L1-L2 TRANSFER IN THE NARRATIVE STYLES OF CHINESE EFL LEARNERS' WRITTEN PERSONAL NARRATIVES

I-Ru Su & Yi-Chun Chou

ABSTRACT

Most of the research on second language (L2) narratives has focused on whether or how L2 learners carry their L1 narrative styles into L2 narration; few studies have explored whether L2 learners' knowledge of the L2 also in turn affects their L1 narrative performance. The present study attempted to probe the issue of cultural transfer in narrative styles from a bi-directional perspective. The L2 subjects of the study were Chinese EFL learners at the intermediate and advanced levels. They were asked to write a fright narrative in their two languages, and their essays were compared to those of English and Chinese native control groups. The participants' written narratives were examined in terms of narrative structure and evaluative devices. Transfer from both directions was found. Moreover, the advanced learners appeared to have merged the narrative styles of L1 and L2 in their writing of personal narratives in both languages. The results of the present study suggested that cultural transfer in narrative styles could occur bi-directionally and that advanced EFL learner's narrative repertoires of their two languages may form an interconnected system instead of independent systems.

Key Words: written personal narratives, narrative styles, bi-directional transfer

Narrative is one of the basic discourse forms found in all cultures. We are used to hearing and telling stories from an early age. We use narratives to share experiences or express our internal feelings as well as to make sense of our experiences (Johnstone, 2001). Although telling stories is a universal activity, cross-cultural studies on narrative discourse have shown that the foci and approaches of narratives may vary across languages and cultures. For second language acquisition

researchers, it is interesting to see how second language (L2) users oscillate between two lingo-cultural worlds if their two languages do not share similar cultural conventions in storytelling.

The present study attempted to probe Chinese EFL learners' narrative styles in their two languages from a multi-competence perspective. Proposed by Cook (1991), multi-competence refers to the knowledge of two or more languages in one mind. In contrast to the traditional view of language transfer which emphasizes uni-directional influence from the first language (L1) to the second (L2) (e.g., Gass & Selinker, 1992), the multi-competence view assumes that transfer can go in two directions (i.e., transfer from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1) and there is a complex interaction between the L2 user's language systems.

Empirical evidence supporting the multi-competence view has been accumulating in the past two decades (e.g., Brown & Gullberg, 2011; Dussias & Sagarra, 2007; Mennen, 2004; Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002; Su, 2001). These studies have shown that L2 users' knowledge and use of their L1 and L2 are distinguishable from that of native speakers of either language. Most of these studies have mainly focused on the linguistic competence of the L2 user, such as knowledge of sound and intonation patterns (Mennen, 2004; Zampini & Green, 2001), morpho-syntactic structures (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002), word association (Zareva, 2010), and sentence processing (Dussias & Sagarra, 2007; Su, 2001). An interesting but rarely explored area is the L2 user's narrative competence, which extends beyond language ability. Narrative is a culture-sensitive discourse genre that varies across languages and cultures (Hymes, 1974). To produce culturally appropriate narratives, one has to be aware of the socio-cultural norms underlying the narrative tradition in the given language and culture. Thus, narrative provides a good test case for second language researchers to see how the L2 user or learner accommodates two sets of socio-cultural values and traditions in one single mind. The present study was undertaken to explore the issue of cultural transfer in narrative styles from a multi-competence perspective by looking at the L1 and L2 written personal narratives of Chinese EFL learners, in comparison to those of Chinese and English native speakers. We would like to see to what extent L2 learners' narrative performance in their two languages is susceptible to bi-directional transfer.

THE NATURE OF NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

In the field of narrative research, one of the most influential narrative analytical models was developed by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972). Labov's narrative model was constructed based on real stories told by real people, often stories about dangerous or embarrassing experiences. It has been proven a helpful analytical framework in analyzing both oral and written personal narratives (Özyıldırım, 2009; Tannen, 1982). According to Labov, a fully-formed personal experience narrative consists of six components: abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result or resolution, and coda. The abstract summarizes the whole story at the beginning of a narrative. The orientation sets the narrative frame by providing information about the characters, place, and time. The complicating action is the obligatory part of the narrative and is composed of chronologically ordered narrative clauses that recreate an experience. The evaluation allows the narrator to express the emotional side of the story, provide comments about the narrated events that s/he experienced and explain why the story is worth telling. The resolution marks the end of the series of narrative events in the complicating action. Finally, the coda acts as a transition between the narrative proper and the present or gives a brief summary of the story.

Research has shown that different cultures adopt similar narrative structural components, but they vary in the amount and types of information included in a narrative (Han, Leichtman, & Wang, 1998; McClure, Mir, & Cadierno, 1993; Porter, 1989; Stein, 2004). For instance, Han et al. (1998) compared oral narratives of personal experiences produced by Korean, Chinese, and American preschool children. They found American children provide more elaborate and detailed descriptions of past events, comment more on their own preferences, and give more personal judgments and opinions. In contrast, Asian children tend to talk about their past events in a succinct, less detailed way without referring to their own thoughts and feelings.

In addition to the basic narrative structural components, evaluative language is also an integral part of narrative construction (Bamberg & Damrad-Frye, 1991; Labov, 1972; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Shiro, 2003). Evaluative language refers to the linguistic expressions which convey additional information about the narrator's attitudes, interpretations of the events, and characters' mental states such as emotions, thoughts, feelings and intentions. Evaluative expressions are scattered throughout the narrative and realized through various kinds of

linguistic means. Without them, the narrative would be less interesting and engaging (Bliss, McCabe, & Miranda, 1998).

With regard to the classification of evaluative devices, there is little agreement in the literature. Different researchers (Bamberg & Damrad-Frye, 1991; Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Shiro, 2003) have proposed somewhat different classifications of evaluative devices for narrative analysis. Although the categorization systems vary, the evaluative devices commonly analyzed in previous narrative studies include the expressions of emotions (e.g., *I was scared.*), cognition (representing thought or beliefs, e.g., *I think…*), reported speech (e.g., He said, *"Let's go."*), hedge (a strategy to indicate the narrator's uncertainty, e.g., He *seems to* be nervous…), repetitions for effect (e.g., I looked *again and again.*), intensifier (emphasizing a particular aspect of the event or character, e.g., I was *very* angry), and physical state (referring to the character's internal state, e.g., *I was tired*). Cross-cultural investigations on narratives have shown that the evaluative function of narrative differs across languages and cultures. In general, Asian narrators seem to be more constrained than American narrators when using evaluative language; in particular, Asians seem to be more reserved in expressing their personal emotions (Bamberg & Damrad-Frye, 1991; Han et al., 1998).

PREVIOUS STUDIES ON L2 NARRATION

Given that there are cross-cultural differences in the way people tell stories, one may wonder how L2 learners produce narratives in a second language. Research on L2 narratives has found that second/foreign language learners carry their L1 narrative styles into L2 narration (Indrasuta, 1988; Kang, 2003, 2006; Lee, 2003; McClure et al., 1993; Söter, 1988). For instance, Söter (1988) examined the English written narratives produced by Vietnamese ESL, Arabic ESL, and English-speaking students in Australia. They were asked to write a bedtime story in English to a younger audience. Söter's analysis showed that the three language groups had different foci in their English narratives. English-speaking students tended to start their story plot directly and provided clear sequences of actions and events. Vietnamese ESL students showed a greater focus on the descriptions of time and location for the story and a greater emphasis on the relationships among the characters in the story. Arabic ESL students gave more references to

4

the attributes of the characters. Söter concluded that one's native cultural thinking and discourse structures can be manifested in L2 narrative writing. Indrasuta (1988) also observed cultural transfer in the narrative styles of Thai EFL senior high school students. She found that the Thai EFL students followed their Thai conventional norms of narrative in writing Thai and English essays by providing more moral lessons and figurative language than American students did to describe things. Lee (2003) examined the discourse structure and rhetoric of English narratives by English native speakers and Chinese learners of English in Hong Kong. Both groups of participants were college students and were asked to write a story in English based on a series of pictures. Lee found that influenced by Chinese cultural traditions, Chinese learners of English produced a larger proportion of coda clauses than English native speakers by telling people what they should or should not do.

