Kinship Address: Socializing Young Children in Taiwan

Todd L. Sandel

Recent scholarship on language socialization, Chinese kinship, and studies of personal address suggests that personal and familial identities are constructed through common everyday interactions. Based upon data collected from ethnographic interviews and participant-observation, this study suggests that kinship address is one way that young children in Taiwan are socialized into these identities. This study also suggests that the meaning system or folk theory associated with the practice of kinship address can be readily articulated by caregivers, and that the folk theory supports this practice. Finally, these data suggest that identities of person and family are creatively and fluidly constructed.

W hile teaching an undergraduate class in intercultural communication, I showed a clip from the movie *The Joy Luck Club* (based upon the novel by Amy Tan, 1989) when Waverly brings her white, "American" boyfriend, Rich, to her family's home for dinner. Rich's performance during the meal is a disaster: he violates every conceivable norm of etiquette for a Chinese family dinner. I wanted to demonstrate how the rules of culture can often be foregrounded when a "stranger" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997), such as Rich, enters a foreign culture and unwittingly violates that culture's unwritten rules (see Hall, 1976). In the ensuing discussion my students identified a number of cultural norms that Rich violated—norms which I had also identified. However, one student, who grew up in Hong Kong, noticed one norm which I had overlooked: she said that Rich addressed his girlfriend's mother (his future mother-in-law) by her first name; this, she explained, was Rich's most egregious cultural blunder.

I narrate this anecdote for three reasons: (1) it illustrates that in Chinese communities there is a patterned way to address one's kin; (2) associated with kinship address is a meaning system, or folk theory (also called ethnotheory, see Harkness & Super, 1996): there are right and wrong ways to address one's kin; and (3) the features of the cultural practice of kinship address and its associated folk theory can become foregrounded by its participants during moments when a novice, such as the "American" Rich, are unable or perhaps unwilling to perform the practice. Researchers of intercultural communication often take advantage of such moments as they may reveal what are otherwise hidden cultural practices and beliefs (see Bluedorn, 1998; Hall, 1976). But intercultural encounters are not the only time when cultural practices and beliefs may be foregrounded. As Hall (1976) explains, parent-child interactions are also another key moment: one of the "situations that expose[s] culture's hidden structure [is] when one is raising the young and is forced to explain things" (p. 222).

This study looks closely at encounters between novices and more experienced members who practice Chinese kinship address. The goals of this study are twofold: (1) to understand how novices are socialized into the daily, routine practice of kinship address; and (2) to understand the meanings or folk theory that more experienced members associate with this practice. Researchers in the field of language socialization have long been interested in investigating both the process by which children are socialized into cultural practices and the meanings that are associated with such practices (e.g., Kulick, 1992; Miller & Hoogstra, 1992; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). The present study follows from this approach as it presents data that show both how this cultural practice is enacted in a community in Taiwan, and the meanings these participants link to this practice. But before presenting the data I first review studies in two related fields, personal address and kinship studies, which help to conceptualize the present study.

Previous Research on Personal Address

Studies of personal address follow from the work of Brown and Gilman (1960), who first investigated pronominal address systems in several European languages, such as *tu* and *vous* in French. They proposed an elegant system to explain the use of these pronouns, claiming that usage is determined by two factors: power and solidarity. In symmetrical relations people use the more familiar pronouns, but in asymmetrical the inferior addresses the superior with the formal, and the superior can address the inferior using either the formal or informal pronouns. Subsequent research, however, has faulted this theory for appearing too deterministic and supposing a pre-existing cultural system from which speaking practices are built. Speakers appear to use address terms to negotiate or transform a cultural system (see

Fitch, 1991; Morford, 1997); speakers can use terms of address in creative and non-literal ways such as metaphor, joking, irony, and deception (Fitch, 1991); finally speakers can apply their own personal meaning when using terms of personal address, one which differs from the conventional interpretation (Sequeira, 1993).

Studies of personal address have shown that in addition to pronominal forms, there exist a number of other categories of address terms and that the use of these forms indexes and constructs cultural beliefs. For example, Fitch (1998) claims that there are five categories of address terms: second-person pronouns, proper names, kinship terms, titles, and nicknames and adjectival terms. She demonstrates that the kinship term, *Madre,* or mother, can be studied as it is used to index and negotiate a variety of relationships among participants in Columbia (Fitch, 1991). Likewise, in China the title, *tongzhi,* or comrade, has been studied as it reveals how a title indexes China's changing social structure (Fang & Heng, 1983; Scotton & Zhu, 1983).

In sum, recent studies of personal address show that it is a much broader field than first envisioned by Brown and Gilman (1960), and that it is a fruitful field for communication studies as it indexes how notions of the nature of persons and relationships can be socially and strategically constructed (Fitch, 1991; Morford, 1997).

Previous Research on Kinship

A second line of research that illumines the present study is studies of kinship, with particular attention to studies of Chinese kinship. For many decades anthropologists included the study of kinship as one of their key tools for understanding local cultures. However, as explained by Carsten (2000), interest in kinship among anthropologists waned in the 1970s and 1980s. The prevailing view among anthropologists was that kinship is a fact of life rooted in the biological composition of the tribe of family. (One notable exception is found in Schneider's (1968/1980) classic study of American kinship where he claims that kinship should be studied as a "cultural system" or "system of symbols.") Given such a static notion of kinship, anthropologists focused their attention upon other phenomena, such as gender, which they studied as socially constructed, not biologically pre-ordained. But recent years have witnessed a shift among some anthropologists who have found that kinship, too, is socially constructed, and that it can be studied as a process constructed through everyday practice.

Stafford's (2000) study of patterns of Chinese kinship illustrates the newer approach to kinship studies. Based upon fieldwork conducted in communities in northeastern China and southern Taiwan, he claims that ties of family and community are constructed on a continuum from most formal to least formal, and that these ties are associated with the terms of *yang* (to care for or nurture) and *laiwang* (to have

relations). He critiques kinship studies of Chinese contexts which see kinship in terms of patriliny, but ignore both less formal relationships and the importance of women in kinship relationships. That is, he challenges studies, such as Gao's (1996), that assume that Chinese kinship is rigid and non-incorporative—wary of and resistant of outsiders—his data suggest instead that kinship is fluid and creatively incorporative. A similar claim is made by Li (1999) in his study of kinship in Tianjin, China. He discusses the phenomenon of "iron brothers and sisters" or the newly emergent process of creating fictive kin. Such ties have become popular in recent years partly due to the migration of people from the countryside to urban centers—where nuclear families are more the norm—and due to the one-child policy. That is, there exists in Tianjin a continuum of kinship bonds ranging from close to less close, bonds that are constructed by participants, not rooted in biology but in the social order of the community, much like that described by Stafford (2000).

