model used in Lee Er-Xin’s (2007) unpublished doctoral thesis on the sociolinguistic authentication of Mainland Chinese identities in relation to their ethnically Chinese counterparts in Singapore, two types of data were collected: interactional data and interview data. Interactional data are significant for the analysis of everyday linguistic practices, while interview data permit analysis of participants’ perspectives and personal narratives on linguistic and social practices.

Research participants

All research participants were drawn from the Melbourne metropolitan university across a diversity of disciplines (e.g. Commerce, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, TESOL, Management) and degrees (graduate coursework, PhD and undergraduate), having sojourned in Melbourne and/or Australia for varying lengths of time (e.g. several months to seven years). For example, the graduate program students may have only been in Melbourne for a number of weeks at the time of being observed, recorded and interviewed while some of the other research participants had completed part of their secondary school education in Melbourne before attending the university. There was no indication among the vast majority of students as to whether they would seek permanent residency in Australia. Qian, as the oldest research participant, was also the only participant actively seeking this.

The overwhelming majority of the 23 Chinese and Taiwanese research participants were female (n. 19). This statistic was not achieved by research design but rather seems a likely consequence of the anecdotally- and experientially-noted gender-skewed nature of (a) the English language
graduate program on which I taught (popular with intending Chinese and Taiwanese ESL teachers) and (b) the tendency for female students irrespective of ethnicity to seek out academic advice in greater numbers than males at university level (cf. Alexitch, 1997).

Finally, following on from Diao’s (2014, p. 220) recommendations for further research, it is significant to note that I acted on her suggestion for a diversity of university disciplines represented among the participant sample. Moreover, in addition to the language education backgrounds of her participants (i.e. ‘they [language education students] were probably more aware of the social and linguistic contexts that may affect one’s identity’), this study also includes Chinese and Taiwanese participants ‘whose [Chinese] names are not phonologically transparent’ (p. 220), most particularly when Romanised (cf. Qian).

Data sources

The following four data sources were used.

1. University graduate program class

A class of 13 graduate students from multilingual backgrounds (e.g. Saudi, Korean, Iranian, Afghani, Chinese, Taiwanese, Japanese – see Appendix item 1 for an excerpt from a classroom discussion featuring these students). Eight of these students were Chinese or Taiwanese, of whom two were male. Although I was working as a curriculum developer and lecturer on the graduate program at the time of data collection, I had never taught the student participants and was not scheduled to do so for two further semesters. The class was observed and audio-recorded in situ in three different subjects (two in the first week of the semester and the third in the mid-semester). In the mid-semester class, a presentation on the short story Jenny (1995) by Australian Chinese émigré writer Ding Xiao was conducted by Chinese student Sophie. The story was part of the syllabus, so regularly timetabled, and involved a Chinese woman who uses an English name and who eventually emigrates to Australia. Appendix item 1, which displays a transcribed excerpt from this graduate class, includes questions posted by Sophie to her peers about the story Jenny that she had just presented. At the end of the semester, the seven Chinese
and Taiwanese students participated in a two-hour long focus group discussion with me in the lunch room used by the program’s students.

2. University lecturers

Four female L1 English-speaking Australian university lecturers (two of whom, Barb and Margie had administered the graduate program, while Margie went on to manage the tertiary language school from whose English for Academic Purposes programs some of the graduate students had been sourced). I had worked with Barb and Margie for three years on the graduate program at the time of data collection, but had never discussed the practice of English name use among the Chinese and Taiwanese students (not to mention a tiny number of Korean and Vietnamese graduate students) with Barb or Margie. They were, however, aware of my research interest in the practice. Three of these lecturers (aside from Margie) were observed and audio-recorded in the three different classes and subjects already noted. Subsequent to classroom observations and audio-recordings, and also subsequent to the focus group discussion with the graduate students, I conducted a 90-minute focus group discussion with Barb and Margie, in which they discussed his observations of the different classes and subjects with reference to the practice, and all three discussed their experiences with and perspectives on the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese.

The other two lecturers observed and audio-recorded were unavailable to attend the focus group discussion. I already enjoyed good rapport with Barb and Margie. One notable aspect of the focus group discussion was that as discussion of the practice continued, Barb and Margie began to acknowledge hitherto ill- or un-considered aspects of it as the talk turned from descriptive experiences of the practice to more analytical accounts of it. This analytical turn was informed by my inclusion of knowledge and understandings garnered from the literature and from discussion with students as well as the process of dialogue drawing the participants into deeper and more critical reflection.
3. Chinese university students

I conducted three focus group discussion of roughly ninety minutes each in length among eleven undergraduate and graduate mainland Chinese students (10 females and 1 male), studying at the same Melbourne university. These student participants were selected after I first met them in academic advice sessions (presentations of one-on-one consultations) as part of my employment at the university. Selection was based on availability, willingness and English language competence (sufficiently proficient and voluble enough to discuss and reflect on language practices). The students were not aware of the topic of my research thesis, simply that I had an interest in Chinese and Taiwanese students’ English language practices. The FGD were semi-structured and I had a pool of questions available should prompting be required. The issue of practices of English name use was introduced so as to elicit personal narratives and accounts within a broader discussion of globalisation and English language learning and teaching in China. Open-ended questions were employed and discussion among the participants without me interrupting was encouraged. I exercised no direct influence over their university grades or progress, except to provide academic advice on their writing, speaking, information literacy or exam preparation skills. These twelve students were from a variety of disciplines and degrees, as illustrated earlier.

4. Language exchange participants

Seven Australian, Chinese and Taiwanese university students (3 male and 4 female) who participated in regular, informal Chinese-English language exchange meetings on the university campus. One of the Chinese university students, Andrea from FGD4, organised these exchanges and had invited me to attend in order to gather data. I observed and audio-recorded Two of these language exchange meetings, from which target or primary language data were collected during introductions. At the conclusion of the second meeting, a focus group discussion was conducted among the attendees and the practice of English name use (and Chinese name use by the two L1 English Australian attendees) was discussed in general and as observed and audio-recorded by the researcher.
Table 1 provides a breakdown of the 23 Chinese and Taiwanese research participants (N.B. Andrea is in two cohorts), two L1 English Australian language exchange participants, two Australian university lecturers, and their respective six focus group discussions whose data were collected for this PhD research.

Table 1: Participant details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant “English name” or pseudonymised Chinese name</th>
<th>Study discipline area and level</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussion 1 (FGD1)</td>
<td>University graduate Master’s/Diploma program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eason</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussion 2 (FGD2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Undergraduate Commerce</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Graduate M. Urban Planning</td>
<td>Mainland Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Major/Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Graduate M.</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie</td>
<td>Graduate M.</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Graduate PhD</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenks</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi</td>
<td>Graduate M.</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfie</td>
<td>Graduate M. TESOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Graduate M.</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD5</td>
<td>Language exchange group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>M. TESOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>M. Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>M. Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection procedures

With reference to the collection of qualitative data, Duff (in press, p. 18) suggests a number of methods and approaches including ‘critical incidents or interactions (e.g. with native speakers in an L2 context) reported by participants or observed by researchers.’ The research design, consequently, emphasises the role of classroom introduction sessions between teacher-lecturer and student and among students as such a critical interaction, during which the name by which the student prefers to be addressed is provided. The research participants described in the preceding section comprise two such classroom introduction sessions that I observed, audio-recorded, and subsequently reviewed. Similarly, as noted above, two sessions of a weekly Chinese-English university language exchange meeting were also observed, audio-recorded, and subsequently reviewed; the difference in the latter being that once the introductions were finished in the second language exchange session, I asked questions of the Chinese and Australian participants based on my observations, recordings and reflections.

Recalling Duff (in press, p. 18), the four focus group discussion sessions primarily allowed for ‘critical incidents or interactions (e.g. with native speakers in an L2 context) to be reported by participants’, so that personal narrative and accounts of the practice might be elicited. They were also an opportunity for the observation and recording of the primary or target language use via participant introductions. As outlined above, the classroom observations and audio-recordings were undertaken in a class for 13 new international ESL graduate students for a Master’s program. The program included content-based subjects (e.g. Intercultural
Communication, which I coordinated and taught) and skills-based subjects (e.g. the particular class being observed and audio-recorded), the latter of which would comfortably fit Duff’s (2010) outline of programs of language socialisation into academic discourse.

In the two latter of the three focus group discussions, the participants were asked at the beginning of the session each to write on separate A4 pieces of paper three things: their Chinese names in Chinese characters, their Chinese names as transcribed in pinyin, and their “English names”. At a later stage of the FGD, I referred the participants to these three written names as a topic for discussion. This was a productive “experiment” that had not been formulated at the time of the first FGD, eliciting discussion of the key them of modality and Chinese names.

3.5 Transcription, coding and analysis of data

Recording and transcription

Data from classroom proceedings and focus group discussions were audio-recorded using an iPhone 4, whose relatively small size made for unobtrusive collection of data. The data were then imported into a computer as .mpeg files and played using a VLC media player. All the spoken data collected from the classroom, language exchange and focus group discussion audio-recordings were then transcribed twice for the sake of accuracy and to facilitate the development of my exposure to and familiarity with the contents. Firstly, I transcribed the data in full in long-hand. Next, transcriptions using Microsoft Word were produced whereby I listened again to the data, checked the long-hand transcriptions for accuracy while also typing from the audio and the long-hand transcriptions into Word documents. Having transcribed the entirety of the FGDs and classroom audio-recordings into Word documents, the data were exported into Excel spreadsheets to facilitate their segmentation, and the first stage of the coding process.

Coding and categorisation

Saldaña (2009, p. 4) describes coding as a ‘transitional process between data collection and more extensive data analysis.’ Moreover, first cycle and, if required, second cycle coding are
preliminary steps in the categorisation of data, allowing researchers, in the words of Richards and Morse (2007, p. 157) to ‘get ‘up’ from the diversity of data to the shapes of the data.’ For Richards (2003, p. 271), categorisation is a central ‘link between interpretive positioning and data collection, suggesting a degree of interconnectivity that undermines any notion of analysis as a linear process that can be instantiated in a series of clearly specifiable steps.’ Accordingly, the data set is broken down and different arrangements of it are explored by the researcher ‘to promote a better understanding of what it represents’ (Richards, 2003, p. 271). Richards (2003, p. 276) lists three stages of coding ‘designed to open up inquiry and move it towards interpretation.’ These three stages are open coding, in which data is broken down, categorised, conceptualised and compared; axial coding, in which relationships within and between categories are explored; and selective coding, in which central categories are established and other categories refined and subsumed accordingly. I undertook data analysis as an iterative process, in which focus group discussion and classroom observation/recording data were coded, the data were progressively reduced and the numerous codes clustered into key themes or motifs. I drew inferences from the data and verified or disconfirmed these with reference to further data collected or the research literature.

In the case of the data collected for this research project from focus group discussions and classroom observations and audio recordings, the names of the codes used were initially derived from ‘what participants talk about’ (Saldaña, 2009, p. 6), although how the various participants talked about a particular topic or issue might vary considerably. In other words, utterances may be grouped together under a specific code ‘not just because they are exactly alike or very much alike, but because they might also have something in common – even if, paradoxically, that commonality consists of differences’ (p. 6).

Keeping in mind, Richards’ (2003, p. 282) admonition against ‘the inclination to tidy up’ the coding – and indeed analytic – process, I tried to code all relevant data obtained and, for the sake of validity, to both seek out negative evidence as per Analytic Induction techniques and constantly review and revise extant categories should new one arise, as would be expected in a
Grounded Theory data analysis approach (Richards, 2003, p. 287). The basic unit of analysis for coding in the project at hand, or the adopted ‘Method for Segmenting the Flow of Language’ (Loban, 1976, p. 8), is determined by the researcher’s judgement of a particular meaning, a particular theme, having been communicated by a participant; it may prove to be a phrase, a word, an entire sentence, or, indeed, a given utterance or interactional turn itself. It is, therefore, a semantic entity. Nevertheless, each line of transcribed data was given a code, which it may or may not in turn share with preceding and subsequent lines. The unit of analysis is not, in other words, a pre-determined, consistently-applied grammatical entity.

The following three tables are intended to provide an overview of these initial processes of transcription, coding, and categorisation of data. In other words, their purpose is largely procedural. With this context and rationale in mind, Table 2 below is an example of a section of participant talk coded. It is taken from an Excel spreadsheet and for clarity of presentation in Word ordered into a table. Table 3, which follows, is a breakdown of the first round codes as deemed emergent from the data by the researcher. Finally, Table 4 shows the preliminary key codes or categories derived from the data (and the various initial codes) and as entered into Nvivo software by the researcher. These themes used to structure the Findings and Discussion chapters were derived from these provisional codes in a process of refinement with each passing of the data.

Table 2: Tabulated example of coded FGD spoken data. R = researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Code (see Table 3)</th>
<th>Researcher Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>My one's hard. Bruce is okay. Bruce is, like, very normal.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>What is “normal” here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Hmmm, yeah.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>What about you guys? Have you had that experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[to Dan] You went from Dolphin to Annie?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yeah, because I changed few times because English for me is quite random, and maybe I like one singer and her name is =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>= Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>= and I change it to her name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It could happen because it isn't my official name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't need to go to a police station [all laughter] or a law office, it's very easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you want to change my official name, it's very hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But, for English name =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>= One's preferences really emotional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Really depends on the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>I actually, I can talk about it [i.e. use of and changing English names]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivations for name change: English as “random”

Source: singers/pop stars/celebrities

Motivations for name change: new favourite singer (e.g. see Olivia on clothing and moods)

Chinese name is official

English name is easily changed

Chinese name is not so easy to change

See Olivia again on mood (cf. emotions)

Cultural practice w. individual varieties/nuances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>In China or Australia?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Here too. Because we had a booth in Orientation [week] and there was this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian boy, he studies Mandarin, very fluently, very good, and straight away he told me his Chinese name. It is something something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But I suppose everybody else calls his English name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He is not addressed by Chinese name; he just told me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 18 | Flipside of practice: non-Chinese use of Chinese names |
| 15 | Contexts or settings of use/dialogic |
He trying to use Chinese name, but everybody else calls him English name.

Not correct, but alludes to comment made later by Jenks.

**Table 3: First round or initial codes derived from data and as applied in Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Etymology of Chinese names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Examples and types of English names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chinese participants’ introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese names as written characters primarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitudes to English name use (one’s own and/or others’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Retrieval and pronunciation of English names vs. Chinese names by L1 English interlocutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Uniqueness of names as virtue in Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Source of English names (including comments on process of naming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Etymology of English names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Notions of self and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Preferred term of address (Chinese and/or English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Contexts of English name use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Motivation for English name use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Changing English or Chinese names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Who can use your English name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Problems arising from English name use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chinese address forms and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Non-Chinese peoples’ use of Chinese names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chinese use of non-English non-Chinese names</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Key (provisional) categories or themes (numbered) and initial codes (bullet-pointed) for Nvivo coding**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary theme or category</th>
<th>Initial sub-theme or code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changeability and interchangeability of English names – primer</td>
<td>• changing Chinese names</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Source of English names and processes of naming | • Chinese use of “non-Chinese, non-English names”  
• Examples and types of “English names” |
| 3. Chinese naming and address practices and address conventions | • Meanings of Chinese names  
• Uniqueness of given name/s as desirable  
• Chinese names as fundamentally written characters  
• Non-Chinese use of Chinese names |
| 4. Participant introductions | • Evidence of practice (viz. target language use) |
| 5. Problems/challenges arising from “English name” use | • Non-Chinese insistence on using Chinese names  
• Stereotypical positioning (e.g. Chinese copy and love West/denigrate themselves)  
• Failure to understand Chinese name mispronounced and English name not yet internalised |
| 6. Motivations for “English name” use | • Mispronunciation and multi-pronunciation of Chinese names  
• Attitudes to English name use by (a) self and (b) other Chinese  
• Notions of self and identity (modern and post-modern) |
Data analysis and judgement calls

Nevertheless, to codify data, to systematically order it and claim to see patterns in the data that allow it to then be appraised as meaningful and explicable, is for the researcher to make a ‘judgement call’ (Sipe and Ghiso, 2004, p. 482), based upon his or her subjectivities and proclivities. Merriam (1998) argues that the various constructs and theories that initially inform a research project, of which coding is one such construct, are subsequently reflected in the project’s findings. As such, the codes I employed in the preliminary stages of data analysis were devised inductively to lead eventually to the fewer key themes through which the data might be displayed and discussed. These themes provide the structure for the presentation and analysis of the data in the Findings and Discussion chapters. As practices of categorisation and coding of data took place, the names given to the different codes and categories, as well as the composition of the clusters, progressively changed with each iteration or passing. So, with a diversity of coding methods potentially available to the qualitative researcher (e.g. Saldaña, 2009, lists 28 first cycle coding methods, some of which may be used simultaneously and some of which overlap), the question arises as to what coding method/s to employ for a given research project. Saldaña’s (2009, p. 47) answer to this question is that ‘it depends.’

The themes I use to structure the Findings and Discussion chapters represent the final stages of data coding and analysis. These themes are not mutually exclusive or hermetic, but function as prompts for the discussion. This reflects what Block (2007, p. 864) describes as an idealisation or simplification, in which he qualifies his use of three particular descriptors for the purposes of analysis. I pursue an equivalent idealisation, or simplification, ‘not as an ontological commitment,
but a strategy that allows me to proceed with the discussion at hand’ (Block, 2007, p. 864). As a result, the themes used to structure this discussion are not definitive ontological commitments, but simply facilitate the organisation of the data and, hence, its discussion. That said, data analysis commenced immediately following data transcription, which I undertook within hours of conducting the focus group discussions and classroom audio recordings. One reason for this was it allowed me to use insights from early stages of data collection to inform later stages of data collection.

New theory about a phenomenon

My study has not inherited any explicit hypotheses that it seeks to support, nor are there established a priori heuristics in the field or the literature, so therefore one goal of the research is ‘to develop new theory about a phenomenon’ (Saldaña, 2009, p. 49) inductively and, consequently, a combination of descriptive and In Vivo coding methods is preferred. This is because the researcher wanted to remain as open to the possibilities of the data as possible. Descriptive coding, sometimes known as topic coding, attributes a word or short phrase as a summary of a passage of data, and is used in this research. Typically, the words and short phrases employed are nouns (Saldaña, 2009, p. 70), supplied by the researcher and these nouns frequently repeat throughout the coded passages. As such, the codes are considered to emerge from the data, as, of course, judged by me, but also according to their frequency of mention by the participants or their emphasis by the participants.

In order to perhaps stay true to the language use and terminology of the participants, In Vivo coding was also employed in the preliminary stages, whereby the topic words used to codify the data are derived from the participants’ actual language. In other words, the topics used to codify the data are ‘participant-generated’ (Saldaña, 2009, p. 74), although the participants themselves may not have specified they be used as code words or topic phrases. Given that many of participants in the study at hand use English as a second (ESL) or additional (EAL) language, I was cautious about making extensive use of In Vivo coding, in case it compromised the accuracy of the descriptor and the code, a fundamental aspect of academic writing. Moreover, a further
caveat is that extensive reliance on In Vivo coding may limit a researcher’s ability to shape the data (Saldaña, 2009, p. 77), to “own” his or her data as it were. Nevertheless, In Vivo coding does function to promote voices, language and therefore perspectives that are frequently ‘marginalized’ (Saldaña, 2009, p. 74). Saldaña (2009, p. 76) observes that a researcher using In Vivo coding should trust his or her instincts inasmuch as ‘when something in the data appears to stand out, apply it as a code.’ Finally, all qualitative data passages (i.e. from focus group discussions and classroom audio-recordings) that were coded with a particular topic word were then extracted from the mass of collected data and stored together for subsequent categorisation and analysis using both Excel and Nvivo software.

3.6 CONCLUSION

Beginning with the theoretical and epistemological frameworks underpinning my research, this chapter then outlined how and why a grounded theory approach was adopted as part of a Qualitative Research methodology and design, that itself incorporated some ethnographic methods. Following this, the four research questions that guided the enquiry were presented. Moreover, the chapter has provided a description of how participants for this study were identified and recruited and how the data for this research were collected, transcribed, coded and analysed, rationalising the decisions made while drawing on relevant literature for support. Data sources were selected to, firstly, provide examples of the target or primary language in use in situ and, secondly, to allow for talk-around-the-text as well as more generalised discussion of the practice under investigation through the perspectives of participants’ personal narratives, reflections and observations. Discussion among participants and myself were largely semi-structured with certain topics and questions consistently addressed, but not necessarily in a particular order or according to a prepared document.

The spoken data collected was not “tidied up” and their transcription attempts as faithfully as possible to render into written form what participants actually said. The Findings chapter follows and presents the data collected from the classroom and language exchange audio-recordings and observations and the focus group discussions.
4. Findings

4.1 Introduction

This Findings chapter presents excerpts of the data from the three key research sources: transcriptions of classroom audio-recordings and observations, language exchange audio-recordings, and Focus Group Discussion audio-recordings and observations. A small number of my logged field notes are referred to in order to complement the participant data.

The majority of the presentation of the data is arranged by six key themes, which are also used to structure discussion of the data in Chapter 5. However, the next two sections of the chapter, 4.2 and 4.3 are devoted to presenting data relating to the practice itself enacted in situ and accounts of the origins of the practice, for most participants, in Chinese and Taiwanese primary and secondary school classrooms. The six thematic sections that follow sections 4.2 and 4.3 have been chosen and labelled by me for exposition and exploration of the practice. The raison d'être for these six themes is a consequence of their frequency of mention, allusion or reference by the research participants. They are therefore considered emergent from the data and not a priori, predetermined categories. The research questions, already given in Chapter 3, are reproduced below:

1. What naming practices are Chinese and Taiwanese students engaging in when they use and request others to use English names in an Australian university’s settings?
2. How do the Chinese and Taiwanese student-participants account for these naming practices?
3. How are these naming practices accounted for by two classroom lecturers, who teach a number of the Taiwanese and Chinese student participants?
4. What insights into Chinese identity practices and performances, in light of the intercultural and dialogic interaction among teachers, students, and the researcher, do these naming practices offer?

4.2 THE LANGUAGE PRACTICES BEING UNDERTAKEN

A practice is understood as a habitual social activity; social practices being, therefore, the series of actions that comprise human daily lives. Ortner (1984) describes a social practice approach as one in which foregrounds the theorising of every day routines and scenarios, which are understood to embody and enact norms, values and conceptual schemes to do with space, time and social order. Accordingly, it is through the practice of these routines and scenarios that such norms, values and conceptual schemes are reproduced and reified. Practices, therefore, are the ways in which everyday social life is organised and, as such, language understood as practice emphasises process over structure.

I analyse language therefore as a social phenomenon, rather than as an abstract formal system. This analysis takes language to be one of many culturally shared resources that are used with different degrees of success to serve the specific social needs of individuals. One such everyday language practice is introducing oneself successfully by name, specifically in this case in an Australian university classroom setting. Introducing oneself by name involves both successfully communicating to others how one will be referring to oneself and also how one would like others to refer to oneself. It is a common practice of Australian university tutorial and seminar classrooms, most especially on the first such meetings of a semester, that the assembled students introduce one another using first names.

The following sub-section provides examples of Chinese and Taiwanese research participants introducing themselves in classroom, language exchange and Focus Group Discussion settings. All Taiwanese and Chinese graduate program students used English names at some point in
initial classroom greetings and introductions, while 13 of the 16 focus group discussion participants did so in their introductions, as did 6 of the 7 Chinese and Taiwanese students in the language exchange session. Nevertheless, at some point in their primary, secondary or tertiary education, all but one Chinese and Taiwanese participant had adopted or received an English name. The one exception, Summer, had chosen her name prior to taking the IELTS test in Australia because she had been led to understand that this would benefit her chances of success by creating a favourable impression on the IELTS examiner. In the data excerpts provided below, we display more of the interaction than the utterance of the name alone in order to provide context or framing of the interaction together with interlocutors’ responses.

4.2.1 Use of English name only.
(Excerpt taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Nancy is a mainland Chinese student and Barb is the course coordinator and subject lecturer.)

1. Nancy: Hello, everyone, my name...[a student arrives late]...my name is
2. Nancy. I’m from China. Um =
3. Barb: = Ah, you are? [Looking down at the student roll, in which names are rendered in Romanised Chinese].
4. Nancy: Yeah, [gives full three-charactered Chinese name].
5. Barb: You are [repeats full Chinese name].
7. Barb: And you’re called Nancy.
9. Barb: And you’ve gone by Nancy for long? I mean, are you used to being called Nancy =
10. Nancy: = Yeah
11. Barb: Or are you not going to listen to us when we call you Nancy?
13. Barb: S’okay, Nancy?
4.2.2 Use of English name only.
(Excerpt taken from language exchange classroom first day introductions. Annie and Amy are mainland Chinese university students and introduce themselves one after the other.)

1. Annie: Oh, hi everybody. I’m Annie.

4.2.3 Use of English name only.
(Extract taken from focus group discussion introductions. Jenks, Qian, and Seffie are mainland Chinese university students, although Qian also works at the university. R is the PhD researcher.)

1. Jenks: My name is, ah, Jenks.
2. Qian: Jenks. Jenks? Yeah?
3. Jenks: It's actually, ah, Jenkins. Short for Jenkins. J-E-N-K-S. Um, it's a weird name. My dad gave this to me. He had no idea how odd it makes.4
4. R: You can all introduce yourselves to Jenks. Jenks, you said?
5. Jenks: That's right.
6. Seffie: James?
7. Jenks: Jenks with a K.
8. Seffie: How do you spell it?
10. Q and S: J-E-N-K-S.
11. Qian: Aaah, I thought it was James.

4.2.4 Unprompted use of English name and Chinese name.
(Extract taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Sylvia is a Taiwanese student.)

Excerpt 7.02 Day 1 GELF new semester classroom introductions

1. Barb: Who’s next?

4 Further analysis of Jenks’ name in light of Chinese naming practices is provided in 4.3.2 An argument against use of “common” English names.
2. Sylvia: Hi everyone. My name is [gives full three-character Chinese name]. Um, my English name is Sylvia.
3. Barb: Sylvia?
5. Barb: [Begins to utter Sylvia’s Chinese given name]
6. Sylvia: [Repeats her full three-character Chinese name].
7. Barb: I can manage [gives two characters of Sylvia’s Chinese given name/s]. Have you always been called Sylvia?

4.2.5 Unprompted use of English name and Chinese name.

(Extract taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Eason is a mainland Chinese student and Barb is the course coordinator and subject lecturer.)

1. Eason: Hi everyone. My name is [gives full three-charactered Chinese name]. I’d like everyone to call me Eason. Um, =
2. Barb: = Ethan? As in...?
4. Barb: Hang about. [Laughter from all]. Not [gives two characters of Eason’s Chinese given name/s]? You don’t want me to, I know
5. Eason: [again gives two characters of Eason’s Chinese given name/s]?
7. Eason: Cos it’s the same pronunciation of [again gives two characters of his Chinese given name/s] in my language.

4.2.6 Unprompted use of English name and Chinese name.
(Extract taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Nancy is a mainland Chinese student, the same one as in 1. (a) above, but this is from introductions two days later.)

1. Nancy: My name is [gives full three-charactered Chinese name]. Please call me Nancy; it is similar to my first name.

4.2.7 Use of Chinese name only.
(Extract taken from focus group discussion introductions. Dan is a female mainland Chinese university student, who introduces herself with a single Chinese given name.)

1. Dan: My name’s Dan. I don’t have English name.
2. Seffie: Dan?

4.2.8 Use of Chinese name only.
(Extract taken from focus group discussion introductions. Qian is a female mainland Chinese university student and employee, who introduces herself with a single Chinese given name.)

1. Qian: Seffie, nice to meet you. I’m Qian.

4.2.9 Use of Chinese and English name in first introduction then use of English name alone in subsequent introduction.
(Extract taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Sophie is a Taiwanese student, the same one as in 4.2.4 above, but this is from introductions two days later)

1. Sophie: I’m Sophie.

4.2.10 Use of Chinese and English name in first introduction then use of English name alone in subsequent introduction.
(Extract taken from graduate classroom first day introductions. Eason is a mainland Chinese student, the same one as in 4.2.5 above, but this is from introductions two days later.)

1. Eason: Hello, I’m Eason.

Summary of 4.2 data
I identify four different types of introduction routines or sequences in which the primary or target language feature is used, that is in which either Chinese or English names or both are provided. One element of the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese is evident in the data and to be found in excerpts 4.2.5 and 4.2.6. In both excerpts mainland Chinese students Eason and Nancy state that their choice of English name sounds similar to their Chinese name. They would both prefer to use an English homophone to their actual Chinese name and have this used by their interlocutor, Barb. As a result, we gain insight into, firstly, the process of one way in which an English name might be chosen and, secondly, one reason why an English name might be chosen. Nancy, for example, chooses an English name that is a homophone of her Chinese name (while having no semantic equivalence). Eason chooses an “English name” that we learn is one used by a Hong Kong pop star and is also homophonous, but which sees Barb rendering it more than once as the closest normative English name to Eason, Ethan. When participants use what we might term for the moment unusual English names (see also Seffie and Jenks), the Chinese or Australian interlocutor typically “reaches” for its homophonous English equivalent (e.g. Steffie and James).

4.3 ORIGINS AND SOURCES

For a substantial majority of the student participants, the practice of English name use began in English language classrooms in China and Taiwan at primary or secondary school level. There were a variety of methods as to how the names might be acquired and, in most cases, the participants changed their English names from those acquired in classroom ‘baptismal events’ (cf. Putman, 1975) to names that might be interpreted as more personal. According to participant accounts, the English names were never used outside the primary or secondary school English language classroom and were unknown to other students or teachers outside these classrooms. For most, the rationale for the practice was never provided by teachers or textbooks and for many (see excerpts 4.3.3, 4.3.4, and 4.3.5) the classroom baptism procedure was a largely lifeless and mechanical affair, something that comes across as akin to a conveyor belt line.
Nevertheless, a minority of the students acquired the practice in extra-curricular settings, though again few of these provided a clear rationale in their accounts and responses for the ontology of the practice among Chinese and Taiwanese youth. The data presented in 4.3 open with the closest account provided to a rationale for the practice: Qian opining on the ontology of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese. For Qian, the practice among Chinese and Taiwanese commenced with the opening up of China to the word in the 1990s and concomitant processes of globalisation. The practice is therefore understood by Qian to index and instantiate these socio-historical changes as well as identity work intended to align with notions of cool (cf. Maher’s, 2005, ‘metroethnicity) and fashionability. Moreover, Qian observes that it provides some Chinese and Taiwanese with a way of being individual amidst cultural forces of homogeneity. Data related to such indexicalities are presented in section 4.7 Identity.

### 4.3.1 Origins of the practice among Chinese and Taiwanese youth. 
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Qian: Chinese probably only started to use English names since, I don’t know, 1980’s or 90’s, when, um, they opened the door to the outside world. I don’t think Chinese people ever had English names before that, you know, so, I guess it’s just when people start to learn English then, you know, they think it’s cool. Also, with the concept of globalisation. As everyone is talking about is the world is becoming smaller and smaller and people become more, how do I say, more or less, um, the same, sort of thing, like, we eat the similar food, watch the similar TV =

2. Jenks: = less diversity.

### 4.3.2 An argument against use of “common” English names.
(Extract taken from FGD3)
Jenks explains an interesting difference between traditional Chinese names and naming practices and those of mainstream Australia; a difference that is established in the literature review. In short, Australian surnames tend to have been drawn historically from a relatively large pool of possibilities, whereas given names have tended to be drawn from a considerably smaller, biblically-derived class of possibilities (cf. Liao, 2000), although this of course is changing with shifting demographics and fashions. The situation in China has tended to be the reverse. As a result, this state of affairs, according to Jenks’ account, exercises an influence over Chinese and Taiwanese practices in terms of English name use. The interaction between Jenks and myself begins once a discussion of globalisation and English name use has wound down.

1. R: You're not choosing a name like David or Bruce. You're not using a, choosing a common name?
2. Jenks No, that's all, it'd be too common to use those names. Cos, family name, Chinese, the difference between Chinese names and English names is the family name gets repeated a lot [in China]; a lot of people have the same family name in China. But in English, you can address someone by their family name and that'd be, they'll be usually unique in a group. So, if I have a similar; if I were to change my name to English, if I have, like, Peter, and with my [Chinese] family name, it would be a lot of Chinese out there called Peter Surname.
3. 12. R: That's an interesting point.
4. Jenks: Chinese trying to make their first name unique and, yeah, whereas Western people usually have a unique family name.

Baptismal events

Noting that ‘serial mononymy is relatively uncommon in the literature on naming practices, Rymes (1996, p. 240) notes that more frequent are instances of individuals experiencing ‘a series of baptismal events in which [they] acquire and maintain different names for different purposes.’
Noting these cases among the Tewa of Arizona on Tanna in Vanuatu, Rymes (1996, pp. 241-2) observes that in both contexts, the acquired ‘names are traceable to a particular baptismal event.’ Rymes (1996) notes in her seminal analysis of one Los Angeles gang member’s experiences with gang names that such ‘baptismal events’ are not to be understood as religious practices, nor are they necessarily singular events in a person’s life. Rymes (1996, p. 240) writes that ‘the name an individual is given has one synchronic meaning in the baptismal ceremony; but as the individual uses that name, it acquires new and varied meanings diachronically’ (Rymes, 1996, p. 240). For some, the name provided by an English teacher in China or Taiwan remains their “English name” throughout their lives yet the name indexes different associations in different settings among varied interactants.

4.3.3  Baptismal event: classroom teacher  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Angel: It's, like, I stay junior high school in foreign language school, like,
2. so we have foreign language teacher, so, she gave me the name
3. Angel. And, like, she stand in front of the desk and, like, we went
4. there one-by-one and she gave us this note, one-by-one, which
5. has your English name written on it. So, my name is Angel.

4.3.4  Baptismal event: classroom teacher  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Linda: I was given by my primary school teacher. At primary school, we
2. learn English. We have an English book, and at the end of the
3. book, we have a list of English names, so my teacher just, "You,
4. Jack; you, Susan" =
5. Angel: = same here.
6. Linda: = And...Linda. I just keep it, when I have to use it.
4.3.5 Baptismal event: classroom teacher  
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Dan: When I was in middle school. This was the first time I studied
2. English, and the teacher give us English name. I use it when I was
3. in middle school and high school. I have to use it because in the
4. English class, the teacher will call our English name so I had no
5. choice...[several lines later]...My English class was small size class,
6. maybe 20 class, and the teacher give us name before we meet
7. each other actually. Yeah, they give us the name according to our
8. student list =
9. R: So, what was your, if you don't mind me asking, what was your
10. English name?
11. Dan: I can't, like, anything, like flower's name, animal's name. My
12. English name was Dolphin.
13. R: Dolphin? That's from your teacher?
15. R: And, why Dolphin?
16. Dan: I don't know. Maybe cos it's similar to [gives Chinese name]. The
17. first alphabet is D; maybe she likes dolphin or something.

4.3.6 Baptismal event: classroom teacher  
(Extract taken from FGD1)

Sylvia’s classroom baptism in a Chinese primary school involved her teacher allowing the
students a choice of one name among several. Moreover, her account provides her
understanding that the classroom practice (choice and implementation) might facilitate greater
student investment (cf. Norton, 2000) in the target language by making speaking activities
involving pairwork dialogue exercises more “fun” and “interesting”.

1. Sylvia: He gave, um, several names. You can choose one, which one you
Excerpt 4.3.7 below shows there does seem to be a condition made evident in the data which might influence whether or not a mainland middle school Chinese student was given an English name by his or her English teacher. Nothing was found in the literature to confirm this. That condition would seem to be whether the student attended a foreign language school or a simple public school. Moreover, this might also determine the size of the English language classes, as well as their frequency. Accordingly, I surmise that English name use in mainland China secondary schools ties in with smaller and more regular English language classes as conducted in foreign language specialist schools.

What is in the literature and among my data and might be analogous is English name use in private companies and foreign language schools and the absence of the practice in state-owned companies and more generalist, public secondary schools. The extended exchange below among three mainland Chinese students in a focus group discussion highlights this distinction at a school level.

4.3.7 Who might undergo classroom baptism
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Qian: I was never given a name by my teacher.
2. Dan: Did you go to, like, foreign language school?
3. Qian: No.
5. Jenks: Oh yeah [in agreement].
6. Dan: The English teacher, cos we've got a lot of English class, maybe three times more than other high school.
7. Qian: I just went to public school.
8. Seffie: I also went to public, ah, middle high school. I remember the teacher ask us, You can choose the English name by ourself, but it seems, by my memory, he didn't use English names in class. Just ask us to choose one, but this never used. So, just wrote down this name on the textbook, but no-one ever use that English name.
9. Jenks: The size of the class is about 50 in my city so if you have to remember all the English names, is a hassle for teacher, I think.

4.3.8 Self-baptismal event: celebrity or fictional character
(Extract taken from FGD4)
Andrea describes the manner in which she chose her current English name, having decided that the first one she received from her teacher, Vicky, was no longer suitable: ‘It was given by my English teacher, but I didn't like it.’

