國立政治大學英國語文學系碩士班碩士論文

指導教授：余明忠先生

Advisor：Ming-chung Yu

中文題目

臺灣英語為外語師生語用教學動機相關經驗：一個質化個案研究

英文題目

A Qualitative Case Study on Teacher's and Students' Motivation-related Experiences of L2 Pragmatics in Taiwan

研究生：謝明宏撰

Name：Ming-hung Hsieh

中華民國 101 年 7 月

July 2012

國立政治大學英國語文學系碩士班
碩士論文

臺灣英語為外語師生語用教學動機相關經驗：一個質化個案研究

（英語教學組）

指導教授：余明忠先生

研究生：謝明宏撰

國立政治大學英國語文學系碩士班

中華民國一百零一年七月

A Qualitative Case Study on Teacher's and Students' Motivation-related Experiences of L2 Pragmatics in Taiwan

A Master Thesis

Presented to

Department of English

National Chengchi University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Ming-hung Hsieh

July 2012

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Ming-hung Hsieh defended on March 16 2012.

Prof. Ming-chung Yu

Professor Directing Thesis

Prof. Chen-ching Li

Committee Member

Prof. Huei-ling Lai

Committee Member

Approved:

Chih-hsin Lin, Chair, Department of English

Acknowledgements

My warmest thanks go to my mentor Dr. Ming-chung Yu (余明忠), professor of Department of English of National Chengchi University, for his inspiring guidance and encouragement throughout my research for this work. Thank two committee members, Dr. Cheng-ching Li, chair professor in Shi-Hsin University and Distinguished Professor Huei-lin Lai of National Chengchi University, for their constructive feedback of reading the manuscript. I also want to thank my friend Dr. Icy Lee, professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, for her kind suggestions and positive influence on my decision to continue my career in English education. My sincere gratitude is also extended to Dr. Yi-ping Huang and my homeroom teacher Dr. Chieh-yu Yeh for their helpful feedback in the oral defense of my master thesis proposal on March 25, 2011 and their conscientious instruction during my study at National Chengchi University. I am cordially indebted to all the participating students and the university teacher Yuan-Yuan (pseudonym). Without the aid of the participants, this study could not have come into fruition. I would like to thank all my school teachers and mentors who taught me throughout my education.

Sincere thanks go to my American homestay parents, Attorney Chris Teras and Ann Teras in Washington D. C. for their hospitality and devoted care during my 10-day journey in August, 2011. They let me experience the authentic American culture, whereby I could understand the importance of L2 pragmatics. I would like to thank one of my foreign friends, Jin-Kyu Jung (鄭鎮奎), who invited me to South Korea in November, 2010, and who inspired me to understand and respect intercultural differences and to embrace the beauty of L2 pragmatics, one of the strongest intrinsic motivations for me to continue my studies on L2 pragmatics. I wish to thank my two Hong Kong homestay families, Peter Lam and Wilson Lam, for helping me know the important tradition of Chinese politeness. I thank all the brothers and sisters in Taipei Church Hall 42 and Hall

10, especially two overseas Thai sisters 王秀容 and 王秀梅 for their Thai instruction. The book is dedicated to those who love me and support me along the way. Finally, this book is dedicated to my beloved English Corner students in Muzha Junior High School and ex-students who encouraged me to become a super English teacher, and who gave me a sense of achievement in teaching and learning L2 pragmatics. I also want to dedicate this book to my deceased grandparents, 謝慶貴 and 曾桂枝妹, who are watching me from heaven. I love them always and appreciate their loving care when I was young. Without them, I could not become who I am today.

Finally, I would like to extend my heart-felt thanks to my beloved parents, Song-kang Hsieh (謝松岡) and Huei-lu Li (李慧茹) and my dear long-term friend, also my elder brother, Ming-feng Hsieh (謝明峯). Without their affective and financial support, this thesis could not come into existence. All the remaining errors, of course, are mine.

Table of Contents

國立政治大學
National Chengchi University

國立政治大學英國語文學系碩士班

碩士論文提要

論文名稱：臺灣英語為外語師生語用教學動機相關經驗：一個質化個案研究

指導教授：余明忠先生

研究生：謝明宏

論文提要內容：

語用教學研究大多專注在教學成效，並以量化研究比較跨文化語用文化規範和溝通策略之差異，然，只有少數的質化研究探討語用研究理論如何落實在外語教學師生的學習動機。準確來說，本研究檢視以英語為外語師生如何看待語用能力培養，以及學習社會語言之動機相關經驗。先前文獻已經指出，第二語言語用學習動機研究，需要投入更多的努力。

因此，本質化個案研究旨在探討臺灣以英語為外語師生學習語用動機。資料蒐集透過面訪、課室觀察和課堂筆記以及研究者的省思日誌，從學習動機的角度審視外語語用教學，洞悉多層次語言學習動機。

研究結果顯示，受訪師生均認為語用教學對第二語言發展極為重要，縱使社會政治情境因素的干擾，諸如考試領導教學、授課時數嚴重不足和偏重語法教學，然而，在學習語言禮貌和適切性方面，受訪者均偏好語言實用功能和實際生活應用，甚於傳統單一語法教學。受訪老師指出在語言四項技能統整課程，語用教學比例明顯偏低，認為語用教學在臺灣並不普及。另外，臺灣英語為外語老師普遍未能滿足學生語用學習需求。

雖然師生起初對學習外語語用似乎未注意其重要性，然而，在回顧外語學習的歷程中，受訪者提高對於文化適切表達之醒覺。本研究期許幫助臺灣學習英語為外語師生了解語用教學在溝通功能中扮演的重要角色，促進未來語用教學研究之實

踐，發展語言使用者之溝通能力。

關鍵字：第二語言語用，學習英語為外語，質化個案研究，學習動機

Abstract

Though much of L2 pragmatics research has focused on the effectiveness of instructional pragmatics and cross-cultural variations of pragmatic norms and strategies used in the target language via cross-sectional quantitative research, little, however, has been conducted to explore teachers' and students' motivational experiences of implementing pragmatics instruction in real-life teaching and learning practices in EFL contexts. Specifically, little was known about what and how teachers and students perceive the role of developing pragmatic ability and their motivations to teach and learn socio-pragmatic functions since prior research has suggested that more research efforts should be done in the line of L2 pragmatics research.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate both teachers' and students' motivations of learning and teaching pragmatics through qualitative research. Multiple data sources were collected through face-to-face interviews, classroom observations and field notes as well as the researcher's reflective journals, to illuminate the dynamic, multifaceted motivational experiences of L2 instructional pragmatics.

The findings suggest that both teachers and students considered the role of teaching and learning pragmatics essential to second language development pertaining to the polite and appropriate use of the target language, and its learning utility, practical functions and intrinsic interest in using language for authentic communication purposes despite the sociopolitical factors, such as exam-oriented teaching, lack of top-down institutional support and the implementation of English language policy in Taiwan. Nevertheless, the teacher voiced her inadequacy of teaching L2 pragmatics in a four-skill integrated course and demonstrated her concerns about the prevalence of teaching students how to speak English in a culturally appropriate way, which is, however, contrary to students' eager expectations to learn L2 pragmatics.

Albeit both the teacher and the students tended to ignore L2 pragmatics at first, after the initial reflections they raised their awareness of culturally speaking in an appropriate way. In this study, it was hoped to empower both teachers and students to understand their teaching and learning practices by sensitizing them to L2 pragmatics in EFL contexts, to facilitate the implementation of L2 pragmatics instruction in the classroom and to underscore the importance of developing learners' communicative competence in Taiwan.

Keywords: L2 pragmatics, EFL, qualitative case study, learning motivation

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The Introduction Chapter offers an overview about the background of the study. It begins with the introduction to English as a global language, highlighting the importance of English as an international language or *lingua franca* (a.k.a. common language) in the world today (Crystal, 2003). Second, given the importance of English for global communication, attempts are made to illustrate the role of English in intercultural communication in an era of multiculturalism (Taguchi, 2011). Third, since pragmatic ability has been considered closely related to the sociocultural ability of the target language, a brief review about L2 pragmatics (i.e. sociolinguistic competence) is presented, which is, though crucial, often neglected in communicative competence (CC), a core tenet in communicative language teaching (CLT). Next, the constraints of the implementation of L2 pragmatics in CLT in Asia will be identified, followed by prior studies on speech acts, issues of extant pragmatics research, motivations of the study, and research purposes.

1.1 English as a Global Language

English has become an increasingly important international language (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2003). People throughout the world tend to use English during intercultural encounters on various social occasions. For example, Chinese people conducted international business and committed social faux pax or social mistakes in England (see Spencer-Oatey, 2000). Due to the expanding cultural globalization and intercultural interactions (Kumaravadivelu, 2008), the importance of intercultural

communication through English has been increasing. Consequently, the role of English in intercultural communication calls for our attention.

1.2 The Role of English in Intercultural Communication

There is no denying that English plays a vital role in intercultural communication inasmuch as it has already been deemed the lingua franca today (Crystal, 2009). Thanks to the user-friendly modern technology (i.e. facebook, youtube, dropbox, skype, msn, etc.), communication between cultures has now become more accessible on the Internet so that cross-cultural communication transcends its cultural, geographical and national borders. However, intercultural communication in English is not without problems. As English has developed into an international language in the new millennium (Seidlhofer, 2005; Crystal, 2009), intercultural understanding is further required for an improved cultural understanding to facilitate a benign interpersonal relationship in an ever-increasingly multicultural society (e.g., Banks & Banks, 2007; Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2010; Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Wolfson, 1989). Without an adequate understanding of the target language culture and its societal norms or conventions, communication breakdowns are bound to occur. Worse still, offensive remarks and negative evaluations of a person may stem from (1) low cultural awareness and sensitivity (e.g., Moran, 2001; Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2010); (2) scant transcultural knowledge (e.g., Hall, 2002; Ishihara, 2009; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Moran, 2001; Omaggio, 2001); and (3) insufficient explicit and implicit L2 pragmatics instruction in language classes (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Ishihara, 2007; Taguchi, 2011). Closely associated with the sociocultural ability in language curricula is sociolinguistic or pragmatic competence (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Hall, 2002; Kasper, 1997; Omaggio, 2001; Taguchi, 2012). In this study, the synonymous terms, including sociocultural ability, pragmatic ability/competence,

sociolinguistic competence/skills, literally refer to the same to reduce the confusion of the various terms used by different authors. The use of L2 language arising from the target sociocultural norms or conditions are subject to a given social context (Taguchi, 2012) and fall into the category of pragmatic competence (illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence).

So far, ample research has been devoted to the teaching and learning of sociolinguistic skills (Kasper, 1997), showing that L1 culture exerts a profound effect on L2 learners' verbal behaviors (e.g., Hall, 2002). Sociolinguistic competence or pragmatic competence, however, tends to be ignored in language classes (e.g., Yu, 2008). Thus, this research intends to bridge such a gap by investigating why this important social interpersonal skill tends to be ignored

1.3 Sociolinguistic Competence (SC)

According to Cohen and Ishihara (2010), the study of pragmatics entails various sub-domains, including references, discourse structures, and conversational principles (e.g., implicature and hedging) (see Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996; Mey, 2001; Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Taguchi, 2011), humors (Bell, 2011), and the most researched area, speech acts, all of which are correlated to the sociocultural aspect in the target language (Taguchi, 2011; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). The sociolinguistic behaviors are often materialized in the teaching of speech acts, such as request, apology and invitation. In fact, L2 pragmatics instruction can now be seen in language curricula through four-skill instruction (see Cohen & Ishihara, 2010).

According to Leech (1983), teaching pragmatics involves two important aspects: sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics. First, sociopragmatics refers to the language users' assessment of the context where linguistic resources are employed. Second, pragmalinguistics drives at the resources available to realize language functions. For

example, in real-time interpersonal communication, learners have to recognize what grammatical structures and words they can use to refuse an invitation from a person, either a close friend or an acquaintance; meanwhile, they need to judge whether such refusal is culturally appropriate or polite in a particular situation in the L2, and if the reply is acceptable, convoluted decisions need to be made regarding what to say to refuse whom and under what circumstances. Consequently, L2 pragmatics research extends the traditional scope of EFL research on grammar to the combination of knowledge of forms and the functional possibilities together with contextual requirements that govern form-function mappings (Taguchi, 2011).

There are various reasons for teaching sociolinguistic competence, one of which refers to the preeminence of learning English through meaningful communication in real-time communication classes (Butler, 2011). In addition, it has been advocated in the current language curriculum guidelines, such as Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, among other Asian countries (Butler, 2004; Nunan, 2003). In a communication class, teachers usually adopt a widely acclaimed communicative approach to improve students' fluency and communicative confidence (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The goal of the communicative approach is reported to enhance students' communicative competence (hereafter CC), including grammatical, organizational/ discourse, strategic and pragmatic/sociolinguistic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Among the four components, sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to transcend the literal meaning of what is communicated to surmise the implied meanings, intentions, purposes or goals and various verbal behaviors realized in all language aspects.

Despite the importance of developing sociolinguistic skills, it has been found that pragmatic ability was the least taught aspect in university EFL classes (Yu, 2008). Little pragmatics instruction, in addition, was offered in TESOL-related degree

programs (Nelson, 1998). A recent US-based national survey (Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009) also pointed out the instructional challenges and inadequacy of sociolinguistic training in TESOL-related programs. No wonder the teaching and learning of sociolinguistic skills tend to be ignored in language curricula in L2 classes, especially in EFL contexts.

1.4 The Constraints and Opportunities of Implementing L2 Pragmatics in Asia

Prior research has revealed the challenges of teaching and learning second language (L2) pragmatics in communication classes (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Butler, 2011; Li, 1998). First, it may have to do with its local societal-institutional-level constraints: Asian countries tend to lay a heavy emphasis on decontextualized grammar-driven exams or traditional grammar-and-translation practices (Butler, 2004, 2011; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Liu, 2007), and insufficient educational knowledge and social experience in teacher education programs in the development of the sociocultural ability (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Omaggio, 2001; Taguchi, 2011; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). Second, it refers to the classroom-level constraints: EFL textbooks are usually designed based on textbook writers' intuitions, failing to reflect its genuine use of the target language (Omaggio, 2001; Taguchi, 2011; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009); in addition, impoverished English learning environment for real-life, functional, and pragmatic use of the target language may explain why students do not perceive the intrinsic value of learning English outside of the classroom (Butler, 2004; Brown, 2007; Dörnyei, 2005); EFL teachers' perceived English proficiency levels may not satisfy students' real needs for communication (Butler, 2004). The third type refers to the conceptual-level constraints. The views of learning and teaching in Asia are found to be different from those of Westerners (Taguchi, 2011). To implement the

Anglocentric views of “language for communication”, EFL teachers’ cultural resistance was identified as the major hindrance (Hu, 2002).

Despite the constraints of teaching students the sociocultural ability, Cohen and Ishihara (2010) argue that there are various opportunities to implement L2 pragmatics instruction through explicit consciousness-raising activities (see Cohen, 2005; Rose, 2005; Rose & Kasper, 2001) or in computer-mediated communication (CMC) environments by receiving more authentic verbal input from native English-speaking teachers (NEST) (e.g., Ishihara, 2007). However, both Bardovi-Harlig (2001) and Taguchi (2003, 2011) pointed out that rarely do the classroom settings provide a sufficient context for learners to acquire pragmatic information explicitly and implicitly because the teaching of pragmatics pertaining to the cultural aspect in a language has often been ignored in language curricula (Moran, 2001; Omaggio, 2001; Taguchi, 2011). Notwithstanding the inherent instructional challenges (Li, 1998), teaching and learning L2 pragmatics is still considered important. It was maintained by Kasper (1997) that L2 pragmatics is teachable and learnable. For example, one recent empirical study has corroborated the instructional effect of L2 pragmatics in Japanese EFL classrooms (Narita, 2012).

1.5 The Instructional Effect on Sociolinguistic Competence

To equip students with such a sociocultural ability, the teaching practices revolve around L2 pragmatics, often realized through the teaching of speech acts (Ellis, 2008; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). With the scaffolding of explicit consciousness-raising activities and implicit L2 pragmatics instruction (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999; Ishihara, 2007), improvements of teachers’ and students’ pragmatic performances have been found (Narita, 2012; Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b; Takimoto, 2009, 2010). A growing body of empirical research on teaching L2 speech acts has been reported. For example,

scholars like Rose (1999), Alcón-Soler (2005), Ishihara (2009), and Narita (2012) investigated the effects of L2 pragmatics instruction and pointed out the positive effect of speech acts instruction on EFL students' sociolinguistic skills.

1.6 Underexplored Areas in L2 Pragmatics Research

Three major underexplored areas in L2 pragmatics research have remained. First, much L2 pragmatics research has yielded substantial research findings concerning the instructional effects of sociolinguistic instruction (Ellis, 2008); however, discrepancies still exist between what we do in research and how we put L2 pragmatics into practice (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). As described earlier, previous studies have reaffirmed the difficulty of instructing students pragmatic skills (Li, 1998; Omaggio, 2001; Yu, 2008); nevertheless, little has been known about what may contribute to the instructional difficulties from the standpoint of EFL instructional contexts (see Alcón-Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Taguchi, 2011), such as Taiwan. Second, given the importance of teaching and learning L2 pragmatics to develop learners' communicative ability, limited understanding exists regarding teachers' and learners' attitudes toward L2 pragmatics. Third, context plays an important role in understanding the sociocultural learning in a target language because ESL and EFL have been reported to have diverse educational practices (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). Since prior L2 pragmatics research was conducted in the ESL context, little was known about EFL contexts. It is reasonable to identify the contextual variables that may facilitate or impede the teaching and learning of pragmatics in EFL contexts. To explore such experience-based classroom inquiry, the research design is thus qualitative in orientation. Through qualitative case study, insights could be gained into the role of L2 pragmatics in a university EFL class based on the insiders' personal practical experience (see Clandinin & Connely, 2000; Xu & Liu, 2009).

1.7 Motivations of the Study

Driven by the motivation to fill the gaps of the extant literature, this qualitative case study utilized interpretive qualitative paradigm to meet three functions (see Nunan, 1992). First, it aims to uncover the insiders' stories of L2 pragmatics, empowering both observed teachers and students to narrate their educational experiences concerning L2 pragmatics (Freeman, 1998). Second, this study hopes to understand the learning and teaching processes of language learning and teaching (Clandinin & Connely, 2000). Third, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, few process-oriented, descriptive studies have been conducted to reveal EFL teachers' and students' incentives about developing L2 pragmatics in a culture-specific setting. In brief, the major motivations to undertake the current study are driven by the qualitative nature of the study, the extant few process-oriented studies and the gaps of the literature.

1.8 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study was twofold: (1) to provide an insightful understanding for readers and the investigator to reflect upon and make sense of their prior English language teaching and learning practices on L2 pragmatics, and (2) to contribute to an informed understanding about L2 pragmatics in EFL classroom settings to transform current thinking about teaching and researching L2 pragmatics. In short, this study extends the scope of EFL research to the sociolinguistic aspect of a university EFL class. The findings may inform current understanding about how English language teachers can assist EFL learners in developing their sociocultural ability and provide important educational implications for future research to implement L2 pragmatics instruction.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The following research reviews first introduce communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (TBLT) in Asia, followed by the studies concerning the current instructional practices in the educational levels of Taiwan's English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts. Second, frameworks of second language (L2) motivation employed to elucidate the learning and teaching of L2 pragmatics will also be reviewed to explain teachers' and students' teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in Asia. Third, endeavors will be made to explicate why sociolinguistic competence tends to be ignored in language classes, followed by underexplored pragmatics studies implemented in EFL classes. Fourth, the advantages, limitations and prior research methods of doing pragmatics research will be presented (see Ellis, 2008; Kasper, 2000; Taguchi, 2011). Fifth, recent L2 pragmatics research on the effect of explicit and implicit learning on pragmatic ability will be described. Lastly, the literature review ends with the research gap, rationale of the current study and research questions.

2.1 The Introduction and Implementation of CLT and TBLT in Asia

In the last quarter of the 20th century, the dominant teaching theories and practices arise from communicative approach. Concepts closely associated with it are communicative language teaching (CLT), content-based instruction (CBI), task-based language teaching (TBLT) (Brown, 2007; for detailed reviews of CLT, see Butler, 2011; for detailed historical development of the approaches and methods in language

teaching, see Richards & Rodgers, 2001), rendering CLT a bandwagon term in English teaching today.

2.1.1 The Premise of CLT

According to Butler (2011), the premise of CLT is on the grounds of developing learners' communicative competence in social interactions, objecting to a mere focus on linguistic forms. Meaningful communication is regarded as both the means and the goal in CLT. Considering the theoretical broadness that invites various interpretations, CLT entails two versions on a communicative spectrum. One end of the spectrum drives at the strong version of CLT, which assumes that language learning is a natural process where learners discover the language. This strong version posits that the process cannot be directly controlled by the teacher whose role is to facilitate this process. On the contrary, the weaker version of CLT affords teachers a more direct role in students' learning process, asserting that the teacher should present structured, meaningful communicative activities in a controlled manner in the classroom; thus, learners can gradually and freely express meaning in more naturalistic settings.