Finally, Chen's (1999) study of the mother and daughter-in-law relationship deserves attention. From her interviews of 12 dyads in Taipei, Taiwan, she finds a range of descriptions of the relationship, ranging from bonds as close as a mother and daughter, to bonds distant and strained. She also reports on a practice called "greeting," one which appears to be much the same as the one focused on in this study.

> Greeting seems to be a big issue to most of the mothers-in-law even though most of the daughters-in-law did not pay attention to this. A mother-in-law-said, "When my relatives or friends came to our house, she [my daughter-in-law] greeted them. I was very happy about that." Other mothers-in-law had similar reactions to the greeting behavior from the daughters-in-law." (p. 66)

Chen reports the positive evaluation one mother-in-law gave to her daughter-in-law's practice of greeting her neighbors: "All my children and daughters-in-law are very filial. My neighbors always tell me that my daughter-in-law is very polite because she always greets them whenever she meets them. I feel very proud from the neighbors' praising" (p. 66) That is, the practice of "greeting" one's neighbors is judged by this mother-in-law and her neighbors to index what it means to be polite, and hence is a praiseworthy act.

In sum, recent studies of kinship, especially Chinese kinship, reveal that kinship ties are constructed and that they vary on a continuum from very close to less close. Li's (1999) and Chen's (1999) studies lend evidence that these ties are indexed by kinship terms used among both kin and fictive kin. Chen (1999), furthermore, indicates that participants positively evaluate the use of these terms.

The present study is guided by these recent studies of both personal address and kinship: it looks at kinship address not as a practice that is rooted in biology, or determined by a pre-existing cultural system, but rather as a cultural practice that both indexes interpersonal rela-

tions and creatively constructs kinship ties. The study follows from the dual aims of language socialization to investigate how novices are socialized into cultural practices by everyday, routine enactments of a practice, and the desire to uncover the folk theories that participants say support these practices. The data presented in this study will look at both the enactments and folk theories associated with kinship address.

Methods

This study is based upon two periods of fieldwork conducted over two months in 1998 and another two months in 1999. It involved participant-observation and 67 interviews with a total of 78 participants, including mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and grandfathers, in Chhan-chng, a small community in central Taiwan (discussed below). In this community our primary goal was to uncover local meanings from the participants' point of view (Geertz, 1973). The current paper is based on a subset of 40 interviews, 17 conducted by a research colleague (who is a native of Taiwan), and 23 conducted by the author; about half of the 23 interviews were done with the assistance of the author's wife, a native of Taiwan. Interviews were open-ended, audio-recorded, and ranged in length from 30 minutes to 3 hours with most lasting approximately 90 minutes.

Following data collection, analysis involved the following procedures: (1) transcribing interviews verbatim into the original languages, (2) coding (in the original languages) for emergent themes, and (3) translating key excerpts into English for presentation.[1] At each step a collaborative approach was taken in order to ensure accuracy and increase confidence in our interpretations. Each interview was first transcribed by one person (four people, including the author, worked on a portion of the interviews) and later checked by a second person for accuracy. Emergent themes were then discussed in periodic consultations with both those working on transcriptions and the author's adviser. Finally, translations—made by the author—were then discussed, primarily with the author's wife, and secondarily with other members of the research team.

The community where most interviews were conducted is Taiwan's Chhan-chng (a pseudonym). This site was chosen because of my familiarity with the community and its residents. I have been known to many people in Chhan-chng since 1990 as *"Iao-se e kia"-sai,"*[2] or Iao-se's (my father-in-law's name) son-in-law. In 1990 I became linked to a family and this community through marriage to a native of Chhan-chng. During the extended periods that I have lived in Taiwan (1990–1996, the summers of 1998 and 1999), I have periodically visited Chhan-chng and spent time with my in-laws, who are prominent members of the community, and their many extended kinfolk. Thus, much like "Rich" of *The Joy Luck Club,* I have had my share of

experiences being socialized as an overgrown novice into the cultural practices enacted on a daily basis in Chhan-chng. It was with this role as kinship member through marriage, and periodic guest, that my experiences as participant-observer were framed during periods of fieldwork in 1998 and 1999.

Interviewing Procedures

As explained by Briggs (1986), the interview as ethnographic tool is subject to limitations when used in diverse cultures. Therefore, it must be analyzed as a metacommunitave event and adapted to local norms of communication. We found this to be the case in Chhan-chng: To most participants the interview was an unfamiliar communicative event.[3] Therefore, we adapted our procedures in a number of ways: (1) older participants were interviewed first—as a way of displaying respect; (2) interviews were conducted in both Mandarin and Tai-gi; (3) we framed the interview as a friendly "chat"; and (4) we conducted interviews in the participants' homes, meaning that we did not attempt to exclude intrusions from other participants—namely children—and did not divorce the interview process from an array of domestic tasks—such as watching over children, cooking meals, taking care of customers (several participants lived in homes adjoining family-run businesses), or peeling onions (see Miller, Wang, Sandel, & Cho, 2001).

In sum, while kinship address was not the main focus of our study, we allowed the *practice* of kinship address to emerge from the flow of everyday talk captured in the interviews; and we allowed the *folk theory* (Harkness & Super, 1996) associated with kinship address to emerge as participants expressed to us what they believe to be the goals of childrearing—among which kinship address plays a prominent role.

Access

Our access to Chhan-chng was developed through the ties that I have to the community through my wife, who grew up in Chhan-chng, and the many members of her extended family. In particular, we were aided by my mother- and father-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Dyoo (all participants are referred to by pseudonyms), who as longstanding residents of the community played a key role in facilitating our access to the community. (We do, however, recognize the limitations posed by their help. As gatekeepers they could have limited our access to certain community members with whom they do not have relationships.) They helped transform our interviewing procedures into a more familiar communicative event, as people come to know each other through the shared ties of intermediaries. But before discussing findings from this study, it is important to ground the research by describing the community within which the enactment and associated folk theory of kinship address were observed, Chhan-chng.

Chhan-chng

Chhan-chng Hiong is a small farming community of approximately 33,000 inhabitants covering an area of 16 square miles. Most of its inhabitants are native Taiwanese: they are descendants of settlers who came to the island from China's Fujian Province during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries when Taiwan was under the control of the Qing (Ch'ing) Dynasty. They speak Tai-gi as their mother tongue, the southern Chinese language spoken by the majority of the inhabitants of Taiwan (see Huang, 1995). Most residents also speak Mandarin Chinese, the official language taught in local schools since 1945.

For children growing up in Chhan-chng today life is different from previous generations. Families have fewer children (Thornton & Lin, 1994), and because adult family members do not need to work such long hours in the fields, caregivers can spend more time supervising their children's (or grandchildren's) activities. A generation ago mothers and other family members lived together close to home and shared in the tasks of caregiving, household maintenance, and farming. But now as more young people have sought employment in nearby towns or moved to the cities for better jobs, some mothers resume work after observing a one month post-partum rest and entrust full-time or primary caregiving responsibilities to the child's grandmother, usually the paternal grandmother. In the past mothers were the primary caregivers while others merely helped as needed. Today's grandmothers sometimes complain that they are expected to care for their young grandchildren while their daughters-in-law work away from home, although this does not prevent them from being proud of their close relationship with grandchildren.

