2006

A study of leave-taking among Russian Jewish immigrants in California

Katherine Zinger
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Zinger, Katherine, "A study of leave-taking among Russian Jewish immigrants in California" (2006).
Master's Theses. 3044.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.tzxq-xmd4>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3044

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

**A STUDY OF LEAVE-TAKING AMONG RUSSIAN JEWISH IMMIGRANTS
IN CALIFORNIA**

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Linguistics and Language Development

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Katherine Zinger

December 2006

UMI Number: 1441138

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI Microform 1441138

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Katherine Zinger

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE
DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Thom Huebner

Dr. Rosemary Henze

Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

A Study of Leave-Taking Among Russian Jewish Immigrants in California

by Katherine Zinger

This thesis reports a preliminary investigation of a process of cross-cultural pragmatics. It compares the speech patterns of monolinguals against acculturating bilinguals to identify the influence of socio-cultural variables on leave-taking routines. It examines speech acts conducted during leave-taking of native-Russian speakers who are bilingual, and compares them to monolingual native-Russian and native-English speakers.

The findings of this study reveal that the native-Russian bilinguals' leave-taking routines are similar to those of the native-English speaking monolingual group, yet they are also influenced in their language choices by their Russian monolingual counterparts. The data collected for this study also shows that, while all three groups employ a number of the same speech acts, they also employ certain speech acts differently. For example, one key difference is that Russian monolinguals repeatedly add a key utterance, the act of "giving thanks." Additionally, the data indicated that gender and acculturation also affect leave taking.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Dr. Thom Huebner, my advisor and thesis chairperson, without whose professional guidance, invaluable suggestions and constant encouragement I could not have accomplished my task. I am deeply indebted to him for supporting my initial curiosity about the topic of this study, and for being an excellent model of an insightful and caring educator. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with such an educator.

My special thanks and gratitude to the members of the thesis committee, Dr. Rosemary Henze, whose experience in ethnography sparked my initial enthusiasm for this study, and to Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley, who confirms the importance of education for second language learners.

I am especially thankful to the 79ers, who agreed to take part in my research. I am deeply grateful for their time and welcoming hospitality during my visits.

To my parents, Eugenia and Gregory Zinger, who came all the way from St. Petersburg, Russia, to provide their children with a better life. Had my parents not been given this opportunity of a lifetime, I would not be here. I am grateful for their unfailing love and encouragement.

To my grandmother, who made me who I am today, and who taught me the power of books and the value of education.

To my brother, who has been a role model throughout my life.

And to my husband, who takes me to higher grounds and whose constant unfailing love, support, and encouragement guided me along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Summary	1
2.0	Introduction	5
2.1	Objectives of the Study	7
2.2	History of Russian Immigration in North America	9
2.3	Russian Jews in California	14
2.4	The Conception of the 79ers	17
3.0	Literature Review	21
3.1	Research on Cross-Cultural Pragmatics	23
3.1.1	Research on Interlanguage Pragmatics	26
3.2	Research on Socio-Cultural Variables	27
3.2.1	Gender	28
3.3	Research on Leave-Taking	28
3.3.1	Leave-Taking as a Communicative Function	30
4.0	Research Design	33
4.1	Subjects of the Study	33
4.2	Researcher's Role	36
4.2.1	Insider-Outsider Role	38
4.3	Survey Instrument	41
4.3.1	Questionnaire Approval, Human Subject Review Board	45
4.3.2	Questionnaire Distribution	46
5.0	Event Analysis	48
5.1	Results of DCT Analysis	62
5.1.1	Categories of Speech Acts in Leave-Taking	64
5.1.2	Different Leave-Taking	66
5.1.3	Giving Thanks	72
5.1.4	Apologizing	74
5.1.5	Closing	76
5.1.6	Gender	79
5.1.7	Similarities of Leave-Taking between 79ers and Russian Monolinguals	83
5.1.8	Similarities of Leave-Taking between 79ers and English Monolinguals	83
5.2	Follow-Ups	83
5.3	Summary of Results	85
6.0	Conclusion	89
6.1	Implications	91

References	93
Appendix A: Human Subjects Approval Letter	99
Appendix B: DCT Questionnaire Consent Form for Subjects	100
Appendix C: Release to Contact Later Form	101
Appendix D: Discourse Completion Test in English	102
Appendix E: Discourse Completion Test in Russian	103
Appendix F: Background Questionnaire in English	104
Appendix G: Background Questionnaire in Russian	105
Appendix H: DCT Table Results	106

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. Characteristics of Subjects	35
--------------------------------	----

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

1. Matrix of Variables	42
2. Frequency of Announcing an Intent to Leave-Take with a Discourse Marker	69
3. Frequency of Announcing an Expectation of Future Meeting	70
4. Frequency of Providing a Greeting when about to Leave-Take	71
5. Frequency of Providing a Greeting with a Self-Introduction when about to Leave-Take	71
6. Frequency of Providing an Explanation	72
7. Frequency of Saying "Thank-You" for Females	73
8. Frequency of Saying "Thank-You" for Males	74
9. Frequency of Saying "Excuse Me" or "I'm Sorry" for Females	75
10. Frequency of Saying "Excuse Me" or "I'm Sorry" for Males	76
11. Frequency of Saying "Bye" for Females	78
12. Frequency of Saying "Bye" for Males	79

1.0 SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the process of cross-cultural pragmatics, specifically within the routine of leave-taking between native-Russian speakers who are bilingual, and monolingual native-Russian and native-English speakers. Like many other daily routines, leave-taking “is highly conventionalized and follows prefabricated linguistic units and cultural knowledge common to the people from the same speech community and reflects their social system and cultural values” (Coulmas, 1981, p.7). The research in this study focuses on a group called the 79ers, a Bay Area Russian Jewish immigrant group of people in their 20s and 30s. They emigrated from the former Soviet Union when they were children, around the peak immigration year of 1979. For comparison, two other groups were analyzed - members of an older generation of Russian immigrants who are monolingual speakers of Russian, and a group of native-English speakers.

During any type of communication, a combination of factors and variables come into play that affect the outcome of any interaction. There have been few studies on leave-taking, although many people “find it difficult to get out of a conversation they are in” (Schegloff *et al.*, 1973, p.290). Since leave-taking takes place at the end of an activity or conversation, the participants need to conduct a cooperative parting to make sure the ending will not jeopardize their future relationship. Goffman (1974) explains that the “enthusiasm of farewell, compensates the relationship for the harm that is about to be done to it by separation” (p.41). Therefore, participants need to express their farewell as clearly as possible, while showing their appreciation of being part of the

interaction no matter the context. To achieve this, the participants will have to follow some prefabricated linguistic routines, which should be culturally and socially appropriate. By discovering what is going on at this moment of leave-taking, we may learn a good deal about the human interaction associated with leave-taking, since “human interpersonal forces are unleashed when people say goodbye to one another” (Knapp & Hart, 1973, p.182). This chance for discovery motivates my research, along with an interest in understanding how this interpersonal communication is terminated in different cultures from a sociolinguistic point of view. I achieve this understanding through analysis of ethnographic field notes taken from various events that I observed and analyzed, as well as a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) administered to subjects involved in my study. In addition to the cultural variable, I found that gender also played a key role in the leave-taking procedures participants selected.

To analyze any differences of leave-taking between the 79ers and the other two groups, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in leave-taking among the 79er group, the Russian monolingual speakers or native-English speakers?
2. What verbal messages are exchanged during a leave-taking?
3. What are the most common verbal and non-verbal exchanges that occur during a leave-taking?
4. How does gender affect leave-taking within all three groups?
5. How does acculturation affect leave-taking for Russian speakers?

To address these questions, the research identified utterances within speech acts and speech events that can be identified as linguistic patterns. The center for advanced research on language acquisition (CARLA) defines speech acts as “an utterance that serves a function in communication...speech acts include real-life interactions and

require not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture” (CARLA, 2006, ¶ 1). For example, this utterance, which can be made up of one or several words, can be a “goodbye,” or a “thank-you.”

In attempting to respond to the first question above, entering this study, I predicted that the results would show that the 79er leave-taking routines would be similar to those of the native-English speaking monolingual group, yet would also be influenced in their language choices by the Russian monolingual counterparts. The results found this prediction correct, such that in leave-taking, the 79ers mirror the native-English speaking monolingual group slightly more often. Within the four leave-taking situations presented in the Discourse Completion Test in this study, groups displayed 13 variables in their utterances during leave-taking. The 79ers mirror native-English speaking monolinguals in 9 out of 13 utterances within each leave-taking, but mirror the Russian monolingual group in only 7 out of 13 utterances.

Addressing the second and third questions on the previous page, the data collected for this study also shows that all three groups employ a number of the same speech acts. However, there is a difference in the formulas each of these three groups employ within certain speech acts. For example, one key difference is that Russian monolinguals repeatedly add a key utterance, the act of “giving thanks” while saying goodbye. Neither the 79ers nor the native-English speaking monolingual group performed this type of leave-taking as frequently as the Russian monolinguals.

Addressing the fourth question on the previous page, gender also affected leave-taking. Findings indicate that in Russian monolinguals’ and in more than half of the

79ers' conversations, it is generally the male who decides when to close a conversation and to take leave, and that it is generally mixed gender in observations conducted with the native-English speakers.

Lastly, acculturation affects leave-taking for 79ers, who use their own leave-taking strategies together with those of the native-English monolingual group. As results show for thanking when leave-taking between 79ers and English monolinguals, 79ers still thank as part of their leave-taking, even if something may not have been directly given to them. For example, they thank for a nice time, evening and/or talk. The 79ers are able to maintain certain linguistic routines that occur in their native culture, such as saying thank- you during leave-taking in certain situations where an English monolingual speaker may not. Yet at the same time, they try to assimilate among the native-English speakers by adding verbal messages specific to English monolinguals.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This study is about cultural patterns of communication in social discourse. More precisely, it juxtaposes leave-taking situations and conversations of Russian immigrants and Americans by exploring the relations between linguistic use and cultural codes. The relationships between language, society, and culture all play a large role in analyzing the relations between linguistic use and cultural codes. These factors shape cultural identities, so how they tie in with one another continues to challenge linguists. My approach shares the assumptions of those traditions in sociolinguistics, based on the ethnography of communication formulated by Gumperz and Hymes in the early 1960s, which view the patterns of language use as being linked with the cultural and social lives in communities studied (Hymes, 1974).

This method of ethnography of communication is one that emphasizes the need for a detailed analysis of discourse patterns in particular settings and events to show how language in itself is a form of cultural behavior. Following in this tradition, this study explores leave-taking among a group of Russian Jewish young adults who are influenced by their monolingual Russian-speaking predecessors, but who live and interact among monolingual English speaking Americans. In the process, I delve into these young Russian Jews' history and paths towards acculturation.

Culture is a part of everyone's life, and it may play an even a more salient role in the life of an immigrant, especially if that culture is not allowed to be expressed in his or her native home - as was the case for Russian Jews. According to Ronowicz (1995):

Immigrants do not fully realize how much their daily life has been influenced by unwritten rules automatically accepted and applied within their social class, their neighborhood, their country until, for one reason or another, they move into another culture, e.g. from one region to another, from town to countryside and particularly, from one country to another. (p.31)

When immigrants “leave” all that they have come to know, they may experience culture shock, but then may also begin the process of adopting foreign cultural beliefs and practices. Their acculturation can affect the linguistic patterns employed in leave-taking. People from different cultures differ not only in their languages; they also have different rules of speaking with regard to the appropriateness and politeness of linguistic behavior in social and personal interactions, of which pre-patterned conversational routines make up an important part (Blum-Kulka *et al.*, 1993; Laver, 1981; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

This research has implications for future research concerning Russian immigrants within the field of cross-cultural pragmatics. Future research based on this study could be extended to researching attitudinal information from all three groups involved in this study, and to examining what these groups think of how the other groups engage in leave-taking as compared to their own. While some researchers, such as Schegloff and Sacks (1973), are more interested in the fundamental order of organization in a closing, others research leave-taking as a routine within one or more speech communities where participants are engaged in the speech acts used in conducting the leave-taking. Future research in these areas would build on the evidence collected in this study to help in understanding how miscommunication occurs when people from different cultures take leave. This study could also have implications for teachers of second and foreign

languages who want to help their students acquire communicatively appropriate patterns of leave-taking.

2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

“Why can't we get all the people together in the world that we really like and then just stay together? I guess that wouldn't work. Someone would leave. Someone always leaves and then we have to say good-bye. I hate good-byes. I know what I need. I need more hellos.”

-Snoopy (Charles Schultz)

Leave-taking “is highly conventionalized and follows prefabricated routines and has an adaptive value in facilitating social relations” (Firth 1972, cited in Laver, 1981, p.289). People from different backgrounds and cultures differ not only in the language and communication they use, but also in their social and personal interactions, of which pre-patterned conversational routines make up an important part (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989; Coulmas, 1981; Hymes 1974; Saville-Troike, 1996).

As far as cross-cultural research on leave-taking goes, there are few studies. Knapp and Hart (1973, p.182) believe that leave-taking may seem to be mundane and ordinary, so perhaps that is the reason for the lack of research on the topic. However, for the researcher, adding a cross-cultural perspective can bring unique insight into leave-taking situations. Closing a conversation may be a problem for some people since they may “find it difficult to get out of a conversation they are in” (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p.290). Leave-taking is a somewhat fragile process, since the participants are involved in a parting that may or may not evolve into a future meeting. Therefore, by discovering what is going on when people say good-bye, a lot can be learned about someone's culture. Most important, “Human interpersonal forces are unleashed when people say good-bye to one another” (Knapp & Hart, 1973, p.182). Therefore, while the

ordinariness of leave-taking and lack of research may suggest a topic with only limited value, it is the underlying fragility and emotional forces generated during leave-taking that open up honest insight into intercultural communication.

In this thesis, a study was conducted among a group of Russian Jews within the Russian community of the San Francisco Bay Area. Russian Jews living in America have been going through the process of adapting to life in America ever since they left their homes back in Russia. They came from a closed society where they were not allowed a great deal of personal expression. This study, therefore, focuses on a group of young adult Russian Jews who immigrated as children with their parents, and who now have many American friends and live as Americans. The study attempts to explore how they communicate with members inside and outside their culture, and whether their habits of communication vary in a leave-taking situation depending on which culture they are communicating with.

I am motivated by the desire to learn more about myself on a cultural level. As a child of Russian immigrants who was free to express my Russian Jewish identity while growing up, I was always conscious of my culture at home. I was constantly facing two cultures, which I believe I only began to appreciate when I started to learn more about my family roots. Growing up in an immigrant environment, I realized there weren't too many others like me around. Then, in the process of studying the '79ers', the focus group of this project, I felt similar to how one member expressed herself: "...the room was filled with other me's." This study then is both an academic task and a personal journey.

The objectives in this study, therefore, are to answer the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in leave-taking among the 79er group, the Russian monolingual speakers or native-English speakers?
2. What verbal messages are exchanged during a leave-taking?
3. What are the most common verbal and non-verbal exchanges that occur during a leave-taking?
4. How does gender affect leave-taking within all three groups?
5. How does acculturation affect leave-taking for Russian speakers?

2.2 HISTORY OF RUSSIAN IMMIGRATION IN NORTH AMERICA

The history of how my parents were granted freedom is similar to that of many other Russian Jews leaving to seek greater freedom. My parents were born in Russia. My mother was born during World War II, but she and her parents were evacuated to Kazan (city on the Volga). They returned to St. Petersburg, then called Leningrad, only at the war's end in 1945, when she was one year old. My father was born in 1946 in Leningrad. A graduate of the Leningrad Electronic Communications Institute, he was an engineer. My mother was a graduate of the Leningrad Chemical Technological Institute and obtained her engineering and master's degree as a chemical engineer.

In the late nineteenth century, the Jewish community of Tsarist Russia was one of the largest in the world, but suffered from unchecked oppression in many forms. Despite the new official freedoms that the communist Revolution promised the Jews, in the early 1920's, the new Soviet State began giving Jews a hard time. The Soviet era was a time of deep suppression of all meaningful forms of Jewish life, religious, cultural and political. Zionism was completely outlawed. For the most part, Russian Jewry was completely cut off from the Jewish world beyond its borders.

Attempts were made by Israel and Jews in the West to make contacts with Soviet Jews. If lucky, visits were made, books and Jewish artifacts were smuggled in, and connections were established with some groups of local Jews in the main cities. With this contact, many Jews began to openly plan to leave the Soviet Union for Israel and the West.

Since the 1920's, the central Communist government of Russia had strictly regulated its people's emigration. However, the Soviets agreed to allow as many as 250,000 citizens to emigrate in response to a new trade act negotiated with the United States in 1974. Although the emigration was theoretically limited to Jews and Armenians, other oppressed and disenfranchised groups (including political dissidents, human-rights activists, and intellectuals) began to leave the Soviet republics. Many Russian Jews immigrated to Israel, the United States, Canada, and Australia. My family's future would lie in Canada. My parents left St. Petersburg, for a number of reasons, which include, but are not limited to, anti-Semitism, and economic and political motives.

