# Abstracts of the Chinese papers in English

Wang Xiaolu, Guo Xiaoqun and Lin Wenlian

## EQS modeling for CFL learning motivation in the non-target language environment

Based on a questionnaire and an interview of 477 Indonesian junior students in Pahoa Middle School, this study aims to investigate the internal structure of CFL learning motivation in a non-target language environment by means of factor analysis and EQS modeling. Exploratory Factor Analysis results in the selection of 34 items from seven identified subscales, including six intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors and one motivated behavior, i.e. integrating intention, cultural interest, attitude towards target language and target speakers, instrumental media, milieu, learning experience and the extended effort representing motivated behavior. To demonstrate how intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation interact with each other in shaping motivated behavior, a structural-equation modeling is performed according to the questionnaire data.

The results show that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors, which are significantly related, have strongly affected on CFL learning motivation, but the effect of the former is much stronger than the latter. As far as intrinsic motivation is concerned, the attitude towards target language and target speakers makes up the most important element as well as the biggest contributor among all the elements that influence the strength and weakness of motivation. When it comes to extrinsic motivation, instrumental media turns out to be the most crucial factor. By analyzing the major factors and their interactive relations in terms of different weights in modeling CFL learning motivation, the study finds that the attitude towards target language and target speakers rates the highest weight among all the involved motivating factors, which not only affects motivated behavior and cultural interest, but also is influenced by milieu, instrumental media and learning experience.

The study also reveals that the extended effort is positively contributed to by attitude towards target language and target speakers, instrumental media and one's learning experience. Furthermore, the learners' interest in Chinese culture, on one hand, is significantly correlated with integrating intention, on the other hand, reversely influenced by milieu, attitude towards target language and target speakers. Through the empirical constructing and examining of CFL motivation model in Indonesian environment, this study attempts to provide CFL teachers with some possible solutions to stimulate and improve learners' CFL learning

motivation in the non-target language environment, such as activating all functions played in CFL learning motivation, guiding the process of CFL learning, intensifying CFL learners' Chinese learning and cultivating their consistent intention. Only in this way can we make the students' motivation play to its fullest in CFL learning.

**Keywords:** EQS modeling, non-target language environment, Indonesian junior students, CFL learning motivation, intrinsic factor, extrinsic factor

Qi Feng

**Focus Markers in Chinese**

The study of focus markers has become a hot research area in the field of Chinese grammar study. Many scholars have done research on the phenomena of focus markers with reference to Chinese data, with different views of language and from different perspectives, and have been producing plenty of literature and abundant conclusions. But because of different theoretical backgrounds, research models and understanding of Chinese data, scholars have produced different interpretations to the phenomena of focus markers, and there are large differences in the study of this topic.

This paper mainly discusses focus markers in Chinese, which is one kind of important lexical means expressing focus. This paper consists of the following four parts:

Part one is an introduction. Focus has different expressional forms, including phonetic, lexical and syntactic means. Different languages, such as English, Hungarian, Chinese and Japanese, express the focus by different means, and the same expressional form has a different degree of use among the different languages, such as using the cleft construction to express the focus between English and Chinese. In addition, when one kind of expressional form expresses the focus, it will be affected by other expressional forms.

In part two, we introduce the importance of focus markers in Somali and different intensities of focus markers, and we argue that the focus marker in Chinese belongs to a weaker type. In other words, the focus marker in Chinese has multiple functions, and the function of marking focus just is one of them.

Part three is the most important part of this paper. We regard the focus marker in Chinese as a focus forcing form, and analyze lexical focus forcing forms by illustration, such as *shi*, *lian*, some adverbs, and so on. We distinguish between focus markers and focus operators by means of a negation test, mainly based on the influence of the truth value of the sentence. Focus markers can increase the

meaning of the original sentence, but it does not affect the truth value of the sentence. The negation test is as follows: A focus forcing form (F) is added to the original sentence ($S^0$), and then a sentence (S) is constituted. If S is negated, as a result, $S^0$ is accordingly negated, then F is a focus marker; But if S is negated, as a result, $S^0$ is uncertainly negated (this can affirm $S^0$, or can't confirm the truth value of $S^0$), then F is a focus operator. Then we can determine the scope of the focus marker in Chinese with the negation test. As to the source of part of speech, these focus markers can come from verbs, such as *shi*, *shu*, *you*, or come from prepositions like *lian*, or come from auxiliaries like *gei*, or come from modal particles like *ma*, or come from adverbs, such as *cai* (meaning "just"), *jiu* (expresses emphasis), and so on.

Part four is a conclusion. We hold that we should distinguish between focus forcing form and focus operational strategy, and argue that stress is the real way of expressing focus in Chinese, and other lexical forms or syntactic forms are just only focus forcing forms; the speaker can take forward focus operational strategy to satisfy their demands, or he can also take a backward focus operational strategy to dissatisfy their demands, so they can't finally decide the focus of the sentence.

**Keywords:** focus operational strategy, focus forcing form, negation test, focus markers

Zhang Yingbao

## Characteristics and restrictions of argumentative discourse acquisition of South Korean students

As a key factor to form macro structure of discourse, the macro information structure of discourse is a functional relationship network which is constructed by different kinds of high level information units with corresponding functions. Based on the HSK Dynamic Composition Corpus, this paper discusses dynamically how South Korean students acquire six components which consist of macro information structures of argumentative discourse by statistical analysis and empirical studies.

The six components are given as follows: information layer, information point, amount of information, information arrangement, information model, and the structural relationship between information modules. From the analysis, we find that the acquisition of the each component is closely related with, and is restrained by the acquisition of other components, instead of a detached process. It is a gradually systemized developmental process for Chinese native speakers.

During this process, the acquisition of these components shows a lot of features. First, the development of various components has the same direction. That is, all the elements are gradually closer to the native speakers. Second, the acquisition paths of the six components are different from each other. To be specific, the development paths of information layer, information point, information arrangement, information model and the structural relationship between information modules is a fast-to-slow process, while the trace of amount of information is a slow-to-fast process. Third, the difficulty of acquisition of the six components are different, information layer, information arrangement and information model are at the low level of difficulty; information point and the structural relationship between information modules are at the medium level; acquisition of the amount of information is at the most difficult level. Fourth, learners have their own favored types and tokens. When South Korean students construct various elements of macro information structure of argumentative discourse, they are likely to use one or several types and tokens on the basis of their mother tongue, cultural background and thinking pattern. Fifth, the proficiency upgrading of each level is continuous. In other words, each level is cohesive with others. Each level has no conspicuous boundary, that is to say, there is no one or several clear-cut exclusive characteristics to distinguish the different levels respectively. Different levels share most characteristics, types and tokens. And the difference of each level reflects on the appearance frequency of different types and tokens, instead of the existence and difference of different types and tokens. Sixth, each of the elements is not isolated, and all elements in the macro information structure of argumentative discourse connect with each other and influence each other. They build up a systematic network together, in which the change and development of a factor will lead to corresponding changes of other elements in the macro information structure of argumentative discourse.

The process for South Korean students to acquire macro information structure of argumentative discourse is restrained by both internal and external factors of discourse. And the internal factors of discourse include stylistic characteristics of discourse, the function and property of information modules and interrelationship and influence between different kinds of factors of macro information structure. External factors of discourse involve universal thinking pattern of argumentation in human beings, discourse constructors' information processing ability, learners' language generating ability, as well as the avoidance in second language acquisition.