But one feature of life that has not changed as much from one generation to the next is children's routine exposure to adult activities. Children live in a community where homes, farms, shops, and businesses are often joined. For example, two children lived with their grandmothers who operated small stores that were connected to the living quarters. These children were accustomed to seeing people come and go on a daily basis. In another case the family's living quarters were located on the upper floors of a factory. Children would often play near the factory floor in close proximity to the employees and customers. Another child lived in a home where his mother and paternal grandfather and grandmother operated a family fish bait business. His home was physically joined to that of his relatives. Thus, he often played in a large courtyard in front of the house, and spent much time playing with siblings and cousins. Most of the children were accustomed to interacting with children, young people, and adults of all ages. Few spheres of adult life were unknown to them; this open lifestyle is one that people in Chhan-chng say is very similar to the

lifestyle of the past generation. (See Sandel, 2000, for further description of Chhan-chng.)

Results

Kinship Address Performed

The performed kinship address analyzed by this study is a communicative act of personal address involving a competent performer and a less competent novice, occuring on those occasions when a competent performer teaches a novice to address another person using an appropriate kinship term. For example, when guests come to visit, the host usually, or sometimes the visiting guest herself, instructs the novice to greet (address) the guest saying: *"Ni you meiyou jiao Ayi,"*[4] or "Did you greet Aunt?" Novices of two kinds participate in this kind of event: (1) a young child, or (2) a novice adult, i.e., the American-born researcher, TLS. In both events it was observed that at least one competent performer, or sometimes several competent performers, would take the initiative to facilitate the novice's enactment of kinship address.

Teaching Kinship Address to American Kin

Kinship address emerges in participant-observation. Since 1990 I have been connected to Chhan-chng through marriage to my wife who is a member of a large and extended family in the community. Hence, whenever I visit it is my responsibility to properly greet my wife's kin. But, quite often I need help from a competent performer to greet my kinfolk because: (1) there are so many kinfolk that it is difficult to recognize all of them, and (2) the kinship terms used in Tai-gi, the language most commonly used in this community, are numerous and quite complex. My mother-in-law, cognizant of her American son-in-law's poor performance, took it upon herself—without my request—to teach me how to address kin. Thus, it often happened that when someone would come for a visit she would say to me: *"Dade, kio A-i."* Or, *"Dade* [my Chinese name] say Aunt." *(A-i* literally means mother's sister.) Once I would greet the guest as *"A-i,"* conversation could resume. This kind of instruction occurred on nearly a daily basis while living in Chhan-chng.

I, however, was not the only American novice to this practice. In 1999 my four-year-old son was also in Chhan-chng, and other competent performers also tried to instruct him into the practice of kinship address. My wife's younger brother, after returning home from work, would say to my son: *"Daoyuan, jiao Jiujiu."* Or *"Daoyuan* [my son's Chinese name], say Uncle." I often watched this performance because my son was an uncooperative performer, and when my son did not do as asked, my brother-in-law came up with humorous and creative ways to get my son to *"jiao Jiujiu,"* such as by withholding a treat until he performed properly.

Kinship address emerges in interviews. It was in the context of an interview with a father, however, that I became aware of the enactment of kinship address—a practice which I had participated in and observed on a daily basis. This father told me that the key to raising children is to teach them to know how to address their kin. If children do this, they will behave well, and society will prosper. His comment led me to look at the interviews that we had conducted about childrearing, even though kinship address was not a focus of our research. I was pleasantly surprised, however, to find displays of kinship on many of the interview tapes.

But perhaps this finding is not so surprising. Recall that the interviews were done in people's homes. Furthermore, some of the interviews were conducted with my wife's kinfolk, meaning that the researchers (my wife and I) should and could be greeted as kin. Hence, although the purpose of the visit was to conduct an "interview," framed as a communicative event the guests (i.e., the researchers) were greeted in the same manner as other guests would be treated. This meant that if children were present they were expected to address the guests in a respectful manner, i.e., enact kinship address. In this manner the boundary between data collected from participant-observation and interviewing is erased, as kinship address naturally occurred in both kinds of communicative events. Thus instances of both kinship address and comments on the meaning system associated with this practice were recorded in interviews.

Kinship address, defined as a sequence of turns in which a child uses or is directed by an adult to use a kinship term (such as aunt or uncle) to greet or address another adult, occurred 6 times in a subset of 40 interviews. Table 1 summarizes these results.

Participants also talked about the meaning system they associate with kinship address. These I identify as metacommunicative comments that: (1) followed a child's greeting: "How nice!"; (2) followed a child's non-greeting: "[He's] embarrassed, [he] doesn't dare speak."; or (3) occurred in response to the researcher's question about childrearing: When asked if she ever hit a child in public, Grandma Kho* explained that learning how to greet adults is the most important element in a child's education. Comments of one or more of these types are found in 15 of the 40 interviews.

In the following I will first show how kinship address is performed and then explain the associated folk theory. But before proceeding it is necessary to first provide the reader some information about the kinship terms themselves.

Briefly stated, in both Mandarin and Tai-gi, the two languages spoken in Chhan-chng, the number of kinship terms available to speakers exceeds those found in many other languages, such as

TABLE 1
Kinship Address Enactments

Facilitator(s)	Addressee(s)	Situation	Child's Response
Grandma Ang	R1*	Grandma tells child (2;1)# "Must call him Uncle."	None
Grandma Go*	R2	Grandma tells child (2;6) to greet auntie	None
Grandma Kho*	R2	Child (2;10) enters, told to greet auntie	None
Mrs. Liao	R2	Mother explains when child (2;6) talks	Child greets
Mrs. Tiu", 4 others	R1	Child (3;11) told by all to "Greet uncle"	Child greets
Grandma Liao	R2 & Mrs. Dyoo	Child (5) enters, says "Great-auntie. Auntie."	Child greets

*R1 = the author, TLS. R2 = the author's research colleague, SHW.
#The child's age is given in parentheses e.g., 2;1 means 2 years and 1 month.

English. As seen in Table 2, the relationships that are indexed by the single English term, "uncle," are more finely defined by the use of five terms in Mandarin and Tai-gi respectively. Furthermore, to each of these terms a "prefix" can be added indicating the person's birth order, i.e., "*da*," Mandarin, or "*toa*," Tai-gi (literally big) can be added to indicate that the "uncle" is the eldest, while "*xiao*," Mandarin, or "*se*," Tai-gi (literally small) indicates that the "uncle" is the youngest. In sum, the kinship system that young children in Chhan-chng are socialized into is a complex one, requiring that the child be aware of such factors as the kin member's sex, birth order, patrilineal or matrilineal relationship, etc. Much more could be said about the complexity of Chinese kinship terms. Such concerns, however, lie beyond the scope of this study.