According to Jacobs *et al.* (1981), between 1961 and 1970, the total number of Jews that had been permitted to leave Russia was approximately 7,000. However, in 1971 alone, 13,022 were allowed to go. In 1972, the figure rose to 31,681, and in 1973, to 34,733. Russia decided it would revive its hope for more trade with the US, and, as mentioned previously, in the early 1970's, decided to allow even more Jews to emigrate. By 1979, the number of Jews permitted to leave Russia exceeded 50,000.

According to the 2000 Census reports, there are now over 27,243 (3.5%) Russian-speakers from Russia and Ukraine in San Francisco, and 3,545,136 (1.2%) in the United States (United States Census Bureau, 2000). The long form of the 2000 Census asks questions that quantify data on foreign-born newcomers. The questions concern ancestry or ethnic origin, any spoken language other than English, and country of birth.

According to data collected, almost 700,000 new immigrants flocked to the nine-county (San Francisco Bay area) region between 1990 and 2000 and of those there are an estimated 31,250 Russians and Ukrainians. (Hendricks, 2002). Sacramento and Yolo counties vied with Los Angeles for the most concentrated Russian and Ukrainian communities (Gaudette, 2002). Refugees from the former Soviet Union represent one of the largest groups of legal refugees to the United States in the past decade. Close to half a million were resettled in the United States from 1983-1999, with over 86,000 of them resettling in California (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1999).

Within my own family, the immigration story mirrored this broader migration. When my parents gave birth to my brother in 1970, they lived in a communal apartment with two other families in the center of St. Petersburg. My mother, my brother, my uncle and my grandparents all lived in one room. All three families shared one bathroom and kitchen.

In 1975, together with their five-year-old son, my parents were given an official invitation and an entry visa to another country. Israel normally filled this role for the Soviet Jews, and virtually any Jew who wanted to leave could be assured of an automatic visa to Israel. With that visa, a Jew could leave Russia. However, in the absence of

direct flights to Israel, many Jews were taken to Vienna, Austria, where Jewish Agency representatives were on hand to complete the transfer to Israel. But it soon became clear that many of the Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union, including my parents, had very different visions about where they wanted to live. This dramatic turn-around occurred as numbers of emigrant Jews soared in the early seventies. Many were looking for a way to North America.

When my parents arrived in Vienna, they were transferred to a major American Jewish welfare agency for helping Jewish immigrants, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS). HIAS is the oldest international migration and refugee resettlement agency in North America. The agency believed in its mission: to help Jews who had managed to leave the Soviet Union and who had been persecuted for their Jewish life to start over in whatever country, city, and town they desired. They also believed that those who wanted to go to Israel should be allowed to go, but in no way should Russian Jews be limited to that one option.

Therefore, HIAS was also dedicated to helping Jews settle in North America if that was their goal. Additionally, HIAS lobbied the American Congress and government to give Soviet Jews special preference as refugees.

HIAS had an office in Rome to provide additional assistance, and help émigrés to leave Vienna for Rome. Once registered with HIAS, my parents were transferred to Rome. They stayed in Italy for about nine months while their papers were processed for admission to Canada. After a few days in a hotel, in a process similar to that of the thousands of other Soviet Jews, they moved to Ostia, the ancient port of Rome. My

father worked as a clerk in the local HIAS office. They were informed by their HIAS caseworker that they would be resettled in Edmonton, Canada. During their flight to Edmonton, their layover in Montreal gave my mother a lasting impression. They decided to remain in that city. A year later, their parents and siblings would also go through this process and arrive in Montreal as well.

Two years later, in 1978, I was born. Raised in a Russian-Jewish home by parents who spoke Russian to me, I also spoke English and French at school and with friends, and Hebrew and Yiddish at Jewish day school and with my grandmother. Like other Russian immigrants, my parents were excited about their freedom and proud of their identity – they were proud to be Russian, Canadian, and Jewish. They participated in Jewish holidays with their children; yet made sure their children went to Russian Sunday school so that they would know the language and culture of their parents' homeland. On Sundays, I lived in two worlds. While I was learning about one, I was already fluent in the other. I wondered then how my parents felt. Their identities as immigrants were continuously redefined. As they assimilated into their new culture, they retained elements of the old. In doing so, my grandparents were able to shed their "old world" identity.

Russian Jews of this area were similar to those in the United States. As a group, they came fairly educated, hard working, with ambition to enjoy their freedom and opportunities. For one thing, they quickly came to understand how accommodating and welcoming a city Montreal was to immigrants. Also, they were amazed by the size and confidence of the Jewish community of Montreal. Jews not only lived proudly as Jews,

but they also seemed entirely at home as Canadians. When it was time for me to attend school, the private Jewish day school opened its doors to both my brother and me. My studies included daily instruction in French, Hebrew and Yiddish. My grandparents found a circle of Russian- and Yiddish-speaking friends in the nearby Jewish community center and busied themselves preparing for our family (since we all lived within walking distance of one another) wonderful dinners of borscht, stuffed cabbage, piroshki, fruit compote, and other Russian specialties.

Several years later in 1992, we moved to California, where my parents quickly became immersed in the Californian Russian Jewish community, and where they continue their immigrant experience.

2.3 RUSSIAN JEWS IN CALIFORNIA

Wherever immigrants settle, they find neighborhoods with others who are similar to them. In San Francisco, where I reside, I noticed an interesting demographic pattern about the Russian-speaking community of the San Francisco Bay Area. Unlike Los Angeles or San Diego, it started off in more than one neighborhood. Most prominent are the Russian-Jewish immigrants living along Geary Boulevard in San Francisco. This contrasts with the oldest San Francisco Russian-speaking (Russian Orthodox) community. Geographically close, but worlds apart, these communities have nothing in common but the language. The third notable Russian speaking community is geographically dispersed and centered approximately 40 miles south of San Francisco in an area called the "Silicon Valley." Russian-speakers that belong to this group tend to be the most affluent and very well educated. On the one hand, this group is the most diverse

culturally, and on the other very strictly characterized as mostly men in their 20s and 30s, many of whom immigrated recently to take advantage of the technology industry there. While the San Francisco Russian Jewish community is large, it is much smaller than in Southern California, where the Russian-speaking community of Greater Los Angeles is one of the most diverse such communities in the United States, and is one of the five largest Russian-speaking communities in the United States, and the largest one on the West Coast. According to the *Jewish Journal* website:

From the early 1970s to mid-1990s, Los Angeles — like other major cities in the United States and Israel — became the constant recipient of Jewish refugees fleeing Communist Russia. Coinciding with the fall of communism, Russian Jewish immigration reached its peak in 1992, when the largest wave of immigration of about 2,800 settled in Los Angeles, according to the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society. Currently there are about 402,000 Americans of Russian ancestry; 72,000 Russian-born persons reside in California, 70-80 percent of whom are Jewish, according to Pini Herman, of Phillips and Herman Demographic Research, who compiled numbers from the 2000 Census and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Aushenker, 2003, ¶ 7)

Due to my location as a resident of the San Francisco Bay Area during this study, I decided to focus my research on the Russian immigrants living in my own community. However, prior to solely focusing on the 79ers for this study, I needed to find more information on the overall Russian Jewish community in the Bay Area, and the United States as a whole. With the help of the Jewish Family and Children's Services of the Bay Area, an affiliate of HIAS, I inquired about Russian immigrant demography of San Francisco. Since the U.S. Census Bureau does not collect data on religious affiliation in its demographic surveys, the research would have to begin with collecting demographic information on Russian Americans, and then continue with research on Russian Jews in the Bay Area.

The 2000 US Census report shows that the Russian American population is estimated at approximately 2.6 million people, of which 364,000 is foreign born and 702,000 are native Russian speakers. It is the ninth largest foreign-language community in the United States. The leading cities that have Russian Americans are New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle, and Detroit. The census also indicates that there are an estimated 118,382 native Russian-speaking people in California. Most Russian speakers are bilingual, but the majority likely prefers to speak their native language at home and turn to Russian-language media for the latest news and information.

The 2000 census also reports that the median age of Russian Americans is 42 years compared to 35 years for all foreign-born people. A higher percentage of the population falls in the age group of 65 years and over (16% compared to 12% for all foreign-born people), and also 18 years and over (80% compared to 74% of all foreign-born people). A lower percentage of the population falls in the age group of under 5 years (5% compared to 7% of all foreign-born people). The Russian American ethnic group is approximately 50% married, and has an average family size of 3 people. The bureau also states that they have higher home ownership rates (57% vs. 41%) and that the median annual household income for Russian Americans is \$59,950.

There is an inclination towards higher education, high-paying employment and higher literacy, with 40% holding a bachelor's degree or higher, and 68% completing a high school diploma, compared to 52% for the total foreign born population. An online study conducted by Ameredia (2006) reports that Russian Americans have a higher

readership of in-language print media among older and first generations and a higher usage of Internet and online media among the more acculturated and tech savvy younger generations.

The study conducted by Ameredia (2006) also reports that Russian Americans focus more on post-collegiate work participation and are often involved in high paying employment. Sixty-seven and a half percent are in managerial, professional, technical and sales occupations (compared to 45.6% for all foreign-born). Twenty-one point four percent are involved in service occupations (compared to 31.2% for all foreign-born).

2.4 THE CONCEPTION OF THE 79ers

The Russian Jewish immigrants in the Bay Area are similar to those anywhere across the country. They left their homeland in order to escape the incidence and virulence of anti-Semitic activity, or to give their children a better life. During the initial wave of immigration, there were no well-established, formalized self-help organizations. Instead, they had to rely on existing organizations that work with the Jewish community in the United States, as well as informal assistance networks such as family and friends. In time, the children of those immigrants, who attended school with other Americans, pulled farther ahead in their English language skills than their parents and grandparents who only spoke Russian. As they became young adults, many wondered about their background and realized that it was different than most of their American classmates. “Imagine you are a 12-year-old boy: Your family finally receives permission to leave for the United States. You travel by bus from your native Odessa, and when you reach Yugoslavia, the border police call you and your family ‘traitors,’ as they rip up your

passports and spit in your faces.” This scenario was recounted by a 79er member who now lives in Santa Clara, CA. His story was not unlike others. They are all part of a Bay Area group called the 79ers. “For a long time I thought I was the only person in the Bay Area who came as a child,” said another 79er, who left Minsk in 1978 when she was 11. “Now I’m sitting in a room full of me’s.”

While one of the 79ers’ two co-founders had wanted to start a group primarily for those who left the former Soviet Union around the first wave of Jewish immigration in 1979, when they were 12 or younger, the group today has become more inclusive, serving Russian émigrés who came as children, no matter when. One of the members is currently a software engineer living south of San Francisco, on the Peninsula, who came from Kiev when he was 9 in 1979 and considers himself typical of those in the 79ers group. His family’s goal, he says, was not to be in the Russian community but to be independent. They ended up moving out to the suburbs where there were no other Russian families. In speaking with this 79er member, I hear a slight accent, but one that he is proud of. He calls the 79er group a “hybrid”. Often native-born Americans cannot tell the émigrés weren’t born here, while more recent arrivals from the Soviet Union consider the émigrés 100% American. “The Russian Jewish values come from your family, but everything else about you comes from American culture,” he says.

While this 79er member came to the Bay Area several years ago, he only sought out the Jewish community in the last four years. But once active, he began looking for connections to the Russian community as well. What he found were the more recent arrivals. “I made some friends and acquaintances but because they were such recent

immigrants I couldn't fully connect with them," he said. "Really, there was no place to go to meet others like myself. That did not exist. So I thought, if it doesn't exist why not create it?" He therefore chose the name 79ers since so many of the Russian immigrants came in 1979, and also, being in San Francisco, he felt the group needed a name similar to the local football team, the San Francisco 49ers. Also, he wanted an English name for the group, since the group was, after all, in the United States. The group could be Russian, and have an English name to represent their acculturation into American life.

Today, the first wave of Russian émigrés has had more than 20 years to successfully assimilate. It is now their children's turn. While San Francisco is the first to form a group such as the 79ers, the local Jewish Family and Children Services (JFCS) which helped sponsor the group by providing a grant, is receiving inquiries from around the country from Russian young adults who are interested in following in their footsteps. For example, the JFCS let me know that a Jewish center for young adults on the Upper West Side of Manhattan held an event for Russian émigrés, calling it "Generation R." The group believes it is important to create similar groups to the 79ers because what they build today is what the Russian ethnic group will look like in this country for many years to come.

The 79er group is currently stronger than ever. Many are taking trips back to Russia, and are even more open to Judaism than their parents, since they don't carry with them the memory of the Soviet's negative associations with religion. My study is now of interest to the 79ers since they are always thinking of issues to discuss, including how the concepts of friendship and love differ in Russian and American cultures, and how they

can communicate to others of different cultures while maintaining the Russian ways they have come to be proud of.

The founder of the 79ers has in essence done more than just put together a group of people with a common background. Over the years, he has put together a community. The 79ers thrive as a group of people who generally come from the same place, and they are therefore their own unique community, living within a greater community that is the Bay Area, while also existing as an online community. On the 79er website, a calendar of events, and message boards with a variety of topics allow members to interact around these topics. This has allowed recent members to become active on a virtual level as well, and attend events that are listed on the website. While English is used in their online community, most active community members continue to use Russian in face-to-face interactions and in meetings. This has influenced other community members to continue to use Russian when meeting together, but to use English on a virtual level.

The concept of community as defined by Fitzpatrick (1996) signifies “a group of people who follow a way of life or patterns of behavior which mark them out as different from people of another society, or from people in the larger society in which they live or to which they have come” (p. 7). The 79ers feel as though they belong to their own community and this feeling has helped recent 79ers assimilate within the American culture, while retaining their distinct social identity among other immigrants. They need the traditional social group in which they feel at home, in which they find their psychological satisfaction and security, in order to move with confidence toward interaction with the larger society (Kluckhohn, 1955).

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Cross-Cultural Pragmatics, Socio-Cultural Variables, and Leave-Taking

This chapter will review three areas of the research literature that are closely related to this study. These three areas are (1) cross-cultural pragmatics, (2) socio-cultural variables, and (3) leave-taking. The first research area, cross-cultural pragmatics, is a line of research that can be attributed to the work of Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989). Blum-Kulka's (1989) perspective on pragmatics is an action-theoretical one, viewing pragmatics as the study of people's comprehension and production of linguistic action in context. This is based on the assumption that immigrants who are fully competent in two languages may create an intercultural style of speaking that is both related to and distant from the styles prevalent in the two groups they are influenced by. This view is supported by many studies of cross-cultural communication, and research into the pragmatic behavior of immigrant populations across generations (e.g. Clyne, 1979; Clyne, Ball and Neil, 1991; Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993). This knowledge would certainly help to comprehend the different speech acts of Russian immigrants and Americans with regard to leave-taking, by investigating native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers' (NNS) cross-cultural and pragmatic competence in leave-taking.

Another area of cross-cultural pragmatics is related to socio-cultural variables. This research focuses on how social variables, such as gender influence, conversation rules in a leave-taking situation. The language-reflection view of language behavior holds that linguistic patterns reflect the social reality of those who use language to communicate. At the same time, "the uses to which a language is put help to reinforce or

change language patterns to coincide with the changing values and goals of the community” (Fishman, 1972, p.45).

The third area for discussion in this literature review is leave-taking. There are two approaches to leave-taking. One approach, as part of the field of pragmatics, has to do with leave-taking in the function of a speech-act. Studies within this approach have been conducted within one community, (Knapp & Hart, 1973; Laver (1975, 1981), and between two cultures. House (1981) researched leave-taking in English and German, commenting that “a closing phase exhibits the interpersonal function of a language” (p.54), while Wierzbicka (1985) focused on English and Polish. Additionally, Hu and Grove (1991) studied the difference in leave-taking between mainland Chinese and Americans. In different languages and cultures, the area of cross-cultural pragmatics examines the differences in performing speech acts across cultures. It takes the position that bilingual communities / speakers often preserve the norms of their native culture in performing speech acts, even in a second or third language. In contrast, interlanguage pragmatics assumes the position that as learners of a second language perform speech acts in that language, the pragmatic norms of the target language become the de facto target norms of the second language learner. Incorporation of the cultural norms of the learner's first language is viewed as a case of negative transfer (Boxer, 2002). The second approach to leave-taking has been referred to as “conversation analysis,” the study of how people comprehend and produce a speech act in a concrete speech situation. This approach provided the framework in Schegloff and Sacks’ (1973) study of leave-taking based on closings in telephone conversations, rather than face-to-face interactions.

