線上電影短片教學對高職學生語用能力發展之效用

The Effects of Online Video-based Instruction on Vocational High School Students' Pragmatic Competence Development

研究生:朱美華

Graduate Student: Mei-Hua Chu

指導教授： 劉美惠 博士

Advisor: Dr: Mei-Hui Liu

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature of

Tunghai University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS in

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY

May 2015

中 華 民 國 一 百 零 四 年 五 月

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing this thesis was a great challenge to me. Without many people's support and encouragement, this thesis would not have been completed smoothly.

First and foremost, I would like to express my grateful and sincere appreciation to my indebted advisor, Dr. Mei-Hui Liu. Dr. Liu always sacrificed her valuable time to help me solve problems during the research process. She contributes her expertise, knowledge and advice to foster my ability in deepening my understanding of academic writing and research. With her patience, understanding, and guidance, I have the courage to accomplish this painstaking but worthwhile journey.

Second, I am fortunate to have Dr. Chuan-Hsiu Hung and Dr. Hsin-I Chen as my committee members. They not only spend their precious time reading this thesis but also offer insightful and constructive suggestions to improve it. I am grateful for Dr. Hung coming from Yunlin to provide valuable advice in my proposal and thesis defenses, particularly with regard to the survey of online video pragmatic instruction. In addition, I am thankful for Dr. Chen who come from Kaohsiung to participate in my thesis defenses. Her useful suggestions enriched the content of my thesis.

Third, my sincere gratitude goes to all the professors in M. A. program and teachers in NYAI Vocational High School (NYAI). My special gratitude goes to Dr. Annie Yu who enlightened me on both the education knowledge and attitude toward the

difficulty. Her wise words help me go through the bottom of my life. I am also grateful for Dr. Chia-Hui Chiu, and Jung-Han Chen who carefully read my DCT questionnaires and offered constructive suggestions. I am very much obliged to their kind assistance. Moreover, my appreciation also goes to teachers in NYAI Vocational High School who allowed me to recruit their students as my participants. They both help me deal with the time schedule and gave me a lot of supports. Because of them, my experiment could be accomplished successfully.

Fourth, my heartfelt gratefulness is expressed to my supportive friends and classmates (Mayjy Chung, Yi-Xuan Chou, Yi-Jun Chen, Vesta Weng, Maggie Tien , Vickie Tsai, Silvia Lin) and my foreign friends (Richard Bean, and Jonathan Hayes). I want to thank for Vesta who always companies me and help me find the solution whenever I had difficulties. Thanks to Mayjy, Yi-Xuan, Yi-Jun and Maggie, their support and encouragement gave me confidence to continue my study. Additionally, Richard and Jonathan were so kind as to help me revise and edit my draft. Furthermore, I would like to express my gratefulness to all my professors, the program secretary, and classmates. I would never forget the assistance and encouragement that I received from them during the graduate school years.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my dearest family. Without their tolerance and support, I would not have the determination to go through the hardship and

challenges I faced, and finished this study in these four years. Hence, I would like to

share my accomplishment with all of them.

線上電影短片教學對高職學生語用能力發展之效用

中文摘要

隨著科技的普及和廣泛運用，許多研究者已經開始研究如何將線上影片運用於語言教育之中。然而，在以英語為外國語言之學術領域中，鮮少有探討語用學之相關教學研究。為彌補此文獻不足之處，本論文意欲探討觀賞英語短片對英語學習者的語用能力發展之效用。其中本研究旨在探討以下三個面向， 包括(1)觀賞英語短片對於英語學習者語用能力發展之效果，(2)英語學習者對於觀賞線上英語短片之學習態度，(3)英語學習者對於線上英語短片教學是否有助於學生增進其語用能力之想法。