Teaching Kinship Address to Local Children

Most enactments of kinship address are short, such as the following, which occurred 10 minutes into the interview I, TLS, conducted with Grandma Ang:

TABLE 2
"Uncle" in Mandarin and Tai-gi

English Gloss	Mandarin Term	Tai-gi Term
Father's elder brother	*Bobo*	*A-peh*
Father's younger brother	*Shushu*	*A-chek*
Father's sister's husband	*Guzhang*	*Ko*-tiu"*
Mother's brother	*Jiujiu*	*A-ku*
Mother's sister's husband	*Yizhang*	*I-tiu"*

> Grandma Ang: [to grandson] This is auntie's [husband]. Should address him as *I-tiu^n* [uncle].
>
> TLS: So he [child] can talk.
>
> Grandma Ang: He can talk. [He is] embarrassed [*phai^n-se,* or uneasy]. . . . *Phai^n-se* [He's embarrassed]. He doesn't dare talk [now], but he's a real talker. *Gugu* [auntie], he can say [or address] everyone, *Gugu.* He can address everyone. When [you] tell him to say it, he can say anything.

Grandma attempted to get her two-year-old grandson to address me as *I-tiu^n*, or literally mother's sister's husband. (Grandma Ang is my mother-in-law's cross-cousin. So I am distantly related to her grandson as an uncle, or *I-tiu^n*.) But the child was unwilling to address me at this time. Hence, Grandma Ang explained his nonperformance saying that he is *phai^n-se*, or too embarrassed or shy to address me—a metacommunicative comment that says something about the meaning system. (More will be explained about this later.) Perhaps this child's noncompliance is interpreted as related to his youthfulness, as he is just two years and one month. This explanation is further supported when we look at Table 1 and see that all three non-performing children are less than three years old, while two of the three performing children are more than three.

In an interview conducted by my research colleague, SHW, the five-year-old girl, Hei, addressed SHW and Mrs. Dyoo (my 66-year-old mother-in-law) when she and her mother entered the home. In this instance we see that the older child was able to perform kinship address; we also see that this child apparently was not coerced, but prepared ahead of time: Her mother reported that her daughter asked how to address the guests before greeting them. Thus, upon her arrival Hei enthusiastically greeted the adult guests calling them "*A-i*" (auntie, referring to SHW) and "*A-po*" (Great-aunt, referring to Mrs. Dyoo).

> Hei: *A-i* [Auntie], *A-po* [Great-aunt]!!
>
> Grandma Liao: *A-i, A-po.* Did you hear?
>
> Mrs. Dyoo: How nice!
>
> Mrs. Liao: She asked me how to greet you. I said call [address] them *A-i, A-po.*
>
> Grandma Liao: One *A-i*, one *A-po.* Ours this kid is five years old.
>
> Mrs. Dyoo: Yeah, this five-year-old grows very well.

It appears that children learn to perform kinship address as they develop and are socialized into this practice from competent adults who teach how and when kin should be addressed, and then verbally praise children when it is done well.

But what happens when an older child, who ostensibly should know how to greet adults, does not comply? We have already seen in one case, that Grandma Ang dismissed her young grandson's inability to perform because he was "embarrassed." But what about older chil-

dren? Is their non-compliance as readily dismissed? The data sample of recorded acts is too small to answer this question with great certainty. A sense, however, of how adults in this community treat a more mature child's non-compliance can be observed in the following child's enactment of kinship address.

One evening I interviewed my wife's cousin, Mrs. Tiu^n, accompanied by my wife (DCS), our two children, and my wife's younger brother. I do not recall if we were greeted by Mrs. Tiu^n's children upon our arrival. (Kinship address was such a common practice that I was mostly unaware of it.) But toward the end of the interview Ahong (3;11) and his ten-year-old sister entered the room where the interview was conducted. Ahong was interested in a video game placed in the room. (The room during the day functioned as a conference room for the Tiu^n family's bicycle parts factory.) He needed 10 NT coins (about 30 cents) to operate the game. At first I paid little attention to him; but then I noticed that he had used up his supply of coins. So, recalling that I had a few coins in my bag, I dug out a few and was prepared to hand them to him. This precipitated the following exchange of turns—the longest one on record involving a child's kinship address—where Ahong was persuaded to address me as "uncle."

> Mrs. Tiu^n: |To DCS| He |Ahong| doesn't know how to use money.
>
> DCS: [To Ahong| Did you say, address [call] *Yizhang*. [Referring to TLS. *Yizhang* means "uncle," or mother's sister's husband.| You say *Yizhang*.
>
> TLS: *Yizhang*. And then I'll see if I have any more |10 NT coins|.
>
> Ahong: Have [you have some coins|.
>
> TLS: Have, have, you think that I have some.
>
> DCS: |unintelligible| say *Yizhang*.
>
> TLS: *Yizhang, Yizhang*, then I won't give any to you.
>
> Mrs. Tiu^n: You say *Yizhang*.
>
> TLS: Say *Yizhang*.
>
> Sister: You say *Yizhang*.
>
> Ahong: *Yizhang*.
>
> TLS: oh! |gives a 10 NT coin to Ahong|
>
> Sister: Money!
>
> TLS: Okay . . . . Alright, so, besides your |continues asking interview questions|

This speech act (Hymes, 1974) displays the degree to which adults, and even an older child—Ahong's ten-year-old sister—may go to when persuading a child to perform kinship address. Apparently aware that a transaction involving money was about to take place between me (TLS) and Ahong, my wife (DCS) decided that Ahong should first greet me as Yizhang (uncle) before getting the money. In the next turn we

see that I concurred, and made it clear that more coins might be had if Ahong greets me. But Ahong was not willing to perform. Instead his first utterance is "Have," as in you have some coins and I want them. But unlike the way we saw that younger children were "let off the hook," Ahong's non-compliance is perceived as a problem. DCS repeated the command; I repeated it. Then persuasive reinforcement came from Ahong's mother who told him to greet me, which I backed up. Finally, the only person in the room who up to this point had not participated in this event, Ahong's sister, added her voice of support: "You say *Yizhang*." Ahong finally complied, marked by the utterance, "*Yizhang*." His performance was rewarded with the sought after coin, and celebrated by his sister who exclaimed: "Money!" Our attention then returned to the matter at hand—finishing the interview with Mrs. Tiu^n.

This example of kinship address illustrates how children and novices are socialized into this practice. It demonstrates a kind of guided participation that more competent members of a practice use to instruct novices into the practice (see Rogoff, Mosier, Mistry, & Göncü, 1993). It also demonstrates that more competent participants (adults and older children) in this speech community share rules of personal address; and that when these rules are violated by children, it is not inappropriate to use persuasive means to correct these children. But *why* do adults perceive it important to teach their young children to perform these discursive rules? The answer to this question emerges when we look at the comments made about the meaning system or folk theory associated with this practice.