3.1 RESEARCH ON CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATICS

To be able to understand the meaning and importance of cross-cultural pragmatics in this study, the meaning of pragmatics should first be defined. "Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Crystal, 1985, p.240). Therefore, pragmatics is the study of communicative action in its sociocultural context. This communicative action includes not only speech acts - such as requesting, greeting, and so on - but also participation in conversation, engaging in different types of discourse, and sustaining interaction in complex speech events (Kasper, 1992). Schifffrin (2000, p.12) focuses on three concepts in pragmatics: meaning, context, and communication of constructed utterances in hypothetical contexts. The meaning of a particular utterance is derived through general assumptions about basic interaction between speakers and listeners. Together with the literal meaning of what people say, these assumptions are the basis from which to draw specific inferences about intended meanings.

According to philosophers such as Grice, we are able to converse with one another because we recognize common goals in conversation, and find ways of achieving these goals. Grice (1975) maintains that the overriding principle in conversation is one he calls the Cooperative Principle where the speaker and listener cooperate in the conversation by contributing to the ongoing speech event. Another principle, the Politeness Principle (Leech, 1983) maintains that the speaker and listener in a conversation behave politely to

one another, since people respect each other's face (Brown & Levinson, 1978). However, the pragmatic principles that people abide by in one language may be different in another, so that a speech act such as leave-taking, in one culture may be different in another.

Cross-cultural studies have reported that what is considered polite in one language may not be polite in another (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Leech, 1983; Wierzbicka, 1985; Yu, 2004).

Cross-cultural pragmatics is the study of linguistic action carried out by language users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

When individuals communicate with each other who do not speak the same language, or are of different backgrounds or cultures, miscommunication can arise. Gass and Varonis (1991) explain two different kinds of miscommunication. First, *misunderstanding* can occur when the addressee's interpretation of a message is not the one intended by the speaker. Second, *incomplete understanding* can occur in a situation in which both the addressee and the listener sense there is a problem, and it is this awareness that causes both parties to seek to negotiate meaning before returning to the main topic. Thus, such situations can cause one of the parties of the conversation to realize that it is not enough for immigrants to learn the grammar of the language of their new home; they will also need to learn how to perform speech acts which make up common speech events in the target culture as well (Wolfson, 1993; Tannen, 1978). Such an example can be found in Ying's (1996) study, with an example of leave-taking over the telephone that cautions Americans planning a vacation in China:

...the American will bring the phone call to an end gradually, with sentences like 'I've got to go now', or 'It's been nice chatting with you', or 'Goodbye', 'Thanks', or 'O.K.', depending on the circumstances. The Chinese may finish with *zaijian*, but very often the signal is nothing more than something like *en en* or *hao hao hao*, and the American might think he was cut off (p.682).

This provides a good example of cross-cultural pragmatics.

Appropriate behavior therefore relies on correct interpretation. Recognizing the social acts that are being performed is necessary to not only understand the conversation, but also to respond appropriately. Pragmatics has been of interest in second language (L2) research since its integration into models of communicative language proficiency (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983a; Canale and Swain, 1980). Canale and Swain (1980) referred to pragmatics as a component of sociolinguistic competence. Canale (1980) defined sociolinguistic competence as "the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts, depending on contextual factors such as the status of participants, the purpose of the interaction, and the norms or conventions of interactions" (1983b, p.7).

Can cross-cultural pragmatic competence be taught? The answer is most likely not, since competence, whether linguistic or pragmatic, is not teachable. Competence is a type of knowledge that a learner possesses, develops, acquires, uses or loses. The challenge for foreign or second language teaching is whether learning opportunities would be available in such a way that they benefit the development of pragmatic competence in the L2. (Kasper, 1992).

Research specifying how lexical and grammatical features are involved in expressing pragmatic functions can be traced to its beginnings with the research

conducted by Blum-Khulka (1989). Blum-Khulka introduced a “coding manual,” intended to be used for the cross-cultural comparison of discourse completion responses in English, French, and German. The two speech acts involved in the manual included requests and apologies. The manual remains a good starting point for analyzing pragmatic function, and has been widely used in interlanguage and cross-cultural pragmatics (Bergman & Kasper 1993; Nelson *et al.*, 2002; Niki & Tajika, 1994; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993).

3.1.1 RESEARCH ON INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATICS

Cross-cultural pragmatic’s paradigm should be compared with that of interlanguage pragmatics. Blum-Kulka and Kasper (1993) define interlanguage pragmatics as “the study of nonnative speakers’ use and acquisition [of] linguistic action patterns in a second language (L2)” (p.3). While this definition may seem similar to that of cross-cultural pragmatics, the basic premise in interlanguage pragmatics is that it is not enough just to know the equivalent words and phrases in a second language (L2). In interlanguage pragmatics, learners need to determine the appropriate utterances in a given situation. To achieve this, interlanguage pragmatics specifically observes how non-native speakers comprehend and produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Kasper, 1995).

The literature on interlanguage pragmatics attempts to address variation of linguistic choices by studying how language learners express and are able to understand utterances that perform some kind of pragmatic function, such as pragmatic acts, and by understanding how specific lexical and grammatical features are used in pragmatic

functions. Studies of pragmatics in the field of applied linguistics are mainly concerned with the production of speech acts, such as apologies (e.g., Cohen & Olshtain, 1981), complaints (e.g., Trosberg, 1995), corrections (e.g., Takahashi & Beebe, 1993), requests (e.g., Takahashi & Roitblatt, 1994), suggestions (e.g., Koike, 1996), advice (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990), refusals (e.g., Nelson, Carson, Al Batal, & El Bakary, 2002), and responses to compliments (e.g., Rose, 2000; Yu, 2004).

3.2 RESEARCH ON SOCIO-CULTURAL VARIABLES

When participants are involved in a conversation, they are usually guided by the role relationships that exist between them. Most frequently, the interactants in a conversation, whether from the same speech community or not, can assume that when the conversation is over, they will be in the same relationship with each other that existed when the conversation began. If the conversation produces some kind of change in the relationship, then the farewells will acknowledge this change (Goffman, 1974).

Yet when individuals belong to the same speech community, there is normally a set of rules that determine the boundaries for their behavior with one another. Certain speech communities may allow different degrees of role change between individuals. Depending on role relationships and purpose, interlocutors may engage in several types of discourse. This can include personal talk, which Fishman (1980) defined as talk in closed networks in home and neighborhood domains. It can also include transactional talk, which McCarthy (1991) defined as communication for getting business done, and which Fishman (1980) said involved a formal occasion, involving a transaction and/or what he termed, status stressing. Lastly, it can include both personal and transactional

talk. Depending on the nature of the discourse, the mode of leave-taking may need to be adjusted.

3.2.1 GENDER

Gender is perhaps one of the most pervasive factors shaping our roles in a conversation. The view and role of gender in different societies can especially vary. Tannen (1993) argues that men and women should try to understand the differences in their speech, and try to adapt to each other's styles. The role of gender is so vast in this area that it has expanded into a debate in the field of language learning over the source and accuracy of common gender stereotypes, such as the claim that women have a superior ability to communicate and learn languages. "Gender stereotypes and stereotyping are well known in many cultures, so we can assume that a variety of social beliefs about gender help to shape and are shaped by conceptions of gender and language learning and teaching" (Schmenk, 2004, p.514). It is possible to presuppose that speech acts will differ among cultures due to the differences in culturally constructed gender roles.

There does not seem to be much agreement as to how gender is constructed and how it could be deconstructed (Todd & Fisher, 1988). Most explanations point to an unequal balance of power in favor of males (Todd & Fisher, 1988), and contrast male and female cultures (Tannen, 1993).

3.3 RESEARCH ON LEAVE-TAKING

As Wiezbicka (1998) explains in her study of greetings and farewells, in every culture there exist certain norms defining the ways in which the conversation should be

started and in which it should be ended. In this section, I will look at the research on leave-taking as a structurally organized and communicative function. As a structurally organized ritual, it is based on the assumption that there is some orderliness in the components of the speech act with regard to the last stages of a conversation. Such has been observed in leave-taking studies conducted by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), House (1982), and Knapp & Hart (1973). Schegloff and Sacks (1973, p.290) explain the ritual of leave-taking by stating that it is the members of a society that methodically produce the components in this phatic communion. Their study, *Opening up Closings*, discusses the structural organization of closing in American English. They find that bye or Good-bye is a common way to end a conversation. However, they find that the analysis of terminal bye exchanges is inadequate as an analysis of closing because participants in a conversation usually “collaborate in arriving at a farewell exchange” (1973, p.291).

The initiated closing section, as Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explain, consists of a pre-closing and warrant for closing. Silence is also possible. They also believe that a proper closure during a leave-taking can be seen as drawing attention to the completion of an interaction. On the other hand, Hartford and Harlig (1989) researched non-native English speakers. They found that learners of English are often unable to end or close conversations appropriately, and that learners sometimes enter into a speech act without having the pragmatic competence. “In one conversation, for example, an advanced learner responded perfectly to the other speaker’s attempts to say goodbye, thus entering into a contract to leave, but did not leave and was finally ushered to the door” (Hartford *et al.*, 1989, p.6).

According to Schmidt (1989), conversations in Thai may be closed with Goodbye, I'm leaving now. Also, in Fieg and Sukwiat's (1987) comparative study of leave-taking among Thais and Americans, the research shows that in American leave-takings, there is more of a sense of gradually winding down a conversation. Alternatively, in Thai leave-takings, a single statement in the form of an announcement that the person is leaving generally occurs. The authors describe how it can be difficult for Thais to develop a feel for the American style of gradually drawing conversations to a close, and so their leave-takings often appear abrupt and unexpected by Americans. However, Thais normally feel that American leave-takings seem drawn out and overdone. In contrast, Swahili closings, like English closings, are generally more elaborate, exhibiting a minimum of three turns (Omar, 1992). These differences suggest that knowing how to close or say goodbye in one's native language does not ensure success in another language.

3.3.1 LEAVE-TAKING AS A COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTION

The linguistic routines in the closing phase of a conversation are often highly elaborate compared with the opening phase of a conversation (Laver, 1981, p.302). In their study of the rhetoric goodbye, Knapp and Hart (1973) researched leave-taking conversations in some videotaped role-plays, called "information-gathering interviews" and conducted by native-English speakers. The purpose of their experiment was to examine the influence of status and acquaintance on leave-taking between students and professors. The study found that leave-taking was behaviorally consistent and referred to a desire to continue the interaction at a later date. Hargie and Saunders (1994) marked

this aspect of leave-taking as 'futurism'. They introduced four different types of closures. First, factual closing, which can be used following the presentation of facts and ideas, and be used intermittently throughout the interaction. This includes summarizing, initiating or inviting questions and any future plans. Second, motivational closing, includes motivating listeners to explore and consider further some of the issues that were discussed during the previous interactive sequence, such as explicitly motivating statements, thought-provoking comments, and future orientation comments. Third, social closing, ensures that the conversation has been enjoyable by both parties. What happens at this stage is likely to determine a lasting impression of one another. Social closing includes task-related supportive statements (drawing attention to what has been achieved as a result of the encounter) and non-task related statements (frequently used when the interaction has been successfully concluded, when utterances such as "Now take it easy" or "when are you going on vacation?" are used). Lastly, perceptual closing, which includes using specific closure markers to avoid embarrassing those who don't know what to say when the time for leave-taking approaches, such as verbal closure markers (good-bye, bye-bye) and non-verbal closure markers (change of body posture, eye contact).

The effect of pragmatic functions, such as a leave-taking, is seldom identical from one language to another. Thus, it can often be the occasion of cross-cultural misunderstanding (Fillmore, 1984; Gass and Varonis, 1985). Cross-cultural communication will be positively impacted once we know when, how and why individuals communicate with members of their community, and with those outside their

community. "When talking about the normative aspects of any communicative event, we must always keep in mind that norms, like the people who produce them, are culture-bound" (Knapp & Hart., 1973, p.184).

The subject of the present study is the realization of the speech act, leave-taking. The main aim of the study is to provide a pragmatic contrastive analysis of leave-taking situations of native-English and Russian speakers and bilingual speakers, stressing the most striking differences and similarities in the form and content of the leave-taking formula used in particular contexts.

4.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

The model for this study is Olshtain's (1981) study on apologies, in which she compares apologies in four different languages using a discourse completion test (DCT). A DCT is a technique used to elicit data in sociolinguistic research. The DCT is a questionnaire containing a variety of situations, briefly described, and designed to elicit a particular speech act. Olshtain (1981) finds common trends in the speech act of apologizing across different situations. Prior to designing the DCT, I was a participant observer at various Russian and 79ers events. I wrote field notes describing each event I attended. These events would become the model for each situation in the DCT. Given the nature of this study, and its primary objective of determining how the 79ers, a bilingual group, interact with two different groups of people in their daily lives, I decided to employ a qualitative methodology using a DCT. The speech acts were qualitatively assessed for importance as a factor in leave-taking, resulting in 13 common utterances that served as variables within the DCT. This DCT was developed based on 30 hours of observing the interaction of the bilingual group with native Russian monolingual speakers and native English monolingual speakers during seven different events. A background questionnaire was also provided at the end of each DCT, so that I would be able to learn more about each participant's background.

4.1 SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

Data were collected from 220 subjects representing three different groups. The 79ers group consisted of 45 males and 45 females. The native-English monolingual speaking group also consisted of 45 males and 45 females, and the native-Russian

monolingual speaking group consisted of 20 males and 20 females. (With the high rate of English language adoption, I was not able to find a larger group of Russian monolingual speakers living in my community). Subjects in the 79er target group were young adults, as were the English native speaker group, ranging in age from 21-35 years old. The native Russian speaker group consisted of older adults between the ages of 60 – 87 years old. The 79ers were given the option of completing the DCT in Russian or in English, the monolingual English native speakers were given an English DCT, and the Russian native speakers group were given and completed the DCT in Russian.

All participants in the 79ers group completed their undergraduate degrees either in the US or in Russia. Many of them had a Master's degree in fields such as engineering, journalism, computer science and medicine. They all had either studied English before entering university in Russia, or studied English as an undergraduate. While no test of language proficiency was performed on the subjects, based on their written answers in their DCT and my phone conversations with several 79ers, I would characterize their English proficiency as being upper intermediate and, for many, based on their written English and fluent English when speaking to me, advanced. They are all Russian native speakers, whose parents are also native speakers of Russian.

Table 1

Characteristics of Subjects

Gender	Russian Monolinguals	79ers	English Monolinguals
Females	20	45	45
Males	20	45	45
Age	60 – 87 years old	21-35 years old	21-35 years old
Education			
Bachelors	30	65	70
Masters	10	25	20
Born			
USSR	40	90	0
USA/North America	0	0	90
Friends			
Russian Immigrants	30	45	10
Native-English Speakers	10	45	80
For Russian Immigrants Only:			
Years in the USA			
Less than 10	34	28	N/A
More than 10	6	62	N/A
Reasons for moving to the USA			
School	0	14	N/A
Work	0	20	N/A
Family	40	56	N/A
Top 3 Activities adopted while living in the USA			
Shopping	26	50	N/A
Gym	10	20	N/A
Active in Jewish Organizations	4	20	N/A

Table 1 illustrates characteristics of subjects who participated in this study. All Russian monolinguals and 79ers were born in the USSR, while all native-English speakers were born in North America. Thirty Russian monolingual subjects answered that their friends consisted of Russian immigrants; while 10 Russian monolingual subjects had native-English speaking friends. Ten out of the 90 native-English speakers answered that they

had 10 Russian immigrant friends. Results were split equally for the 79ers when it came to having both Russian immigrant friends and native-English speaking friends. When the Russian monolinguals were asked for their reasons of moving to the United States, they had all marked down that it was for one reason only - family. The 79ers on the other hand, moved to the United States for a variety of reasons, which include family, employment, and school. A question directed towards the Russian monolinguals and 79ers asked them to write down what they believe are the top 3 activities that they had adopted while living in the United States. Twenty-six Russian monolinguals believed shopping was one activity, while 10 marked the gym, and 4 thought it was being active in Jewish organizations. Fifty 79ers answered shopping, while 20 thought it was the gym, and another 20 for being active in Jewish organizations.

4.2 RESEARCHER'S ROLE

Prior to conducting research with the 79ers, I approached the Jewish Community Center of San Francisco, where I requested information from the coordinator of a young adult Russian immigrant group. The coordinator then introduced me to the 79ers, after getting an idea of my project. After our initial meeting, I e-mailed the coordinator to find out about upcoming events, as well as to obtain official permission to participate and volunteer at events in order to obtain data.

In order to design a DCT, it was my goal to be an observer at various social events, where I would be able to witness how not only the 79ers, but also how monolingual Russians, interact among themselves, and among monolingual native-English speakers. My observations took place during the 2005 Fall and 2006 Spring

semesters. During each event, I brought a small notebook to take notes on what I thought would be valuable in my research; especially differences in situations of leave-taking in a variety of contexts.