1. Andrea: Cos I saw a film and I liked the heroine so I took her name as my name... [several lines later] Um, there are some teachers who will give their, who will name their students with English names =
2. Aurora: In our first English class, I think. Yeah, but some students will change; some students will continue with their name.
4.3.9 Self-baptismal event: celebrity or fictional character  
(Extract taken from FGD4)

Jodi’s self-baptism account includes an explanation for English name change that incorporates one of the key aspects of the name for many participants: the desire not to share a given name. This is a value that also is apparent in conventional Chinese naming and address practices; where family names are so few across China, given names tend to be singular.

1. Jodi: Actually, why I chose it? We are free to pick our English names, but what happen is there is a girl, there was a girl in my same dormitory, she happened to have the same English name as Judy, so cos I’m several months older than her, so I just give up the Judy, and change to a similar pronunciation like the Jodi. And another reason is cos I’m a sort of, not sort of, cos, ah, one of my favourite movie stars is Jodie Foster, and er, her masterpiece is, um, Silence of the... Yes, and I really admired the courage of the character she acted in that movie so I just chose Jodi.

4.3.10 Self-baptismal event: celebrity or fictional character  
(Extract taken from FGD1)

Eason’s comment indicates that for him the English name is more process than product insofar as he describes it as ‘improving all the time’. This accords with Andrea’s account earlier when changing from Vicky, a name no longer suitable for her purposes, and Rymes (1995) observation that the meanings accrued to a name change through time; in these cases precipitating name changes.

1. Eason: My English name is complicated and this is improving all the time. I had three English names. First one was in primary school. I choose Steven, you know, from a cartoon. The most powerful character
4. was called Steven; I called myself Steven.

4.3.11 Self-baptismal event: chosen from dictionary
(Extract taken from FGD1)

Vincent’s account, in which the selection of an English name was set as a homework exercise, outlines as part of the process ensuring that the name chosen does not have other meanings that might be offensive or undesirable.

1. Vincent: When I was a pupil, one day a teacher said, um, "You should get an English name." This is homework. [laughter from all]. I just
2. bring a old edition dictionary and check the name list. I find many
3. names so I think, ah, it's so easy. When I get a electronic
4. dictionary, I check every name and I find nearly every name have a
5. slogan [sic: a slang meaning]. Like a John, have a toilet [as its slang
6. meaning]. So, I check everyone and, ah, I just check a few with no
7. slogan, ah, slang, so I just want to avoid this John.

4.3.12 Self-baptismal event: chosen via Google search
(Extract taken from FGD5)

Vicky emphasises not just the source or origins of her English name through a Google search, but also its significance as a substitute for her Chinese name, of which she is not proud.

1. Vicky: Yeah, I'm not so proud about my Chinese name, so I pick one
2. English name for myself.
3. R: And why Vicky?
4. Vicky: Well, whichever one I like. When I tried to find one and I see Vicky
5. first and I choose it. No reason.
6. R: Did you use a dictionary for it?
4.3.13 Self-baptismal event: chosen on basis of Chinese name
(Extract taken from FGD4)

Aurora highlights the importance of uniqueness for her in English name choice as well as a meaning that is similar to that of her Chinese name. In excerpt 4.3.2, Jenks outlined one reason behind a quest for uniqueness among Chinese and Taiwanese in their choice of English name. In doing so, she alludes to other ways an English name might be chosen. Uniqueness as a quality of an English name was mentioned repeatedly by participants as significant.

1. Aurora: Well, I didn't [choose my name from a film star]. I prefer to
2. have a unique English name, also that, um, nice connotations so I
3. did quite a lot of research actually before I decide to have this one.
4. R: How did you research?
5. Aurora: Oh, there are a lot of these, um, like baby namer, things like that.
6. Also, like, the local [unintelligible], also like my homestay, she's a
7. Aussie and she studied in England for quite a long time, now she
8. lives in Melbourne. So together we got several ones that we like.
9. R: Several ones you both liked?
10. Aurora: Yep. Yeah. And also one of the very important, um, sometimes
11. people get their English names by choosing the one with similar
12. pronunciation their Chinese name. Sometimes that happens, but
13. for my Chinese name, almost impossible to find any that get
14. pronounced similar in English, so I picked the one that's got the

---

5 Peter was a non-Chinese Australian learner of Chinese who was one of two non-Chinese who attended the language exchange sessions.
15. same meaning. So, my Chinese name that means sunrise or
16. morning light, so it's Aurora. And it's, like, really unique. I never
17. met any Aurora's so far.

4.3.14 *Baptismal event: chosen by parent*

*(Extract taken from FGD4)*

Jenks outlines a number of issues when describing his father as origin of his English name. While stating that his father believed use of an English name would greatly assist his son’s “blending in” when in Australia, Jenks also points out the administrative issues that English name use can present (cf. different from the passport name). Finally, he mentions the “need” for an English name in a Chinese school English speaking class.

1. Jenks: I'm known as Jenks because I've been using that name as my
2. name, and in fact my [Australian] high school, um, student ID has
3. Jenks on it as my official name. So, that caused a bit of a problem.
4. But on my passport, it's actually [*gives full Chinese name*]. It
5. [*Chinese given name*] means sword in Chinese. But my dad's trying
6. to make me easier to blend in here, so he made an English name.
7. R: It's quite unusual in my experience for mainland Chinese to be
8. given an name by their parents.
9. Jenks: Yeah, I was going to go for Peter. [*laughter from all]*
10. R: When did your dad do this?
11. Jenks: Oh, just right before I came here; I think a couple of weeks before I
12. came to this place. Um, four years ago, I needed a English name
13. for my English class in there, back there.
14. R: In China?
15. Jenks: Yeah, in a speaking class.
16. R: Okay. And why, if you don't mind me asking, why Jenks?
17. Jenks: It's, um, similar to [*Chinese given name*] and it's not very female
18. like, I think. If I translate, the closest I can get is Jane, J-A-N-E, and
19. that's a girl's name, isn't it? Maybe you have better ideas, but my
dad didn't have any. He just searched online and said, "Oh, this
20. name is pretty close".

21.

4.3.15 Baptismal event: chosen by parent
(Extract taken from FGD4)

While Candy’s mother suggested she use the English name, it is apparent that the name itself
was derived from Candy’s English language learning materials used while at home in Taiwan.

1. Candy: I get my English name when I was 8.
2. R: So similar to =
3. Candy: = Sophie's [Chinese graduate classmate] age. And my mum give
4. this name.
5. R: Why did she give you this name?
6. Candy: Actually, in that time, my mum brought a couple of English tape,
7. and we would play that conversation and dialogue and I love it. In
8. that time, I always hear the female's name called Candy and so my
9. mum just have a Candy.

4.3.16 Baptismal event: chosen by Australian homestay “parent”
(Extract taken from FGD6)

This account is from lecturer and graduate program manager, Margie, who describes a Chinese
student on the graduate program who was given her English name by an Australian homestay
parent. The practice is understood by the Chinese student as being mandatory. Moreover, the
student expresses a dislike for the English name. There is a powerlessness over practice and
product to her reported response. Arguably, it mirrors some of the mechanical Chinese
classroom baptisms described by participants. The excerpt contains a number of key themes
including the notion, this time expressed by a non-Chinese speaking Australian interlocutor, that English names are required to circumvent the mispronunciation of Chinese names.

1. Margie: This little girl said, I said, What's your name?
2. And she said, Cloudy. And I said, How do you spell that?, and she said, C-L-O-U-D-Y, and I said, Oh, that's an interesting name; why have you got that name? I said, That makes me a little sad to have a name like Cloudy, and she said, Yes, I don't like it, but my homestay mother when I came to Australia said I had to have a,
3. she couldn't say my name, and that I had to have an easy name to pronounce. It was a cloudy day outside so she called me Cloudy.

Summary of 4.3 data

The data from participant accounts and personal narratives demonstrate that there a number of different ways that participants acquired English names, though for most it was a school classroom affair, largely perfunctory. Sylvia’s understanding in 4.3.6 that the practice might facilitate among learners development of investment in the target language through engagement in classroom speaking activities is a notable exception. That said, the majority of participants subsequently changed those first classroom names in order to index and instantiate processes of growth, maturity (e.g. Andrea describes her original name Vicky, given by a teacher, as “It sounds quite naïve. Sometimes it was laughed at by my friends. They say it's a funny name.”), and change. Similarly, there were different sources for these names ranging from film stars to comic book heroes, the products of dictionary or online searches (homophonous with Chinese name, devoid of vulgar meanings, or simply just found), or the choices of parents.

While learning about the origins and sources of these English names, we also learn something about the greater likelihood that students at specialist foreign language schools, certainly in mainland China, seemed more likely to acquire English names than those at generalist public schools. If this is the case, this mirrors the data (as well as that from the literature) that show
that employees in Chinese-based multinational companies were considerably more likely to use English names than their counterparts in state-owned businesses.

4.4 RESISTANCE

Section 4.4. Resistance presents data related to equivocation and conflict as well as questions of illegitimate and inauthentic language use and Othering that infuse the practice. Among the data, I identify three types of resistance in the findings and follow, for example, Canagarajah’s (2004) argument in which language schools are understood as ‘power-laden...medium[s] of ideological and social reproduction’ (p. 120). Resistance is one of the major and multi-faceted themes identified. As if to underscore the capacity for overlap among these different themes, I note that in 4.7, data related more explicitly to identity performance is presented. I understand negotiation, equivocation and conflict as well as questions of illegitimate and inauthentic language use as constituent of and constituted by ‘the on-going negotiation of language’ (Pennycook, 2008, p. 30.3), in effect, language use as dialogized heteroglossia. While the graduate degree program I study is likely more a model of tertiary academic socialisation than language school and it seems problematic to describe the enrolled tertiary students as language learners, I believe that Canagarajah’s (2004) characterisation still holds.

Data relating to the three types of resistance identified, which precipitated negotiation, equivocation or even proscription over English name use are presented in this chapter section. Firstly, there is the resistance among Chinese and Taiwanese research participants to the use by non-Chinese and non-Chinese speakers of the participants’ Chinese names. Secondly, there is the resistance among the university lecturers to the use of English names by the vast majority of their Chinese and Taiwanese students. Thirdly, there is the resistance by a minority of Chinese research participants to the practice of English name use themselves.

4.4.1 Resistance by students due to anticipated mispronunciation and misuse of Chinese names
There is abundant evidence in the data that English name use involves strategies of convenience (cf. Liao, 2000) and catering (cf. Diao, 2014) being deployed by Chinese and Taiwanese. As a result of these preferred strategies, there tends to be resistance, certainly reluctance, among the vast majority of Chinese and Taiwanese to their Chinese names being “used” (or ‘managed’ cf. Barb in 4.2.4) by non-Chinese interlocutors. These strategies attempt to accommodate two issues anticipated by Chinese and Taiwanese students when interacting with non-Chinese interlocutors: (1) anticipated non-Chinese (mis)pronunciation of and failure to recall Chinese names and (2) anticipated cultural or pragmatic norms (i.e. first name basis interaction in egalitarian, low context or non-Confucian cultures like mainstream Australia). Strategies of convenience or catering in terms of (1) anticipated mispronunciation and poor recall of Chinese names by non-Chinese speakers primarily derive from Chinese being a tonal language and English not. Data related to this strategy are presented in 4.4.1 to 4.4.5 below. There is also a grammatical aspect to the strategy because conventionally Chinese “first” or given names are seldom used outside of intimate relations (e.g. downward family communication and between lovers or close friends) and are seldom used as single unbound morphemes characters without an honorific or title appended (e.g. Young X or Brother Y). Data related to these socio-grammatical issues are presented in 4.4.14 to 4.4.17.

My argument is that Chinese and Taiwanese consciously modify or attune their language, in this case choosing English over Mandarin or using an “English” first name semantic or phonetic cognate in place of their Mandarin (first) name, so that it ‘approaches the norms of their interlocutor and accentuates commonality between the interlocutors’ (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 75). Moreover, the strategies tend to obviate the issues raised above as well. Nevertheless, as is evident, this type of convergence by interlocutors was sometimes understood by interlocutors as instances of ‘over-accommodation’ (Hua, 2014), and therefore read as condescending.

### 4.4.1 Anticipated mispronunciation of Chinese names.
*(Extract taken from FGD1)*

1. Nancy: Maybe, in Australia in English class, I prefer teachers to call me
English name because last semester Teacher [gives teacher’s name]⁶ call me Chinese name once, and at that time I didn’t hear clearly, and I’m not sure he call me or not. And I told him later, I prefer my English name.

4.4.2 Anticipated mispronunciation and mis-recall of Chinese names. 
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Angel: For me, it's, like, if you're talking to or meeting other friends with foreigners, Chinese name is, like, hard for them to remember or pronounce. But, like, Angel, it will, like, easier to remember.

4.4.3 Anticipated mispronunciation of Chinese names. 
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Jodi: Why I would want the English speaking people say, call me English name rather than the Chinese name is basically because of pronunciation I heard is kind of strange since I been in Australia, so I think it's a more natural way they call my English name.

4.4.4 Anticipated mispronunciation of Chinese names. 
(Extract taken from FGD1)

1. Sylvia: But I think Australian people always like to use the English name because our name is maybe difficult for them, the people, to pronounce because it have four tones, so maybe they can’t pronounce correctly.

⁶ What is also fascinating about Nancy’s utterance is that she uses the classically Chinese construction “Teacher X” to designate her lecturer from the previous semester. However, this lecturer would have explicitly stated a preference for being addressed as simply X (his or her first name) as would all lecturers, tutors and administrators on the program.
4.4.5 Anticipated mispronunciation and mis-recall of Chinese names.  
(Extract taken from FGD1)

1. Summer: The IELTS teacher told me you have to choose an English name
2. before you do the test. Because within 15 minutes the examiner
3. can't remember your Chinese name and can't pronounce perfectly
4. so if you give the English name, it's easier to make you guys’
5. distance closer.

4.4.6 Actual mis-recall of Chinese names by non-Chinese interlocutor.  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

During a focus group discussion introduction sequence in which I introduced a number of the
Chinese participants to a late arrival, Olivia, I managed to recall all English names given, but was
unable to recall the Chinese name that participant Linda preferred to use. One of the
consequences of my faux pas was that Linda felt obliged to give her English name to Olivia in the
introduction sequence, when she would have preferred to use her Chinese name alone.

1. R: Um =
2. Linda: Wait. You can't remember!
3. R: Exactly! I'm sorry. [Laughter from all.]
4. Linda: [to Olivia] Linda. My name is [gives full Chinese name].
5. Olivia: [Repeats Linda's Chinese given names].
6. Linda: I've got an English name, but I don't like to use it.

4.4.7 Unawareness of lecturers about anticipated mispronunciation account  
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Barb and Margie clarify that despite the prevalence of the pronunciation issue among the
accounts provided by our participants for their preference for and practice of English name use,
neither of them has been given this rationale. Instead, a convenience account has been invoked by Chinese and Taiwanese students, claiming that it is simply easier for them as non-Chinese interlocutors.

1. R: Has any student ever explained the tonal reason to you? Have they ever said, Look, the reason is...
2. Barb: No.
3. Margie: No, I've never had that.
4. Barb: No, the only reason I've ever had is that "it's easier for you". That's the only reason I've ever had.

4.4.2 Consequences of mispronunciation, mis-recall and misuse of Chinese names

Having presented data related to anticipated mispronunciation and mis-recall of Chinese names by non-Chinese interlocutors, I turn now to the undesirable consequences of such mispronunciation from the perspectives of Chinese and Taiwanese student participants. These undesirable consequences that are derived from participant accounts include a relatively straightforward inability among Chinese and Taiwanese to recognise their names being used through to the by-product pronunciation instead of an undesirable or offensive word produced by the non-Chinese speaker, feelings of embarrassment, exclusion, and confusion as well as unhappiness at the wrong name being used.

4.4.8 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names: wrong name
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. R: Why does it make you uncomfortable? I mean, when I taught ESL, my name was frequently mispronounced and I didn’t feel uncomfortable.
4. Andrea: But what if people call you the wrong name?7

4.4.9 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names: wrong name
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Suzie: My situation with my English name is because when people call
2. my Chinese name, cos, like, especially for Western people, when
3. they call my name, I feel it’s weird cos it’s not the same sound.
5. Suzie: When people pronounce it [Suzie deliberately mispronounces it], it
6. sounds like Japanese and I’d rather have English name instead.

4.4.10 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names: avoidance/exclusion
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Olivia: Yeah. I tried to use my Chinese name for about a year, and then I
2. realised that people, I was working in Target8 at that moment, and
3. then my supervisor, if there was a group of people, although I
4. have my name tag, he will avoid to ask me to do something, yeah,
5. like, because he wouldn’t want to, like, make, um make a mistake
6. of pronouncing, which I understand. So then I realise that maybe
7. it’s easier to use an English name.

4.4.11 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names: confusion
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Andrea: Because it’s more convenient for people, for English speakers, to
2. call me, cos my Chinese name, the pinyin for my Chinese first

---

7 "The wrong name" here meaning that the attempt at pronouncing the student’s Chinese name has produced an entirely or substantially different word or name.
8 Target is a large Australian department store.
3. name, it’s pronounced as *pronounces and spells*, and people of
4. English native speakers will call me ‘you’, Yeah, that’s extremely
5. confusing.

### 4.4.12 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names: embarrassment
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Jodi: Don’t want to cue my tutors every time she pronounce the =
2. Andrea: = have difficulty pronouncing my name =
3. Jodi: = makes her embarrassed, makes me embarrassed.
4. Aurora: Yeah, both of us really embarrassed.
5. Andrea: Yeah, and the other students will just look at me in a strange way.
6. Aurora: *[miming other students]* “What kind of a name is that?”
7. Andrea: Yeah. *[miming other students]* “Weird name.”

### 4.4.13 Consequences of mispronunciation of Chinese names 2: embarrassment
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Lecturer Margie acknowledged the potential for embarrassment, confusion, exclusion, and outright error when mispronouncing Chinese names. A key difference between mispronunciation of mainstream English or Australian and Chinese names is that, in the case of the latter, it is quite likely that a different word than that which the name represents will result. In effect, any word is a potential name in Chinese, although there are mitigating sociolinguistic circumstances that increase the likelihood of some being chosen over others. I mentioned in the prefatory remarks to excerpt 4.3.2 that, traditionally, in the case of mainstream Australian or English “Christian” names, as they tended to be called until the mid-to-late 20th century, there has been a set of largely biblical-derived names from which a name is likely to be chosen (cf. Liao, 2000). Nevertheless, as the lecturers point out in Excerpt 4.4.7, no Chinese or Taiwanese student had made them aware of this concern about mispronunciation of Chinese names.
1. Margie: So, our pronunciation might be fine, but it's the tone we don't get.
2. So, in an English-speaking situation when we say the name, and
3. they say, “Ooh, you've got it wrong.” We don't know what we're
4. actually saying in Chinese that they are hearing and the problem is
5. it could be terribly embarrassing for them with the rest of the
6. Chinese who are listening, if they're being called penis instead of
7. what it is supposed to be. And I think that is a problem we don't
8. appreciate when we say, “Don't have an English name.”

4.4.2 Resistance by students due to non-kin, non-intimate use of Chinese first names

The second issue that Chinese and Taiwanese students hope to circumvent through the practice of English name use is a tendency described in the Literature Review that first-name basis interaction between non-kin and non-spouses would still seem to remain largely atypical within conventions of Chinese or Confucian communication. Moreover, as also established in the Literature Review, both grammatically and pragmatically, to address a Chinese or Taiwanese person using a single unbound Chinese character (e.g. the first one of a two-character given name) would seem to be equally unusual (e.g. see Footnote 5 on Nancy’s use of Teacher X to designate her Australian lecturer, rather than use his or her first name alone). Indeed, for some Chinese and Taiwanese, particularly young females as is documented here, to be referred to by an unbound single character from their name, especially one of their given names (what Andrea calls with reference to Chinese name order her ‘last name’) and particularly by a male is undesirable.

Nevertheless, in many Australian contexts, primarily for the purposes of this research in workplaces and university classrooms, first name basis interaction, especially in spoken interactions, is the norm, typically regardless of contextual factors like relative status or seniority of interlocutors.
Considerable research into cross-cultural communication (e.g. Scollon and Wong-Scollon, 1995) emphasises the role that first-name basis interaction plays in establishing rapport between interlocutors in particularly what have been termed low-context (cf. Hall, 1976) or low power distance (cf. Hofstede, 1980) cultural settings. With this in mind, in excerpt 4.4.5 above, we saw Summer note of her English name use in an Australian IELTS test setting the acknowledgement that “if you give the English name, it's easier to make you guys’ [i.e. the researcher’s culture and L1] distance closer.” Therefore, to mitigate (mis-)use of Chinese given names yet permit Chinese and Taiwanese students to conform to an Australian tendency for first-name basis interaction, an English name serves a double purpose.

4.4.14 To obviate attempts at use of Chinese first/given names
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Andrea: Yeah, we never say only the last [i.e. the Chinese given name]
2. name. That's strange. My tutor call me [first name], and I say,
3. "Urgh, strange."
5. Aurora: Not just strange. I mean, sometimes we do use only one character;
6. that's when you're writing with really close friends, you'll leave
7. your name as the last name [i.e. given name].
8. Andrea: Yeah, it's quite poetic.
9. Aurora: Or, if you've got three characters, you use the last two as your
10. signature, that's really really close friends or family. Yeah. So,
11. we're using the parts that not family name. What's that called?
12. Surname? Yeah, well, like sometimes we use only first name, but
13. that's like happens between really really close friends.

4.4.15 To obviate attempts at use of Chinese first/given names
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Linda: Cos my mum call me my given name, yeah, so I feel like only my
parents or grandparents can call me that way.

3.  ["Yeah" from all others]

4. Linda:  So, I feel uncomfortable if some grown-up guy call me my given name in Chinese.

4.4.16 To obviate use of unbound single Chinese name/character  
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Andrea:  He [tutor] is right to call my first name\(^9\) [=surname], but the problem is that's only one character. It's quite strange.

4.4.17 To obviate use of unbound single Chinese name/character  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Angel:  Yeah, so he [tutor], like, every class, like, everybody Chinese so he will also insist call them Chinese, even if they introduce their English name. But, sometime, he cannot remember the whole name, so he will say the surname, or something like that.

5. R:  And how does that make you feel though?

6. Suzie:  It's a bit weird if people just call your surname...

7. Angel:  ...and he insist to do that, I would feel weird.

4.3  Resistance by lecturers due to anticipated mispronunciation and misuse of Chinese names

There are multiple accounts provided by Barb and Margie to explain their general resistance to the practice of English name use among their Chinese and Taiwanese students and the data are

\(^9\) Often referring to first and last names with Chinese and Taiwanese participants while discussing Chinese names, there is an evident confusion between Chinese name word order and Australian/Western name word order; they are conventionally the reverse. Moreover, as a tutor and therefore of higher status if not seniority in a Chinese context, it would be entirely appropriate for the downward communication to employ the student’s surname.
presented according to these reasons. Firstly, the lecturers often felt insulted and Othered by the practice. Secondly, Barb particularly wanted to be permitted the opportunity to learn to pronounce the students’ Chinese names, believing it her right and responsibility to “have a go”. Moreover, we interpret Barb as feeling excluded, given that she is happy for them to mispronounce her name (see excerpt 4.4.19). Thirdly, both lecturers argued, given the second reason, that because the graduate program in which the students were enrolled emphasised an approach to language use that highlighted linguistic pluralism and the linguistic ideologies underpinning English as an international language studies, philosophically at least, the students should be prepared to tolerate “Chinese as an international language” being used by non-native users. Fourthly, both considered the English names being used were frequently inappropriate and often used inappropriately. Within such a reading of the practice, Margie argued that its seemingly mandatory status in Chinese and Taiwanese primary and secondary classrooms contributed to students believing they required an English name in much the same way they might require an English dictionary: to be appropriately set up to learn and use English. Next, the lecturers argued that the practice among some Chinese and Taiwanese students to change their English names or inter-change between English and Chinese names indexed a lack of ownership of the names, of suitable investment in the names, allowing them to position the practice in a spurious light. Finally, Margie especially believed the practice manifested an inauthentic or duplicitous sense of self and identity among the students.

Data excerpts 4.4.18 to 4.4.21 display findings related to Barb’s articulation of concomitant feelings of being insulted, Othered, excluded and patronised by the practice and the absence of an explicit rationale for it. Chinese and Taiwanese students seemed to think that a surface explanation of “it is easier for you”, reifying a Chinese discourse that normalised the anticipation of mispronunciation and mis-recall of Chinese names by non-Chinese, was sufficient rationale for the catering or convenience strategy adopted toward both lecturers. Clearly, it is not. The final outcome of these affective responses to the practice by Barb is to ascribe immaturity to the students as the justification for the naming practice.

4.4.18 Lecturer resistance: feeling insulted and Othered
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Barb: And that’s often, in a way, slightly insulting. There’s that attitude
2. that, there’s an overlay of “they’re [i.e. non-Chinese lecturers] a
3. little bit thick.” Look, this is sub-text, right. Absolute sub-text.

4.4.19 Lecturer resistance: feeling excluded
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Barb: I apologise if I am not making it appropriate. I didn’t want to say,
2. You’re pronouncing my name wrongly, but that’s fine; I know who
3. were talking to.

4.4.20 Lecturer resistance: feeling patronised
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Barb: But also, I actually think, one part of me because inevitably, it’s
2. easier for you [i.e. non-Chinese lecturers] to pronounce this, and I
3. said, Well, I’m not here for my life to be easy. I will do my best to
4. pronounce it in an appropriate way. So, what’s going on is
5. occasionally they’ll say, Call me this because it’s easier than my
6. Chinese name [to pronounce]. And I say, No, no, no. Life isn’t
7. about my life being easy. Let me try this. And if you don’t mind my
8. pronunciation being slightly wrong, I will try hard to correctly
9. pronounce it.

4.4.21 Lecturer resistance: Immaturity
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Barb: Gwen, whose name is Xiao Wu, and I, she is Taiwanese, and over
2. and over again I said, Look, Xiao Wu's not a real struggle for me.
3. And she said, Ooh, but you’re not pronouncing it properly. And I
4. said, Well, tell me and she would tell me and there was just
5. something in the way I said it. And I don't know if that, I felt that
6. was an immaturity rather than anything else.

Arguably this ‘immaturity’ Barb describes in excerpt 4.4.21 line 6 might be read as a lack of worldliness or savoir faire on behalf of the Chinese and Taiwanese students, developed further in excerpts 4.4.22 to 4.4.23, in which participants are described by both lecturers as needing to tolerate “Chinese as an International Language” [a term used by the researcher to summarise their arguments].

4.4.22 Lecturer resistance: Chinese as an International Language
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Margie: We’re doing English as an International Language, which is saying
2. there are multiple Englishes, which is saying that words are
3. pronounced differently all around the world. So, if your name is a
4. difficult name for me to pronounce, that's fine. And if I don't
5. pronounce it exactly as you pronounce it, that's fine too because a
6. Scottish person is going to mispronounce it too. So, it is part of
7. their training to say that if people are pronouncing their name in a
8. different way, that's not a big problem because [by analogy]
9. words get pronounced differently around the English native-speaking world.
10. Margie: Cos they're saying, No, call me Betty because that's easier for you
11. today. And we're saying, Well, no because part of English as an
12. International Language is that native speakers have to learn to
13. communicate within the international sphere, just as non-native
14. speakers do. So by saying that non-native speakers have to adjust,
15. even to the point of changing their names, so that native speakers
can communicate with them. Well, no. Native speakers have to learn how to communicate in the international world where it's not only native speakers who have to communicate in English, but also non-native speakers.

### 4.4.23 Lecturer resistance: Chinese as an International Language
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Barb: That's my point though. The Chinese and Taiwanese here seem to be saying, Okay, rather than hear Chinese as an International Language [a term used earlier by the researcher in a question to Barb] being spoken, I'd prefer to be called Betty.

### 4.4.24 Lecturer resistance: English names as lexically inappropriate
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Margie is both a lecturer but also the manager of the graduate program.

1. Margie: I think it's [the practice of English name use] absolutely fascinating.
2. You might know that one of the things I'm pretty famous for within this course is that on the first day of the orientation, we go around the room and talk about names, and I'll say, you know, "What's your name?" and then they'll come out and say, "Pansy" or whatever, and I'll then say, "Why is your name Pansy?"
4. Margie: Um, one student, you know, famous for it was Seven [gives his Chinese name]. He said, "My name's Seven." And I said, "That's not a name, that's a number." And he said, "But that's my name", and I said, "No, it's not anymore."
4.4.25 Lecturer resistance: English names as age and era inappropriate
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Issues with the practice and its products for the academic socialisation/English language lecturers, like the age or generational appropriateness of the names used, embody deeper issues to do with language gatekeeper functions like who determines the standards of appropriateness and how and why are they determined. Margie underscores this point in lines 2 and 3 with the observation that “our names are appropriate”, are the yard-sticks of appropriate language use.

1. Margie: The names are so inappropriate. Gloria, for a twenty-year old girl?
2. Now, we know that Gloria is a name that was 1930's. Um, our
3. names are appropriate for our age groups so that people who are
4. called Margie are post-war people, were sort of 1940's, maybe
5. 1950's. But after that that name disappeared. Um, and all the
6. names go through a cycle like that. So, I try to explain to them that
7. names come back. Ruby was a very, my grandmother may have
8. been called Ruby, but now it's a new name and it's coming back
9. into fashion. But it's still not appropriate for a twenty-year old. It's
10. now appropriate for little kids who are just about to go off to
11. school. They're the Rubies now.

4.4.26 Lecturer resistance: policies and proscription
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Margie opens the account with a description of new school policy following the example of Cloudy, recounted in excerpt 4.3.15, outlining the responsibility of homestay parents to learn Chinese students’ Chinese names and to approach the practice of giving a student an English name with caution.

1. Margie: So, I went to our school services manager and said, Next time you
2. write a letter to our student homestay hosts, please, or if we have
3. a package that we give to homestay or prospective homestay families, I said, Please put in a paragraph about appropriate names and that it's our responsibility to learn how to say the students' names, and to think very carefully before you give them a name.

4.4.27 Lecturer resistance: English names as age and era inappropriate
(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Margie: And I said to him [i.e. Seven], he said to me, That's my name, and I said, Not any more. Not in [the graduate program] you're not Seven. I remember being really strict with him and saying, No. I refuse to talk to you; I refuse to call you Seven. He just looked at me dumbstruck as if to say, You can't do this to me. I said, I can and I'm doing it and I will.

4.4.4 Resistance by Chinese and Taiwanese students to the practice of English name use

Of the three Chinese participants who tended to not or preferred not to use an English name, Dan was the most resolute and consistent, not respecting the practice in fellow Chinese and requesting they use Chinese names should they present with an English name. Qian and Linda were more pragmatic in their use of English names: Qian seeing their benefit on Australian résumés while Linda tended to align with the circumstances of individual interactions as evident in Excerpt 4.4.6. Qian’s attempts to use a number of English names during her life in Australia had themselves met with resistance from Australian friends, prompting her to more or less cease the practice.

4.4.28 Chinese student resistance: Rejected by Australian friends
(Extract taken from FGD3)
Qian’s account provides a neat segue from the resistance of Australian university lecturers to the practice, via her Australian friends’ resistance to her using English names. Their resistance was not predicated on issues of mispronunciation but had more to do with authentic performances of self and the notion that identity is inextricably tied up with name, a concept arguably less significant to Chinese and Taiwanese than identity tied up with relative address form.

1. Qian: But then when I tried to use back my English name, my friend[s] start to laugh at me. They say, "[derisive snort] You are not Lisa; you're not Rachel; you're not Lilly", because in their mind they have people, like, if you know someone whose name is Lisa and if you tell them you're Lisa, they look at you and say, "You're not Lisa; you're not Rachel." [laughter from Qian]

7. R: So, these are Chinese friends or general friends?

8. Qian: General Australian friends.

4.4.29 Chinese student resistance: duplicitous
(Extract taken from FGD3)

In excerpt 4.2.7, Dan introduces herself to others in the FGD with her Chinese name and the assertion that she does not have an English name. Dan’s account below makes it clear that for her the practice of English name among Chinese and Taiwanese allows interlocutors to hide themselves, arguing that such capacity to hide indicates an unreliable and untrustworthy person. This is especially the case when the landlord does not sign the invoice with her character-based, written Chinese name, using instead an English name.

1. Dan: Because you can change your English name anytime. Anytime you want. But with your Chinese name, it means your official name.

3. You can't change it. I feel more secure. I don’t know. Last year or two years ago, one of my landlords, she was Chinese, she never give me a Chinese name, even when she signed the invoice, she's
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6. still using her =
7. R: = Maybe that's her official name now?
8. Dan: No, it's not. I didn't know her family name; I have no idea. Because
9. I can tell that person got some problem; she's not very good
10. person. Maybe that's why I moved out very soon, because she's
11. got bad troubles.
12. R: And because she didn't give you her Chinese name, only her
13. English name, you found that...
14. Dan: I find that she always try to hide something, or maybe she doesn't
15. want me to know much about her.

4.4.30 Chinese student resistance: compromise
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Linda describes her use of an English name as a last resort “compromise”, that is, she keeps it for when she absolutely has to use it, when non-Chinese interlocutors simply cannot remember her Chinese name.

1. Linda: I just keep it [for] when I have to use it.
2. R: And when do you have to use it?
3. Linda: Because, like, people say, "I can't remember your Chinese name; I really can't." So, I say, "Okay, just call me Linda." Yeah, cos I
4. already ask them to call my Chinese name, which is hard for them.
5. I don't want to make it harder. It's like a compromise.

4.4.31 Chinese student resistance: uniqueness of the Chinese name
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Linda prefers to use all three characters of her Chinese name with fellow Chinese, an unusual practice in itself. This is because she delights in the uniqueness and beauty of her Chinese name. The same applies to her approach to English name use, where she argues that many Chinese use
the same English name, a situation that would be anathema to her, yet would seem to her to be unavoidable.

1. Linda: Yeah, I don't like to use English name. For me, like, you can meet a
couple of people; they're already named Angel, right? [Angel
chuckles]. I don't like to share my name with others, because in
China my name is kind of unique. Never met someone called, ah,
someone has the same name. [Several lines later.]

2. R: It sounds to me, like, it's easier to have a special name in Chinese,
because there's more given names to choose from?

3. Linda: That's why I don't want an English name. I don't want sharing with
others. Like, when I'm walking on the street, I hear someone else
calling “Linda”, and that's not me. That make me uncomfortable.

4. So, I don't use Linda.

Summary of 4.4

This section has displayed data related to various kinds of resistance that inheres in the practice,
including proscription, equivocation and compromise. Firstly, I presented the participant
accounts of their preference, if not in many cases outright insistence, on English names being
used by non-Chinese interlocutors. This was argued to circumvent the anticipated
mispronunciation and mis-recall of their Chinese names by non-Chinese, a discursive
understanding that seemed borne out by the evidence presented of Australian lecturers
attempting to pronounce Chinese names but being rebuked. I then presented some of the
consequences of mispronunciation from the perspectives of the participants, it becoming
apparent that mispronunciation (in effect mis-use) of Chinese names was a very different affair
to mispronunciation of English names in terms of likely outcomes.

Following this, data underscoring the resistance of the lecturers to the practice of English name
use were presented. For the lecturers involved, the practice produced feelings of being
excluded, insulted, Othered, and patronized. Neither lecturer had ever been provided with the mispronunciation/mis-recall premise that underscored the practice for many Chinese and Taiwanese. Moreover, insistence on using English names was also positioned by the lecturers as revealing a lack of linguistic capital and target language investment on behalf of the Chinese and Taiwanese. Additionally, the lecturers read it as contrary to the linguistic ideology that the graduate program promoted in terms of international languages like English and Chinese with speakers, native and non-native. Finally, I presented data concerning resistance to the practice among a minority of Chinese students, ranging from outright rejection of it to its perception as a necessary but last resort compromise.

4.5 RELATIONALITY

This section displays data related to the traditionally understood as intersubjective and contextual nature of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices and both reflection and reification of the conventional notion of self. Xinyan (2006, p. 544), argues that ‘what distinguishes the Confucian notion of self from others’ is its emphasis on the relational nature of self... the concept of the relational self is an opposite of the concept of the autonomous self.’ Chinese and Confucian society tends to be analysed as hierarchically oriented with social status and seniority both reflected in and reinforced by intricate naming conventions and address forms. Chinese and Confucian society tends to take the family as its prototypical social organisation and, therefore, specific familial kin terms are employed between family relations but also, more significantly, with non-kin interlocutors.

4.5.1 Relationality of Chinese names and address forms
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Aurora: Or, if you've got three characters, you use the last two as your signature, that's really really close friends or family. Yeah. So,
2.            we're using the parts that not family name. What's that called?
3. Surname? Yeah, well, like sometimes we use only first name, but
5. that's like happens between really really close friends.

4.5.2 Relationality of Chinese names and address forms: “it’s relative”  
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Linda: But, they [i.e. friends in China] don't call me [gives full 3 character name]; they call me [gives her Chinese nickname meaning Old + Surname]. Like, nickname. My family name is [gives family name].
2. Angel: Yeah, people usually do it, like, you know, Old Someone and then Young Someone. A little bit like 'buddy'; like, we are bro, or something
3. Linda: More close
4. R: Okay, so, Old + Surname [to Linda]? But, you're so young?
5. Angel: But, it's not...it's just literally translate. It’s relative term. It's not like you're old or something. It's, like, to call someone, like, bro or something. Just if someone can call you in that style, it shows a closer relationship.