在此為期 10 週的研究中，受試者共有 78 位，他們是中台灣某所高職的兩班不同科別之一年級學生，在此研究中分別被分派於實驗組及控制組。兩組學生都先接受如何使用英語請求和拒絕的明示教學法（Explicit Instruction）；之後，實驗組學生透過觀賞線上英語短片以學習請求和拒絕的用法。相反的，控制組學生則是以研讀影片的英語腳本，再完成學習單上有關請求與拒絕的練習題目。

本研究資料蒐集來源分別為言談情境填充問卷(Discourse Completion Task)及學生學習經驗調查問卷。實驗組及控制組的學生在接受不同實驗的前一週及接受實驗的後一週，均接受言談情境填充問卷(DCT)的測驗。而實驗組學生

在接受實驗完的後一週，還需填寫學生學習經驗調查問卷。在資料分析上，本研究採用描述性統計及獨立樣本 T 檢定來分析所收集之資料。而如此做的目的為：(1)探討實驗組受試者在接受線上英語短片教學後在請求以及拒絕的語用能力上是否比控制組受試者有明顯進步。(2)了解實驗組受試者針對觀賞線上英語短片是否能增進其語用能力之想法。

研究結果顯示,若與紙本教學相較，線上英文短片教學對學生語用能力發展有顯著成效。由 DCT 後測的分析結果顯示，實驗組學生的後測結果勝於控制組學生(t =3.02, p =0.04< .05 請求的言語行為；t =3.49, p = 0.001<.05 拒絕的言語行為)。 而根據學生學習經驗調查問卷的結果顯示，實驗組受試者很肯定輔以線上英語短片作為增進其語用能力之教學方法。實驗組受試者肯定的表示在未來的語言學習上他們希望能繼續使用線上英語短片。除此之外，實驗組的學生更進一步對英語短片的語用教學上提供了幾項建議,包括教師能提供更多的支持,學生須足夠的練習，影片的內容選擇以及增加字幕等。依據本研究的發現及研究設計限制,英語教學的教師及未來的研究者在探討英語為外國語言的語用學學習上可參考本研究的語用學教學方法、建議、以及所面臨的限制。

關鍵字： 語用學教學；線上英文短片；語用能力；英語教育

The Effects of Online Video-based Instruction on Vocational High School

Students' Pragmatic Competence Development

ABSTRACT

With the prevalence and availability of technology, researchers have studied the efficiency of employing online videos in language education. Yet, a scarcity of studies have specifically focused on pragmatic instruction in the English as foreign language (EFL) field. To fill this literature gap, this study aims to investigate the effects of the online pragmatic video clip viewing on EFL learners' pragmatic competence development. Three aspects are mainly focused in this study, including 1) the effects of online video clip viewing on EFL learners' pragmatic competence development, 2) learner's learning perspectives toward online pragmatic video clip viewing, and 3) learners' perspectives toward online video clip instruction on EFL learners' pragmatic competence development.

The participants in this study were 78 grade-10 students at a vocational high school located in central Taiwan. The participants were recruited from two classes of students with different majors (i.e., Architecture and Horticulture). According to learners' willingness and teachers' recommendation, the Architecture class was placed in the experimental group (EG, N=37) and the Horticulture class in the control group

(CG, N=41). Both groups first received explicit pragmatic instruction regarding how to make requests and refusals in English. Afterwards, the experimental group was exposed to learning activities via online pragmatic video viewing while the control group was requested to study video transcripts and complete worksheet activities.

Data collection methods included a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire and a Student Learning Experience Survey. The DCT task was conducted as the pretest and posttest before and after both groups received different instructional treatments. This set of data were analyzed by software package SPSS 17.0 for Windows, including descriptive analysis and independent *t*-test analysis with an aim to investigate if there is any significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of the development of their pragmatic competence in make requests and refusals in English. Furthermore, descriptive statistics analysis was employed to analyze the data collected from Student Learning Experience Survey to gain the participating EFL learners' perspectives toward the effects of pragmatic video clips viewing on developing their pragmatic competence.