2.1.2 TBLT as an Adaptation of CLT

To understand CLT, it is important to know one of its most distinctive variants, task-based language teaching (TBLT) (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). In TBLT, task was progressively used to supersede communicative activity during the 1980s (Skehan, 2003). Tasks can be defined as things people do where the connection with the real world's activity is identified with the overall purpose of enhancing language learning through either process or product (Long, 1985). Various versions of TBLT have also been proposed, from a strong version (i.e. task-based teaching) to a weak version (i.e. task-supported teaching). The former views tasks as the chief constituent of syllabus

design; the latter employs tasks for communicative practice together with a form-or-function-oriented syllabus (Butler, 2011).

2.1.3 Difficulties of Implementing CLT

Despite the aforementioned goal of developing students' communicative competence embedded in communicative approach, ample studies have revealed that Asian EFL students tend to learn English for exam purposes (Butler, 2004), reinforcing exam-oriented language teaching in all grade levels of Asian English language education (for Taiwan: see Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; for China: see Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Hu, 2002; for Thailand: see Prapaisit de Segovia & Hardison, 2008; for Singapore: see Kirkpatrick, 1984; for Japan: see Gorsuch, 2000; Nishino, 2008; Sakui, 2004; Samimy & Kobayashi, 2004; Taguchi, 2003; for South Korea: see Li, 1998). The wash-back effect, or teaching-to-the-test effect, has generally been considered to be devoid of learner autonomy (Butler, 2011; Tsai & Kuo, 2008; Xu & Liu, 2009).

Through the incorporation of CLT, the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Taiwan aims to promote students' general English proficiency level, meanwhile transforming Taiwan into an internationalized country to enable its people to communicate confidently in English. Additionally, Taiwan's MOE (2009) revised its curriculum guidelines by incorporating the concepts of the widely acclaimed pedagogical principles embedded in CLT, for example *learner-centered*. However, it is not without challenges. The overall repercussion has been found discouraging in EFL contexts (Chang, 2009). Besides, huge gaps exist between theory and practice (Butler, 2011; Liu, 2007). According to Butler (2011), initial concerns regarding the implementation of CLT and TBLT include three primary constraints that contribute to the limitation of

implementing CLT in EFL contexts: (a) conceptual-level constraints, (b) classroom-level constraints, and (c) societal-institutional-level constraints.

2.1.4 Three Constraints of Implementing CLT

Butler (2011) synthesized prior studies that the first set of constraints arise from the differences between the major concepts of CLT and those of the traditional view of learning and teaching in Asia. From the earliest stages of implementing CLT in Asia, the communicative nature (e.g., oral-focused discussion activities, the preeminence of group work, and teachers as facilitators) has been questioned since the views of learning and teaching in Asia are considered different from those of Westerners. That is, the concept of *communicativeness* can be regarded as *Anglocentric ideologies*, including the obsession with communicative activities and mismatch in cultural values. However, Butler (2005) found that some EFL learners favored meaning-based communicative activities in elementary school classes. Thus, it is premature to attribute the failure of implementing CLT to the traditional cultural values in shaping Asian classroom practices at all grade levels across Asia (Butler, 2011). In addition, misconceptions about CLT (e.g., only oral without written practices and ignoring grammar instruction as well as the accuracy of language use) have been found regarding how CLT should be implemented (Li, 1998).

The second set of constraints refers to classroom-level constraints, such as huge class size, limited teaching hours, inadequate reliable and effective assessment tools (Butler, 2011). Teachers generally encounter such constraints to develop proper materials and reliable alternative assessments. As a result, materials and activities fail to accurately reflect the actual use of the target language in English-speaking countries. Moreover, the classroom language students learn in expanding circle

countries is generally irrelevant to their language needs, which cannot meet the expectations for global communication (Butler, 2011; Kachru, 1992).

The third set of constraints refers to the societal-institutional level constraints, such as grammar-driven exams and the limited opportunity to use English outside of the classroom (Butler, 2011; Hall, 2002). CLT might not be the most efficient way to teach or learn grammar or to enhance literacy skills, especially with the extra pressure of college exams (i.e. improving students' scores within limited instructional hours). However, it is worth noting that a number of Asian countries, such as Taiwan, have recently attempted to include communicative components in their college entrance exams (e.g., listening and writing skills). It is scheduled to include the listening test in the 12-year national education as of 2014 to transform the current grammar-focused English education. Albeit teachers may be fully aware of such changes, research has identified the intended wash-back effects in language curricula (Gorsuch, 2000). In fact, it has already been indicated that relatively few opportunities to use English outside of EFL classrooms, which still remains a primary concern among TESOL educators in the expanding circle countries, such as Japan and Taiwan (Kachru, 1992). Much variability, in addition, has been found regarding students' use of English outside of the classroom in comparison with that in ESL contexts (Taguchi, 2011).

2.1.5 Example of Implementing CLT in Taiwan

Take Taipei, the capital of Taiwan, for example. Children born in a wealthy family are able to start learning English in kindergarten to receive bilingual or monolingual education (mostly English and Chinese). The major ways of teaching young learners are purportedly to arouse learners' interest in learning English (Butler, 2005; MOE, 2009). However, for parents and school teachers in Chinese learning contexts, they generally display early concerns about children' learning outcome of

college entrance examination by emphasizing the content of school exams, mostly the reported drudgery of grammar drills, sentence substitutions, and test-taking strategies (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). To address such concerns, it is worth noting that cram schools provide custom-made service to students with various needs of taking relevant standardized exams (i.e. extrinsic motivation).

In secondary schools, the teaching of language forms dominates Taiwan's EFL classrooms. It has been reaffirmed that Asian EFL learners, such as Taiwanese students, have been spending considerable time memorizing vocabulary and grammar relevant to exam preparations and test-taking strategies, evidenced in several earlier studies (Butler, 2011; Chen & Tsai, 2012; Chung & Huang, 2009). Exams have been reported to exert a negative wash-back influence on students' academic performance and intrinsic motivation (Xu & Liu, 2009), possibly causing them to lose a genuine interest, a sense of achievement or sustained motivations to learn English (Dörnyei, 2005). For some learners in EFL contexts, taking exams is believed to be the major reason for learning English, a.k.a. instrumental and extrinsic motivation (e.g., Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Deci & Ryan, 1985) in that English is generally not considered a readily used language in daily life in EFL contexts, especially in expanding circle countries (see Kachru, 1992; Chen & Tsai, 2012).

Although exams play a crucial role in assessment for learning (i.e. understanding one's learning to improve one's ability) (Williams, 2001), it seems, however, that the benefit of *assessment of learning* (i.e. learning for exams only), does not always lead to *assessment for learning*. Learning anchored in such an exam culture that stresses exams appears to be a reality in EFL contexts, especially in Asian learning contexts (for Taiwan: see Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Chen & Tsai, 2012; for China: see Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Hu, 2002; Liu, 2007; for Japan: see Gorsuch, 2000; Nishino, 2008; Sakui, 2004; Samimy & Kobayashi, 2004; for South Korea: see Choi, 2000; Li,

1998). Although the trend of ELT now incorporates communicative elements into language classes, it has been reported that learning situated in Taiwan's sociocultural context, such as the predominance of cram schools that cater to learners' extrinsic needs of taking exams (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Tsai & Kuo, 2008) may affect teacher beliefs of teachers' professional development. That is, if teachers' conceptions are oriented toward preparing students for exam-taking (standardized paper exams on grammar and vocabulary), it is by no means easy for teachers to incorporate CLT into language curricula.

ELT has been progressively directing its attention from traditional focus on forms to social-functional use of the target language in CLT. However, the progress of the situated ELT in Taiwan's EFL classes has been considered stagnant perhaps because current EFL teachers, if not all, did not receive continuous professional TESOL education training in second language teacher education programs (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009), which may be due to the lack of intrinsic motivation for continuous professional development constrained by the local sociocultural context, such as the limited teaching hours and teachers' low self-efficacy and confidence in their ability to implement CLT (Butler, 2011).

In fact, to implement culture-embedded teaching in English-mediated classes, teachers are expected to have a good command of English and intercultural and pedagogical understanding to prepare an English lesson (Brown, 2007; Li, 1998; Moran, 2001). Although it is not necessary for teachers to have profound knowledge of both culture-general and culture-specific knowledge (Hall, 2002), it is still a sufficient condition for every teacher to have intercultural communicative ability to teach students to use English appropriately (Hall, 2002; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). The motivation to teach may be constrained by the reality of ELT in Asian countries (Dörneyi, 2005).

In a communication class, probably no one will deny the fact that students need ample opportunities to practice using English to perform various sociocultural functions, such as making requests and apologies, expressing gratitude and regrets, and showing agreement and disagreement in a culturally appropriate way (see Ellis, 2005). The above-mentioned comprise complicated skills of choosing correct vocabulary and sentence structures, understanding the social status, gender and distance of self and others, evaluating the context during interpersonal and intercultural exchanges, and what not (Spencer-Oatey, 2000). If teachers do not have such a strong motivation to improve their own English proficiency (four skills), it is reasonable to argue that they may not spend additional time improving their own sociocultural understanding regarding the teaching and learning of L2 pragmatics.

To be pragmatically competent, learners tend to orchestrate a wide range of commonly used request strategies by the target language users, for example the ability to understand an invitation as a closing remark, such as *we should get together sometime*). However, learners, who do not understand the sociopragmatic norms, and who have limited pragmalinguistic knowledge in a given speech community, such as mainstream Anglophone culture, tend to have difficulty understanding the real intentions in the target language (Pinto, 2011). As a result, communication tends to break down due to cross-cultural misunderstandings (Spencer-Oatey, 2000) and limited sociolinguistic competence (Hall, 2002; Taguchi, 2011).

Li (1998) pointed out that in communication-oriented classes, sociolinguistic competence was considered difficult to teach and learn for non-native English speakers who do not have much exposure to the authentic English learning environment regarding its cultural aspects in EFL contexts, mostly limited to classroom situations (see Alcón-Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Taguchi, 2011). In addition, Omaggio (2001) also indicated that the teaching of culture tends to be

neglected by language teachers in the classroom. Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) also found out that the acquisition of pragmatic skills could not occur without instructed learning. It has been reaffirmed that explicit pragmatics instruction can generally improve L2 pragmatic ability by EFL learners in recent empirical studies (Narita, 2012; Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b; Takimoto, 2009, 2010).

However, factors that affect the acquisition of pragmatics were also suggested in the extant literature, such as learners' ego/identity and cultural resistance (Hu, 2002; Judd, 1999; Taguchi, 2011). Another factor refers to teachers' lack of confidence in their ability to teach L2 pragmatics (Omaggio, 2001). Since EFL teachers may be constrained by their English skills in introducing the appropriate use of the target language, it may pose a challenge for them to teach students (Li, 1998). Still other factors refer to the EFL school textbook design according to textbook writers' intuitions (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Students' limited English proficiency as well as individual differences may affect students' motivations to learn L2 pragmatics (Taguchi, 2011). Although Yu (2008) found that L2 pragmatics was the least taught aspect in language learning (i.e. classroom-level constraints), the study maintains that there may be other, such as learning motivation, which can influence the teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in EFL classes.

2.2 L2 Motivation Theory and L2 Pragmatics

To address the issue of L2 motivation that may influence L2 pragmatics instruction, it is important to operationalize motivation, an often discussed but elusive construct (Dörnyei, 2005). One of the most common and famous distinctions in motivation theories is that of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation (Vallerand, 1997). Intrinsic motivation deals with behaviors performed to experience desire and satisfaction, for example, the joy of learning American culture. Extrinsic motivation,

on the other hand, refers to performing a behavior to accomplish a purpose or to receive some extrinsic rewards (e.g., parental praises, stickers and good grades).

Although intrinsic motivation has generally been regarded as a one-dimensional construct, three subtypes of intrinsic motivation were pointed out by Vallerand (1997), including (1) *to learn* (to explore the world and to satisfy one's penchant for knowledge), (2) *to achieve* (to engage in an activity for the satisfaction of surpassing oneself, overcoming challenges and accomplishing something), and (3) *to experience stimulation* (to engage in an activity to experience pleasant feelings). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation encompasses external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation (see Deci & Ryan, 1985). External regulation refers to the least self-determined type of extrinsic motivation, arising solely from exterior forces, such as teacher's rewards and tokens. Introjected regulation involves externally imposed rules that the student obeys in order not to feel humiliated. Identified regulation occurs when the person engages in an activity because he or she highly treasures and relates to the behavior, and perceives its usefulness (e.g., learning a language necessary to satisfy one's job-related needs). Integrated regulation, according to Deci and Ryan (1985), is the most developmentally advanced form of extrinsic motivation, involving given behaviors associated with the individual's values, needs and identity. For example, learning English is usually regarded as higher social status and greater job opportunities in EFL contexts.

In 1997, Williams and Burden proposed a social constructivist model, raising two fundamental issues in researching motivation—context and time. Different from Deci and Ryan's (1985) motivation theory, this model is based on the social constructivist conception of motivation, which is contingent upon social and contextual influences, including both external and internal factors. The external

factors include significant others, the nature of interaction with significant others and the learning environment as well as the broader context involving family networks, local educational system, conflicting interests, cultural norms and societal expectations and attitudes. On the other hand, the internal factors encompass the intrinsic interest of activity conducted in the classroom, students' perceived value of learning activity, sense of agency, mastery of the target language, self-concept and attitudes toward the target language, culture and community, and affective states, such as confidence, anxiety and fear.

In 1998, Dörnyei and Ottó proposed their all-inclusive process model of L2 motivation, capturing a process-oriented perspective of motivation, synthesizing various lines of research in a unified motivation framework, and building an overarching framework. According to Dörnyei and Ottó (1998), their comprehensive model includes three phases: preactional, actional and postactional phases. In the preactional phase, it involves the process of choosing a course of action to be realized, the sub-processes include goal setting, intention formation and the initiation of intention enactment. Four main motivational factors underlie the goal-setting process, including subjective values and norms. For example, learners may want to learn effective communication with foreigners, so they select a specific learning goal, for example, understanding American request behaviors in an English-speaking university. In the actional phase, three basic processes include (1) subtask generation and implementation (e.g., the learner may desire to learn more about the appropriate request behavior of asking professors to write a recommendation letter); (2) an ongoing evaluative process (i.e. learners may need to evaluate their own learning of request behaviors and choose alternatives if their plans abort or terminate); and (3) the application of various action control mechanisms, which refer to knowledge and strategies used to cope with cognitive and non-cognitive demands for goal

accomplishment. The self-regulatory mechanisms are activated to enhance, scaffold or protect learning-specific actions. According to Dörnyei (2005), active use of the mechanisms through the use of motivation maintenance strategies, language learning strategies and goal-setting strategies may monitor the ongoing learning process and prevent learning from slowing, stopping or backsliding (Oxford, 1990). In the postactional phase, causal attributions to the success or failure of the learning goal may be assessed against one's own standard. Through such an on-going evaluation, a person is believed to cultivate a sense of an effective learner (Boekaerts, 1988).

According to Dörnyei (2005), several motivational influences on the different action phases of the model include (1) fundamental beliefs and feelings about the importance of being culturally open-minded, knowing foreign languages and engaging in cross-cultural communication, consistent with Deci and Ryan's (1985) *integrativeness*; (2) the values and norms are mingled with the specific motives, arising from intrinsic pleasure a person receives from learning languages and the instrumental benefits such as a well-paid job or increased travel opportunities, i.e. instrumental motivation; (3) the value preferences that determine the likelihood of achieving the goals; and (4) the external environment, such as parents' and teachers' expectations and the school environment, can make a considerable impact on the choice of possible goals. Intention formation is shaped by the learner's perceived expectancy of success, the relevance of the goal (e.g., How is learning L2 pragmatics related to students' lives?), and the accompanying risks the individual takes (e.g., What pros and cons does teaching and learning L2 pragmatics entail in a communication class?). To the best of the researcher's understanding, there seems to be relatively few studies investigating the socio-psychological aspects of L2 pragmatics. Therefore, in this study efforts would be made to understand the

motivation-related experiences felt by EFL teachers and students from L2 motivation theory.

2.3 Experimental/Intervention Studies of L2 Sociolinguistic Skills

The teaching of L2 sociolinguistic skills arises from the model of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). One of its components refers to sociolinguistic or pragmatic competence (Brown, 2007; Moran, 2001). Sociolinguistic instruction marked a transformation of second language (L2) learning from a mastery of forms to the learning of functional and social use of the forms (Taguchi, 2011). Sociolinguistic competence deals with both the social and linguistic aspects in the target language, involving complicated skills and strategies, such as choosing the appropriate words, sentence structures and social strategies (greetings or small talks served as conversation starters), and the appropriate judgment of social contexts (Taguchi, 2011). For example, in French the social use of *tu* and *vous* (i.e. informal and formal you in English) signifies different social distances that target at close friends and acquaintances. Thus, failure to recognize the differentiation of the address forms or inconsistent use of the expressions may cause negative evaluation or misunderstandings of the language user (Moran, 2001).

The importance of teaching sociolinguistic skills can be reflected in earlier studies (Li, 1998; Omaggio, 2001; Yu, 2008), which demonstrated that sociolinguistic skills were the least taught aspect in communication-oriented classrooms, and that researchers (Pinto, 2011; Spencer-Oatey, 2000) suggested that EFL students tend to lack pragmatic ability when interacting with people from various sociocultural backgrounds. Thus, the lack of pragmatic ability is likely to cause cross-cultural misunderstandings and cultural faux pas.

Two strands of L2 pragmatics can be found in current literature. The first strand of L2 pragmatics studies aims to identify the differences between L1 and L2 cultural norms and its accompanying strategies, such as request and apology behaviors. The other strand of literature refers to the intervention or experimental studies on teaching effectiveness from the cognitive standpoint. Alcón-Soler (2007) is an example of an intervention study that compared the effect of explicit and implicit treatment on Spanish EFL learners' acquisition of request forms in English. The explicit group received metalinguistic information about requests (i.e. explicit explanations of social conventions and norms of the target language use, such as social status, gender, age, distance, and imposition of request). Subsequently, they were told to pay attention to examples of requests in the scripts and to justify their decisions. The implicit group was offered awareness-raising tasks that include input enhancement (i.e. requests and related sociopragmatic factors in bold type or capitalization), but it received no metapragmatic explanation. In the posttest, both groups outperformed the control group; however, no significant differences were found between the two treatment groups. Nevertheless, the explicit group retained their learning up to the delayed posttests three weeks after the treatment. In a recent study done by Takahashi (2010a, 2010b), she reviewed 49 intervention studies on L2 pragmatics since the 1980s, including three types of studies: (a) studies that investigated the effectiveness of explicit intervention (n=26); (b) studies that focused on the effectiveness of implicit intervention (n=2); and (c) studies that compared explicit and implicit situations regarding their teaching effects (n=21). Several generalizations were made in her study. First, echoing Jeon and Kaya's (2006) insightful analysis, the strength of explicit instruction was largely corroborated, reaffirming the vital role of metalinguistic explanation for pragmatic improvement. Second, instructional treatments that suggested strong pragmatic performances in delayed posttests included

cognitively demanding tasks by engaging participants in comparing their performance with target-like standards and/or increasing their awareness of target sociopragmatic norms. Alcon-Sóler's (2007) and Takimoto (2009) contended that the superiority of explicit instruction can be explicated by learners' greater cognitive engagement in the explicit condition; unlike implicit conditions where learners identified request forms that were controlled by researchers through input enhancement, learners in the explicit condition were self-guided to find target request forms independently.

Despite sizable experimental studies on the effect of explicit instruction on learning gains of pragmatic ability, relatively few qualitative descriptive/interpretive studies were conducted to explore the development of pragmatic behaviors given the time-consuming nature of qualitative studies (Ellis, 2008; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). In addition, qualitative studies conducted in non-Anglophone contexts were few (Ishihara, 2009), most of which were conducted in Anglophone or ESL contexts (Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). Recent trend on pragmatics research has witnessed a burgeoning interest in qualitative studies, such as the development of pragmatic behaviors in study-abroad contexts (Barron, 2003; Ellis, 2008; Kinginger & Belz, 2005).

However, learning in EFL and ESL differs concerning its contextual variables. Quantitative results and its research methods cannot explicate the subtle relationship between students' English proficiency and its pragmatic development (Ellis, 2008; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). As quantitative research was carried out usually on a short-term basis, the effect of teachers' intervention has been suggested to be limited. Besides, little was known exactly about what and how teachers and students teach and learn L2 pragmatics in a situated learning environment from the standpoint of L2 motivation. Since Yu (2008) found that pragmatics instruction may not be adequately taught by university teachers in Taiwan, the study extended the scope of L2

pragmatics research to a more qualitative orientation to reveal the L2 pragmatics instruction and its impacts felt by teachers and students in one EFL class in Taiwan.

2.4 The Intrinsic Need to Learn Functional, Interactive and Social Use of English

Out of mutual respect and politeness, people from diverse multicultural backgrounds are supposed to communicate with each other in a pragmatically appropriate way (Samovar, Porter & MacDaniel, 2010). As mentioned earlier, the functional, pragmatic use of English did not receive focal attention in university classes in Taiwan (Yu, 2008) possibly because deep-rooted concepts and traditional teaching methods, i.e. grammar-translation and audio-lingual methods, still dominate the language classroom for the most part in Asia (Butler, 2011; Liu, 2007). The crux of the underlying problem may not be the methods per se; rather, it could be how teachers and learners perceive the role of English that affects their intrinsic desire for learning the practical, interactive and social use of the target language (Brown, 2007).

Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) and Yu (2008) have shown that L2 pragmatics instruction was largely neglected by language teachers in the classroom, for some teachers may not be able to teach such skills and students may adhere to their cultural values, upholding their L1 identity and resisting the target language pragmatic features (Butler, 2011; Judd, 1999; Li, 1998; Taguchi, 2011). Often are the cases that learners do not know how to interact with people appropriately. Some may offend others unconsciously in intercultural encounters (Spencer-Oatey, 2000), form misunderstandings (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001), and cause cultural stereotypes (Banks & Banks, 2007) in an era of multiculturalism (Taguchi, 2011). It has been shown that the cultural differences between English and other languages vary in terms of the sociopragmatic norms, such as English and Chinese (Spencer-Oatey, 2000), and that cultural differences may also cause confusion and frustration (Brown, 2007). Rapid

cultural globalization and frequent intercultural encounters make people unable to grasp all kinds of intercultural encounters, and therefore cross-cultural misunderstandings may occur from time to time (Kumaravadivelu, 2008; Pinto, 2011).

As language has been considered by many to be a communication tool, its functional and pragmatic use is now emphasized concerning its importance of managing interpersonal relations. It is maintained that learners may find L2 pragmatics instruction practical and interesting, though sometimes confusing and frustrating, given its focus on authentic interpersonal communication (Taguchi, 2011); consequently, the upshot of teaching and learning L2 pragmatics may not only give learners the incentive to learn English, but it could also satisfy people's intrinsic needs of using language for real-life communication purposes on various social occasions (Brown, 2007). To meet the increasing needs of intercultural communication, understanding L2 pragmatics has received focal attention.

In brief, communication across cultures is reflected in language use and function, and L2 pragmatics is one of the key components in communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Without having such competence, hardly can learners communicate smoothly and harmoniously with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. In this study, language is considered a crucial communication tool for teachers and learners in EFL contexts in that the focus of the study is mostly on the verbal behaviors performed by teachers and learners in an EFL class through four skills—listening, speaking, reading and writing. The teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in one EFL university class was specifically investigated through classroom observations plus multiple sources of data collection, including teacher and student interviews as well as the researcher's reflective journals. The following section illustrates the research gaps on prior L2 pragmatics studies.

2.5 Research Gaps on Prior L2 Pragmatics Studies

Much pragmatics research has been investigated to identify the social variations of language use by two groups of L1 speakers and one group of L2 learners. Among all the pragmatics research, speech acts studies have been the most researched area in pragmatics (see Ellis, 2008). Its data collection methods, according to Cohen and Ishihara (2010), employed written and oral discourse completion test (DCT), questionnaire, judgment test, natural observations in a naturalistic setting, such as business meetings and academic institutions (see Spencer-Oatey, 2000). Few, however, employed qualitative methods to investigate second language learners' development of pragmatic ability in both ESL and EFL contexts because of its time-consuming nature (Ellis, 2008; Taguchi, 2012). In addition, no clear understanding about the EFL teachers' perceptions of teaching L2 pragmatics in EFL classroom contexts on the grounds that students generally do not have ample opportunities to use English (Butler, 2011; Kachru, 1992).

Albeit results on the effects of explicit and implicit instruction have been found (Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Taguchi, 2011), little was known about the application of the empirical evidence in the current literature. In Yu's (2008) study, he identified that in both high and low communicative classes, pragmatics seems to be the least taught aspect in CLT-based classes. Teachers may claim that they teach students such sociocultural skills, whereas it remains unknown whether and how students acquire the necessary language skills to perform social functions appropriately. For instance, Ishihara (2009) indicated that EFL learners, despite many years of learning English, did not know how to react to a certain situation in English appropriately. Apparently, gaps still exist between what we know in research and how we implement it in the classroom. Therefore, how we put the theory into practice has become one of the

major concerns by many spearheading English language teachers given its interactive nature of social use (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

As mentioned earlier, gaps exist between research and practice. What teachers claim to teach may not be consistent with their real teaching practices. Take CLT in Asia for example. Although CLT has been considered a widely acclaimed approach, its implementation has met criticisms and constraints. Conceptually, the values of learning and teaching in Asian contexts are distinct from those in Anglophone contexts, rendering CLT difficult to be implemented. Even though teachers and students may be willing to embrace such a communicative approach, classroom-level constraints, such as huge class size (Li, 1998), inappropriate materials (Butler, 2011), and few qualified language educators with TESOL expertise and relevant training, may influence how teachers put their teaching philosophies and teacher beliefs into classroom practices. Besides, societal-and-institutional-level constraints may also limit teachers' autonomy to implement CLT, such as the prevalence of grammar-based exams in Asia. The above-mentioned factors may exert a huge influence on the development of pragmatic ability.

Based on the prior studies, this study assumes that generally EFL teachers and learners lack pragmatic ability in the given sociocultural context in Taiwan. In addition, L2 pragmatics tends to be ignored by language educators. Thus endeavors need to be made to explicate why L2 pragmatics was identified as the least taught aspect in a given context. As Ellis (2008) appealed to our attention, maybe focus could be shifted to the sociolinguistic environments on doing pragmatics research to uncover the insiders' perspectives to understand the bigger picture of EFL classroom teaching and learning practices on L2 pragmatics.

2.6 Rationale of the Current Study

Following Yu's (2008) study, Hsieh (2010) explored ten pre-service secondary school teacher beliefs about L2 pragmatics in Taiwan, and the participants generally acknowledged the importance of teaching L2 pragmatics in his study; nonetheless, Hsieh (2010) did not take the contextual factors into consideration, an important issue in doing L2 motivation research. The perception data, in addition, may not reveal true teaching practices (Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009); hence, it seems crucial to incorporate classroom observations into the design of the study to verify the reported interview data.

In brief, much L2 pragmatics research, speech acts in particular, has been done to explore cross-cultural variations between L1 and L2 and the experimental studies on the learning gains of sociolinguistic instruction; scant attention, however, was devoted to exploring the motivational aspects of L2 instructional pragmatics from both teachers' and students' perspectives from the standpoint of L2 motivation theory. This study thus aimed to throw light on the motivational dimension of L2 pragmatics to contribute to a better understanding about how they conceptualize the role of L2 pragmatics in the observed EFL university teacher and students' English language development in Taiwan.

Research reviews have revealed crucial findings on teaching L2 pragmatics in terms of the cognitive, affective and sociocultural factors (Cohen & Ishihara, 2010), all of which may have an impact on L2 motivation. Burden and Williams's (1997) social constructivist model of L2 motivation was chosen as the major theoretical framework to discuss the research findings because the researcher believes that motivation is socially constructed and influenced by the external forces (school-institutional-level constraints) in addition to individualistic/conceptual and classroom-level constraints. In addition, the issues of time and context are supposed to

be adequately explained (Dörnyei, 2005), and their model could better illustrate the research findings, especially the contextual variable. It should be noted that the current findings may be interpreted from other theoretical lens (i.e. theoretical triangulation, Freeman, 1998), and the theory used in the study emerged only after repeated perusals of the interview data and classroom observations (i.e. a grounded approach to data analysis, see Wolcott, 1990).

To summarize, the rationale or motivation of the current study is threefold: (1) to address the underexplored area of teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in EFL contexts in Taiwan; (2) to contribute to an informed understanding of and to raise awareness of the functions of L2 pragmatics instruction in EFL classes in Taiwan; and (3) to uncover the motivation of teaching and learning L2 pragmatics, which is believed to be socially influenced in EFL university classes in Taiwan.

2.7 Research Questions

The following two research questions guided the investigation of the current study. This study examined (a) whether, if any, the observed language teacher who adopted communicative approach taught sociolinguistic skills and (b) how teacher and students responded to L2 pragmatics in an EFL university class in Taiwan. Specifically, what were the teacher's and the students' attitudes toward L2 pragmatics in one EFL class in Taiwan?

國立政治大學
National Chengchi University

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The methodology section will first describe the design of the study—qualitative case study. Second, strategy of choosing the participants, i.e. purposeful sampling (Merriam, 2009), will be mentioned. Third, both the observed teacher and students will be profiled to provide the detailed educational background. In addition, the classroom will be described to understand the learning and teaching activities through one of the most widely used and developed observation schemes-communicative orientation of language teaching (COLT)—by Allen, Fröhich and Spada (1985). Fourth, various sources of data collection, including its instruments (e.g., the use of the COLT-scheme in classroom observations and that of interviews), will be presented, followed by data analysis and its validation.

3.1 Design of the Study

This study employed a qualitative interpretive research paradigm (Nunan, 1992), which fit the purpose of the qualitative case study primarily (1) to gain an insider's perspective of the research under investigation (Freeman, 1998), (2) to illuminate a better understanding of the effect of L2 pragmatics instruction in an EFL university class, and (3) to get the whole picture of L2 pragmatics instruction by tapping into the mind of the participants through semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 2009).

In addition, this study is qualitative in nature to fulfill three important purposes: (a) to illuminate a better understanding of L2 pragmatics instruction; (b) to attain transferability in EFL contexts (Freeman, 1998); and to increase credibility or trustworthiness (Sarah, 2010; Walcott, 1990) through multiple sources of data

collection (classroom observations triangulated with field notes and student/teacher interviews) (for methodological triangulation, see Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Freeman, 1998; Walcott, 1990) and hopefully to achieve catalytic validity, i.e. to facilitate student and teacher reflections that could be beneficial to future classroom practices (e.g., Li, 2007), a common research goal of doing teacher-research or classroom inquiry (Freeman, 1998). Simply put, not only could the investigator gain a better understanding of L2 pragmatics teaching and learning, but the observed teacher and participants (i.e. the students) could benefit from the study under investigation (i.e. mutually beneficial).

The metaphor of a white elephant and blind men could illustrate the reasons for multiple sources of data collection. First, since either interview or classroom observation (the instrument typifies the blind man) alone cannot precisely explain the whole picture of the elephant (the elephant typifies L2 pragmatics instruction), the study attempted to yield a substantial amount of information regarding what and how L2 pragmatics instruction was implemented through multiple data collection methods, in line with the spirit of qualitative research to meet the criteria of methodological triangulation (Freeman, 1998; Merriam, 2009; Nunan, 1992). Second, qualitative case studies conducted in various contexts could better provide different research perspectives and methodologies for theory generation (Li, 2007). Third, another important advantage of case studies not thoroughly investigated previously is their potential for exploring the students' own perspectives. Process-oriented case studies appear to be an optimal tool for understanding the observed teacher's and students' acquisition of L2 pragmatics.

3.2 Selection of the Participants

The selecting strategy was based on a number of measures. First, through online

course syllabus in university websites in Northern Taiwan, the investigator looked for certified candidates who implemented CLT-based instruction in the university. Second, the observed participants need to acquire TESOL background training and expertise at least with a Master's degree. Third, he/she believes in the core principles in communicative approach (see Brown, 2007) or closely related concepts such as learner-centered, or task-based language teaching (TBLT) to develop students' communicative competence.

One public university in Northern Taiwan was chosen based on its reputation in English-mediated environments and the recognition of internationalization. The college English education guidelines also implemented CLT-based instruction and wished to develop learners' appropriate language skills. At first, the investigator sent email requests to the qualified research participants to obtain their permission to observe them in the classroom. However, after the investigator substantiated the main purpose of the study and its research methods (i.e. classroom observations and interviews), the teachers refused to enroll in this study due to (1) their concerns of being observed and evaluated and (2) worries about the investigator's interruption of their original teaching schedules. In fact, it is due to the time-consuming nature of doing process-oriented research that the high rejection rate was expected (Richards, 2009). Fortunately, one willing teacher, Yuan-Yuan (a pseudonym) lent her support to participate in the study and the investigator reached a consensus that both students' and the observed teacher's confidentiality shall be protected (Paltridge & Starfield, 2008). The letter of confidentiality (see Appendixes A and B) was signed by both the observed teacher and students to protect their privacy (Freeman, 1998). The transcribed and recorded data obtained in the study are kept in the investigator's computer only for research purposes.

To confirm the belief of the observed teacher implementing CLT-based

instruction, the investigator went to the intended observed class (i.e. research site) and conducted one pilot study at the end of December, 2010. The main purpose was to ensure that the teacher satisfied the set criteria of the study. After observing and examining the course syllabus and the required textbook, Hemisphere 4 (Renn & Iannuzzi, 2008), the investigator was able to know how and what the observed teacher taught in her class. According to the investigator's field note, the observed teacher acted as a facilitator who helped students (1) verbalize freely by engaging students in various graded conversational activities and (2) facilitate student-student interaction in English to develop their communicative fluency. Reading and writing instruction centered on meaning and comprehension with a central focus on reading strategy training, such as pre-reading, reading and post-reading strategies. As for writing, the teacher would teach students how to write summary reports of textbook articles with minor instruction on students' grammatical errors. Last, Yuan-Yuan implemented her teaching of sociolinguistic competence, both verbally and nonverbally. Take nonverbal cues for example, intonation was taught to highlight speakers' attitudes and intentions (for the six principles in communicative competence, see Brown, 2007, p.80).

In addition, the course syllabus indicated that the objective of the course was to develop students' communicative competence (see Canale & Swain, 1980). After a thorough understanding of the educational background of the observed teacher with both an MA-TESOL degree in the US and a Ph.D. TESOL degree in Taiwan, it was assumed that the observed teacher knew what communicative competence meant and she appeared to be an ideal candidate in this regard. Apart from her TESOL-related credentials (i.e. her extensive teaching experience in formal and informal educational institutions), her kind support and willingness to participate in this study were highly valued due to limited willing participants.

3.3 Profile of the Participants

This section first introduces Yuan-Yuan, the observed Taiwanese university English teacher in the study. Based on interview data concerning her educational background and demographic information, the following sub-sections will be divided into (1) the training Yuan-Yuan received in her MA-TESOL program, (2) motivations of pursuing a Ph.D. degree, (3) her perceptions of the TESOL training theoretically and practically, (4) teaching experience, (5) teaching philosophy, and (6) role of a facilitator, all of which were revealed in the first teacher interview and tabulated in Table 3.1.

3.3.1 Courses Taken in the MA-TESOL Program

The observed teacher, Yuan-Yuan (a pseudonym), got her MA-TESOL degree in the United States of America. In her MA-TESOL program, Yuan-Yuan took more linguistics-related courses than TESOL-related ones. The courses Yuan-Yuan took placed less emphasis on the pedagogical aspect, such as theoretical pragmatics and sociolinguistics. As for the practical courses, she only took TESOL methodology and materials and second language acquisition (SLA) courses. According to Yuan-Yuan, two thirds of the courses were linguistics-oriented and the remains were TESOL-related. However, there have been additions to the program, integrating more TESOL-related elements to the original course structure. As she remarked, “it has a lot to do with the specialty of the teachers in the program.” It appears that more TESOL-related courses have been expanded since Yuan-Yuan graduated from the MA-TESOL program.

Table 3.1 Teacher's Profile (Yuan-Yuan)

Name of the Teacher	Yuan-Yuan (University English teacher)	Notes
1. Major courses taken in MA and Ph.D.	Linguistics-related courses mostly in Master's degree program TESOL Methodology, SLA, Seminar on Reading Theories, CALL, L2 Writing	More emphasis on linguistics in Master's degree program and TESOL courses in Ph.D. degree program
2. Motivations for pursuing Ph.D. degree	a. Meeting the requirements of the school b. Sharpening research skills and accumulating research experience	Proximity near the workplace and family in Taipei
3. Perceptions of the training	a. Too much focus on exam preparation b. Need for more hands-on practice to produce research papers	Balance between research and teaching
4. Teaching experience	a. Formal (affiliated language center of a private university and a public university) b. Informal (Intensive English Institute)	About ten-year teaching experience
5. Teaching philosophy	a. Critical thinking b. Establishment of personal value c. Student-centered	Principles or essence of CLT
6. Teacher Role	Facilitator who provides scaffolds to facilitate student learning	Affected by her teacher belief

3.3.2 Motivations of Pursuing a Ph.D. Degree in Taiwan

Yuan-Yuan was motivated to pursue her Ph.D. degree in that she needed to satisfy the school requirement. In addition, she needed more solid support to carry out her research. Yuan-Yuan returned to Taiwan immediately after her completion of MA-TESOL program. She secured a teaching job in a private university and she taught adults English in its continuing education center. Due to school requirements, Yuan-Yuan must submit papers to conferences or school journals. Yuan-Yuan opted to

study in Taiwan given the vicinity of her workplace and family in Taipei city. As she humorously put it, “Generally speaking, no one will improve teaching by studying in a Ph.D. degree program, which is kind of irrelevant to teaching. The fact is that you do not have time to improve teaching.” As for Yuan-Yuan’s specialty, she is interested in reading theories. She chose Reading Theories and Seminar on Teaching Reading and wrote her dissertation on teacher belief of teaching students reading strategies in Taiwan. She mentioned that she benefited greatly from taking the reading courses. In addition, she took cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and discourse, among others, in the Ph.D. degree program. Her linguistics professors emphasized the practical aspects more than the theoretical ones. In other words, Yuan-Yuan’s professors asked them to integrate theories into practice and focused more on the practical aspects of linguistics theories, such as analyzing speech acts in the films and comparing the differences between native and non-native speakers of English. Therefore, unlike the MA-TESOL program in the United States, Yuan-Yuan took more TESOL-related courses in Taiwan.

3.3.3 Perception of the Training

According to Yuan-Yuan, she received training more on the theoretical than on the practical aspect. She expressed that she had some fundamentals in the field of corpus linguistics, L2 writing and computer-assisted language learning (CALL); despite that, she integrated what she learned to real classroom practices. Yuan-Yuan longed to improve the program concerning publications because she took many courses without hands-on practice on writing papers. For Yuan-Yuan, writing research papers for publication is an essential skill for investigators in order to be promoted, which is one of the responsibilities that current university teachers need to assume to publish papers in journals indexed SSCI or SCI (Lillis & Curry, 2010). This may

affect her teaching to some extent if she focused too much attention on doing research.

3.3.4 Teaching Experience

Yuan-Yuan had extensive teaching experience. She used to be a head teacher in a continuing education affiliated to a private university in Northern Taiwan. She expressed that in the institution she needed to teach English in Intensive English Institute (IEI). “Actually, it is like cram schools although it has the university logo, so it sounds *fancier* and she asked us to teach students in English only,” said Yuan-Yuan. However, she mentioned that not every student she taught was good at English. As a consequence, Yuan-Yuan pondered over what her teaching practices should be because she did not have much teaching experience when she started teaching English. In addition, Yuan-Yuan used to be a supervisor of IEI, so she was quite used to teaching students in English with occasional explanations in Chinese to achieve effective teaching.

In total, Yuan-Yuan had had approximately 10-year teaching experience in formal and informal educational institutions when the study was conducted. Based on her teaching experience and training about L2 reading strategies in the Ph.D. degree program, Yuan-Yuan believed that meaning always comes first because learning English must make sense to students so that it can be meaningful to them. As for the forms (i.e. grammar and vocabulary), she mentioned that she would take care of them later. Simply put, Yuan-Yuan, who practiced CLT-based teaching, also taught grammar and vocabulary, but she focused more on the use of the target language.

3.3.5 Philosophy of Teaching English

As for Yuan-Yuan’s teaching philosophy, she hoped to engage students in

establishing their value system to boost students' communicative confidence. She considered English to be a means to the end. In other words, Yuan-Yuan intended to teach students English for specific/academic purposes, like business English or academic listening skills. Through English, she expected students to develop their own value system and thinking ability, not solely limited to vocabulary learning or exam preparation in secondary schools.

Yuan-Yuan chose student-centered approach in teaching English because she was influenced by some student-centered theories. She considered teachers to be facilitators who could maximize learning opportunities for students to use the target language. In Intensive English Institute (IEI), she was able to use student-centered approach to teach English in a small-size class. She felt that for students who enrolled in IEI, they were already motivated, either extrinsically or intrinsically, to study English because of (1) the investment of time and money; and (2) their urgent needs to improve English due to work, graduation requirement, or simply self-reward, such as curiosity/interest, (i.e. intrinsic motivation). According to Yuan-Yuan, unlike cram schools, students in formal schools were more likely to nod off in class and less cooperative with her probably due to students' perceived irrelevance to their own learning English in their daily lives.

Although Yuan-Yuan cares fluency over accuracy, she finds it indispensable to strike a balance between fluency and accuracy to ensure that meaning can be conveyed comprehensibly to interlocutors. Yuan-Yuan also considers grammar important because without appropriate use of L2 grammar learners will not perform language functions accuratetly.

3.3.6 Teacher Role as a Facilitator

Yuan-Yuan used to teach various kinds of students with different learning

motivations in both cram school and university. The class size and willingness to cooperate with her differed substantially, which is the major concern for her to teach English. Interestingly, she considered students' unwillingness to cooperate with her not because of low motivation but because of other factors, such as individual differences. In addition, Yuan-Yuan would not challenge or compel her students to speak up in class; instead, she, as a facilitator, would assist her students in speaking English by scaffolding them to build English language repertoire despite students' *low motivation*.

3.4 Student Profile

The participating students are described below, which will briefly touch on their English learning experiences and their preferred learning styles in English classes.