4.5.3 Relationality of Chinese names and address forms: “it’s familial”  
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Margie reflects on the everyday and otherwise unremarkable practice of Australian classroom introduction sequences, typically conducted with students at the outset of the first tutorial of a university subject. Typically, students are asked for their names, likely enough checked off on a roll or added to one, and, again, according to established norms, first names are generally supplied. Margie’s argument is that this practice is problematic for Chinese and Taiwanese as one tends not to have a name as such in spoken interactions, but rather a relationship that the name-as-address-form instantiates and indexes.
1. Margie: The other thing too is that the Chinese don't use the Chinese name so that when you say to them, “Well, what do your friends call you?” It'll be “So-and-so's son or Wong's daughter or so and-so's big sister or something.” But there's no name, because it's all familial. All those names are, you don't have an actual name, you just have your relationship. And also it shows that I'm wrong in the sense that if they're coming here and they don't have, they can't carry that identity with them because it's something that's a chop [aka a seal, 姓名印]. It's not a real name and before [in China or Taiwan] everyone who knows them locates them within their family or the relationship. When they actually come here [to an Australia tertiary classroom], they lose their identity, then lose that name. But of course it seems to me it's others who give them that name; it's not something that you give yourself. So to come to Australia and be asked, “What's your name?” is in a way a meaningless concept. But I think there's the reality too that the name you're actually given [at birth], that is written down in The Book of Life or whatever; that name is a name that you probably never ever use apart from on your passport, and it's on your official papers, but you're never actually called that.

4.5.4 Relationality of Chinese names and address forms
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Seffie: It's like me in my family. My family call me just my given name, ah, just the last character. My given name is [two characters given] and my family call me [the last – Australian word order = first – of those characters]. But my friends, my Chinese friends, call me the given name, both characters together. I don't know why. It
6. depends. Maybe in family because you're so close to each other,
7. so you're used to last character.
8. Dan: But my mum always calls me full name.
9. Qian: It's like, I suppose, the thing with English, people don't really call
10. the full name. For example, just for example, in [unintelligible], if
11. you call a person in [unintelligible] some people say, “Oh, call me
12. Liz”, or some other [unintelligible], because it sounds, um, people
13. only call my full name when I'm in trouble!
14. R: That's true. [to Jenks] So, what's your father call you?
15. Jenks: My full name cos I only have two characters in my name, and
16. calling the first character is a bit too short.
17. R: So, he doesn't call you Jenks though?
18. Jenks: No, no. Though my close friends call me Brother [+ first character]
19. That's another, like, Chinese, how do you call that? It's like, ah,
20. god-brother or something like that.

Summary of 4.5 data

This section has presented data related to the intersubjective or relational fundamentals of traditional Chinese and Confucian names and address forms. From these perspectives, the Chinese individual is understood conventionally and fundamentally as ‘a relational being’ and never as ‘an isolated, separate identity...[but rather one]...socially situated, defined and shaped in a relational context’ (King and Bond, 1985, pp. 31). This is an identity and name that are dialogically realised. Invariably then the name/s used to refer to this individual or used by that individual underpin such heightened relationality and contextuality. The Confucian tradition that by all accounts continues to exercise some impact on Chinese and Taiwanese interaction is ʻlî. King and Bond (1985) depict ʻlî as ‘the grammar of relationships’ (p. 30) and the ideal Confucian society as ‘a massive and complicated role system...embedded in the doctrine of zhèng mìng (rectification of names).’
This section presents data that demonstrate that the Chinese name as typically two- or three-character entity is fundamentally a written and glyph-based phenomenon, whose essence and meaning reside in the characters used for writing, not in the words uttered. Participants and research emphasise that numerous Chinese characters with disparate meanings may be pronounced identically and that it is only through resort to the actual written characters that Chinese interactants may be able to correctly determine the actual meaning of an utterance. My data provide evidence of this practice being enacted among participants. As a consequence of this fundamental distinction between spoken and written forms, the names used in spoken interactions, the address forms, heavily dependent on the contextual elements of the interaction, may have limited existential association with the characters of the written name. Watson’s (1986) analysis emphasises that it is the character-based written form of the Chinese name that is fundamental to meaning, fate and fortune. For example, consider the continued importance of calligraphy to Chinese art practice and Liao’s (2000) observation that feng shui resides in the number of strokes comprising a character.

4.6.1 The written characters clarify the spoken utterance

During the various focus group discussions as well as while in the field, I logged observations of the practice of Chinese and Taiwanese students “writing” the characters of the name recently uttered in the air, with pen on paper, on the interlocutor’s palm in order to clarify any confusion over what the characters comprising the name were. The participants discuss this need for clarification.

4.6.1 Clarifying the written characters of a name
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Suzie discusses the practice of clarifying the characters comprising a Chinese name while also stating that knowing the written characters makes a Chinese name easier to remember.

1. Suzie: Well, since we know the Chinese name, we’ll probably ask
2. how to write the characters.
3. R: Tell me about that.
4. Suzie: It's easier to remember.
5. Linda: Yeah, the characters.
6. Suzie: We'll say how to write it. We will say which characters it is.
7. R: Okay. Why do you do that?
8. Suzie: See, that's the language difference, because in Chinese, you've got
9. the same pronunciation=
10. Linda: =for different characters

4.6.2 Clarifying the written characters of a name: “write me this way”.
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Angel discusses the difficulties she encounters among Chinese with the correct written character – and hence meaning – that comprises part of her name. Because she is a woman, most Chinese people assume that the character being uttered when she gives her Chinese name is a female character; however, it is not.

1. Angel: Um, like, for my last character [i.e. second given name], um, it's
2. actually, like, it actually should be written in this way [shows the FGD], and, but, people would always use, like this [shows the FGD].
3. R: So, when you say "people", this is Chinese people as well?
4. Angel: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Of course. Like, Westerners don't know how to
5. write it. Yeah, it's actually this; so this is the right thing [refers to written character], but people would just, most people would
6. write me this way, cos this is the female...So, that's why people
7. would might think, "Oh, she must be this way", so I would like to
8. tell people again and again I'm actually this.
4.6.3 Clarifying the written characters of a name: “that’s not my name even though they sound the same”.
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Linda: [to fellow Chinese participants] I told you my name is [gives full name]; how would you write it?
2.   
4. Linda: = Maybe not in exactly the character[s] I have. They might write it in another characters. So, but that’s not my name, even though
5.   
6. they sound the same.

4.6.2 The pinyin is not my name

Just as the Chinese name-as-utterance may not actually constitute the Chinese name because of the potential for multiple characters to be pronounced in an identical manner, the data evidence pinyin-ised or Romanized names (i.e. rendered with tones marked in the former or without any tones marked in the latter) being described by participants as not being their names. Without the written characters evident, no Chinese name is being presented.

4.6.4 “The pinyin is not my name”.
(Extract taken from FGD4)

All three participants look at the three renderings of their names they were asked to provide at the beginning of the FGD: Chinese characters, pinyin and English name. The data that follow are a discussion of the follow-up interaction concerning this researcher-instigated experiment.

1. Aurora: We learn pinyin before actual Chinese characters. So, that's supposed to assist your Chinese study. Pinyin's like, ah, sort of, it's a system to tell you how you pronounce the words, so it's basically helping to learn Chinese.
3. R: So, if you look at your name in Chinese characters, in pinyin, and in
7. English name, are there any differences?
8. Andrea: The pinyin is not my name.
10. Andrea: It's just some system to assist the pronunciation.
11. R: Okay, so it not your name at all. [Pointing to the Chinese characters] Your name is this? And this is? [Pointing to pinyin].
12. Andrea: Like, second name.
13. Aurora: So, there are two kind of name, but this one [to pinyin] is, um, just showing, like a footnote =
15. Aurora: = showing how you pronounce.

4.6.5 “My [Romanized] Chinese name...it’s not really my Chinese name.”
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Olivia: Or, if I use my [Romanized] Chinese name, I think, first, it’s not really my Chinese name, like, it's not the real words.
2. R: What do you mean? It's not the real words?

Summary of 4.6 data

This section has presented data related to the idea that while Chinese and Confucian address forms vary substantially according to the circumstantial ingredients of the interaction and interactants, Chinese names are fundamentally written, character-based phenomena intended for visual apprehension, appreciation and, in certain cases, divination. Participant accounts as well as researcher observations demonstrate that the utterance of a Chinese name or names is frequently accompanied by discussion or delineation of its constituent written characters by the interactants because several characters (all of which may conceivably or theoretically comprise the name) may sound identical and so clarification is required. Moreover, participants
underscore the assertion made by Tan (2001, p. 49) of the Singaporean situation for ethnic Chinese, when he observes that the *pinyin* version of his name ‘looks totally alien to me.’ Accordingly, while the Romanisation of a Chinese name facilitates its mispronunciation in terms of tones elided, Chinese names rendered in writing in *pinyin*, let alone Roman alphabet, are described simply by participants as not being their names.

4.7 **Identity**

In as much as it might be isolated from other themes and linguistic acts, this section presents data to do with participants’ identity work as enacted through language use. Identity is analysed as an emergent and dialogic product of discourse and practice, rather than as the pre-existing origin of such discourses and practices. The data contain numerous and diverse instances of participants making such language and identity choices and the differing readings of the interactions and positionings of the participants on the basis of these choices that ensued. Diao (2014, p. 209) notes of Chinese people that ‘historically one individual could have multiple names...for different identity and pragmatic functions.’

In this section I present data concerned with the practice already outlined in 4.5 for Chinese and Taiwanese to toggle among multiple names and intersubjective selves according to interactional circumstances. No claim is being advanced that this tendency does not also occur to differing degrees in other cultures aside from Chinese and Confucian ones.

The identity or identities represented among my data are characterised for the sake of display as variously fluid, contingent and dual, alternatively diachronic and synchronic. Canagarajah (1990) describes colonial era Sri Lankan subjects’ identities as sometimes being variously ‘dual’ and characterised by ‘hybridity’ (p. 116). The example that Canagarajah (2004, p. 121) provides is what he terms the ‘double-faced behavior’ of local Hindus, who presented duplicitously as Christian in order to qualify for better employment and education opportunities. I follow Canagarajah (1990) in using terms like duality and hybridity when presenting identity work
enacted through language by Chinese and Taiwanese, but I do not wish to restrict the presentation to just simple binaries of this or that. Instead I prefer to foreground fluidity and plurality.

These characteristics of discursively-constructed, dialogic and performed identities are achieved or articulated by Chinese and Taiwanese through such phenomena as English name change, ambivalence towards use of English or Chinese names, and a strategic interchangeability of Chinese and English names. For non-Chinese interactants like the university lecturers and career guidance counsellors, such capacity for name change or interchange and ambivalence can be read as indexing among the participants a lack of investment in the target language, a presentation of inauthentic or false selves, or the flippancy or faddishness of the practice. For the participants, however, this combination of playfulness and purposefulness in terms of English and Chinese name use was part of a deeper presentation of global, mobile and transnational identities and subjectivities alternatively in flux, flow and friction.

I commence the presentation with three accounts (across two excerpts) that highlight nascent mobile identities in flux, flow and friction, the tension of not recognising oneself being called into being, of being interpellated (cf. Althusser, 1971), as a by-product of linguistic and cultural in-between-ness. From my logged research field notes I present the case of Chinese Engineering undergraduate Abby, recently arrived in Australia, who spent unnecessary hours waiting in a medical clinic as a result of her Chinese name being called over the public address system, but incomprehensibly so. The subsequent broadcast of her English name, something she had not been long using in such a generalized and regular manner, was also not recognised by the Engineering student.

4.7.1 The identity of the in-between: “a long time for me to get used to it” (Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Aurora: [Only] just got really used to it [i.e. being addressed as Aurora].
2. Andrea: Oh, it took quite a long time for me to get used to it. Sometimes
people call me Andrea, and I didn't react at first. After maybe half a year.

4.7.2 The identity of the in-between: “I didn't recognise her”

(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Angel: That's what I feel like when I first arrived here [in Melbourne]. I will feel weird, people call me English name. I was, like, I didn't recognise her; like, I don't recognise Angel. I recognise my Chinese name so... But, gradually, I will get used to that...

4.7.3 English name change: growing up

(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Aurora: But that's just when you grow up, you prefer to have something more serious. It's like, um, my first English name was, like, Candy, like in primary school that used to be a really popular...Yeah. That used to be quite popular English name for young girls. But then you gradually grow up and it's like the whole thing K; it's not just
6. always be nice and sweet and cute. So that you prefer something =
7. Andrea: = I got the name Vicky when I was 11 or 12. Maybe that suits
8. a little girl, but not for me.

**4.7.4 English name change: a new high school, a new name**  
(*Extract taken from FGD3*)

1. R: But you decided you're not going to use Dolphin when you came to Australia?
2. Dan: No, before that. I use, I change to another high school and I give myself another name. A very simple and a very common one: Annie.
3. R: Why did you choose Annie then, if you don't mind me asking? Why Annie? Why not an unusual name?

**4.7.5 English name change: “one’s preference is really emotional”**  
(*Extract taken from FGD3*)

1. Dan: Yeah, because I changed [a] few times because English for me is quite random, and maybe I like one singer and her name is =
2. All: = Yeah
3. Dan: = and I change it to her name. It could happen because it isn't my official name. I don't need to go to a police station [*laughter from all*] or a law office, it's very easy. If you want to change my official name, it's very hard. But, for English name =
4. Jenks: = One's preference is really emotional.
5. Dan: Really depends on the person.
4.7.6  English name change: “improving all the time”  
(Extract taken from FGD1)

1. Eason: My English name is complicated and this is improving all the time. I had three English names. First one was in primary school. I choose Steven, you know, from a cartoon. The most powerful character was called Steven; I called myself Steven. And, in junior high school, they called me Steven; [but] everywhere is Steven. You should be creative and at that time we are just growing up and we like to do something new, and I'd created an English name for myself: B-O-P, Bop.

9. R: B-O-P?

10. Eason: Be Of Perfect. Bop. And I was follow that name for a while and someday people told me, ah, English-name people never use this kind of name [laughter from all] and, indeed, this name [Eason] is created by Chinese people, maybe it doesn't exist in English.

4.7.7  English name change: don't like English teacher's choice  
(Extract taken from FGD5)

1. Vicky: Yeah, my English teacher used to give me an English name, Rose, because my Chinese name means flower, like rose, but I don't like it now so it's, like, change it.

4.7.8  English name change: “it's a good you can exchange”  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

4. Olivia: And it's interesting that people don't mind changing their English name. Like, I have a friend, she was calling herself Christina, and then she just suddenly decide to call herself Melody, and she just doesn't really mind. She just decide to change her name, English
8. name, but people wouldn't decide to change their Chinese name
9. that frequently, because people take English name, not as a given,
10. it just like, not really luxury, but it's a good that you can exchange.

4.7.2 Synchronic Interchangeability of Chinese and English names:

In this sub-section, my attention changes from participant accounts of English name change diachronically to a more synchronic interchange, perhaps what 20th century applied linguistics would term code-switching, between English and Chinese names. In this sub-section, we start to see participant accounts of dual or binary identities in Australia: one Chinese and tending to be marked by Chinese name use and one Australian and tending to be marked by English name use. From my field notes comes the case of the Chinese student, one of three who all used Chinese names when classroom attendance was being taken, in a tutorial I was taking. When packing up at the end of the tutorial, I remarked to the last of the three Chinese students to give his name at the beginning of class that it was statistically unusual for three out of three Chinese students to use Chinese names, that at least one did not use an English name in an Australian university classroom setting. The Chinese student replied that he ordinarily did use an English name in his university studies in Melbourne but that because the two Chinese students before him had given their Chinese names only without providing English names, he had decided to alter his usual behaviour and not use an English name as well. As a result, his language choice was made on the basis of the context, the socio-historical moment in which he had temporarily found himself.

4.7.9 English-Chinese name interchange: “double identity”
(Extract taken from FGD4)

1. Aurora: But I think only reason we use both English name and Chinese
2. name is that, um, sort of, most of the Chinese students got two
3. sets of friends, one is like English speaking friends.
4. Andrea: Yeah, two groups of friends.
5. Aurora: With English name and speak English with them. Also, in terms of
6. the Chinese friends, it's a bit strange to speak English to the
Chinese person. Chinese people, so, we speak Chinese to each other so naturally we use our Chinese names.

Andrea: So, we don't mix.

R: The two groups of friends don’t mix?

Andrea: Yeah, so we have, like, double identity. They seldom meet, I think.

4.7.10 English-Chinese name interchange: “protection”  
(Extract taken from FGD4)

The data displayed here commence with the continuation by Aurora and Andrea of the exchange above in excerpt 4.7.9 above. Two inter-related sub-themes about the practice emerge in this exchange including the notion of public and private selves and the function of pseudonymous protection of a Chinese self through strategic use of an English name. Aurora’s description of an English name providing “protection” for her when she behaved in ways that might not seem appropriate to her Chinese self, functions as a curious flipside to the distrust Dan in excerpt 4.4.29 felt towards her landlord, whom she suspected used an English name in order to hide or protect her Chinese self – in Dan’s eyes a troubled self.

1. Aurora: At least for me, they're [friendship groups] quite different. My English-speaking friends, I go parties, drinking. And my Chinese friends, study, basically [laughter]. So, I guess the English name provides a sense of protection and the help is for me that I know I'm not supposed to go to parties, but I go to parties when I'm Aurora, and when I promote in nightclubs, I use Aurora as my name there. So, that's a difference.

7. R: So does Aurora dress differently?


4.7.11 English-Chinese name interchange: interpellation of “sweet” self
(Extract taken from FGD1)

Taiwanese participant Candy emphasises a performativity function of an “English” name, through which one becomes one’s English name.

1. Candy: But in my, I think it’s when people change to, like, call my English name all the time and that’s become a character for me. Yeah,
2. because people will think I'm quite sweet, and that's what changes my personality as well, because when you be called that name all
3. the time, probably will change for you your character.

4.7.12 English-Chinese name interchange: interpellation of “outgoing” self
(Extract taken from FGD4)

Similarly to Candy, Andrea’s interpellation through other’s use of her English name typically occurred in a public sphere (e.g. volunteering) and elicited a more outgoing and confident self than that she associated with her Chinese name.

1. Andrea: I feel like when people call me Andrea, or I say, "I am Andrea", I am more outgoing cos usually I'm in a public sphere. When I'm
2. doing something, like, volunteer or just work part-time, people will
3. call me Andrea, I will be more confident.

4.7.13 English-Chinese name interchange: “a foot in the door”
(Extract taken from FGD3)

I cited Canagarajah (2004, p. 121) at the start of this section on the ‘double-faced behavior’ of local Hindus in colonial Sri Lanka, presenting duplicitously as Christian in order to qualify for better employment and education opportunities. In this excerpt, Qian displays a similar cultural capital through her understanding of “English” name use as a function of or antidote to the
institutional racism that adheres to some Australian workplaces and their hiring practices (cf. Booth, Leigh, and Varganova, 2009).

1. Qian: I also hear from other people's stories where, when you're applying for a job, um, especially if you apply for marketing job, for example, you use a Chinese name and people will see your name on a résumé, because they think =
2. Dan: = That's what I've heard
3. Qian: Yeah, but if you use an English name, so Rachel [+Qian's surname], then they will probably think you are born here, something like that, and they will look at your resume and stuff, something like that. But then, once you start working, you change back your Chinese name [laughter from all]. You just get your foot in the door.

4.7.14 English-Chinese name interchange: the power-laden classroom
(Extract taken from FGD3)

Margie and Barb discuss their experiences of students alternating between English and Chinese names, depending on the teacher (including myself) and that teacher's preferences and practices. Arguably, as senior lecturers and administrators on the graduate program, Barb and Margie's preference for students to not use English names was marked by some students as over-riding my own approach to the practice, in which students determined the names they wanted used in my classes. As a result, some students were known to some lecturers by an English name or different English names, while being known to others by a Chinese name.

1. Margie: We're very aware of that with you [different campus, same university program] because we get your grades and we have all
2. Of these names like Rebecca; I can remember two Xues.
4. Barb: One was a Gloria and I don't what the other one was.

5. Margie: Rebecca. And there were two of them and you would put down the English names, and we didn't know who =

6. Barb: = We had no idea =

7. Margie: = who they were. But the interesting thing was sometimes

8. students had told us one name, one English name, and by the time

9. they'd got to you [the 2nd semester], they'd given another English name.


11. Margie: Elsa started out as Elsa and ended up as Angie. I don't know what

12. she was with you? Taiwanese students. Different names. So we

13. used to say to her, "Elsa, Angie, whatever your name is this week."

4.7.3 Adaptation, assimilation, and compromise: the Australian experience

Following on from Qian and Dan’s reading of English name use in light of discriminatory Australian workplace hiring practices, this sub-section presents data concerned with participant readings of mainstream Australian cultural practices. Adaptation refers to the use of English names by Chinese and Taiwanese participants in Australian contexts in order to index a kind of preparedness to modify practices accordingly, a cultural capital. Bourdieu’s (1986) cultural capital refers to a people’s acquired symbolic capital in embodied, objectified or institutionalised states and these include, for example, academic qualifications, accent or dialect, tastes, fashion sense, mannerisms, and material possessions. Certain forms of cultural capital are more valued than others, and can help or hinder a person’s social mobility and networks, thereby facilitating accumulation of social capital, just as much as the strictly economic capital evident in income or wealth.

The terms adaptation and compromise are used by Olivia when accounting for her and her peers’ practice of English name use. Despite Australia being considered by many a multicultural, in aspects multilingual country, by and large, some participants inferred that to adapt to
Australia and Australians, or to display or signify a willingness to adapt, a Chinese or Taiwanese person would be well served by using the signifier of an English name. Diao (2014) found in her U.S research that the use of English names by her participants and the practice more generally among Chinese inferred this kind of reading of the USA as a largely monocultural and monolingual culture.

This English name as adaptation theme was expressed in a variety of ways as the data below display. However, this was oftentimes not a display of the participant’s desire to adapt or assimilate, but instead of the perception that others (i.e. Australians) would respond positively to and connect better with such a signification or display of adaptability. Therefore, it signaled an alignment with such a discursive reading of mainstream Australia and an understanding of a dialogic self. Accordingly, a decision by a Chinese participant not to use an English name (see excerpt 4.7.18 to follow with Olivia talking to Linda) and to persist with a Chinese name might be read as an unwillingness to adapt to these perceived Australian expectations.

4.7.15 The perceptions of others
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Olivia’s comments emphasise the role played by one’s reading of others in identity performance and presentations of self – a dialogics of self. I refer to an understanding of identities comprising more than static macro-level demographic categories, but also temporary and dialogic stances and participant roles, and local, emergent positions (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). The “identity” Olivia talks about people insisting on is this notion of a macro-level demographic category (e.g. Chinese) and the tension elicited when one endeavours to get a reading on the perceptions of others.

1. Olivia: But I understand that some argue that you should insist your identity, it's part of your identity, you shouldn't just, yeah, change it [i.e. one’s name] that easy. But, I guess, from the other hand is,
2. as I said before, identity is not only what you think we are, but also
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5. the other people, how they perceive.

4.7.16 “Belonging”  
(*Extract taken from FGD1*)

1. Eason: Sometimes this to me, like, three circumstances. One is belonging.
2. If they call you English name, you are part of this country; you are a part of this culture. Then you feel exciting.

4.7.17 “Connection”  
(*Extract taken from FGD2*)

1. Olivia: When you use an English name, it's familiar to Australian people so when they see your name there's this kind of positive connotation with people; if this people call, "I know Angel" [*a fellow Chinese participant*], you have positive connotation; you have something relate to this name. If you have Chinese name, there's nothing to Australian people; there's no connection.

4.7.18 “Compromise”  
(*Extract taken from FGD2*)

1. Olivia: I guess name is just one of the means that people use to judge other people. Like, if you have a Chinese name [*to Linda*], then I might thought, well, maybe you're not so Australian or, maybe you're not so open-minded. So we have a series of judgement we think when we see this kind of name. And, the other thing is that's how people perceive you, and the other thing is how you perceive yourself. If you're keeping your Chinese name, I guess the reason you do that is cos you still identity yourself as Chinese, and your identity of your past, not past, but where you're
4.7.4 Authentic presentations of self

In light of Olivia’s observations on compromise, adaptation and assimilation in excerpt 4.7.17 above, this subsection presents data from students and lecturers alike on the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese and questions that arose over authentic presentations and performances of self. Such questions derive largely from non-alignment of some participant and interlocutor understandings of the project of self and its relationship with ethno-biology and name use. In section 4.5, Relationality, data related to the intersubjective and contingent elements of Chinese and Confucian selves underscored a traditional understanding that it is through dialogue and negotiation that a Chinese self (and a conception thereof) might emerge discursively. This sub-section looks at data in which the practice of English use is read by non-Chinese Australian interlocutors, like lecturers or employers, as presenting false or inauthentic selves.

In this sub-section, it is the Australian interlocutors, frequently in positions of relative greater power as a result of both institutional status as well as the linguistic capital typically bequeathed to L1 native speakers, who question the practice in light of Chinese and Taiwanese performances of self. Nevertheless, such questioning of and resistance to is a product of its capacity to Other non-Chinese.

**4.7.19 “Tell me your “real” name”**
*(Extract taken from FGD4)*

Andrea is discussing the preference of her volunteer work coordinator at an opportunity shop for Andrea to use her Chinese name and not an English name. The excerpt follows on from Andrea’s frustration at repeated attempting to correct the coordinator’s mispronunciation of her Chinese name.
1. Andrea: And I realised the inconvenience, as usual, and I say, "Okay, just call me Andrea." And she try, and then she tried to insist on calling me, then she said, No, no, no. Tell me your “real” name.

4. R: "Real name" in inverted commas. You were doing that.

5. Andrea: Yeah, yeah. I think she was trying to express a kind of respect by calling me by my [Chinese name].

4.7.20 “You’re not Lisa; you’re not Rachel, you’re not Lilly.”
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Qian: But then when I tried to use back my English name, my friend[s] start to laugh at me. They say, "[derisive snort] You are not Lisa; you're not Rachel; you're not Lilly", because in their mind they have people, like, if you know someone whose name is Lisa and if you tell them you're Lisa, they look at you and say, "You're not Lisa; you're not Rachel." [laughter from Qian]

7. R: So, these are Chinese friends or general friends?

8. Qian: General Australian friends.

4.7.21 “A false you”
(Extract taken from FGD6)

For Margie especially, an individual’s name is synonymous with his or her non-dialogic identity. According to Margie’s position, it is how an individual is known professionally and positioned in terms of categories like nationality. For Margie, both are unitary and singular. Therefore, names index ideas of authenticity of self and self is to be understood as less an ongoing project or a becoming and as more of a fixed product where fixity equals authenticity. As a result, the name is fixed just as the self is fixed. Within such a framework, there is little negotiating space for a fluid, dialogic or contingent self because this would index inauthenticity. The following data
excerpts, largely drawn from Margie, concern her positioning of the indexical relationship between one’s fixed name (i.e. Chinese or English, but not Chinese and English) and one’s fixed (national) identity.

1. Margie: But the issue that I have if you're not internalising it [i.e. English name] or accepting it, then you're putting up something that is false. You're putting a label on yourself that is showing people a false you. They don't know who you really are. Because we were saying to them, well, this was part of their learning process of who you are as an individual. "You are Chinese, you know. The most important thing is your Chinese identity. Are you trying to be English? What are you trying to be? Why are you using an English name?"

4.7.22 “Professional identity” (Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Margie: My attitude with him [i.e. student Seven Wang], with any of them is, "What name's going to be on your certificate? When you get your diploma, your Masters; what's the name that's going to be on there?" Because that's your professional name. "When you're a child and you have a nickname, that's fine; and some people use their nicknames right through their lives and that's fine, if that's what you want to do. But if you're going to start calling yourself Seven Wang, then that is your name, and that's the name that you tell the university and that's the name that's on your driver's licence, and it's the name that's on your certificate. It's your name; you adopted it. But you can't start saying, "Oh that's my real name, but everyone in Australia can call me Seven", because it's saying that I have a real name that's a work name and I have a
name that’s not appropriate for work. And, really, by the time they get into Masters they should be thinking about their professional identity; and their professional identity working with and meeting other people within their sphere that they're in, um, and becoming known as an identity. So that's the name they should be using.

4.7.5 Western cool, high income and cultural capital

Pulling back the focus from specifically Australian settings of English name use and notions of dual or binary identity work, this sub-section presents data relevant to Chinese and Taiwanese students’ identity construction, diverse as it is among the participants, as emergent from situated Chinese and Taiwanese language practices. In other words, their use of language resources at a local linguistic level is understood to inform their alignment with or disalignment from other speakers and other utterances, conscious, intended and otherwise.

A key question to be addressed by my research is why, when many of the participant accounts provide reasons drawn from pragmatics and intercultural communication theories to do with anticipated readings of Australian cultural and linguistic practices, does the practice of English name use invariably commence and continue in Chinese and Taiwanese local settings? The use among Chinese and Taiwanese of an English name is a form of cultural capital, revealing or indexing among other possible things, an individual’s attendance at a prestigious language school, a proficiency in English language and the intention to travel abroad, or comparatively well-salaried employment in a Chinese-based multi-national private company. Eason in 4.7.22 takes Bourdieu’s (1986) notion of a linguistic market to its logical and literal end when he compares the current Chinese use of “English” names to the practice of Chinese and foreign consumers using US dollars in Chinese marketplaces (but not Chinese RMB currency in the USA). For Eason, the practice is as much to do with power as it is with pragmatics.

4.7.23 Power not just pragmatics
1. Eason: If China becomes more powerful, or suppose we conquer Britain,
2. United States and Australia [laughter from all] that's Chinese
3. become powerful and everyone will like to learn Chinese, and it's
4. very important, and they will change their names [to Chinese
5. names]. And when we come to balance, keep a balance, that
6. situation will change and we won't change our names. It's like, er,
7. just like U.S dollars. If U.S is not powerful, why you use U.S dollars?
8. You use Australian dollars. You use European dollars. It's kind of
9. like the powerful country can control language, can control
10. currency.

4.7.24 “Like Starbucks in China”
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Angel: They will, like, if you have a English name [in China], so, maybe
2. they will think that maybe you, like, went abroad, or, ah, you
3. have a characteristic of, like, Westerners, and you can speak
4. English, and people will, like, respect you better or something like
5. that.
6. Olivia: I share your feeling. I agree. I feel like a English name is like
7. Starbucks in China; it's not really about a English name, it's about
8. this representation. Like it's about democracy, capitalism and it's
9. kind of with this characteristic of bourgeoisie, like, it's kind of
10. middle class, yeah.

4.7.25 Educated, cool, Western
(Extract taken from FGD3)

1. Qian: Another point I want to say is English is such a dominant language
2. in the world at the moment. It's almost like a trend in China. If you can speak English well, you are well educated or, you know, you are cool. It's associated with Hollywood, you know: Hollywood movies and singers, with Western because everything is about Western at the moment.


4. Qian: So, having an English name is sort of like a trend as well. I guess that's one of the major reasons why Chinese people choose to use English names.

5. 4.7.26 Multi-national and private sector
   (Extract taken from FGD3)

In lines 8 and 9, Dan underscores that English name use in China certainly is less about communicative functions of language and more about meta-pragmatic functions. Dan emphasises that in multinational companies based in China with Chinese employees, Mandarin Chinese is likely the language spoken but English names tend to be used.

6. 1. Qian: And also, I guess, also another group is actually if the Chinese person speaks English. Only if they have learnt English at school, of if they work in a multi-national company, so joint venture, they tend to have English name. But if they just work in the national companies or factories, they don't have English name.

7. Jenks: There's no point.

8. Qian: They don't need.

9. Dan: I think for some, like we say, multi-national companies, they speak Chinese, but they call each other by English names.

10. 4.7.27 “You’ve got a good job”
    (Extract taken from FGD3)
1. Eason: And then another circumstance is in your own country [i.e. China].
2. You work for, um, a company and, you know, in my country, you
3. work for a foreign company, then you've got a good job, and if in
4. foreign company, they call you English name, that means you've
5. got a good job. Yeah, the company's colleagues call each other
6. English names, but that's just for the foreign company, not the
7. Chinese company.

4.7.6 Transidiomatic practices and recombinant identities

Olivia alludes to the themes of cosmopolitanism (cf. Diao, 2014) and metroethnicity (cf. Maher, 2005), in which discrete and a priori modernist identity categories of nationalism and ethnicity are superseded by a post-structuralist and emergent understanding of fluid, fleeting and fragmented self or selves. Olivia’s ambivalence about what may be her authentic national or ethnic self underscores this kind of post-structuralist and transnational understanding, this new Chinese subjectivity (cf. Nononi and Ong, 1997), of the project of self as emergent and contingent.

4.7.28 “Today I’m Australian, tomorrow I’m Chinese”
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Olivia: But for me, name is like nationalism. Like, I'm more cosmetic
2. [wrong word], um, cosmopolitan, so I don't really mind. Like, today
3. I'm Australian, tomorrow I'm Chinese; I don't really mind.
4. Like, so name for me is just like a symbol, so it doesn't really
5. matter...I'm not saying it's not good, but I don't really mind that
6. much. [several lines later] It's like a clothe [sic]: today I feel like
7. Melody, tomorrow I feel like Christina. But for the Chinese name is
8. different. People think, oh, that's actually who I am. It's like a
9. body, and then the English name is like the clothe. I can wear a
10. different one according to my mood. But the Chinese name
11. actually is different.

Summary of 4.7 data

This section has presented data on English (and Chinese) name use in Australian as well as urban Chinese and Taiwanese local settings and the attendant presentation and project of self. In doing so, it looks at tensions that can arise when modernist conceptions of self and identity, with a focus on ‘macro-level demographic categories’ (cf. Bucholtz and Hall 2005) of identity like nationality, ethnicity and first language, come up against newer Chinese subjectivities, some of which are ambivalent towards these 20th century categories, and espouse instead more fragment, fluid and fleeting identities akin to themes of cosmopolitanism (cf. Diao, 2014) and metroethnicity (cf. Maher, 2005).

4.8 HETEROGLOSSIA

In excerpt 4.4.25, Margie and Barb’s discussion of the appropriateness of some of the names used in relation to their ideology of Australian naming practices invokes Bakhtin’s (1981) argument that ‘every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal stratifying forces).’ This, Bakhtin (1981, p. 272) continues, is ‘the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school’, in which the analysis of any utterance, in this case the outcome of a translingual practice: an English name, ‘exposed it as a contradiction-riddled, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.’ The same analysis might be offered to the participants’ resistance to Barb and Margie using their Chinese names (cf. Chinese as an International Language).

The data excerpt is reprised in 4.8.2 to follow. There are therefore two types of dialogism that the word as utterance likely encounters. The first is with ‘an alien word within the object itself’
(Bakhtin, p. 282), which is evident in the semantic clash between, for example, Seven as affective sound poem and Seven as number (and, therefore, not name). The second is ‘the subjective belief system of the listener...sometimes crassly accommodating, sometimes provocatively polemical’ (p. 282), which represents Margie and Barb’s linguistic ideology as subjective belief system, polemical and proscriptive in the case of the former, yet increasingly accommodating of the practice upon the conclusion of our focus group discussion.

4.8.1 “She might think that in English would be the same”  
(Extract taken from FGD2)

Olivia discusses a Chinese friend of hers who used the English name, Snow. Olivia’s reading of this name is that as both transliteration and translation of her Chinese name (meaning “snow”) into English it is entirely acceptable for Chinese as an English name; it allows Snow, as I present in the next section, 4.9, “to use something she can relate back to Chinese.” However, Olivia notes that her friend assumes that this acceptability of the name will also map onto English language performance. The relative value accorded utterances is provided by Blommaert (2003, p. 617) in his analysis of a piece of writing by a 16-year old Tanzanian girl. The analysis takes from Eastman and Stein (1993) the notion of a ‘language display’. The writing that is presented is by normative or native speaker standards riddled with grammatical errors and pragma-linguistic inappropriateness. These errors, however, gain significance once the writing ‘moves across a world system’ (p. 619) from its Tanzanian EFL context, where such a capacity to use English the way the girl does indexes success and prestige, to L1 setting, in which ‘the resources used by Victoria [the girl] would fail to index élite status and prestige.’

1. Olivia: So, the example I told you about with Snow, that would be if a 
2. people call herself Snow in Chinese, and she is acceptable, and it's 
3. quite popular, people think it's cute, pretty. So, um, she might 
4. think that in English would be the same.

4.8.2 “The names are so inappropriate. Our names are appropriate.”
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(Extract taken from FGD6)

1. Margie: The names are so inappropriate. Gloria, for a twenty-year old girl?
2. Now, we know that Gloria is a name that was 1930's. Um, our
3. names are appropriate for our age groups so that people who are
called Margie are post-war people, were sort of 1940's, maybe
5. 1950's. But after that that name disappeared. Um, and all the
6. names go through a cycle like that. So, I try to explain to them that
7. names come back. Ruby was a very, my grandmother may have
8. been called Ruby, but now it's a new name and it's coming back
9. into fashion. But it's still not appropriate for a twenty-year old. It's
10. now appropriate for little kids who are just about to go off to
11. school. They're the Rubies now.