Most of the research on L2 narratives has focused on L1 influence on L2 narration; few studies have explored whether L2 learners' or users' knowledge of the L2 also in turn affects their L1 narrative performance. To our best knowledge, Stavans (2003) is the only study to date that explored the narrative competences of L2 learners in their two languages. The L2 subjects in Stavans' study were Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew bilingual adults. She observed L1 influence on L2 narration in the bilinguals' use of the narrative components. Compared to the monolingual speakers, Hebrew-English bilinguals produced more initiation clauses in narrating in the L2 English, and English-Hebrew bilinguals used more resolution clauses when narrating in the L2 Hebrew. L2 influence on L1 narration was found in the bilinguals' use of temporal frame. The Hebrew monolinguals preferred to use the past tense in their narration, while the English monolinguals did not have a clear preference for tense choice. Stavans found that the English-Hebrew bilinguals used the past tense more often than the English monolinguals did when telling the story in the L1 English. She concluded that bilingual narrators differ from monolingual narrators in several ways when telling stories.

Stavans' study has presented some interesting findings on the bi-directional interaction between bilinguals' narrative repertoires of their two languages. However, the narratives collected in her study were stories based on a series of pictures, which contain a standardized content of the story and thus may eliminate possible cultural differences in the events the narrators choose to report. The present study attempted to further explore the issue of bi-directional transfer in L2 learners'

narrative competences by looking at personal experience narratives, which may better reflect culture-specific narrative organization. We examined Chinese EFL learners' narrative styles in their writing of personal experiences in the L1 and L2. A cross-cultural comparison of Chinese and English narrative styles is first presented below.

CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISONS OF CHINESE AND ENGLISH NARRATIVE STYLES

Narrative is acquired early by children through natural socialization, and much of the research comparing Chinese and English narrative styles has focused on how Chinese and American parent-child interactions socialize their children to acquire the appropriate cultural norms and language forms (e.g., Miller, Wiley, Fung, & Liang, 1997; Wang & Leichtman, 2000; Wu, 1996). Some studies have reported that in Chinese society, parent-child conversations and storytelling mostly center on group harmony, interpersonal relationships, conformity, and moral behavior (Han et al., 1998; Wu, 1996). Some researchers have suggested that Chinese parents' or caregivers' emphasis on social and moral values could be attributed to the influence of Confucianism because strict discipline and acceptance of social obligation are highly emphasized within the Confucian tradition (Chao, 1995). These researchers also observed that Chinese children are encouraged to be empathetic with other people's feelings to show good manners and maintain group harmony, but they are taught to restrain their own emotional expressions. By contrast, American culture appears to embrace individuality, self-expression, autonomy, and personal uniqueness (Markus & Kitayama, 1998). American mother-child conversations tend to promote children's self-esteem by making them the center of the conversation such as letting them talk about their personal interests and preferences (Mullen & Yi, 1995). Compared with Chinese parents, American parents more often encourage their children to convey or articulate their own emotions and feelings openly (Chao, 1995).

Wang and Leichtman (2000) conducted a comparative study, in which they asked American and Chinese 6-year-old children to tell stories prompted by eleven pictures and to recount seven personal experiences. In general, their results indicated that different social orientations and family socialization may lead to variations in storytelling between cultures. According to the researchers, American

children's narratives reflect a sense of independence and autonomy, while Chinese children show greater orientation toward social engagement by introducing more story characters and more other people in their narratives. Moreover, Chinese children put more emphasis on moral correctness than their American counterparts by making didactic statements about moral rules as well as showing references to correct their future behavior at the end of the story.

Similarly, in an analysis of Chinese written narratives produced by Hong Kong primary school children, Ho (2001) also found that the coda serves important functions in Chinese narratives. Her data indicated that the coda often conveys moral lessons that one learns from an incident, a warning or a revelation for the future action, or the narrator's extended reflections upon the story. Furthermore, Ho pointed out that Chinese teachers often emphasize the importance of coda during their teaching. Students who do not provide codas in their narrative writing often receive lower marks. Stories with codas are considered good stories in Chinese culture, but probably not so much in American culture. Minami (2008) reported that when English native speakers rate English narratives, they consider relating a sequential series of actions and providing emotional information about a person, place or event are crucial elements of a good story; the coda, on the other hand, is optional.

Given the cross-cultural differences between English and Chinese narrative styles, the present study addressed the following questions:

1. Does Chinese EFL learners' knowledge of the L1 influence their L2 narrative style in terms of the use of narrative structure and evaluative devices?
2. Does Chinese EFL learners' knowledge of the L2 in turn influence their L1 narrative performance in terms of the use of narrative structure and evaluative devices?
3. Do Chinese EFL learners merge or differentiate the narrative styles of their two languages when writing L1 and L2 narratives?

METHOD

Participants

A total of 100 college students participated in the study and were divided into four groups: English native speakers, Chinese native speakers,

Chinese EFL learners at the intermediate level, and Chinese EFL learners at the advanced level. Each group consisted of 25 people. The data gathered from the native speakers served as the baseline data, against which the EFL learners' data were compared to examine cross-linguistic influence from both directions. The English native speakers were recruited from a university in the United States; they did not know Chinese nor were they familiar with any other foreign languages. The Chinese-speaking participants were recruited from two universities in Taiwan. Since English is a mandatory school subject in elementary and secondary education in Taiwan[1], it is difficult to find Taiwan college students who do not know English at all to serve as the native control group. One solution suggested by Cook (2003) is to find participants with minimal proficiency in English and contrast them with those of higher English proficiency. Hence, a mock TOEFL test (paper version) was administered to screen Chinese-speaking participants. They were placed into different groups according to their scores on the TOEFL test: Chinese native control group (average 370), intermediate EFL learners (average 480), and advanced EFL learners (average 600). None of the EFL learners had stayed at an English-speaking country for more than six months by the time of the study. All groups of participants contained a mix of humanities, business, and science and engineering majors.

Procedures

The participants were given a written prompt. They were asked to write about a frightening experience in their lives. The participants were given as much time as they needed to complete the essay. In addition, Chinese EFL learners were allowed to consult a dictionary when writing the essay in English.

The native control groups wrote the narrative essay only in their respective native language. Chinese EFL learners needed to complete two essays, one in English and one in Chinese on different days with an interval of one month. A one-month interval between the two writing tasks was to minimize any possibility of memory retention or directly translating the first essay to the second essay. Furthermore, the order of

---

[1] In the past, English education in Taiwan began at junior high school. In 2001 English education started to be implemented in the fifth-grade of elementary school and from the third-grade by 2005.

English and Chinese writing tasks was counterbalanced within each EFL learner group to eliminate the task effect. That is, half of the EFL learners wrote in English first and Chinese second, and vice versa for the other half.

Data Analysis

To establish a basis for the comparison of overall narrative length and the relative lengths of different narrative components within an essay, the participants' narrative essays were first divided into clauses. We adopted Berman and Slobin's (1994) and includes finite, nonfinite verbs, and predicate adjectives.

The analysis of the participants' narrative essays was centered on their frequency of use of structural components and evaluative devices. The coding scheme of narrative structure was based on Labov and Waletzky's (1967) narrative categories. Definitions and examples of the structural components are provided below. Each clause in the narrative was coded as fulfilling one of the following narrative functions. A sample essay from the current study which exemplified the coding of narrative structural components is given in Appendix A.