Playing the role of a participant observer was my main priority during these events. In order for these observations to be descriptive, I included a considerable amount of information of where I went, with whom I went, and whom I interacted with or saw at each of the events, as listed below. In my notes, the events all include a physical place, people, speech acts, duration of time, emotional expressions and descriptions of how leave-taking between individuals was conducted at each event. The events included strangers, family members, and friends, ranging across all ages. There was also always a mix of males and females at these events. The events that I attended and observed were:

2/4/06: Dinner party, Menlo Park, CA (event duration: 5 hours)
 1/29/06: Shabbat Dinner, San Mateo, CA (event duration: 4 hours)
 1/1/06: Russian New Years Party, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 5.5 hours)
 12/19/05 Vodka/Latke Party, Mountain View, CA (event duration: 2.5 hours)
 10/29/05: Dinner at Cinderella Russian Restaurant, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 2.5hrs)
 10/15/05: Bat-Mitzvah, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 3.5 hrs)
 10/1/05: Wedding, San Diego, CA (event duration: 7 hrs)

During these events, my status as an observer also included the role of guest or as volunteer. Prior to attending these events, it was also necessary that guests did not know that my purpose was to witness how they say good-bye, because, had they known, they would have most likely been extremely cautious when the time came for their leave-taking. For the few times that I was asked about my pad of paper and what I was writing down, I explained that I was a graduate student, and then described in simplified terms the focus of my research on sociolinguistics and pragmatics. Also, that I was interested in understanding how people interact with one another in cross-cultural social settings.

When necessary, I further explained that I was interested in observing such interactions specifically between Russians and Americans.

4.2.1 INSIDER-OUTSIDER ROLE

This section will explore my role both as a member of the class of subjects *inside* the study, and as an *outsider* and observer in the study. For the first 79er event, I did not know anyone attending. With permission from the coordinator of the group, I had arrived as a guest. For subsequent events, I would attend as a volunteer. My goal as an observer was to make myself comfortable and familiar with the socio-cultural context. While it was effortless to take on this role, due to my similar background, the challenge was in not letting myself form quick judgments based on my own experiences or on how I *thought* that these participants might interact in certain situations. Also as an observer, I had to stay carefully neutral at times, playing the Russian or the American, alternating as an insider so that 79ers would be comfortable around me. As an outsider, I always knew that I would never share their immigration story, nor would I understand the emotional pain many of their families had gone through. However, while I began as an outsider, I later, due to my common interests and desire to learn more about the group, was “adopted,” enabling myself to take on the dual role of an insider.

By definition, an outsider is the researcher who has not shared the experience of the subjects. The insider research is considered to be from an emic perspective, as it involves the description of a phenomenon that is understood by the researcher who has also experienced it (Spiers, 2000).

After attending several 79er events, I conclude that I was treated more like an insider than an outsider. Perhaps this was because I was able to prove to the 79ers that, even though I grew up in North America and not in Russia, I still valued the Russian culture that my parents and grandparents had instilled in me. Also, I was able to participate and be a member of their group because I respected their beliefs, and shared their traditions and ideas regarding the goals for their group.

My role with the native-English monolingual speakers was one I thought was closer to that of an insider. This was the group where I felt as a 79er might – feeling torn between my own culture, yet understanding and living in another. The observations I made of this group included study sessions and social events in the homes of my friends and colleagues. Their interactions among each other, at times, seemed similar to how I would interact with my friends who are Russian immigrants, and the differences I did notice occurred during conversations that involved food and hobbies, greetings and leave-taking situations.

While the insider's advantage is that she can inquire more comfortably and may be able to more thoroughly explain a situation and its details, the advantage of the outsider is that she may question the obvious. I believe assuming these two roles simultaneously in my research gave me a more complete understanding of the 79ers through my ethnographic inquiry.

When taking on the role of observer and outsider to the group during my few experiences with the 79ers, I came to understand the value of the outsider's eye in ethnographic research. Instead of solely focusing on the familiar Russian culture of the

79ers, I attempted to discover how my subjects communicate with me in my outsider role.

This understanding was formed while listening to their stories about life back in Russia, their descriptions of how life now in America had its ups and its downs, and their reasons for participating in 79er events. Their participation, I learned, is based on the need to form a community within a community. In my research with the two other groups participating in this study, an older generation of monolingual native Russian speakers and monolingual native-English speakers, I had a different experience. With the older generation of Russian monolingual speakers, I felt I was in an outsider role. It proved challenging to find Russian monolinguals in California. This was particularly true, since, as the demographic data above suggest, Russians tend to have come to the US with much more formal education than most other immigrant groups. The monolinguals I was able to find generally were grandparents who stayed at home raising their grandchildren. When I spoke to them while attending events, they treated me as they would their own grandchildren. In cross-cultural situations, as in communicating with a native-English speaker, they remained quiet, and let their children or grandchildren do the talking. Other factors complicating outcomes included my lack of familiarity with their leave-taking interactions; my own cultural restrictions requiring politeness and respect towards the older generation, making it difficult to press them for answers; and subjects' attitude toward me as a "grandchild" and an outsider. These conditions made it difficult to observe how they interacted with each other as they would with only insiders around.

As I began my journey into the 79ers' world as an outsider, as previously mentioned, I was "adopted," into their community, enabling me to take on the dual role of an insider. I also realized that while there are definitions and roles to being an insider or an outsider, for my situation, I was able to hold one viewpoint while still acknowledging the part of myself that fit within the other role.

4.3 SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Prior to designing the survey instrument for this study, I designed a matrix of variables involved with the groups I was regularly observing. Through my field notes and observations, I observed that 79ers essentially live and interact in two separate worlds. They communicate, verbally and non-verbally, in two different languages and within two different cultures in their daily life. While they communicate with native-Russian monolingual speakers and native-English monolingual speakers on a day-to-day basis, I also found that depending on gender (female vs. male), the communication will vary greatly. How they take into account this social variable, who they most associate with, and the differences between them and the groups they communicate with is reflected in their leave-taking behavior.

The matrix (Figure 1) is based on my observations of the variables involved during the events I attended. At these events, I witnessed interactions among participants whose gender influenced their interaction with one another, and within and/or outside of their culture. This figure also proved helpful in designing the survey instrument, as well as for organizing results where young adult Russian bilinguals navigate between two cultures and two languages.

Variables	Russian Speakers – Older Adults (OA)	Bilingual Russian/English Speaking Young Adults (YA)		English Speakers – Young Adults (YA)
		<div style="text-align: center;"> </div>		
Male-male				
Female - female				
Female - male				
Young Adult – Older Adult				
Young Adult – Young Adult				
Older Adult – Older Adult				

Figure 1. Matrix of Variables

= Focused interaction within the group for this study

= Demographic not covered by this study

The figure represents the different variables involved in this study:

Same Gender:

Old Adults – Old Adults (Monolinguals)
 Young Adult– Young Adult (Bilinguals)
 Young Adult– Young Adult (Monolinguals)

Opposite gender:

Old Adults – Old Adults (Monolinguals)
 Young Adult– Young Adult (Bilinguals)
 Young Adult– Young Adult (Monolinguals)

The instrument used to collect the quantifiable data for this study was a written discourse completion test (DCT). It was designed and developed based on observational notebook data. Similar to Eisenstein and Bodman's (1986) study of gratitude, a structured observation method using field notes was used. The survey instrument consists of two parts. The first part follows the interlanguage pragmatics research

tradition (Blum-Kulka *et al.*, 1989; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993), by using a DCT. The second part includes a background questionnaire for subjects to fill out, with questions that asks Russian immigrants their reasons for moving to the United States, or what activities they believe they have adopted while living in the US.

DCTs constitute important starting points for any further research since they facilitate the collection of large amounts of data. The DCT for the data collection consists of a prompt that describes a situation, and then a space for participants to write their response. Yuan (2001) explains that “although the written DCT has its limitations, it would still be a preferable choice if the goal of a study is to describe the realization patterns of a particular speech act of a particular language...” (p.289). Furthermore, as Olshtain (1993) points out, DCTs can be administered to a large number of people, enabling the researcher to work with frequencies of realization patterns and their relation to the manipulated variables.

In this study, four different situations were selected to elicit leave-taking responses. All four of these were designed to assess cultural competence among bilingual speakers of English and Russian. They included an assessment of stylistic competence as well, such as the use of a stylistically appropriate good-bye (e.g., “I wish to express my farewell now” – more formal, “Bye, I’m leaving” – less formal), in the given context. The four situations included, (a) saying good-bye by interrupting someone at a wedding, (b) saying good-bye to a speaker at an event, (c) saying good-bye to an acquaintance at a dinner party, and (d) saying good-bye to a close friend. These situations were intended to represent a continuum from more formal, such as saying

good-bye to a speaker, to more casual, such as saying good-bye to your best friend.

Variables considered to be contributing significantly to style in this continuum were age, gender, and social distance (close, familiar, distant). There were two versions of the DCT – one in English and the other in Russian, which I translated. One Russian graduate student in linguistics checked translation. The translation produced identical DCTs in English and Russian. The following situations were included:

Situation A: You are at a wedding reception and have danced the night away. You are ready to leave and want to say goodbye to your friend who is talking to a couple at a table (please note: for this situation, your friend is the same gender as you). You walk up to your friend to say goodbye while he/she is in the middle of a conversation:

Situation B: Your evening was spent volunteering at an event that hosted a panel of speakers. At the end of the event, everyone is talking around the dessert table in the corner of the room. You promised yourself that before you leave, you would say goodbye to one of the speakers tonight. The speaker, who shares your background and who has been living in your community for twenty years, is someone you respect and want to be like when you reach his/her age (it is important to note that for this situation, the speaker is the opposite gender as you). Now that you are ready to leave, you see the speaker is just walking away from a conversation, so you walk up to the speaker to say goodbye:

Situation C: You are at a formal dinner party with seven other guests. You have a lot in common with most of the guests since they have been living in your community for many years now. It's been a lovely evening but you are getting tired. You look at your watch, it's 11pm, and you realize that just about everyone has gone home. You decide you are ready to go home, too. You are standing next to another guest, whom you have met several times before, as you decide you want to leave, you: (please note: for this situation, this guest is the opposite of your gender)

Situation D: Your best friend, (please note: for this situation, your friend is the same gender as you) invited you over for lunch. You have a great time catching up and eating the wonderful meal that your friend prepared. You remember that you have so much work to do this afternoon, so after about two hours, you decide that you are ready to leave and say:

Administration of the DCT was followed, when permission was granted, by interviews for five DCT's whose responses to the DCT varied considerably from the others. Those five participants from the 79ers group (3 males and 2 females) were

interviewed by phone. They were given the option to use Russian or English. Participants therefore felt free to say anything without linguistic difficulty, thereby producing more elaborate explanations for their responses.

The advantage in using a DCT is that it allows for manipulation of contextual factors (Bonikowska, 1988, p.120). A disadvantage, however, is that some of the semantic formulas employed in a DCT vary noticeably from those employed in naturalistic contexts (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1990). I tried to limit the chance of any such disadvantage, yet since the situations described in my DCT were based on my own experiences of situations during observations, the possibility exists that some subjects may have limited exposure to such situations and therefore their responses could be less authentic. Three subjects who were not sure how to reply simply stated on their DCT that they were uncomfortable putting themselves in a situation that they have never experienced before, in which case I gave them permission to move on to the next situation. Note that the data obtained in the DCT must not be treated as pieces of authentic discourse, but as informants' perceptions and beliefs of appropriate discourse across different situations.

4.3.1 QUESTIONNAIRE APPROVAL—HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD

Prior to handing out the DCT, I was required to submit my thesis objectives and sample DCT to the Human Subject's Review Board. The purpose of the review of research involving human subjects at San Jose State University is to insure the protection of the human subjects in such research. Once approved, I received a letter from the review board with permission to conduct research for my thesis. I then met with the

79ers coordinator to let her know I would be coming to events to hand out the DCT and background questionnaire.

4.3.2 QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

The coordinator of the 79ers and I had picked an initial event that would have a good turnout of 79ers attending. The event was a Russian-American comedian night, with a comedian who came up from Los Angeles. Kira Soltanovich, the improv comedian, has written for and appeared on numerous comedy shows. Like the 79ers, she was born in the former Soviet Union and raised by her immigrant parents in San Francisco. One of her lines, where she demonstrates a sense of humor regarding her past, is, *"Like most kids, my parents took me to Disneyland – but not for the rides, for the lines. They assumed there'd be food at the end of them."* I arrived at the show one hour before any of the 79ers arrived. As they came in, they were greeted by the coordinator, and were asked to take a seat. As they waited, I was able to hand out DCT's to 40+ guests. I continued to hand out DCT's after the show as well, taking some of the 79ers aside and having them fill out a DCT. My verbal instructions, in English, were as follows:

"The following is what is called a Discourse Completion Task. I have put together 4 situations that you all may be familiar with. Your goal is to write down what you would truly say in these situations. Notice that they all have to do with saying good-bye. Please answer in English or in Russian – whatever you feel most comfortable in answering. Do you have any questions?"

I then attended a total of two more 79er events where I administered the DCT. The same DCT was also given to the monolingual speaking groups in their homes and at

the library. It should be noted that instructions were read out loud in English for the 79er group, even though I let the subjects know that they might choose to reply in Russian or in English. For future research, I believe it would be best to provide verbal instructions in both English and Russian so that influence or preference of one language over another would not occur.

The second part of the survey instrument consisted of a background questionnaire that was attached to the reverse of each DCT. Questions inquired regarding level of education, profession, the types of cultures the subjects interacted with the most, and whether or not any challenges arise when leave-taking in a situation with someone of another culture. The questionnaire given to the native-Russian speakers differed from the one given to native-English speakers because the native-Russian version contained five questions that requested information on the types of activities, beliefs, or challenges that subjects believe they have adopted since immigrating to the US. It was of interest to me to find out which of these activities, if any, would match the 79ers interests.

5.0 EVENT ANALYSIS

The major aim of the data analysis within this study was to determine the possibility of assessing sociocultural and pragmatic behavior of leave-taking among non-native English speakers who are bilingual, and who may have fully acculturated among native English speakers, yet who also continue to interact with their native Russian community on a day-to-day basis. This called for initially determining the range of patterns in leave-taking among the bilingual speakers, and then for comparing monolingual native responses to bilingual responses.

To enhance the validity of the survey instrument, I attended Russian and 79ers events. At these events, I gathered research findings by taking a substantial amount of field notes and observations. After taking field notes during each event, I transcribed them while adding additional observations and analysis to create a complete recap of each event. This recap attempted to capture details of participants throughout the event, with special attention to the end of an event where good examples of leave-taking occur. The following are vignettes which are summarized from the full recap of each event, and intended to illustrate certain leave-taking situations during each of the events that I attended:

Event 1- 10/1/05: Wedding, San Diego, CA (event duration: 7 hrs)

The vignette below describes a leave-taking observed at a Russian-American wedding. The newly married couple is approached by an elderly Russian couple.

As we were out in the hallway, I saw a couple saying good-bye to the bride and groom, but they didn't hug or kiss them. The woman said: "Horosho, dosvedanya, spacibo za sjo" – "Very well, good-bye and thank-you," and then the man said, "Da, Ok, sjo bilja zamichachitna" – "Yes, ok, everything was great." An elderly Russian couple walking past the bride and groom also stopped to say something to them, and I heard them say "Oy, spacibo, v'sjo bila tak horosho!" – "My, everything was so great!" The elderly woman was playing with the bride's hair as she said: "Takaya krasivaya nivesta" – "What a beautiful bride." In response the bride said: "Oh, thank-you, spaciba." The groom, who is American, hugged the couple, while the Russian bride gave them both a kiss on one side of their face. The couple said thank-you to them again: "Spaceebo i mazel-tov" – "thank-you and good-luck." It did appear as though they knew each other very well. As the elderly couple was walking away, the groom said, "Dosvedanya, thanks for coming!" As he waved to them with his right hand, the couple looked back at them and smiled.

What is interesting to observe in this vignette is the similarity in leave-taking utterances of the newly married couple –both the native English (American) and native Russian members of the couple use Russian and English in their responses to the elderly couple.

Based on this observation, my questions then were, do elderly native-Russian speakers not verbally say good-bye, and only say thank-you in such a situation? Also, does the American husband have an influence on the choice of words that his wife would use since she is Russian and appears to be code-switching? Also, did they not touch/kiss the bride because she was in wedding attire? (From many other events I attended, there usually

was always a kiss involved in the leave-taking among Russians, but it wasn't the case for this leave-taking.)

Event 2: 10/15/05: Bat-Mitzvah, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 3.5 hrs)

The following vignette includes leave-taking observations during a Bat-Mitzvah, between bilingual and monolingual young and older adults. The Bat-Mitzvah girl, who was born in Russia and moved to the United States ten years ago, conducted her leave-taking with her guests.