The Meaning of Kinship Address

As explained earlier, comments about the meaning of kinship address occurred in 14 of 40 interviews. While this number may seem low, it must be understood that all of these comments occurred spontaneously as the researcher never raised kinship address in interviews as a topic of discussion. Instead, participants themselves raised this topic as they responded to more general questions regarding what they believe are the important things that children need to learn—among which kinship address figures prominently.

Kinship address displays a smart and polite child. A theme that emerges is that participants positively evaluate a child's ability to perform kinship address: A child who can address kin is said to be polite, well-behaved, well-taught, smart, and listens well. For example, Ahong's Grandmother, when asked, "What kind of kid do you think your Ahong is?" responded: "I think he is smart and listens very well. Ah, when he comes back here [to visit], always says, 'Grandma, I am back again.'" SHW asked Mrs. Chng for an example of what is important to teach a child. She responded: "Greetings. ... Because this is what we Taiwanese, [think is] a

beginning thing. So you can't, can't say [the child] is unable [to greet]." Then SHW asked this mother if there is anything that should be developed in her son's personality. Mrs. Chng responded: "Personality, I think you've got to do it gradually. Because a child, if he's three years old, you pressure him and he hasn't yet passed age three, you try to [formally] teach him, and it's maybe harder . . . . We come, greetings, that's a kind of politeness." In other words, it appears as though Mrs. Chng is reluctant to use a formal method of teaching—one that requires pressure—on her young son. Instead, what is important is to show him how to greet people, for that is a form of politeness; and it is a practice which you cannot say (to other adults) a child is unable to do.

Kinship address displays a mature child. One participant linked a child's ability to enact kinship address to the child's maturity. When Grandma Ti^n was asked if she has any particular hope for how she wants her young grandson, Ti^n Axian (2;9), to behave, she responded:

Grandma Ti^n: Just like our second [son's grandchildren]. I told them, "Ah, when you come home from school, don't drink cold water. You should first eat, don't first drink cold water." None of them answered me. So I said, "I've wasted my time taking care of you. I've wiped your ass and dried your urine [changed your diaper]. Maybe someday you won't even know who your grandma is." Terrible! That morning, his mother said, "Ti^n Axian [focal grandson's name], your grandma is here. How is it that you haven't greeted your grandma? Give her something to eat." And then he gave me something [to eat]. And then my grandson asked me, "Grandma, do you want something to eat? Today you've worked so hard." And then he asked me, "Grandma, do you want to eat?" . . .

DCS: Should greet [you].

Grandma Ti^n: Yeah. At that time I told him, "Ti^n Axian, you've grown up. If people come, you've got to ask people, got to greet them. Like if your daddy, or your grandma, or if your grandpa comes, you must say, 'Grandma come here and sit down.' Or 'Come here and eat.' We must address [call] people. It's wrong to not do this. [You] cannot not address people. You can't be so grown up and not address people." I often teach him this way.

In this excerpt we observe that Grandma Ti^n links together two stories about her grandchildren to illustrate her claim that "We must address people." (Grandma Ti^n lives in the same household with her youngest son and his son, Ti^n Axian. She sees her second son's children on a daily basis as they live nearby.) The first story is about the problem she had with her second son's grandchildren, who after coming home from school would not listen to her advice to not drink cold water. (Many

people in Taiwan believe that drinking cold drinks, even on a hot day, will cause one to catch a cold.) But what is worse is that they did not respond to her, or one can imply, did not "greet" her, recognizing her as their grandma—the one who "wiped your ass and dried your urine."

The second story follows from the first and centers on Axian's (her grandchild's) actions. Apparently the next day Axian's mother reprimanded her son for not greeting his grandmother. Then Axian changed his behavior and did what was right: he addressed his grandmother by asking her: "Grandma, do you want something to eat?" DCS picks up on the metacommunicative message underlying Grandma's story: "Should greet." Grandma agrees with this message, and emphasizes her point explaining that the child is "grown up" and must greet people such as his daddy, grandma, grandpa; her grandson should say: "Grandma come here"; one cannot fail to greet people in this fashion; she concludes by explaining how often she tells her grandson this message: "I often teach him this way."

Kinship address displays a moral child. A similarly rich discussion of the folk theory that participants in Chhan-chng associate with kinship address occurs in an interview SHW conducted with Grandma Kho*, who is the primary caregiver of her young granddaughter, Xiaohui (2;10). Grandma's comments emerged when SHW asked her: "When in a public place will you hit your child?" Grandma Kho* replied:

> I haven't hit my children. My children are all very well-behaved. When out of the home, they have all done very well in school and won awards. I've *never hit them. I don't need to be worried at all* . . . . But do you know what is the most important thing to teach children? [Teach them] to be moral [or follow the *dao*]. If you study, and study to a very high level, but if you don't have enough knowledge of society it is all useless. Society's school. Society's *university, it is very hard to study. If you get a doctorate or study in* graduate school, but if you haven't been taught family education you, in the future when you go out into society you are immediately "out." Do you understand? Yeah. Other people see you and they don't pay any attention to *you. You're, you're not like we here have a person who sells steamed bread* [*ban-tho*], his name is called "A-tho-ka." So I tell her [Xiaohui], you must call him "uncle" [*A-peh*] You cannot call him "A-tho-ka."
>
> [To Grandma Kho*'s granddaughter] Come, come, Xiaohui (2;10). This is Auntie [*A-i*]. You must call her auntie . . .
>
> [to Xiaohui] You say [call] Auntie. You've just woken up.
>
> [To SHW] This is, she is not yet three-years-old. "A-thok the seller comes." She'll just call him "A-thok the seller." If you don't talk with her, she will just call out "A-thok the *ban-tho* seller." So when she is young you must teach her, to have respect in her eyes for elders. Children all have some schooling. But if they are out in public, people will look down on them. This is the most difficult thing to learn—society's university. If at home, if you teach her then she will understand, "Eh, Grandma has taught me this, when I see someone [an older man] I have to call him uncle [*A-peh*]. I can't call him in any such way."

Several points can be gleaned from this excerpt. First, Grandma Kho*
frames the practice of kinship address as the example of what is "the
most important thing to teach children." She considers it to be a part
of what it means for a child to be "moral," ("*cho* lang e to-li*," literally
"do people's morals"). Second, Grandma says that a child learns this
important moral practice at home: kinship address is characterized as
"family education." Third, Grandma talks about the consequences one
may suffer if one does not know this important practice: she will be
called "out" by society. "Other people see you and they don't pay
attention to you." She also claims that it is more important to know
this system than to know enough to have a doctorate degree—which is
perhaps directed at SHW who is pursuing a doctorate. Fourth,
Grandma provides an example of how her granddaughter should ad-
dress a neighbor, a man who sells "*ban-tho*" (a kind of steamed bread):
whenever she sees this man, she is not to address him as "A-thok the
ban-tho seller." Instead, she must use a form of address which indexes
"respect in her eyes for elders," i.e., she must address him as "*A-peh*"
(uncle, or father's elder brother). Grandma's final comment anticipates
how her granddaughter in the future will greet an older man: Xiaohui
will know that she is to call a man *A-peh*, because she will know that
she cannot "call him in any such way."