4.8.3 Resignification
(Extract taken from FGD6)

Barb draws on her experiences several decades earlier in post-colonial Zimbabwe to locate the practice within discourses of imperialism and (post-)colonialism. Barb and Margie had been discussing their understanding of a practice among some foreign-born English language teachers in China, Taiwan and Hong Kong in the late 20th century to provide their students with unsuitable and offensive English names, a kind of in-joke among some English teachers. Barb’s argument is that the practice from this perspective may have had racist origins but now resignification is underway and the formerly mocked and marginalized (as in colonial Zimbabwe) now “own” the names.

1. Barb: There's an awful lot happening here, isn't there? And all I
2. can think of, especially when I see Sevens and things is my
3. background, which is African, where everybody I met was called
4. Banana or Mercy. Well working in, living in Zimbabwe for ten
5. years and so the people that you’re interacting with are called
6. Banana. The President was the Top Banana. These were names
7. given to them by mission schools, so you can only ask yourself why
8. these names were given, and they're given to maintain position, to
9. maintain the position of being something of a joke and something
10. not human, and you just wonder if there isn't this inherent racism
11. underlying a lot of this and that's not reciprocated now. Well, why
12. not? It was going on forever and ever and ever. Although they now
13. proudly own their names and call their children Banana and

Summary of 4.8 data

This section has presented data related to the confusions that can arise between Chinese and Taiwanese participants’ desires and intentions that imbue and inform their language choices, and their interlocutors’ possible purchase on the multiple meanings or indexicalities of these choices. This tension constitutes (and is constituted by) the practice’s fundamental heteroglossia, a principle inherent to all ‘verbal-ideological life’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 290). Heteroglossia refers to the stratification of languages, in which socio-ideological contradictions co-exist in the production and reception of utterances, perhaps most potently in meaningfully-loaded language items like names.

4.9 RELOCALISATION

Relocalisation (cf. Pennycook, 2010) refers to accounts of language practices that are less concerned with posited and pre-fabricated language structures and systems like English and Chinese, along with their peripheral variants (e.g. Chinese English), and more attuned to accounts of the “doing” of language, or of languaging, in particular local settings. This entails a focus on languages as linguistic resources rather than as discrete and enumerative entities. Accordingly, a relocalisation reading of English name use concerns itself with what language users “do” with English language items, how they understand the relationship of English to their own socio-historical conditions, and what new meanings and subjectivities are generated by its
use (Pennycook, 2010). Pennycook, (2010) describes this doing of language, this ‘relocalisation of other’s expressions’ (p. 34), as ‘a social practice constantly reconstructed in sensitivity to environmental factors’ (p. 71).

There are a number of different ways in which the practice of English name use as presented through the data evidences relocalisation. The process of (re)localisation of language practices, in this case the practice of using what are provisionally termed English names, is considered to involve some practices that are normatively Chinese, and that might therefore prime or predispose Chinese and Taiwanese for English name use. However, this relocalisation might also be argued to simultaneously represent that of some normatively Australian naming practices (e.g. first-name basis interaction).

We arrive therefore at an ontological location not dissimilar to Pennycook’s (2010) Malaysian sign encounter. This is an example of a sign spotted in Malaysia, which read *Pub dan karaoke*. Pennycook (2010, p. 68) begins by asking rhetorically whether the sign might be described as being trilingual or a bilingual. However, Pennycook’s (2010) summation is that ‘to render [linguistic] diversity contingent on the numerical representation of languages is to focus on languages as entities rather than on linguistic resources.’ In his case, the encounter with the sign occurs geographically in Kuala Lumpur, but with reference to a geometry of transcultural flows, it exists at a space that might best be mapped in terms of language as repertoire and resource, not in terms of language as national and territorial. To do so, to consider geometry rather than geography and languaging as process rather than language/s as product, is then to dissolve the enumerative and intractable binary of whether the practice we are investigating is best categorised as involving Chinese or English language items and cultural practices.

The normatively Chinese naming practices that might be present in the practice of so called English name use include name changes undertaken for reasons of *feng shui* or unsuitability; the tradition of giving “Chinese names” to foreign workers in China; the use of “foreign names” in Chinese school and university foreign language classes; the fatalistic tendencies of Chinese
naming traditions; the quest for uniqueness in Chinese given names, and the use of Chinese transliterated “English names”. Secondly and complementarily, I identify a relocalisation of Australian naming practices by Chinese and Taiwanese in response to their revised socio-historical conditions in an Australian university.

4.9.1 Localisation

Olivia refers to the idea of localisation with reference to a Chinese friend of hers, whose English name is Snow. Olivia describes Snow as trying to use a name that she could relate back to her Chinese-ness, a rationale echoed in the next turn of the same data set by Angel with reference to an English name popular among Chinese young women, Princess. What differs localisation from relocalisation is that both examples emphasise the product over the practice, emphasise the language type over the languaging.

4.9.1 “I think it’s localisation of English names.”
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Olivia: I guess she trying to use something she can relate back to
2. Chinese...Yeah, a little snow. [Laughter from participants]
3. Angel: Princess, something like that.
4. Olivia: I think it’s localisation of English names, like they try to bring
5. some...
6. R: Tell me what you mean by localisation of English names?
7. Olivia: I think people using English names is like a globalisation. Like,
8. Chinese people, they want to be part of the world, so they want to
9. be closer, better communicate with the outside world, so they use
10. an English name. But, in the same time, they want to keep their
11. own Chinese identity, so they localize the English name.

4.9.2 Giving foreigners in China “Chinese names” 1
(Extract taken from FGD4)
Aurora expands on the Chinese convention of giving some foreign nationals resident in China Chinese names. Aurora argues that in fact what appears to be a “Chinese name” tends rather to be a conventional way in which English names are phonically rendered in Chinese. Therefore, it might be argued that what is actually been achieved is not a Chinese name per se, but instead a Chinese practice that Findings in the relocalisation of an English name.

1. R: There are some celebrity English teachers in China and some
2. American CEOs who are given Chinese names.
3. Andrea: Yes.
4. Jodi: Probably if you want to narrow, narrow the distance =
5. Andrea: = Close the gap between the two countries.
6. R: Even if they don't speak Chinese?
7. Andrea: It's symbolic.
8. Aurora: I don't think it has much to do with the culture what you mention about these English people or English-speaking people getting
9. Chinese names. One of the possible ways of how it happens is that
10. we have sort of conventional ways of translating English names
11. into Chinese. It's like Susan. We got, everyone knows that means
12. Soo-San [sic], which means, um, and that refer to specific two
13. Chinese characters. And, like, Peter, we also got a conventional
14. way of translating that name into Chinese, so maybe they look like
15. they've got a Chinese name but actually there's just a Chinese
16. translation for their English name.

4.9.3 Giving foreigners in China “Chinese names” 2
(Extract taken from FGD1)

1. Vincent: You know the painter is Picasso, yeah? But in Chinese we also say
2. that bi-jia-suo.
3. Sylvia: No, no, no. It's different in Taiwan and China.
4. Candy: We have different translation.
5. R: Three characters. Meaning? Not important?
6. Vincent: Just pronunciation, so we just give a Chinese name because it's easy to remember and read.
7. Sylvia: In Taiwan, we say bi-ka-so, so different pronounce.
8. R: Different characters as well?
10. Vincent: We have many. I just give you an example. [Does so for David Beckham]. No matter the Chinese or Taiwanese, we also get the H, ah, have an H sound [BeckHam], but in English, we don't, ah, get this sound. But we emphasise this sound.

4.9.4 Using target culture names according to target language used (e.g. Russian) 1
(*Extract taken from FGD4*)

The practice of Chinese adopting or augmenting “foreign names” also occurs with languages other than English. The Chinese practice is not just restricted to normatively English names or to contexts or spaces in which English is the lingua franca. What this suggests is a Chinese predisposition to the practice irrespective of whether the language or, perhaps better, the lingua franca, is English. Aurora discusses her parents’ experiences during and since Soviet Russia with “Russian” names.

1. Aurora: Yeah. They [Aurora’s parents] do cos they both studied Russian for quite a long time. They were sent to study in the Soviet Union.
2. R: So, they didn't use their Chinese names, they used Russian names in the Soviet Union?
3. Aurora: Yes. I can't reckon I can pronounce, but I recognise them cos my mum still writes her Russian name on her diary book or things like that.
8. R: Really? In Chinese characters?

9. Aurora: In Russian characters. It's, like, totally different. I can't pronounce it.

4.9.5 Using target culture names according to target language used (e.g. French) 2 (Extract taken from FGD4)
Andrea discusses her experiences with “French” names in her Chinese secondary school French classes.

1. Andrea: I speak French. I haven't reached a phase in which I need to have a
2. French name, cos I got a name in foreign language, only when I
3. reached some extent of proficiency in that language. So, my
4. French is not that good.
5. R: So, when you went to French class in China, your teacher didn't
give you a French name?
6. Andrea: Oh, he did. He did. He tried to ask our French name, but we said,
7. "No, we don't have French names." I mean, some of them don't
even have English names, so how can we have French names?!
8. R: Your teacher was French?

4.9.6 A Chinese predisposition to name change (feng shui) 1
(Extract taken from FGD2)

1. Suzie: My [Chinese] name means like a special gift; I don't know which
2. special gift. Some people suggest me to change it because...Cos
3. that's part of the feng shui.
5. R: Tell me about the feng shui.
6. Suzie: I don't know. Look at your birthday and look at your ..... 
7. Angel: Look at a lot of things like [Chinese word], especially in southern
8. part of China, I think. Like, northern part, like, sometimes they will
9. need, like, *feng shui* aspect.
10. Suzie: I don't know they see, but they say, um, "This name contains too
11. much fire" and =
12. Angel: = Yeah, yeah, yeah. Like, the day we born and the time we born
13. identify, like, you, like lack of fire or lack of water or lack of wind.
14. You got the four...If they say, "You need water here", they may call
15. you [*Chinese for water*]; it's, like, water in one character.

**4.9.7 A Chinese predisposition to name change (feng shui) 2**
*(Extract taken from FGD1)*

1. Sophie: Okay. I have to make a conclusion [*her presentation of the story and moderation of the subsequent graduate class discussion*].
   Basically,
2. I changed my name before. So, before, because the first name
3. when I was born, my parents give me this name, but after a few
4. years later they find that name, one of the surname [*sic: given names*], the words in my surname [*sic: last names*] is not good for
5. me, so they change the name for me so now I use the new name
6. and I feel good.

**4.9.8 A Chinese predisposition to name change (context)**
*(Extract taken from FGD2)*

1. Suzie: My mum used to work in the Chinese...We used to have a Chinese
2. restaurant [*in Australia*], but that's only a family business, so my
3. mum just call me Chinese name But once, after we moved to the
4. new shop, fish and chips, we have, like, foreign people staff so
5. Mum tend to call me my English name.
6. R: And so you’re working in the shop?
7. Suzie: Yeah, that's why my mum starts getting used to call me my English name.

4.9.8 (Re)localisation and resignification of English names and naming
(Extract taken from FGD6)
Barb acknowledges a process of resignification of language items, of transcultural flows (cf. Pennycook, 2006) and of relocalisation, in which “English” names are being “taken over” or appropriated in the repertoire-based languaging practices of Chinese and Taiwanese others. For Barb, therefore, the items are “no longer our names anymore”; one argument being that this is because they never in fact were “our” names. Through such relocalisation and resignification, the names acquire different connotations and meanings.

1. Barb: Bonnie, yes. There are several Gloria's. Maybe that's what happening though; that those names are going to be taken over, and they're going to have all these other associations. They're no longer our names anymore.

Summary of 4.9 data

The data presented in this section relate to accounts of the practice English name use that evidence processes of relocalisation being enacted by participants. This relocalisation combines elements of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices being reworked in Australian university “locals” as well as the reworking of the mainstream Australian communicative norm of first-name basis interaction. For the sake of enumeration, we see that what might be superficially described as English names as the products of such processes as relocalisation can simultaneously serve pragmatic and meta-pragmatic functions that are at once Chinese and Australian, should we care to call them such, yet which simultaneously transcend these two binary categories. Instead, relocalisation allows for the focus to be transferred away from the
products (are they English names? Are they Chinese names?), and onto the processes at work amidst this everyday practice, the languaging being done by participants in response to their readings of the “locals” in which they operate.

4.10 SUMMARY

This chapter has presented data derived from participant accounts of their practice of English name use in Australian university settings, some attendant workplace settings and in mainland Chinese and Taiwanese locations. The data are presented according to themes, whose labels have been determined by the researcher, but whose categorical existence is the result of frequency of mention or emphasis by the participants. Necessarily, this is a curated but still representative selection of all seven and half hours’ worth of spoken data obtained through focus group discussions, and classroom and language exchange session audio recordings. These themes are used as organizing tropes for the analysis and discussion of the data in the next chapter, Discussion.
Chapter 5 Discussion

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Having presented coded data according to emergent themes in Chapter 4 Findings, this chapter discusses these findings. Data sources are triangulated throughout the chapter in order to achieve multiple perspectives on and a deeper understanding of the students’ naming practices. The chapter organisation reflects the key themes emerging from analysis of the data. These themes are not mutually exclusive or hermetic, but function as prompts for the discussion. This reflects what Block (2007, p. 864) describes as an idealisation or simplification, in which he qualifies his use of three particular descriptors for the purposes of analysis. Referring to the three descriptors he uses, he writes

naturalistic, foreign language, and study abroad are being used here in an idealized and somewhat simplified manner. I see this idealization, or simplification, not as an ontological commitment, but a strategy that allows me to proceed with the discussion at hand (Block, 2007, p. 864).

Therefore, the themes used to structure this discussion are not definitive ontological commitments, but better facilitate the organisation of the data and, hence, its discussion. Within each section of the chapter are sub-sections, whose headings I have derived from participant utterances. The seven themes that comprise the discussion are a cumulative and inductive argument as to why, when and where this practice has been observed and discussed to operate, successfully, strategically and otherwise. Finally, with Relocalisation, the chapter arrives at a “where to from now” section in terms of labelling the practice.

Overview

The first section, 5.2, is titled Resistance and discusses findings related to dialogic processes of naming and identity negotiation through language practices, equivocation and conflict. Furthermore, it discusses questions of illegitimate and inauthentic language use and Othering
that infuse the practice. Resistance was one of the major and multi-faceted themes encountered throughout my research. Such negotiation, equivocation and conflict between lecturers and students and, indeed, among the students, as well as attendant questions of illegitimate and inauthentic language use are understood as constituent of and constituted by ‘the on-going negotiation of language’ (Pennycook, 2008, p. 30.3). This on-going negotiation is dialogic and heteroglossic in its processes and outcomes. Within this study, I identify three types of resistance in the findings and follow Canagarajah’s (2004) argument in which language schools are understood as ‘power-laden…medium[s] of ideological and social reproduction’ (p. 120).

Section 5.3 is titled Relationality and discusses findings related to the intersubjective and dialogic dimensions of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices in general. Moreover, it discusses the use of English names among Chinese and Taiwanese specifically in the shadow of these practices. I argue that name change (e.g. augmentation, diminution, substitution) in mainstream Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices and address is a function of the intricacies of intersubjective and relational performance of Chinese selves and identities. I use the term ‘relational self’ in the sense employed by Xinyan (2006, p. 544), whereby ‘what distinguishes the Confucian notion of self from others’ is its emphasis on the relational nature of self… the concept of the relational self is an opposite of the concept of the autonomous self.’

Canagarajah (2007) argues that multilingual learners of English frequently ‘bring pragmatic strategies valued in their own communities to facilitate communication with outsiders’ (p. 93).

King and Bond (1985) emphasis that ‘nowhere does Confucius discuss relations among strangers’ (p. 39) so, conventionally, Chinese people have tended to be uncertain in terms of address norms in social situations involving non-kin and non-primary group members (i.e. cross-cultural interactions cf. Li, 1997). This uncertainty, I argue, is intended to be mitigated by deployment of English names.

Nevertheless, throughout the discussion, it is also important to recall Zhu Hua’s (2015) study of a diasporic Chinese family resident in the UK, and the different family members’ use of interactional resources to perform desired cultural identities. In Zhu Hua’s (2015) discussion of
Chinese address terms, especially the contrast drawn between Chinese and English address terms, the author observes that Chinese address forms, like Confucian social practices in general and of which they are one example, are ‘very sensitive’ (p. 116) to ‘roles, status, degrees of intimacy and familiarity, age, gender and situational contexts.’ As a result, there is conventionally a preference among Chinese for pseudo-kinship name use, ‘contrary to the use of first name to address friends or colleagues’ (p. 116) that tends to characterise English practices.

That noted, what is also apparent in Zhu Hua’s (2015) study is that the 40-something year old Chinese émigré parents’ preference for classically Chinese address forms to be used in English language family discussion of Chinese friends is contested by the practices of their teenage son, whose dominant language is English. Contrary to his parents, the son prefers to use English first names for Chinese and British-born Chinese family friends and peers indiscriminately, to both circumvent Chinese conventions of address and to perform his globalised identity as a Chinese-born, London-raised youth. English name use in this study is understood to perform pragmatic and meta-pragmatic functions, allowing for the negotiation of conventional Chinese practices and the presentation of a cosmopolitan and transnational 21st century self.

With these findings of Zhu Hua (2015) in mind, and, hopefully, without labouring the point, in any discussion of Chinese naming practices and conventions of address, it is important to recall previous discussion of Gao’s (1995) concept of the ‘paradox of intercultural communication’. This paradox means that intercultural understanding is, on the one hand, premised on an understanding of measures of intercultural difference and of intracultural homogeneity. However, on the other hand, the positing of such cultural difference runs the risk of perpetuating cultural stereotypes through articulation of such difference, and the reification of fixed demographic categories like ethnicity and nationality. Therefore, cultural relativism invoked out of sensitivity might in fact further “otherise” a group. Accordingly, I acknowledge that relationality, as a concept underpinning intersubjective construction of selves in naming and address practices and address practices, is not a quality unique to Chinese culture and language; it is a question of degrees and not of absolutes, nor is it equally practised among all.
Section 5.4 is titled *Modality*, referring to the classic Saussurian (2011) distinction between the written and spoken registers. This section argues that full Chinese names are fundamentally written, glyphic or character-based phenomena and that Romanized or even *pinyin* transcriptions of such names are inauthentic and inadequate substitutes, irrespective of whether appropriate tones are marked (i.e. *pinyin*). Similarly, it is argued that the vocalised performance of such names by non-Chinese speakers near invariably, but also in some cases by native speaker Chinese, fails to render accurately or meaningfully the written ideogram and, therefore, the name. Saussure *et al.* (2011, pp. 25-6) describes Chinese as ‘the classic example of an ideographic system of writing’, in which ‘each word is represented by a single sign that is unrelated to the sounds of the word itself.’ English, by contrast, would be defined by Saussure *et al.* (2011, p. 26) as fitting the second system of writing, ‘phonetic...[in that it]...tries to reproduce the succession of sounds that make up a word.’ This distinction becomes pertinent when Saussure writes that:

*The statement that the written word tends to replace the spoken one in our minds is true of both systems of writing, but the tendency is stronger in the ideographic system. To a Chinese, an ideogram and a spoken word are both symbols of an idea; to him, writing is a second language, and if two words that have the same sound are used in conversation, he may resort to writing in order to express his thought (Saussure et al., 2011, p26).*

What these sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 have in common in effect is the argued misuse and misunderstanding of Chinese names and name use (and hence of classically Chinese conceptions and performances of self) by non-Chinese and non-Chinese speaking interactants. In other words, I argue they derive from Chinese naming and address practices, sociolinguistics and address. A key argument of mine is that these various factors explored especially in sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 and related to a sociolinguistics and pragmatics of Chinese naming and address practices, predispose Chinese and Taiwanese students in an Australian university context to certain practices of English name use. That is to say that the dialogics underpinning the conventions of Chinese naming and address practices determine the names used to address a
subject, so immediately there is a cultural trigger or proclivity for name modification or change according to perceptions of interlocutor and setting.

In the case of this research, these settings are a function of the dialogised and heteroglossic intercultural nexus between the global (i.e. the Chinese or Taiwanese university student operating translocally and trans-culturally) and a “local” (i.e. the sociolinguistic settings in a Melbourne university classroom and workplace on a given day at a given time). In an effort to locate “culture” through practices and performances and not in persons and psychologies, I analyse these shared practices and dispositions among Chinese and Taiwanese students abroad as habitus (cf. Bourdieu 1991), following Rampton’s (2010, p. 20) attempts to ‘characterise the linguistically indexed positioning of groups in historical process and ideologically freighted, polycentric sociolinguistic space.’

Sections 5.5 to 5.7 provide further insights into the practice beyond the conventions and contexts of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices and address forms. Canagarajah (2007, p. 90) cites research into ‘the negotiation of English in everyday conversation’ that demonstrates how ‘multilinguals’ can exploit English language resources while retaining ‘their values and identities’. What permits this is the capacity to exploit English ‘in socially situated and contextually informed manner’ (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 90). In effect, these latter sections begin with participants’ reasonably straightforward accounts of attempts at situated and subversive identity work in Australian workplace and university interactions, before I frame the practice according to Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia and associated accounts of translingualism.

Translingual communication practices refer to everyday language practices brought to prominence and increased frequency by processes of globalisation including transnational migration, language hybridisation and online interaction. These practices are what Canagarajah (2012, p. 2), for example, describes as ‘transnational contact in diverse social, economic and cultural domains [that] has increased the interaction between languages and language
groups...[and]...has involved people taking their heritage languages to new locales and developing repertoires that were not traditionally part of their community.’ In these transnational settings, not all of which need to involve migration or movement to geographically new locales but could instead involve the changing dynamics of domestic locales, participants ‘adopt creative strategies to engage with each other and represent their voices’ (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 2).

I do not seek to invalidate the discussions of sections 5.2 to 5.4, but to highlight another perspective – or a suite of heteroglossic and translingual perspectives – through which accounts of the practice may be framed and further explored. These perspectives include Pennycook’s (2010) relocalisation, Rampton’s (1995, 2010) crossing and contemporary urban vernaculars, Bakhtin’s (1981) heteroglossia, and Li Wei’s (2011) translanguaging space. In effect, sections 5.2 to 5.4 argue provisionally that this is a Chinese practice, and the language items under investigation are best termed Chinese names. Sections 5.5 to 5.7, however, argue that this is a local practice, best explored using a heuristic of Said’s (1983) notion of worldliness, which claims that readers, authors and texts cannot be meaningfully analysed without a fundamental awareness of the political circumstances surrounding their production and consumption. As well as deference to Said’s (1983) seminal analysis, I further cite as an overarching framework or heuristic, Silverstein’s (1985, p. 220) ‘total linguistic fact’ from linguistic anthropology:

*The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms, contextualized to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology.*

With these approaches to language use and diversity, to languaging, in mind, I consider as key Pennycook’s (2008) Australian Review of Applied Linguistics response piece to an ARAL introduction by Clyne and Sharifian (2008, pp. 28.1-28.16). In the latter’s piece, titled ‘English as an International Language: challenges and possibilities’, Clyne and Sharifian consider how best to ‘grapple with the global spread of English’ (Pennycook, 2008, p. 30.1). Pennycook’s (2008) rejoinder is that in attempting to rethink analytical approaches to globalised English language so as to not locate diversity within a national/geographic heuristic, much work simply ‘reproduces
the epistemology it needs to escape’ (p. 30.1). The argument is for the need to escape a simple pluralisation (i.e. English vs Englishes) and enumeration of English varieties in order to acknowledge and account for ‘the amorphous, ongoing, moment-by-moment negotiation of English that is actually its daily reality’ (Pennycook, 2008, p. 30.3).

Section 5.5 is titled Identity and discusses data related to participants’ readings of, ambivalence towards and assimilation of and into mainstream Australian cultural practices and tendencies as well as ideas of transnational identity work in globalized and mobile settings of language use. Identity is understood in a post-structuralist light, as a process and not a product, which frames identities as ‘fragmented and contested in nature. In particular, when individuals move across geographical and psychological borders’ (Block, 2007, p. 864). I augment this sentence with linguistic borders, having Rampton’s (1995) work on crossing in mind. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) argue for approaches to identity in which it is understood as a relationally-constructed product rather than the source of linguistic and other semiotic practices. Moreover, identities comprise more than static macro-level demographic categories, but also temporary and interactionally-contingent stances and participant roles, and local, emergent positions (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005).

The interaction and fusion of different flows of information, images, ideas, and people constructs ‘transnational publics’ (cf. Nononi and Ong, 1997, pp. 25-6), which offer alternatives to established and modernist discourses like state ideology for the performance of early 21st century identities. Through their transnational practices, the Chinese draw from their participation in these proliferations of difference in the global economy. The experiences of fragmentation and displacement that are articulated by my participants derive from of an ever-increasing and ambivalent sense of being simultaneously embedded in and disembedded from different social relationships (Giddens 1991), as well as the inevitable tension between their identification with specific places (or families) and the postmodern flux of many places and many identifications. In this, the subjectivities of modern Chinese transnationalists, constituted in part by heteroglossic and urban vernacular practices like “English name” use, are not especially different from those subjectivities of many Westerners; they need not be essentialised as
specifically Chinese. However, Ong (1993, p. 23) argues that, in some ways, ‘diaspora Chinese are even more ultra-modern in their global manoeuvres.’

Section 5.6 is called *Heteroglossia* and discusses the clashes and confusions that arise between Chinese and Taiwanese participants’ desires and intentions that imbue and inform their language choices. This discussion includes their interlocutors’ readings of the multiple meanings or indexicalities of these choices, and therefore of the speaker’s desires and intentions. In 5.2 *Resistance*, the primarily classroom-located and local tensions and negotiations of the practice were discussed. In this section, such tensions and negotiations are elaborated against a background of Said’s (1983) worldliness and within a Bakhtinian (1981) heuristic. The practice’s core heteroglossia is fundamental to all ‘verbal-ideological life’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 290). Heteroglossia refers to the stratification of languages, whereby

‘*at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form...[so that]...each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life*’ (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 290 and 293).

Bakhtin’s (1981, p. 293) argument – considered here in light of Widdowson’s (1994) interrogations of received notions of English language ownership – is that a word is always effectively someone else’s at the time when another ‘appropriates’ it in order to ‘populate’ it with by his or her ‘own intention, his accent’. Bakhtin (1981, p. 294) states that words are not neutral prior to this ‘appropriation’ – rather, they live ‘in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions: it is from there that that one must take the word, and make it one’s own.’ Moreover, neither, although Bakhtin (1981) does not state this categorically, are words equal; some resist this appropriation more so than others might, ‘this seizure and transformation into private property’ (p. 294). The category of English names – those of one’s self and of one’s friends and family, say, of one’s neighbours and peers – are examples of linguistic recusants.
As a consequence of this resistance and recusance, Bakhtin (1981) tells us that some words always ‘sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them; ‘it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker’ (p. 294). What is then immediately striking is the similarity in language or metaphor used by Bakhtin (1981) and by Widdowson (1994) to characterise this resistance and appropriation inherent in language use. Widdowson (1994, p. 384) defines proficiency in a language as a speaking subject’s ability to ‘bend it to your [sic] will, assert yourself through it rather than simply submit to the dictates of its form’ (p. 384). What transpires in both critics’ discussion through use of terms like bend and submit, seizure and property, is this understanding that language use – the population of linguistic forms with one’s own ‘semantic and expressive intention’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293) – can be a violent entanglement, ultimately a dialogism and dialectic from which emerges, sometimes bloodied and bruised, the word, coloured further by accrued ‘contextual overtones (generic, tendentious, individualistic)’ (p. 293). Bakhtin (1981, p. 294) questions the assumptions underpinning the positing of the ‘abstract-linguistic unity of literary language’, and goes on to extend this to all language, arguing instead that once employed ‘what results is not a single [‘inviolable and indisputable’ (p. 295)] language but a dialogue of languages’ (p. 294).

Finally, after the representation of the practice locally and globally in terms of dialogised heteroglossia, that tussle between the centripetal and centrifugal forces inherent in language-as-process, section 5.7, Relocalisation is presented. In 5.7, I use Pennycook’s (2011) relocalisation to rethink the conventional descriptor “English names” and propose alternative ways of presenting the practice that underscore its dialogic, centrifugal and emergent status. Key to the rethinking project discussed, for example, by Pennycook (2008) in his ARAL response and to the move away from nation-based models of English is understanding the relationship among language resources (e.g. English names) as used by certain communities and the local practices of specific spaces in which these resources are deployed and the relationship of the users to the language varieties (i.e. the social, economic, and cultural positioning of the speakers), Said’s (1983) worldliness.
Pennycott’s (2008) argument is in favour of the idea of discussing ‘communicative repertoires’ (p. 30.5) and not languages as such. Pennycook (2011) achieves this with relocalisation, accounts of language practices that are ‘drawn away from a language entity called English with peripheral variants…and… directed instead to the doing of language in particular localities’ (Pennycook, 2010, p. 71). Accordingly, a relocalisation reading of English name use directs itself towards ‘what language users do with English, how they understand its relationship to their own condition, and what new meanings are generated by its use’ (Pennycook, 2010, p. 74). What I arrive at is a non-geographical (instead geometric) understanding of space and its sociolinguistic coordinates, and a deterritorialised reading of language use, in which ‘multilingual speakers’ creative and critical use of the full range of their socio-cultural resources…both going between different linguistic structures and systems and going beyond them’ is evident (Li Wei, 2011, p. 1223).

5.2 RESISTANCE

I follow Canagarajah (2004) in analysing language school classrooms as ‘power-laden’ (p. 120) sites, in which the authority and power of the classroom teachers or lecturers may intimidate students into not ‘presenting identities that are not institutionally rewarded’ (p. 120). For the purposes of this section, presentation of identities is analysed as commensurate with presentation or performance of language practices, the latter a subset or component of the former, in so far as ‘investment in the target language is in fact an investment in the learner’s own identity’ (Norton and Gao, 2008, p. 110). Therefore, with identity construction emerging from situated practices, speakers’ use of language resources at the local linguistic level is understood to inform their alignment with or disalignment from other speakers.

Within Canagarajah’s (2004) conception, language schools are understood as ‘medium[s] of ideological and social reproduction’ (p. 120). While on the surface not a language school but a university program, and with its students, drawn from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, technically not or no longer strictly “language learners”, the university graduate program from which much of my target or primary language data are obtained shares enough
features with a language classroom, vis-à-vis ideological and social reproduction, as to be understood as one in terms of Canagarajah’s (2004) analysis. The graduate program is a classic example of academic discourse socialisation (cf. Duff 2008), in which transitioning university students, in this case from EAL backgrounds, are explicitly or implicitly inducted into local discursive practices through demonstration of skills, knowledge, and understandings. It is through their interactions with peers, instructors, tutors, and knowledgeable others that the development of proficiency in these practices is facilitated.

I identify three types of resistance precipitating negotiation, equivocation or even proscription over English name use identified in the research findings pertaining to the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese students. The findings related to these three types are discussed individually in this section. Firstly, there is the resistance among Chinese and Taiwanese research participants to the use by non-Chinese and non-Chinese speakers of the participants’ Chinese names, despite some insistence by the latter that they be allowed to do so. This concerns a preference among the Chinese and Taiwanese students for the English names to be used in such classroom and workplace spoken interactions.

Secondly, there is the resistance among the university lecturers to the use of English names by the vast majority of their Chinese and Taiwanese students. This concerns a preference among the former for the participants’ Chinese, or what Diao (2014) terms ‘ethnic’, what participant Andrea’s Australian volunteer coordinator terms ‘real’, names to be used. These three different ways of referring to the practice: English, ethnic and/or real names is itself remarkable. Thirdly, there is the resistance by a minority of Chinese research participants to the practice of English name use themselves.

I note that with lecturers Barb and Margie, the longer our focus group discussion about the practice and their experiences of it went on, the deeper and more reflective the conversation between the researcher and the lecturers became. What happened was that the more they grew to understand the accounts provided by their students and the resistance frequently offered by
the students to their own attempts to curb it and have it understood as a frivolous and immature practice. So, in representing the accounts and positions of Barb and Margie, it is important to note that I am representing works in progress, whose analytical depths developed as the focus group discussion continued.

Excerpt 5.01 provides a representative example of the first and second types of resistance outlined above, precipitating negotiation and equivocation between lectures and students. It also allows for the depiction of the classroom practice as a call-and-response dialogue between lecturer and students. The interaction features university lecturer Barb and Chinese student Sylvia on the first day of the first semester of a new intake of graduate students on a university program. The equivocation that the audio-recording shows in line 8 when Barb points out that she believes she can “manage” a portion of Sylvia’s Chinese name, rather than Sylvia feel Barb need to use her “surrogate” English name, was typical of Barb’s classroom responses that day. FGD data reveal it to have been Barb’s and Margie’s typical or default responses to the practice of English name use as they encountered it in day 1 classroom introduction sequences.

**Excerpt 5.01  Day 1 new semester graduate classroom introductions**

1. Barb: Who’s next?
2. Sylvia: Hi everyone. My name is [gives full three-character Chinese name]. Um, my English name is Sylvia.
3. barley: Sylvia?
5. Barb: [Begins to utter Sylvia’s Chinese given name]
6. Sylvia: [Repeats her full three-character Chinese name].
7. Barb: I can manage [gives two characters of Sylvia’s Chinese given name/s]. Have you always been called Sylvia?
It was also very likely that the graduate students, like Sylvia in excerpt 5.01, were aware that an official document (i.e. a classroom roll) was being checked in the first instance of use and that their English names tended not to be recorded on official documents, since they were not, unlike perhaps Hong Kong residents, official names; they did not appear on Chinese passports or university enrolment forms unless they had been formally changed. I made this inference as I observed the classroom roll-calling and introductions sequence or identification routine taking place and subsequently looked at the classroom roll used by the lecturer. This observation underscores the English names’ status as largely or initially spoken phenomena, devices employed for reasons predominantly related to spoken interaction and identity work in this study’s focus of Australian university settings. This point about the status of the participants’ English names as functions of spoken interaction is fully explored later, suffice however to foreshadow it here.

Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008, pp. 656 and 663) research into symbolic competence in multilingual San Franciscan settings demonstrates that a seemingly unproblematic or everyday ‘identification routine’ like asking for and providing one’s name can momentarily at least derail a communication in certain settings or configurations of interactants. “Derail” might seem too strong a word to describe the disruption to Sylvia’s introduction that occurs in line 8 of excerpt 5.01, when Barb interjects to announce her ability to pronounce Sylvia’s Chinese name. However, coming as it did on day one of a new university class in the power-laden setting of a “foreign” (for Sylvia) tertiary classroom, I characterise Sylvia’s own resistance to Barb’s “I can manage” request, her “Yes, Sylvia”, as an instance of what black North American feminist bell hooks (1990, p. 337) terms ‘talking back’: ‘speaking as an equal to an authority figure.’

Accordingly, a seemingly unremarkable and innocuous cultural practice like classroom introductions can become fraught with resistance and confusion. This is also evident in Diao’s (2014) findings, when she comments about one of her Chinese participant’s contested use of Anna or her Chinese name on a graduate language program at a United States university. Diao (2014, p. 214) notes that Anna’s English name ‘that used to provide her mobility between
different “kinds of people” as an English major in China now became contradictory to her ethnic identity in the new community. Name choice had turned into a site of struggles and complex negotiations.’ In short, her United States professor refused to use English names in interactions with Chinese students and her ethnically Chinese compatriots used their Chinese names in preference to English names.

In Diao’s (2014) United States university community of practice, the indexicalities and subject positions attributed to use of an English name among Chinese graduate students were considerably different to those that attended English name use among Chinese in a mainland Chinese setting. In short, language resources do not always correspond in meaning across communities. Accordingly, language resources are not always associated with the same categories across different local contexts. In light of social meaning of language resources emerging through localized practice, changes from one local context to another are likely to introduce changes to meanings of language resources as well as how the resources are used by speakers.

This is also apparent in my findings, whereby something typically acquired or adopted in the everyday settings of a Chinese or Taiwanese English or foreign language classroom – something that in Chinese and Taiwanese discourses positioned one as having attained, for example, a high level of education, as having travelled abroad, as having obtained desirable and well-paid employment with a foreign national company (cf. Findings chapter) – became instead a contested utterance between the Chinese and Taiwanese students and lecturers. We recall Olivia’s description of an English name used in mainland China as akin to ‘Starbucks in China; it's not really about a English name, it's about this representation. Like it's about democracy, capitalism and it's kind of with this characteristic of bourgeoisie, like, it's kind of middle class, yeah.’ Therefore, an utterance and its attendant subject positions that were desirable in one discursive location, to quote Bakhtin (1981, p. 290), in one ‘historical moment of verbal-ideological life’, were undesirable and subject to proscription in another.
5.2.1 ‘Although I have my name tag, he will avoid to ask me to do something, yeah, like, because he wouldn't want to, like, make, um make a mistake of pronouncing.’