The Bat-Mitzvah girl, Olga hugged her friends when some of them said good-bye to her. "Bye guys!" When her cousin, came up to her, she said to Olga: "Mazel-tov Olga, I am very proud of you." "Skora Uvidimsa" –We'll see each other soon, to which Olga responded, "Ok, paka (bye) Jana!" When it was time for me to leave, I went up to her and said, "Bye, Olga!" She said: "Paka (bye) Katia, spaceebo (– thanks) for coming!" Some of Olga's friends simply said "bye" without hugging her. When her friends said bye to one another, it was simply with a wave of a hand, or in most cases, a hug. In one situation, when Olga's friend yelled out 'bye' to her, Olga ran up to her to hug her and say good-bye, "Ok, bye Sarah, I hope you had fun!" I noticed that Olga was definitely more of a hugger than her friends were. She was also the only Russian bilingual in her group of friends.

From this observation, my questions were how someone like Olga, a young adult and a Russian American, decides how to take leave with someone of a similar background, such as my background or her friends? Also, based on the above, code-switching could regularly occur with those who share similar backgrounds to Olga. Does

this happen frequently with other young Russian bilinguals as well as elderly native-Russian speakers? Also, do Russians not verbally say good-bye, and only say thank-you in such a situation? My analysis also indicates that Olga's leave-taking was more similar to the physical contact a Russian would make in this situation, mixed in with the verbal tendencies that make up more of American leave-taking.

What is also interesting in this observation, as indicated by the above vignette as well as the other events, were the differences of how people physically acknowledged their leave-taking. I observed Americans waving goodbye, or shaking their hands with one another. When it came to some of the Russians saying good-bye, the women either hugged or said good-bye to one another by kissing each other on the cheek (both sides), or one woman squeezed another woman's hand instead of shaking it, while saying good-bye. The Russian men seemed to stick to handshakes and pats on shoulders at the same time, not necessarily uttering a goodbye.

Event 3- 10/29/05: Seventy-Niner's Dinner at Cinderella Russian Restaurant, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 2.5hrs)

This vignette is an observation of how young adult Russian bilinguals would take leave after having dinner together. The vignette below begins once everyone had gotten up from the table. They stood around the exit of the restaurant, preparing to say goodbye.

As soon as one of the men initiated by saying "Nu, sjo, let's go?" – "well, that's it, let's go?" everyone started to walk out of the restaurant together. The few females remaining walked up and said "paka" – bye, to all their friends, while the men who remained asked

some of the females questions as to when they would see each other next, “Nu, so, I guess you’ll be going to that event next Friday night?” “Um, I think so,” replied one of the females he was asking. I also heard, “do you need a ride home?” being asked by a male to a female who was playing with the ring tone on her mobile. I noticed two people who walked out and didn’t say goodbye. I saw a few others who were about to say goodbye and began complimenting each other, “You look great tonight” or “It was really great seeing you.” Some compliments seemed to occur, replacing a goodbye. As soon as a compliment was uttered, people parted ways, without saying goodbye. From the time people intended to leave and walked out of the restaurant, to the time people left lasted about 8 minutes.”

In this vignette, my questions then were, how common is code-switching among this group when saying good-bye? Do young adult Russian bilingual males compliment members of the opposite gender whenever they say goodbye, or are they selective on who they compliment? Also, are young adult Russian bilingual females more likely to utter goodbye when it is time to leave? Why did the two people who left without saying goodbye do so? Many of the young adults did not know one another, so it was interesting to observe what occurs in situations where people may feel awkward at saying goodbye to one another. It is interesting to observe the interaction of females versus males during the leave-takings.

Event 4: 12/19/05 Seventy-Niner’s Vodka/Latke Party, Mountain View, CA (event duration: 2.5 hours)

This observation was of a Russian bilingual young adult gathering at the home of one of the 79er coordinators.

The woman standing next to the male on my right, who earlier was in a political discussion with him, shook his hand and said goodbye and thanked him for the interesting conversation. He wasn't Russian American, and was a friend of a Russian American attending. She then said good-bye to everyone standing around her, out loud in English, "Ok, it was nice seeing you guys, gotta go now, see you at the next event!" She then walked away from us and towards the host, tapping him on the shoulder and said, "Paka, thanks for a great meal," "Sure, sure, spaciba sh'to prishla – thanks for coming," he replied, and he walked her to the door and she left. I noticed three people in the hallway who were about to leave, and who never came to say good-bye to the rest of us in the kitchen. It seemed as though everyone waited for his or her right time to say goodbye, and no one left at the same time. One of the few men at the gathering shook hands with the host when he was leaving, but did not say good-bye to any of us. I did notice him saying good-bye to a woman standing across the kitchen from me. Also, I noticed that the first couple to leave were the only ones who had expressed goodbye by announcing their leave-taking as "We're leaving now" and then went around the room with a kiss or a hug to everyone in the room, or it seemed at least to everyone they knew well. I waited until there were less than three people remaining at the party before I decided to go. So when it was time for me to leave, I walked around the room to say good-bye to the remaining three guests and one of the women said to me, "Harosho sh'to ti prishla" – It's really nice you came tonight." I replied, "Da, ya ochen rada" – "Yes.

I'm very happy." She also told me how impressed she was with one of my friends' husbands who was still present, and who tried to speak to us in his Russian-English. I heard her telling him, "So, horosho govoritzi po ruski" – "So, you speak Russian well." He replied, "Ja govoru nimnoshko po ruski," – "I speak a little Russian." He then said, "Paka!" – "Goodbye" to the people he was talking to in the kitchen and then followed some people over to the host. I waited for the rest of the guests to walk out the door after saying "paka" to the host and shaking his hand.

This observation raised questions about gender and leave-taking. What is the difference of a 79er male saying good-bye to females he is attracted to, and who they are not attracted to, or unavailable. Also, are 79er females more likely to announce intent of leave-taking instead of announcing that they are leaving? It seems to take longer for females to follow through with a leave-taking, whereas the males at this event seemed to have announced their leave-taking to a select group of people, then just said good-bye out loud to everyone in the room. Most of the guests attending knew one another, so it was interesting to observe how some of the guests left the party without saying goodbye. It was also interesting to observe the reaction of some guests in regards to an American, with some knowledge of the Russian language, who happened to be present at the party. How common is it for English Monolinguals to begin a pre-closing with a greeting in order to get someone's attention and then explain why they have to leave? What explains the difference of why some people just leave, while others prefer to provide an explanation for why they need to leave.

Event 5 – 1/1/06 Russian New Years Party, San Francisco, CA (event duration: 5.5 hours)

The below describes a Russian gathering, which included many older Russian adults who are monolinguals as well as some young adult bilinguals. Most of the guests were seated at tables, and knew everyone seated at their table.

A woman, who is Russian and has been living in North America for 30 years now, walked over to two of the women from their table and they forcefully kissed each other on each cheek (starting from the left cheek). Then she kissed their husband's cheek once on their left cheek. Her husband kissed the same women his wife had just said goodbye to, on one cheek, and did the same to the men. I waited for them to finish talking to their friends, so that I could walk up to them and say good-bye. "Bye, Sasha!", I said. She then leaned down to me, kissing my forehead. She said to me: "I love you!" and I replied: "I love you, too." As her farewell to me, she yelled out "Ciao," and waved her arm out in the air as if about to blow me a kiss. I kissed her husband on his left cheek, he did the same to me on my right, and we hugged each other tightly. No words were exchanged between us, except when I was getting my coat, he said: "Zeit Gezount," which in Yiddish translates to "be well." After he hugged me, I noticed he put both of his hands in his pockets and started to walk towards one of the Russian males my age. "Good to see you," he said and the young adult replied by saying "Good to see you too – paka!" His wife walked up to the young adult and hugged him. He leaned down (she is much shorter than he is) and kiss her on the cheek, saying "Paka." There was some confusion

between them because it felt as though she didn't think he would kiss her so she didn't kiss him back, but was about to as soon as he pulled away. Her husband patted him on his back as they walked away from the table. Another couple at my parent's table whom I don't know too well walked towards my parents and I to say good-bye. I kissed the woman on her cheek and she smiled and wished me a happy new year. I said: "Dosvedanya" – good-bye and they replied with "bye, bye." Her husband did the same. I noticed that an American male who was seated at our table, and was saying his goodbye, didn't kiss this woman, but instead wished both her and her husband a happy new year. (When I asked him why, he said because he had never spoken to her and didn't even know her name so he felt uncomfortable kissing her; whereas I, who had met her at least once before, felt it was a necessity to kiss her and her husband, because they were my parents' friends, even though I didn't know them very well.). The remaining couples at the table were walking away, so we didn't get a chance to say goodbye to everyone, although I did walk up to a couple of elderly ladies whom I had spoken to earlier in the evening. I had seen them once before at another Russian event months before, so they remembered me. As I was walking over to their table, it looked like they were getting ready to leave. They were speaking in Yiddish. One of them said to the other: "Dos is di tochter fune Grisha" – "This is Gregory's daughter," and I realized that was probably my cue to say something. Trying to pull out my Yiddish, I said: "scholem-aleichem!" – Hello! They all seemed quiet as they were starting to stand up from their chairs. I helped one of them with her coats, and when I heard them speaking in Russian again: "Sjo zakonchilas?" – "Is it all over?" they asked one another. "Jo" – "Yes," I

replied back in Yiddish. “Ti vidila Tanya?” – “Did you see Tanya?” I told her I did see Tanya, her granddaughter. She then asked that I should come over sometime to the house where Tanya is temporarily living. While I was talking to the woman, I noticed her friends were leaving without saying goodbye. The elderly woman was beginning to put on her coat, so I helped her with it, while I was telling her I was planning on leaving. I kissed the elderly woman on her cheek, and said: “Snovom Godom, horosho bilya uviditza” – “Happy New Year, it was very nice seeing you.” As she held my hand, she replied, “Dosvedanaya Dorogoya, Zeit Gezount” – “Goodbye dear, be well (in Yiddish).” As I was walking towards the exit, there was a family getting ready to leave. The kids were yelling at their parents that they wanted to leave, and the parents seemed to have been ignoring them, because they were saying their farewells to the couple that was seated at their table. Everyone else I was walking by was putting on their coats, or about to leave the table. It seemed as though everyone was outside by now.

How do young adults generally approach a leave-taking situation where there is a person older than them. Who generally initiates the leave-taking? When the leave-taking does happen between a Russian bilingual young adult and a bilingual older adult, what language is the leave-taking communicated in? If there is a mix of English and Russian, who generally speaks in which language? What is interesting in this vignette are the many different ways of communicating a leave-taking with a Russian monolingual adult, and how frequently physical interaction becomes a part of the leave-taking. Also important to note is how wishing someone a Happy New Year, in this observation, was a way to say good-bye.

Event 6 – 1/29/06 Shabbat Dinner, San Mateo, CA (event duration: 4 hours)

During this dinner, I observed a gathering with Russian American adults, and native-English speakers.

The Russian woman's husband who got up, gave an older Russian adult male somewhat of a low bow and then a nod of his head, agreeing with what he was saying and thanking him at the same time. It was interesting to witness the non-verbal communication.

Everyone got up from the table and headed towards the living room. The Russian woman and her husband were talking to the older Russian adult male and his wife, and she put her arm around me and told me she hoped to see more of me this semester. I gave her a hug and kissed her on one side of her cheek. She gave me a kiss on the cheek as well.

The older Russian adult male and his wife were saying goodbye to her husband. "Well, you guys should come up more often," her husband told them. "We will, we will. It was very nice to see you both," the older Russian adult male responded. The Russian woman's husband was putting on his coat, as the older Russian adult male's wife stood in front of him ready to say good-bye. "Sjo vam horoshova," – "all the best," she said to him. She kissed him on both sides of his cheek and the older Russian adult male gave him a hug and a handshake, and stepped over to kiss the Russian woman on both sides of her cheeks. The older Russian adult male's wife and the Russian woman hugged each other and also gave each other a kiss on both sides of the cheek. I realized I had not said goodbye to the Russian woman's husband yet, so I gave him a kiss on both sides of his cheeks, too, as he said, "So, we won't wait so long to see you again, right?" I said, "We will try our best!" Tonight's hostess, a native-English woman in her late 50s, hugged

them both and told them she was so happy to meet them and said: "Take care, or should I say, dosvedanaya?" They all laughed and said, "Yes, dosvedanya, you are learning from the best teachers!" The host's daughter, a native-English speaker who is approximately my age, stood there but she didn't hug them. Instead, she shook their hands and they said to her "We wish you all the best in your studies...good luck!" The son of the hostess, who is a few years older than I and has some greater experience with Russians, kissed the Russian woman on one side of her cheek and shook hands with her husband. The male host opened the door for them and before they walked out of the house, they turned around and waved back at us and smiled. As soon as they left, the older Russian adult male and his wife asked me if we were going to go too, since we had arrived together. "Nu shto, pajdjom?" – "So, shall we go?" I said yes, "da, pashli" – "yes let's go," and we retrieved our coats from the closet.

The host was getting his shoes on because he wanted to walk us to our car. The hostess hugged me and said: "Well it was really nice meeting those guys, glad you all could come tonight, it was really nice." "Of course," I replied, "I'm just glad you all got along and enjoyed each other's company!" At this point, the older Russian adult male's wife walked up to her to say good-bye, and said, "Thank you – great dinner!" and I noticed that the older Russian adult female leaned in to give her a kiss on the cheek, but it didn't follow through because the hostess' intentions seemed to just give a hug (talk about cross-cultural differences in leave-taking!!!) and as they separated, the hostess said, "I'm so glad you were able to make it over!" Her husband leaned down and gave the older Russian adult female a kiss on her cheek, and then he and the older Russian adult male hugged.

To this the older Russian adult male gave him a slap on his back. The older Russian adult male then hugged the hostess.

My observations here raised questions in a number of different areas. Do older Russian adults talk more about making future plans during their leave-taking with other Russians, and do they ever follow-through with these plans? Do native-English speakers who say goodbye to others of a different culture, think about how they are truly saying goodbye? Do they feel confused? Did the younger native-English speaking female only shake hands with the Russians because to her they were 'professors' and therefore social distance or power may have begun to play a role for her in their interaction? Do monolingual English speakers compliment more when they are saying good-bye to people they know well, as opposed to someone they have just met? It was particularly interesting to observe the leave-taking between the native-English speaking woman and Russian American woman because there was some confusion in the physical exchange of the leave-taking. Also interesting was the fact that gender played a great role in this observation as to who decided to initiate the leave-taking, and how the leave-taking was conducted.

Event 7 – 2/4/06 Dinner party, Menlo Park, CA (event duration: 5 hours)

This last vignette includes an observation of a gathering of young adults, some of whom are Russian native speakers, and some of whom are native-English speakers. They are all married, and two of the three couples are married to someone who is a native Russian. The beginning of the vignette begins with the American couple saying goodbye

to everyone, and concludes with one of the Russian/American couples announcing their leave-taking.

As soon as Jim walked out of the office, the host of the dinner party (an American male in his 30s who has been exposed to the Russian culture and understands a few words) and Kevin followed him into the living room where they stood, facing the females. “Do you want to head out now?” Sarah asked Jim. He said, “Ok, well, yeah, we better get going” and then Sarah stood up from the couch. The host handed them their coats, and she said to me, “Ok, well, thank you so much for a wonderful dinner.” Then Jim said: “Yes, the dinner was great – thank you very much!” He seemed to give a small bow towards the host. The host initiated a handshake with Jim while Sarah and I hugged. After I hugged Sarah, she and the host hugged, and then Jim and I hugged. They said good-bye to Masha and Kevin. Sarah said, “Bye, it was so nice seeing you guys again. We should do something again soon, but at our place!” Masha said, “Yes, definitely. It was good to see you guys, too.” Kevin initiated a handshake with Jim, while I opened the door for Sarah and Jim. Jim said, “Later!” and I replied with “Goodnight!” As soon as I closed the door, Masha said, “Thank you so much for everything.” I said, “You’re welcome. I’m so glad you guys could drive down from the city to meet us.” Kevin then said: “Katia, the dinner was amazing as always” and then he hugged me. He also approached the host and hugged him too and even slapped him on the back after their hug. Masha and I hugged, although I was going in for a kiss on the cheek until my face ended up in her hair. Then I just realized that maybe she prefers to hug, American-style. The host handed her coat over to her, and they quickly hugged each other as Kevin opened the

door. As they walked out of our place, I said, "Thanks for coming guys, drive safe!"

They said "goodnight" in unison, and Masha said, "See you again soon!"

Had Masha acculturated towards her husband's leave-taking strategies? This was the second time I noticed she did not say good-bye like many of the 79ers would. I wondered if she would have gone for the kiss on the cheek had we been with other Russians. What is interesting about this observation is how Masha, who has been living in the United States for many years takes leave similarly to her American husband. Also, in regards to Sarah, an English monolingual, she initiated the leave-taking with her husband. As well as complimenting on the evening, it seemed as though she was in control of the leave-taking and her husband was taking her cues. I wondered if the opposite was happening among English monolinguals and gender when it came to leave-taking. In almost all of the leave-taking occurrences with Russians, it was the male who took the lead.