One of the surprises of this rich excerpt is that we not only see
Grandma Kho* discussing the folk theory of kinship address, we also
see her enacting the practice. While she is talking to SHW about how
important it is for a child to learn how to address people, she appar-
ently sees that Xiaohui has just woken from a nap. Grandma then calls
her granddaughter, addressing her by her given name, Xiaohui, and
instructs her how to call SHW: "This is Auntie [*A-i*]. You must call her
Auntie." That is, this excerpt nicely demonstrates that this interview
bridges both a metacommunicative event (Briggs, 1986) with a cultur-
ally encoded enactment of kinship address.

Lack of kinship address displays an inattentive caregiver. Perhaps
the most vivid expression of the folk theory participants in Chhan-
chng associate with kinship address comes from an interview my
wife and I conducted with Grandma Ang, the same participant who
explained that her grandson was too embarrassed to address me as
"*I-tiu*," or "Uncle." Her comments were prompted by the question:
now that you are the full-time caregiver of your grandson (the boy's
mother lives and works in a nearby town and returns on the
weekends to see him), do you think this influences his personality?
Grandma Ang responded by telling four interwoven stories: the first
illustrates the good child, her own grandson, who on one occasion
properly enacted kinship address by greeting his parents, the second
through fifth—presented below—illustrate the bad child, a
neighbor's grandson, who failed to properly enact kinship address
with his parents.

Story Two

Ang: I have an aunt [*Toa-m* or wife of father's older brother], the second one [the aunt's husband is the second son in the family]. She has a son who moved to X [a large city in central Taiwan] to do business. . . . But because they are country folk, and wanted to go to the city to do business, at the time when they moved there, one son was about this big [gestures to show a child about 2 years old], and the other was about as big as your son [4 years old]. Their mother was pregnant with another child. Life was really tough for them. Her mother-in-law said to her, "Your oldest son you take with you, the second you leave with me to take care of." Ah, this grandma while she took care of her grandson never mentioned his own parents to him. And did not even sometimes say to him, "Ah, Daddy and Mommy." Didn't do anything, never did it. Later on, when his parents would come back he would not address [call] them. Even until now that he's [grown up and] completed his military service, he never addresses his own parents, still won't address them.

Story Three

One year, when he was in junior high school, the evening before Chinese New Year, his brothers and his parents discussed how they would let his brothers urge him to go and greet his dad and mom. And then he could receive his red envelope [containing New Year's money]. And then let him go to sleep. His brothers, some pulled him and others pushed him. He still wouldn't call out [address]. He is the second brother. From the time he was young he never addressed his parents and his grandma never taught him.

Story Four

When he was young his parents wanted to take him back to X [to live with them]. His grandma just kept crying and wouldn't let him go. She cried that she wouldn't have anyone to accompany her. So his parents let him stay [with her]. This is not right. . . .

DCS: Is it that his parents never came back to see him?

Story Five

Ang: They did, every week they would go back to see him, about every half a month they would go back to see him once [they would return twice a month]. Whenever they would return his father would say, "You didn't address your dad." His mouth would not open. In other words, if parents are not physically present, and it is the grandmother who is the caregiver, the one who does the grandmothering is more important. [The child thinks,] "I see grandma to be more important." So we people can't be lazy. When his parents wanted to take him [to X], his grandma would just cry, and the child's parents gave up.

Didactic Coda

So the one who does the grandmothering cannot be like this. When children are grown up, she should let his parents take him back. We who do the grandmothering, we just do our own work, and then we won't be bored. When the children are grown they can also come back to see grandma. [One] shouldn't take possession of one's grandchildren.

Looking at this excerpt through narrative analysis (e.g., Miller, Fung, & Mintz, 1996; Polanyi, 1982), we see that Grandma Ang begins the second story with a series of orienting clauses: she has an aunt (*Toa-m*); she is the second one. She then uses a series of narrative clauses to move the listener back to the time of the story when this aunt's son moved from Chhan-chng to the city to do business, explain-

ing that life was really tough for this family: The mother had two sons and was pregnant with a third. So, seeing their difficult situation, Grandma Ang quotes the mother-in-law as saying, "Your oldest son you take with you, the second you leave with me to take care of," (which Grandma Ang is now similarly doing for her daughter-in-law—taking care of her older child.) But this other grandmother did something wrong: she failed to mention his parents to him. The gravity of this failure is magnified by use of the rhetorical device of accumulatio, repeating four times what this grandmother did not do: "never mentioned," "did not even sometimes say," "didn't do anything," and "never did it." She failed to teach her grandson how to enact kinship address because she did not even mention the words "Daddy and Mommy." The story concludes with a shift in time to the present: Even today, now that this boy is a young man, "he never addresses his own parents, still won't address them."

Story three begins with a series of orienting clauses: it was "one year," when the boy was in junior high school, and on "the evening before Chinese New Year." (The evening before Chinese New Year is one of the most important times of the year: No one is working or studying and everyone has returned to his or her natal home—except married daughters, they go to their husbands' homes—to eat a feast, exchange "red envelopes" containing sums of money, and set off fireworks throughout the night. It is a time for festivity and family gatherings much like the Christmas season in the West.) Grandma Ang then narrates the key events. She tells us that this boy's brothers and parents, ostensibly knowing that he did not "call" (address) his parents, got together and discussed what measures they could take to get him to call his dad and mom. Part of the strategy was to withhold his red envelope. (Recall that this strategy was similar to the one I used with Ahong when I withheld the 10 NT coins from him.) Another part of the strategy was to deny him sleep. The third part was to have his brothers push and pull him until he called out or addressed his parents. But, "he still wouldn't call out." Grandma Ang concludes by placing the blame squarely on the grandmother's shoulders: "From the time he was young he never addressed his parents and his grandma never taught him."

In the fourth story Grandma Ang further exposes the blame. She briefly recounts another time when the boy's parents wanted to take him back to X to live with them. But this grandma would not let him go: "She cried that she wouldn't have anyone to accompany her" and the parents relented. Grandma Ang closes this story with the evaluative remark: "This is not right." Her listener (DCS) then responds by trying to uncover the blame for this child's failure to enact kinship address: "Is it that his parents never came back to see him?" Grandma Ang places the blame squarely on the boy's grandmother who did not teach her grandson to address his parents.