3.4.1 Students' English Learning Experience

As far as students are concerned, they had various English learning experiences. One male student, John, used to study abroad for more than five years and came back to Taiwan in elementary school, thus having a better command of English than his peers. Another student, Peter, attended high school in Seattle, Washington, in the United States, having some study-abroad experience there. Still others studied English in Taiwan and never studied abroad. All of the participating students had some years of experience in cram schools for exam preparation, private language institutes, bilingual schools, and children's English learning centers, etc. However, not every student had pleasant experience or experienced a sense of achievement in learning English. For example, one student called Timmy once had a disastrous experience in childhood. He went to a private institute and he was trapped by the automatic door of the institute. Since then, Timmy did not dare to go there again except when he went to

cram school for college entrance exam in the 12th grade. Still, he considered his listening and speaking abilities poor.

3.4.2 Students' Preferred Learning Styles in English Classes

Students seemed to have different learning styles. Take English Conversation class for example. Some students enjoyed learning in English-speaking environments in secondary schools. The English conversation class was conducted by a foreign teacher, who conversed with the students and encouraged them to speak English. One male student John figured that when he returned to Taiwan, he found his English ability backsliding because of "living in Taiwan and receiving the same education like everyone in the school system." One student commented that "it is useless to teach us how to prepare for exams [because] the major thing is to apply and enjoy English." That is, the participants considered English to be an important tool for authentic communication to increase intrinsic motivation for communicative functions. However, for some students, they do not enjoy learning English whatsoever.

3.5 Classroom Vignette & Course Materials

Based on classroom observations, the English class generally followed a fixed sequence/routine. It usually started with reviewing the previous lesson or assignments in the last class. In the textbook, each unit was divided into listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary and conversation strategies, with more emphasis on reading plus supplementary materials, which were adapted from commercially produced resources. The textbook claimed to develop students' four-skill integration ability and critical thinking skills based on communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. Each unit claimed to teach a language function, for example staying neutral, asking for and responding to opinions, expressing doubts

and skepticism, starting and continuing conversations.

For example, the skill focus section of starting and continuing conversations in the textbook explains “We can start a conversation by asking a question about something we observe around us. Asking follow-up questions keeps the conversation flowing.” Some formulaic or pragmalinguistic expressions are also listed in the textbook, such as “Which one are you going to see?”, “What about you? Is this your first?”, “Do you have any recommendations?”, and “In what way?” Fill-in-the-blank dialogues (mechanical drills) and role-plays are the most common communication activities for students to recycle the phrases or sentences. However, the communicative activity does not include explicit instructions to explain the differences of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects. Neither does the teacher’s manual resource book.

The conversation topics vary, ranging from table-sharing at lunch in a crowded cafeteria to signing up for tennis lessons at a gym. However, there seems not enough space and time (lack of sufficient amount of information) for students to practice. The teacher usually taught conversation strategy at the end of each unit and students practiced using conversation strategy after teaching the four skills and grammar. Usually, Yuan-Yuan asked students to answer the questions one after another by filling in the blanks and reading out loud in class. Yuan-Yuan sometimes would supplement her teaching on conversation strategy with video clips, and she would later proceed to explain the social use of the strategies students could employ in role-play, or she would use pictures to elicit students’ responses.

However, time spent on this section was usually limited to 20 or 25 minutes as this class was not a pragmatics-focused instruction course, unlike the one conducted by Ishihara (2009) in the five-day institute courses in the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota (see

Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

During group discussion or role-play, the seat arrangements and partners were observed to be almost identical. There were some students who did not engage in discussion, sitting alone in the front. Female students usually sat in the front or near the doors; however, male students tended to sit in the back with their classmates and sometimes students slept in class or cruised the Internet through school Wi-Fi without attending to the teacher's lectures.

Initially, both Yuan-Yuan and her students were found to be a bit uncomfortable being observed and they appeared to be unnatural; however, they got accustomed to being observed by the investigator and gradually ignored the existence of the video-recorder. As Yuan-Yuan explained in the second interview,

> Actually, at least it was video-recorded and you know what you say will be scrutinized and interpreted under the microscope. Psychologically, it is true that I felt not very comfortable, but I already consented to participate in your study.

It was also felt by the investigator that Yuan-Yuan did express her honesty of feeling uncomfortable due to classroom observation and she would inadvertently look at the video-camera and feel anxious. However, Yuan-Yuan did not purposefully prepare her lesson to satisfy the investigator's research purpose because "I still have to achieve my course objective. That is, you need to teach according to the objectives, so it seems that I cannot do a lot. Yeah…but I feel that everything you said was on record and maybe someday you need to reflect upon what you said and maybe you did not have too many thoughts at that moment. So I found it to be a kind of….pressure." Therefore, Yuan-Yuan, pressured as she may appear, did follow her own style of teaching and she did not change her teaching style or prepare contents

specifically designed to measure up the investigator's expectations. In addition, Yuan-Yuan, who only had a rough idea about the research topic on communication, did not know what (i.e. pragmatics instruction) the investigator intended to explore.

In brief, Yuan-Yuan implemented her teaching with the aid of the textbook and online resources and she supplemented course-related materials by integrating and reorganizing the textbook content because "the textbook appears to be messy, especially four-skill integration course". She explained that the activities or exercises are not designed well in the textbook, saying

> I felt that I often need to spend an enormous amount of time connecting these things, which I found very annoying. I inquired some teachers in the language center about their opinion of using the book. One of the teachers told me that she is not compatible with the four-skill books because she said they were *messy* [emphasis in original].

By *messy*, Yuan-Yuan meant that the book covered a lot of learning items, such as listening activities, reading comprehension questions, oral discussion, grammar exercises, writing paragraphs, conversation strategies, etc. Yuan-Yuan considered it *messy* too after using the textbook. She joked sarcastically that "my teaching is kind of messy, corresponding to the spirit of the textbook."

3.6 Data Collection

Data were gathered through classroom observations according to the activity type in the COLT-scheme to identify the element of L2 pragmatics instruction in the observed EFL university class. In addition, both student and teacher interviews were employed based on previous literature reviews on the implementation of CLT, questions related to L2 motivation were added to follow-up interviews. Detailed

explanations regarding the use of the instruments are delineated below.

3.6.1 Instruments

Since this study employed a qualitative case study, multiple data collection methods were used to answer the two research questions: (a) whether, if any, the observed language teacher who adopted communicative approach taught sociolinguistic skills, and (b) how the teacher and the students reacted to L2 pragmatics in one EFL class.

The major instruments that were used to address the first research question entail (1) one of the most sophisticated classroom observation schemes (Nunan, 1992): COLT-scheme developed by Allen, Fröhich and Spada (1985) for identifying the classroom events of L2 pragmatics in EFL classes in Taiwan, (2) teacher and student interviews: interview questions were developed based on Freeman's (1998) and Merriam's (2009) suggestions on the interview design, and a review of recent studies by Sharpless and Vásquez (2009) on L2 pragmatics in TESOL program and Cohen and Ishihara (2010) on students and teachers' reflections to apply L2 pragmatics to English learning. After initial confirmation by examining the course syllabus and objectives of fostering students' communicative competence, the investigator invited the teacher to have three semi-structured interviews, each of which lasted at least one hour.

Follow-up interview questions emerged when issues arose in the classroom and the investigator wrote down the questions that were asked in the two follow-up interviews. For example, extrinsic motivation (e.g., learning English for exam) was found to be a salient issue, compared to participants' concerns about the practical, interactive and social functions of English.

Data collection lasted nine months, ranging from late February to early

November, 2011. Ten classroom observations were recorded to understand the interaction between the teacher and the students and their classroom discourse, especially the motivation aspect of teaching L2 pragmatics in the EFL university class. It was shown that the four-skill integration English class is the norm rather than the exception given that communication entails four aspects and that communicative competence is the core feature of communication-based classes (Canale & Swain, 1980).

The following section on the instruments is divided into (1) classroom observations and (2) teacher and student interviews.

3.6.2 Classroom Observations

To observe a communication class, the investigator departed for the observed teacher's class to understand the teacher's overall teaching styles via the communication-orientated language teaching (COLT) scheme, a.k.a. COLT-scheme (see Fröhich, Spada, & Allen, 1985). The COLT-scheme includes two parts. The first part described classroom activities at different levels and the second part was used to conduct a post-hoc qualitative analysis of classroom language at the level of verbal interaction. The COLT-scheme was chosen because it could help the investigator identify the *communicativeness* of the observed class in terms of (1) the classroom events, including activity, participant organization, content, the use of four skills, pedagogic or non-pedagogic materials; (2) communicative features, including the use of the target language, information gap, sustained speech, reaction to code, incorporation of preceding utterances, discourse initiation, and the degree of language control manifested in the classroom and teaching practices. In particular, the investigator examined the aspect of sociolinguistic instruction in the COLT-scheme, which can provide important answers to the teacher's teaching practices related to the

teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills. In Yu's (2008) study, he utilized the criteria of teaching sociolinguistic elements as the characteristics of language which make them appropriate to given social situations based on his self-adapted COLT-scheme. Yu (2008) employed the revised COLT-scheme to capture whether the instructional content was on form, function, discourse or sociolinguistic rules.

3.6.3 Role of the Researcher

The investigator observed the class (two hours per week, 20 hours and 10 weeks in total) in the spring semester of 2011, and video-recorded the teacher-student verbal interaction in the classroom, jotting down notes together with salient issues related to the teaching and learning of L2 pragmatics. Before classroom observations, the investigator explained to the students how the recorded data were to be used, mainly for research purposes without revealing their identity, so that students would not feel uncomfortable or threatened due to the presence of the investigator. The researcher, acting as a non-participant-observer, recorded the verbal interaction between the teacher and the students and minimized the intervention of the classroom activities. As mentioned in the course syllabus, this class aimed to foster students' communicative competence through four-skill instruction.

To ascertain the real practice of the teacher, the investigator entered one of Yuan-Yuan's classes in the fall semester of 2010. Afterwards, the investigator identified key features in the course—(1) the teaching of four skills with communicative approach; (2) textbook that claimed to assess and teach students conversation strategies with supplementary authentic materials; and (3) teacher as facilitator and students' engagement in the learning context through role-play and the use of L2 (i.e. English) most of the instructional hours.

3.6.4 Teacher Interviews

Teacher interviews constitute three parts: (1) demographic information, (2) educational experiences in teaching and learning pragmatics in a four-skill integrated class, and (3) the teacher and the students' motivations to teach and learn L2 pragmatics in EFL classes in Taiwan. For example, the investigator started by asking the teacher, "Dear XYZ, I know that you are teaching in XYZ. Could you tell me where you started your Master program?" After the initial question, the investigator continued to ask the reasons for pursuing the Ph.D. degree. The investigator identified the motivation factors and proceeded to ask additional teaching experience in Taiwan both in formal and informal language institutions. For example, the investigator asked "Could you tell me your earliest teaching experience?" After the teacher provided the information relevant to the research topic, the investigator further inquired "What did you learn from this course? And could you tell me the reasons for choosing the course?" Besides the factual questions, the investigator asked open-ended questions, suggested by Freeman (1998) and Merriam (2009), such as "How did you find your teaching experience?" and "How did you find your teaching position as a supervisor?" As the teacher expressed their sentiments, the investigator would explore the sentiments in greater detail. For example, the investigator would elicit examples from the teacher to inquire into such ambiguous terms as "important, crucial, good, bad, interesting, and practical", to name a few. Finally, cognitive, affective and sociocultural factors that may influence student and teacher motivation about L2 pragmatics in the educational institutions were explored. For example, the teacher was prompted to answer "How did you feel about the teaching of L2 pragmatics in Taiwan? Please give me some examples."

Since the interviews were semi-structured in nature, emerging questions (e.g., L2 motivation about learning and teaching L2 pragmatics) were added to the follow-up

interview, which was conducted at the end of the research (around early November in 2011). Efforts were made to answer the questions on L2 pragmatics instruction on both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects (Leech, 1983). Cases in point are "What are the reasons for teaching students conversation strategies in this section?" and "How did you feel about instructing students pragmatic skills, let's say its social conventions and its language expressions? Please give me several examples." and "What are your views of the popularity of teaching pragmatics in Taiwan?"

3.6.5 Student Interviews

To address the second research question about the affective domains of L2 pragmatics, semi-structured student interviews were included to explain the motivation factors on how they perceived teaching and learning L2 pragmatics and its relevance to their English learning in EFL contexts. For example, "In your opinion, what were the reasons for learning and teaching conversation strategies, such as interrupting someone politely, in this book? What may be the purpose of this section?" Through delving into students' thinking process, it may better reveal their underlying assumptions, motivations or views of learning such sociocultural skills (Freeman, 1998).

For some participants, it may be better to use focus group interviews considering their heterogeneous backgrounds and personality because some would be less talkative than others. Most importantly, focus group interview could empower less-talkative students to speak up and contribute to group discussion and the enrichment of data consolidation (Freeman, 1998; Merriam, 2009). The interview guideline is similar to the one used by individual teacher and student interviews, and more dominion was relinquished to students who could initiate the talk. The investigator's main task was to ensure that the discussion among students could flow

smoothly. Following the semi-structured interviews, member check (Merriam, 2009) was used to verify data interpretation.

In sum, data collection lasted approximately eight months in 2011, including background surveys (see Appendixes C and D) used to locate willing participants in the study. In addition, classroom observation data obtained through the COLT-scheme were used to address the first research question regarding the effect of L2 pragmatics instruction (first-order research question, Freeman, 1998) and the interviews were used to answer the second research question concerning the observed teacher's and students' responses to L2 pragmatics, tapping into their minds of L2 pragmatics (second-order research question, Freeman, 1998).

3.7 Data Analysis

The framework for analyzing the qualitative data in the study was proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998), who assume that a theory is embedded in qualitative data and that it can be established only through a step-by-step analysis. According to Wen (2011), two basic tasks need to be undertaken: (a) coding and (b) memoing. The first task, coding, can be divided into three types, including open coding, axial coding and selective coding, which yielded three types of codes accordingly. The resulting codes formed a hierarchy in terms of abstraction, i.e. substantive codes from the opening coding are at the lowest level, core codes from the selective coding at the highest level and theoretical codes from the axial coding, in between (Wen, 2011). The second task is memoing, which means taking notes while coding. Notes are multilayered, which could be the investigator's examination, explanations, or comments about the data. Simply put, the investigator recorded anything that may possibly inform the research results during data coding.

To analyze the data, the initial data were recorded, transcribed verbatim

(word-for-word translation from Chinese to English) and analyzed by grouping the highlighted data into separate sub-categories. The sub-categories would later be reorganized into categories and recurrent themes (measured by the frequency of the semantic elements in the transcripts, such as the core words *exams*, *communication*, *interest*) were identified in the data through constant abstracting and comparing (Freeman, 1998; Wen, 2011). The degree of abstraction can be varied from less abstract to very abstract (i.e. from concepts, categories, and hypothesis to theory). It should be noted that it is difficult to explain the mental operations since "our minds may work with concepts, categories, hypotheses and theory simultaneously and each may interact with the other" (Wen, 2011, p.239). In classroom discourse, salient issues were identified and the interaction between Yuan-Yuan and students was also recorded together with interview data to increase the trustworthiness of the study (Freeman, 1998).

While the investigator was collecting relevant data, the preliminary data analysis also began. The data analysis was performed through a type of analytic induction in line with qualitative research methodology, which employs (1) examining the data for categories of phenomena and for relationships among such categories, (2) scrutinizing the data for meaningful themes to uncover and explain how these are patterned together, and (3) reiteratively comparing data collected over time and across data types (Freeman, 1998; Merriam, 2009). The transcribed interviews and other sources of documentation (e.g., student interviews, field notes, and course syllabus, the investigator's reflective journals) were recursively read and examined to capture salient themes. By *recursively read*, it means that the investigator would read through the transcripts across data types (such as syllabus, field notes and classroom recordings) to identify the salient issues. For example, this study identified intrinsic and extrinsic motivations as one of the key issues that influenced teacher's

decision-making in teaching L2 pragmatics and students' attitudes toward learning English. Concepts were first formed in the investigator's mind, such as students' interest, curiosity, practical and functional use of L2, etc. Second, categories emerged after combining subcategories (forming a pattern), such as extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, and hypotheses may be generated (e.g., How is motivation related to L2 pragmatics?) and finally theory emerged through constantly comparing different sources of data (i.e. field notes, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews). Simply put, the investigator compared different sources of data and looked for some recurrent patterns or themes identified in the classroom observations with field notes and teacher and student interviews to the end that an established theory in the extant literature could be used to analyze the data. The above-mentioned path of data analysis echoes the four types of activities during data analysis, including naming (ideas/concepts), grouping (categories), finding relationships/patterns/themes, and displaying (Freeman, 1998). As a consequence, no preconceived theory was proposed prior to the generation and analysis of data emerging from interviews and classroom observations. It was after the re-examination of the data that L2 motivation theory emerged.

3.8 Validation of Data Analysis

To validate the analyzed data, verbal interactions between teacher and students in the ten-time classroom observations were video-recorded and methodologically triangulated with three student interviews and one student focus group interview (see Appendixes E & F) given that multiple data sources were important to secure the trustworthiness in qualitative reports and to increase research credibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Freeman, 1998; Merriam, 2009; Sarah, 2010). In total, involved in the study were one teacher and ten students (three females in face-to-face interviews and

seven male students in a focus group interview). The data of classroom observations were video-recorded, transcribed, and translated from Chinese to English and the classroom L2 pragmatics discourse was incorporated into data analysis (Freeman, 1998). In addition, semi-structured teacher interviews and student interviews were utilized. The summary of the reported data were corroborated through member check (Merriam, 2009). After data analysis, the effect of L2 pragmatics on the development of students' pragmatic ability and both the observed teacher's and students' reactions to L2 pragmatics in EFL classes in Taiwan are presented in the result section.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

Chapter Three described the methodologies that were chosen to empirically investigate the research propositions. This chapter reports on the results of the data-gathering phase. The obtained data (i.e. interview and classroom observation) are analyzed in relation to the two central research questions raised in this thesis: (a) whether, if any, L2 pragmatics instruction was implemented in the target EFL class and (b) how the observed teacher and students reacted to teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in Taiwan.

Inherent in these two questions is the assumption that L2 pragmatics can be taught in communication-based classrooms to enhance students' pragmatic ability (Canale & Swain, 1980; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009), and intrinsic motivation to acquire the authentic, pragmatic and functional/social use of the target language (Brown, 2007). The notion of motivation is operationalized that there is more than one valid type of presenting learners' motivational experiences (e.g., see Brown, 2007; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dörnyei, 2005; Vallerand, 1997). Investigating teacher-student classroom interaction, the study strived to achieve an illuminating understanding of L2 motivation in the chosen class. Specifically, one question was asked about their motivation-related experiences of L2 pragmatics in the chosen university EFL class.

Classroom observations and the interview data were utilized in that the central questions were qualitative in nature. This study yielded crucial findings on the factors that may affect the teaching and learning of L2 pragmatics in the chosen EFL university class. To address the first research question, this study described how the observed language teacher taught sociolinguistic skills in a CLT-based class according to classroom observations. The themes of the observed teacher's and students' classroom practices regarding L2 pragmatics in a four-skill integrated class include (1) insufficient instruction

(i.e. limited time for teaching sociolinguistic skills) despite its importance in the learning and teaching of communicative competence; (2) students' limited English proficiency probably due to the inadequate instructional materials/exposure to the target language used in the classroom or immediate environments (i.e. lack of immediate use of English in EFL contexts); and (3) exam-oriented instruction that dominated L2 instruction.

To address the second research question: how the teacher and the students reacted to L2 pragmatics in a university EFL class in Taiwan. The current study showed that students favored the socially appropriate use of the target language and enjoyed learning L2 pragmatics. However, to the observed teacher's surprise, she did not expect students to enjoy learning L2 pragmatics, so student expectations may not be consistent with teacher expectations.

The following first illustrates the results of the effect of L2 pragmatics instruction on EFL learners' development of their pragmatic ability. The second part presents teacher's and students' reactions to L2 pragmatics.

4.1 The Effect of L2 Pragmatics Instruction on EFL Learners' Pragmatic Ability

The results of this study showed that the observed teacher did not focus her full attention on the sociolinguistic aspects in the language class. Based on the classroom observations plus follow-up interviews, the amount of L2 pragmatics (i.e. time spent on the teaching and learning of L2 pragmatics) was scarce. The effect of L2 pragmatics instruction on students' gains of their pragmatic ability may not be as significant as expected. According to classroom observation data, the instructional time was limited to 20-25 minutes in a single unit (around 10% to 12.5% in total instructional hours: 200 minutes). In addition, the instructor rarely evaluated students' sociolinguistic skills.

Three important themes emerged from the data that possibly explained the limited amount of sociolinguistic instruction. The results include, but are not limited to, the

following. First, university teacher's insufficient L2 pragmatics instruction may be due to limited instructional hours. Second, students' English proficiency and L2 pragmatics input were both inadequate. Third, exam-oriented teaching played a major role in L2 learning.