(1) **Prologue**[2]: introduction to the story, which includes a brief summary of the story (e.g., *One of the most frightening experiences I've ever had occurred when I was in senior high school.*)
(2) **Orientation**: occurring near the beginning of the narrative and introducing characters, time, and setting of the story (e.g., *It was the second day of the summer vacation, and I was about to leave for my evening French class when my cellphone rang.*)
(3) **Complicating action**: reporting what happened, which contains the climax or high points of the story (e.g., *I picked up the phone and realized it was my mother calling for help. The trembling voice from the other side of the phone uncovered a horrible fact that my sister ran away from home without leaving a message.*)
(4) **Results or resolution**: describing how the complicating action was

---

[2] In Labov and Waletzky's (1967) model, the term "abstract" was used to refer to the short statement that summarizes the whole story at the beginning of the narrative. In the present study, we found that our participants, especially Chinese speakers, started their stories from various perspectives and thus we decided to use a broader term, "prologue," to refer to the story introduction.

resolved (e.g., *After two hours of desperate waiting, my sister finally texted me back and returned home safely.*)

(5) **Evaluation**: stating the comments or personal feelings about the events or characters in the story (e.g., *I was never so scared in my life!*). Different from the other components of the narrative, evaluative clauses occur throughout the narrative, rather than at one point.

(6) **Coda**: appearing at the end of the narrative and indicating the story is over by providing a short summary (e.g., *That was the most frightening experience that I've ever had in my college life*), connecting the narrative proper with the present (e.g., *Though many years have passed, I can still feel the sense of horror at the moment*), or conveying a moral lesson (e.g., *I supposed we had all learned a big lesson that a sweet family is the most lovable treasure in life.*)

The other element for analysis were evaluative devices, which are embedded in any part of a clause in a narrative. Using an adaptation of classifications adopted in previous studies (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Shiro, 2003), we classified the evaluative devices used by the participants into the eight categories listed below. In the present study we only coded the evaluative devices which were embedded in the "orientation,' "complicating action," "results or resolution," and "evaluation" clauses. That is, we only analyzed the evaluative devices used in the description of the event proper, and excluded those in the prologue and the coda. Definitions and examples of the eight types of evaluative devices are given below. A sample essay from the current study which exemplified the coding of different kinds of evaluative devices is provided in Appendix B.

(1) **Emotion**: expressing affect, emotion (e.g., *I was scared.*)
(2) **Cognition**: representing thought, beliefs (e.g., *I thought* I was about to die.)
(3) **Perception**: referring to anything that is perceived through the senses (e.g., *We could hardly see* anything in front of our car.)
(4) **Physical state**: referring to a character's internal state, which is physical rather than emotional (e.g., *I was tired.*)
(5) **Intention**: referring to a character's intention of carrying out some action (e.g., *I decided to* walk in the other direction)
(6) **Reported speech**: referring to the character's words.
   (a) direct speech: the character's words are recorded verbatim (e.g., I tried to hold my friend and yelled, "*Help me!*")

10

      (b) indirect speech: the character's words are indirectly reported (e.g., I told her *that I couldn't find my teacher and classmates.*)

(7) **Hedges**: indicating the narrator's uncertainty, making the narrator's utterances less assertive (e.g., *Maybe* they are not so bad when they happened; Her memory *seemed* to last for two years.)

(8) **Intensifiers**: strengthening a particular aspect of the event or character (e.g., go to sleep *very* early; I was *so* lucky.)

The authors coded the data independently. To calculate inter-rater reliability, 50% of the data were randomly selected and compared. The inter-rater agreement for narrative structural components and evaluative devices was 90% and 93%, respectively.

For the analysis of narrative structure, we examined if each participant included every narrative structural component in his or her narrative essay. Each structural component was coded as presence or absence in each essay. In regard to the use of evaluative devices, due to the fact that the participants' narratives were of different lengths, we measured the relative frequency of each type of evaluative device by dividing the number of one certain kind of evaluative device by the total number of evaluative devices in each essay. Independent-samples *t*-tests were performed to compare the frequency of occurrence of each structural component and each type of evaluative device between the control groups, and one-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the EFL learner groups with each native control group. Paired-samples *t*-tests were administered to compare the EFL learners' narrative performance in their two languages. The significant *p* value was set at .05.

To determine whether transfer was operative, the present study adopted an adapted version of Selinker's (1969) operational definition of language transfer. According to the definition, L1 transfer to L2 was obtained when L1 and L2 native control groups' narratives exhibited statistically significant differences in the frequencies of use of a narrative feature, and significant differences in the frequencies of the given narrative feature were also obtained among learners' L2 narratives and those of L2 native control groups. Likewise, L2 transfer to L1 held when statistically significant differences in the frequencies of use of a narrative feature were found between L1 and L2 native control groups' narratives and between learners' L1 narratives and L1 native control groups' (cf. Su, 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparing English and Chinese Native Control Groups' Written Narratives

Narrative length and structure. The result of independent-samples *t*-test indicated that there was no significant difference in the length of English and Chinese native speakers' narratives ($t(48) = -0.235$, *ns*). On average, English native speakers (ENSs) produced 29.96 clauses, and Chinese native speakers (CNSs) 30.88 clauses.

Although both English and Chinese native control groups produced a similar number of clauses in their fright narratives, they varied in the use of structural components. Table 1 presents the number of occurrences of each narrative structural component in the written narratives produced by English and Chinese native speakers. The results of *t*-test analyses indicated that the two control groups differed significantly in the frequency of use of "prologue" ($t(48) = -3.176$, $p = .003$) and "coda" ($t(48) = -2.714$, $p = .009$) categories.

Table 1

Number of Occurrences of Each Narrative Structural Component in the Written Narratives of L1 Control Groups

	ENSs (*n* = 25)	CNSs (*n* = 25)
prologue	4 (16%)	14 (56%)
orientation	24 (96%)	23 (92%)
complicating action	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
resolution	25 (100%)	22 (88%)
evaluation	21 (84%)	22 (88%)
coda	11 (44%)	20 (80%)

Note. Percentage of occurrence of each structural component is provided in parentheses.

As seen in Table 1, the Chinese native speakers were more inclined to provide a prologue than the English native speakers (CNSs: 56% vs. ENSs: 16%). The Chinese native speakers had a tendency to start their introduction to the story from various perspectives, such as providing background information of the story to be revealed, summarizing the whole story, or revealing the collective value by indicating that everyone has had a similar experience. Examples (1) through (3) are the examples

of the Chinese native speakers' story openings.

(1) 家裡的熱水瓶已經用了好多年了，算是古董級的。小時候，我很
頑皮，喜歡爬高，看到什麼就玩什麼，天不怕地不怕，在我的頭
腦裡，沒有「危險」兩個字。

jiāli de rèshuǐpíng yǐjīng yòngle hǎoduō nián le, suànshì gǔdǒngjí de.
xiǎoshíhòu, wǒ hěn wánpí, xǐhuān págāo, kàndào shénme jiù wán
shénme, tiān bùpà dì bùpà, zài wǒ de tóunǎolǐ, méiyǒu `wéixiǎn'
liǎnggè zì.

*"The thermos had been used for many years; (it) was very old. When
(I) was little, I was mischievous. (I) liked to climb high. (I) played
with whatever (I) saw. (I) was fearless. In my head, there was no
such word 'danger'."* (background information)

(2) 在我小學三年級的時候，曾經有過一次可怕經驗，也是一個教
訓！

zài wǒ xiǎoxué sān niánjí de shíhou, céngjīng yǒuguò yīcì kěpà
jīngyàn. yěshì yīgè jiàoxùn!

*"When I was in third grade, (I) had a frightening experience. (That)
was also a lesson (for me)!"* (summary)

(3) 在每個人的生活裡，一定都有經歷過可怕經驗，可怕經驗因人不
同。

zài měigèrén de shēnghuó li, yīdìng dū yǒu jīnglìguò kěpà jīngyàn,
kěpà jīngyàn yīn rén bùtóng.