The blame is underscored in the fourth story, a generic narrative (see Polanyi, 1982) of a recurring event: whenever the boys' parents would return and see him, "his father would say, 'You didn't address your dad.' His [the boy's] mouth would not open." Grandma Ang concludes by explaining the proper role of all grandmothers who take care of grandchildren: If the child's parents are not physically present, then it is the responsibility of the grandmother to correct the child's false assumption that grandmother "is more important." Parents, however, are also responsible for teaching children how to address family members. Ang says that "we people"—grandparents and parents—"can't be lazy." Just as the grandmother should have tried harder to let go of her grandson, so too should his parents have tried harder to take him away.

Grandma Ang concludes with an extended didactic coda (see Miller, Wiley, Fung, & Liang, 1997). People who are grandmothers and full-time caregivers of their grandchildren (do the grandmothering), cannot be like the grandmother who would not give up her grandson. Grandmothers should be willing to let parents "take back" their children. Then grandmothers should get on with their own work so they "won't be bored." When the grandchildren are grown they can come back to visit. But grandparents should not "take possession" of their grandchildren as did this "bad" grandmother.

In sum, from Grandma Ang's well-developed narratives we see some of the values communicated by and through children's ability, or inability, to properly address their kin. On the one hand, in the opening story (not presented above) the ability of a child to refer to his/her mother and father by the appropriate kinship term indexes a healthy relationship between the child and his/her parents. On the other, the inability of the child to address indexes a poor relationship, one which both aunt and her listener, DCS, interprets as being problematic. Just as Grandma Kho* said that teaching a child to be moral is most important (see Fung, 1999; Stafford, 1995)—exemplified by the child's ability to properly use kinship terms to address adults—similarly, Grandma Ang's stories demonstrate the morality associated with a grandmother's ability to teach a child to address his/her parents. In other words, it is morally imperative that caregivers teach children to address their kin.

Discussion

Two kinds of data are presented in this study: (1) enactments of kinship address wherein the novice—the young local child or the unsocialized American—is instructed by the more competent performer how to properly address kin, and (2) metacommunicative comments by local participants about the folk theory associated with kinship address. The former kind of data indicate that kinship address is an everyday practice, one so common that it is ostensibly taken for

granted and consequently invisible. The latter kind indicates that with novices, and in the context of a discussion about childrearing, participants are able to talk about the meaning system associated with the practice. Hence, we see that both the enactment and the folk theory of kinship address fit together quite well: the practice performed on an everyday basis can be talked about, and the folk theory discussed in interviews is frequently enacted.

These data also point to how identities are created through everyday practices, something which has long been a matter of concern for scholars in the field of language socialization (e.g., Fung, 1999; Kulick, 1992; Miller, Fung & Mintz, 1996; Ochs, 1988, 1993; Schieffelin, 1990). This study suggests that the practice of kinship address plays an important role in creating what it means for a child to be identified as smart, polite, mature, and moral. From Grandma Ang's story we also see evidence that kinship address indexes what it means to be an attentive caregiver, and that the practice plays an important role in creating family bonds. This, coupled with the evidence that kinship terms are frequently used to address nonkin, supports the claim of more recent studies of kinship (Carsten, 2000; Li, 1999; Stafford, 2000) that kinship is not rooted in biology, but rather is fluid and created through interpersonal interactions. It concurs with recent studies of personal address (Fitch, 1991, 1998; Morford, 1997, Sequeira, 1993) that through this form of personal address the nature of persons and relationships can be socially and strategically constructed.

The nature of identity construction through kinship address presented in this study cannot be complete, however, without demonstrating that this socializing practice does more than just teach children and novices that they are members of a family. Kinship address can also point inward and teach the individual child what is her personal identity. That is, the data presented thus far might suggest that children are socialized into a kinship system that is fixed, a stable hierarchy of kin that never changes. While a part of this system does not change, e.g., one's mother and father always remain one's mother and father, another part does. Consider the changes that the following mother, Mrs. Ti^n, says have happened to her young son (2;9):

> My [sister-in-law] just gave birth to a *Meimei* [younger sister]. And then I'll tell him, "Oh, you've become a *Gege* [older brother]." And then, "[You] must listen." . . . And then I told him, he is now a *Gege* [older brother] and then some other, some other things must, must listen, like that. Only in this way is one a true *Gege* [older brother]. And then every time he'll say, "I am *Gege*. I am." And then I'll explain to him that he's not a *Didi* [younger brother], "I am not a *Didi* [younger brother]. I am a *Gege* [older brother]."

Mrs. Ti^n socializes her two-year-old son to learn that his personal identity has changed: while in the past he was a *Didi* (younger brother), now that his aunt has given birth to a *Meimei* (younger

sister), he is a *Gege* (older brother). To be a "true" *Gege,* or to inhabit the identity of what it means to be a *Gege,* he must now learn to listen better i.e., be more obedient. We see that the kinship term *Gege* indexes on two levels a changing personal identity for this young boy: (1) it indexes a change in status from one who was younger (*Didi*), and presumably less accountable for his actions, to one who is now older (*Gege*) and more accountable; and (2) it indexes a changed construction of his family, teaching him to see his cousin not as a member of another family, but rather to see her as his own *Meimei,* or younger sister. That is, this child's identity is not a fixed psychobiological idiom, but is, as claimed by Carbaugh (1996), "a dimension and outcome of communicative practices that is salient in some but not (necessarily) all social scenes" (p. 24).

In sum, kinship terms may not only be used to index for the young child who other people are, but also index to the young child himself what his identity is, and how that identity can change and be reconstructed when the family changes. This indexing and constructing performed by kinship address resonates with the theories of personal address (e.g., Fitch, 1991; 1998; Morford, 1997; Sequeria, 1993), kinship studies (e.g., Carsten, 2000; Stafford, 2000), and language socialization (e.g., Miller & Hoogstra, 1992; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) found in recent studies.

Finally, two implications can be drawn from the present study. First, this study sheds light on the claim made by Hall (1976) that participants within a given culture are unable to talk about, or draw a conceptual map—via language—of their own cultural practices. In part, the findings from this study support Hall's claim. That is, the author of this study, who was a frequent participant in the cultural practice of learning how to address his many kin, found the practice so familiar that it was almost invisible to him: He did not (initially) put this practice on the map he was drawing of practices most important to a child's socialization. But the findings from this study also dispute Hall's claim. That is, while the author was oblivious to this practice—because it was so familiar to him, the participants themselves—for whom this practice was presumably even more familiar, were quite cognizant of this practice. Not only did adults repeatedly guide their children's participation in this practice, many also commented on the meaning they attach to this practice. Hall claims that culture is something so deeply embedded in the consciousness that it takes an unfamiliar outsider to notice its patterns; but in this case the insiders were more cognizant of their cultural practices than the outsider, and the insiders could articulate the rules of their culture both to their children and the researcher. This study challenges us to rethink our notion of what is culture and how it is perceived and articulated from the insider's point of view.