The preference among the overwhelming majority of Chinese and Taiwanese students in my research for their English names to be used in university classroom spoken interactions and, on the flipside, for their Chinese names not to be used in such classroom practices, is predicated on a key assumption held by the students about non-Chinese and non-Chinese speaking interactants. The assumption is alluded to by Barb in line 8 of Excerpt 5.01 with her use of “manage”. The assumption is that non-Chinese and non-Chinese-speaking interactants, like many of the university lecturers encountered, will be unable to correctly pronounce, retrieve or recall participants’ Chinese names. This widely-held assumption of mispronunciation and mis-recall or lack of recall is a sound one, as Mandarin or Cantonese Chinese are tonal languages and the Romanisation of Chinese names into English letters and spellings that a lecturer likely encounters on a written class roll, for example, fails to communicate these phonetic and phonemic features of Chinese languages.

A key question then to be asked of the participants is why it should matter that their Chinese names are mispronounced by non-Chinese or non-Chinese speaking interactants. It is a question after all that lecturer Barb countenances in our focus group discussion when she comments, ‘I apologise if I am not making it [the Chinese name] appropriate. I didn't want to say, “You're pronouncing my name wrongly, but that's fine; I know who you were talking to.”’ The first answer provided to the question of mispronunciation of Chinese names or their anticipated mispronunciation is exclusion, in effect, silencing. Olivia describes the situation in her part-time workplace before she opted to use an English name, in which her employer would deliberately avoid asking her to do things in case he mispronounced her Chinese name. As a result, Olivia felt her employers might overlook her for duties or responsibilities, a situation she hoped to avoid through her subsequent adoption and use of an English name. Therefore, evidence is provided of the efficacy of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese in obviating practices of exclusion and name avoidance in spoken interactions.
5.2.2 ‘But what if people call you the wrong name?’

Exclusion is one possible consequence of incorrect pronunciation of Chinese names – or the anticipated likelihood of such mispronunciation – by non-Chinese and non-Chinese speaking interactants. For example, from my field notes comes the story of Chinese Engineering undergraduate Abby, who spent unnecessary hours waiting in a medical clinic as a result of her Chinese name being called over the public address system, but incomprehensibly so. The subsequent broadcast of her English name was also not recognised by the Engineering student. This is a fascinating if unfortunate feature of the practice’s provisional in-betweenness, in which neither the Chinese name as mispronounced nor the English name as still unfamiliar are recognized by the Chinese or Taiwanese person.

Other undesirable consequences of mispronunciation are the concomitant likelihood of production of an offensive, confusing or simply wrong name. These unfortunate functions of undeliberate mispronunciation for the Chinese and Taiwanese students range from a relatively straightforward inability among Chinese and Taiwanese to recognise their names being used as evident in Abby’s account above, through to the by-product pronunciation instead of an undesirable or offensive word by the non-Chinese speaker, often unbeknownst to him or her. Examples of both are evident in the data. For Liao (2000), the issue of mispronunciation of a Chinese name is dissimilar to mispronunciation of an English name, for example, due to the likelihood that the mispronunciation will cause instead the pronunciation of a homonym with an offensive or derisory meaning. Liao’s (2000) argument is therefore premised on the notions that the mispronunciation of Anglo-Saxon English names seldom results in an offensive or undesirable homonym being produced.

For example, Andrea and Suzie respectively comment on the mispronunciation of their Chinese names resulting not just in a skewed name, but in an ontologically wrong name: one sounds like the 2nd person English pronoun “you”, while the other sounds like a Japanese name, something unacceptable to the mainland Chinese participant. For Andrea, the consequence is a name that
is categorically wrong. An Australian English mispronunciation equivalent might at first glance seem to be the use of Jim instead of Tim, but then one must add a semantic layer to that mispronunciation also in order to grasp the Chinese dilemma. In effect, insult is added to injury. For Suzie, a mainland Chinese, the undesirable result of mispronunciation is the production of a Japanese-sounding name, which in a follow-up email to the researcher Suzie described as ‘not good’. In turn, Suzie outlines the value of English names as desirable alternatives to such mispronunciation that results in the potential for offence and confusion.

We also recall from my data discussion of a Chinese convention of translating English or foreign names (i.e. that of the Modernist painter Picasso and the English soccer player Beckham) into Chinese characters so as to aid pronunciation and recognition for Taiwanese and Chinese audiences. Qian’s explanation of how the practice is done is enlightening: ‘they either get the Chinese name similar to the pronunciation in English, or they give the Chinese name has meanings.’ In other words, this Chinese tradition seems primarily to be based on one of two moves: the use of a Chinese homophonic or semantic cognate. My argument here is that the Chinese and Taiwanese use of English names in an Australian university would seem in part to derive from this tradition of giving foreigners resident or famous in China a Chinese name so as to facilitate recognition, pronunciation and, as participants Jodi and Andrea suggest when commenting on the Chinese practice, to close the gap or narrow the distance between the two countries and cultures.

5.2.3 ‘Makes her embarrassed, makes me embarrassed.’

One of anthropologist Duthie’s (2007) Shanghainese female participants noted that her Chinese name sounded ‘ugly’ when mispronounced but that she could not, on the other hand, continue to correct her boss’s mispronunciation. Something similar transpires when Andrea, Jodi and Aurora discuss the embarrassment they perceive for both parties caused by the mispronunciation of their Chinese names by a university tutor, their desire to not always correct such mispronunciation, and their bullying by fellow students about the “weird” name that ensues as a result of the mispronunciation. Indeed, a University of Denver Centre for
Multicultural Excellence (2013) paper, developed by the university’s Office of Teaching and Learning, explores and expounds ‘microaggressions’ (cf. Sue et al. 2007) committed in tertiary classrooms by student and staff, of which the first listed is, ‘Continuing to mispronounce the names of students after they have corrected you time and time again.’

Microaggressions have been analysed in social psychology studies as subtle, stunning, often automatic exchanges that function as “put downs” (Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, and Willis, 1978, p.66). Sue et al. (2007, p. 73) categorise ‘microaggressions’ into three types: the typically deliberate ‘microassault’, and the often indeliberate or unconscious ‘microinsult’ and ‘microinvalidation’. These microaggressions tend not to be consciously intended by the perpetrator, but from the recipient’s perspective, they constitute a negative experience. Sue (2003) argues that on account of microaggressions often taking place outside of conscious awareness, well-intentioned individuals can produce these discriminatory behaviours without guilt or knowledge of their actions. Sue et al. (2007, p. 73) define microinvalidations as ‘actions that exclude, negate or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings or experiential reality of a person of color.’ As a result, the resistance being proffered by Chinese and Taiwanese students to the persistent use of their Chinese names (or corruptions thereof) by non-Chinese university staff and students, despite the students’ repeated preference for their “English names” to be used, is based in part on resistance to behaviours, in many well-intentioned and/or unconscious, that are experienced as racist and demeaning.

Excerpt 5.02 Jodi, Andrea and Aurora on the mispronunciation of Chinese names: embarrassment, awkwardness and mutual loss of face

1. Jodi: Don’t want to cue (?) my tutors every time she pronounce the =
2. Andrea: = have difficulty pronouncing my name =
3. Jodi: = makes her embarrassed, makes me embarrassed.
4. Aurora: Yeah, both of us really embarrassed.
What I arrive at from, for example, Excerpt 5.02 with Aurora’s and Andrea’s improvisation of the type of bullying that might result from the mispronunciation of a Chinese name in a university classroom setting is that this kind of disruption happens routinely enough for it to be recognisably parodied or re-enacted by the participants, both studying in different disciplines and degrees from one another. While negotiation and equivocation over name pronunciation and protocols of use may be part and parcel of an introduction sequence in institutional talk, suffice it would seem to say that few people would expect the quotidian social practice of a university classroom introduction to produce bullying and mockery. The argument is that the use of English names among Chinese and Taiwanese students elides the embarrassment or loss of face that likely ensues for classroom academic and student alike and, moreover, avoids the bullying and the often undeliberate microaggression that my participants recount as being a function of having such “weird” names.

5.2.4 ‘It will create a kind of distance, a sense of distance between us, if people call me You [=anglified version of name].’

Diao’s (2014) research participant Anna reads the insistence by another of her professors on using her Chinese or ‘ethnic’ name as marking Professor David as a Mandarin-speaker who is ‘Chinese minded’ (Diao, 2014, p. 213). Andrea comments similarly that she positions an Australian university lecturer who can ‘surprisingly’ pronounce her Chinese name correctly as being therefore knowledgeable of Chinese culture and language. According to this perspective, correct Chinese pronunciation indexes a deeper understanding of Chinese naming and address practices and its foundations in Chinese and Confucian culture. However, Andrea also articulates the flipside of this scenario to describe her positioning of a university tutor or lecturer who fails
to correctly pronounce her Chinese name as someone not knowledgeable about Chinese culture. This, therefore, creates distance between Andrea and her non-Chinese (speaking) interlocutor. A distance, I surmise, that would be avoided from Andrea’s perspective were her Chinese name to be correctly pronounced (that is legitimately used), or were an English name substituted instead and as requested.

The question that begins to arise is to what extent such microaggression works two ways. In other words, whether the mispronunciation of Chinese names by non-Chinese Australian lecturers, despite efforts to get them right and despite Barb and Marge admitting that these student rationales for disliking such mispronunciation not ever being given, should be tolerated by the students. The tolerance would be licensed by an understanding of the workings of Chinese as an international language, the flipside of the classroom analyses of English as an international language. On the other hand, the relationality that infuses Chinese address conventions, whereby one individual may be addressed in a variety of ways according to interactional circumstances, none of these address forms being his or her actual name, suggests that these English names are relational address forms for these specific intercultural interactional circumstances.

5.2.5 ‘It’s a bit weird if people just call your surname.’

Another issue with the misconception and misuse of Chinese names in Australian university classrooms that fuels resistance from students to their Chinese names being used by lecturers and tutors, however, is not just to do with their likely mispronunciation and misapprehension. A further source of tension and resistance is the grammar of Chinese names and the Confucian address protocols that underscore this grammar. Chinese students Angel and Suzie discuss a design lecturer who insisted on using Angel’s Chinese name despite her repeated attempts, along with those of her Chinese classmates, to have their English names used. Much like the outcome involving Andrea’s tutor in Excerpt 5.02, what happens with the insistence by Angel’s design teacher on use of her Chinese name is not the production of classroom conviviality or of some sort of acknowledgement of the design teacher’s Chinese language attempts or “Chinese-
mindedness”, if these are examples of desired outcomes; rather, we see that it produces estrangement on behalf of a Chinese student.

**Excerpt 5.03  Angel and Suzie on the weirdness of being addressed by surname**

1. Angel: Like, "My name is Angel", but he was, like, I think, I feel like, 
2. maybe, he wants to, like, us to feel, like, he can pronounce 
3. Chinese name very well [laughter from all]. 
4. Yeah, so he, like, every class, like, everybody Chinese so he will 
5. also insist call them Chinese, even if they introduce their English 
6. name. But, sometime, he cannot remember the whole name, 
7. so he will say the surname, or something like that. 
8. R: And how does that make you feel though? 
9. Suzie: It's a bit weird if people just call your surname.

As a result of the anticipated outcomes of Chinese name use by non-Chinese and non-Chinese speakers (i.e. anticipated perceived inability of non-Chinese to correctly pronounce and recall Chinese names), I argue that the language practice undertaken deliberately in an effort to obviate these likelihoods, to resist their proscribed use of Chinese names, is a convenience strategy. Liao (2000, p. 137) refers to a convenience theory in her study of Taiwanese people’s use of English names, while Andrea has described English name use as more convenient for non-Chinese and non-Chinese speaking interactants. Diao (2008) uses the emic term ‘catering’ (p. 19), provided by her research participant Anna, for this positioning of Chinese self and foreign other when interacting with non-Chinese teachers. Nevertheless, I also propose that this theory can function as something of a smokescreen, in itself a tool of convenience, behind which can operate at the very least the semantics and significance of Chinese naming and address practices. So, when the theory of convenience is invoked to account for the practice, I might legitimately ask: whose convenience exactly, that of the non-Chinese interlocutor (as claimed), or of the Chinese or Taiwanese student?
The argument of convenience theory or catering is that Chinese and Taiwanese consciously modify or attune their language, in this case choosing English over Mandarin or using an “English” first name semantic or phonetic cognate in place of their Mandarin (first) name, so that it ‘approaches the norms of their interlocutor and accentuates commonality between the interlocutors’ (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 75). Such convenience, and the norms to which it attempts to attune, is I argue to elide the commonplace assumption of anticipated (mis)pronunciation of and failure to recall Chinese names. Nevertheless, for Barb and Margie, the two university lecturers and administrators, this strategy of convenience or catering was read instead as one of Othering and, ironically enough, of microaggression. It consequently tended to be resisted and rejected by them, until at least the opportunity to analyse the practice in greater depth was afforded by our focus group discussion. I now discuss the six aspects of Barb’s and Margie’s resistance to the practice among their Taiwanese and Chinese students now.

5.2.6 ‘I’m not here for my life to be easy. I will do my best to pronounce it in an appropriate way.’

Diao (2014) reports instances of academics on the United States graduate program in which her research participants were studying refusing to use or resisting use of the Chinese students’ English names. For example, her Chinese research participant Anna negotiated her English name choice with various professors on the program and, sometimes during these negotiations, ‘tensions emerged when her professors used her ethnic name’ (p. 213). Anna reported that a U.S professor had stated ‘that she absolutely could not stand using an English name to call a Chinese student’ and that Anna acquiesced because she positioned herself as being of considerably lower status than the professor. When speaking of her Chinese participant Anna’s decision to accede to the wishes of her United States university professor and permit the latter to use her Chinese name in spoken interaction, Diao (2014, p. 213) describes the action as ‘surrender’.

What is interesting in Diao’s (2008) earlier paper that draws on the same research is that while Anna “surrendered” to her North American university professors, she did not “surrender” to her Portuguese boyfriend’s insistence on using her Chinese name in the United States. Instead, Anna
pejoratively termed his attempts as exotising her and being snobbish (2008, p. 25). “Local” and dialogic factors of setting and interactants, combined with the seniority and status ingredients of Chinese naming and address conventions, influence who may use a Chinese name to address Anna and who may not. The practice cannot simply be reduced to or adduced by a priori externalities like geography and dominant language.

Again, what is relevant is Canagarajah’s (2004) analysis of language classrooms as ‘power-laden sites’ (p. 120), in which students often assume ‘the unitary identities...conferred on them by the dominant discourses’ (p. 117). At the time of his writing, Canagarajah (2004) bemoaned the lack of research evidence in scholarly corpora for the resistance among language students to such ‘unfavorable identities imposed on them’ (p. 117). In *The Ecology of Global English* (2007, p. 89), Canagarajah argues that although English has been effectively ‘deterritorialized and that we live in a postnational age’, the idea that globalized English or Englishes are no longer positioned by some as affiliated with ‘specific communities or nations’ is disingenuous. Nevertheless, ‘there are multiple tendencies and forces in globalisation that resist generalisation into a monolithic whole’ and, moreover, as our data on student-teacher and student-employer interactions attest, relations between such global monolithicism and local practices ‘are always under contestation’ and negotiation.

Within such relations of power, Canagarajah (2004) identifies a number of ‘institutional reward systems’ (p. 120) that subtly restrict how much students can resist the institutionally desirable subjectivities. The practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese students, and any identities and indexicalities commensurate with the practice, is an undesirable institutional subjectivity in Diao’s (2014) graduate program research and in the graduate program of my research. However, these subjectivities play out quite differently. For one, all Chinese students on Diao’s (2014) program eventually “surrender” to use of their ethnic names, having all at one point in their lives used English names. I find no such equivalent practice among our student participants. However, when I consider the interactions reported by Margie with Chinese student, Seven, the proscription of his English name choice and use, I note accord with
Canagarajah’s (2004) statement that ‘when students flagrantly oppose the identities desired in the classroom, the school has a way of defining them as failures and assigning them socially marginalised positions’ (p. 120). Canagarajah (2004) argues that much of the time students tend not to have the resources or space to successfully negotiate these conflicts over identity. It is interesting in my research that we do witness examples of students ‘talking back’ to university authority figures. When considering learner investment, that is ‘the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it’ (Norton and Gao, 2008, p. 110), the authors define the likely outcomes of investment (and hence motivation) as being the types of ‘symbolic and material resource’ (cf. Bourdieu, 1977) that learners are likely to acquire as a result, in doing so increasing their ‘cultural capital’.

However, what is striking about the findings of Diao’s (2014) research and my own, in light of such sociolinguistic research as Canagarajah’s (2004) among young African-American university students and Norton’s (2000) among immigrant women in Vancouver, is that such characteristic ambivalence towards practicing of the target language is not apparent among my participants. Paradoxically, what I see instead are participants who by and large desire to invest in the target language so much so as to use English names. Accordingly, if there is apparent in our research any ambivalence towards investment in the target language as characteristic of other late 20th century/early 21st century research into language learning and identity, it would seem to be an ambivalence of the university lecturers and teachers and not of the students towards investment. If this is the case then it is a stunning role reversal indeed.

5.2.7 ‘That's often, in a way, slightly insulting. There's that attitude that, there's an overlay of “they're [i.e. non-Chinese lecturers] a little bit thick.”’

Diao (2008) argues that the concept of her participant Anna’s “catering” for non-Chinese and non-Chinese speaking interactants through her practice of English name use involved Anna’s own self-positioning and the simultaneous positioning of her interlocutors, thereby arriving at a ‘dichotomy of self/other as Chinese/foreigners’ (p. 19). This strategy is also known as a
convenience account and when outlining its details in a previous sub-section, I questioned for whom it might best be described as convenient and catering: the lecturers as claimed or the students as might better be argued. Certainly, Barb contests the value of the convenience account with her earlier statement that she was not there [i.e. teaching] for her life to be easier. One of the reasons for Barb’s and Margie’s resistance to the practice among their Chinese and Taiwanese students is because it resulted in Barb feeling Othered by it, whereby to be insulted, to be labelled as ‘a little bit thick’, is to be Othered. Moreover, to have not acknowledged and not agreed to one’s desire to use the students’ Chinese names – in short to not have one’s positioning or reading of the practice vindicated – is also to be Othered. Edwards (2006) also states that most of the EFL teachers she interviewed believed that ‘they did not find Chinese names difficult to pronounce’ (p. 95), leading Edwards to follow Diao (2008) in asserting that the teachers were in effect Othered by the Chinese students as ‘incapable of getting to grips with even the most basic aspects of Chinese culture’ (p. 96).

Barb’s reading of her positioning by the practice is quite an interesting perspective on Andrea’s earlier observation about her positioning of people unable to correctly pronounce Chinese names as not being ‘knowledgeable’ about Chinese culture. Andrea goes on to say that such mispronunciation of her Chinese name will create a distance between her and her interlocutors. It is also a pre-condition for illegitimate use of a student’s Chinese names. As a result, Barb’s reading of the practice as ‘insulting’ may indeed have credence if we accept that being cast as not knowledgeable of Chinese culture by dint of mispronunciation of a subject’s Chinese given names is insulting. Clearly, if Othering amounts to insult as it seems to here, forged as it is on generalised assumptions and on top of unrealised expectations, the grounds for resistance between Chinese or Taiwanese students insisting on their English name being used and non-Chinese lecturers preferring to use their Chinese name, to be able to have a go at its pronunciation, to demonstrate through this that they are not ‘thick’, are established. Indeed, what is apparent is the previously discussed microaggression working in reverse, directed by students towards lecturers in what amounts to a multicultural and multilingual setting.
Consequently, I arrive at an intercultural impasse that is also laced with irony, precisely the opposite of what the practice is intended in part to obviate; in which both parties agree to the Australian classroom practice of first-name address, yet neither can agree on which or whose first names to use: the Chinese or the English. Indeed, the Chinese want the English while the Australians want the Chinese. There is also an irony to this impasse since in what I cautiously term low-context cultures (cf. Hall 1976) such as mainstream Australia, first-name basis interactions are seen to index strategies of involvement among interactants (e.g. Choi’s 1997 research among Korean students at Australian universities and also Scollon and Wong-Scollon, 2005). Such involvement is considered to reflect and reinforce democratic notions of egalitarianism and openness.

Nevertheless, the more an Australian lecturer attempts to correctly pronounce the Chinese student’s ethnic name, that is the more the opportunity to do so is requested by the lecturer and the model pronunciation given by the student to the lecturer, the greater the distance created between student and lecturer, and the greater the Othering of the non-compliant but in a sense unknowing lecturer. For example, excerpt 5.04 illustrates Barb’s efforts with a Taiwanese student, Gwen, in which no amount of ‘struggle’ by Barb, ‘over and over again’ (see lines 2, 3 and 4), resulted in the correct pronunciation of Gwen’s Chinese name. In the end, Barb decides in line 8 that Gwen’s insistence on her using Gwen’s English name rather than a mispronounced version of her Chinese name was a consequence of Gwen’s ‘immaturity’.

**Excerpt 5.04  The practice as indexing student “immaturity”**

1. Barb: Gwen, whose name is [gives Chinese name], and I, she’s
2. Taiwanese, and over and over again I said, Look,
3. [Chinese name]'s not a real struggle for me. And she
4. said, Ooh, but you’re not pronouncing it properly.
5. And I said, Well, tell me and she would tell me
6. and there was just something in the way I said it.
7. And I don’t know if that, I felt that was an
immaturity rather than anything else.

5.2.8 ‘Look, [Chinese name]’s not a real struggle for me.’

I now discuss a second account provided for the lecturers’ resistance, based on another aspect of intercultural communication breakdown to do with differing values. This reason, I argue, also contributes to feelings of Othering and insult by Barb as a result of the practice. On several occasions during these first day introductions, Barb requested a Chinese or Taiwanese student to reconsider their use of an English name. Her stated rationale for this was because Barb believed she could do a reasonable job of pronouncing the students’ Chinese names and, moreover, would certainly have liked to be permitted the opportunity to attempt to do so. Barb also argues that her name is regularly mispronounced by Chinese and Taiwanese but that she can tolerate this because she is aware of to whom or about whom the students are talking. Barb’s relativism, however, reveals an understanding of language, a reification of language, as fundamentally a means of communication, whose efficacy may be determined by whether meaning has been communicated (i.e. Barb knows to or about whom the students are talking despite “mispronunciation” of her name). This is at odds with a more translingual reading of language or of languaging – an approach that favours ‘communicative repertoires’ (cf. Pennycook, 2007, p. 30.5) –, in which language is not simply analysed as a system used to communicate, but is understood as a social activity of which communication is one of its functions.

Nevertheless, tallying these expressions that Barb uses when describing her efforts at pronunciation of Chinese names, I am left with the impression that there is struggle involved in pronunciation, and I am sympathetic to this struggle. For Barb, the desirable outcomes of this struggle, more so than its cause, is her ‘managing’ a Chinese name (like Sylvia’s) and the Chinese or Taiwanese student in turn tolerating or, I go as far as to suggest, appreciating Barb’s efforts to pronounce the name to the best of her ability.

This synopsis is consistent with Barb’s statement that she is not there for her life to be made easier. In other words, she is not there to be catered to. She is happy to struggle provided that
the struggle bears fruit. Indeed, Barb’s struggle and the fundamental dialogised heteroglossia that it portends, is something of a language lesson in itself for the Chinese or Taiwanese student (cf. Chinese as an International Language). However, the corollary of Barb’s desire not to allow her life to be made easier through her acceptance of the pragmatics of the practice as catering or convenience strategy, as we have learned and will learn again further in sub-sections to follow, is that mispronunciation of Chinese names does not make the campus lives of her Chinese and Taiwanese students easier either. So, why does Barb initially resist using her student’s English names, against the wishes of the students? Why doesn’t Barb “surrender”?

I suggest two approaches to the question of Barb’s resistance to students’ English name use and her concomitant persistence in tackling their Chinese names. The first, quite simply, would seem to be answered by returning to Canagarajah’s (2004) pronouncement on the language classroom as laden with power. Barb and Margie act as they do because under the reasonable guise of an academic socialisation program (e.g. Margie’s comments about the name to be used on Seven’s formal certification or on hypothetically seeking out Seven in his future workplace), they can exert their preferences as L1 English teachers, as gatekeepers. In short, they can reward and punish. In Canagarajah’s (2004) experience, the students, by and large, assume ‘the unitary identities...conferred on them by the dominant discourses’ (p. 117), although with his concept of ‘safe houses’, Canagarajah (2004, p. 120) defines spaces where students can ‘negotiate identities more critically.’ Nevertheless, classroom teachers or lecturers may wittingly or otherwise intimidate students into not ‘presenting identities that are not institutionally rewarded’ (p. 120).

That said, the research into microaggression, specifically ‘microinvalidation’ (cf. Sue et al. 2007), shows that such displays of classroom power that result in students feeling demeaned, insulted, silenced and marginalized are frequently invisible to and unintended by the perpetrators, yet ‘these exchanges are so pervasive and automatic in daily interactions that they are often dismissed and glossed over as being innocuous’ (Sue et al. 2007, p. 72). Sue et al. (2007, p. 78) conclude that most of their participants acknowledged that the majority of those who engaged in microaggressions did so unintentionally, and that the perpetrators frequently positioned their
remarks or actions in a positive light (cf. Barb and Margie’s program of academic socialisation). Nevertheless, most of Sue et al.’s (2007) Asian American participants emphasised that the behaviours reflected a biased worldview that tended to communicate something negative and disrespectful about their group.

A second approach to analysis of Barb’s accounts of her resistance commences with The Oxford Dictionaries’ (2015) definition ‘to manage’, as Barb uses the term. It means to ‘succeed in surviving or in achieving something despite difficult circumstances’ and to ‘succeed in achieving or producing (something difficult).’ Such tenacity in the face of difficulty is a key and positive trait of mainstream Australian culture, which I also argue Barb is embodying and instantiating. The struggle requiring tenacity is with multiculturalism and multilingualism. Given the setting for this tenacity is Barb’s attempts to succeed (and to model success for her students) in multicultural discourse, the desired outcome is laudable. However, this outcome is not shared by the students. Such an analysis is not incompatible with the first approach and also involves a biased worldview in terms of the assumption that what I consider a mainstream Australian value has universal resonance. With this expression ‘to manage” in mind, for example, Sekiya (2008, p. 24) argues in her discourse analysis of the Australian vernacular term ‘battler’ that an important icon of Australian culture, of which a ‘battler’ is emblematic, ‘is someone that just keeps trying – no matter how hard things are. ‘They’ are always prepared to have a go or just keep going.’ I equate Barb’s efforts to struggle with pronunciation of her Chinese and Taiwanese students’ English names ‘no matter how hard things are’ as being the actions of a ‘battler’. In return, what Barb wants is for this struggle to be acknowledged by the students and, presumably, given her positioning of former student Gwen as “immature”, I infer that to acknowledge the struggle is to be mature, and for the students to do this by tolerating her valiant mispronunciations in the same way she does theirs.

However, a failure for this scenario of mutual acceptance to eventuate, and for the students not to ‘surrender’ (cf. Diao 2014) through acquiescence to Barb’s requests, rather to resist Barb’s efforts to have them surrender, leads, I argue, to further feelings of alienation, insult and feeling
'a bit thick’. What is lost, of course, and fuels by its absence this collision of cultural values and sociolinguistic positions are the “unexplained” consequences of mispronunciation for the Chinese and Taiwanese participants; the etic positioning of their resistance as immature rather than an emic understanding of its ontology. An understanding that Barb and Margie achieve or articulate towards the end of our focus group discussion.

5.2.9 ‘So, it is part of their training to say that if people are pronouncing their name in a different way, that's not a big problem because words get pronounced differently around the English native speaking world.’

In the second half of the focus group discussion with Barb and Margie, both Margie and Barb outlined another account of Margie’s insistence on and Barb’s preference for Chinese name use by Chinese and Taiwanese students in classroom interactions. Their accounts of the practice under investigation and their perspectives on it are specific to the subject content of the graduate program that they at different times have administered and continue to lecture on, in which the linguistic ideology of English as an International Language is a key theme. What Margie seems to be doing is arguing against the privileging of essentialist or native-speaker centred models of pronunciation norms regardless of the language under discussion, but especially with reference to lingua franca like Mandarin Chinese and English. Margie’s idea is that, philosophically, native speakers of Chinese should learn to accommodate non-standard variation by tolerating the mispronunciation of their Chinese names by non-native speakers of Chinese or non-Chinese speakers. This likelihood of mispronunciation and the accommodation of it are conflated with the ideology underpinning of English as a lingua franca or international language. To what extent this also laudable approach aligns with cross currents of Chinese naming and address conventions remains the question. However, a heteroglossic analysis of the tensions between Margie’s position and that of her Chinese and Taiwanese students would allow us to understand this as the ongoing and dialogic negotiation of language use.

In effect, Margie applies the philosophical arguments of an ELF or EIL ideology to Mandarin Chinese. Interestingly, this argument may be understood as a more sophisticated version of her colleague Barb’s earlier explanation that her name is frequently mispronounced by Chinese and
Taiwanese students; however, she does not allow it to perturb her because, communicatively, the language function is achieved. Both emphasise the need for students to grasp that as a language develops into a *lingua franca* along the global-local nexus, as it enters the repertoire of non-native speakers, it is likely that standard pronunciation norms will be compromised. However, it is this emphasise on a communicative function of language, the reduction of language to its most utilitarian, skeletal or pragmatic aspects without acknowledgement of its role in identity construction and display, that weakens Barb’s and Margie’s arguments from a Chinese or Taiwanese participant’s perspective.

5.2.10 ‘He said, "My name's Seven." And I said, "That's not a name, that's a number." And he said, "But that's my name", and I said, "No, it's not anymore."’

The tendency among many Australian interlocutors like Barb and Margie to not fully appreciate the practice of English name use among Taiwanese and Chinese from the perspectives of the Chinese and Taiwanese users, and to so resist it, can in turn lead to greater assumptions about the legitimacy of the practice and its indexicalities. In this sub-section, I consider Barb’s and Margie’s positioning of their Chinese and Taiwanese students as lacking sufficient language ownership and investment as well as linguistic and cultural capital as indexed by their adherence to the practice and the aspects of that adherence. Adherence might seem a term that questions the Chinese and Taiwanese students’ agency, but this is what Margie effectively does, when she positions the practice as something mandated in Chinese language education policies. What we are left with from both Margie’s and Barb’s readings, certainly as young English language learners in Chinese or Taiwanese classrooms, is the students are given little if any investment in or purchase on the names they receive. Margie states that from what she knows about the practice in China and Taiwan, the English names are often given to Chinese and Taiwanese

---

10 Margie’s comments on her positioning of the practice as essentially something mandated in Chinese language education policies are somewhat supported when we consider the personal narrative of classroom baptisms delivered by participants in Findings 5.3, for example. For many of our participants, the baptism was a largely bewildering and decontextualized affair in which English names were allocated systematically by EFL teachers yet never used outside the classroom in which the baptism took place; in some instances, only used to label exercise books.
students in their first English class when some are as young as five. Indeed, the names might be the first English words the students pronounce or identify.

As part of the graduate program’s academic socialisation ideology, Barb and Margie identify themselves in gatekeeper-like roles. Through these roles they model and police, consciously and otherwise, appropriate and inappropriate inter-cultural uses of language and identity markers, like English versus Chinese or ethnic name use, especially within Australian academic practices and discourses. One of the criteria Barb and Margie employ for determining the appropriateness of an English language utterance and academic practice, and therefore its legitimacy, are the norms of what I’ll clumsily call mainstream Australian (i.e. Anglo-Celtic), native English speaking models. There are in effect two types of inappropriateness discussed by the lecturers with reference to the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese: age or era inappropriateness and word category inappropriateness.

Rampton’s (1995) work on crossing, that is the use of a language or variety by a normatively (e.g. ethnically) outgroup speaker, shows that crossing implies movement across some sort of sociolinguistic boundaries. This crossing invariably causes questions about the legitimacy of the language use. These questions are frequently raised, as we see here with Barb and Margie, by interlocutors who consider themselves or are normatively considered legitimate users of the language crossed into. Rampton (1995) identified among multilingual and multicultural British youth, situated examples of crossing that were both licensed by virtue of speaker and setting and also unlicensed. Similarly, my research has identified local settings in which crossing through a Chinese or Taiwanese students use of an English name or names, has been positioned as legitimate and, we will continue to see, as disputed and controversial. Rampton (1995) describes these instances of crossing as rich in revelations about interlocutors’ linguistic ideologies.

Margie presents her linguistic ideology of mainstream Australian names and naming practices, and accordingly addresses what for her is the appropriateness of a twenty-year old Chinese or Taiwanese student using the name Gloria. It should be noted that Gloria is a reasonably popular
choice of name for Taiwanese and Chinese women; the graduate program might have one Gloria in each semester intake of twenty Chinese and Taiwanese students. For Margie, however, this name is inappropriate for a twenty-year old woman. It is evident that Margie’s understanding of Australian naming practices includes names being age appropriate and also cyclical in nature in terms of popularity and, therefore, appropriateness. The example Margie provides is Ruby; a name Margie argues that was popular with Margie’s grandmother’s generation (i.e. a woman born towards the end of the 19th century) and is now popular with millennial babies born in the first decade of the 21st century. Regardless of whether Margie is factually correct about names like Gloria and Ruby, her judgment that it is inappropriate for a twenty year old in Australia to use the name Ruby or Gloria comes about because in Australian cultural practices, a twenty year old in 2013 would likely not be called Ruby or Gloria. It is therefore an ethnocentric judgement based on Margie’s reading of Australian mainstream native English speaker norms. Nevertheless, it is a judgment she seeks to licence for her Chinese and Taiwanese charges.

From a linguistic ideology perspective, it belies a restrictive understanding of language change and use, in which native speaker norms and practices are privileged and reified. This reading is at odds with Margie’s earlier comments on linguistic pluralism in the context of English as an International Language. However, it is also a cultural issue and the heteroglossic clash that frequently arises among my participants is as much about issues of language use as of cultural practices.

Margie displays a different type of language gate-keeping based on normative, native speaker practices and preferences when she proscribes a male Chinese student from using the name Seven, stating that she will refuse to talk with him. To recall Canagarajah (2004), the punishment for a student’s preference for an ‘undesirable institutional subjectivity’ is to be designated as a failure and assigned a ‘socially marginalised positions’ (p. 120). In effect, the student is silenced. Indeed, Margie describes herself as being famous as a classroom teacher, graduate program administrator, and language school principal for resisting and refusing the practice of English name use among some of the program’s Chinese and Taiwanese students. Margie repeats the
story of Chinese student Seven during a classroom introduction sequence when she told him that Seven was ‘not a name that’s a number’, despite the student’s subsequent retort, ‘But that’s my name.’ Margie rationalises her practices of resistance and refusal with the explanation to students that one day she might visit the university or business in China or Taiwan at which the student is working and ask for ‘Professor Seven’ and no-one will know about whom she is talking.

However, what transpires towards the end of the focus group discussion with Barb and Margie is a function of the dialogic nature of such exchanges. Barb and Margie in effect forgo their earlier positions on language ownership and language change with its positioning of native speaker norms and practices as benchmarks for legitimacy and appropriateness of language use. This is the realisation by Barb that what might in fact be happening is a process in which Chinese and Taiwanese students, understanding and using language as a fluid resource and not a fixed product, claim these English names for their own purposes and infuse them with such purposefulness, adding them to their repertoires. Recalling Rampton (1990), I describe such crossing as being licensed. Indeed, Rampton (1995) suggests that an interlocutors’ next questions after experiencing crossing are to ask ‘why that now?’ and ‘what next?’. Excerpt 5.05 evidences Barb’s arrival at a position in which such questions are considered. This realisation by Barb signalled something of a change in the direction of the focus group discussion, whereby Barb and Margie understood that this language practice to which they been witness and of which they had tended to be proscriptive and punitive, possessed hitherto unnoticed and unknown dimensions.

**Excerpt 5.05  Barb on the repurposing of “our” English names**

1. Barb: Maybe that’s what happening though; that those names are
2. going to be taken over, and they're going to have all these
3. other associations. They're no longer our names anymore.
Excerpt 5.05 displays Barb’s rejoinder to Margie’s concerns about the appropriateness of the English names chosen by Chinese and Taiwanese students in the graduate program. Barb argues that what might in fact be happening is a process in which Chinese and Taiwanese students, understanding language as a fluid resource and not as a fixed product, appropriate English names for their own purposes, adding them to their repertoires. This is languaging as process rather than language as product. I reproduce a brief passage from Widdowson’s plenary address to the 1993 Annual TESOL convention,

_You are proficient in a language to the extent that you possess it, make it your own, bend it to your will, assert yourself through it rather than simply submit to the dictates of its form_ (Widdowson, 1994, p. 384).

Consequently, I argue that rather than such use of some English names being considered (and proscribed) as old-fashioned and inappropriate, what is evident are these processes articulated by Widdowson (1994), all of which demonstrate proficiency and thus ownership: bending language to one’s will, asserting one’s self through it, and thereby making it one’s own. In other words, we witness the fundamental heteroglossia of the practice, a quality of languaging that necessarily involves conflict and resistance as centripetal and centrifugal forces tussle within a word-as-utterance. In Excerpt 5.05, we witness Barb’s dialogic arrival at such a position as Widdowson’s (1994) on language proficiency and ownership and Bakhtin’s (1981) on dialogised heteroglossia.

5.2.11 ‘Different names. So we used to say to her, “Elsa, Angie, whatever your name is this week.”’