*"Everyone must have a frightening experience throughout their lives,
but the frightening experience differs from person to person."*
(collective value)

In contrast, most of the English native speakers did not provide an
introduction to the story; they tended to begin their stories directly,
introducing time, place, and characters of the story, as illustrated in
examples (4) and (5) below. This observation is also reported in some
previous narrative studies (González, 2009; Söter, 1988). The difference
in the use of the prologue between the two native control groups could
be attributed to different writing conventions between English and
Chinese. English texts have been shown to have a direct, to-the-point
introductory style, while Chinese texts tend to exhibit an indirect,
circular style without indicating the main idea directly in the beginning
(Connor, 1996; Kaplan, 1996).

(4) I once was playing with some of my friends at my middle school,
during recess.

(5) When I was 5 years old, I got a concussion at an ice rink during the winter.

The statistical analyses also indicated that the Chinese native speakers provided a coda significantly more often than the English native speakers (CNSs: 80% vs. ENSs: 44%, $t(48) = -2.714$, $p = .009$). The Chinese native speakers often provided a moral lesson learnt from the story, a revelation about the future action, or self-reflection on the event of the narrative to conclude their stories. Examples are given below.

(6) 活了下來所以更加珍惜自己的生命，學會感恩。
huóle xiàlái suǒyǐ gèngjiā zhēnxī zìjǐ de shēngmìng, xuéhuì gǎn'ēn.
"(I) survived, so (I) cherish my life more and learned to express gratitude."

(7) 經歷這一次的經驗，提醒了自己在騎車時，不是只要注意左右是否有來車，也要注意四周圍或是天空中突如其來的任何事物都應當小心。
jīnglì zhèyīcì de jīngyàn, tíxǐngle zìjǐ zài qíchē shí, bùshì zhǐyào zhùyì zuǒyòu shìfǒu yǒu lái chē, yě yào zhùyì sìzhōuwéi huòshì tiānkōng zhōng tūrúqílái de rènhé shìwù dōu yīngdāng xiǎoxīn.
"After this experience, (I) remind myself to watch out for cars and be attentive to the surroundings when I ride a motorcycle. (I) have to be more cautious."

(8) 第一次發生這種事也不知道怎麼處理，也沒記到車子的車牌，只能買一次教訓以後保持安全距離。
dìyīcì fāshēng zhèzhǒng shì yě bù zhīdào zěnme chǔlǐ, yě méi jì dào chēzi de chēpái, zhǐ néng mǎi yīcì jiàoxùn yǐhòu bǎochí ānquán jùlí.
"(I) encountered this experience for the first time and did not know how to deal with it. (I) did not see the license plate number. So, (I) can only learn a lesson and keep a safe distance in the future."

The finding that Chinese native speakers liked to provide moral codas in their narratives is in line with previous narrative studies (Ho, 2001; Lee, 2003; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). Chinese narrators' preference of giving moral messages can be due to the influence of Confucianism, which stresses conformity to moral behavior and acceptance of social obligation (Chao, 1995; Wu, 1996).

Previous narrative research has reported that Chinese narrators are more reserved than American narrators in revealing their emotions and inner thoughts on an event they have experienced, and so Chinese

narrators are found to give fewer evaluative remarks than their American counterparts in telling stories (Han et al., 1998; Wang, Leichtman, & Davies, 2000). In line with the previous studies, we noted that although CNSs included an evaluation as often as ENSs did in the narratives (ENSs: 84% vs. CNSs: 88%, $t(48) = -0.40$, *ns*), a closer examination of the data revealed that ENSs produced a slightly higher proportion of evaluative clauses than CNSs (ENSs: 19% vs. CNSs: 12%, $t(48) = 1.957$, $p = .05$). The proportion of evaluative clauses was calculated by dividing the number of evaluative clauses by the total number of clauses in an essay. Compared to CNSs, ENSs elaborated to a greater extent on their personal feelings and thoughts on the story. Examples of the evaluations in English and Chinese native control groups' personal narratives are provided below.

English native speakers:

(9) This was perhaps my most frightening experience because I felt so small and helpless since I did not know how I could help my sister and if she would be OK.

(10) Watching my father go through this－knowing that I could lose him to one thing or another in a second—was the most frightening experience of my life. I felt utterly helpless, and knew I didn't want to live without him.

Chinese native speakers:

(11) 在當下覺得很可怕。
zàidāngxià juéde hěn kěpà.
"(I) felt very frightened at that moment."

(12) 整個氣氛變得很怪異。
zhěnggè qìfēn biànde hěn guàiyì.
"The atmosphere became very weird."

Evaluative devices. Table 2 presents the frequency distributions of the eight types of evaluative devices in the written narrative of Chinese and English native speakers. As shown, no significant differences were obtained between ENSs and CNSs in their use of evaluative devices, except for reported speech. CNSs used significantly more reported speech than ENSs in their written narratives (CNSs: 18.2% vs. ENSs: 5.1%). A close scrutiny of our data revealed that more CNSs than ENSs included secondary characters such as family members, friends, and others, in their stories (CNSs: 96% vs. ENSs: 68%). Moreover, CNSs

tended to make references to the interactions with the other characters in their stories, as illustrated in examples (13) through (15) below. In these examples, the reported speech statements are italicized and in boldface.

Table 2

Mean Proportions (%) of Different Types of Evaluative Devices in the Written Narratives of the L1 Control Groups

	ENSs (n = 25)		CNSs (n = 25)		t-test	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
emotion	29.0	21.4	22.3	21.0	1.121	*ns*
cognition	10.6	11.3	7.1	12.7	1.000	*ns*
perception	15.2	15.6	14.2	17.8	.203	*ns*
intention	10.0	14.3	5.8	11.7	1.138	*ns*
physical state	12.0	21.3	19.7	33.3	-.976	*ns*
reported speech	5.1	9.7	18.2	22.5	-2.659	.011
hedge	4.5	8.9	2.4	5.9	1.004	*ns*
intensifier	13.6	16.3	10.3	13.3	.785	*ns*

(13) 害怕的是爸媽會罵我，結果爸媽並沒有罵我，反而跟我說*下次要小心點，別再走失了*。
　　 hàipà de shì bà mā huì mà wǒ, jiéguǒ bà mā bìng méiyǒu mà wǒ, fǎn'ér gēn wǒ shuō *xiàcì yào xiǎoxīn diǎn, biézài zǒushīle*
　　 "(I) was afraid that my parents would scold me, but they did not scold me. Instead, (they) told me *to be more careful next time and not to get lost again.*"

(14) 我突然問我朋友說：「*欸！那棟房子是什麼*？」他說：「*我也不知道*。」
　　 wǒ túrán wèn wǒ péngyǒu shuō: *"āi nàdòng fángzi shì shénme?"* tā shuō: *"wǒ yě bù zhīdào."*
　　 　"Suddenly, I asked my friend, *'Hey, what is that house?'* He said, *'I don't know.'*"

(15) 我就問：「*你們幹嘛掀我的被子*」，他們卻說*他們一直都在客廳，沒有進去過房間*。
　　 wǒ jiù wèn: *"nǐmen gàn ma xiān wǒde bèizi?"*, tāmen quèshuō *tāmen yīzhí dōu zài kètīng, méiyǒu jìnqùguò* fángjiān.
　　 　"I asked, *'Why did you pull my quilt?'* They said *they had been in the living room the whole time and did not come to my room.*

The different degrees of emphasis between the two control groups on the use of reported speech could be related to different social orientations in Chinese and American cultures. As observed by some researchers, Chinese culture embraces interdependence and interpersonal connectedness, whereas American society values independence and individualism (Markus & Kitayama, 1998; Wang & Leichtamn, 2000). The use of reported speech in Chinese narratives could reflect a cultural style of interdependence and an emphasis on interpersonal relationships (cf. Wang & Leichtamn, 2000).