The results showed that online video-based instruction had a significant effect on EFL learners' pragmatic competence development, in comparison with the paper-based instruction conducted in the CG group. After receiving video-based instruction for eight weeks, the EG learners had improved their pragmatic competence

in making requests and refusals. The analysis of leaners' posttest DCT questionnaire revealed that the EG learners outperformed the CG learners in the judgment of pragmatic appropriateness ($t =3.02$, $p =0.04< .05$ in the request speech act; $t =3.49$, $p = 0.001<.05$ in the refusal speech act). In addition, participants in the EG responded positively to the Student Learning Experience Survey. Data analysis revealed that this group of learners highly accepted the application of the online video clips in their pragmatic learning process, and they had positive attitude toward using video viewing in their future learning. Moreover, the EG learners offered several suggestions to the online video-based instruction, including more supports from instructors, frequency of practices, appropriate selection of video clips, and inclusion of video subtitles. Finally, based on the findings and limitations of this study, pedagogical implications and research suggestions are offered to language teachers and educational researchers for further investigation on EFL pragmatics learning and teaching.

Keywords: pragmatic instruction; online pragmatic videos; pragmatic competence; English language education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers an overview about this study and is divided into five sections. Five sections are covered, including the background and motivation of current study, purpose of this study, research questions, significance of the present study, and definition of terms.

Background and Motivation of the Study

Communicative competence (CC) in English plays an important role for language learners to have a benign relationship in today's multicultural society, since English has been regarded as an international language (Crystal, 2009). Without appropriate communication, learners are likely to cause misunderstandings, which may be perceived as rude or even offend the interlocutors. Communication, as Canale (1983) defined, is "the exchange and negotiation of information between at least two individuals through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, oral and written/visual modes, and production and comprehension processes" (p. 4). Among various models of communicative competence, pragmatic competence plays a central role to rationally determine second or foreign language learners' ability to communicate appropriately in target language (Bachman & Palmers, 1996; Eslami-Resekh & Eslami-Resekh, 2008).

In the past two decades, researchers have begun to examine major issues in interlanguage pragmatic phenomena which are related to ESL/EFL learners' pragmatic competence development. Initially, some studies investigated interlanguage pragmatics from second language learners' perspectives. For example, Kasper and Blum-Kull (1993) regarded pragmatics as "the study of the nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language" (p. 3). For second language learners, two decisive components in language learners' proficiency are evaluated, including 1) to conduct target language functions well, and 2) to employ social factors appropriately in real-time communication (Taguchi, 2011).

Additionally, a group of studies have highlighted the significance of appropriateness in pragmatic performance. Findings in these studies have shown that high-level ESL/EFL learners may still fail in a real-life communication for the lack of appropriate expressions (Amaya, 2008; Bardovi-Harlig & Harford, 1990; Li, 2011; Liu, 2010). The error of appropriateness in a conversation, termed pragmatic failure, has been investigated by number of studies (He, 1988; Leech, 1983; Li, 2011; Thomas, 1983; Zheng & Huang, 2010). Instead of words and grammar used, He (1988) expressed that infelicitous style, incompatible expressions and improper habit are the main aspects that cause pragmatic failure in a conversation.

Finally, pragmatic transfer is another central issue explored in interlanguage pragmatic field. Language learners tend to transfer their L1 pragmatic knowledge into target language use (Aydin & Koch, 2012). Thus, with an aim to improve ESL/EFL learners' pragmatic competence, teachability of pragmatic competence has gained its greater attention in the interlanguage pragmatic field.

In Taiwan, however, the cultivation of students' pragmatic competence and knowledge has long been neglected in English education (Chen, 2009; Yu, 2008), even though the National Curriculum for grades 1-9 guidelines clearly specify students' basic communicative competence as one of the curriculum goals of English education (Ministry of Education, 2003). Investigating English education in Taiwan, researchers have found that exam-oriented teaching negatively affects motivation in learning and teaching L2 pragmatics in EFL contexts (Chen, Warden, & Chang, 2005).