In some instances, Chinese and Taiwanese students would use their English names with one lecturer, despite the class composition being unchanged and their Chinese with another lecturer. In 4.7.14, Margie and Barb discuss this practice among various students including a Taiwanese student known alternatively as Elsa, Angie or by her Chinese name. Frequently, teaching staff (and I count myself among these staff) were unaware of this. Moreover, in a number of cases, a student changed his or her English name mid-semester so that he or she might be known by different names to different classmates and teaching staff at different stages throughout a
semester. This aspect for some students of the practice was positioned by some lecturers and university administrative staff as indexing a lack of investment in the name, a lack of adequate ownership of the English language, and flippancy towards identity, in as much as identity might be indexed and instantiated by name use – this latter consideration being a complicated and culturally-relative position. As a result, of such positioning, name changing and interchanging were discouraged among graduate students by the lecturers and administrators.

The name changes presented largely administrative difficulties as different lecturers experienced difficulties in identifying students whose progress warranted discussion. Barb outlines these difficulties and confusions, emphasising the disruptive nature of the practice in when she says with evident exasperation that ‘We had no idea.’ I have emphasised the function of English names among Chinese and Taiwanese students as being primarily repertoire items or language resources used in spoken interactions, seldom employed in written settings when signatures were required. However, what is observable in the data is that such name changing within a semester and with different lecturers by students like Elsa/Angie elicited from Margie elements of impatience and ridicule: specifically the reported classroom talk of "Elsa, Angie, whatever your name is this week." In summary, I understand that from an administrative perspective, the lecturers’ resistance to the practice was also predicated on experiences of confusion and disruption to administrative and pedagogical practices.

However, a second reading of the practice of name changing from one English name to another and of interchanging between Chinese and English names is that it was resisted because it positioned the student as lacking investment in the practice and the product (i.e. the name), of presenting ambivalence towards engagement with the target language (cf. Norton 2000), and, subsequently, in terms of Bourdieu’s (1991) material or cultural capital accrual from suitable learner investment, representing themselves as flippant, dilettante or disengaged learners. In such situations like that of excerpt 4.7.14, Margie’s comment, "Whatever your name is this week", suggests that, firstly, the names themselves as used by the student might be nearly anything (the whatever factor as a pronoun meaning no matter what). Secondly, the this week
factor implies the frequency of such change and the relative lack of temporal investment in a name (i.e. one week).

Nevertheless, resistance and microaggression operate heteroglossically in two directions, as two opposing forces co-existing within the identical utterance, so this practice among some students of switching between Chinese and English names or between English names according to contextual or local elements like teachers can itself be read as resistance to the classroom (if not cultural) norms attempted by Margie and Barb. Here I reach beyond Widdowson’s (1994) language proficiency and ownership and enter a conflicted space over cultural appropriateness and possibly an intercultural updating of the ‘hidden curriculum’ (cf. Martin, 1983). It is one thing for students to adopt English names, to “bend” language so that they may assert themselves through it. However, it is quite another thing to switch between English and Chinese names or English and English names and, in doing so, to “bend” a cultural practice (i.e. Australian naming and address practices) so as to assert oneself (as new Chinese subjectivity, for example) through it. The contest (and the resistance inherent in the conflict) becomes not simply one over appropriate language use, but over appropriate cultural practices.

5.2.12 ‘One of my landlords, she was Chinese, she never give me a Chinese name, even when she signed the invoice.’

In considering strategies of resistance among the Chinese and Taiwanese research participants, I am also interested in intransigence towards the practice among Chinese (for in my research the resistance to the practice was by three Chinese) and not just the considerably more commonplace yet nuanced strategies of interchanging between Chinese and English names according to readings of the interaction event and positioning of self. Accordingly, mainland Chinese students Dan, Qian and Linda were the only research participants who no longer used an English name under nearly any circumstances in Australia, and who made it a habit to ask their Chinese interlocutors their Chinese names should they present with English names. Theirs was an explicit resistance. This situation of a marked minority of my research participants insisting on using their Chinese names is quite the reverse of Diao’s (2014) findings, in which all her four
research participants used – or eventually used – their Chinese or ethnic names when studying on the graduate program in a United States university.

This is an interesting contrast between the two pieces of research, but reinforces, for example, a key foundational underpinning of Lin Er-Xin’s (2007) unpublished doctoral thesis on the sociolinguistic authentication of Mainland Chinese identities in relation to their ethnically Chinese counterparts in Singapore, that of local communities of practice versus universalised cultural homogeneity across diasporas and transpublics. In considering this contrast between Diao’s (2014) findings and those of my own research, I posit two different communities of practice negotiating two different local settings: the participants as Chinese students aboard in predominantly L1 English destinations superficially similar and the United States and Australian university settings likewise superficially similar. If there is an expectation therefore of an equivalent similarity between the participants’ practices, we would do well to consider the following. Lin Er-Xin’s (2007) assesses:

Mainland Chinese speakers’ identity construction in relation to Chinese Singaporeans, in view of the fact that certain aspects of Chinese identity are essentialized as universally shared by all who are Chinese. This ideology circulating within the larger Chinese community seems to over-simplify Chinese-ness by constructing differences across communities of Chinese people as somehow inconsequential to identity construction. While such an ideology might act as a unifying force that binds Chinese peoples together at a supra-national level, it certainly could not be the only ideology governing how Chinese people relate to one another at local levels of interaction’ (p. 279).

Participant Dan resisted the practice of English name use because she positioned Chinese users of English names as potentially untrustworthy. Indeed, for Dan, Otsuji and Pennycook’s (2010) creative worlds of ‘urban hybrid multilingualism’ read as something more dystopian. Having experienced Chinese middle and secondary school use of English names as both mandated and impersonal, Dan describes the use of English names by her fellow Chinese as something she discourages and distrusts: ‘Some people tell me their English name; I will ask them back, What’s your Chinese name?’
The specific example Dan uses is a Melbourne landlord of hers, whose Chinese name she did not know and was never given. Dan eventually moved out of the accommodation because she positioned the practice and, therefore, the landlord as duplicitous and untrustworthy. Dan specifically emphasises that the landlord in question did not provide her Chinese name ‘even when she signed the invoice’ upon receipt of Dan’s rent. Dan’s comment here once again underscores a key discussion point of the Modality section to follow, that an English name’s primary function among Chinese and Taiwanese is for spoken interactions in Australia. For written modes of interaction or expression, the full Chinese name in characters tends to be deployed and would tend to be expected by Chinese and Taiwanese.

The reason behind Dan’s mistrust is not dissimilar to Margie’s reading of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese as presentation or performance of a false self. I develop this latter reading further in the section on the derived theme of *Identity*. Dan suggests that the Chinese landlord may well have been trying to hide something, while also not wanting Dan to know details of her life. We shall see in later sections that two of my Chinese research participants understood the protection and pseudonymity that use of an English name in certain Australian circumstances and settings might afford them. The protection and pseudonymity afforded these two by strategic deployment of English names, I argue, provided Aurora and Andrea with opportunities to enact Canagarajah’s (2004, p. 120) ‘safe houses’, spaces where students can ‘negotiate identities more critically’. The term is understood as synonymous with Goffmann’s (1961) ‘underlife’, sites that are somewhat free from surveillance as a consequence of being unofficial or extra-pedagogical.

5.2.13 ‘I don’t like to share my name with others, because in China my name is kind of unique.’

The reason provided by Linda for her resistance to the practice in Australia is very different from Dan’s, although it does relate to presentations of self, and it tells us something further about Chinese naming practices – the desirability of uniqueness in Chinese names. Watson (1986)
notes that uniqueness of names is important among Chinese and the prospect of sharing one’s name with another is so ‘extraordinary’ (p. 622) that in Taiwan at least it is legal grounds for name change should two people in the same city share names. Linda emphasises that her Chinese name, by which she means the full three written characters of her Chinese name, the way she would like it spoken by non-Chinese interlocutors, is quite uncommon in China: she had never encountered another with that name, and that this is a desirable state of affairs. However, her observation on the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese was that in contrast there were frequently many who shared the same English name; her colleague in the focus group discussion, Angel, being a case in point.

I return to Linda’s experience of classroom baptism in China, an experience she describes with ambivalence and which, moreover, I surmise from her account, was conducted by her primary school teacher with clinical indifference (cf. ‘We have an English book, and at the end of the book, we have a list of English names, so my teacher just, "You, Jack; you, Susan")). It is this experience of classroom baptism – decontextualised, impersonal, mechanical – that mirror Dan’s and Angel’s accounts on the same topic. There is no denying the mechanical nature of the “ceremonies” described by the students and the largely arbitrary nature of the names chosen and distributed among the Chinese classmates. One is led therefore to wonder whether for Dan and Linda another reason for their resistance to the practice of English name use has to do with the circumstances of their induction into the practice through those classroom baptisms.

For example, when I asked why Dan’s teacher in China may have chosen the evocative English name Dolphin for her, Dan responds that she has little idea: ‘I don't know. Maybe cos it's similar to [gives Chinese name]. The first alphabet [i.e. letter] is D; maybe she likes dolphin or something.’ The implication would seem to be that it has more to do with the teacher (the baptiser) than the student (the baptised).

5.2.14 ‘You just wonder if there isn't this inherent racism underlying a lot of this and [if] that's not reciprocated now.’

Barb hypothesises the situation with Chinese and Taiwanese students using English names as analogous to her experiences of post-colonial Zimbabwe. She begins her account (at a relatively
late stage in the focus group discussion) with the summary statement, almost in spite of how the practice had had been previously discussed by the two lecturers, ‘There's an awful lot happening here, isn't there?’

In other words, we apprehend her realisation that there is in fact legitimacy, authenticity and investment evident in the practice, that it might not simply be a product of immaturity, ambivalence towards the target language, and Othering. Barb concludes her comparison between post-colonial Zimbabwe and the Taiwanese and Chinese practice with the observation that the colonised Zimbabweans ‘now proudly own their names.’ In other words, she locates the practice in discourses of resistance to imperialism and colonialism. Eason does something similar in 4.7.23 when he likens English name use to world currencies and the practice to power. Presently, US dollars (like English) are a global currency and may be used in China. However, Eason comments, should Chinese military and economic power increase, the world may find themselves using Chinese names and Chinese currency.

Barb locates it accordingly, having heard Margie earlier observe the possibility that some non-Chinese interlocutors, like themselves, might mispronounce a Chinese name so as to render it as the Chinese word for penis (see Excerpt 7.24 line 1). Non-Chinese interlocutors would likely be oblivious to their mispronunciation and its consequences: a situation in which insult is added to injury, and a lecturer in that scenario would therefore not be aware of why the other Chinese and Taiwanese students in the classroom were laughing.

**Excerpt 5.06  Barb on the empire writing back**

1. Barb: And all I can think of, especially when I see
2. Sevens [i.e. Chinese student] and things is my background, which
3. is African, where everybody I met was called Banana or
4. Mercy...well working in, living in Zimbabwe for ten years and so
5. the people that you're interacting with are called Banana. These
6. were names given to them by mission schools, so you can
only ask yourself why these names were given, and they're
given to maintain position, to maintain the position of being
something of a joke and something not human, and you just
wonder if there isn't this inherent racism underlying a lot of
this and [if] that's not reciprocated now.

What Barb also describes in Excerpt 5.06 is a kind of appropriation and resignification, a concept fundamental to dialogised heteroglossia. Kramsch (2009) describes this type of practice as a ‘disruption in the symbolic order’, whereby in Bakhtinian terms, all utterances retain the traces, ‘the voices of others’, and are a ‘resignification of other people’s words.’ Kramsch’s (2009) description derives from Bakhtin (1981, pp. 293-4), in which ‘the word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention.’ So, the resistance my research witnesses and describes, from both lecturers to the Chinese and Taiwanese practice of English name use and also the resistance of the Chinese and Taiwanese in turn to the lecturers’ attempt to use Chinese names, is this tension and tussle over appropriation, over the fundamental heteroglossia of language. In effect, linguistically and culturally, the “names” Seven and Ruby and the naming practices they are a product of, for example, are half Barb and Margie’s, but now half Seven and Ruby’s, redolent with the latter’s intentions and accents, linguistic and cultural footballs sought by both sides as their own.

Lines 7 to 11 of Excerpt 5.06 show Barb reflecting on a putative racism in the discursive practice of English name use. This is a consequence of an earlier comment by Margie that the practice had originated among English language teachers in China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, who took it upon themselves in the relatively early days of EFL to equip their students with English names. Margie had taught in Hong Kong in the 1980s and noted in our discussion that in her experience such naming was frequently done by male teachers in a pejorative and offensive way, so that the combination of Chinese name and English name produced a vulgar utterance in English. If this is
the case, then the practice is tainted by racist imperialism, and, as a result, Barb’s reflection would constitute a ‘resignification as politics’ (cf. Butler 2004), in which a pejorative term traditionally used against a community is reappropriated by that community and used for the benefit of that community.

5.3 RELATIONALITY

This section discusses findings related to the intersubjective and contextual nature of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices in general and to the use of English names among Chinese and Taiwanese specifically in light of these practices. Chinese naming and address conventions and practices tend to be contrasted with the perceived simplicity of Western models as a result of their relative complexity. Typically, this contrast is understood to hinge around two fundamental social differences observed between Western and Chinese social models. Firstly, that Chinese society is hierarchically oriented with social status and seniority both reflected in and reinforced by intricate naming conventions and address forms. Secondly, that Chinese society takes the family as its prototypical social organisation and, therefore, specific familial kin terms are to be employed between family relations but also, more significantly, with non-kin interlocutors. Xinyan (2006, p. 544) provides a greater understanding of the theme of relationality in the context of Chinese and Confucian performances of self.

[T]o believe that the self is relational is to believe that a person is mainly identified by his or her social roles and relationships to others, that is, to regard one’s social roles and relationships as a major constitutive part of one’s personal identity. Even if we do not regard one’s self as the equivalent of the total of one’s roles, it will still be reasonable to say that one’s roles are so important for one’s identity that “if some of my roles change, others will of necessity change also, literally making me a different person.” The concept of the relational self, understood as such, is not incompatible with the belief that a person is autonomous in the sense that the self has a capacity to reflect and choose.

In this section, I argue that name change (e.g. augmentation, diminution, substitution) in mainstream Chinese naming practices is a function of the dialogic, intersubjective and relational performance of Chinese selves and identities. Furthermore, I propose the use of English names
by Chinese and Taiwanese students as another example of such name change within a heuristic of Chinese naming practices. As ever, when positing, albeit cautiously and provisionally, seemingly definable and discernible entities as Chinese culture, Chinese language and Chinese identities, I refer the reader to my discussion at the outset of this chapter of Block’s (2007) foregoing of ontological commitment in order to attain strategic or analytical convenience, the dangers of exoticisation and essentialisation of Chinese and Chinese-ness (cf. Nononi and Ong 1997), and Gao’s (1995) concept of the ‘paradox of intercultural communication.’

Nevertheless, I identify a trigger for name change in Chinese naming and address practices according to the contextual circumstances of relative status, seniority, intimacy and gender, for example, underpinning and infusing an interaction. In particular, I identify two features of Confucian relationality that help to account for the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese students. Both these features operate simultaneously and discursively, so it is for convenience of analysis that I separate them on the page. Subsection 5.3.1 discusses data relating to what a grammar of Chinese names and Confucian address forms; in other words, the inappropriateness of using unappendaged fragments of Chinese names in situated interactions. Subsection 5.3.2 discusses data concerning the intersubjectivity of Chinese and Confucian address forms. In short, I arrive at a point in the thesis argument where I could, should I desire to, suggest that a more accurate term for these so-called English names that would highlight the Chinese-ness of their function and features (e.g. intersubjective and dialogic) would be Chinese names. Accordingly and taxonomically, I would then describe them as another 21st century or translocal feature of conventional Chinese naming practices. However, this provisional labelling of the practice is not my ultimate goal, as attractive as it might be to turn a standard nomenclature (i.e. English names) on its head.

There are three precedents identified from the literature for the use of normatively English language items in situated interactions, situations in which the primary language otherwise in use (Mandarin or Swahili) was the shared L1 of the interlocutors. In these three instances normatively English language items were used to elide otherwise nuanced or complicated L1 and
C1 forms and practices: two from Chinese or Taiwanese ethnographic research and one from Tanzanian research by anthropologist, Higgins (2009).

Chen (2007) researched the use of “sorry” by Taiwanese posters on an online discussion forum to express apology, noting that the English form permitted posters to circumvent the formal and social distance building use of Mandarin Chinese apology among peers. Secondly, when contrasting Chinese state-owned companies with foreign-owned companies, Duthie’s (2007) Shanghai participants discussed the ease with which English name use allowed for teamwork endeavours among employees and frank discussion of opinions and participation with bosses; the latter two important aspects of non-state workplaces. Thirdly, Higgins (2009, p. 44) noted the tendency among the Tanzanian newspaper journalists to greet one another in the workplace in English, where, traditionally, Swahili or Tanzanian greetings lasted several minutes and involved ‘a series of ritualized question and answer sequences regarding the well-being of one’s family, one’s farm and one’s neighbours.’ English language greetings among the journalists are, on the other hand, seen to index the speakers’ identification as metropolitans engaged in fast-paced commercial life and, therefore, permit the ‘cutting short of niceties’ (p. 45).

5.3.1 ‘He [tutor] is right to call my first name [=surname], but the problem is that’s only one character. It’s quite strange.’

Related to earlier discussion of the mispronunciation of Chinese names is the commonplace of improper use of fragments of Chinese names by non-Chinese speakers, be they unbound morphemes (e.g. family names or given names alone) or particularly intimate first name use by strangers. This might be described as the misuse of Chinese names in terms of a grammar of Confucian address, regardless of any concerns about pronunciation. This consideration relates to the grammatical conditions of Chinese name use and has to do with the conventional restrictions on the use of unbounded monosyllabic Chinese names without some sort of accompanying title (e.g. Little, Uncle) to create an acceptable disyllabic term (see Chao, 1956). Despite the more than fifty years since publication of Chao’s classic grammar of Chinese names, research participants also mentioned this grammar as a further consideration that compromised the use
of their given or monosyllabic names in first-name basis interactions by others. Qian, for example, describes the “weirdness” – a descriptor commonly used by the participants to describe the misuse of their unbounded given names – of addressing someone in Chinese interaction with just one syllable or character of the name; in other words, with an unbound morpheme. In contrast with an honorific or relational “title” like Old or Young, or Brother or Uncle, Qian asserts that the given name may also be doubled up in certain relational contexts.

In the data excerpt used as a heading for this section, Andrea conceded that while her Australian tutor was correct in addressing her by her surname, rather than her given name/s, to do so without a title that created an appropriate disyllabic utterance (e.g. the Chinese for “Little Andrea”) was unusual: ‘the problem is that's only one character. It's quite strange.’ Similarly, Angel reflects on a tutor who was typically unable to recall her full Chinese name ‘so he will say the surname, or something like that’, which both Angel and participant Suzie described as ‘weird’. Andrea and Aurora comment further on what we are describing as a Confucian grammar of Chinese address forms, concluding with the observation that single-character given names may be used in Chinese or Confucian interaction and address, but only in suitably intimate contexts, indexing and instantiating that intimacy between certain interlocutors.

5.3.2 ‘I feel uncomfortable if some grown-up guy call me my given name in Chinese.’

Participants tend to confirm the literature on Chinese address practices that typically only in intimate circumstances might a Chinese person be addressed using a single, unappendaged character – his or her given name. For example, Andrea and Aurora describe how attempts by non-Chinese speaking or non-Chinese lecturers at first name basis classroom interaction using what appear to be Chinese first or given names can contribute to awkwardness if not offence. Again, we find ourselves in a situation not dissimilar to the previous accounts of convenience of or catering to non-Chinese speaking lecturers, in which what might be the best of intentions in a practice result instead in an effect contrary to these intentions once enacted. In this case, the lecturer’s desire for first-name basis interaction in Australian university classroom interaction is understood as akin to students’ previously discussed attempts to minimise the inconvenience of
non-Chinese speaking lecturers and students struggling with Chinese names and address forms. My argument here is that first-name basis interactions between lecturers, tutors and their students, if not among students themselves, tend to be the cultural or pragmatic norm in Australian universities. Linda also underscores this pragmatic quandary, adding the ingredients of gender and seniority (‘grown-up guy’) into the mix.

The impediment for many Chinese and Taiwanese is a classically intercultural one: the particularistic relationality of first-name basis interaction contrasted with the generality of such across much of mainstream Australian society. As Li (1997, p.498) argues, the use of traditional Chinese names does not facilitate the ‘quick development of friendship between new acquaintances’, therefore, the use of an English first or personal name ‘may serve as a lubricant in speeding up the process of getting acquainted and developing intimacy, especially between people who perceive each other as equals.’ Emphasising the gendered aspect of the intersubjectivity of Chinese address conventions with reference to names and reinforcing Linda’s personal narrative account, Gu (1990) notes that Chinese intellectuals abroad, particularly in the UK and particularly females, ‘will be considerably embarrassed’ (p. 250) when addressed by friends and colleagues with the middle name or, worse, the given name alone.

What complicates things further for non-Chinese interlocutors is the word order of Chinese names, in which the first name written tends to be the family name with the typically two given names to follow. Recall from some sections of the Findings chapters that Chinese and Taiwanese participants needed to clarify with the researcher when they were talking about the Chinese word order first name (i.e. family name) or the Australian word order first name (i.e. given name). This Chinese ordering of names is then directly transposed into Australian classroom rolls or administrative forms and the unwary classroom teacher might use the family name (i.e. that which comes first) as given name, without any accompanying title.

5.3.3 ‘After we moved to the new shop, fish and chips, we have, like, foreign people staff so Mum tend to call me my English name.’
Suzie describes a recent and Australian experience of working in her parents’ Chinese restaurant in the metropolitan eastern suburbs. Suzie then contrasts this work experience with working in the family’s fish and chip shop, which was their next business after the restaurant. In the former, Suzie’s Chinese mother only addressed her in accordance with Chinese address practices. Moreover, the conversations among the Chinese staff, including between Suzie and her mother, were in Mandarin. However, upon opening the fish and chip shop, where ‘we have, like, foreign [i.e. ethnically non-Chinese] people staff’, Suzie’s mother stopped the practice of addressing Suzie in Chinese and, instead, began addressing her by her English name. This was in accordance with Mandarin no longer serving as the appropriate “public facing” language in such a normatively, even stereotypically, non-Chinese setting as a fish and chip shop.

What had changed was not the relationship between mother and daughter, nor Suzie’s mother’s English language proficiency, nor even had the business moved geographically from China to Australia. Suzie’s mother remained relatively non-proficient in English. Rather, the circumstantial arrangements or sociological intersections of place, person and protocols had altered, that is, the dialogics of the local had changed. With this change, so too Suzie’s mother’s practice of social address to her daughter had also changed, reflecting and reinforcing such changes. Therefore, evidenced by Suzie’s account is an instance of relationality of Chinese social practices concerning this time a shift in the use of a conventional mother-daughter Chinese address form in a Chinese-speaking staffed enterprise located in Melbourne’s wealthier eastern suburbs, to her use of an English given name in a normatively non-Chinese-speaking setting, a fish and chips shop.

5.3.4 ‘You don’t have an actual name, you just have your relationship’

The “authentic or real” Chinese self, if I might hesitantly speak of such a thing, tends to – arguably has tended to be – an interdependent and intersubjective one, a familial one – so, accordingly, the name used in spoken communication as address form both reflects and reinforces these qualities of contingent and dialogic self. This dialogic and relational nature of name and address form practices among Chinese and Taiwanese participants should mean that
the English name they give in the classroom introduction sequence is actually the contextually correct or appropriate form for that Australian university classroom setting. It is situated and strategic language use as drawn from a speaker’s expanded repertoire according to his or her reading of local sociolinguistic conditions.

I argue that this distinction between the Chinese name as fundamentally written and character based entity and an address term as intersubjective or dialogic utterance – a distinction key to the next section 5.4 Modality – is captured in the exchange between Chinese student Sylvia and Barb, recorded on the first day of the first semester of a new intake of graduate students, in Excerpt 5.01 towards the beginning of this chapter. I reproduce 5.01 for convenience’s sake here in attenuated form, featuring Sylvia’s articulation of the distinction between her Chinese name (i.e. ‘My name is…’), comprising its full three characters, and her English name, which is what she has always been called (cf. lines 4 and 5) and wants to be called.

**Excerpt 5.07  Day 1 new semester graduate classroom introductions**

1. Sylvia: Hi everyone. My name is [gives full three-character Chinese name]. Um, my English name is Sylvia.
2. Barb: I can manage [gives two characters of Sylvia’s Chinese given name/s]. Have you always been called Sylvia?

Towards the end of the focus group discussion with Barb and Margie, the latter arrived at this fundamental understanding of the Chinese intersubjective or dialogic self and its reification in conventional Confucian address forms. This is presented in Excerpt 5.08, in which Margie contrasts the classroom institutional talk of first day introductions, a situated and culturally specific practice whose everyday status in Australian universities might obscure for local students and lecturers its situatedness, with the dialogic and emergent address forms integral to traditional Confucian and Chinese society. I argue then that the emergent and dialogic address forms that are a product of this classroom interaction (and of which the subsequent classroom
interaction is a product) for Chinese and Taiwanese students tend to be the production of English names. Put simply and paraphrased, the typical Chinese and Taiwanese student response to the contrivances of a first-day Australian university classroom introduction practice is to say: My name is X, but please call me Y, where X is the full Chinese name and Y is the English name as address form.

**Excerpt 5.08  Margie on the intersubjective Chinese or Confucian self**

1. Margie: The other thing too is that the Chinese don't use the Chinese name, so that when you say to them, Well, what do your friends call you?, it'll be so-and-so's son or Wong's daughter or so-and-so's big sister or something. But there's no name because it's all familial; all those names are, you don't have an actual name, you just have your relationship. And before [i.e. in China or Taiwan], everyone who knows them locates them within their family or the relationship; when they actually come here, they lose their identity, then lose that name. But of course it seems to me it's others who give them that name; it's not something that you give yourself, so to come to Australia and be asked, What's your name? is in a way a meaningless concept.

To summarise, I arrive therefore at an interesting situation in which it is established that the mispronunciation of Chinese names by non-Chinese speaking lecturers and classmates can produce instead an utterance that may well be incomprehensible or offensive or, as Andrea comments, plain wrong. Furthermore, I have established that efforts by non-Chinese speaking or non-Chinese interlocutors to use participants’ first or given names for reasons primarily pragmatic to establish or underscore communicative involvement can instead produce unintended and unwanted effects of alienation and awkwardness among Chinese and Taiwanese
students as principles of Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices and address are compromised.

5.4 Modalité

Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second exists for the sole purpose of representing the first. The linguistic object is not both the written and the spoken forms of words; the spoken forms alone constitute the object. (Saussure et al., 2011, pp. 23-4)

In 5.4 Modality, I discuss a third aspect of Chinese naming and address conventions that is intrinsic to the naming practice: that a Chinese name is fundamentally a character- or glyph-based written compound, a thing of visual apprehension more so than of aural distinctiveness. Margie, following on from her discussion in about the essentially familial or relational nature of Chinese names in spoken interaction, describes the glyphic and compound Chinese name as something seldom used outside of its status as ‘a chop [aka seal, 姓名印]’.

Liao (2000) describes an auspicious number of strokes in the written characters of a Chinese name as being fundamental to the feng shui of that name. I think immediately of the continued significance of traditional Chinese calligraphy in contemporary Chinese art in which, for example, ‘the elevated status of calligraphy reflects the importance of the word in China. This was a culture devoted to the power of the word’ (Delbanco, 2008). Moreover, Tan (2001) notes the contrast between mainland Chinese and ethnically Chinese in Singapore, whereby in the case of the former, a person’s official name is that which is rendered in Chinese characters whereas in Singapore it is the Romanized version of the name – transcribed into English, typically without tonal information – that is the official name. Upon noting this contrast, Tan (2001, p. 49) then remarks that the pinyin version of his Chinese name ‘looks totally alien to me’ when compared with his name as written Chinese characters.
The tension between spoken and written language as to which is the proper object of linguistic enquiry remains fraught. There is insufficient space to chronicle its peregrinations and protagonists here. Coulmas (2003, p. 2) argues that the most typically cited definition of writing is that provided by Aristotle, in which written words were understood primarily as symbols of spoken words. Subsequently, Coulmas (2003) states that mainstream linguistic thought, following de Saussure, has tended to support this Aristotelian surrogationalism, in which, according to a hierarchy of relevance and as likely determined by Ancient Greek language, the thinking is that letters stand for sounds. With this potential for an alphabetical Greek bias in mind, Coulmas (2003) observes the significance of an analysis of the origin and essence of writing within the context of Chinese literary culture. Coulmas (2003, p. 4) argues that Chinese classical writer and philosopher Liu Hsieh’s discourse on writing resembles Aristotelian thought in part, yet also differs significantly in so far as writing (vis. the Tao) is attributed with ‘a creative analytic potential’. Unlike in Aristotelian surrogationalism, ‘the relationship between the two [the spoken and the written] is not necessarily unidirectional.’

However, Coulmas (2003, p. 10) states ‘that writing is an active agent of language is unpalatable to many linguists for a number of reasons. One is that in modern linguistics languages are stripped of their historical dimension.’ Accordingly, Coulmas (2003) argues that introductory textbooks of linguistics tend to elide the issue of writing or provide instead an insubstantial overview of various writing systems somewhere in a final chapter. However, it would seem that what Coulmas (2003) terms ‘the Eastern tradition of the scientific study of language’ adopts a different approach to written language. In mainstream linguistic enquiry, however, Coulmas (2003) observes a paradox in which linguists never study any language without recording its speech and writing it down. However, because linguistic enquiry has tended to be ‘concerned with ‘natural language’, whereby writing is analysed as an artifact, this is difficult to openly integrate into linguistic theory.

According to this assessment, linguistic theory which, as a result, is characterised by scriptism, defined as the tendency of linguists to base their analyses on writing-induced concepts such as
phoneme, word, literal meaning and sentence, at the same time subscribes to the principle of the primacy of speech for linguistic inquiry’ (Coulmas, 2003, p. 14). Yet, there is historical justification for the idea that writing did not evolve to record speech, but instead as a system of communication. Accordingly, ‘recording information by graphical means is a basic function of writing that is never narrowed down entirely to the representation of sounds. Writing cannot and should not be reduced to speech’ (Coulmas, 2003, p. 16).

This sub-section therefore argues that conflation of spoken Chinese address forms with written Chinese characters – that is a confusion between a Chinese name and a Chinese address form – functions precisely as an example of this tendency to reduce writing to a kind of subsidiary or shadow of speech, an alphabetical bias. As a result, a classic confusion, perhaps even original bias, inherent in mainstream Western linguistic thought is reproduced in a failure to distinguish between the spoken and written forms of Chinese, especially with regard to Chinese names, as much if not more so works of visual art as products of aural articulation.

5.4.1 ‘The pinyin is not my name.’

A similar sentiment was evident among the Chinese and Taiwanese participants to that of Tan’s (2001) when I conducted a minor experiment at the outset of the first two student focus group discussions. The participants were asked to hand-write three “versions” of their names in a vertical column: the first in Chinese characters, the second in pinyin or Romanised form, and the third name was their English name as written. Two-thirds of the way through the focus group discussion, when their attention was drawn back to this piece of paper in front of them on which the three names were written, the students effectively echoed the comments of Tan (2001). For example, Olivia described the pinyin version as ‘not really my Chinese name, like, it’s not the real word, like, it’s letters. But in Chinese, it’s actually…characters. So, it’s not really a good representation.’

Coulmas (2003, p. 233) in a discussion of digraphia in written language, notes that pinyin is seldom used by Chinese. Aurora, Andrea and Jodie described the role and status of pinyin in
Chinese education, before reflecting on their Chinese names as written down in characters for the FGD experiment. Aurora describes pinyin as a system learnt by Chinese students – before Chinese characters themselves are learnt – to aid pronunciation, something she describes as akin to footnotes.

I suggested to Suzie that there might be several versions of the focus group discussion participants’ Chinese names, in doing so categorising the pinyin and Romanised renditions as distinct from one another. Suzie, however, was quick to clarify that pinyin is simply an aid for pronunciation and that, ontologically, it is the same as the Romanised form of her name. Indeed, unless the written Chinese characters are capable of being understood by, for example, an ESL or EFL teacher, there is likelihood that the Romanised name, as transcribed and subsequently pronounced or mispronounced, bears little if any resemblance to the actual Chinese name and its correct pronunciation. This effectively guarantees the Chinese name’s inevitable mispronunciation by people unable to read Chinese characters certainly and pinyin most likely. In which case, irrespective of concerns about homonymy with unfortunate or unfavourable words, the Chinese recipient, in the workplace or the classroom, simply may not recognize his or her name being called.

5.4.2 ‘For my last character [i.e. second given name], um, it’s actually, like, it actually should be written in this way [shows], and, but, people would always use, like this [way].’

As is evident from the data, but is also common knowledge among Chinese speakers and learners, structurally and semantically different Chinese characters may frequently be pronounced the same way. Context is a significant determiner of which character is being articulated or described. As a result, participants tended to emphasise that their Chinese names are fundamentally written, character-based entities and that, therefore, Romanised or even pinyin transcriptions of such names were inauthentic substitutes, regardless of whether appropriate tones were marked (i.e. pinyin) or non-Chinese could read and recall the “names” more effectively. Various data presented highlight that a spoken Chinese character may represent a number of different written characters. Therefore, in order to clarify the person’s
actual Chinese name, participants may ask for the character to be described or written, in the air, on paper, or on the palm. On a number of occasions during FGD Chinese participants’ introductions to one another, I observed this practice of writing characters down on paper or in the air.

Suzie, for example, notes that ‘since we [Chinese/participants] know the Chinese name, we'll probably ask how to write the characters.’ Linda, for example, rhetorically enquired of her fellow Chinese participants how they might write the character for her Chinese name and, when doing so, noted that based on the pronunciation of it, they might use different characters to the actual ones that constitute her name. In other words, Chinese too may not fully appreciate the meaning, the essence, the actuality of a Chinese name until the written characters for that name are also viewed. As a result, a Chinese spoken introduction might be a multimodal affair involving both the utterance of the name as well as the description or delineation of the written characters.

My argument is that without reference to the written character being evident through the actions of the speaker, there can be considerable ambiguity over exactly which character or characters are being spoken, and the speaker’s name might remain indeterminate. This is a state of affairs that occurs even among L1 Mandarin speakers. Consequently, in interactions with non-Chinese speakers, the characters being uttered when a name is provided can never be verified through recourse to the actual Chinese characters. As a result, the Chinese name as uttered by a non-Chinese interlocutor is likely to be not just ambiguous in its reference (as it can be among L1 Mandarin speakers) but wrong. Given the likelihood of such a scenario, Andrea’s comment is that a correctly pronounced English name is preferable to a mispronounced and meaningless Chinese name, whose semantic and semiotic meanings cannot be appreciated without reference to the written character.

5.4.3 ‘Then she said, No, no, no. Tell me your “real” name.’
I conclude sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4: Resistance, Relationality and Modality, with the understanding that the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese is consistent with conventions of Chinese and Confucian naming and address, sharing some of their key features of emergence, intersubjectivity and change. Therefore, I propose that to term these items “English names” is to inaccurately and restrictively limit their creative and critical value as pragmatic and metapragmatic spoken resources in a Chinese or Taiwanese person’s language repertoire. Moreover, to do so is to permit them and the practices of their use to be evaluated and positioned from an L1 English language native-speaker bias, and with application of classically Western conceptions of an authentic self. I see just this, for example, when Andrea accentuates the inconvenience of Chinese name use in a non-Chinese Australian context, claiming nevertheless that her Australian interlocutor preferred to use her “real” Chinese name, although she could neither pronounce it nor read its Chinese characters. Despite this and Andrea’s stated preference for her English name to be used, the Australian interlocutor insisted on using Andrea’s Chinese name.

This then would seem a fundamental paradox at the heart of the issue of so-deemed authentic presentations of self. As we have learned, a Chinese name incorrectly pronounced and without written characters known or present is meaningless. The Romanized or even pinyin-ized forms are not recognised by participants and researchers as Chinese names, at best the latter might be (cf. Aurora’s comment) a footnote to aid pronunciation. Add to this that a Chinese name is fundamentally a written phenomenon, seldom if ever present in spoken interaction, and what might be positioned by an outsider as an authentic display of Chinese or Taiwanese identity and selfhood, when he or she is permitted upon insistence to use the “Chinese name” to address her Chinese volunteer in an opportunity shop or a university classroom, can be understood as something substantially different, a spectacle of selfhood, a form of Orientalism, intended for the benefit of the Western Other. For example, Diao’s (2008) participant Anna describes her Portuguese boyfriend’s insistence on calling her by her Chinese name in the United States, despite her protestations, as an “exoticisation” of her, a type of snobbishness. Diao (2008, p. 25) quotes Anna as ‘never happy that Carlos called me Min. I am never happy about that. He
sometimes [does so] in order to emphasise [me being] exotic Chinese. I will deliberately correct him – I just feel what a snobbish! Anna is Anna. You are just a foreigner [Diao’s italics].’