5.1 RESULTS OF DCT ANALYSIS

Following the method used by many researchers (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Beebe & Cummings, 1985; Beebe *et al.*, 1990), data collected from the DCT's were analyzed using semantic formulas as units of analysis. The written responses in the DCT's were coded according to the classification of various speech acts. For example, in the situation where respondents had to take leave after having lunch with a close friend "I'm sorry, I have a lot of work to do, so I should probably take off now" was analyzed as consisting of three units, each falling into a corresponding semantic formula (as shown in the brackets):

(1) I'm sorry.

[regret]

(2) I have a lot of work to do.

[explanation]

(3) so I should probably take off now.

[discourse marker and announcement of intent to take leave]

To make sure the semantic formulas suited the data for the classification of the speech acts selected based on subjects' responses, one independent rater was selected to analyze random samples. The rater, a female, is a graduate student in linguistics. Results showed that even though she reached a high level of consistency (93%) in classifying the data, there were discrepancies on how to categorize certain responses. Therefore, we held a discussion session to consider those responses that differed. This increased consistency and consensus with my own ratings, and the rater raised her level of agreement to 100%.

My objective was to identify and explain the formulas of leave-taking among the 79er group, and to build these into a testing instrument. First, I will present all situations in which leave-takings occurred for all three groups. Second, I will present instances in which 79ers leave-taking pattern differed from Russian monolinguals due to negative transfer, possibly from non-native cultural patterns. Third, I will look at instances in which the 79ers deviated, even though native and non-native cultural patterns seemed similar. Fourth, I will indicate instances where 79ers did not deviate notably from native

English speakers in their use of formulas of leave-taking, despite apparent cultural differences between native English and native Russian speakers.

5.1.1 CATEGORIES OF SPEECH ACTS IN LEAVE-TAKING

The speech acts used in leave-taking situations are classified into a set of functional categories, some of which were adopted from Knapp and Hart (1973) and House's (1982) studies and also based on the collected data from all three speech communities for this study. These categories are:

Apologizing: any statement indicating acknowledgment of inconvenience caused by the speaker and expressing regret (such as interrupting a conversation), or asking for pardon (e.g. "Excuse me..." "Sorry to have taken up your time," etc).

Announcement of Leave-Taking: any statement given by a guest that clearly indicates his desire to leave (e.g. "I'm taking off now," "It's time for me to leave," etc.)

Discourse Marker and Announcement of Intent of leave-taking: any statement given by a guest which clearly indicates his intent to leave, also stated with a discourse marker (e.g.: "I think I'm going to head out pretty soon," "I should probably start getting my stuff together," "So....I think I'm going to head out pretty soon," "OK...I should probably start getting my stuff together," etc.)

Thanking: any statement indicating the speaker's gratitude of having been part of the occasion in any way ("Thanks for such a great time," "Thanks for a great lunch," etc.)

Complimenting: any statements expressing the speaker's satisfaction and joy in having been part of the occasion, or personally complimenting on appearance or time spent

together (“It was so nice to have met you,” “I had a great time speaking to you tonight,” “You looked great tonight,” etc.)

Greeting: any statement expressing a form of greeting prior to the indication of leave-taking: (e.g.: “Hey, I’m taking off now,” “Hi, want to go now?” etc.)

Greeting and Self-Introduction: any statement expressing a form of greeting with a self-introduction to the listener prior to the indication of leave-taking: (e.g.: “Hey, I’m Molly, just wanted to let you know that I’m taking off now,” “Hi, I’m Larry, nice to meet you, but I’m leaving now,” etc.)

Expectation of Future Meeting: any statement indicating the speaker’s intention to get together again in the future (“I’ll see you next week,” “Lunch is on me next week!,” etc).

Closing: any short formulaic utterances indicating the termination of the interaction (e.g. “Goodbye,” “See you later,” etc).

Explanation: any statement indicating a reason or excuse on the speaker’s part to take leave (“I’ve had a busy day” “I’m tired” etc.)

Questioning: any statement expressing a speaker’s questioning when asking something of the hearer (e.g. “Did you have a nice time tonight?” “Are you going to leave soon?” etc.)

Please note that the list on the previous page does not demonstrate all of the speech acts that are applied in leave-taking situations. They are representations of those I have come across in my observations and testing.

5.1.2 DIFFERENT LEAVE-TAKING

The data from the DCT show that, among the 79ers, the Russian monolinguals, and English monolinguals, there are some marked differences in conducting leave-taking. In this section, these differences will be described. The figures in this section represent speech acts that are employed more frequently by one speech community than by another. This difference in frequency suggests that the varied methodologies employed by each of the three speech communities to fulfill the leave-taking event. I also found some situations where the 79er speakers' deviations from the cultural patterns of Russian monolingual speakers seemed more likely a result of transfer from English-speaker patterns rather than a misperception of how to use the formulas in Russian when saying good-bye to a Russian speaker. Lastly, the research indicates that some speech acts are more important in a leave-taking situation for the 79ers than for the other groups, as they maintain consistent use of these formulas regardless of cultural situation or language.

Overall, in most cases differences in gender became apparent. Seventy-Niner females use a semantic formulae considerably less than Russian female monolingual speakers. For example, results show that 100% of Russian female monolinguals utter "dosvedanya" – "good-bye," while only 67% of 79er females would in fact utter a form of good-bye when leaving a dinner party in situation C. Seventy-Niner females therefore in this situation seemed to have leave-taking strategies similar to their native-English speaker counterparts, and varied considerably from their Russian counterparts. To provide another example, when the leave-taking was at a wedding, situation A, males and females in all three groups said "good-bye." However, in this situation, females in the

79er group (42%) and in the native-English group (53%) were the two groups that least likely reported to uttering good-bye during this event, while male results indicate 76% of 79er males, 100% of the Russian male monolinguals, and 84% of native-English speaking males would say good-bye at this event.

However, these formulas changed depending on the specific situation. Apart from the wedding situation, use of a formula matching that of the monolingual English speakers was low or non-existent. For instance, 79er females approached a closing that was similar to that of their female Russian counterparts during situation D, a lunch with a best friend. Additionally, only 45% of all 79ers, and noticeably only 27% of 79er females said “good-bye” than native-English speaking monolinguals (0%) during situation B, an event where, first, they were listening to a speaker they highly admired, and second, they were given the opportunity to speak to that person before leave-taking. Almost all Russian monolinguals thought they would say “good-bye” in such a situation, while no native-English speakers thought they would.

Data from the observations and DCT’s illustrate that there are some speech acts are more basic components in leave-taking situations, and are therefore essential in successfully conducting the speech event, such as thanking for Russian monolingual speakers at the end of an event. Some speech acts, on the other hand, ensure their closing function, such as announcing an intent to take leave or apologizing to get the other person’s attention. The data suggest that different speech communities have different needs for certain speech acts. Evidence of these patterns is summarized in the tables found in Appendix F. In the following pages, however, figures illustrate the most

frequent speech acts within leave-taking for all three groups. To provide more specificity on the differences in these situations and formulas, several figures will now be presented as illustration.

As illustrated by Figure 2, 79ers obtained results similar to Russian monolinguals when it came to announcing an intent to take leave with a discourse marker. For example, when about to leave Situation C, a dinner party, 79ers would announce an intent to take leave beginning with a discourse marker by saying: "*Nu* (so), or *OK*, I think I'm going to get going now". Results were similar between these two groups when an expectation for future meeting occurred within the leave-taking. I recall from attending events that Russians and 79ers were similar when it came time to making plans for a future event. They seemed to take more time in planning their future meeting during the conversation. In contrast, English monolinguals, who also expected a future meeting, were more quick in communicating this fact by simply stating when they will see each other, such as "I'll see you next week" or "I'll see you next time."

Figure 2. Frequency of Announcing an Intent to Leave-Take with a Discourse Marker

There were also situations where the problem may have been in inter-language pragmatics. Several 79ers may not have been proficient enough in English to readily include the expected semantic formulas in their responses for the situations. In these cases, the frequency of use of semantic formulas by Russian monolinguals and native English speakers seemed similar, while the 79ers tended to use these formulas less. For example, 79er females were less likely to thank when taking leave at a dinner party with a guest of opposite gender. Similar results were also obtained when announcing a leave-taking, as opposed to announcing a plan or intent to take leave in the near future (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Frequency of Announcing an Expectation of Future Meeting

Additionally, there were situations in which 79ers responded similarly to native-English speakers, even when Russian monolinguals responded quite differently in Russian. As the figures illustrate, the 79ers greeted (Figure 4) and even provided a greeting and self-introduction (Figure 5) when about to take leave in certain situations. For example, situation B, which entailed going up to say good-bye to a speaker during a volunteering event.

Figure 4. Frequency of Providing a Greeting when about to Leave-Take

Figure 5. Frequency of Providing a Greeting with a Self-Introduction when about to Leave-Take

Also, in situation A, the wedding situation, (except for one in the native-English speaker group) and situation B, the volunteer event, the 79ers seemed to be the only group (except for one in the native-English speaker group) to provide for an explanation (Figure 6) as to why they were leaving.

Figure 6. Frequency of Providing an Explanation

5.1.3 GIVING THANKS

Also noticeable in the results were gender differences in thanking. In all situations, females scored higher in thanking than males did across all groups. Russian monolinguals thanked more frequently than any other group, except in situation A, the wedding. As for the 79ers, one situation in which 79ers females (13%) thanked equally to native-English speaking females (13%), and more than Russian monolinguals, was

during situation A, the wedding. One hundred percent of Russian women thanked in situation B, the speaker event, and in situation D, the lunch. In these two situations, 64% of 79er females thanked, and in situation B, and 73% of 79er females thanked for their lunch. As Figure 7 demonstrates, Russian monolingual scores were closest to the 79ers for situations that involved thanking. Giving thanks (Figures 7 and 8) is something that my results and observations indicate that Russians are culturally known to do profusely, but it would seem that 79ers did not thank as much as their Russian counterparts, possibly a change brought about through their interaction with native-English monolingual speakers.

Figure 7. Frequency of Saying “Thank You” for Females

Figure 8. Frequency of Saying “Thank You” for Males

5.1.4 APOLOGIZING

Prior to analyzing any other differences of leave-taking between the three groups, I must acknowledge the role of apology in the results. The apology was the one speech act with the most occurrences in all situations. When leave-taking a wedding and saying goodbye to a friend, all groups provided an apology when interrupting a conversation, or letting someone know they were about to leave. One of the situations in the DCT called for an individual to walk up to a couple they know and say good-bye. All groups apologized, but the way they do so varies. Russian monolingual speakers who apologized included in their DCT's that they would wait for the couple to stop speaking before saying good-bye. Therefore, they would not interrupt the conversation, and would patiently wait before saying good-bye. Fifty percent of the 79ers, however, believe that

they would interrupt the conversation if they were good friends with the couple. They would also either apologize by providing what Cohen and Olshtain (1981) term expression of regret (“I’m sorry”), or a request for forgiveness (“Excuse me”). Native-English speakers did not indicate in their DCT how they felt about interrupting; however, they would all do so by an expression of regret. In situation B, the speaker event, all groups apologize when approaching the speaker to say good-bye, and all groups do so with a request for forgiveness. In situation C, a dinner party, only three 79er females and two female native-English speakers apologized with an expression of regret when about to engage in leave-taking with a member of the opposite gender. In situation D, lunch with a best friend, only native-English speakers felt the need to offer an expression of regret when about to take leave. Figures 9 and 10 on the following page represent the frequency of apology across all three groups.

Figure 9. Frequency of Saying “Excuse me” or “I’m Sorry” for Females

Figure 10. Frequency of Saying “Excuse me” or “I’m Sorry” for Males

5.1.5 CLOSING

In analyzing the closings within each situation, I found notable differences between Russian monolinguals and the 79ers. In situation A, 79ers utter a good-bye in their leave-taking when saying good-bye to a friend, and similar results were obtained from both groups. However, 79er female results (42%) closely matched to those of native-English speaking females (53%); Figure 11. When following up on this, I found that 79er females might not necessarily utter good-bye because they feel as though non-verbal communication, such as providing a kiss during the leave-taking, can be used in lieu of the good-bye. One 79er female wrote: “I may not truly say good-bye, because I can just kiss someone on their cheek.” One Russian monolingual female, when asked why she did not need to say good-bye in situation A, replied that she has lived in this country long enough to have adopted American habits, and that, by being American, she

can just walk away without uttering a good-bye. The results of the closing among the 79ers and Russians for situation B makes these two groups similar since none of the native-English speakers uttered a “good-bye” in this situation. For those who provided a closing, Russian monolingual males (90%), Russian monolingual females (60%), 79er males (18%), 79er females (27%) did so because they thought it would be rude if they didn’t say good-bye to the speaker (Figure 12). When asked why they couldn’t just thank him, they said that would be separate from saying good-bye.

For a closing in situation C, at a dinner party, results were more similar among the 79ers and native-English speakers. The Russian females all provided a closing, whereas only 70% of males did. The males contacted in the follow-up to the DCT, thought that it was okay to let the member of the opposite gender at a dinner party know that you are leaving, and thanking her would be enough without needing to say ‘good-bye.’

The final situation, where one is having lunch with a close friend, produced similar responses among females in all three groups. The Russian monolingual females (35%) thought they should say good-bye to their friend right when they were thinking of leaving, while 79er females (42%) believed saying good-bye was just a small part of the closing but that it was important, and native English speaking females (31%) thought it would be rude to leave without saying good-bye. When asked why some respondents did not think they would say goodbye, three Russian monolingual speakers couldn’t understand why they would have to since they had already said thank you and complimented the lunch. Two 79er females thought that if they were already announcing a leave-taking, they didn’t necessarily think they should be the ones saying good-bye.

Also, that it was possible for their friend to do so instead. Four English-native speakers thought they could express a good-bye to their friend with a hug or a statement of an explanation of a future meeting. It is possible that in this situation, 79er females have adopted more of a native-English speaker way of closing.

Figure 11. Frequency of Saying "Bye" for Females

Figure 12. Frequency of Saying “Bye” for Males

One additional variable that should be taken into consideration involves how certain situations will result in different leave-taking strategies due to the number of people involved. In situation D, lunch with a friend, two people are involved rather than many individuals. Results might be different had the lunch been more similar to Situation C, a dinner party. Leave-taking after a lunch with a friend constitutes the event being over, while when leave-taking a dinner party, on the other hand, the event may continue after you take leave.

5.1.6 GENDER

As seen in the above results, gender in fact plays a significant role in determining leave-taking across cultural groups. A closer analysis of the data regarding gender is therefore merited. For instance, during the wedding situation, situation A, when saying good-bye, Russian monolinguals expected a future meeting. However, including gender

to the analysis, (see Appendix F), more females (75%) did so than males (40%). For the 79ers, though, just about half of the males (51%) expected a future meeting. The males, in their DCT, marked that they would assume a future meeting only if they thought the future meeting would include a social event with the opportunity of meeting other people, especially members of the opposite gender. For example, one male 79er stated in his DCT:

“If I am attracted to her, I might decide this is the time to make my move. I’ll go up to her to say good-bye, but then also find out if she had a nice time, and see what she is doing this weekend. I would then say good-bye and give her a kiss on the cheek. If I wasn’t attracted to her, I would give her a kiss on the cheek, unless I sensed her to be reserved, or not so comfortable with such affection, then I would just shake her hand, or maybe wave good-bye.”

However, during the volunteer event, situation B, females in both groups expected a future meeting with the speaker. In this case, more native-English speakers believed they would see the speaker again, or made plans to see him at another event:

“I just wanted to take this opportunity to say good-bye, and thank you for speaking. I believe you are also speaking next month at the University, so I plan to be there.”

It appears that the males in the Russian monolingual and 79er groups did not believe they would see the speaker again, and therefore did not state a future encounter. The only exception occurred if the 79er was very interested in the speaker’s career and was looking for opportunities:

“‘I really enjoyed your talk tonight, thank you. I’m Boris, and I’m looking to do what you do someday.’ If the speaker is receptive, I would give him my card and say: ‘please let me know of any opportunities.’ Then I would shake his hand firmly.”

During a dinner party situation, when saying good-bye to someone of the opposite gender, Russian monolingual males did not provide for such an expectation. They all marked in their DCTS that they were married, perhaps as a reason for not making future plans with a member of an opposite gender at a dinner party. In the native-English speaker group, more females (40%) than in any other group provided for an expectation of future meeting in this situation. Four of them indicated so, because they felt as though they might see that person at another dinner party in the next few months. The last situation, where two friends were having lunch, provided for interesting results. Russian monolingual male speakers had lower scores compared to the females in this group, as did the 79ers. Almost all of the females in both groups indicated that they would like to invite their friend over for lunch the next time around, and that they would be in touch to do so. On the other hand, males in both groups indicated that they would see each other sometime soon. Yet only two males in the Russian monolingual group invited their friend over to their place. The native-English group for males and females showed the same results. Males did not include any detail as to when they would see their friend again, simply stating that they would see each other again soon. Females made specific plans, and provided similar results to the females in the Russian and 79er groups.