It is interesting to note that no significant difference was found between English and Chinese native speakers in their frequency of use of emotional evaluative devices. As we can see in Table 2, the reference to emotion was the most favored evaluative expression for the two native control groups. This is contrary to the previous finding that Asian narrators (e.g., Chinese, Korean or Japanese) seem to be more reserved in expressing their emotions and feelings than American narrators (Han et al., 1998; Kang, 2003; Mullen & Yi, 1995). One possible explanation is that in fright narratives, narrators are required to describe the frightening incidents they had personally experienced; thus, a high number of clauses of emotional evaluative devices could be anticipated.

To summarize, the comparisons of two native control groups' written narratives indicated that CNSs were more inclined to provide a prologue and a coda than ENSs. Although CNSs included an evaluation in their narratives as often as ENSs, ENSs' essays contained a higher percentage of evaluative clauses than CNSs'. With regard to the use of evaluative devices, CNSs produced significantly more reported speech than ENSs. The differences between the English and Chinese written narratives produced by ENSs and CNSs may come from their distinct literacy styles and cultural conventions.

In the next section, we compare the EFL learners' narrative essays to the English native speakers' to see if the EFL learners carried their L1 narrative styles into L2 narration.

Comparing ENSs' and Chinese EFL Learners' English Written Narratives

Narrative length and structure. One-way ANOVA comparing the length of the written narratives among the English native control group and the two learner groups showed that there was a significant difference among the three groups ($F(2, 72) = 10.59$, $p = .000$). Results of Tukey post-hoc

tests indicated that both intermediate and advanced learners produced significantly more clauses than ENSs: Inter EFL: 40.04 clauses; Adv EFL: 46.96 clauses; ENSs: 29.96 clauses. A closer examination of the data showed that the marked difference in the length of narratives between the ENSs' and the EFL learners' essays comes from their differential use of narrative structural components. Most of the EFL learners included a prologue and a coda in their narrative essays, which appeared to be L1 influence, while relatively fewer ENSs did.

Table 3 displays the number of occurrences of each narrative structural component in ENSs' and EFL learners' fright narratives. The results of ANOVA analysis indicated that there was a significant difference among the English native control group and the two learner groups in the use of "prologue" ($F(2, 72) = 19.41$, $p = .000$) and "coda" ($F(2, 72) = 6.86$, $p = .002$) categories. Tukey post-hoc tests showed that both intermediate and advanced EFL learners provided a prologue significantly more often than ENSs (Inter EFL: 80% vs. ENSs: 16%, $p = .000$; Adv EFL: 76% vs. ENSs: 16%, $p = .000$). This is an indication of L1 transfer because the Chinese native control group has been shown to include a prologue in their written narratives more often than their English counterparts (see Table 1). Like the CNSs' narratives, the prologue in the EFL learners' narrative essays conveyed three main functions: summarizing the story, providing background information about the story, and indicating that everyone has had a similar experience. Examples (16) through (18) are some samples of the EFL learners' introductions to their stories.

Table 3

Number of Occurrences of Each Narrative Structural Component in English Written Narratives by ENSs and EFL Learners

	ENSs ($n = 25$)	Inter EFL ($n = 25$)	Adv EFL ($n = 25$)
prologue	4 (16%)	20 (80%)	19 (76%)
orientation	24 (96%)	24 (96%)	22 (88%)
complicating action	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
resolution	25 (100%)	23 (92%)	25 (100%)
evaluation	21 (84%)	16 (64%)	25 (100%)
coda	11 (44%)	20 (80%)	20 (80%)

Note. Percentage of occurrence of narrative structural components is given in parentheses.

(16) While I was a child, the most frightening experience was that I was lost in the department store. (summary)

(17) I always studied at the library for my mid-term and final exam. Basically, I would spend my whole night there and would not go back to my rented house until the library was closed. However, now, I will leave library around 10:30 p.m. and then hurry to go back. It is because I have to avoid all dangerous affairs, especially avoid the strange guy I've ever seen. (background information)

(18) Everyone has his/her frightening experiences. Many people feel scary because something they afraid, hate or disgust happened, so do I. (collective value)

In addition, the written narratives of the two learner groups exhibited a higher percentage in the use of the "coda" component than those of the English native control group (Inter EFL: 80% vs. ENSs: 44%, $p = .006$; Adv EFL: 80% vs. ENSs: 44%, $p = .006$). The higher percentage of codas in the EFL learners' narratives can be attributed to L1 transfer because the Chinese native control group also included a coda in their written narratives significantly more often than the English native control group (see Table 1). Similar to CNSs, the EFL learners tended to conclude their stories by sharing what they learned from the incident they had experienced, or providing extended reflections upon the stories. Some examples of the EFL learners' coda remarks are given below.

(19) I suppose we had all learned a big lesson that a sweet family is the most loveable treasure in life. (moral lesson)

(20) After a while, I was afraid of water very much even taking a shower. I realized I was so lucky to come back to Taiwan safely. I promised I won't swim in an unsafe place even though how fun it is. Every time when I encountered difficulties in life, I was thinking about this experience which is very close to death. In my opinion, we can work hard on everything when we are alive. (extended reflections)

Regarding the evaluation of the narrative, the intermediate learners' essays displayed a lower percentage in the use of the "evaluation" component than ENSs' (Inter EFL: 64% vs. ENSs: 84%), although the difference did not reach significance. We also noted that the intermediate learners' essays contained a significantly lower proportion of evaluative clauses than ENSs' (Inter EFL: 6% vs. ENSs: 19%, $p = .000$). This could be a result of L1 transfer as CNSs also provided a significantly lower proportion of evaluative clauses than ENSs. It is also possible that the

intermediate learners did not have adequate English ability to elaborate their evaluative comments, and so their percentage of evaluative clauses was significantly lower than ENSs'. As for the advanced learners, they provided an evaluation slightly more often than ENSs (Adv EFL: 100% vs. ENSs: 84%), and their essays contained a similar proportion of evaluative clauses as those of ENSs (Adv EFL: 15% vs. ENSs: 19%). It seems that the advanced learners have picked up the American style of giving evaluative comments when writing stories. They were as explicit and expressive as ENSs in revealing their emotions and thoughts on their personal experiences.

Evaluative devices. Table 4 presents the mean proportion of each type of evaluative device used by the ENSs and EFL learners. As shown, the three groups differed only in the use of reported speech ($F(2, 72) = 6.304$, $p = .003$). The results of post-hoc Tukey comparisons indicated that the advanced EFL learners employed significantly more reported speech than ENSs (Adv EFL: 18.3% vs. ENSs: 5.1%, $p = .003$), but no significant difference was found between ENSs and the intermediate learners. Some examples of the advanced learners' reported speech statements are provided below. In these examples, the reported speech statements are italicized and in boldface.

Table 4

Mean Proportions (%) of Different Types of Evaluative Devices in English Written Narratives by ENSs and EFL Learners

	ENSs (*n* = 25)		Inter EFL (*n* = 25)		Adv EFL (*n* = 25)		*ANOVA*	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
emotion	29.0	21.4	21.6	15.5	29.4	17.1	1.457	*ns*
cognition	10.6	11.3	12.1	13.9	14.3	11.9	.562	*ns*
perception	15.2	15.6	22.6	19.9	12.6	14.5	2.368	*ns*
intention	10.0	14.3	7.2	7.4	3.6	6.9	2.520	*ns*
physical state	12.0	21.3	10.2	16.1	5.8	7.6	.971	*ns*
reported speech	5.1	9.7	8.7	12.2	18.3	17.6	6.304	.003
hedge	4.5	8.9	2.7	6.3	1.0	2.4	1.849	*ns*
intensifier	13.6	16.3	14.8	12.8	14.8	10.1	.075	*ns*

(21) She pressed her right-hand thumb right away and kept saying, "***It's not a big deal. Let's go to the health center! Quick!***"

(22) As I was burning my energy grappling with those complicated procedures, my flatmate texted me, saying that ***he found my wallet on the table where I had my breakfast***.