4.1.1 Teacher's Insufficient L2 Pragmatics Instruction

Based on classroom observations, Yuan-Yuan was first limited by the instructional hours. Only two-hour English class was offered per week. The teaching focus was on reading strategy and four-skill training. Although the study pointed out that Yuan-Yuan truly taught L2 pragmatics, it was unknown about how much students learned from Yuan-Yuan's L2 pragmatics instruction.

To illustrate L2 pragmatics instruction, common L2 pragmatics activities used by Yuan-Yuan included role-plays and mechanical drills (i.e. repetition of the commonly used phrases or expressions/chunks regarding a given social function, such as topic nomination, turn-taking and back-channeling in conversations). Based on the researcher's observations, Yuan-Yuan did not devote much time to instructing and engaging students in the active use of the appropriate language use to raise students' cultural sensitivity and awareness. When asked about the role of L2 pragmatics, Yuan-Yuan considered L2 pragmatics not popular in English classes island-wide. As L2 pragmatics was not fully addressed in the observed class, sociolinguistic instruction was thus ignored.

Having said so, the investigator did observe Yuan-Yuan teach L2 pragmatics. For example, Yuan-Yuan attempted to raise students' awareness about the function of intonation to reveal language users' intentions, explaining that one may sound less enthusiastic to end conversation according to the varied tone, stress, rhythm and intonation. As one part of the classroom excerpt explained:

T: Check whether this person is enthusiastic. We are going to hear a few sentences.

CD: (Woman) I am just doing one of the network sites. It's called My World. Have you heard of it?

(Man) Yes! I am on My World TOO. I SPENT ALL my TIME there. I have TWO HUNDRED online friends to keep up with.

T: What do you think about the man? Is he enthusiastic or UN-enthusiastic?

Ss: Enthusiastic!

T: VERY enthusiastic! YESterday, I SAW... If he stressed a lot of words, probably he's very enthusiastic about it.

In the excerpt, Yuan-Yuan informed students of the importance of the tone, stress and intonation, all of which carry important contextual meanings during conversation. She explicitly said that "you can vary the stress and the way you speak to show your emotion." Yuan-Yuan tried to raise students' awareness of the use of sounds to express social meanings, such as enthusiasm to engage in conversation as a way to continue the conversation, and vice versa. However, it is unknown whether students did understand the actual use of the meaning of the various tones, intonation, stress or rhythms partly because students were not provided with plenty of time to role-play and partly because students were not evaluated. As Yuan-Yuan admitted, she did not evaluate students' L2 pragmatics learning. She mostly provided students L2 pragmatics input, short of real classroom practices. In short, Yuan-Yuan did not spend much time on sociolinguistic instruction.

4.1.2 Students' Limited English Proficiency to Learn L2 Pragmatics

Students' English proficiency level was found to be closely entangled with how much students could learn from teacher's sociolinguistic instruction. Therefore, English

proficiency level is believed to be instrumental to understanding sociolinguistic instruction. The results already showed that only 10% was devoted to the sociolinguistic aspect, so students had few opportunities to practice English. As it takes time to develop sociolinguistic skills, students do not practice English often, so the effect of sociolinguistic instruction was limited. If students already receive scant pragmatics instruction in L2 classes, it is not difficult to assume that students may lack relevant experience to use the language appropriately.

To illustrate, one female student expressed that she rarely received L2 pragmatics instruction. She could not recall when she learned sociolinguistic instruction. She could only share her experience of learning Japanese regarding the appropriate use in a given social context. In fact, she was concerned about her limited English ability. She noted that "when I speak Japanese, I will think about the appropriateness of the language." She illustrated her learning experience of Japanese instead of English because she did not have relevant experience of learning the social use in English before. In fact, all the participants' accounts were mostly grammar-driven exams. By grammar-driven exams, it refers to the exams that lay a heavy emphasis on vocabulary, sentence structures and grammar. She articulated the importance of learning social functions in a language, expressing her adamant belief that using a language also entails learning the appropriate aspect in language learning. However, she considered her English proficiency to be weak, eager to practice her English skills. Constrained by her limited English proficiency, she was not able to carry out fluent conversation with people, not to mention understanding the appropriate use of the target language.

Another case in point is that one male student talked about his English learning experience. Similar to the female student's story, he did not practice English a lot in oral and written forms. Much time was spent on explaining sentence structures and analyzing grammar. Although his teacher always told him to practice his conversation ability, he

remarked that “I feel that basically if your proficiency level is not that high, it does not work. Yeah. It is not effective.” He considered it ineffective because his limited English proficiency could not allow him to understand the target language, let alone its social use.

In brief, learners may not know how to express themselves in English and possibly find it difficult to understand the figurative propositions or implications. As one student explained:

> I do not have any conversation ability. Basically [I know] some grammar and I use some words to express my meanings. If I want to distance myself, it is still not feasible.

She argued that she had some grammatical competence in English, but she could not express herself adequately due to her limited conversation ability. The learner indicated that to practice English, she needed to master that language to a certain extent. Otherwise, it is impossible for her to shift between different speech styles naturally, either to distance herself from others or to initiate a conversation with a stranger. In short, limited English proficiency could constrain their pragmatic development in the target language, preventing them from communicating effectively with native English speakers.

Given the scant language practices both inside and outside of the classroom, one student commented that: “I think if we could implement English-mediated instruction, there would be more opportunities to use the language.” It is asserted by some informants that they hoped to implement English-mediated instruction to receive more input to learn English and to prevent negative pragmatic transfers.

The reason behind all-in-English lessons may be that the participating student wanted to use the language without relying on their mother tongue to prevent themselves from causing misunderstandings or making social mistakes. Also, linguistic interference may occur accordingly through direct English-Chinese translation. As one female

participant identified the importance of the English learning environment, “Now I seldom have exposure to English. It is a far cry from my proficiency in high school [the peak of learning English]. Now one English class per week, I read English magazine at most.” She hoped to take more English classes and maintain her English ability. This concern of the infrequent use of English, though not surprising, was unanimously raised by students in the study.

To sum up, given that the L2 pragmatics has been found to be limited in language curricula, students did not practice using English in their daily life. Thus, their English proficiency and sociolinguistic competence were limited. To address the issue of students’ limited English proficiency, teachers may need to gauge the difficulty of the materials and the clarity of their presentation of sociolinguistic instruction in English (Brown, 2007; Omaggio, 2001). In the EFL contexts, language learners may not improve their L2 pragmatic ability partly because students generally do not use English in their everyday life and partly because the language used in the classroom context cannot reflect the actual use of the target language. The instructional hours of L2 pragmatics, in addition, tend to be limited.

4.1.3 Exam-Oriented Teaching that Constrained L2 Pragmatics

The following illustrates the predominance of exam-oriented teaching that emphasizes grammar-driven exams in the current ELT environment. In secondary schools in Taiwan, most classes were grammar-driven. Speaking and listening practices were found to be the most neglected. Vocabulary and grammar were emphasized. Although students were asked to do skill practice alone, the effectiveness was still unknown in that “we were asked to listen to English radio program, but did not understand at all,” said one student. Therefore, communicative competence may be limited due to grammar-driven exams without guided speaking and listening practices, which may constrain L2

pragmatics instruction in the classroom.

In such a learning context, the classroom teachers were reported to have low English ability to teach L2 pragmatics. For example, one female student complained that she did not understand her secondary school English teacher due to his inaccurate pronunciation and poor speaking ability. For some learners, they did not practice a lot. “Mostly the teacher had me listen to English radio,” recalled another female student. Still other female student asserted that “listening may be adequate, but oral skills are not.” By adequate, she argued that at least her teacher told them to listen to English. If teachers do not have adequate English ability, it could be challenging for students to develop oral skills and pragmatic competence.

Another student noted that “we only did sentence pattern drills and exercises in class.” Students in high school may not receive proper instruction in EFL classes, not to mention L2 pragmatics. Although the textbook may contain interactive exercises, how the high school teacher implemented their teaching remains to be seen. As the example illustrated:

> The English textbooks are dialogue-based in junior high school. Reading was emphasized. Our English teacher asked us to read XYZ [outside reading].

Another student mentioned that “Reading may be reading the articles for exams. The teacher tested us based on the articles provided.” It seems that most of the classroom activities centered on exams. In fact, the aforementioned exams may not help students develop their L2 pragmatic ability in that the current tests do not reflect what students really want and it may not assess students’ sociolinguistic competence, as can be seen below:

> It was in the 9th grade that we began to do this [exam teaching]. The teacher explained how to take the exam because our teacher found our reading speed poor. So, every day in the first period we began with reading one article before the class started.

Generally, teachers focused on exams. Given the practicality and effect of exam-oriented teaching on student learning and teacher instruction, some classroom activities may center on exam preparation. For example,

> The teacher would explain the content and asked everyone questions about the article. They would teach us how to answer the questions as the priority and then they continued to cover the content.

In sum, teachers taught students test-taking strategies to answer exam questions and he/she would teach students the content of the article through the analysis of sentence structures and direct translation from English to Chinese. That is, almost every classroom activity was devoted to exams.

4.2 Motivation of Teaching and Learning L2 Pragmatics in Taiwan

It has been shown that exam-oriented teaching plays a major part in students' learning experience. Seldom did learners receive proper sociolinguistic instruction and they tended to spend time memorizing vocabulary and analyzing grammatical structures in secondary schools. In university, the sociolinguistic instruction was found neglected (e.g., Yu, 2008). To reveal why sociolinguistic instruction was ignored, the second research question was raised: How did the teacher and the students react to L2 pragmatics?

Two important themes emerged during the data-gathering phase. They refer to the extrinsic and intrinsic motivation factors.

4.2.1 Extrinsic Motivation Factors

Exam-oriented teaching dominates the EFL contexts, especially in Asian countries, such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China and Hong Kong (Butler, 2004; Nunan, 2003). This study reaffirms the popular belief that exam does exert a profound influence on student learning. The current study found the teaching-to-the-test effect the most prominent in secondary schools because students need to take the basic competence exams and joint college entrance exams (JCEE). To the best of the researcher's understanding, the teaching methods advocated in the ELT cannot address the concern of exam preparation; hence, secondary school teachers tend to favor teaching students test-taking strategies, vocabulary expansion and grammar development, some of which may cater to students' extrinsic needs, but fail to arouse their interest in learning English (e.g., Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005).

The student interviews showed that school exams play a major part in their English learning experience, and exam-oriented teaching has generated the most responses from the participants. For example:

> I feel that people whose English is already good will become better and those who are interested in English will continue to learn it well, even without studying abroad. But if you are pressured by exams, after the peak [12th grade] there won't be any pressure and your ability will backslide. So I feel that the English-speaking environment matters.

She expressed that she was not as motivated as those students whose English was already good. In addition, she thought that some intrinsically motivated students were

able to master English without studying abroad. Also, she reached her peak of English ability in high school due to the exam pressure, but she could not maintain her English ability without intrinsic motivation (e.g., Brown, 2007). She was concerned that the assessment aspect of learning English should correspond to teaching and learning in the classroom; otherwise, her English ability may decrease without exposure or pressure to learn English. As some students mentioned:

> My English backslides and I re-learned English from the English alphabet. My high-school English teacher was an *exam person* [emphasis in original]. He asked us to read XYZ every day in 11th grade. In 12th grade, we memorized 10 to 20 words a day and read XYZ.

This student considered her high school English teacher to be an *exam person*. Her teacher would instruct her to read English magazines and memorized 10 to 20 words every day. As she continued to say, "…We read XYZ magazine, every week we took 2 to 3 English tests in addition to the textbook, so our English improved a lot, yeah, for exams, very exam-oriented practice." It is worth mentioning that the XYZ magazine was designed to prepare students for college entrance exams and the format of the magazines was customized to suit the needs of test-takers. Also, it has established a deep-rooted reputation that this magazine could improve students' exam performance. As a consequence, the simulated exams supplemented by the magazine were used to evaluate student learning. As for the four skills, listening and speaking appeared to be neglected; reading and writing were mostly exam-based practice, such as:

> In senior high school, I took the class for college entrance exams, taking simulated exams and writing test papers for reading and listening.

It could be extrapolated that reading and writing were exam-oriented and test-taking strategies were taught to prepare students for college entrance exams. “In the 12th grade, I took the Exam Preparation Class for college entrance examination,” said one student. In fact, exam preparation started from junior high school, not from senior high school. As one student mentioned,

> In junior high school, I was always attending classes to cope with the exams. Yeah. I am good at memorizing words.

The student attended English classes for exam preparation. As he mentioned, he was “good at memorizing words.” It is implied that exams were considered to be vocabulary exams in that by learning the necessary words, students could handle the demands of the entrance exams. However, whether memorizing words alone could meet the demands of English exams remains to be seen since no claims have been made that memorizing words alone could answer all the language questions in the tests (e.g., Brown, 2007). There may be others, such as grammar, discourse, and reading comprehension involving the use of learning strategies, which were not explicitly stated by the participant. One male participant stated that:

> I took English classes for the short-term goal of taking the JCEE, attending a cram school near Taipei Railway Station. I *suck at* [emphasis in original] my speaking skills, English listening in particular. I took the intermediate exam of the GEPT. My oral exam was *only 20%* [emphasis in original], and it is quite sad.

The student expressed his insufficient listening and speaking ability, attributing his aural/oral failure to Joint College Entrance Examination (JCEE) in that the exam did not prepare test-takers for listening and speaking. He suffered from his failure to meet his

own criteria of success. Although the JCEE exam includes writing, it was mentioned by some participants that the teaching of writing occurred due to the exam, saying: “I went to cram school in junior high school, mostly the one for exam preparation.” One student added: “Yeah, the teacher taught us writing for exams.” Another student remarked that “I feel that our school teachers only taught us how to take exams.” One student complained that:

> Yeah. This [Taking exams] is very meaningless. I feel if you do this English is a dull subject, and students don’t want to learn. The pressure is so heavy that we don’t use English in our daily lives. The teacher taught English through Chinese, yeah and it is useless to teach us how to take the exams. The main thing is for students to apply English.

The student complained about the pressure to take the exams and considered English to be a dull subject in that all they did was to take the exams and they could not apply what they learned into practice. The functional and pragmatic use of the target language was not remembered whatsoever by the students in secondary schools. In fact, the effect of the test-taking atmosphere, such as the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT), has been so widespread that repeated mentions were made. One student remembered: “In fact, I was more familiar with English in junior high school, such as the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT).”

Another student also mentioned: “At that time, people took the GEPT, and TOEIC was not known by many people then. I thought that people who took the exams were good at English.” To illustrate, the GEPT test is divided into four skill sections—the preliminary test includes listening, reading, and the final test includes writing and speaking. In fact, the wash-back effect of taking the GEPT could be felt in junior high school. As one student mentioned:

> In junior high school, he [the teacher] played the radio and it resembled listening questions in the GEPT, 0.5 for each question, and 20 points in total.

Another student mentioned the test-taking phenomenon: “We are sort of the same. We subscribed to English magazines. We were tested one article per week.” Through the English magazines, the teacher evaluated what students had learned. Every week, students had to be tested. Take listening for example. “The student needed to take the exams through the radio,” said one student.

To summarize, in secondary schools where the participants attended, it is not surprising that exams seemed to be a crucial factor that dominated the English language teaching, including listening, speaking, reading and writing. However, these tests did not, in fact, assess students’ pragmatic ability and most of the exams were form-focused or grammar and vocabulary-driven exams in nature, which de-emphasized the balance of form, meaning and context in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Taguchi, 2011) or what Brown (2007) called the appropriateness in the social use of the target language.

As mentioned before, exam-oriented instruction was so manifest that all participants in the study unanimously pointed out the problem of regarding English as a subject for exams. However, to understand the learning environment in secondary schools, one student described:

> The environment let us practice ABCD and memorize words and grammar and sentence structures and later we knew how to listen and read. I think the order is kind of against the natural order of language learning. The initial learning could be tedious.

What students generally experienced includes memorizing words and grammar, and they practiced making sentences and altering sentence structures, mostly focusing on forms. In addition, this student protested against the artificial order of learning. He complained that "the initial learning could be tedious" because too much emphasis was on drills and sentence structures. On the contrary, some participants felt: "You need to be taught grammar and vocabulary, but you need to memorize vocabulary yourself." She believed that grammar should be taught and she could memorize words independently. In teaching grammar, one male student contended that grammar was not considered as important as communication:

> Every day is about new words. What this word means and how the grammar is used. I feel that English should be used for communication. When you communicate, you won't think too much. It is okay if your grammar is poor as long as people can understand you. The first point is this and the second point is about reading and writing. You don't need to be always right with grammar unless you want to write thesis and novels, more formal ones. I don't think grammar is *that* [emphasis in original] important.

He seemed to imply that communication should receive focal attention in language teaching and learning and spoken mode should prevail over written mode of communication. As for grammar, he argued that it is not necessary "to be always right with grammar unless you want to write thesis and novels, more formal ones." He does not think that grammar should receive paramount importance. The student preferred the immediate and spontaneous use of English to convey meanings, and he thought that advanced literacy skills could be enhanced later if needs arise. His assumption would be that practical use of the target language is prior to the overemphasis on linguistic accuracy. Due to the exam-oriented teaching and form-focused instruction of English language

teaching in secondary school in Taiwan, L2 pragmatics was, unfortunately, the least taught or the most neglected aspect in language teaching according to Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence. In brief, the pedagogical foci were on grammar, test-taking strategies, and less on sociolinguistic dimension in the target language. The four-skill teaching is generally limited to entrance exam preparation.

4.2.2 Intrinsic Motivation Factors

EFL contexts where English is not used in daily life tend to one major factor that explains the lack of intrinsic motivation to learn the target language. Learners with different educational backgrounds in the classroom may exhibit various degrees of learning motivation. Some considered English interesting, practical and useful. Others held a rather conservative attitude toward learning English. Still others were indifferent to learning English. As one student said candidly, "I haven't used English for a long time. I won't use it except homework." To increase learners' motivation, it is often suggested to remind students of some intrinsic self-rewarding experience of learning English (Brown, 2007) or to achieve a sense of achievement and successful experience (Deci & Ryan, 1985). As one participant expressed, "I also feel that communication [speaking] is more important [than grammar and vocabulary]." One student in the focus group interview also mentioned, "In the classroom, I seldom use English and I feel if you [teachers] don't make it more interesting, I will not learn it."

To maximize learning opportunities, it seemed that the learner desired to enjoy learning L2 pragmatics. Learners in the study expressed that efforts should be made to incorporate more interesting elements, such as L2 pragmatics, into mainstream English classes rather than repetitious grammar-based English classes with drills and mechanical practices. As one student indicated that "I also feel that developing interest is important so that you will be an autonomous learner. Otherwise, people will force you to learn." It

seemed that interest is a pathway to improving student learning in the classroom. They yearned to be both self-regulated and autonomous learners by developing their interest in learning English.

For some students, they were not fully aware of the importance of learning pragmatics in EFL classes in Taiwan. As one female student said, “Recently I found it quite important while reading it, but last semester I did not find it important during [exam] preparation.” Another female student mentioned that she at first did not know why the teacher taught them L2 pragmatics. However, she grew to appreciate learning L2 pragmatics since she found it useful and practical, saying:

> In the beginning, I did not understand what the section is all about. I did not know at first. That is, it was taught and there were some sentences. After one semester, I came to realize that it is quite useful…It [pragmalinguistic strategies] contains role-play and we could apply the sentences. If I did not hear how people said, I could not know [its use].

As the student mentioned, after one semester she could apply the conversation strategies she learned. She added that she could not know how to use the expression adequately if she did not learn it before. In fact, negative pragmatic transfer may occur if the L2 user does not know the correct expression in the target language and culture since different linguistic expressions in a given speech community may differ cross-culturally (Moran, 2001). A case in point is that some learners reflected in their L1 experience that they were offended by foreigners learning Chinese in Taiwan. One student narrated that:

> Because when we learn a language, we cannot learn it without knowing its usage. For example, when we hear foreigners speak Chinese, we know what they are saying, but we will find their words either too outdated or too nasty. By nasty, I mean it will offend me.

She mentioned the importance of using a language appropriately, thus recognizing the importance of using English appropriately. She used to have a Korean friend who used inappropriate and rude Chinese expressions. She considered some expressions used by her classmates improper. For some students, the real benefit of learning L2 pragmatics was an opportunity to practice speaking and enjoy learning:

> The benefit…I feel that to me it is not learning the strategies; rather, I think the greatest benefit is not directly related to the original purpose to learn conversation strategies, but for communicative purposes.

By designing some conversational situations, she could conjure up some words or phrases (i.e. the conversation strategies in the textbook), applying the expressions to the conversation. She could practice English by engaging in the discussion with her friends to have a sense of achievement and to experience the joy of learning English conversation. As for students' attitudes toward learning conversation strategies, the majority of students expressed their intrinsic interest in learning this aspect of language. As one conversation with one female participant illustrates the best:

> *R*: In your opinion, what is the purpose of learning conversation strategies listed in the section?
>
> *S*: I think this section is *way too interesting* [emphasis in original]. I never learned it before. That is, it is a very colloquial and very practical conversation, enabling you to converse with Americans. For example, I think if you want to reject someone or touch on sensitive topics, I will find it very practical, really close to life.
>
> *R*: So you feel that it is quite close to life?

S: I feel that it can enable us to converse with people. Through this, we can converse with people and we can learn his/her [cultural] background.