The results strongly indicate that gender differences among groups outweigh sociocultural differences. In situation A, the wedding, women in the 79er and Russian monolingual group apologized, more females in all groups announced an intent to leave, females in the 79er and native-English speaking group thanked, and women in the Russian monolingual and native-English group used a discourse marker when

announcing their leave-taking. However, more men in the wedding situation announced a leave-taking, complimented, greeted, and said 'good-bye' more frequently than females. Men also scored higher in frequency in situation B, where more men greeted (42% of 79ers vs. Thirty-eight percent of native-English speakers), and also greeted and provided for a self-introduction. Alternatively, more women in this situation thanked (100% Russian monolingual females, 64% 79er females, 42% English monolingual females). Situation C, the dinner party, had females scoring higher in frequency for apologizing in their leave-taking (7% 79er males, 4% English monolingual females), while more men provided for a discourse marker in their announcement of intent to take leave (35% Russian monolingual males, 24% 79er males, 44% English monolingual males). Females scored higher in frequency during a lunch with their best friend than men when it came to thanking (100% Russian monolingual females, 73% 79er females, 51% English monolingual females), complimenting (50% Russian monolingual females, 60% 79er females, 73% English monolingual females), and expectation of future meeting (65% Russian monolingual females, 73% 79er females, 56% English monolingual females). The cases where all three groups of females scored higher were of interest to me because it appears as though 79ers can both continue to use strategies of leave-taking that they are accustomed to in their culture, and adopt new ones from native-English speakers.

5.1.7 SIMILARITIES OF LEAVE-TAKING BETWEEN 79ERS AND RUSSIAN MONOLINGUALS

In analyzing all situations, I then questioned where 79ers acted more similarly to Russian monolinguals, where the scoring came significantly close. For situation A, the wedding, this occurred in apologizing, announcing an intent to take leave, complimenting, and providing a closing. In situation B, the volunteer event, results were similar again in complimenting and providing a closing. In situation C, the dinner party, results were similar in complimenting and using a discourse marked when announcing an intent to take leave. Finally in situation D, the lunch, results were close when announcing a leave-taking, announcing an intent to take leave, thanking, and an expectation of a future meeting.

5.1.8 SIMILARITIES OF LEAVE-TAKING BETWEEN 79ERS AND ENGLISH MONOLINGUALS

Having analyzed results of the Russian and 79er groups, I was curious to see if I could find any similarities between the 79er group and native-English speakers. I found that in situation A, the wedding, these two groups both used 'I'm sorry,' and they tended to greet when leave-taking. In situation B, the volunteer event, they provided a greeting and self-introduction. In situation C, the dinner party, they used 'I'm sorry' and provided a 'good-bye' for their closing. In situation D, the lunch, they complimented.

5.2 FOLLOW-UPS

After collecting the results from each DCT, I was able to discern patterns. I then developed a curiosity towards some of the responses that stood out from all the others. I had telephoned those participants whose DCT's did not follow the established patterns. In

situation A, at a wedding, a 79er male believed he would just walk up to his friends and simply let them know he would see them later, without saying good-bye, whereas most 79er males indicated they would say goodbye. When asked why he would not say good-bye, he said it would feel weird to say good-bye when he knew he would see his friend in a few hours. He added that he would have also waved, using non-verbal communication to gesture the leave-taking.

Three 79er females used code-switching in their responses for this situation, and since this is something I had encountered in the events I attended, I thought it was interesting that I was also encountering it in writing. When I asked one of the subjects about it, the reply was: "We all grew up speaking Russian, and it's sometimes weird to be in front of English speakers and speaking to Russians in Russian. This way, I think it makes them feel a little more comfortable, like they know we're not speaking about them."

For situation C, the dinner party, I was also curious as to why one 79er male stated that he wouldn't say good-bye to a female unless he absolutely found her attractive. His response to that was: "When I go out, I like to meet new people. Since I'm single, I think it's a waste of time for me to speak to someone I don't find attractive." Another 79er male, replied, "I think this situation would enable me to use one of my 'pick-up lines,' so why not at least try?!" When one 79er female replied that she would offer the male a ride home at the end of an evening, she explained that it was a nice gesture, especially because a lot of guys in the city don't have cars. Also, why did one English monolingual speaker think that she would not say thank-you at the end of a

lunch, whereas all Russian monolinguals females and males did? When I asked her about it, she said it was because she may have already complimented her friend on the lunch and thought saying thank you as well would be too much, but that it depended on how big the lunch was.

5.3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Entering this study, I predicted that the results would show that the 79er leave-taking routines would be more heavily influenced by their Russian monolingual counterparts, yet would also involve similarities to the native-English speaking monolingual group due to some level of acculturation on the part of the 79ers. The results found this prediction correct. Through my observations, I witnessed that 79ers speak Russian at Russian events and English during American events. Also, the DCT results found that the most frequently employed speech acts in the 79ers leave-taking scenarios include expressing an apology, giving thanks, complimenting, expecting a future encounter after the leave-taking, and often providing an explanation for their leave-taking. The most frequently employed speech acts in the native-Russian monolingual leave-taking scenarios similarly included expressing an apology, giving thanks, complimenting, expecting a future encounter after the leave-taking, and providing an explanation for their leave-taking. One difference was that native-Russian monolinguals also often announced their leave-taking, said good-bye, making their leaving more explicit than the 79ers would.

For the native-English monolingual speakers, the most frequently employed speech acts included, similar to the 79ers, expressing an apology, complimenting, and

providing an explanation as to why they were leaving. Unlike the 79ers and like the Russian monolinguals, they also announced their intent to take leave and said good-bye. However, like the 79ers, they did not spend as much time giving thanks. Giving thanks, as my results illustrate, is something that my observations indicated Russians are culturally known to do profusely, so it would seem that 79ers lost this habit through their interaction with native-English monolingual speakers.

It appears as though the 79ers express their leave-taking through pleasure and joy when participating in a social setting by thanking and complimenting, more so than the English native speakers, but not as frequently as the Russian monolinguals. Based on the DCT results, compared to the 79ers, Americans may not normally thank during a leave-taking, and I think that this contrast is noticeable because thanking is one of the most powerful Russian traits during the closing of discourse. When 79ers speak with Americans, they may still thank even if something may not be directly given to them. They thank for a nice time, evening and/or talk.

The speech act of thanking for a 79er is a good example of what occurs in cross-cultural communication, maintaining certain linguistic routines that occur in their native culture, while trying to assimilate by adding new verbal messages into the cross-cultural leave-taking routine.

Another major finding in this study is that during a leave-taking, men and women behave differently. My observations indicate that for the Russian monolinguals and in more than half of the 79er conversations, it was generally the male who decides when to close a conversation and take leave. However, with native-English speakers the

observations conducted indicated it was generally mixed. Female-female leave-takings across all three groups were longer and more polite, with greater concern for their listener.

In male-male leave-taking, brief leave-taking and much more directness in the speech act became apparent, especially in native-English speaking males. However, in male-female conversations, males use polite leave-taking strategies just as females do. Based on the DCT results, differences in gender occurred in speech acts such as apologizing, thanking, announcing a leave-taking, expecting a future encounter, and complimenting. During leave-takings, the 79er males and females both had the experience of acculturation in common, which neither of the two other groups experienced.

While the analysis of results captures the data of speech acts involved during the leave-taking for each situation that all three groups have responded to in their DCT, by also attending events I have been able to capture how a 79er going into a certain situation would most likely take leave. Therefore, based on the results and observations, I indicate that when entering any of the situations below, the 79ers will most likely take leave as stated below:

At a wedding, when walking up to a couple to say good-bye, a 79er male will most likely take leave by interrupting the conversation and saying:

“Excuse me. I just wanted to say that I’m leaving. I’ll see you soon. Bye.”

At a wedding, when walking up to a couple, a 79er female will most likely take leave by saying the following, once she has waited for a pause in the conversation:

“Excuse me. I just wanted to say goodbye.”

At a volunteer event, when saying good-bye to a speaker of the opposite gender, a 79er male will take leave by saying the following:

“Hi. I just wanted to say I enjoyed your talk. Thanks for participating tonight. I am about to leave, so I just wanted to say goodbye.”

At a volunteer event, when saying good-bye to a speaker of the opposite gender, a 79er female will take leave by saying the following:

“Thank you very much for a great event. I really enjoyed your speech.”

At a dinner party, when speaking to a member of the opposite gender and ready to leave, a 79er male will take leave by saying the following (based on the DCT’s, this leave-taking can change based on whether or not she is a potential date interest:

“It was a nice night, wasn’t it? I have to get going now because (enter explanation), so goodbye.”

At a dinner party, when speaking to a member of the opposite gender and ready to leave, a 79er female will take leave by saying the following:

“It was very nice to see you again. (enter explanation) - so I have to go now. Have a good night.”

At a lunch with a best friend, a 79er male will take leave by saying the following:

“This was a great lunch. Thanks for the great meal. I’ll call you later. Bye.”

At a lunch with a best friend, a 79er female will take leave by saying the following:

“Thanks for a wonderful lunch. It was so nice seeing you. I have to go now because (enter explanation). Let’s get together again very soon.”

6.0 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to identify differences in leave-taking between the 79ers, an older generation of Russian immigrants and young adult native-English speakers. By observing various events, and by asking all three groups to fill out a Discourse Completion Test, I attempted to examine if the 79ers take leave uniquely, or whether their leave-taking more closely matches the new culture they have adopted, or the culture of their older generation. I found that the 79ers leave-taking more closely resembles that of the native-English speaking group. The leave-taking patterns in this research signify how the 79ers have adopted a pluralistic model of adaptation in the United States, as they both acculturate to life in the United States and choose to observe their culture's tradition by speaking their mother tongue and using some of the leave-taking strategies of their Russian monolingual counterparts.

The results of this study suggest that the 79ers, though non-native English speakers, can mainly utilize the same semantic formulas in leave-taking for certain situations as native English speakers. However, the results also indicate that sometimes the 79ers did not use the same semantic formulas for leave-taking, sometimes due to lack of proficiency in English, but often because of the influence of native language patterns. Additionally, the majority of the 79ers used written English for their replies in the DCT, and, where results mirrored the Russian monolinguals, it can suggest that 79ers therefore maintained qualities of their native language to maintain their identity.

Results also indicate that gender was an important variable, and that gender difference between groups may even outweigh sociocultural differences. The data

analyzed in terms of gender indicate that speakers of both sexes are able to adjust their leave-taking to the styles of their partners, but that it is the males who may have more flexibility and seem to take more of an initiative when it came to announcing the leave-taking in the presence of females. Tannen (1993) has previously suggested that men and women do manage conversation differently, and that the best style is a flexible one. She has also suggested that both men and women could benefit from learning each other's styles.

While this study was focused on leave-taking, it also acknowledged a group of Russians Jews, who all left Russia for opportunities in the United States. They gave up their material and sentimental possessions (i.e., jewelry, family albums) and a culture they were familiar with to secure greater opportunity and freedom. In learning about the American way of life, they have become one of the most successful immigrant groups in a nation of immigrants. While they have acculturated to life in the United States, the 79ers continue to be successful in maintaining their own cultural heritage and language. The concept of community as defined by Fitzpatrick (1996, p.7) signifies "a group of people who follow a way of life or patterns of behavior which mark them out as different from people of another society, or from people in the larger society in which they live or to which they have come." The 79ers feel as though they belong to their own community, and this has helped recent 79ers assimilate within the American culture while retaining their distinct social identity among other immigrants.

6.1 IMPLICATIONS

This study of leave-taking illustrates how conversation closings are collaborative. Hodge and Kress (1988) believe that the most interesting way to view language is as a dynamic, living process. The utterances found in leave-takings can tell us about the context, the social organization of the participants, and about the conditions of their interactions.

I would like to say that while I found different patterns of leave-taking among the different groups in my study, I have not strongly endorsed any single explanation for these differences. Clearly, the 79ers leave-taking was influenced by both of the other groups, but it is not clear as to the underlying reasons certain patterns were regularly adopted by the 79ers. Additionally, gender was a powerful factor, as was the age or generational difference, in determining strategies of politeness.

All of the variables involved in this study, and possibly others, influences leave-taking among the Russian monolinguals, 79ers, and native-English speakers. The study also points out the importance of social context as a factor that produces differences in leave-taking. The judgments on the appropriateness of a particular utterance can be made only by considering the full context in which language is used.

For future studies on leave-taking, other researchers might wish to focus on attitudinal differences among these groups when it comes to leave-taking in certain contexts, and how these groups perceive interaction among themselves and with other communities. Additionally, it would be valuable to find out directly as to why the 79ers believe they use their native language patterns, and if this is to maintain a connection

with their roots, or with each other. I also hope that the cross-cultural data presented in this study will be especially useful for those non-native English speakers to understand and adapt more easily to patterns of leave-taking with which they are unfamiliar.

GOODBYE

Dear reader, I do not like goodbyes, but I would like to be polite and provide a *closing* to this thesis. *Thank you* for reading my thesis. I hope you found my study interesting. *Dosvedanya. Goodbye!*

REFERENCES

- Ameredia. (2006). *Russian American population*. [Electronic version]. Retrieved July 24, 2006. Available: <http://www.ameredia.com/demographics/russian.html>
- Aushenker, M. (2003, January 10). A growing presence. *The Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles* [Electronic version]. Retrieved August 20, 2006. Available: <http://www.jewishjournal.com>
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning*, 40, 467-501.
- Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1985). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 65-86). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *On the development of communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.
- Bergman, M. & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology, in G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp.1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonikowska, M. (1988). The choice of opting out. *Applied Linguistics*, 9,169-184.
- Boxer, D. (2002). Discourse issues in cross-cultural pragmatics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22,150-167.

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M. (1983a, 1983b). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In J. W. Oller, Jr. (Ed.), *Issues in language testing research* (pp.333 – 342).Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. (2006). *Speech acts*. [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 16, 2006. Available: www.carla.umn.edu
- Clyne, M. (1979). Communicative competences in contact. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 43,17-37.
- Clyne, M., Ball, M., & Neil, D. (1991). Intercultural communication at work in australia: complaints and apologies in turns. *Multilingua*, 10, 251-273.
- Cohen, A.D. & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of an apology. *Language Learning*, 31,113-134.
- Coulmas, F. (1981). Introduction: conversational routine. In F. Coulmas (Ed.) *Conversational routine* (pp.1-17). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 2nd. edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, JW. (1986). 'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.
- Fieg, J. & Sukwiwat, M. (1987).Greeting and leave-taking. *PASAA*, 17, 2-12.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1984) Remarks on contrastive pragmatics. In J. Fisiak (Ed.) *Contrastive linguistics, prospects and problems* (pp. 119-141). Berlin/ New York/ Amsterdam (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs; 22).
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1972). *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A. (Ed.). (1980). *Never say die!: A thousand years of Yiddish in Jewish life and letters*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Firth, J.R. (1972). *The tongues of men and speech*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, J. (1996). The Importance of "community" in the process of immigrant assimilation. *International Migration Review*, 1, 5-16.
- Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1991). Miscommunication in nonnative speaker discourse. In N. Coupland, H. Giles, & J. M. Wiemann (Eds.), *Miscommunication and problematic talk* (pp. 121-145). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gaudette, K. (2002). Census: *Ethnic pockets abound in California*, San Francisco Chronicle. San Francisco, August, 2002.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole and Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, volume 3, speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hargie, Owen, Christine, S, & Dickson, D. (1994). *Social skills in interpersonal communication*. Third Edition. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hartford, B. S. & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Closing the conversation: Evidence from the academic advising session. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 93-116.
- Hendricks, T. (2002). All roads lead to the bay area: number of foreign-born residents climbs to 27.5%. (2002, August 27). *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. A1.
- House, J. & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in english and german. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine*, The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton (pp. 157-185).
- Hu, W. & Grove, C. (1991). *Encountering the Chinese: A guide for Americans*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Hymes, D.H. (1974). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperz & D.H. Hymes (Eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35-71). New York, NY: Holt.
- Jacobs, D. & Paul, E. (1981). *Studies of the third wave: recent migration of Soviet Jews to the United States*. Boulder, Colorado: West-view Press.
- Kasper, G. (Ed.) (1995). Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language. In *Second language teaching & curriculum center* (pp.119-163). University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Kasper, G. (Ed.) (1992). *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language*. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1955). Physical anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1280-1295.
- Knapp, M. & Hart, R. (1973). The rhetoric of goodbye: Verbal and nonverbal correlates of human leave-taking. *Speech Monographs*, 40, 182-198.
- Koike, D. A. (1996). Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 257-281). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Laver, J.D.M.H. (1975). Communicative functions of phatic communication. In A. Kendon, R. M. Harris, & M. R. Key (Eds.), *The organization of behavior in face-to-face interaction* (pp.215-238). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Laver, J.D.M.H. (1981). Linguistic routines and politeness in greeting and parting. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication, situations and prepatterned speech* (pp.289-304). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, G., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian arabic and U.S. English communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relation*, 26, 39-57.
- Niki, H., & Tajika, H. (1994). Asking for permission vs. making requests: Strategies chosen by Japanese speakers of English. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning: Vol. 5* (pp. 110-124). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Office of Refugee Resettlement. (1999). *Refugee resettlement program: Report to Congress*. (DHHS Publication). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Omar, A. (1992). Opening and closing conversations in Kiswahili: A study of the performance of native speakers and learners. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.),

- Pragmatics and language learning: Vol. 6* (pp. 125-144). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Ronowicz, E.A.(1995). Aussies are friendly and Poles aren't rude: Some remarks on overcoming problems in intercultural communication. *Paper and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 300, 31-44.
- Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, 27-67.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1996). The ethnography of communication. In S. L. McKay & Hornberger, N. H (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp.351-82). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289-327.
- Schiffrin, D. (2000). *Approaches to discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schmenk, B. (2004). Language learning: A feminine domain? The role of stereotyping in constructing gendered learning identities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 514-24.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206-226.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (2001). Interpersonal politeness and power. In R. Scollon and S. Scollon (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: a discourse approach* (pp.612-634). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Spiers, J. (2000). New perspectives on vulnerability using emic and etic approaches. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31, 715-721.
- Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp.138-152). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Takahashi, S., & Roitblatt, H. (1994). Comprehension processes of second language indirect requests. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15, 475-506.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.) (1978). Cross-cultural study of oral narrative style. *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp.640-650).
- Tannen, D. (1993). *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Todd, F. & Fisher, S. (1988). *Gender and discourse: The power of talk*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2000) *Census of population and housing*. Retrieved July 3, 2006. Available: <http://www.census.gov>
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 145-78.
- Wolfson, N. (1993). An empirically based analysis of compliments in American English. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 82-95). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Yu, M. (2004). On the universality of face: Evidence from Chinese compliment response behavior. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1679-1710.
- Yuan, Y. (2001). An inquiry into empirical pragmatics data-gathering methods: Written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 271-292.
- Ying, I. (1996). Multiple constraints on processing ambiguous sentences: Evidence from adult L2 Learners. *Language Learning*, 46, 681-711.

APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL LETTER

**San José State
UNIVERSITY**

**Office of the Provost
Associate Vice President
Graduate Studies & Research**

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0025
Voice: 408-924-2427
Fax: 408-924-2477

E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Katherine Zinger
683 Roble Ave. #4
Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: Pam Stacks, Ph.D. *Pam Stacks*
AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: February 15, 2006

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Leave-taking Among Russian Immigrants in the U.S.A."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to all data that may be collected from the subjects. The approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information. This approval for the human subject's portion of your project is in effect for one year, and data collection beyond February 15, 2007 requires an extension request.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

Cc: Thom Huebner

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Domínguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

APPENDIX B: DCT QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM FOR SUBJECTS

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigator: Katherine Zinger

Title of Protocol: Patterns of Leave-Taking among Russian Immigrants

Please read the following carefully, and make sure you understand what you are agreeing to. After you are sure you understand, please initial at the bottom of each page, and sign and date the end of the document:

You have been asked to participate in a research study investigating Russian Leave-Taking.

You will be asked to answer a series of background questions and then write responses to five hypothetical situations.

If there is a question in the background questionnaire that you feel uncomfortable answering, that is completely acceptable. Just write that you would prefer not to answer, and move on to the next question.

This study is about how people say goodbye and depart from one another, called leave-taking. Hopefully, through this study you may come to think more closely about how you conduct leave-taking, and that will improve your social abilities.

Although the results of this study may be published, no information that could identify you will be included.

Please note that there is no compensation for this study.

No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to "not participate" in the study.

Questions about this research may be addressed to:

Katherine Zinger: 650.838.0293

Complaints about this research may be presented to:

Dr. Thom Huebner, Professor and Chair
Department of Linguistics and Language Development, 408.924.3742

Or

Dr. Rosemary Henze, Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics and Language Development, 408.924.4438

Questions about research subjects' rights or research-related injury may be presented to:

Pamela Stacks, Ph.D, Associate Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research at 408.924.2480

Your consent is being given voluntary. You may refuse to participate in the entire study or in any part of the study. If you decide to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative effect on your relations with San Jose State University, the researcher, or with any other participating institutions or agencies.

At the time you sign this consent form, you may, upon request, receive a copy of it for your records, signed and dated by the researcher.

The signature of a subject on this document indicates agreement to participate in the study.

The signature of a researcher on this document indicates agreement to include the above named subject in the research and attestation has been fully informed of his or her rights.

Signature and Date

Researcher's Signature and Date

APPENDIX C: RELEASE TO CONTACT LATER

The results of this study may be published, and the researcher may wish to use your questionnaire as a specific example. May the researcher contact you later to discuss or obtain permission to use portions of your questionnaire? If so, please sign this form below and include your telephone number.

Even if you give permission for the researcher to contact you later, no information about you will be revealed or used in the published study without obtaining your express and written permission at a later date.

You should feel free to not sign this form, in which case no information that could identify you will be included in the study, and no one will contact you after you have finished the included questionnaire.

Signature and Date

Phone Number

APPENDIX D: DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST IN ENGLISH

Please check whether you are: Male: _____ or Female: _____

Please describe what you would **SAY** in the following situations:

1. You are at a wedding reception and have danced the night away. You are ready to leave and want to say goodbye to your friend who is talking to a couple at a table (please note: for this situation, your friend is the *same* gender as you). You walk up to your friend to say goodbye while he/she is in the middle of a conversation:
2. Your evening was spent volunteering at an event that hosted a panel of speakers. At the end of the event, everyone is talking around the dessert table in the corner of the room. You promised yourself that before you leave, you would say goodbye to one of the speakers tonight. The speaker, who shares your background and who has been living in your community for twenty years, is someone you respect and want to be like when you reach his/her age (it is important to note that for this situation, the speaker is the *opposite* gender as you). Now that you are ready to leave, you see the speaker is just walking away from a conversation, so you walk up to the speaker to say goodbye:
3. You are at a formal dinner party with seven other guests. You have a lot in common with most of the guests since they have been living in your community for many years now. It's been a lovely evening but you are getting tired. You look at your watch, it's 11pm, and you realize that just about everyone has gone home. You decide you are ready to go home too. You are standing next to another guest, whom you have met several times before, as you decide you want to leave, you: (please note: for this situation, this guest is the *opposite* of your gender):
4. Your best friend, (please note: for this situation, your friend is the *same* gender as you) invited you over for lunch. You have a great time catching up and eating the wonderful meal that your friend prepared. You remember that you have so much work to do this afternoon, so after about two hours decide that you are ready to leave and say:

APPENDIX E: DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST IN RUSSIAN

Пожалуйста, отметьте ваш пол: МУЖ _____ ЖЕН _____

Просьба описать, что бы вы сделали или сказали, если бы вы оказались в следующих ситуациях:

- 1) Ваш лучший друг (просьба обратить внимание, что для данной ситуации очень важно, что пол вашего друга/подруги совпадает с вашим) пригласил вас на обед. Вы замечательно проводите время за вкусной едой, которую приготовил/а ваш/а друг/подруга, обсуждая свои последние новости. Вы вспоминаете, что вас ожидает много дел во второй половине дня, поэтому приблизительно через 2 часа вы решаете, что вам пора уходить...

- 2) Вы были приглашены на ужин вместе с другими семьёю гостями. У вас много общего с этими людьми, так как вы знакомы уже несколько лет. Вечер прошёл замечательно, но вы чувствуете, что устали. Взглянув на часы, вы понимаете, что уже 11 часов вечера и большинство гостей ушло. Вы осознаёте, что вам тоже пришло время покинуть этот приём. Вы стоите рядом с другим гостем, с которым вы уже не раз поговорили за вечер (важно отметить для данной ситуации, что этот гость принадлежит к противоположному полу от вашего); по мере того, как вы решаете уходить, вы....

- 3) Вы находитесь на русской свадьбе. Протанцевав весь вечер, вы готовы покинуть приём, но сперва хотите попрощаться с вашим другом/подругой, который/ая разговаривает с парой у стола (обратите внимание, что в данной ситуации пол вашего друга/подруги совпадает с вашим). Вы подходите к нему/ней, чтобы попрощаться в то время, как он/а разговаривает с другими людьми.

- 4) Вес вечер вы помогали организовывать российско-американское событие, на которые было приглашено несколько ораторов. В конце вечера все разговаривают возле стола с десертами в углу помещения. Вы дали себе обещание, что перед тем, как уйти, вы непременно должны попрощаться с одним из ораторов. Вы глубоко уважаете этого русского иммигранта, прожившего в вашей общине уже около двадцати лет (просьба обратить внимание, что в данной ситуации этот гость принадлежит к противоположному полу от вашего). Готовясь покинуть банкет, вы замечаете, что он/она только что закончил/а беседу и направляется к выходу. Вы догоняете его/ее, чтобы попрощаться. вы...

APPENDIX F: BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH

Please answer each question below as completely as you feel comfortable doing. If you need additional paper, please ask. If at any point you are not comfortable answering a question, or completing the questionnaire, then you should stop and not feel obligated to continue.

Part I:

1. What is your highest level of education received?
2. What is your profession?
3. Would you say that most of your friends are Russian immigrants or native –English speakers?
4. What do you do in order to keep in touch with the your culture? Please give three examples.
5. Are you ever challenged in communicating with people who do not speak the same native language as you at the end of a conversation when saying goodbye? If so, how?

For U.S. Immigrants Only:

If you feel comfortable, please answer the following questions:

6. How long have you been in the US?
7. What was your reason for moving to the US?
8. Are you planning to permanently stay in the US?
9. What types of activities do you believe you have adopted while living in America?

APPENDIX G: BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE IN RUSSIAN

Анкета

Пожалуйста, ответьте на каждый вопрос анкеты. Если по каким-то причинам вы не желаете отвечать на определенный вопрос, то вы можете его пропустить и не обязаны заполнять анкету. Если же вам потребуется дополнительный лист бумаги, то непременно сообщите об этом.

Часть I:

10. Ваш уровень образования:
11. Ваша профессия:
12. Кто составляет большинство ваших друзей: русские иммигранты или американцы, у которых английский – родной язык?
13. Что вы предпринимаете, чтобы сохранить свою родную русскую культуру? Пожалуйста, приведите три примера.
14. Случаются ли ситуации, когда вы испытываете сложности при завершении разговора с людьми, которые не говорят на вашем родном языке, когда вам необходимо попрощаться? Если да, то что это за ситуации?

Только для иммигрантов США:

Просьба ответить на данные вопросы, если вы не возражаете против их содержания:

15. Как долго вы проживаете в США?
16. Что послужило причиной для вашего переезда в США?
17. Планируете ли вы навсегда остаться в США?
18. Как вам кажется, что вы переняли от американской культуры за время проживания в США?

APPENDIX H: DCT TABLE RESULTS

The number of semantic formulas employed by each group in response to each DCT situation was included in a chart that was created for each situation. The following terminology is used to describe the speakers'

characteristics:

RMM = Russian Monolingual Males
 RMF: Russian Monolingual Females
 YBM: Young Bilingual Males
 YBF: Young Bilingual Females
 EMM: English Monolingual Males
 EMF: English Monolingual Females

Situation A: You are at a wedding reception and have danced the night away. You are ready to leave and want to say goodbye to your friend who is talking to a couple at a table (please note: for this situation, your friend is the *same* gender as you). You walk up to your friend to say goodbye while he/she is in the middle of a conversation:

Speech Acts	RMM (20)	RMF (20)	YBM (45)	YBF (45)	EMM (45)	EMF (45)
<i>Situation A</i>	M	F	M	F	M	F
1) Apologizing (excuse me)	14	16	25	36		
2) Apologizing (I'm sorry)			14	12	32	40
3) Announcement of leave-taking	16	12	21	17	17	11
4) Announcement of intent to leave- take	9	10	16	21	23	37
5) Thanking				6		6
6) Complimenting	14	2	18	7	9	
7) Greeting			20	3	28	7
8) Greeting and Self-Introduction						
9) Expectation of Future Meeting	8	15	23	11	19	7
10) Closing	20	19	34	19	38	24
11) Explanation				9		1
12) Discourse Marker and Announcement of intent to Leave-Take		6		3		
13) Questioning						

Situation B: Your evening was spent volunteering at an event that hosted a panel of speakers. At the end of the event, everyone is talking around the dessert table in the corner of the room. You promised yourself that before you leave, you would say goodbye to one of the speakers tonight. The speaker, who shares your background and who has been living in your community for twenty years, is someone you respect and want to be like when you reach his/her age (it is important to note that for this situation, the speaker is the *opposite* gender as you). Now that you are ready to leave, you see the speaker is just walking away from a conversation, so you walk up to the speaker to say goodbye:

Speech Acts	RMM (20)	RMF (20)	YBM (45)	YBF (45)	EMM (45)	EMF (45)
<i>Situation B</i>	F	M	F	M	F	M
1) Apologizing (excuse me)	15	6	9	16	6	7
2) Apologizing (I'm sorry)						
3) Announcement of leave-taking				1	6	
4) Announcement of intent to leave- take			13	3	8	
5) Thanking	12	22	14	29		19
6) Complimenting	28	25	36	38	30	27
7) Greeting			19	11	17	6
8) Greeting and Self-Introduction			9	5	15	5
9) Expectation of Future Meeting		6		9	15	20
10) Closing	18	12	8	12		
11) Explanation				1		
12) Discourse Marker and Announcement of intent to Leave-Take						4
13) Questioning						

Situation C: You are at a formal dinner party with seven other guests. You have a lot in common with most of the guests since they have been living in your community for many years now. It's been a lovely evening but you are getting tired. You look at your watch, it's 11pm, and you realize that just about everyone has gone home. You decide you are ready to go home too. You are standing next to another guest, whom you have met several times before, as you decide you want to leave, you: (please note: for this situation, this guest is the opposite of your gender):

- 1 YBF did not include an answer for this speech event. She wrote that she was not sure what she would do.
- Two YBF's did not include specific written responses for this speech event, and instead wrote 'Depends'. When following up on their responses by asking why they wrote this, the explanation was that it depended on whether or not the YBF found the member of the opposite gender attractive, which would impact the leave-taking.

Speech Acts	RMM (20)	RMF (20)	YBM (45)	YBF (45)	EMM (45)	EMF (45)
<i>Situation C</i>	F	M	F	M	F	M
1) Apologizing (excuse me)						
2) Apologizing (I'm sorry)				3		2
3) Announcement of leave-taking	9	12	20	15	13	12
4) Announcement of intent to leave-take			9	11	21	21
5) Thanking		10				6
6) Complimenting	10	14	30	29	12	33
7) Greeting					19	14
8) Greeting and Self- Introduction						
9) Expectation of Future Meeting		6	16	12	9	18
10) Closing	14	20	24	30	23	23
11) Explanation	10	19	14	16	28	23
12) Discourse Marker and Announcement of intent to Leave-Take	7	5	11	9	20	
13) Questioning		6	23		6	12

- Five YBF's wrote that their closing to the member of the opposite gender would be different in this situation if they were attending the dinner party with a boyfriend/husband.
- Eleven YBM's did not include specific written responses for this situation, and instead wrote 'Depends'. When following up on their responses by asking why they wrote this, the explanation was that it depended on whether or not they thought the member of the opposite gender in this situation was attractive. Two of these subjects also wrote that if they did find the member attractive, they would prolong their leave-taking with "small talk".

Situation D: Your best friend, (please note: for this situation, your friend is the *same* gender as you) invited you over for lunch. You have a great time catching up and eating the wonderful meal that your friend prepared. You remember that you have so much work to do this afternoon, so after about two hours decide that you are ready to leave and say:

Speech Acts	RMM (20)	RMF (20)	YBM (45)	YBF (45)	EMM (45)	EMF (45)
Situation D	M	F	M	F	M	F
1) Apologizing (excuse me)						
2) Apologizing (I'm sorry)					6	8
3) Announcement of leave-taking	7	8	16	8	1	9
4) Announcement of intent to leave-take (with Discourse Marker)	8	11	20	11	17	17
5) Thanking	13	20	31	33	20	23
6) Complimenting		10	25	27	30	33
7) Greeting					6	
8) Greeting and Self-Introduction						
9) Expectation of Future Meeting	6	13	17	33	25	25
10) Closing	4	7	32	19	12	14
11) Explanation	20	16	17	31	32	15
12) Discourse Marker and Announcement of intent to Leave-Take					28	10
13) Questioning				8		14