(23) Earlier that day, my sister called me to tell me that ***she failed the college entrance exam, and the results came out on that day showed that she was not admitted to her best colleg****e*.

The advanced learners' frequent use of reported speech compared to the ENSs' could be an indication of L1 influence, as CNSs have been shown to vary from ENSs in this regard. It is interesting to see that L1 influence was found in the advanced learner group rather than in the intermediate learner group. This result is contradictory to our expectations that less proficient learners should have relied more on L1 strategies than more proficient learners. Previous studies have pointed out that formulating reported speech in English requires more linguistic manipulations and grammatical processing (Davidse & Vandelanotte, 2011; Williams, 2004). In the construction of reported speech, L2 learners have to take into account the shift of tense, the change of pronoun, and word order. It is fair to say the advanced learners are more linguistically capable of producing reported speech than the intermediate learners, and thus can carry this L1-specific evaluative expression over to their L2 narratives.

In the next section, we compare the EFL learners' Chinese narratives to those of the Chinese native control group to see if the EFL learners' narrative performance was distinguishable from that of the Chinese native control group as a result of learning English.

Comparing CNSs' and Chinese EFL Learners' Chinese Written Narratives

Narrative length and structure. Results of one-way ANOVA analysis indicated that there was a significant difference among the CNSs and the two learner groups in the length of fright narratives they produced ($F(2, 72) = 27.34$, $p = .000$). A post-hoc Tukey test revealed that both groups of EFL learners produced significantly more clauses than CNSs (Inter EFL: 55.64 clauses; Adv EFL: 60 clauses; CNSs: 30.88 clauses). A closer scrutiny of the data indicated that neither learner group differed significantly from CNSs in the frequency of occurrence of each structural component (see Table 5), but they produced a greater amount

of prologue clauses than CNSs (Inter EFL: 13%; Adv EFL: 11%; CNSs: 7%); nevertheless, the differences among the learner groups and CNSs did not reach significance. The advanced learners also devoted significantly more clauses to the evaluation of the narrative than CNSs (Adv EFL: 20% vs. CNSs: 12%; *p* = .02), which could be a trace of L2 influence on L1.

Table 5

Number of Occurrences of Each Narrative Structural Component in Chinese Written Narratives by CNSs and EFL Learners

	CNSs (*n* = 25)	Inter EFL (*n* = 25)	Adv EFL (*n* = 25)
prologue	14 (56%)	18 (72%)	20 (80%)
orientation	23 (92%)	24 (96%)	24 (96%)
complicating action	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
resolution	22 (88%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
evaluation	22 (88%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
coda	20 (80%)	22 (88%)	25 (100%)

Note. Percentage of occurrence of narrative structural components is given in parentheses.

Although the CNSs' and advanced learners' narratives exhibited a similar occurrence of the "evaluation" component (see Table 5), a further analysis indicated that the advanced learners' narratives contained a significantly greater number of evaluative clauses than the CNSs' (Adv EFL: 20% vs. CNSs: 12%, *p* = .02). This can be an indication of L2 transfer, as ENSs have been shown to produce a higher proportion of evaluative clauses than CNSs. The advanced learners have picked up the American style of conveying explicit evaluation in writing English narratives, and they seemed to have carried the L2 evaluation style into L1 narration. Examples of the advanced learners' evaluative expressions in the Chinese narratives are illustrated below.

(24) 在這趟旅途中，我強烈感受到心臟的狂跳，手掌心冒著汗和一種喘不過氣的窒息感。我恐懼的是不知下一個轉角有什麼樣相貌怪異的東西等著我，也害怕無法預測的閃電巨響。
zài zhètàng lǚtú zhōng, wǒ qiángliè gǎnshòudào xīnzàngde kuáng tiào, shǒuzhǎngxīn màozhe hàn hé yīzhǒng chuǎn bùguòqì de zhìxígǎn. wǒ kǒngjù de shì bùzhī xià yīgè zhuǎnjiǎo yǒu shéme

yàng xiàngmào guàiyìde dōngxī děngzhe wǒ, yě hàipà wúfǎ yùcède shǎndiàn jùxiǎng.

"*During this trip, I felt my heart beating very hard, my palms sweating, and (I felt) a sense of suffocation. What scared me was that I didn't know what horrible-looking things were waiting for me at the next corner. (I) was also scared of unpredictable loud lightning strikes.*"

(25) 那時我想，我的未來就這麼斷送在一時興起的貪念上了，是我，是我親手葬送了我的前途，抹煞了我一直以來追求的光明，我自心底湧出一股惡寒，心想我的白紙上將會有一筆如何也擦不掉，掩蓋不了的汙點，世人將以嫌惡的目光看我，唾棄我。

nàshí wǒxiǎng, wǒde wèilái jiù zhème duànsòng zài yīshí xīngqǐ de tān niàn shàngle, shì wǒ, shì wǒ qīnshǒu zàngsòngle wǒ de qiántú, mǒshāle wǒ yīzhí yǐlái zhuīqiú de guāngmíng, wǒ zì xīndǐ yǒngchū yī gǔ wù hán, xīn xiǎng wǒ de báizhǐ shàng jiàng huì yǒu yībǐ rúhé yě cā bù diào, yǎngài bùliǎo de wūdiǎn, shìrén jiāng yǐ xiánwù de mùguāng kàn wǒ, tuòqì wǒ.

"*At that moment, I thought my future was ruined due to my greed. I was the one who ruined my future and destroyed my integrity. A sense of guilt popped up in my mind. I thought there would be a stain left on my white sheet and nothing could erase it. Everyone would look down upon me and spurn me.*"

Evaluative devices. Table 6 displays the frequency distributions of the eight types of evaluative devices in EFL learners' Chinese narratives as compared to those of the Chinese native control group. As shown, no significant difference was found among the three groups. Both learner groups appeared to perform similarly to CNSs in terms of the use of evaluative devices.

Table 6

Mean Proportions (%) of Different Types of Evaluative Devices in Chinese Written Narratives by CNSs and EFL Learners

	CNSs (*n* = 25)		Inter EFL (*n* = 25)		Adv EFL (*n* = 25)		ANOVA	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
emotion	22.3	21.0	28.6	15.7	30.6	18.3	1.384	*ns*
cognition	7.1	12.7	14.3	13.7	12.8	9.7	2.423	*ns*
perception	14.2	17.8	18.8	12.7	13.0	14.6	.996	*ns*
intention	5.8	11.7	3.3	6.8	4.8	6.7	.514	*ns*
physical state	19.7	33.3	11.2	12.8	6.2	7.4	2.643	*ns*
reported speech	18.2	22.5	7.8	11.3	10.4	12.4	2.753	*ns*
hedge	2.4	5.9	3.4	6.1	6.6	7.5	2.830	*ns*
intensifier	10.3	13.3	12.7	12.8	15.6	16.5	.876	*ns*

Within-Group Comparisons in English and Chinese Written Narratives

In addition to probing possible cross-linguistic influence from both directions, we would like to see whether the EFL learners merge or differentiate the narrative styles in their L1 and L2 narration. This issue is addressed by comparing the EFL learners' narrative productions in their two languages.

Intermediate EFL learners' Chinese and English written narratives. The result of the paired-samples *t*-test indicated that the intermediate learners produced significantly more clauses in the Chinese essays (55.64 clauses) than in the English ones (40.04 clauses) (*t*(24) = 4.872, *p* = .000). This result is not surprising given that Chinese is the learners' dominant language, and so they could elaborate the story to a greater extent.