Therefore, I arrive at what might provisionally be termed English names in appearance that are in fact Chinese names in function, allowing for the complex dialogism of Chinese naming and address practices. However, the danger of me positing such an entity – the English name in form but Chinese name in function – is that it proposes a binary between this a priori thing called English on the one hand and this a priori thing called Chinese on the other. In other words, it presumes languages as systems, as discrete and prefabricated resources to be learned and used, rather than language as process and practice, as a product of situated social action. It is appropriate for me now to steer the discussion to Pennycook’s (2010, p. 25) suggestions of a theory of practice for applied linguists that enquires of language users how it is they ‘know how to do what they do in the very specific contexts in which they operate, not as a theory of competence underlying performance [since this implies competence as assessed in relation to a pre-determined and/or core language structure or system], but as a knowledge of everyday practice.’

5.5 Identity

5.5.1 ‘But for me, name is like nationalism. Like, I’m more ... cosmopolitan, so I don’t really mind. Like, today I’m Australian, tomorrow I’m Chinese; I don’t really mind.’

I now consider Chinese and Taiwanese students’ identity construction, diverse as it is among the participants, analysing it as emergent and dialogic from situated language practices, in so far as their use of language resources at a local linguistic level is understood to inform their alignment with or disalignment from other speakers, conscious, intended and otherwise. In sociolinguistic research since the late twentieth century, identity has increasingly been analysed as an emergent product of discourse and practice, rather than as the pre-existing origin of such discourses and practices. Bucholtz and Hall (2005, p. 585), for example, argue that ‘it is perhaps easiest to recognize identity as emergent in cases where speakers’ language use does not
conform with the social category to which they are normatively assigned. Such cases are striking because they sever the ideologically expected mapping between language and biology or culture; that is, they subvert essentialist preconceptions of linguistic ownership.

Within Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005) framework, identities are understood to comprise three aspects: a macro-level demographic category; more localized, ‘ethnographically cultural positions’ (p. 585); and, thirdly, short-term and interactionally-contingent roles and stances. Thus, according to her reading of one context, its participants and particularities, a Chinese or Taiwanese student might identify herself using an “English name”, yet in another, or the seemingly same but slightly different, using her Chinese name. One observer may only be alert to the macro-level demographic category of Chinese, say, while the student herself is particularly and momentarily paying attention to a more micro-level category of ‘interactionally-contingent role and stance’. Accordingly, the readings of the interaction – and the concomitant positioning of the student by her dialogic other – can differ profoundly. Recall that language is understood as not simply a system used to communicate, but as a social activity that includes communication as one of its functions and identity performance, for example, as another. Profoundly different readings of an interaction and utterance can, therefore, be a product of both misconstrued identity performance between the speaker and his or her interactant/s as well as a product of the inherent and dialogic heteroglossia of language.

Clothing, currency and cool

In a fascinating metaphor, Olivia describes an English name as clothing and a Chinese name as the body beneath – the latter considerably less changeable and, indeed, hidden, perhaps at times with sections revealed, by the clothing on top in everyday identity performance. Accordingly, a Chinese student might, Olivia suggested, choose one day to use her English name (or names) or her Chinese name on the basis of what Olivia terms ‘mood’. Rather than indexing some sort of divided or inauthentic self (as this practice can also do for commentators) or simple-minded flippancy, this instead indexes the students’ reading of the context and the interaction and his or her positioning and performance of self through that reading and using the
linguistic resources or repertoire available to best achieve the goals of everyday life. Olivia also compares her name choice with her nationality – today she feels Chinese; tomorrow she feels Australian – and her choice of name instantiates this. What I see is the inadequacy and obsolescence of macro-level demographic (cf. Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) and *a priori* markers of identity, like nationality or first language or, indeed, birth name, in meaningfully capturing what might be fleeting, ambivalent and contingent moments of identity work.

Eason uses the metaphor of US dollars to describe the practice of using an English name; one might use US dollars in China but would not attempt the reverse situation: use Chinese currency in the United States. As long as the geopolitical world seemed to revolve around United States’ economic and cultural dominance, Eason argued, Chinese would likely use English names as they would US dollars. Should China turn these geopolitical, financial and cultural tables, however, like some United States’ CEOs presently, North Americans and Australians might start strategically using Chinese names.

Olivia’s comments on the discursive construction of identity recall Blackledge and Pavlenko’s (2001) work on the negotiation of identities, which included ‘interactive positioning’, the practice of assigning identities to others, and its dialectic partner, ‘reflexive positioning’, the performing of an identity or identities for oneself. Moreover, Olivia in excerpt 5.09 acknowledges the role of an anticipated Other in one’s presentation or performance of self. This perspective on the project of self as dialogic and as mutually negotiated concurs with Kramsch and Whiteside’s (2008, p. 659) ‘relativity of Self and Other...because the I is not unitary, but multiple; it contains in part the other and vice-versa; it can observe itself both subjectively from the inside and objectively through the eyes of the other.’

**Excerpt 5.09  Olivia on the mutability and mutuality of identity**

1. Olivia: But I understand that some argue that you should insist your
2. identity, it's part of your identity, you shouldn't just, yeah, change
3. it that easy. But, I guess, from the other hand is, as I said before,
identity is not only what you think we are, but also the other
people, how they perceive.

Jacquemet’s (2005) noted the need for twenty-first century, late modern sociolinguistics to acknowledge the experiences and problematics of de- and reterritorialisation and ‘raise the question of how groups of people no longer territorially defined think about their multiple voices, transidiomatic practices, and recombinant identities.’ Elsewhere, Olivia mentions that her “English” name is also a French name, a language she had studied at university in Australia and of a country where she had subsequently been an exchange student, an ethnicity, therefore, with which she seeks strategically and sometimes to align. Maher’s (2005) notion of metroethnicity investigates Japanese youth who, like participant Olivia, reject fixed and nation-based notions of cultural identity in favour of a more playful and cool metroethnicity, ‘a hybridised “street” ethnicity deployed by a cross-section of people...who are oriented towards cultural hybridity, cultural/ethnic tolerance and a multicultural lifestyle...[who]...play with ethnicity.’ For Otsuji and Pennycook (2010), a linguistic realisation of Maher’s (2005) metroethnicity is their notion of metrolingualism, in which connections among ‘language, culture, ethnicity, nationality and geography’ (Pennycook, 2010, p. 85) are not assumed, but where instead identities are played with and negotiated through language use.

In the _The Ecology of Global English_ (2007, p. 89), Canagarajah warns that although English has been effectively ‘deterritorialized and that we live in a postnational age’, the idea that globalised English or Englishes are no longer deemed affiliated with ‘specific communities or nations’ remains disingenuous. Nevertheless, ‘there are multiple tendencies and forces in globalisation that resist generalisation into a monolithic whole’ and, moreover, relations between such a monolithic global and the local of disparate communities and practices ‘are always under contestation’ and negotiation. The research that Canagarajah (2007) surveys ‘from microsocial contexts of language contact’ indicates that ‘multilinguals are able to use English for shared purposes while not losing their values and identities’ (p. 90). Previously, linguistic approaches tended to understand identities as ‘static, unitary, discrete and given’ (Canagarajah, 2004, p.
117), this ‘social turn’ in language acquisition studies, analyses human identities as ‘multiple, conflictual, negotiated, and evolving.’ In doing so I write of global cultural flows that tend to take place independently of the ‘static, unitary, discrete and given’ mechanisms of nation-states. Perhaps most crucial, new identities are thereby constituted—”new types of flexible personal controls, dispositions and means of orientation, in effect a new kind of habitus” (Featherstone 1990, p. 8)” (Nononi and Ong, 1997, p. 4).

I acknowledge that there are a number of plausible accounts of the practice provided by participants and supported by literature to do with classically intercultural and Chinese or Confucian naming and address practices, address practices and sociolinguistics. However, I also note, for example, that there remains the fact (observed and audio-recorded in participant focus group discussion introductions, for example) that in the absence of non-Chinese or non-Chinese speaking interlocutors – be they Australian classroom lecturers, tutors or classmates – the majority of our Chinese and Taiwanese participants continued to use English names. Moreover, these English names were typically acquired in geographically Chinese or Taiwanese primary, secondary or tertiary classrooms for purposes that are not entirely clear to the participants and to myself, and are used locally in situated and strategic ways in metropolitan China and Taiwan. Language resources do not always correspond in meaning across settings. As a result, language resources are not always associated with the same categories across different local contexts. In light of the social meanings of language resources emerging through localised practice, changes from one local context to another are likely to involve changes to meanings of language resources as well as how the resources are used by speakers. My remit is not to understand the practice in such local Chinese or Taiwanese settings – although the use of personal narrative inevitably raises accounts of such use – but to investigate and when appropriate reconcile accounts of the practice in light of its metapragmatic and metroethnic functions.

I consider identity categories as fluid, at times momentary, and believe in speakers having both agency and habitus that allow them to align differently with different interlocutors, according to their reading of the sociolinguistic moment and their positioning of self and other. Identities,
therefore, are understood as not grounded in speakers’ personal attributes but as emergent in speakers’ practices. Identity construction emerges from and shapes these situated practices, whereby speakers’ use of language resources at the local linguistic level is taken to inform their alignment with or disalignment from other speakers. If I consider Rampton’s (1995) crossing or Bucholtz’ (1995) passing, studies in which individuals whose physical attributes allow them to present to others as being from a normatively different ethnic group to their own or as being from either group, what emerges is that linguistic practices may precipitate and instantiate fluid and fleeting changes to an interlocutor’s identity alignment, so that conventional social categories may be claimed or elided in liminal and felicitous moments.

For example, Rampton (1995) analyses crossing as the use of certain language features or resources by a normatively “out” social or ethnic group, raising issues of legitimacy and authenticity for discourses which reify ‘the ideologically expected mapping between language and biology or culture’ (cf. Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). Rampton’s (1995) findings are that this tends to occur in strategic moments of everyday interaction when in-group membership is temporarily signalled and instantiated through crossing. The investment made therefore is not in this or that particular social or ethnic group or identity, but, rather, it is in the overarching project of signifying multiracial youth as a local category. The tension, therefore, or incompatibility between a linguistic ideology which reifies a connection between speakers’ language use and his or her biology or culture and one that understands identity performance as achieved through situated language use as – at times – fluid and fleeting is apparent in Barb and Margie’s accounts to follow.

5.5.1 ‘You are Chinese, you know. The most important thing is your Chinese identity. Are you trying to be English? What are you trying to be? Why are you using an English name?’

I have noted that resistance by Barb and Margie to the classroom practice of English name use among their Chinese and Taiwanese students has to do with different conceptions and performances of selves and the presupposition of an existential relationship between one’s formal name, one’s ethnicity, nationality and/or physiognomy, and one’s true or authentic
Identity. Identity from such a modernist perspective is not an emergent and dialogic phenomenon. For Margie, there is an alignment between a student’s formal name and his or her authentic self, so that she can argue that when using an English name as a Chinese or Taiwanese student, ‘you’re putting a label on yourself that is showing people a false you. They [i.e. interlocutors] don’t know who you really are.’

For Margie, therefore, one’s name as ethnic or L1 marker should be unproblematically synonymous with one’s identity; it is how one is known professionally, argues Margie, and how one is positioned in terms of categories like nationality. According to such a heuristic, both name and identity are unitary and singular. In order to understand Margie’s position on the practice in terms of her understanding of authentic performances of self, using a formal Chinese name, it is illustrative to consider the one example Margie discusses of a Chinese student whom she positions as legitimately using an English name. Margie considers the case of Macau student Vicky, aligning her legitimate use of an English name (i.e. a 24/7 undertaking irrespective of context and contingencies) with that of Hong Kong actor, Jackie Chan. Margie argues that ‘Jackie Chan signs his autograph as Jackie Chan. He’s known as Jackie Chan; that is his name.’ Similarly, Vicky had ‘internalised’ the name she acquired at school, perhaps at age 5, so much so that it appeared on her graduate diploma.

The key to Margie’s licensing of Vicky’s use of an English name is this notion of her having ‘internalised’ it to the extent that her mother and father also used her English name, despite having not given her that name. Moreover, it is a name that she has used since her Chinese classroom baptism when she was five and it appears on official documents. To paraphrase and conflate both Austin (1975) and Althusser (1971), from Margie’s perspective, Vicky has been felicitously interpellated, so that every subsequent iteration of her hailing into being, including that done by Margie as university lecturer and administrator signing the university certificates, is legitimate.
In contrast to this is Margie’s positioning of student Seven as illegitimately using an inappropriate English name – for Margie, in a sense a double negative. Margie positions Seven as presenting a false self to the world, as falsely performing self. This is because the name Seven is used dialogically by the Chinese student, according to his reading of the local circumstances – the heteroglossia – of the interaction and, therefore, underpinning his construction of the interactive event. The name as emergent phenomenon like the self as emergent thing is positioned by Margie as an illegitimate and unlicensed performance. Margie’s proscription of Seven’s practice is premised on an understanding of identity performance, in which Seven ‘can’t start saying, ”Oh that’s my real name, but everyone in Australia can call me Seven”, because it’s saying that I have a real name that’s a work name and I have a name that’s not appropriate for work.’ It hardly needs pointing out that many people are addressed differently at work to how they might be addressed with friends or among family.

5.5.2 ‘But then you gradually grow up and it's like the whole thing K; it's not just always be nice and sweet and cute.’

Reflecting on their own English name changes throughout school, Aurora and Andrea recall that certain English names and indeed English sounds became inappropriate as a Chinese subject grew up. Andrea recalls her classmates’ derision of her first English name, Vicky, and she describes it as sounding ‘quite naïve’, suitable for ‘a little girls, but not for me [now].’ Aurora describes ‘the whole thing K’, meaning the popularity of English names that began with a /k/ sound among her peers, when reflecting on the popularity in her primary school experiences of the name Candy, for example. Aurora observed that as one grows up, life is no longer about being ‘nice and sweet and cute’ and consequently one’s English name needs to reflect the person who has arrived at this awareness. For Aurora and Andrea, English names that started with /k/ did not perform this identity function.

That said, Taiwanese Candy, whose name was derived by her mother from English language cassettes played at home, exemplifies Aurora’s theory when she observes that, contrary to when using her Chinese name, when she is known as Candy, ‘people will think I’m quite sweet, and that’s what changes my personality as well.’ In much the same way as Andrea and Aurora above,
Eason charts his three successive English name changes from the EFL Chinese primary school classroom to graduate program at an Australian university, describing his English name as ‘complicated’ but ‘improving all the time.’

As a primary school boy he chose the name Steven from a comic book as the character represented a powerful individual, yet when he arrived at junior high, many other boys were also called Steven. Therefore, comic book fantasy gave way to individuality and creativity and Eason invented the acronymic name BOP (standing for Be of Perfect) until after some time his friends explained that L1 English-speaking people would never use such a name. Finally, individual creativity and a concern with English native speaker licence gave way to Chinese creativity and Eason chose his present name, that of a Hong Kong pop star and homophonic with his Chinese name, but also ‘created by Chinese people, [so] maybe it doesn’t exist in English’ – an irruption, and perhaps a disruption, redolent with Bhabha’s (2004) idea of ‘third space’. We also find ourselves in Li Wei’s (2011) playful ‘translanguaging space’, featuring language users ‘going between different linguistic structures and systems and going beyond them’ and in Blommaert’s (2003, p. 611) realm of ‘fantastic semiotic creativity’, as we picture Eason travelling through identity construction and language use beginning with the cartoon-esque and commonplace through the acronymic and unique to the hybridised and relocalised.

5.5.4 ‘But then, once you start working, you change back your Chinese name. You just get your foot in the door.’

With specific reference to Sri Lankan learners of English in the early 20th century colonial era, Canagarajah rhetorically enquires as to how these Sri Lankans might learn English while at the same time continuing their engagement with ‘their vernacular community and culture’ (p. 116), especially when such vernacular practices were frequently proscribed and stigmatised. Canagarajah (2004) identifies this as a conflict common to many subjects of colonisation. Given the proscription of local practices by the British colonisers, Canagarajah (1990) describes the subjects’ identities as being variously ‘dual’ and ones of ‘hybridity’ (p. 116). The example that Canagarajah (2004, p. 121) provides from colonial era Sri Lanka is what he terms the ‘double-faced behavior’ of local Hindus, who presented duplicitously as Christian in order to qualify for
better employment and education opportunities. Although, I prefer to not posit the binary of a
dual or hybrid identity – of ‘double-faced behaviour’ – as Canagarajah (1990) does, but rather to
discuss fluidity and contingency, I identify a near identical practice and account among Dan and
Qian when discussing job application processes.

Qian notes a belief among some Chinese students that potential Australian employers will tend
to disregard résumés from Chinese job applicants who do not use or include English names. The
rationale provided by Qian for interchanging between English and Chinese names when
submitting written employment applications represents a strategic and nuanced presentation of
self through language use. Moreover, it exemplifies possession of cultural capital: a knowledge of
the workings of institutional racism in mainstream Australian culture and a linguistic strategy for
its subversion. Indeed, the laughter which Qian’s comment elicited from her fellow Chinese and
Taiwanese focus group discussion participants when she adds the rejoinder that ‘but then, once
you start working, you change back your Chinese name [having used your English name on your
résumé]. You just get your foot in the door’ suggests that this strategy combines Li Wei’s (2011)
creative and critical use of English language resources as part of the strategic repertoire for
identity construction.

Knowingly or otherwise, when Qian, for example, discusses her strategic use of either her
Chinese or English name in workplace contexts – the English name on her résumé, but an
insistence on her Chinese name being used in the workplace upon getting the job – she displays
a strategic understanding of the racially discriminatory practices of some Australian employers.
In a follow-up email response, Qian states she is prepared to have her Chinese name clumsily or
wrongly pronounced at work and will provide instruction in its pronunciation as appropriate.
Booth, Leigh, and Varganova’s (2009) research used an ‘audit discrimination experiment’ (p. 6),
in which fake CV’s using ethnically and racially identifiable names were submitted for over 5000
jobs using an online job-finding website. The researchers found that Chinese applicants needed
to send 50% more applications to receive an equivalent number of callbacks as Anglo-Saxon
applicants.
While articulating a respect for her focus group discussion fellow Linda for tending to insist on interlocutors in Australia using her Chinese name, Olivia argues that the key to the practice in broader Australian contexts of workplaces and university classrooms is that it indexes, firstly, the preparedness to connect with Australian people and, secondly, stereotypically Australian values such as open-mindedness. In Excerpt 5.10, Olivia discusses the practice as signifying a propensity to connect with a generalized Australian public.

**5.10 Olivia on connotations of connectedness aligned with the practice**

1. Olivia: When you use an English name, it's familiar to Australian people
2. so when they see your name there's this kind of positive
3. connotation with people; if this people call, "I know Angel" [a
4. fellow Chinese participant in the focus group discussion], you have
5. positive connotation; you have something relate to this name. If
6. you have Chinese name, there's nothing to Australian people;
7. there's no connection.

In Excerpt 5.11, I present Aurora, aligning herself alternatively as Chinese-named industrious student and English-named nightclub promoter, and to workplace volunteer Andrea, as they discuss the strategic interchangeability of Aurora’s English and Chinese names. As if to reinforce the reading that I propose for Aurora’s account, she uses the word ‘protection’ to describe one affordance of an English name, an interesting parallel with Dan’s earlier suspicions about her Chinese landlord’s use of an English name. The name choice instantiated Aurora’s clearly divided and self-ascribed English and/or Chinese identities. Aurora is the Chinese student in Australia who promotes nightclub events and dresses quite differently from her Chinese-named double, who studies diligently with other Chinese students. Andrea describes this as their ‘double identity’, witnessed alternatively by their two different groups of friends – one Chinese and the other Australian – ‘who seldom mix’. In 5.11, Andrea refers to the confidence she acquires when addressed, when interpellated or called into being, as Andrea in her volunteer workplace.
5.11  **Aurora on double identities and the protection of an English name**

1. Aurora: [With] my English-speaking friends, I go parties, drinking. And my
2. Chinese friends, study, basically. [laughter]
3. Andrea: I feel like when people call me Andrea, or I say, "I am
4. Andrea", I am more outgoing cos usually I'm in a public sphere.
5. When I'm doing something, like, volunteer or just work part-time,
6. people will call me Andrea, I will be more confident.
7. Aurora: [several turns later] So, I guess the English name provides a sense
8. of protection.

Granted these are considerably less fluid and metroethnic understandings of identity than
Olivia’s ambivalent cosmopolitanism (and Maher’s, 2005), but nevertheless they indicate a
strategic and situated deployment of English names according to readings of and alignments
within specific contexts. Olivia had studied and worked in Melbourne for longer than Andrea and
Aurora and, moreover, referred to herself as considerably more cosmopolitan and less so
bilingual and bicultural (i.e. proficient in English/Australian, French and Chinese) than Andrea
and Aurora so, inevitably, such factors might influence perceptions and constructions of self
through these language practices. Nevertheless, all three parties obtain the effects desired
through the practice.

**Transnational publics**

I now consider the implications of these findings on the practice of English name use among
Chinese and Taiwanese drawing upon Nonomi and Ong’s (1997) transnational strategies for
modern Chinese identities and subjectivities. In doing so, I reject the idea that a person simply
“has” or “possesses” an identity. For example, Rouse (1995) observes that much liberal discourse
on identity describes it as ‘something that unproblematically connects individuals to society’,
with individuals who share some common trait thereby having an “identity” as members of a
particular group in society. In contrast, post-structuralist studies discuss identities and bodies, although variously marked, possessed, and experienced, as unstable agglomerations constituted within circumstantial and dialogic constraints of power relations. As a result, different tropes of identity, those of gender, age, nationality, subculture, and dominant culture (cf. Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) intersect in and constitute individuals.

An individual becomes, therefore, a site of differences, at times complementary or conflicting; there is no inconsistency or inauthenticity implied by this observation. The striated and dialogic heteroglossia Bakhtin (1981) apprehends in everyday language use, is also evident in everyday identity performance. A person like Olivia may be simultaneously Chinese, Australian, Commerce student, and cosmopolitan, as well as all of these combined. What is invoked, or when this is invoked, what passes (cf. Bucholtz, 2005) and what does not, is derived from particular circumstances and configurations of the social relations that constitute the everyday world. Nonomi and Ong (1997, pp 24-5) discuss identities that are ‘shaped by the intersections between localizing regimes of truth, on the one hand, and the articulations, practices, and deterritorialized imaginaries of subjects who operate in reference to a transnational world, on the other.’

I see this with, for example, Vicky on the one hand and Seven on the other hand in Canagarajah’s (2003) power-laden Australian university classroom. When considering the subjectivities of contemporary diasporic Chinese, identities not dissimilar to those performed by my student participants, Nonomi and Ong (1997) observe identities forged through ties to different geographical places as well as through what they identify as ‘a propensity to sojourning as a way of life’ (Nonomi and Ong, 1997, pp 24-5). A propensity at once aided by and accommodating of globalised and mobile movements of capital and labour. As a result, the authors describe seemingly contradictory subjectivities, simultaneously fluid, fleeting and fragmentary, ‘but also enabling of an agency to circumvent certain modalities of control [e.g. nation-states] while taking advantage of others.’ Macro-level demographic categories like ethnicity and nationality, those preferred by Margie, as anchored to specific histories and geographies are diminished and
disrupted by these fluid and fragmentary globalized sojourners, migrants, and travellers. The various ingredients that comprise globalisation (e.g. digital and online communications, mass media, global travel, mobile capital and labour) disrupt the body politic of nation-states creating instead what Nonomi and Ong’s (1997, pp 24-5) term ‘transnational publics’.

As a consequence of these global flows of information, images, ideas, and people, transnational publics challenge state-derived and national ideologies for the construction of identities. Nonomi and Ong (1997, pp. 25-6) describe transnational publics as constituting ‘new Chinese subjectivities that are increasingly independent of place, self-consciously postmodern, and subversive of national regimes of truth.’ Much like the findings of Rampton’s (1995) crossing or Bucholtz’ (1995) passing, these new Chinese subjectivities can play with different cultural fragments, not always as we have seen successfully, in ways that can facilitate them transcend established discourses and practices, experimenting with a variety of forms of identification, and resisting, if not always avoiding, imposed instances of macro-level demographic identifications.

5.6 HETEROGLOSSIA

"The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276)"

English as a lingua franca: language for communication, language for identity

In her 2003 discussion of characteristics of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), House distinguishes languages for communication from languages for identity, wherein the former is ‘a useful instrument for making oneself understood in international encounters’ (p. 559). The discussion recalls Canagarajah’s (2008) distinction between English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and Lingua Franca English (LFE), in which ELF posits a prefabricated language system used by speakers whose first languages are not English. LFE, on the other hand, argues for a resource emergent in
contexts of use: ‘intersubjectively constructed in each specific context of interaction...[so that]...it cannot be characterised outside the specific interaction and speakers in a communicative context’ (Canagarajah 2007, p. 91). House (2003) summarises ELF as neither restricted language for special purposes, nor pidgin, nor interlanguage, but one ingredient in a repertoire of different communicative instruments at a non-native English speaker’s disposal, a useful and versatile tool, a 'language for communication'. In describing LFE as such, House (2003) argues that it can be distinguished from the other ingredients in an individual's repertoire, which function instead as 'language(s) for identification.'

In articulating this distinction, House (2003, p. 560) argues that non-native English speakers are unlikely to think of ELF as a 'language for identification' because ‘local languages, and particularly an individual's L1(s)’ are likely to be primary determinants of identity, which means holding a stake in the collective linguistic-cultural capital that defines the L1 group and its members.’ Moreover, House (2003, p. 560) argues that ELF, not being a national language, but instead ‘a mere tool bereft of collective cultural capital’, is unsuitable for marking identity or for indexing a speaker’s ‘positive ('integrative') disposition toward an L2 group’ for the reason that there is no such thing as ‘a definable group of ELF speakers’.

Nevertheless, it is a tangled argument that House (2003) builds. Its assumptions about ‘collective cultural capital’ and a ‘definable group of speakers’ are undone, for example, by the third wave work of Rampton’s (1995) ‘crossing’ and Nonomi and Ong’s (1997) ‘transnational publics’ and new Chinese subjectivities, in which normatively out-group deployment of repertoire-based language items in situated and strategic ‘local’ settings are key elements of identity performance, not simply communication. House’s (2003) ELF argument, despite acknowledging the participant- and interaction-level negotiation of meanings and indexicalities, falls back on identities as predominantly L1-determined and a priori, not emergent. In other words, that it is a speaker’s L1 that provides the linguistic foundation for his or her identity work and it is only native speakers of this L1 who can undertake felicitously such identity work.
5.6.1 ‘When I tried to find one and I see Vicky first and I choose it. No reason.’

Some of my participants (students and lecturers) believe that when its pragmatic functions are considered, the practice of English name use approximates House’s (2003) language of communication. As sections 5.1 to 5.4 of this chapter demonstrate, some participants argue that their primary reasons for using English names are fundamentally pragmatic, yet I argue that, unlike House’s (2003) languages for communication, the practice is not ‘a mere tool bereft of collective cultural capital’ (p. 560), despite some participants’ wishes or beliefs that it might be (i.e. that English names used are largely just labels or tools of convenience). For example, Margie described students’ enactment of the practice, the Sevens and the Elsas, as ‘putting a label on…that is showing people a false you.’ Similarly, Margie and Barb’s discussion of the appropriateness of some of the names used in relation to their ideology of Australian naming practices invoked Bakhtin’s (1981) argument that ‘every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal stratifying forces).’

This, Bakhtin (1981, p. 272) continues, is ‘the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school’, in which the analysis of any utterance, in this case the outcome of a translingual practice: an English name, ‘exposed it as a contradiction-riddled, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.’ There are therefore two types of dialogism which the word as utterance likely encounters. The first is with ‘an alien word within the object itself’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282), which is evident above in the semantic clash between Seven as affective sound poem and Seven as number (and, therefore, not name). The second is ‘the subjective belief system of the listener…sometimes crassly accommodating, sometimes provocatively polemical’ (p. 282), which represents Margie and Barb’s linguistic ideology as subjective belief system, polemical and proscriptive in the case of the former, yet increasingly accommodating upon the conclusion of our focus group discussion. In the power-laden setting of the university classroom,

‘Many words stubbornly resist, others remain alien, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them and who now speaks them; they cannot be assimilated into his
So, I augment the identity work attempted and achieved through the practice of English name use and discussed in 5.6 and focus on these heteroglossic dimensions of the practice, the state of play of any language and languaging all the time: this clash between users’ desires and intentions – their attempts at positioning and alignment or at relatively simple pragmatism – and their interlocutors’ reading of the practice’s multiple meanings or indexicalities. Both camps (the pragmatist students and the L1 English lecturers) in their efforts to fix unitary meaning on their language use represent the centripetal, conservative forces of a presumed ‘unitary language’, one that is never simply given but is ‘posited’, at every moment of its linguistic life, opposed to the realities of heteroglossia’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 270). Nevertheless, such stratification and heteroglossia are the forces that provide language with dynamics: ‘Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear ... (p. 272) ... every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces).’ Bakhtin (1981, p. 272) continues that ‘it is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.’

Some of the participants chose their English names from purpose-built dictionaries or internet searches as homework exercises or peer group practices, and some received them in dispassionate classroom baptisms, in some cases bamboozled (cf. Dan as Dolphin) by the wherefores of the name. In many cases, these names, derived from dictionaries or allocated from lists, can appear to be in their origins and reference what Bakhtin (p. 1981, p. 294) castigates as a ‘neutral and impersonal language (it is not after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!)’. The illusion created by these baptisms is that these names-as-words are borne of dictionaries and web pages, perhaps heard once or twice in Hollywood movies or on English language learning cassettes: flat, black and white, waiting to be chosen. However, the
fact is as Bakhtin (1981, p. 294) states, a word ‘exists in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions.’ The misapprehension of such baptism is that the words in dictionaries and then having been appropriated from dictionaries remain neutral and neutered, despite their all the time presence in translingual heteroglossia (neither English alone nor Chinese; not a Chinglish interlanguage, but of the repertoire-derived translingualism).

So, I argue that it is these initial circumstances of the names’ bestowal and adoption – more often than not Chinese and Taiwanese classroom exercises in the main, seldom to be used and unknown to others beyond the walls of the language class – that allows them to attain the appearance of neutrality, passivity, two-dimensionality and abstraction for some of the students. They would seem to simply be tools to obviate mispronunciation or misapprehension by non-Chinese others in some faraway future, suspending the names in a vacuum removed temporarily from the word’s heteroglossic multi-dimensionality, obscuring for some of their bearers the knowledge that they have a verbal hand grenade in their possession, primed to explode. And explode it can as it:

"enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgements and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276)."

However, even in Beijing and Taipei, we have learned from Olivia, Candy, Eason and Angel, the names are already brimming with meaning, as much as a Starbucks in Hangzhou or payment for a cocktail with US dollars in a Shanghai bar brims with transnational and capitalist significance: tertiary education, travel abroad, bourgeois values and aspirations, private multinational employment and salary. Recall Vincent doing his English language homework, avoiding the name John for its slang meaning of toilet, and Jodi mishearing or mis-recalling Angelina Jolie’s surname and so settling for a name that subsequently she could associate with US actress and director, Jodie Foster. Accordingly, many of my participants – as Andrea and Aurora discussed – claimed
new and different English names from the ones given, investing them with their own significance and meaning, desiring to counter the centripetal with the centrifugal, all the time contributing to the living heteroglossia of languaging, rather than the nation-based territorial boundaries of language.

In conclusion, I imagine the utterance by a Chinese or Taiwanese student of an English name that answers the question “Who are you?” or completes the statement “I am ...”, understanding Bakhtin’s (1981, p. 276) observation that ‘no living word relates to its object in a singular way.’ Most likely, it is not a deliberately parodic or transgressive English name with which the student answers, but what he or she describes as a ‘label’ and intends as a neutral marker chosen to facilitate the English-speaking interlocutors’ pronunciation and memory. Drawing from my logged field notes and Harris (2008) a selection of names presented by students, university administrators and lecturers, and tertiary language school managers, I note the transgressive name Hitler, enrolled in a Melbourne tertiary English language school, is predictably greeted with censoriousness (the threat of expulsion unless the name was substituted for another from the English language school ... from the English language); the ludic name Toilet arouses suspicion of limited English language proficiency and cultural capital/savvy; the antiquated name Daisy suggested hopelessly outdated notions of femininity and passivity; the mispronounced Hailey (spoken as Harry) confirms suspicions of illegitimate language use and out group membership; the directly translated Grace or Angel connote again a lack of cultural capital. The innocuous label (i.e. the intended neutral signifier), therefore, intended as compensatory or accommodation device in a perception of language as unitary and centripetal (operating for maximal mutual comprehension) in fact founders in heteroglossia, confounds and contradicts itself.

Before outlining several caveats concerning the uptake of translanguaging approaches by early 21st century sociolinguistics researchers, Canagarajah (2011, p1) outlines several conditions for its achievement. These include the ontological perspective that languages are neither discrete nor separate phenomena but instead integrated as part of a multilingual’s repertoire, ‘accessed
for their communicative purposes’ and that ‘multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication’ so that multilingual competence is a question of ‘repertoire building’ (Canagarajah, 2011, p1) and not abstract mastery of individual languages. In other words, translanguaging is ‘a creative improvisation according to the needs of the context and local situation’ (p. 5). Nevertheless, Canagarajah (2011) also counsels against romanticising translanguaging as solely a (post)modern and metropolitan phenomenon, it having existed in pre-colonial and rural communities throughout South Asia, Africa and South America. Moreover, given that ‘translanguaging is a social accomplishment…[that]…involves shuttling between the languages brought by the other to co-construct meaning’, Canagarajah (2011, p. 4/5) asserts the need for research to consider the dialogical aspects and interactive nature of translanguaging, specifically how others might feel about ‘their codes being appropriated’ (p. 5).

5.7 RELOCALISATION

What we do with language in a particular place is a result of our interpretation of that place; and the language practices we engage in reinforce that reading of place. (Pennycook, 2010, Introduction, p. 2)

Having concluded that the Chinese and Taiwanese naming practices reinforce Bakhtin’s (1981) understanding of all utterances as participating in the dialogised heteroglossia of language, this section addresses the question of where to now for the practice conventionally and chauvinistically labelled “English name” use. Olivia refers to the idea of localisation with reference to a Chinese friend of hers, whose English name was Snow. Olivia describes Snow as trying to use a name that she could relate back to her Chinese-ness, a rationale echoed in the next turn of the same data set by Angel with reference to an English name popular among Chinese young women, Princess. Olivia describes this as being for her an example of localisation,

‘I think people using English names is like a globalisation. Like, Chinese people, they want to be part of the world, so they want to be closer, better communicate
Olivia does not refer to herself as engaging in localisation with her choice or use of English name, articulating an ambivalence about both practice and product: ‘I think just the sound and how it look. Yeah, and I wouldn't, I wouldn't really mind about which one I use.’ However, Aurora, for example, articulates a similar process to localisation when she discusses her English name choice: ‘So, my Chinese name that means sunrise or morning light, so it's Aurora. And it's, like, really unique. I never met any Auroras so far.’

Localisation, therefore, according to this reading is a process by which a language in this case, typically identified as a lingua franca, like English and, indeed, Mandarin Chinese, is understood to have spread across the globe from a native speaker centre or core and in the process acquired local characteristics or flavours of a host culture as it arrives in these different peripheral or satellite settings. The classic expression of this spread theory is Kachru’s (1985) three concentric circles model that influenced the development of a nation-based World Englishes (WE) paradigm. Accordingly, the English name Snow (what prescriptivists might describe as not in fact an English given name at all) is analysed as an example of a local or regional variety of English with a Chinese flavour, as Olivia has done.

Commentators might also argue that what is in evidence here with the use by Chinese of English names like Snow and Princess is rather a localisation of Chinese names. With the WE paradigm mentioned above in mind, I could refer to such an idea as a World Chineses approach. That is to say, as Chinese as an International Language spreads beyond the PRC and Taiwan, for example, it takes on the local flavours of its disparate and diasporic satellite locations. So, the Chinese character for Snow or Princess translates instead into its Romanised English semantic or homophonic cognate and, in such a way, a wealth of new English given names is coined, derived from Chinese names, another function of globalisation.

Both these World Englishes and World Chineses models are based on the metaphor of language spread. However, the drawback of notions of localisation – the spread across the globe from
core native speaker contexts of China or Australia – and what inevitably leads to an intractable and enumerative argument about just which language is being localized in such a scenario, is the presumption of languages as a priori systems and structures whose existence may be quantified or enumerated in models like World Englishes, based on regional or national variation or deviation from a fixed core model.

As a result, whenever questions are raised of whether Snow as a given name might be English or Chinese or perhaps a hybridisation of both, some sort of Chinglish, or indeed the use of Snow evidences proficiency or a lack of proficiency, the possession of cultural capital or the lack of cultural capital in any of the two language types above, a resolution for such intractability is to appeal instead to the analyses permitted by translingual approaches to language and languaging. Such approaches include Lingua Franca English (cf. Canagarajah, 2007), and Li Wei’s (2011) translanguaging space; the latter being a non-geographical understanding of space, devised to analyse ‘multilingual speakers’ creative and critical use of the full range of their socio-cultural resources...both going between different linguistic structures and systems and going beyond them.’ If geography is that which speaks of defined territories like nations with attributes like national languages, we prefer to speak instead of geometries, the properties of translanguaging spaces, the products of variable co-ordinates that emphasise a “local” over a locale; a translanguaging space that conforms to our ideas of fleeting and fluid language and identity work, whose coordinates are derived and thus the “shape” of what is being done with language, by considering Pennycook’s (2010, p. 77) three key questions:

- What do language users do with English?
- How do they understand its relationship to their own condition?
- What new meanings are generated by its use?