Through learning conversation strategies, the learner felt that she could relate L2 pragmatics to her daily life and she found it *interesting, practical and close to life* because she could converse with people and learn their cultural backgrounds in a given speech community. Another participant thought that: "I feel that the textbook wants to enable us to communicate with foreigners [it refers to people who can communicate in English, often American people]. So the teacher does want us to apply [what we learned] to the conversation with foreigners, to have the ability to use them and then we may feel like…wow, we do speak like Americans!" This student may believe that having a command of L2 pragmatic ability may enable her to communicate effectively with the target language users of English.

Another student stated:

I still feel that it is something *magical* [emphasis in original] because we were rarely taught conversation strategies in the textbook before [secondary schools]. Most of them were grammatical structures and sentence analyses. For example, if you use Facebook to communicate or chat with people, we do not care too much about grammar, we get the meanings.

The student believed that various language styles should be adjusted according to the context depending on whether they are formal or informal. She believed that some language use should be less formal, and that grammar should not be meticulously required. However, the formality of language should be adjusted to various speech styles in a given speech community.

In addition, when the student was asked to comment on the learning of pragmatics, she responded that *it is something magical* because the foci of the textbooks in secondary schools were sentence structures and analyses. She believed that she could use the strategies or the formulaic expressions to enable her to communicate with people, which she found *magical* because she could use them to communicate with her classmates during role-plays. Also, what she meant by magical possible indicates that she never learned conversation strategies before. It is reasonable to assume that she may not be extremely aware of its existence in her secondary English textbooks. She may not have ample opportunities to converse with foreigners before, which may explain why some students believed that the teaching of L2 pragmatics could allow them to communicate with foreigners.

In short, the major findings that addressed the first research question in the study revealed that L2 pragmatics did not receive focal attention in the observed English class. Students revealed the insufficient sociolinguistic instruction in secondary schools, primarily due to (a) insufficient amount of time for sociolinguistic instruction, (b) students' limited English proficiency and inadequate English input to carry out fluent conversations; and (c) exam-oriented teaching that constrained pragmatics in four-skill learning. To further analyze why sociolinguistic instruction was neglected, the second research question examined learners' motivation-related experiences. It reports on the most salient factor regarding the extrinsic motivation—learning English mostly for exams. As for intrinsic motivation factors, students favored the authentic, pragmatic, interactive and social use of the target language. The study revealed that students tended to enjoy learning the L2 pragmatics. In addition, they preferred communicating in English to memorizing and analyzing sentence structures and grammatical rules. It seems that learning how to communicate effectively with foreigners in the target language does a much better job in fostering learners' fluency and boosting their communicative

confidence in the L2. Better yet, it can increase their chances of success and fulfill their desire for learning English as a foreign language (EFL).

國立政治大學
National Chengchi University

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.0 Introduction

Chapter Four indicates that scant attention was devoted to the teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills in the investigated EFL class based on the perceived limited time on sociolinguistic instruction. Results also revealed that Taiwanese EFL students in the observed class seldom learned L2 pragmatics in secondary school based on the interview data. Although students may favor the use of using English for authentic, interactive and social use of the target language, exam-oriented teaching that places a heavy emphasis on grammar learning appears to be a prominent factor that influences teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills.

Aiming at investigating the effect of L2 pragmatics instruction and students' and teachers' attitudes toward the instruction, this chapter discusses five emerging issues, though not mutually exclusive: (a) the instructional effects on students' learning L2 pragmatics; (b) the neglected sociolinguistic instruction in CLT-based classes; (c) the relationship between extrinsic motivation and EFL students' learning of L2 pragmatics; (d) the relationship between intrinsic motivation and L2 pragmatics instruction; and (e) EFL students' and teacher's attitudes toward the instructional practices of L2 pragmatics.

5.1 The Instructional Effects on L2 Pragmatics Learning

This study showed that the observed EFL university class did not improve and learn from Yuan-Yuan's sociolinguistic instruction since little attention was devoted to the sociocultural aspects in the target language considering the limited instructional hours allocated to the L2 pragmatics (around 10% of total instructional hours). The

result is in line with Yu's (2008) study. Given that the instructional hours of L2 pragmatics teaching in the observed class were already limited and that the focus of the observed class was not on L2 pragmatics, it is expected that students' sociolinguistic competence hardly improved. To illustrate why students did not improve their sociolinguistic skills, Ishihara (2009) indicated that learners' L2 sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics performances were enhanced in pragmatics-focused instruction class due to sufficient time devoted to teaching sociolinguistic skills. In addition, according to a number of prior teaching-oriented L2 pragmatics studies (e.g., Narita, 2012; Takahashi, 2010), learners improved their sociopragmatic awareness to some degree by learning this important sociocultural skill. The study disclosed that learners did not spend much time doing L2 pragmatics learning; therefore, their L2 pragmatic ability is likely to be hindered, which is supported by Alcón-Soler's (2005) study. However, the effect of L2 pragmatics was still reported to be transient in previous studies (Taguchi, 2003). That is, even if students in the study received enormous amount of metapragmatic information and engaged in intensive L2 pragmatics learning, current research did not support the claim that L2 pragmatics learning could be retained perennially with much attention to learning L2 pragmatics, especially in EFL contexts (Ellis, 2005; Rose, 1999). Given that ample time does not necessarily guarantee successful L2 pragmatics instruction, the effect of L2 pragmatics was undoubtedly limited in a pragmatics-deprived classroom learning context.

In fact, the researcher observed that there were numerous opportunities that Yuan-Yuan could seize to teach students L2 pragmatics in the classroom, such as the commonly used request behaviors. For example, Yuan-Yuan once asked a male student to answer her question in English; however, the student with limited English proficiency rejected her request by saying a direct no, which is considered

inappropriate by English social conventions (Brown, 2007). It is a pity that Yuan-Yuan did not exploit the opportunity of teacher-student verbal interactions to teach students L2 pragmatics through comparing cross-cultural differences. As some students mentioned, they did not understand the reasons why Yuan-Yuan taught this sociocultural part. Probably the instructions Yuan-Yuan gave may not be implemented or explained explicitly, which was mentioned by Yuan-Yuan through member check. It is asserted that learners should be taught about why they should learn such a skill and how it is relevant to their life experience to increase their learning motivation (Ellis, 2005).

Since little was known about whether students understood the proper use of the metapragmatic information and conventional expressions and the associated social functions in the target language, teacher's professional understanding to teach sociolinguistics (i.e. the ability to teach sociolinguistic skills) is suggested to play a part in learners' success of learning L2 pragmatics. It was confirmed that the observed teacher, Yuan-Yuan, attempted to explain the sociopragmatic functions, such as some discourse markers in polite interruptions (e.g., *sorry to interrupt*, *excuse me*, *may I ask*, etc.). Yuan-Yuan normally introduced a short dialogue between two speakers, followed by role-play practice. During role-play practice, students needed to perform speech acts or pragmatics-related behaviors. Later, they were guided to use the pragmalinguistic strategies according to the teacher's metapragmatic explanations. Yuan-Yuan sometimes varied her teaching techniques by employing pictures to involve students in using the expressions in social scenarios that require the use of social functions or conversation strategies (e.g., the use of negative questions to clarify or seek approval of personal opinions), a.k.a. the instruction on form-function mapping (Butler, 2011). By doing so, Yuan-Yuan wished to raise students' awareness by sensitizing them to the features realized in the target language. However, as

Ishihara (2009) argued that “in the FL [foreign language] setting, learners’ direct contact with a local English-speaking community tends to be limited and sometimes indirect exposure to the L2 culture can be encouraged only through media or formal instruction” (p. 463), students may not understand the hidden aspect of the target language use, and thus it does require the teacher’s effort and time to teach sociolinguistic skills explicitly

How teachers teach students sociolinguistic skills may also play a part in their learning effectiveness. Yuan-Yuan reported on her limited understanding about teaching sociolinguistic skills. Yet, the existing body of research, in fact, has suggested many effective teaching techniques of teaching sociopragmatic information to promote learners’ pragmatic ability (e.g., Alcón-Soler, 2005; House & Kasper, 1981; Narita, 2012). For example, House and Kasper (1981) investigated German university EFL students’ learning of discourse markers in a communication class, which offered learners sufficient input and opportunities to facilitate their understanding and using the sociopragmatic functions in the target language. Learners in the explicit group received metapragmatic information/explanations and engaged in explicit awareness-raising activities, whereas learners receiving the implicit instruction in the control group did not receive metapragmatic explanations. The result demonstrated that the experimental group receiving explicit L2 pragmatics information improved their L2 pragmatic skill. In addition, teacher resource books and publications on L2 pragmatics teaching have suggested classroom-related activities to promote L2 pragmatics learning cross-culturally (see Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). However, gaps still exist between teacher knowledge and real practices in EFL classrooms. In this study, it is asserted that it is necessary to equip teachers with professional knowledge about L2 pragmatics through continuous in-service teacher training so that students may benefit more from teachers’ professional growth of teaching expertise (see

Ishihara, 2009). By participating in workshops, seminars or conferences on L2 pragmatics teaching, an informed understand can be achieved, like the one in the CARLA project.

Concerning the degree of explicitness in L2 pragmatics instruction, without explicit L2 pragmatics teaching, hardly could EFL learners improve their pragmatic ability. Yuan-Yuan mentioned that she attempted to implement L2 pragmatics instruction through explicit approach in order to raise students' sensitivity to the social functions in the target language, hoping that the students could respond to the use of social conventions. In fact, a number of recent L2 intervention studies on pragmatics teaching (Alcón-Soler, 2005; Ishihara, 2007; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Narita, 2012; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2011; Takimoto, 2009) have reaffirmed the positive effects of teaching students sociopragmatic functions and pragmalinguistic strategies in an explicit manner.

In this study, Yuan-Yuan believed in the effect of explicit instructional pragmatics. Nevertheless, as Yuan-Yuan remarked, she did not know how much the student could understand L2 pragmatics and whether she did implement her explicit consciousness-raising activities effectively. According to Yuan-Yuan, she believed that she taught students both sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics, whereas she once doubted to what extent L2 pragmatics should be taught explicitly, which recent studies have not yielded conclusive results (Alcón-Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Ellis, 2005, 2008; Taguchi, 2003, 2011; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). In fact, teaching L2 pragmatics involves complicated language skills, extending the traditional scope of grammar to the combination of discourse and social, interpersonal communicative abilities, as Taguchi (2011) argued. Thus, how to implement and evaluate L2 pragmatics teaching, either in an isolated or integrated manner, leaves the task of

future research to explore the effectiveness of L2 pragmatics concerning the degree of explicitness in L2 pragmatics instruction.

Related to the effect of explicit L2 pragmatics instruction, efforts and time are crucial to the growth of learners' pragmatic ability. Some current thinking about the explicitness of teaching and learning L2 pragmatics can be found in one exploratory study in a pragmatics-focused instruction EFL class (Ishihara, 2009). Similar to earlier studies (Rose, 2005), metapragmatic information on given speech norms was offered to Japanese learners of English in Ishihara's (2009) study. Guided instructional practice of pragmalinguistic strategies was employed in her study. Adapting some typical data collection instruments of carrying out L2 pragmatics research (Ellis, 2008), including open-ended written/oral discourse completion task (DCT), or guided multiple choice questions, role-play in designed scenarios, and natural observations and evaluation judgment test, Ishihara (2009) attempted to (1) improve and elicit learners' pragmalinguistic competence to utilize L2 speech norms; (2) foster sociopragmatic awareness of the consequences of L2 pragmatics; and (3) evaluate the connection between speakers' intentions and listeners' most probable understandings in a given social context.

However, Yuan-Yuan found it impossible to ensure whether learners did raise their pragmatic awareness and improve their productive skills concerning the appropriate use in English. Plausible factors that could affect the decision to choose whose pragmatic norms to follow may be related to learners' participation in or resistance to using target community norms (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Judd, 1999). Thus, learners' subjective cultural identity (i.e. following one's own cultural treasured values and expectations) should be considered in L2 pragmatics instruction since teaching L2 pragmatics is closely related to the cultural aspect in the target language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). As Judd (1999) and Omaggio (2001) advocated, teaching

culture-related language skills often involves the sensitive issue of learners' language ego and identity. Whether or not students are willing to follow the norms may affect learners' L2 pragmatic performances.

Although research has shown that explicit learning could raise students' awareness of cultural learning in terms of the appropriateness of the language use (Ishihara, 2007; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010), no claims were made that students will have no difficulty understanding and using the social conventions appropriately (Moran, 2001). However, it is reasonable to assume that the time allocated to L2 pragmatics instruction in the EFL class is already constrained, and the effect of teaching pragmatics may not be significant due to the time-consuming nature of teaching L2 pragmatics (Ishihara, 2009; Rose, 1999), not to mention the observed class since Yuan-Yuan did not devote all her attention to sociolinguistic instruction because the observed class was not pragmatics-focused.

In the classroom, Yuan-Yuan explained the sociopragmatic functions in English and it seemed that not each and every student could follow her elongated instructions. As the following excerpt illustrated:

> In the article, we learned about challenging an opinion, right? Because in the editorial the author talked about his opinion about first-born children, right? In the response article, the author challenged his opinion by giving examples and stuff. So that's an article, a leeway to challenge people's opinion, but what about conversation? The book tried to tell you a strategy that people use to express your opinions. It's the one you can use here what we call negative questions to show your opinions. I want you to take a look at the board. How would you change this affirmative sentence into a negative question?

As Yuan-Yuan explained metapragmatic information, students may not follow her because they could be limited by their language proficiency. If students did not have sufficient language ability, it may be difficult for them to follow her lead and to employ the strategies taught by Yuan-Yuan (see Taguchi, 2011). Switching to the students' native language (i.e. Chinese) to explain the communicative purpose or expressing social functions cross-culturally in an explicit way may enhance their comprehension. It has been observed that Yuan-Yuan tended to dominate the talk (if not monologue), though not purposefully. Yuan-Yuan, in fact, tried every possible means to elicit student responses and to grab students' attention. For example, she tended to ask for volunteers first and then engaged students in doing pair/group work (e.g., interview). She also selected students to answer her questions, asking them to make pragmatically appropriate sentences (e.g., negative questions to seek approval) based on the exemplars provided in the textbook.

It may be the students' attitudes toward English class, their limited language proficiency, knowledge on a certain topic, or willingness to communicate that they seldom participated in the classroom. According to Williams and Burden (1997), their social constructivist model states that student attitude was one internal factor that affects the successful implementation in classroom contexts. For example, students dozed off in class or did not pay attention to Yuan-Yuan's instruction. Some students used the Internet or chatted with their peers in class. Therefore, they could not generate relevant and appropriate responses expected by Yuan-Yuan who asked them to answer questions. As Yuan-Yuan once mentioned, some of the students did not perform well on the part of pragmatics in mid-terms. She designed roughly two to three open-ended questions for pragmatics-related questions. Students were instructed to answer the questions by using sample expressions in the textbook. However, not until they knew L2 pragmatics would be tested did students review the textbook. By

incorporating L2 pragmatics tests, Yuan-Yuan expected students to write pragmatically appropriate answers.

In addition, Yuan-Yuan explained to the researcher that she did not expect every learner to generate answers because she understood that the learner may not have background knowledge or relevant experience in responding to the scenarios mentioned in the textbook. As some participants may argue that the conversation scenarios were mostly restricted to classroom context (e.g., Alcón-Soler, 2005), so students were likely to find it difficult to create dialogues based on the conversation strategies they learned because they did not have a lucid idea about how to integrate the conversation strategies to the dialogues they fabricated. Their ability to create the dialogues may also be constrained by their English proficiency. However, Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) have shown that the development of grammatical competence is not necessarily positively correlated to that of pragmatic competence; therefore, it is premature to assert that language proficiency is the major reason that impedes L2 pragmatics learning. Yet, it is a reasonable claim that without adequate English skills, learners cannot fully understand the intended meanings of the language in a given cultural context and respond to their interlocutors in a pragmatically appropriate way (Taguchi, 2011). Thus, regarding learners' English proficiency, it is an important consideration in designing L2 pragmatics curricula (i.e. do not use too complicated language to teach) since not every learner can pick up what they hear and understand and produce the desirable sentences or expressions appropriate in a given speech community. To enhance student learning, the incorporation of learners' L1 in the language classroom or a comprehensible classroom language may be conducive to the overall learning quality (e.g., Brown, 2007; Oxford, 1990; Taguchi 2011).

In addition, it has been found that Yuan-Yuan may not have sufficient time to evaluate students' progress of learning L2 pragmatics. As some students used to comment on the insufficient time on learning conversation strategies, it may explain why Yuan-Yuan did not implement pragmatics instruction in the classroom. Also, as Ishihara (2009) claimed in her study, assessing pragmatics is also an important aspect to evaluate student learning as a diagnostic tool to understand students' strengths and weaknesses to give constructive feedback for future learning, namely assessment for learning (Williams, 2001). However, the result has shown that time for teaching and learning pragmatics was already constrained; to implement the assessment of L2 pragmatics, it may not be feasible in the researched class since the foci of the teaching objectives in the course syllabi were not pragmatics-focused instruction. Also, lack of effective assessment tools may be key to eliciting student responses in the classroom.

It is suggested that EFL teachers integrate L2 pragmatics instruction in language courses given the contextual requirements of language use. Probably few EFL classes will be specifically targeted at teaching students L2 pragmatics since in EFL classrooms the contexts and motivations for learning are dramatically different from those in Anglophone or ESL contexts (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Ishihara, 2009; Taguchi, 2011). EFL students may not have the immediate needs to communicate with foreigners and they tend to demonstrate instrumental motivations more than integrative ones, especially in Chinese learning contexts (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Taguchi, 2011). The exam-oriented culture has been found to be an overriding factor that influences teaching, student learning and assessment practices in pan-Asian contexts, such as Taiwan, Japan and South Korea (Butler, 2004; Nunan, 2003). The factor of exam-oriented teaching will be explained in the next section on teaching culture, an often neglected but crucial dimension in language teaching classrooms.

5.2 The Neglected Aspect of Sociolinguistic Instruction in Language Curricula

The results showed that sociolinguistic instruction tend to be neglected in the language curriculum. According to Omaggio (2001), the teaching of culture tends to be limited since teaching culture has often been considered the hidden element that is often ignored in the language classrooms. Scholars like Moran (2001) articulated that the relationship between language and culture is inseparable and that the crucial element of teaching language in context should be understood in its socio-cultural context. Without knowing the cultural aspect, such as L2 pragmatics, communication tends to break down and misunderstandings may occur (Spencer-Oatey, 2000). To implement L2 pragmatics instruction, teachers could use explicit approach to raise students' awareness if teachers wish to teach students the implied, intended meanings that need rich contextual information to facilitate a better understanding of the target language.

According to Moran (2001), the five dimensions of culture encompass products, practices, persons, perspectives and communities. As for the tangible products and persons as well as communities, students may easily discern and absorb the cultural experience by direct contact with the target language. However, culture-embedded practices and perspectives (i.e. socio-pragmatic norms) tend to be hidden and less tangible, thus rendering culture difficult to teach and learn.

In fact, culture has been suggested to be an important motivator that could possibly increase students' integrative motivation and learning (Moran, 2001). As studies on integrative motivation (Dörnyei, 2005) have suggested, the integrative motivation orientation could be effective given that language learning is indispensable to the target language (Brown, 2007). Noels et al. (2000) acknowledge the crucial importance previously attached to the integrative motivation orientation, yet they suggest that this may be applicable to a given sociocultural context, usually ESL

contexts (e.g., Brown, 2007). Take Taiwan for example. The *Chinese Imperative* that emphasizes the exam requirements and the fulfillment of filial obligations should be taken into consideration in the culturally specific context (see Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). The interviewees in the study claimed that what they did in secondary schools were mostly exam-driven and traditional teaching methods, like grammar translation and audio-lingual methods, dominate the language classroom in Taiwan, as evidenced in the extant literature (Butler, 2011; Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Liu, 2007). It could be extrapolated that students did not engage in real-life, communicative and authentic interaction. It may explain why students did not perceive the direct relevance to learning English in expanding-circle countries (Kachru, 1992). Previous studies suggested that instrumental motivation could improve student learning; however, this study suggests that intrinsic motivation may arouse students' interest, corresponding to Dörnyei's (2005) suggestions.

Intrinsic motivation was suggested to be crucial to increasing student learning through continued effort, self-regulation, autonomy, inherent interest and curiosity of a given subject matter. The importance of time and energy devoted by the learner should be pinpointed. Because the study showed that for the EFL learners in Taiwan, they did not practice using English very often in secondary school inside and outside of the classroom. In addition, some of the students did not relate English to their everyday lives. Therefore, how to motivate students to learn through motivational learning strategies may open a door to lifelong learning even after graduation (e.g., Brown, 2007). It is maintained that in Taiwan where English is not commonly used, language learning opportunities could be maximized and more efforts could be made to incorporate intrinsically motivating activities into the classroom so that students may better appreciate the value of learning and understand the social functions in English (see Alcón-Soler, 2005).