Regarding the narrative structure, the results of paired-samples *t*-tests indicated that the intermediate EFL learners differentiated their two languages in the use of the "evaluation" component (*t*(24) = -3.67, *p* = .001). The frequency of occurrence of the evaluation is 100% in their Chinese narratives, but only 64% in their English narratives. This result may have to do with the learners' insufficient English ability to provide evaluative remarks in English, and so their English written narratives exhibited a lower percentage in the use of evaluation than their Chinese

ones. As for the use of evaluative devices, the statistical results showed that the intermediate learners used similar strategies in their L1 and L2, except for the "intention" category ($t(24) = 2.218$, $p = .036$). They used significantly more expressions referring to the character's intention in the English narratives than in the Chinese ones (ENSs: 7.2% vs. CNSs: 3.3%).

Overall, the intermediate EFL learners seemed to have employed the L1 narrative styles in writing personal stories in their two languages.

Advanced EFL learners' Chinese and English written narratives. The advanced learners produced significantly more clauses in the Chinese narratives (60 clauses) than in the English ones (46.96 clauses) ($t(24) = 4.941$, $p = .000$). Given that Chinese is the learners' dominant language, it is not a big surprise to see that they could write more in the Chinese essays than in English essays.

As to the use of narrative structure, paired-samples *t*-tests showed that there was no difference in the use of the structural component in the advanced learners' English and Chinese narratives. Moreover, the advanced learners produced a similar proportion of evaluative clauses in their narratives in the two languages (English narratives: 15%; Chinese narratives: 20%), which was in the direction of the ENSs (19%). With respect to the use of evaluative devices, no significant difference was found between the learners' English and Chinese narratives except for the "hedge" category ($t(24) = -3.541$, $p = .002$). The advanced learners used significantly more hedge expressions in the Chinese narratives than in the English ones (Chinese narratives: 6.6% vs. English narratives: 1%).

Generally speaking, the advanced EFL learners seemed to have merged the narrative styles of the L1 and L2. They used the L1-based narrative structure in writing both L1 and L2 essays, but at the same time, they adopted the American style of evaluation in both languages.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study examined the narrative styles of Chinese EFL learners in their writing of frightening experiences in the L1 and L2, focusing on the use of narrative structural components and evaluative devices. The goal of the study is to shed some light on our understanding of bi-directional cultural transfer in second/foreign language learning. The results of the study presented strong evidence for L1 influence on L2 narration. Like the Chinese native control group, the intermediate and advanced EFL learners provided a prologue and a coda significantly

more often than the English native control group when writing personal narratives in English. The advanced learners also produced a higher proportion of reported speech than the English native control group did in their English narratives. These findings suggested that L1 socio-cultural values and writing conventions play important roles in L2 narrative writing.

On the other hand, L2 influence on L1 narration was less noticeable and mainly observed among the advanced learners. The advanced learners appeared to follow the American style of evaluation when writing Chinese narratives; they made more explicit references to personal feelings, attitudes and interpretations on the story than the Chinese native control group did. Moreover, the advanced learners appeared to have merged the narrative styles of L1 and L2 in their writing of personal narratives in both languages. They followed the L1 narrative structure and use of evaluative devices and the L2 style of giving evaluative comments in their narration in their two languages. The results of the present study suggested that cultural transfer in narrative styles could occur bi-directionally, and that the advanced learner's narrative repertoires of their two languages may form an interconnected system instead of independent systems, and thus lent support to the multi-competence view of second language learning.

In light of the multi-competence theory and the findings of the present study, some teaching implications can be drawn. Since L2 learners inevitably bring their cultural values, discourse structure, and rhetoric to L2 writing/narration, language teachers should be encouraged to treat L2 learners as resourceful writers/narrators. Language teachers should recognize that L2 learners are different from monolingual native speakers in their knowledge and use of their L1s and L2s, and therefore, the linguistic and cultural characteristics that L2 learners exhibit in their writing/narration should be valued as their resources and as representation of their unique voices and identities (Canagarajah, 2002). Multilingual writers/narrators with developed multi-competence in narrative discourse and rhetoric possess more resources than monolingual writers/narrators, and it is these resources that language teachers should nurture and develop in their classrooms.

Using a written prompt, this study is one of the few early attempts to explore bi-directional transfer in L2 learners' narrative competences. Some of the previous studies comparing oral and written personal narratives have suggested that although the two registers of narratives

share a similar structure, they may differ in some discourse and rhetorical features (Özyıldırım, 2009; Sun & Yang, 2011). Future research employing an oral prompt is recommended to see if similar findings are also obtained.

REFERENCES

Bamberg, M., & Damrad-Frye, R. (1991). On the ability to provide evaluative comments: Further explorations of children's narrative competencies. *Journal of Child Language*, *18*, 689-710.

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A cross-linguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bliss, L. S., McCabe, A., & Miranda, A. E. (1998). Narrative assessment profile: Discourse analysis for school-age children. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *31*, 347-363.

Brown, A., & Gullberg, M. (2011). Bidirectional cross-linguistic influence in event conceptualization? Expressions of path among Japanese learners of English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *14*, 79-94.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Chao, R. K. (1995). Chinese and European American cultural models of the self reflected in mothers' childrearing beliefs. *Ethos*, *23*, 328-354.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research*, *7*, 103-117.

Cook, V. (Ed.). (2003). *Effects of the second language on the first*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Davidse, K., & Vandelanotte, L. (2011). Tense use in direct and indirect speech in English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 236-250.

Dussias, E., & Sagarra, N. (2007). The effects of exposure on syntactic parsing in Spanish-English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*, 101-16.

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (Eds.). (1992). *Language transfer in language learning.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

González, M. (2009). Narrative clause organization of Catalan and English storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*, 540-563.

Han, J. J., Leichtman, M. D., & Wang, Q. (1998). Autobiographical memory in Korean, Chinese, and American children. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*, 701-713.

Ho, J. W. (2001). The cultural significance of coda in Chinese narratives. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 61-80.

Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Johnstone, B. (2001). Discourse analysis and narrative. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 635-649). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Indrasuta, C. (1988). Narrative styles in the writing of Thai and American students. In A.

Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 206-226). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kang, J. Y. (2003). On the ability to tell good stories in another language: Analysis of Korean EEL learners' oral "frog story" narratives. *Narrative Inquiry*, *13*, 127-149.

Kang, J. Y. (2006). Producing culturally appropriate narratives in English as a foreign language: A discourse analysis of Korean EFL learners' written narratives. *Narrative Inquiry*, *16*, 379-407.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*, 1-20.

Labov, W. (Ed.). (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral version of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp.12-44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lee, M. P. (2003). Discourse structure and rhetoric of English narratives: Differences between native English and Chinese non-native English writers. *Text & Talk*, *23*, 347-368.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1998). The cultural psychology of personality. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *29*, 63-87.

McClure, E., Mir, M., & Cadierno, T. (1993). What do you include in a narrative? A comparison of the written narratives of Mexican and American fourth and ninth graders. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, *4*, 209-224.

Mennen, I. (2004). Bi-directional interference in the intonation of Dutch speakers of Greek. *Journal of Phonetics*, *32*, 543-563.

Miller, P. J., Wiley, A. R., Fung, H., & Liang, C. (1997). Personal storytelling as a medium of socialization in Chinese and American families. *Child Development*, *68*, 557-568.

Minami, M. (2008). Telling good stories in different languages: Bilingual children's styles of story construction and their linguistic and educational implications. *Narrative Inquiry*, *18*, 83-110.

Mullen, M. K., & Yi, S. (1995). The cultural context of talk about the past: Implications for the development of autobiographical memory. *Cognitive Development*, *10*, 407-419.