Second, this study has implications for scholars interested in the study of social influence. As noted previously, a young child's participation in kinship address does not happen voluntarily. Caregivers (parents, grandparents, older siblings) may expend great effort in persuading their young child to perform, i.e., address kin (both real and fictive) appropriately. In some cases such persuasion involves a material transaction, such as giving or withholding money from a child; in others it may involve a physical function, such as denying a child's sleep. But in most cases persuasion appears to have an affective component. That is, "emotions function to produce action in a way promoting the achievement of goals" (Bagozzi, Baumgartner, & Pozzi, 1998, p. 2), praise and positive reinforcement fosters the child's performance. For example, Ahong's sister celebrated her brother's performance exclaiming, "Money!" which is an example of what Ortony, Clore, and Collins (1988) call an event-based emotion. In other instances the emotion is agent-based (Ortony, et al., 1988), an adult's affective reaction to a child's performance—Mrs. Dyoo responded to Hei's performance saying, "How nice!"; or an affective explanation of a child's nonperformance, explaining that he is too embarrassed to greet properly. But what is perhaps most interesting is to find an example of what Bagozzi, Baumgartner, and Pieters (1998) call an anticipatory emotion, e.g., I go on a diet because I anticipate feeling good when I have lost weight. Likewise, Grandma Kho* explains that she is teaching her young granddaughter to address kin so that when she is grown up she will know the rules of "society's university," so that someday she will appreciate her grandmother's instruction and feel good about herself.

Bagozzi et al. (1998), however, studied anticipatory emotions solely from the perspective of the individual actor. But these data suggest a new function: The caregiver anticipates what positive emotion the child will sense in the future when the child becomes a competent performer of kinship address. That is, these data suggest that anticipatory emotions can function in complex ways. Not only does the anticipated emotion motivate the caregiver's own persuasive communication, but the caregiver may also communicate to the child what emotional state she will feel in the future when she becomes a competent kinship addresser. This leads to a call for future studies to look at how emotions are socially constructed in persuasive communication.

NOTES

[1]Readers interested in examining excerpts in the original languages are advised to contact the author.

[2]Mandarin language utterances are written without tone markers in Pinyin, and Tai-gi (also called Taiwanese, Hokkien, etc.) utterances are written without tone markers in the phonetic system of Taiwan's Presbyterian Church.

[3]Chen (1999), in her study of mothers and daughters-in-law in Taipei, writes the following about interviewing: "Most of the older Chinese women were fearful of the

formal social setting. Therefore, in future studies, the interviewer may need to transform the formal interview to an informal chat in order to promote the interview conversation" (p. 129) We observed the same hesitancy among our participants—including both mothers and grandmothers. Thus we consciously attempted to transform "interviews" into "conversations."

⁴The words *jiao* (Mandarin) or *kio* (Tai-gi) are found in each of the recorded enactments of kinship address involving adults and children. These terms literally mean "to call." However, in order to make it clear to the reader that these are face-to-face encounters, not "calls" placed over the telephone, I have rendered these terms as either "address" or "greet" or "say."

REFERENCES

Bagozzi, R. P., Baumgartner, H., and Pieters, R. (1998). Goal-directed emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 12,* 1–26.

Bluedorn, A. C. (1998). An interview with anthropologist Edward T. Hall. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 2,* 109–115.

Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R., and Gilman, A. (1972). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Carbaugh, D. A. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Carsten, J. (2000). Introduction: Cultures of relatedness. In Janet Carsen (Ed.), *Cultures of relatedness: New approaches to the study of kinship* (pp. 1–36). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, M. H. (1999). *The relationships of mothers and daughters-in-law in urban Chinese families.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Women's University.

Fang, H., and Heng, J. H. (1983). Social changes and changing address norms in China. *Language in Society, 12,* 495–507.

Fitch, K. L. (1991). The interplay of linguistic universals and cultural knowledge in personal address: Columbian madre terms. *Communication Monographs, 58,* 254–272.

Fitch, K. L. (1998). *Speaking relationally: Culture, communication, and interpersonal connection.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Fung, H. (1999). Becoming a moral child: The socialization of shame among young Chinese children. *Ethos, 27,* 180–209.

Gao, G. (1996). Self and other: A Chinese perspective on interpersonal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey, & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 81–101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3–30). New York: Basic Books.

Gudykunst, W. B., and Kim, Y. Y. (1997). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Anchor Books.

Harkness, S., and Super, C. M. (1996). Introduction. In S. Harkness & C. M. Super (Eds.). *Parents' culturual belief sytems: Their origins, expression, and consequences* (pp. 1–26). New York: The Guilford Press.

Huang, S. (1995). *Yuyan, shehui yu zuqun yishi: Taiwan yuyan shehui xue de yanjiou* [Language, society and ethnic consciousness: The study of Taiwan's languages and societies]. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing Ltd.

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

Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self, and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Li, J. (1999). *Changing kinship relations and their effects on contemporary urban Chinese society: A case study in Tianjin City.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Miller, P. J., Fung, H., and Mintz, J. (1996). Self-construction through narrative practices: A Chinese and American comparison of early socialization. *Ethos, 24,* 237–280.

Miller, P. J., and Hoogstra, L. (1992). Language as tool in the socialization and apprehension of cultural meanings. In T. Schartz, G. White & C. Lutz (Eds.), *New directions in psychological anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, P. J., Wang, S. H., Sandel, T. L., and Cho, G. E. (2001, November). *Self-esteem as folk theory: A comparison of ethnographic interviews.* Paper presented at the Language and Social Interaction Division of the 87th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

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

Morford, J. (1997). Social indexicality in French pronominal address. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 7,* 3–37.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 287–306.

Ochs, E., and Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays in mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., and Collins, A. (1988). *The cognitive structure of emotions.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, L. (1982). Linguistic and social constraints on storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics, 6,* 509–524.

Rogoff, B., Mosier, C., Mistry, J., and Göncü, A. (1993). Toddler's guided participation with their caregivers in cultural activity. In E. A. Forman, N. Minick, C. Addison (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp. 230–253). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sandel, T. L. (2000). *Leading children in Chhan-chng: Language socialization in a Taiwanese community.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B., and Ochs, E. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, D. M. (1980). *American kinship: A cultural account* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1968).

Scotton, C. M., and Zhu, W. (1983). Tongzhi in China: Language change and its conversational consequences. *Language in Society, 12,* 477–494.

Sequeira, D. L. (1993). Personal address as negotiated meaning in an American church community. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 259–285.

Stafford, C. (1995). *The roads of Chinese childhood: Learning and identification in Angang.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stafford, C. (2000). Chinese patriliny and the cycles of *yang* and *laiwang.* In Janet Carsten (Ed.), *Cultures of relatedness: New approaches to the study of kinship* (pp. 37–54). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, A. (1989). *The joy luck club.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Thornton, A., and Lin, H. S. (1994). *Social change and the family in Taiwan.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.