5.3 Extrinsic Motivation on Learners' English Learning Experiences

Research has shown that in Asian countries, instrumental motivation orientation has been pervasive since the teaching and learning contexts in Asia lay a heavy emphasis on memorization and test-taking strategies for instrumental motivations such as job promotion, school application, social values on prestige and fame, accompanied by higher advancement of socio-economic status. For example, Taiwanese schools require students to pass the threshold of the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT) or other internationally recognized standardized tests, such as TOEIC, TOEFL, among others in the college English threshold. In Taiwan's English language teaching context, exam-oriented teaching played an important role in shaping L2 pragmatics instruction.

All the participants expressed their negative attitudes toward treating English as a subject or exam preparation at school; rather, they hoped to use the language and increase their chances of interacting with native speakers of English. The majority of the students favored the university teacher's use of English since hardly could they get immersed in an English-speaking environment in Taiwan. Since Taiwan is not an ESL environment where foreigners abound, students may not have ample chances or investment of time and money, which was similar to Ishihara's (2009) findings in the Japanese EFL context. In order to have more communicative feel of the target language, students wished to have more time to engage in-class language practices in class rather than drill-and-kill practices in the classroom, especially in secondary schools. In one study conducted by Chang, Chen and Warden (2005), they attempted to modify Dörnyei's (2005) idea of instrumental motivation orientation given that it could not fully explain the contextual factor that greatly influences the teaching and learning embedded with overemphasis on the social value upheld by Chinese-speaking people. The emphasis of exams often lead to an overreliance on

memorization, as evidenced in the media reports or the proliferation of cram schools attended by EFL learners whose parents expected their children to accomplish the socially accepted values (Tsai & Kuo, 2008), such as meeting filial obligations by gaining jobs, increasing prestige and climbing the corporate ladder for upward social movements (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). The wash-back effect, or teaching-to-the-test effect, has exerted a profound influence on the learning and teaching of English in Taiwan, as the interviewees mentioned: “English is for exams.”

It may not be entirely accurate from the participants’ verbal reports that English language teaching is all about tests given that self-reports may be partially biased and under-representative of the entire population. However, exam-oriented language teaching has become the norm rather than the exception, at least to the students in the study. This kind of wash-back did influence English teaching in secondary school, where the proclaimed pedagogical principles that emphasize learner autonomy and communicative approach are violated (LoCastro, 1997).

In Williams and Burden’s (1997) framework of L2 motivation, the results could be explained by both internal and external factors. First, the internal factors included the learners’ intrinsic interest of activity, curiosity or optimal degree of challenge. It seems that in secondary school the majority of students wished to enjoy learning English and to be immersed in an English-speaking environment. However, grammar, vocabulary and exam-focused teaching dominated the whole class. The goal of language learning and teaching is *for exams only*, which may make students bored, uninterested or even de-motivated to learn English as a subject. Second, some students considered their English proficiency to be weak, thus unable to carry on conversation and to undertake schoolwork. This feeling of incompetence or inability to meet teachers’ and parental expectations may make the participants helpless, lost or diffident (i.e. lack of self-efficacy). As mentioned before, the Chinese imperative may

be a collective experience for students in Chinese-speaking culture, such as getting good grades, entering a good university, obtaining a well-paid job, and leading a luxurious and comfortable life as one part of filial obligations, which could be adequately explained by the external factors mentioned by Williams and Burden's (1997) social constructivist model.

In their model, the significant others, such as parents, teachers and peers, may exert a profound influence on their thinking and conceptions about learning. Through interaction with the significant others, their learning experience may be loaded with such societal values and expectations to succeed in a competitive society, to avoid punishments and receive rewards if they fulfill such a stipulated requirement (e.g., the GEPT). In addition, the local educational system as well as cultural norms may interfere with student learning. Students expressed their preferred ways of learning English in a non-threatening environment and they hoped to enjoy learning with more interesting activities that could encourage learner autonomy and develop intrinsic interest in learning English. A case in point is the practical use of the target language, such as teaching and learning L2 pragmatics in the study (e.g., Brown, 2007). However, students generally seemed not satisfied with secondary school teachers' teaching and the educational system in Taiwan. As the students expressed, learning English is for exam preparation, especially grammar and vocabulary exercises. The classroom teacher (Yuan-Yuan) also felt the same way, adding that more efforts could be made to incorporate empirical pragmatics research findings into current classroom settings only if all acknowledge the importance of learning and teaching pragmatics, and that students should benefit from the balanced form-function instruction for improving their motivation and communication skills. The teacher shared with the researcher that she is quite willing to support the reform of current language teaching with a shifted focus on L2 pragmatics. As Ishihara (2009) advocated, a unanimous

consensus should be reached among professionals, researchers, and the authorities concerned, corresponding to Taguchi's (2011) appeal to incorporating L2 pragmatics into the mainstream curriculum. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, forming a cohesive school-university partnership can facilitate the professional development and growth of in-service teachers. Through the collaboration with the university resoures (professors and recent research output) current in-service teachers may better understand how to access the resources and apply what they learn into real practices. In retrun, the in-service teachers can offer research sites for researchers to disseminate research findings and contribute to an informed understanding of the combination of theory and practice

5.4 The Relationship between Intrinsic Motivation and Sociolinguistic Instruction

Intrinsic motivation plays a part in L2 pragmatics instruction. In Taiwan's language classrooms, students did not actively participate in class and they did not have too many opportunities to practice speaking. The lack of opportunities to practice English may limit students' chances to experience the joy of using English and lowering their motivation level. In the long term, students may be conditioned to learn English (Butler, 2011). Simply put, the investment of time and effort is still crucial to maintaining students' intrinsic motivation level. As Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) may argue, learners could be intrinsically motivated by setting a goal to fulfill their desires, wishes and hopes to reach the target, such as reading an English novel, watching a movie or understanding the lyrics of a song. Afterwards, they need to accomplish the task with an action plan and commitment. The initiation of the intention enactment could further motivate the learner to "cross the Rubicon" of action (Dörnyei, 2005). Later, the executive motivational influence served to modify or continue action, leading to an outcome, either terminating the action or achieving

the goal. Finally, more efforts need to be made to sustain the motivation and further planning is needed for progression.

Generally speaking, the learner's goals in secondary school could be twofold. First, students had to meet parents', teachers' and societal expectations and second they treated passing language proficiency exams and entering university as the ultimate goal for learning a language. Once they enter university, they may stop learning or may not deliberately study it. Therefore, it is not difficult to see students, after getting into university or reaching a certain level of English proficiency, not improve their English (i.e. fossilization) after college entrance examination in that students did not perceive any intrinsic value of improving their English proficiency. Students mentioned that the 12th grade may be the peak of their English ability because they crammed a plethora of words every day during the "exam season". They spent much time learning English to score well on their exams. However, according to the learners, they did not develop a genuine interest in learning English, and some did not find the joy of learning English. The intrinsic nature of motivation may better explain why students appreciated the university teacher's (Yuan-Yuan) instruction and her emphasis on meaning and communication rather than over-emphasis on forms. Students favored the communicative feel of using the target language and hoped to gain a genuine interest and develop a habit of self-regulation and learner autonomy.

In addition, they did find university English learning far more interesting than the one they received in high school, especially the aspects of L2 pragmatics. They displayed a keen interest in learning L2 pragmatics and hoped to have more hands-on practice to use the conversation strategies. Contrary to the teacher's expectations, she did not find students interested in learning the strategies judging by students' negligence of learning conversation strategies. Yuan-Yuan inferred that students did not feel motivated to learn it at all. As the teacher explained, "I think students were

not serious about learning L2 pragmatics because when I taught them, they seemed not interested and they were paltering with me." By paltering, it means that students did not pay attention to her L2 pragmatics instruction.

As Chung and Huang (2009) found out, their secondary school participants favored the use of the communicative practices and the learning of the functional use in the target language. However, no claims were made that teaching L2 pragmatics or culture could lead to positive motivation and acceptance. For example, students may find the learning of pragmatics irrelevant to their extrinsic needs for taking the exams in Taiwan (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). This study opens an array of avenues for future research to investigate the link between learners' motivation and L2 pragmatics in EFL contexts. This study suggests that teacher and student attitudes should be documented at length.

5.5 Teachers' and Students' Attitudes toward Sociolinguistic Instruction

In this study, Yuan-Yuan and the students recognized the importance of communicative competence, revealing positive attitudes toward sociolinguistic instruction. However, their attitude toward L2 pragmatics instruction was not subject to external influences. First, Yuan-Yuan held the attitude that students do not have ample chances to use English in EFL contexts. Second, both teacher and students need to deal with the issue of exam-oriented teaching with a heavy focus on grammar and memorization (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). Incongruence exists between what students want and what teachers give. Students hoped to receive pragmatics instruction given its intrinsic joy of using language in real life. After the secondary school exam-oriented teaching, students appeared inclined to learn English for practical, intrinsically motivating purposes. Although the classroom teacher, Yuan-Yuan, implemented her lesson quite differently from what students used to

receive in secondary school, students seemed to favor more communication activities in the textbook, echoing the study by Chung and Huang (2009). Students' expectations were more communication-oriented and less on forms. However, to Yuan-Yuan's surprise, she did not expect that students were interested in L2 pragmatics. Students seemed not enthusiastic about learning L2 pragmatics according to her understanding. After the interview, Yuan-Yuan was made aware that students expressed their needs for more L2 pragmatics instruction. Yuan-Yuan told the researcher that she was thankful to the researcher for recommending some teacher resources on L2 pragmatics to her (e.g., Ishihara & Cohen, 2010) because she expressed that she does not know the various activities and teaching techniques in teaching L2 pragmatics. Yuan-Yuan extended her gratitude to the researcher that she demonstrated a better sense of self-confidence in designing her lessons to develop students' communicative confidence.

What Yuan-Yuan believes, in fact, was mostly realized in her practice. However, there may be some inconsistencies regarding the dynamic nature of teacher and student motivation. Like the multilayered construct of motivation, beliefs may be subject to change due to the socio-cultural and contextual influx in a given speech community. Since classroom is full of learners with various personalities, characteristics, motivations, it may not be easy to realize one's teaching philosophies and put them into real practice. This may be a reason for explaining why teachers cannot teach what they hope to teach in the classroom. On the other hand, students may or may not want to receive exam-oriented teaching. Some students may want to pass exams and never learn English afterwards; some learners may be more willing to learn English and show a stronger motivation to understand the target language and its culture, possibly studying in America or other English-speaking countries in the future. It is believed in the study that understanding culture plays an important role in

language learning. Without an adequate understanding of the target language, cross-cultural misunderstandings may occur (Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Wolfson, 1989). In fact, learning the cultural aspect of the target language may be effective in improving learners' intrinsic motivation. From the pedagogical standpoint, if learners could benefit from both integrative and instrumental motivations, not only could students improve their learning, but they could continue to learn on their own.

In short, L2 pragmatics instruction could be explained by Williams and Burden's (1997) social constructivist motivation theory, which underscores the importance of context and time in a given social situation. Although the classroom teacher and the students both agreed that learning should be based on interactive, practical, and functional use of the target language, there are still some challenges that may impede the learning and teaching of L2 pragmatics. First, exam-oriented teaching is still dominant in secondary schools in Taiwan (Chang, 2009; Chen & Tsai, 2012). Most students in the study reported on their dissatisfaction of learning English for exams, discrediting the so-called instrumental motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985), or external regulation; rather, they favored learning English for authentic communication purposes in real-life, more integrative orientation motivation. Second, the collective experience of *Chinese Imperative* may be a crucial social factor that influences student and teacher conceptions of learning English for practical purposes (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). Students may perceive learning English to be equal to job promotions, career advancements or college entrance exams. Shaped by such a prevalent social value and attitude, teachers may consider the role of English to be a pragmatic means to achieve the desired goal: Students attend top-tier universities as a way to fulfill parental expectations and school administrative requirements. As for learning L2 pragmatics, it may become subsidiary compared to the practicality of learning English.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Summary of the Research Findings

To summarize, the research results showed that the effect of L2 pragmatics was primarily constrained by insufficient L2 pragmatics teaching, teacher's limited sociocultural understanding, and learners' low English proficiency, all of which may influence student and teacher motivations to teach and learn L2 pragmatics (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). Due to incorrect L1 transfer, learners' limited English proficiency, and negative L2 pragmatic failures (see Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Taguchi, 2011), cross-cultural misunderstandings and communication breakdowns may occur, which is in line with previous studies (Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Wolfson, 1989). In addition, some students may appear motivated to learn L2 pragmatics, to experience the intrinsic pleasure or joy of learning and to be assimilated into the target language culture (Williams & Burden, 1997) through the authentic, interactive and social use of the target language (Brown, 2001).

However, some students may exhibit temporary introjected motivation (see Deci & Ryan, 1985), i.e. learning English for meeting the requirements of graduation threshold or parental expectations. Thus, the student probably demonstrated some negative attitudes toward learning English. In addition, teachers' limited English proficiency and students' dissatisfaction with the teacher's profession may demotivate them to learn English.

On the other hand, the classroom teacher, Yuan-Yuan, perceived students as not interested in learning L2 pragmatics. Consequently, she did not focus too much on teaching pragmatics in the classroom; rather, she focused more on reading strategy and students' self-expression. Yet, this may not be in accordance with students'

expectations or learning needs regarding the motivation aspects of learning English, which refers to the pragmatic, interactive, and functional use of the target language (Brown, 2007). In addition, the textbook used in the classroom may not be designed systematically based on empirical studies, whereas it may be based on textbook writers' intuitions (Taguchi, 2011). It may constrain Yuan-Yuan's teaching. As Yuan-Yuan admitted, she did not have concrete ideas about how to design and diversify L2 pragmatics activities that could motivate students to learn L2 pragmatics.

Regarding teacher and student motivation, students expressed their intrinsic motivation to learn the interesting elements in English for authentic communication. Students generally regard learning English as an important means to real-life communication. Therefore, motivation was conceived to be a salient issue among the participants in this study. Closely associated with student and teacher motivation is exam-oriented teaching that exerts a profound influence on students' conceptions (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005). It may have demotivating effects on learning and teaching L2 pragmatics in EFL contexts.

6.2 Pedagogical Implications for EFL Teachers and Students

To teach L2 pragmatics effectively, the study yielded three important implications. First, the use of L1 in EFL classes suggests greater effectiveness in teaching students sociopragmatic conventions if students' language proficiency cannot enable them to understand and handle the complexities of the L2 cultural norms or conventions (see Taguchi, 2011). Occasional explanations in Chinese, i.e. students' mother language, may enhance their understanding of the cultural norms, so they may apply the communication strategies (see Dörnyei, 2005). Second, intrinsically motivating activities related to L2 pragmatics are suggested to be vital to the enhancement of student learning as research on intrinsic motivation (Deci &Ryan, 1985) has

corroborated the importance to maintain learner motivation (Brown, 2007; Dörnyei, 2005). In addition, L2 pragmatics teaching has been suggested to be related to the hidden cultural aspects of learning (i.e. integrative motivation), which has been shown to enhance students' intrinsic motivation and improve student learning (Moran, 2001). As the MOE in Taiwan has advocated the importance of multicultural understanding and global competence in the newly revised curriculum guidelines (MOE, 2009) by teaching culture, students are expected to appreciate the differences of various cultures (Banks & Banks, 2007). In addition, they can also engage in cultural experience (for the culture-teaching model, see Moran, 2001) and improve their understanding about various cultures (Samovar, Porter, & MacDaniel, 2010). Third, it has been indicated that learning and teaching should complement its assessment practices (Lee, 2008; Williams, 2001). It has been shown that current exams place a heavy emphasis on vocabulary and grammar. To strike a balance between language form and function, learners' communicative competence may be better developed (Canale & Swain, 1980). It is argued that intercultural communicative competence, involving the intercultural communication skills and abilities, should be enhanced in the current era of multiculturalism (Taguchi, 2011). It is also suggested that both top-down language teaching scheme and school administrative support are important to transform the current language teaching landscape into a more balanced language teaching in Taiwan. By changing the content of the tests, such as adding the L2 pragmatics and L2 listening elements to current English tests, i.e. *assessment for learning* (Williams, 2001), it is believed that the quality of current English teaching can improve.

6.3 Limitations of the Study

This study is not without limitations. Since this is only a case study; thus the

willing participants may not represent the entire population of the learning situation in Taiwan. However, it should be noted that no claims have been made that this qualitative study could make a generalized claim that the English language education in Taiwan does not emphasize L2 pragmatics instruction. However, it is a reasonable claim that L2 pragmatics already received little attention in university (see Ishihara, 2009; Yu, 2008), where teacher autonomy is highly granted to university instructors (Butler, 2011), let alone the sociolinguistic instruction in secondary schools where grammar and vocabulary exams are prevalent (Chang, 2009; Chen & Tsai, 2012). Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is to inform the current understanding of EFL teaching and learning practices and raise students' and teacher's awareness of the neglected dimension of L2 pragmatics to make changes to the landscape of English teaching in Taiwan.

6.4 Suggestions for Future Research

As suggested earlier in the Discussion Chapter, the direction for future research could be to address specific students' and teachers' needs of L2 pragmatics learning or to investigate the effect of L2 pragmatics training in L2 teachers' professional teacher development programs in Taiwan through school-university partnership (e.g., Ishihara, 2009). It is hoped that endeavors could be made to address students' increasingly diversified or special needs of learning L2 pragmatics and meanwhile to enhance teachers' professional growth and understanding on L2 pragmatics. As Taguchi (2011) suggested, efforts should be made to meet the needs of various students' English proficiency levels and goals to improve English education in the multicultural, multilingual, transcultural and glocalized society in Taiwan. Teachers and students need to continue to make a breakthrough not just in their linguistic repertoire on grammar and vocabulary but in their sociolinguistic and illocutionary competence.

References

Alcón-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System, 33*, 417-435.

Alcón-Soler, E. (2007). Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. In M. De Pilar Garcia Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 221-241). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Alcón-Soler, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Pragmatics in foreign language contexts. In E. Alcón Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing (pp. 3–21)*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 233-262.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State, Office of English Language Programs.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bell, (2011). Humor scholarship and TESOL: Applying findings and establishing a research agenda. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(1), 134-159.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Albex.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University.

Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(2), 219-238.

Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain in order to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 245-278.

Butler, Y. G. (2005). Comparative perspectives towards communicative activities among elementary school teachers in South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research, 9*, 423-446.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 36-57.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical aspects of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 27*, 45-75.

Chang, W. (2009). *Examining Taiwan English language policy*. Taipei: Crane Publishing.

Chen, J., Warden, C., & Chang, C. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(4), 609-633.

Chen, S., & Tsai, Y. (2012). Research on English teaching and learning: Taiwan (2004-2009). *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 180-201.

Choi, S. (2000). Teachers' beliefs about communicative language teaching and their classroom teaching practices. *English Teaching, 55*, 3-32.

Chung, I., & Huang, Y. (2009). The implementation of communicative language teaching: An investigation of students' viewpoints. *The Asia-Pacific*

Educational Researcher, 18, 67-78.

Clandinin, & Connely, (2000). *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *2*(3), 275–301.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). English teaching and learning in China. *Language Teaching*, *29*(2), 61-80.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel, *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp.196-219), England: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language (2nd ed)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2009). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language (2nd ed)*. Beijing: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E, & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum, New York.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd Eds.). Sage Publications.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press (FLTRP).

Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 4,* 43-69.

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *Asian EFL Journal, 7*(3), 9-24.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding*. Boston,

MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Frölich, M., Spada, N., & Allen, P. (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 19* (1), 27-56.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 675-710.

Hall, J. K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture*. London: Pearson Longman.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Zur Rolle der Kognition in Kommunikationskursen. *Die Neueren Sprachen, 80*, 42-55.

Hsieh, M. (2010). *Pre-service English teachers' beliefs of sociolinguistic instruction in communicative language teaching: The Cinderella in Taiwan's EFL classes*. Paper presented at the 27th International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the R.O.C., p. 153-163, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, May.

Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 15*(2), 93-105.

Ishihara, N. (2007). Web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness-raising approach. *Language Awareness, 16*, 21–40.

Ishihara, N. (2009). Teacher-based assessment for foreign language pragmatics. *TESOL Quarterly 43*(3), 415-470.

Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. London: Pearson Longman.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Jeon, E. H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic

development: A meta-analysis. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language teaching and learning* (pp. 165–211). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emergent beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 439-452.

Judd, E. (1999). Some issues in the teaching of pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 152–166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching, 25*, 1-14.

Kasper, G. 1997. *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In Spencer-Oatey *Culturally Speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp.316-341).

Kinginger, C., & Belz, J. (2005). Socio-cultural perspectives on pragmatic development in foreign language learning: Microgenetic case studies from telecollaboration and residence abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(4), 369-421.

Kirkpatrick, T. A. (1984). The role of communicative language teaching in secondary schools: With special reference to teaching in Singapore. In B. K. Das (Ed.), *Communicative language teaching* (pp. 171-191). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 59-81.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 69-85.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* Harlow, UK: Longman.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32* (4), 677-703.

Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: An intraview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(1), 55-79.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Liu, J. (2007). Critical period hypothesis retested: The effects of earlier English education in China. In J. Liu (Ed.), *English language teaching in China: New approaches, perspectives and standards* (pp. 170–191). London: Continuum International.

LoCastro, V. (1997). Politeness and pragmatic competence in foreign language education. *Language Teaching Research, 1*, 239–267.

Long, M. H. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hylstenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 77-99). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ministry of Education (MOE) (2009). *The revised nine-year integrated curriculum guidelines*.