Özyıldırım, I. (2009). Narrative analysis: An analysis of oral and written strategies in personal experience narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*, 1209-1222.

Pavlenko, A., & Jarvis, S. (2002). Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*, 190-214.

Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (Eds.). (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. New York: Plenum Press.

Porter, D. (1989). A comparison of narrative structures of English-speaking and Spanish-speaking students. *Issues and Developments in English and Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 69-83.

Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. *General Linguistics*, *9*, 67-92.

Shiro, M. (2003). Genre and evaluation in narrative development. *Journal of Child*

Language, *30*, 165-195.

Söter, A. O. (1988). The second language learner and cultural transfer in narration. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 177-205). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stavans, A. (2003). Bilinguals as narrators: A comparison of bilingual and monolingual Hebrew and English narratives. *Narrative Inquiry*, *13*, 151-191.

Stein, C. L. (2004). Analysis of narratives of Bhutanese and rural American 7-year old children: Issues of story grammar and culture. *Narrative Inquiry*,*14*, 369-394.

Su, I.-R. (2001). Transfer of sentence processing strategies: A comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *22*, 83-112.

Su, I.-R. (2010). Transfer of pragmatic competences: A bi-directional perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*, 87-102.

Sun, Y., & Yang, W. (2011). A comparative analysis of discourse features in EFL learners' oral and written narratives. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *3*, 1-23.

Tannen, D. (1982). Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language*, *58*, 1-21.

Wang, Q., & Leichtman, M. D. (2000). Same beginnings, different stories: A comparison of American and Chinese children's narratives. *Child Development*, *71*, 1329-1346.

Wang, Q., Leichtman, M. D., & Davies, K. I. (2000). Sharing memories and telling stories: American and Chinese mothers and their 3-year-olds. *Memory*, *8*, 159-177.

Williams, H. (2004). Lexical frames and reported speech. *ELT Journal*, *58*, 247-257.

Wu, D. Y. (1996). Chinese childhood socialization. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 143-154). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Zampini, L., & Green, P. (2001). The voicing contrast in English and Spanish: The relationship between perception and production. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages* (pp. 23-48). Boston: Blackwell.

Zareva, A. (2010). Multi-competence and L2 users' associative links: Being unlike nativelike. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 2-22.

CORRESPONDENCE

I-Ru Su, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan
Email address: irusu@mx.nthu.edu.tw

Yi-Chun Chou, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan
Email address: judychou1122@gmail.com

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Coding of narrative structural components: A sample essay

[PROLOGUE] The most frightening experience I ever had took place when I was only eight years old. It was so frightening that I can still remember the event clearly after so many years.

[ORIENTATIION] On that day when this event happened, I went to a field trip to the Taipei Zoo with my class. For the whole day I followed my teacher and saw different kinds of animals.

[COMPLICATNG ACTION] When the trip was about to end, my teacher gave us some free time to hang around and do whatever we like until a specific time to gather at the gate of the zoo and go home. I went to see cute animals such as rabbits and goats, and meanwhile made sure my teacher was nearby so I wouldn't get lost. All of a sudden, however, I couldn't see any of my classmates around, not to mention my teacher. Everywhere around me I only saw strangers and I didn't know how to get to the gate of the zoo.

[EVALUATION] I was so afraid that I would be left behind and couldn't go home, or even worse, get kidnapped by bad guys.

[RESOLUTION] I burst into tears and cried out loud, until finally a kind lady came and gently asked me what happened. After I told her that I couldn't find my teacher and classmates, she took me to the zoo's tourist center and had them broadcast throughout the zoo in search of my teacher. Finally my teacher came to the tourist center and brought me back to my class, ending this scary incident.

[CODA] Though many years have passed, I could still feel the sense of horror at the moment. Thankfully it ended in a happy ending.

Appendix B. Coding of evaluative devices: A sample essay

<u>**Note:**</u> In the present study we coded only the evaluative devices which were embedded in "orientation', "complicating action", "resolution", and "evaluation" clauses. That is, we only analyzed the evaluative devices used in the description of the event proper, and excluded those in the prologue and the coda.

There are a lot of experiences in everyone's life. Some are filled with joy, some are full of sorrow, and some are embarrassed. In my memories, from all of the events that happened to me, the most clearest one was a frightening experience which occurred when I was a student of an elementary school.

I clearly <u>remembered</u> [COGNTION] that it was late in the spring and the weather started to get hot. I could easily get sweat even after the sunset. Due to the fact that I had to get to the cram school after a whole tiring study day, I usually <u>went home late with an exhausted mind</u> [PHYSICAL STATE]. I took a shower as soon as possible as usual and then sat in front of my desk in order to make the preparation for tomorrow. Before I studied, I set my long hair on top of my head to <u>make me feel fresh</u> [PHYSICAL STATE]. It was all <u>very</u> [INTENSIFIER] <u>safe and sound</u>. There were some noise of the bugs coming from outside and the sound of running machines from the inside. I <u>felt sleepy</u> [PHYSICAL STATE] and nodded my head once every few minutes. Suddenly I <u>felt</u> [PERCEPTION] <u>a strength</u> from behind pulling my head. I was soon awake and <u>my heart was beating like a drum</u> [PHYSICAL STATE]. The room got <u>extremely</u> [INTENSIFIER] <u>quiet</u> and I <u>was afraid</u> [EMOTION] to make a move. I waited patiently for my mother to pass through. It was the longest five minutes in my life before I grabbed my mother to tell her what just happened. However, she merely smiled and told me <u>that I was too tired</u> [REPORTED SPEECH]. It was <u>really</u> [INTENSIFIER] <u>annoying</u> why those adult rarely believed what we said. I asked for my mom to stay with me before I recovered gradually. Finally, I could <u>hear</u> [PERCEPTION] <u>the machines and bugs</u> except for my heart beat. I packed all my things in a hurry and turned to turn off the desk lamp. In this moment, <u>a thought came over my mind</u> [CONTITION]. I <u>stared</u> [PERCEPTION] <u>at the desk lamp</u> and used my one hand to <u>touch</u> [PERCEPTION] <u>claw clip</u>. Everything made sense. Since I was nodding, the claw clip hit the lamp while I am trying to raise my head.

In the end, it proved that I was not lying as a result of that there was a strength which pulled my head from behind certainly. The adult really should hear what the children say. Although it seemed to be very silly after everything was clear, I was scared at the moment and this was a frightening experience that I would not forget.

I-Ru Su & Yi-Chun Chou

雙向語言移轉：
以書寫個人經驗的敘事風格為例

蘇怡如
國立清華大學
周怡君
國立清華大學

過去在敘事言談（narrative discourse）分析的研究發現人們的敘事風格因文化而異，且外語學習者的母語知識與能力會影響其外語的敘事表現，但鮮少研究探討外語的知識是否會反過來影響其母語的敘事表現。因此，本研究以台灣英語學習者為研究對象，以 Cook（1991）提出的「多元語言能力」（multi-competence）觀點探討他們在外語習得中，其中語及英語的敘事寫作策略是否有雙向影響的現象。研究結果顯示學習者的母語敘事風格會影響其英語的敘事表現。寫英文敘事文時，英語學習者比英語單語人傾向提供開場白（prologue）和結尾（coda），特別是跟道德訓誡（moral lesson）有關的結尾，而在評價方法上，英語學習者也比英語單語人使用較多的引述結構（reported speech），這些現象都是受到母語的敘事文化所影響。然而，英語學習者的英語影響母語的敘事表現比較不明顯，且只在英語程度較高的學習者身上發現。他們受到英語的影響，在寫中文敘事文時，評價子句（evaluative clause）的使用比例較高。本研究結果讓我們對外語學習者其母語與外語的互動有更進一步的瞭解。

關鍵詞：個人經驗敘事寫作、敘事風格、雙向語言移轉