These analyses share a consideration of language as not existing a priori or external to the socio-historical and geo-political moments of its use. Rather, language or languaging, is understood as a process and as emergent. For example, Blommaert (2003, p. 609) seeks to counter notions of
linguistic imperialism, that is the spread metaphor of English that eliminates local languages, with a sociolinguistics of globalisation that addresses the fact that English ‘enters the repertoire of language users as a resource that fulfills both pragmatic functions and metapragmatic ones.’ One task of Blommaert’s (2003) sociolinguistics of globalisation is then ‘to discover what such reorderings of repertoires actually mean and represent to people’ (p. 609), and to describe in turn the ‘fantastic semiotic creativity’ (p. 611) that Blommaert’s (2003) ‘late-modern discourse’ (p. 611) both produces and is a product of.

For my purposes, this approach, complementary to an understanding of language use as dialogised heteroglossia, allows for a move away from language products to language processes, and, therefore, the question of what to call these products so as not to reify languages over languaging, structures over repertoire (i.e. English names or Chinese names?), is avoided. For example, Aurora recalled her Chinese parents still used Slavic-scripted Russian names on their diaries, a practice retained from their earlier sojourn in the Soviet Union. We learned that some Chinese students of French might be given French names for classroom use, and that among Taiwanese girls (but not mainland Chinese) Japanese “English names” are popular. The point being that normatively speaking this practice does not only involve English names being used – recall Eason’s comparison between use of English names and use of US dollars: contingent on economic hegemony and not some inherent quality of US currency. The practice is in fact truly translingual and to uncritically refer to the outcomes of the practice as English names is to (a) emphasise the product at the expense of the practice or process and (b) privilege English over other possibilities. I consider now how to best represent those other possibilities.

Pennycook (2010) elides such earlier attempts at enumeration of languages as systems and variations with regional or national flavours with his concept of relocalisation, at once a reworking of both localisation and recontextualisation. The “local” in relocalisation is understood not as a geographical concept (i.e. a fixed and specific national or regional place), but as instead a fluid, sometimes fleeting, and dynamic geometrical arrangement, the existential and ephemeral function of a series of sociolinguistic intersections (place, persons, protocols), which
does not exist outside its particular ‘realm of practice’ (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 94). Pennycook, (2010, p. 71) describes it as ‘a social practice constantly reconstructed in sensitivity to environmental factors.’ It involves a sociolinguistic analysis ‘that is drawn away from a language entity called English with peripheral variants...[whereby]...we are directed instead to the doing of language in particular localities.’ “Context” implies something systematic and sustained (e.g. the invariable context of a university classroom), whereas “local” captures the possibility of shifting and short-lived spaces or sociolinguistic geometries.

Recall the Chinese student from my university tutorial experience in 4.7.2, who when attendance was checked was the third of three Chinese students present to give a Chinese name. Upon commenting to the three Chinese students at the end of class on what a statistical anomaly that seemed to me (i.e. all three Chinese students in an Australian university tutorial using Chinese names rather than English ones), the third student replied that ordinarily he would have given an English name. However, because the other two before him had used Chinese names, he too decided there and then to use his Chinese name in preference to his English one. The key ingredient was the behavior of his compatriot peers in that particular “local”, what I have termed relati...
This then is why Pennycook (2010), among others of the sociolinguistic third wave, assert that
language should be analysed as a social practice and as the product of repeated social activity so
that the emphasis is on the particularities of the local, rather than on more universalistic
context/s. When this is achieved, analysis can also account for observations and findings that
might normatively seem anomalous and unsystematic: products of a fleeting moment and a fluid
practice, readings of a sociohistorical “local”, whose very particulars and peculiarities might
never again be reproduced, or whose particulars and peculiarities are so regularly reproduced as
to attain the simulacra or chimera of permanence and normality.

For Pennycook (2010), a relocalisation approach is an inversion of the traditional analytical
relationship between language and practice, in so far as the investigation begins with a local
practice (e.g. the norm or tendency of Australian university classroom first name basis
introductions and interactions and the Taiwanese and Chinese students’ negotiation of this) and
examines its ‘linguistic instantiation’ (p. 77) (i.e. the near-ubiquitous employment by Chinese and
Taiwanese interlocutors of English given names for reasons outlined above that might be
analysed as both pragmatically Chinese and Australian). Therefore, what I arrive at is a
relocalisation of the practice of English first name use, a translingual practice, a dialogised
heteroglossia; something whose form or product might appear normatively to be English, yet
whose function simultaneously services both Chinese and Australian (in this case) language and
identity practices.

Thinking of the more commonplace or mainstream names used by my Chinese and Taiwanese
student participants like Suzie, Sophie and Olivia and the more eccentric and creative like Eason,
Seffie and Aurora, I arrive at what Pennycook (2010, p. 35) describes as ‘the possibility of
simultaneous sameness and difference.’ That is, what is [mis]understood to be the appearance
of sameness in the deployment of English names, yet what simultaneously functions as or
indexes quite different language and identity desires. Moreover, these desires as presented in
the research data are multifarious and complex, ranging from the relatively straight-forwardly
pragmatic to the meta-pragmatic of identity negotiation and alignment in the eyes of self and Other.

Something further to note is that when considering the puzzling indexicalities which the practice can elicit from a variety of commentators and interlocutors, its partaking of the heteroglossia that defines a language at any given moment and place; the tension between the centripetal and the centrifugal – this essential quality of simultaneous sameness and difference explains much of their incomprehensibility and misunderstanding. For example, consider Qian’s initial and abandoned attempts to use English names with her Australian friends. The simultaneity of sameness and difference, the double-voicedness of the utterance, was lost on them, and in a friendlier, certainly, but equally proscriptive manner to Seven’s silencing, Qian was repudiated by native speaker gatekeepers.

5.12 Qian on attempts at simultaneous similarity and difference

1. Qian: But then when I tried to use back my English name, my friend[s] start to laugh at me. They say, "[derisive snort] You are not Lisa; you're not Rachel; you're not Lilly", because in their mind they have people, like, if you know someone whose name is Lisa and if you tell them you're Lisa, they look at you and say, "You're not Lisa; you're not Rachel." [laughter from Qian]

Nor is the practice a mimicry indexing reappropriation-as-resistance in a post-colonial sense (although the potential for that is noted by lecturer Barb and one imagines such outré name choices as Hitler and Toilet from Harris (2008) data as approaching this11), nor is it simplistic copying, a “yet another” kind of self-effacing and stereotypical example of Chinese plagiarism.

---

11 I present Jenks’ observation that Chinese naming tends to differ from Australian in that Chinese people historically share a relatively small number of family names, so tend to find diversity in first names used. Conversely, Jenks notes (as supported by research into this phenomenon), Anglo-Australian traditionally share a relatively small pool of largely biblically-derived given names and a wider range of family names. Jenks’ key point is that were he to choose the common English name Peter then as Peter Wang, he would share this name with a large number of other Chinese; however, as Jenks Wang (using an idiosyncratic “English” first name, his is likely to be a singular full name.
Rather I argue that the practice is ‘repetition as an act of difference, relocalisation, renewal’ (Pennycook, 2010, p. 36). Pennycook (2010, p. 41) argues that ‘local language practices repeat difference, and not sameness.’ What I see is not simply that the same things are repeated in different instances of language use or contexts as with recontextualisation. Instead, language use is analysed in terms of ‘fertile mimesis’ (p. 42), so that relocalisation is understood as ‘a form of language repetition that creates difference’ yet superficially appears to reproduce sameness. Heraclitus of Ephesus asserted that the same river is never stepped in twice, although it retains both its name and its territorial geography; it is the water that forever gushes towards a sea.

5.7.1 ‘My aunt was working in one of the company, and then it's kind of like foreign trade company, and they give my aunty a name, they say, um, it's called Yuki, And she say, "No, it's not a English name."'

Pennycook (2010) emphasises ‘the ideas of fertile mimesis [his italics], of copying that goes slightly wrong, of repetition that is something else, of sameness that is difference’ (p. 37). This linguistic ideology acknowledges the ambivalent status of the utterance, whereby ‘ostensibly identical utterances...carry significantly different meanings and significance in different contexts’ (Lu and Horner, 2013, p. 30). Fertile mimesis has a convoluted epistemological provenance, which Bhabha (1994, p. 33) ascribes to Foucault’s original notion of ‘repeatable materiality.’ Repeatable materiality is understood as a process by which ‘any change in the statement’s conditions of use and reinvestment, any alteration in its field of experience or verification, or indeed any difference in the problem to be solved, can lead to the emergence of a new statement, the difference of the same’ (Bhabha, 1994, p. 33). This is an analysis of language as a local and dialogic practice in which difference is taken to be the norm and sameness ‘as that which needs to justify itself’ (p. 37).

The contention is that seemingly stable and systematic foundations for human behaviour (e.g. gender cf. Butler, 1990; grammar cf. Hopper, 1998), upon or through which many human practices are predicated, are indeed mistakenly analysed as ‘same’ and as stable, when in fact such sameness and stability are ‘the effects of repetition’ (p. 46), illusions brought about by often unremarkable, daily iterations. This is a sedimented repetition that is the product of
historically specific relations of knowledge and power, not something ahistorically intrinsic to this or that language. Pennycook (2010) refers to the work of ‘more socially oriented linguists’ (p 40), who have surmised that, firstly, ‘repetition in discourse may be the norm rather than the exception’ (cf. Hopper, 1998). Pennycook (2010) also notes there is considerable regularity of creative language use, in which repetition plays an important role; so much so that creativity might be understood as the default mode and non-creativity, therefore, the aberration.

Pennycook (2010) produces the fundamental syllogism that if, firstly, the breaking of putative norms is indeed, paradoxically, the norm and, secondly, repetition enjoys an important role in creative language use, then conventional understandings of rule-based language systems require realignment. This is because the norm would seem to be repetitive and creative rule-breaking; in a sense, hardly a norm at all. Accordingly, seeming ‘non-creative repetition of language is in fact more creative than first thought...[wherein]...local language practices repeat difference, not sameness.’ What my research highlights is a situated social practice, not examples of peripheral and deviant language use. To analyse the practice according to conventional English language-as-system norms is to reify languages as a priori structures, operating independently of local sociolinguistic geometries. To do so is to also privilege the utterances of those that best accord with this reified model of system and structure, so that digressions from and disruptions to these norms acquire the status of deviant and deficient use and can be dismissed, at times ridiculed and proscribed, and marked accordingly.

Moreover, surrounding and infusing instances of the practice are communities of practice (cf. Wenger, 1998): at once L1 Mandarin-speaking and Chinese or Taiwanese, but also significantly different from other such dispersed and diasporic communities across the globe (e.g. Diao’s 2014 cohort) as to require understandings beyond the conventional of Chinese or Confucian naming and address practices. In closing, I refer to Pennycook’s (2010) argument that ‘the mimetic enactment of language may radically relocalise what superficially may appear to be the same, then a use of English...may be full of multiple meanings of identification, localisation, imitation and reinterpretation (p. 50).’ The paradox is that the fixed language structures and
systems favoured by the centripetal forces of linguistic conservatism and prescriptivism are not the default condition of language. Rather it is the tension and torque engineered by dialogised heteroglossia and manifest in relocalisation that underscores language.

*If we view language practices as a set of social activities that are always bound up with other practices, as mediating between the activity of language and the larger social sphere, we can see how social practices are relocalized in language and language practices are relocalized as other forms of doing* (Pennycook, 2010, p. 136).

Such an understanding of language as languaging encourages the questioning of 20th century linguistic concepts like borrowing, code-switching and multilingualism (Pennycook, 2010, p. 83); concepts that operate according to a languages-as-systems-and-structures model. Under such 20th century models, the Chinese and Taiwanese practice of English name use might be analysed as an instance of borrowing, perhaps at times as code-switching. I reject that analysis and its underlying ideology. Similarly, Pennycook (2010) argues that 20th century conceptions of identity articulated in terms of discreet ethnicities and cultures, of macro-level demographics like L1, as we have seen, become theoretically unsustainable within such analyses.

5.8 **Summary**

This chapter has discussed my research findings in light of themes derived from conventions of Chinese naming and address practices and address forms as well as approaches from “third wave” variationist sociolinguistics, the latter including translingualism, relocalisation, heteroglossia, crossing and metroethnicity. From a chapter beginning that retained the commonplace descriptor “English names” to describe the products of this practice that is emergent and local, I next proposed “Chinese names” as a putatively more apt terminology, given the practice’s propensity to being analysed according to Chinese and Confucian sociolinguistic norms and values. However, loathe to essentialise behaviours and to homogenise difference through use of such macro-demographic categories as Chinese and Confucian when considering 21st century identity work and language use, I arrived by the chapter’s end at an approach that questions the descriptors “English” and “Chinese”. It also questions the linguistic
ideologies that advance the epistemological categories of “English” and “Chinese” when considering processes and practices of languaging over *a priori* products like languages.

The initial sections of the chapter therefore discussed accounts of the practice that addressed my interest in what it might be about Chinese language and culture – as reluctant as I am to reify such a thing, and in doing so “freeze” it in time and space – that could predispose Chinese and Taiwanese student communities (and their primary and secondary school English teachers) in such numbers to the practice of “English name use”. In essence, and in the absence of such wholesale uptake by international and EAL students from other cultures and countries (cf. Harris, 2008), I sought triggers among the students’ accounts, and from my application of the literature to these accounts and my observations and recordings of the practice enacted *in situ*, for why, when, where and how the practice of English name use among Chinese and Taiwanese originated and occurred. Certainly, there is evidence that Chinese and Confucian naming and address practices and address practices exercise some kind of influence over the practice in terms of themes like relationality, modality, and issue of pronunciation, yet more questions remained about the practice than were answered. To address these questions, I removed the practice and its products from the constraints of 20th century sociolinguistic and structuralist discourses, and applied to it a sociolinguistics of globalisation (cf. Blommaert 2003) with its understandings of transnational publics, transcultural flows, dialogised heteroglossia and translingualism.
6. Conclusion

6.1 Overview of the Study

My study has investigated the naming practices of a selection of Chinese and Taiwanese undergraduate and graduate international students from a range of disciplines at an Australian university. I employed a qualitative approach that included classroom observation and audio-recordings and audio-recorded semi-structured focus group discussions along with some ethnographic elements in an attempt to articulate and analyse the use (and, in a minority of cases for our research participants and settings, non-use) of so-called English names. In doing so, I have sought to determine what the practice looks like in certain local settings, how the research participants account for their practices in these settings and how the practice is in turn accounted for by two university L1 English Australian lecturers. These two participant accounts, provided by the Chinese and Taiwanese students and the university lecturers, function, like the practice itself, as a dialogised heteroglossia that infuses the practice in local settings of everyday interactions. In addressing these concerns, I have also considered why the practice is so substantially confined to Chinese and Taiwanese cohorts and communities of international students in Australia. Finally, I discuss the insights afforded into Chinese identity practices and performances, in light of the intercultural, indeed transcultural, and dialogic interaction among teachers, students, and the researcher, by these naming practices.

My theoretical focus is how identity construction connects to language use and how these two aspects can become sites of considerable contest and negotiation. Specifically, the findings reveal that what is normatively termed “English language” and what are normatively termed “English names” remain sites of dialogic contest and negotiation when analysed using a heuristic of a 21st century ‘post-Labovian, “third wave” variationist sociolinguistics’ (cf. Rampton, 2010), a sociolinguistics of globalisation (cf. Blommaert, 2003), and Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia.
Broadly speaking, I characterise these contests over language and identity practices as between two forces: on the one hand, the Chinese and Taiwanese student participants and their naming practices and, on the other, the two university lecturers and their naming practices, notwithstanding the variation and gradations within these two camps or discourses. In this sense, the practice reveals itself as a type of call and response between student and teacher. That I analyse this contest over language and identity practices – over this product normatively termed English – as one between two forces should cause neither surprise nor concern, because, for Bakhtin (1981) this contest is the incessant and insistent state of all language. Bakhtin (1981) characterises utterances as the intersection points and moments ‘where centrifugal and centripetal forces are brought to bear’ (p. 272). These are forces of linguistic centralisation and decentralisation, of unification and disunification, constituting Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia, a contest also between language as product and as process, between system and repertoire, between fixed and emergent.

Within these two discourse strains – the Chinese and Taiwanese student discourse and the Australian university lecturer discourse – there is variation and contradiction, so there is also further dialogised heteroglossia, or a ‘struggle among socio-linguistic points of view’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 273). This contest between the centripetal and the centrifugal is not so neat as to be clinically binary; there is fuzziness and greyness. For example, just as the lecturers’ accounts of the practice tended to develop with complexity and understanding across the two-hour focus group discussion, there was also a range of perspectives and practices among the Chinese and Taiwanese research participants’ accounts. The heteroglossic tussle, in other words, was not only between lecture and student, but also among students. As English emerged in the data as a site of contest, so too did 21st century Chinese-ness among Nononi and Ong’s (1997) Chinese ‘transnational publics’.

These varying accounts of the practice among the students began with the relatively commonplace perspective that it was non-Chinese speaker mispronunciation and mis-recall of
Chinese names that precipitates the naming practice. If this were the case, I wondered, why then is the practice evident, if not indeed inaugurated, in L1 Mandarin and normatively Chinese settings like mainland primary schools and Taiwanese secondary schools and among the new middle classes in Shanghai multinational workplaces and Starbucks coffee houses. Another account then involved the characterisation of “true” Chinese names as written, glyph-based entities, whose spoken counterparts (be they said by fellow Chinese or my non-Chinese) were not simply shadows of the written characters, but barely comparable utterances dependent on the contextual and contingent aspects of the interaction, like the Confucian dyadic relationship between speakers. According to this account, and to recall lecturer Margie’s pithy assertion: one does not have a name, one has a relationship. Within such a perspective, I argued, it seems no wonder that a more purpose-built English name is employed when the Chinese name remains largely absent from spoken engagements within Chinese and Taiwanese social practice.

For some Chinese and Taiwanese participants, the practice of English name use was understood to signal a preparedness (or pretence) to assimilate Australian cultural norms and values or to mitigate racist workplace recruitment tendencies among Australian employees. These included a tendency towards first-name basis interactions among work colleagues or between lecturers and students that jarred for many Chinese and Taiwanese students when their Chinese first names (i.e. given names) were used. For some others, like Olivia, the English name was analogised with the ephemeral and protean qualities of clothing, while the Chinese name was the fixed body beneath. According to this analogy, an individual tried on English names and attendant identities as he or she might choose clothes, based on mood, a function of playfulness and ambivalence, as much as practicality. Finally, I cannot overlook the three participants who resisted the practice and, with varying degrees of vehemence and success, preferred their Chinese names to be used. What my thesis therefore achieves in analysing the practice in situ as dialogised heteroglossia is Bakhtin’s (1981, p. 272) ‘concrete and detailed analysis of an utterance [i.e. an “English name”], once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.’
6.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

My study is a systematic attempt to understand a contemporary and cross-cultural language practice and identity performance whose diversity, near ubiquity, proteanism and liminality in my work, life and research experience seldom fails to elicit comment, confusion and oftentimes condescension from university colleagues and everyday interactants alike. The wealth of primary and secondary data I have obtained contributes to a corpus of what Rampton (2010) describes as ‘contemporary urban vernaculars’. Previous studies into the practice as English classroom phenomenon drawn primarily from mainland Chinese or United States settings have tended to overlook the dialogic perspectives and engagement of the classroom teacher or lecturer involved, unless the researcher himself or herself had fulfilled this role. As a result, the dialogic contest over not just the meanings of the practice, but the questions over the legitimacy and authenticity of the language and identity displays undertaken have tended to be overlooked. This has tended to occur because the focus of other researchers has often been on the products of this linguistic phenomenon, that is the hugely problematic red herring of “English names”, to the diminution, if not exclusion, of the processes implicit in and instantiative of the language performances.

Diao (2014, p. 213), for example, notes that those among her four Chinese graduate research participants at a United States university who had commenced their study program using English names subsequently made the decision to ‘surrender’ to seniority and status, acceding to the wishes of their United States university professors by permitting the latter to use their Chinese (‘ethnic’) names in spoken interaction. My study did not reveal a similar kind of “surrender”. Instead, the study found resistance from Chinese and Taiwanese students to attempts by the university lecturers and administrators to proscribe their intended naming practices. At the same time, the study found resistance on behalf of the students to the lecturers’ attempts to mandate use of Chinese names in classroom, spoken interactions.
As a result of such contestation and resistance over language use and cultural display, innovative strategies frequently emerged among the students, like the use of different names with different lecturers. These strategies were in turn sometimes read by non-Chinese others, like university lecturers and administrators, as duplicitous or disingenuous. In fact, I argue that they are logical and lexical outcomes of a heteroglossic tussle for rights to enact linguistic ideologies, cultural particularities, and translocal sensibilities at a socio-historical moment where centrifugal and centripetal forces were brought to bear (cf. Bakhtin, 1981).

A key significance of the study’s findings is to locate the practice within Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogised heteroglossia, so that it can be understood as an everyday contest between centripetal and centrifugal forces, as situated and strategic. In doing so, rather than analyse the practice of what is typically called English name use as an anomalous and contradiction-ridden fad among learners of English struggling with proficiency and identity, I instead understand an “English name” as Bakhtin notes as a process and not simply a product, in which:

[a] word, directed towards its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgements and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelations, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276).

Earlier I described this focus on the products of English names as a red herring. By this I mean that such a focus, itself an ideological stance on language use, detracts from a more useful analysis of the dialogical and ideological richness of the practice. Such an analysis like the one I conduct in this research therefore facilitates 21st century understandings of language as process, of languaging in transnational and translocal settings, as deployed strategically by predominantly young, mobile and postmodern identities. A process-oriented dialogical analysis permits a researcher to capture, however momentarily, identities and language displays in flux and contingent. By drawing together the insights and apparatuses of at least five key researchers, I strive to bring applied linguistics into the 21st century by problematising 20th century concepts.
like national language, national culture, and macro-demographic identities in the course of understanding this relocalised and recombinant language practice.

Diao (2014, p. 220) describes her research as preliminary and restricted only to four students undertaking language education. In doing so, she suggests further study among other areas ‘that are less concerned with language and identity but meanwhile are extremely popular among transnational Chinese students (e.g. engineering, business).’ My research achieves precisely that, involving Chinese students from disciplines as diverse as commerce and business, engineering, architecture, and language studies. Moreover, it includes a mix of undergraduates and graduates from both Taiwan and mainland China. Again, in considering Diao’s (2014) concluding recommendations, my study also includes Chinese students whose names are and are not ‘phonologically transparent’ (p. 220) and who also discuss the negotiation of name choice practices outside of their specific academic communities. Diao (2014) moreover alerts future researchers to the importance of considering the typical practice of assigning Chinese EFL students with English names in light of ‘the construction of ideologies about a monolingual, monocultural Anglophone society’ (p. 220).

Finally, I argue against the use of “English names” as an appropriate descriptor for the practice, for what is better understood as a process rather than as a product. Instead, one outcome proposed would be the use of descriptors like Rampton’s (2010) ‘contemporary urban vernaculars’ or Li Wei’s (2011) translanguaging within a heuristic of ‘post-Labovian, “third wave” variationist sociolinguistics’ (Rampton, 2010), where analysis of language use extends beyond linguistic structures, typically identified with 20th century categories like nationality and mother tongue to ideas of agency, practice, and ideology. I argue therefore that the use of “English name” reifies that which we witness throughout the thesis being contested; that is, English, as unified and unilateral structure, and identity as equivalently unified and unilateral.

6.3 Pedagogical implications
Given that the local settings for observation, audio-recording and analysis of the practice were primarily university classrooms, it is important to conclude with what implications my findings might have for cross-cultural, multi- or translingual tertiary pedagogy, be that of EAL classrooms, academic socialisation or preparation programs or of fully-fledged, discipline-based undergraduate or graduate university courses. An obvious first conclusion I would suggest is that it opens up – as appropriate – discussions of language use and identity practices, specifically the influence of a primary culture and language on the negotiation of other languages and the interface with other cultures. Accordingly, rather than the use of an English name by a normatively Chinese or Taiwanese national in an Australian university classroom being read as indexing, for example, Westernisation, self-effacement or duplicity, or dismissed or proscribed as illegitimate or inauthentic language use, the practice is instead understood as the desire by Chinese and Taiwanese students to ‘innovate in English making full use of their multilingual resources to create their own preferred forms’ (Jenkins, 2011, p. 928).

Kramsch (1998) contends that traditional EAL classroom methodologies based on native speaker norms and practices typically define language learners in terms of deficit models, that is, in terms of what they are not, or at least are not yet. My findings should operate to diminish the native speaker bias inherent in language learning and use and to turn the deficit model on its head. In other words, the appropriateness or correctness of this or that utterance as judged according to a native speaker measure (i.e. deviation from a unitary and non-contextualised ideal) gives way to an understanding of language use based on the speaker’s reading of the setting and situation – the dialogised heteroglossia – of the interaction and the extent of his or her success in achieving relevant pragmatic and meta-pragmatic goals, drawing upon linguistic resources as appropriate. Recall Van Leeuwen’s (2008, p. 3) invocation of the Weberian (1977) notion of rationalization, in which ‘social action is no longer oriented toward meanings, values, and beliefs, but toward strategies, no longer toward the questions “is it true?” “Is it good?” but toward the questions “Does it work?” “Does it achieve its purposes?” With the move away from analysing languages as enumerative and discrete systems or structures towards one of understanding languaging as repertoire-based practice, the findings demonstrate how one cohort of language
users exploit some of the resources available to them from what is normatively called English in order to perform a 21st century translocal and mobile Chinese or Taiwanese identity, while simultaneously achieving the various goals of social life.

Kramsch (2012) asks what it would mean to teach languages not as discrete linguistic systems, but, as Blommaert (2012) would have them, semiotic resources, in which language use can be understood as a semiotic game, at once critical, communicative and creative? Kramsch (2012, p. 114) refers to an early 21st century proliferation of ethnographic and autobiographical accounts of speakers having been ‘coerced into a “monolingualism of the Other”’ (cf. Derrida, 1998). This proliferation reveals for Kramsch (2012) an abiding and critical interest in ‘lives lived on the hyphen, identities lived across multiple languages and multiple countries (p. 114).’ These interstitial lives are local instantiations and irruptions of a greater globalisation: the larger flows of capital, goods, people, images, information and discourses across the globe of which they are a subset and a current.

Kramsch (2012, p. 115) also refers to ‘the proliferation of metaphors we find applied to multilingual individuals.’ One of the more disturbing metaphors encountered during my research has been Diao’s (2014) reading of Chinese students on a United States graduate language program “surrendering” to their U.S professors’ desires for them to use their “ethnic” rather than Western names. Do we really want people surrendering? Although such “surrender” is rationalised by Diao (2014) as deriving from or finding support among a community of practice model, it remains for me an undesirable outcome. Granted, from a modernist standpoint, one could analyse such “surrender” as a normatively Chinese practice, deference, for example, to seniority and status. Nevertheless, my interest is to move away from normatively.

My research strives to leave modernist discourses behind in the 20th century and instead promote postmodernist and translingual approaches to language use in 21st century multilingual and cross-cultural settings, according to which the idea of EAL students “surrendering” to the wishes of their United States professors is anathema. Kramsch (2012, p. 115) observes a
tradition in applied linguistics to take a monolingual approach to the study of language acquisition and, paradoxically enough, this is what I argue we witness here among Diao’s (2014) U.S professors. Paradoxical because they as language experts should understand the nexus between language practices and identity performance and the dialogical heteroglossia underpinning linguistic exchanges, especially when tempered by cross-cultural and translingual considerations. Their desires to have the Chinese students on the program use what are termed their ‘ethnic’ names reifies ethnicity, a fixed modernist discourse contrary to the fluidity of postmodern global identities, over, for instance, translingualism and transnationality. It is a deeply conservative position reinforcing native speaker norms and values.

Kramsch (2012, pp. 114-5) describes this 20th century setting that notions like “ethnic names” conjures, as a time ‘when the roles of native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS), the structures of L1 and L2, the boundaries of speech communities were more clearly delineated and everyone knew their place, legitimacy and authenticity were simple.’ Under this regime, a language user’s communicative competence was assessed according to a priori standards of ‘grammatical, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence’ and for its approximation of benchmarks of accuracy, fluency, and cultural content based on monolingual speakers of a standard national L1. The monolingual native speaker was the measure of authenticity and legitimacy of language use in that L1. Kramsch (2012, p. 115) contends that ‘globalisation is reshuffling the cards’ and my research chronicles in some small way that reshuffling of the sociolinguistic deck with reference to naming practices.

When I consider two everyday type practices witnessed in this PhD research: the Chinese students’ “surrender” to their US professors’ desires (Diao 2014) and the introduction routine typical of day 1 Australian tertiary classrooms, it is instructive to remember Kramsch’s (2012, p. 116) contention that ‘applied linguists with a sense of social justice are drawn to a modern approach to multilingualism that shows how social reality is constructed, maintained and reproduced through small acts of discourse in everyday life.’ As pedagogues and classroom practitioners, remembering and reflecting on this discursive construction of everyday social
reality would seem a key take-away from my research findings. Quotidian, almost banal discursive moves such as these two examples enact deeper power and identity relations. By problematising conventional tropes like “native/non-native speaker”, languages as a priori systems versus languaging as semiotic repertoire engagement, or notions of linguistic, cultural and ethnic “authenticity,” educators can pluralise communicative competences and empower multi- and translingual speakers to deploy language in ways quite different from those of monolingual speakers, and not to speak in the shadows of these monolingual native speakers.

As a result, I arrive at a position akin to Canagarajah’s (2010) multilingual turn in SLA. Canagarajah (2010) proposes taking as models of SLA the hybrid, flexible, and emergent practices of multilingual English speakers, rather than the repertoires of monolingual NS speakers. The focus then becomes one on language practices in local settings, rather than on acontextual and a priori language forms and meanings in texts. Kramsch (2012, p. 118) writes that such a multilingual turn in SLA explicitly validates ‘all languages and stressing their equal value, they seem to have eliminated any notion of kitsch or imposture. The linguistic world has become flat.’ This flatness, it needs to be stated, is what might be referred to as a level playing field; it is a description of equality and equity, and not a description of character that might indicate a lack of sparkle, a removal of zest or of life. Consequently, we might kick off a new semester’s teaching or studying in the first week’s tutorial and listen to the Chinese or Taiwanese students in the class introduce themselves as Snow, Jenks, Seffie or Angel, understanding that this quotidian practice of first name classroom introductions is itself a culturally-specific form. And, more than that, we understand that these choices of names, these instances of (trans)languaging, are a response by their Chinese and Taiwanese bearers to their readings of local settings, not as kitsch or imposture might suggest, attempts by these students at Westernisation or duplicity, not the products of limited English language proficiency, but the processes of language as ceaseless and dialogised heteroglossia. To recall Olivia’s reflections from 4.7.28 on these practices by herself and among her friends:
Looking back on my study, I am struck by things I might have done differently or would like to have included. Inevitably there are also directions that future research might take. Had circumstances permitted a greater ethnographic element to the study, I would have relished the opportunity to witness the practice in operation outside the classrooms of the university and, specifically, the practice of first-day introductions. It would be interesting, for example, to see whether English name use accorded with participant accounts in more social and workplace settings. In other words, it would have been wonderful to have a more diverse range of settings in which the practice might be witnessed, recorded and analysed. However, this would also have likely benefitted from proficiency in Mandarin, something I lack.

In terms of future research, I can’t help but wonder whether the popularity of the practice, what I term at one point its ubiquity, among Chinese and Taiwanese will diminish over time or remain. It would be fascinating to know more about its origins within Chinese and Taiwanese English language discourses and its function from the perspectives of Chinese and Taiwanese English language pedagogies. I noted that among my research participants, the practice seemed largely unremarkable and untheorised. While this certainly has allowed me to step in and undertake theorisation, I cannot help but wonder why those primary and secondary school baptisms took place in Chinese and Taiwanese settings and why the experience for the students was so often underwhelming if not perfunctory.
Lastly, over the 8 or so years that my research has taken, particularly when I was still employed in the face-to-face worlds of university classroom teaching and advising, I noted an increase in the number of Vietnamese students enrolled in course and workshops. The names of these students on the rolls and administrative documents typically did not contain information on tones and letters to aid pronunciation among non-Vietnamese speakers. Moreover, the Vietnamese writing system, while employing a Latin script, uses diacritics to indicate sounds different from those among Romance languages and various tones. It would be interesting to conduct a similar study among Vietnamese international students at Australian universities because, as a traditionally Confucian culture with a tonal language, the sociolinguistic and cultural conditions are in place for a similar practice of English name use to be evident among Vietnamese students. It is common knowledge after all that Vietnam is the most ‘sinicised’ country in Southeast Asia, a consequence of over 2000 years of colonial, cultural and commercial involvement between Vietnam and China. A possible outcome of such a study would be to permit a comparison with the Chinese and Taiwanese practices and to look further at endemic factors that might trigger it.
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The following transcript excerpt is taken from the university graduate program class. This comprised a class of 12 graduate students from multilingual backgrounds (e.g. Saudi, Korean, Iranian, Afghani, Chinese, Taiwanese, Japanese). Seven of these students were Chinese or Taiwanese, of which two were male. The excerpt represents 7 ½ minutes of the classroom structured discussion – led by Taiwanese presenter (and research participant) Sophie – that followed her analysis of that week’s class reading, the short story Jenny (Ding, Xiaoqi, 1995). N is an Afghani student, E is Chinese research participant Eason, T is the classroom teacher (neither Barb nor Margie), C is Taiwanese research participant Candy, S is Taiwanese research participant Sylvia, J is a Korean student, and M is a Saudi student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Jenny changes her name from Chinese to English. What do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Maybe it was difficult to pronounce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>What do you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Like, some names are, ah, difficult to, um, like my name is [gives his full name], right? So, I make it shorter; I move the {parts of his full name}, so it won’t be difficult for the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>But why you don’t change your name? Just make a new name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Because I want to be known with N, whatever I do here [i.e. in Australia]. Good, bad, it should refer to N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>So, what’s the meaning of your name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>It comes from Farsi. There are two parts, light, king. It means King of Light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>In my opinion, it is easy to memorise the name in English, choose English name, because my Chinese name is very difficult to pronounce. I think English is better for people to memorise me. What do you think, Sylvia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>I think the Chinese people and Taiwanese people prefer to change their name because – I agree with Sophie – because our Chinese name is difficult for the foreigner to pronounce. They always pronounce /k’/ incorrectly. And also is difficult for them to remember our name. So, I think the Chinese, when they come to another country – Australia, United States, England – they will always change their name. It’s easier for the people to remember them and pronounce their name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eason</td>
<td>You always feel uncomfortable when someone call you the wrong name. Even though we Chinese won’t say we’re uncomfortable, as time goes I will change my name. Then you can call me this name. And, you know, some Australians also come to China and have their own Chinese name, because we Chinese don’t call their English name very easy. It’s a balance. So, Kevin Rudd [Australian Prime Minister at the time], his Chinese name is 陸克文 (Lù Kèwén) [laughter from all].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Does it have a meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>No, 陸克文 (Lù Kèwén). Just a pronunciation translate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eason</td>
<td>So, it’s a balance, I think. It’s a balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>I think probably one reason for us to change the name from Chinese to English is because when we choose the English name [is] because we want to join the culture and join the life as same as Australians, as same as the local people. And to help us to live here... We choose a new one, maybe it stand for a new us, to come to this country, and it’s not the same as who we were in our country. So, we want to bring a new impression to the people and to understand this country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie (to J)</td>
<td>How ‘bout in Korea? Korean change their name from Korean to English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Not usually, because it’s not hard to pronunciation. Actually, I don’t like the change the name because the Jenny [character from short story], when the people call Jenny in Chinese name, she hate that, but even if Jenny change the name, she’s from China. She never can change the nationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie (to M)</td>
<td>How about in Saudi Arabia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>I think it’s about the culture, it’s not about the country. And the connection, the meaning of the name. What about the other people pronounce our name...For example, with my name, Mohammed, the native /خاء/ [letter khā‘] does not exist in English, so they say Mohammed [i.e. with / h/]. I accept the pronunciation of the name from non-Arabic native speakers. It doesn’t make any difference to me. I’m proud by my name, even if its [gives Arabic and non-Arabic pronunciations], Saeed or Sad. I think it doesn’t make any difference. And even the English-speaking people in our country, they called John or Smith or whatever, they don’t change their name. We call...actually in Arabic language, it has the same meaning. Like Jesus and Isa [Arabic equivalent to Jesus]. So, even if we have English man in Saudi and his name Jesus, we call him Jesus, we don’t say Isa. We don’t translate the name. Maybe it’s about the culture and the connection between the name and the person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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