Moran, P. (2001). *Teaching culture: Perspectives in practice*. Beijing: Cengage Learning.

Narita, R. (2012). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(1), 1-29.

Nelson, G. (1998). Intercultural communication and related courses taught in TESOL master's degree programs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*, 17–33.

Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal, 30*, 27-50.

Noels, K., Pelletier, L., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50*, 57-85.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. London: Pearson Longman.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 589-613.

Omaggio, A. C. (2001). *Teaching languages in contexts: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2008). *Thesis and dissertation writing in second language: A handbook for supervisors*. London: Routledge.

Pinto, D. (2011). Are Americans insincere? Interactional style and politeness in everyday America. *Journal of Politeness Research, 7*, 215-238.

Prabhu (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Prapaisit de Segovia, L., & Hardison, D. M. (2008). Implementing education reform: EFL teachers' perspectives. *ELT Journal, 63*, 154-162.

Renn, D. , & Iannuzzi, S.(2008). *Hemisphere 4*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, K. (2009). Trends in qualitative language teaching since 2000. *Language Teaching, 42*(2), 147-180.

Rose, K. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 167-180). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rose, K. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System, 33*, 385–399.

Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes: Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal, 58*, 155-163.

Samimy, K., & Kobayashi, C. (2004). Toward the development of intercultural communicative competence: Theoretical and pedagogical implications for Japanese English teachers. *JALT Journal, 26*, 245-261.

Samovar, L., Porter, R., & McDaniel, E. (2010). *Communication between cultures*. Boston: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.

Sarah, T. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(10), 837-851.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 59*(4), 339-341.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching, 36*, 1-14.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Takahashi, S. (2010a). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Handbook of pragmatics: Vol. VII* (pp. 391-421). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Takahashi, S. (2010b). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. In A. Martinez-Flor & E. Uso-Juan (Eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 127-144). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Takimoto, M. (2009). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners’ pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics, 30,* 1-25.

Takimoto, M. (2010). *Evaluating the effects of task repetition on learners’ recognition and production of second language pragmatic chunks*. Paper presented at the International Conference of Malaysian English Language Teaching Association, Selangor, Malaysia, June.

Taguchi, N. (2003). *Pragmatic performance in comprehension and production of English as a second language*. Unpublished Dissertation, Northern Arizona University.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching Pragmatics: Trends and Issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 289-310.

Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences and pragmatic competence*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tsai, C.C. & Kuo, P.C. (2008). Cram school students' conceptions of learning and learning science in Taiwan. *International Journal of Science Education, 30,* 351-373.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 29,* 271-360.

Vásquez, C. & Sharpless, D. (2009). The role of pragmatics in the master's TESOL curriculum: Findings from a nationwide survey. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(1), 5-28.

Walcott, H. F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Wen, Q. (2011). *Applied linguistics research methods and thesis writing*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press (FLTRP).

Williams, D. (2001). An overview of the relationship between assessment and the curriculum. In D. Scoot (Ed.), *Formative assessment: Improving learning secondary classroom* (pp. 165-181). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. University of Pennsylvania.

Xu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2009). Teacher assessment knowledge and practice: A narrative inquiry of a Chinese college EFL teacher's experience. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 493-513.

Yu, M. (2008). Teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills in university EFL classes in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 31-52.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Statement (Teachers)

Study Investigator: Ming-Hung Hsieh, MA-TESOL student

You are invited to participate in a research study about communication-oriented language teaching, with the purpose of illuminating the teaching context experienced by Taiwanese EFL university teachers and students. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to have three audio-recorded semi-structured interviews and fill in one background survey. Each interview will last approximately 1 hour. Since this is a qualitative case study, ten video-recorded classroom observations and classroom documents will be employed to collect rich data.

In the study, you may feel free to comment on your experience on teaching, learning, curriculum planning and material design and implementation, among others, all of which will be coded in pseudonyms. Thus, your identity will not be disclosed. The obtained data will be kept in the researcher's computer and be used for research purposes only, and will not be accessed by any other person without your permission.

Your participation in this study is truly valuable. You have the right to withdraw at any time and there will be no penalties.

Should you have any concerns about this study, you may contact Mr. Ming-Hung Hsieh, principal investigator via 0924048770, leo.mh.hsieh@gmail.com, National Cheng-chi University, Taipei, Taiwan.

I have read this consent from and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

_____ _____

Participant's signature date legal representative date

_____

Relationship to participant

I have explained this study to the above participant and have sought his/her understanding for informed consent.

Ming-Hung Hsieh 02/21/11

Researcher's signature date

Appendix B

Informed Consent Statement (Students)

Study Investigator: Ming-Hung Hsieh, MA-TESOL student

You are invited to participate in a research study about communication-oriented language teaching, with the purpose of illuminating the teaching context experienced by Taiwanese EFL university teachers and students. Since this is a qualitative case study, ten classroom observations will be audio-recorded and you will be asked to fill in one background survey to collect rich data.

Also, if you agree to participate in focus group interviews, you may feel free to comment on your prior and present experience on teacher's instruction, your own learning inside and outside of class, among others, all of which will be coded in pseudonyms. Thus, your identity will not be disclosed. The obtained data will be kept in the researcher's computer and be used for research purposes only, and will not be accessed by any other person without your permission.

Your participation in this study is of paramount importance. You have the right to withdraw at any time and there will be no penalties. Should you have any concerns about this study, you may contact Mr. Ming-Hung Hsieh, principal investigator via 0924048770, leo.mh.hsieh@gmail.com, National Cheng-chi University, Taipei, Taiwan.

☐ I have read this consent from carefully and agree to allow the researcher to observe the class and use the obtained data in his study.

☐ I am willing to participate in the focus group interviews.
Contact email: _____ Cell phone#: _____

_____ _____

Participant's signature date legal representative date

_____

Relationship to participant

I have explained this study to the above participant and have sought his/her understanding for informed consent.

Ming-Hung Hsieh 02/21/11

Researcher's signature date

Appendix C

Background survey (Teachers)

Dear participating teachers,

Thank you for participating in the study. This study aims to explore university teachers' and students' perceptions of communication-oriented language teaching and wishes to shed light on the English language teaching (ELT) and learning context in Taiwan. Your opinions are highly appreciated. There is no right or wrong answer in the study. Please answer the following questions according to your true feelings. The information given will be kept in confidentiality and will be used for research purposes only.

Mr. Ming-Hung Hsieh

Graduate student in MA-TESOL program in National Cheng-chi University

1. Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Concentration of studies/expertise _____
3. When and where did you start to teach English?
   _____
4. Years of teaching English (how long)
   _____
5. What is your aspiration for the field of English language teaching (ELT)?
   _____
   _____
   _____
6. In terms of teaching students the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing),
   A. Which skill do you tend to emphasize the most?
      _____
   B. What may be the reasons for doing so? (Please give details.)
      _____
7. Could you describe the most memorable English class conducted by you before?
   _____
   _____
8. Could you talk about your teaching philosophy or belief about teaching and learning English in Taiwan?
   _____
   _____
   _____

Appendix D

Background survey (Students)

Dear participating students,

Thank you for participating in the study. This study aims to explore university teachers' and students' perceptions of communication-oriented language teaching and wishes to shed light on the English language teaching (ELT) and learning context in Taiwan. Your opinions are highly appreciated. There is no right or wrong answer in the study. Please answer the following questions according to your true feelings. The information given will be kept in confidentiality and will be used for research purposes only.

Mr. Ming-Hung Hsieh

Graduate student in MA-TESOL program in National Cheng-chi University

1. Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Field of study (major) _____
3. When and where did you start to learn English?

   _____
4. Years of learning English (how long) _____
5. Proficiency level

   Self-rated language proficiency

   ☐ very good ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor ☐ very poor

   I passed such language exams as (Please check the box if you took the tests below.)

   ☐ TOEFL (Score:) ☐ TOEIC (Score:) ☐ IELTS (Score:)

   ☐ GEPT (Level: _____) ☐ Others: _____ (Multiple choices)
6. In terms of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing),

   Which skill do you want to improve the most? _____

   Why do you want to improve the given skill? (Please give details.)

   _____
7. Besides learning English in school, how did/do you learn English outside of school?

   _____
8. Language learning histories (learning experience)

   What was your most unforgettable English learning experience in the past?

   _____

   How do you feel about learning English in Freshman English Class?

   _____

Appendix E

Interview Guide (teachers)

Opening:

Thank you for participating in the study. This study aims to explore EFL university teachers' and students' perceptions of communication-oriented language teaching in Taiwan. Your participation is highly appreciated and your recorded data will be used for research purposes only and stored in the researcher's computer. Pseudonyms will be used in the report of the research results; therefore, your confidentiality will be kept. Please feel free to express your opinion and answer questions to the best of your knowledge. There is no right or wrong answer to each question asked.

During or after the interview, if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to ask the researcher for further clarification. There will be three interviews in total. Each interview will last 1 hour. Before we begin the interview, I would like to know whether you understand the instructions. If not, shall we begin our interview?

There will be three major parts in the interview: (1) demographic/background information, (2) prior teaching experience, and (3) motivation of teaching L2 pragmatics in Taiwan.

Topic Domain 1: Demographic/Background information

1. I know that you graduated from XYZ, and your expertise is on XYZ. Since I am not familiar with your training background,
   A. Could you talk about your studies in master program first? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
   B. What about Ph.D degree program? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
   C. There seem to be some differences between the two programs. What major differences did/do you perceive between Master degree and Ph.D degree?
   D. Are you finding _____ a different experience from what you expected? Would you like to elaborate? I am very interested in what you said about _____.
   E. Courses taken in MA/doctoral programs:
      i. It seems to me that you benefited/learned from _____. Could you tell me what the most unforgettable thing ever happened to you during the course of study?
      ii. If possible, would you describe what you think the ideal training program would be like? Could you tell me the reasons?
      iii. Which course has the most influential impact on your learning? Suppose it were

my first day in the class. What would it be like?

iv. In general, how did you feel about the course training in the program? Could you talk about it in detail?

Is there anything that you would like to add? Thank you. In brief, you talked about your learning in MA and doctoral program and share your course-taking experience. In addition, you shared your feelings about _____ and suggested _____ to improve the course.

Topic Domain 2: Prior teaching experience

2. I now have a better understanding of your training in MA and PhD programs. Yet, I would like to know about your teaching experience as well. Could you tell me:
   A. How long have you been teaching English? Since when?
   B. What motivated you to begin your teaching career? Suppose I were your student, what did you teach? How?
   C. In your opinion, what was your relationship between you and your students before? What may be the factors that resulted in such a relationship? What about now?
   D. It seems to me that you feel/find ___ power relationship more comfortable. I am interested in _____. Tell me more about your reasons.
   E. Some people say that in the classroom teachers tend to talk more than students. What is your opinion on such a statement? Give me an example of one recent teaching event between you and students.
3. Classroom activity:

Since I only observed your class ONLY one time last semester, I am not familiar with the typical classroom activities. Thus,

   A. Could you paint me a picture about a typical day in your class from the beginning till the end?
   B. What are the typical activities used in your class? Could you elaborate on that?
   C. I know that you may ask students to have pair/group work to facilitate interaction. How did you usually do to tell students to engage in interaction?
   D. To my understanding, your Freshman English class focuses on communication and critical thinking skills. Could you talk about your ideas on fostering students' communication skills? What role does it play in students' learning?
   E. How about critical thinking skills?
   F. In terms of the four skills, what do you tend to emphasize the most/least? Could you talk more about it?
   G. It seems to me that you tend to integrate the four skills (combination of skills).

Could you tell me your reasons? Tell me a time when you taught students to use the four skills.

H. *Hemisphere* is the required teaching material you used. Since I am not familiar with the material, could you talk about it?
I. What supplementary external materials did you use? Could you talk about it?
J. What is/are the purpose(s) of the materials you use? How do you feel about the materials you used?
K. What did/do you perceive students' reactions toward the materials?

Thank you. In brief, you talked about your teaching experience and relationship with your students (teacher role and student role). Also, you shared your experience on conducting classroom activities with an emphasis on communication and critical thinking skills. In addition, you talked about your use of the required textbook and students' _____ reactions/attitudes toward the materials. Now, I would like to know more about the language used in your class.

4. Classroom language
   A. To what extent is the target language (English) used? What factors/conditions do you consider when choosing the target language instead of students' first language?
   B. What are the goals/expectations that you aim to reach through using English to communicate?
   C. Some people say that English-mediated instruction may not be helpful for students with low proficiency level. What is your opinion of it? Give me an example of your reason(s).
   D. Suppose I were your student, I did not know how to express my ideas in English. What would you usually do to help such a student with limited English proficiency?
   E. Some people contend that English has become an important international language for communication. In your opinion, what role does English play in students' lives?
   F. Due to globalization and internationalization, communication between cultures (intercultural communication) has become frequent. What do you think about the use of English during intercultural encounters? Could you elaborate on how you teach students to manage interaction with foreigners?

In short, we have talked a lot about the typical classroom activities you used and the role of English in students' lives and intercultural communication. You also mentioned

such things as A and B. Do you want to add more to _____?

Domain 3: Motivation of Teaching and Learning L2 Pragmatics in Taiwan

5. Thus far, you shared your educational experience and teaching experience in Taiwan. Now, I would like to explore your views on the educational environment in Taiwan.
   A. To the best of your understanding, when you started to learn English, how did your English teachers teach you under what circumstances?
   B. What current changes of English teaching have you perceived?
   C. What problems do you think of about the status quo/current situation in Taiwan's English language teaching (ELT)?
   D. It is a known fact that private language institutions abound in Taiwan. What do you feel about them? Give me an example of _____.
   E. Some people say that nowadays students' learning attitudes are not proactive (lack of learner autonomy). What is your opinion about it?
   F. Regarding students' English learning attitudes/motivations you have observed, what factors do you think the English-learning environment in Taiwan that may affect their attitudes toward learning English? Could you say more about that, say learning L2 pragmatics?
   G. Since you mentioned culture may have an impact on students' attitudes. Someone says that language and culture are intricately interwoven.
      I. What do you think about L2 pragmatics in students' learning?
      II. What about their attitudes toward learning L2 pragmatics?
      III. How do you feel about teaching L2 pragmatics in Taiwan? Could you give me an example of teaching L2 pragmatics?
      IV. Have you encountered any difficulties in teaching L2 pragmatics?
   H. Scholars have pointed out that L2 pragmatics is difficult to carry out. What is your opinion on that?
   I. What is your ideal condition of teaching L2 pragmatics in Taiwan?

In brief, you believe that _____ and students may _____. To you, the learning of culture may be _____ and there may be some difficulties for you to teach culture. Is there anything that you want to add to your ideas?

Closing remarks:

This is the end of the first interview. Thank you for participating in the study. Your opinions are of great value to the on-going study. This recorded interview will be transcribed verbatim. If quotes are to be used in the study, I will send them to you with a short summary about the content of the quotes via email. Should you have any concern

about the use of the interview, please feel free to contact me. Pseudonyms will be used and your information will be kept in confidentiality. Therefore, do not worry about the fact that your identity will be revealed. If additional/new questions emerge, the second interview will continue to explore them in greater depth. Thank you and have a nice day.

Appendix F

Focus Group Interview guide (Students)

Opening

Thank you for participating in the study. This study aims to explore EFL university teachers' and students' perceptions of communication-oriented language teaching in Taiwan. Your participation is highly appreciated and your recorded data will be used for research purposes only and stored in the researcher's computer. Pseudonyms will be used in the report of the research results; therefore, your confidentiality will be kept. Please feel free to express your opinion and answer questions to the best of your knowledge. Remember: there is no right or wrong answer to each question asked. Since this is a focus group interview; thus, I hope everyone has an equal chance to say what you think. You may feel free to add any ideas or take a different stance.

During or after the interview, if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to ask the researcher for further clarification. The focus group interview will last roughly 2 hours. Before we begin the interview, I would like to know whether you understand the instructions/rules. If not, shall we begin our interview?

My name is XYZ. I am conducting a study on teachers' and students' perceptions of university communication-oriented language teaching. There will be two major parts in the interview: (1) educational Experience from elementary school to high school, (2) prior learning Experience in university, and (3) your reflections on the classroom events in your class.

Topic domain 1: Educational Experience from elementary school to high school

1. Since I am not totally familiar with everyone. Could you take turns introducing yourselves? Thank you.
   A. Could you talk about your studies in elementary/middle school/cram school? What did you learn from your English class (middle school)? Could you give me more details on that?
   B. How much time did you spend learning English a day?
   C. What did learning English mean to you?
   D. Since you mentioned XYZ, what about listening? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
   E. Since you mentioned XYZ, what about speaking? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
   F. Since you mentioned XYZ, what about reading? What did you learn from

_____? Could you give me more details on that?

G. Since you mentioned XYZ, what about writing? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?

H. Does anyone have a different experience on XYZ? Would you like to elaborate? I am very interested in what you said about _____.

I. Focus-on-form courses (vocabulary/grammar/pronunciation):
What about vocabulary? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
What about grammar? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?
What about pronunciation? What did you learn from _____? Could you give me more details on that?

2. Classroom language
What language did your middle school English teachers use in English class? How do you feel about _____?

3. It seems to me that you benefited/learned from _____. Could you tell me what the most unforgettable thing ever happened to you during the course of study?
   A. If possible, would you describe what you think the ideal English class would be like? Could you tell me the reasons? What about others?
   B. Which course has the most influential impact on your learning? Suppose it were my first day in the class. What would it be like?
4. In general, how did you feel about the English class in your school? Could you talk about it in detail? What about others?
5. Does anyone have similar/different experience on XYZ? You may feel free to respond to each one's remarks.

Thank you. In brief, you talked about your learning in childhood/middle school/high school and indicated the similarities/differences of your ideal English course. In addition, you shared your feelings about _____ and suggested _____ to improve the course.

Topic domain 2: Prior learning experience in university

6. Now, I have a better understanding of your educational experiences. Yet, I would like to know more about your learning experience as well. Could you tell me:
   A. In your opinion, what was your relationship between you and your teachers? What may be the factors that resulted in such a relationship? What about now?
   B. It seems to me that you feel/find ____ relationship more comfortable. I am

interested in _____. Tell me more about your reasons. What about others?

C. Some people say that in the classroom teachers tend to talk more than students. What is your opinion on that? Give me an example of one recent teaching event between you and teachers.

7. Classroom activity:

Since I only observed your class _____times, I am not totally familiar with the typical classroom activities. Thus,

I. Could you paint me a picture about a typical day in your class from the beginning till the end?

II. What are the typical activities used in your class? Could you elaborate on that?

III. I know that your teacher may ask you to have pair/group work to facilitate interaction. What do you usually in group discussion?

IV. To my understanding, your Freshman English class focuses on communication and critical thinking skills. Could you talk about your ideas on developing communication skills? What role does it play in your learning? Any other ideas?

V. How about critical thinking skills? What do you think about it?

VI. In terms of listening, speaking, reading and writing, what do you tend to emphasize the most/least? Could you talk more about it?

VII. *Hemisphere* is the required teaching material you use. Could you talk about your feelings of using the material? Does anyone have different opinions?

VIII. What supplementary external materials did you use outside the class? Could you talk about it?

IX. Some people contend that English has become an important international language for communication. In your opinion, what role does English play in your lives?

8. Cultural aspects in language learning:

Due to globalization and internationalization, communication between cultures (intercultural communication) has become frequent. Thus,

A. What do you think about the use of English during intercultural encounters?

B. Could you elaborate on how your teachers taught you to manage interaction with foreigners?

C. Could you tell me about a recent event on your teacher taught you issues on culture?

Thank you. In brief, you talked about your learning experience and relationship with your teachers (teacher role and student role). Also, you shared your experience on participating in classroom activities with an emphasis on communication and critical thinking skills. In addition, you talked about your use of the required textbook and your

_____ reactions/attitudes toward the materials and your ____ values on culture.

Topic Domain 3: Reflections on the teaching events in Freshman English class

9. Look at the video clip. What was the activity for?
   A. How did you feel about the activity?
   B. In your opinion, to what extent do you think you tend to participate in classroom discussion? Why?
10. Look at the video again. Did you see any difference between A and B? What may cause such a difference?
11. Your teacher taught you about the language function _____. How do you think about it?

Closing

This is the end of the first interview. Thank you for participating in the study. Your opinions are of great value to the on-going study. This recorded interview will be transcribed verbatim. If quotes are to be used in the study, I will send them to you with a short summary about the content of the quotes via email. Should you have any concern about the use of the interview, please feel free to contact me. Pseudonyms will be used and your information will be kept in confidentiality. Therefore, do not worry about the fact that your identity will be revealed. If additional/new questions emerge, follow-up interviews will continue to explore them in greater depth. Thank you and have a nice day.

Curriculum Vitae

NAME	Ming-Hung Hsieh (b. 8/ 8/ 1987)
EDUCATION	M.A. in English, June 2012 National Chengchi University Taiwan, R. O. C. B.A. in Applied Linguistics and Language Study, June, 2009 Chung Yuan Christian University Taiwan, R. O. C.
WORK HISTORY	Pre-service English Teacher, July 2012 Muzha Junior High School Taiwan, R. O. C. Pre-service English Teacher, June 2008 Chung Yuan Elementary School Taiwan, R. O. C.