It seems that Taiwanese EFL learners' difficulties in developing pragmatic competence have been linked to several factors. According to Hsieh (2012), several challenges are in relation to the language education policies or teacher education system in Taiwan, such as 1) insufficient pragmatic information in textbooks, 2) insufficient hours of English instruction resulting in limited pragmatic instruction, and 3) lack of pragmatic instruction training on language teachers. Without enough pragmatic instruction and input, ESL/EFL learners are not able to become a competent L2 user,

even though they have grammatically perfect sentence, as echoed in the results of several studies (Eslami, Eslami, & Fatahi, 2004; Falasi, 2007; Mirzaei & Fsmaeili, 2013). That is, even advanced L2/EFL learners who could have excellent pronunciation and produce accurate complex sentences may apply language inappropriately and undergo pragmatic failures.

Previous instructional studies have shown that applying pragmatic instruction and authentic input may facilitate learners to become more pragmatically appropriate in real-life communication (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Schmidt (1993) stressed that simply exposure to the target language environment is not enough for ESL/EFL learners to raise awareness of the appropriateness in sociopragmatic usage and develop pragmatic competence. Moreover, pragmatics is teachable in ESL/EFL language classes, such as interpreting utterances in context, or interlocutors' relationship (Rose, 2005). Considering the difficulties of providing authentic pragmatic input in ESL/EFL instructional contexts, a school of researchers have investigated the value of employing video sequences as learning material to introduce pragmatics into language classes (Martínez- Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010). Ishida (2009) expressed that through video or audio materials, learners have opportunities in paying attention to the target pragmatic features and sociolinguistic variables of particular speech events.

Recently, with the development of the Internet technology, online video clips have been recommended to replace traditional video learning materials to involve language learners in a self-directed and autonomous learning environment (Cohen, 2007; Sykes, 2008). Cohen (2005) expressed that "online material can be used either as a supplementary or major part of regular language course or as a tool for completely self-guided learning" (p. 5). Though several researchers claimed that applying online material can facilitate ESL/EFL learners' pragmatic competence development (Cohen, 2007; Ishihara, & Cohen, 2010; Sykes, 2008), limited studies have investigated the effect of combining pragmatic video viewing with pragmatic instructions in a classroom context. To fill in the literature gap, the current study aims to apply online video clips as authentic learning materials to explore whether EFL learners can improve their pragmatic competence development via online video-based instruction.

Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions

The present study aims to investigate the effect of online video-based instruction on EFL learners 'pragmatic competence development. This investigation in particular is concerned with the participants' pragmatic competence development, the participants' perspectives toward the online video clip viewing, and the participants' perspectives toward the online video-based instruction. Based on the research purposes, this study addresses the following questions:

1. Are there any significant differences in vocational high school (VHS) EFL students' pragmatic competence between those who engage in the online video pragmatics viewing and those who do not?

2. What are the participants' perspectives towards the online video clips viewing in pragmatic learning?

3. What are the participants' perspectives towards the video-based pragmatic instructions?

Significance of the Study

The present study is significant in terms of the research and pedagogical aspects. In this research field, this study examines the use of online video clips as an authentic input material that has been seldom explored in the literature. In addition, the findings of this research may highlight the role of websites in making pragmatic materials accessible to ESL/EFL learners. Moreover, the findings in this current study adds additional evidence to the current literature which continues to document the potential of integrating pragmatics instruction into EFL/ESL education, and the challenges to be encountered by the students as well.

As to the pedagogical field, the findings of this study offer classroom instructors alternative ways to implement online pragmatic instruction. Curriculum designers could broaden their perspectives by including pragmatic features and speech act

strategies in the textbooks or learning materials. Furthermore, book publishers might consider the possibility of providing pragmatic online clips for both instructors and ESL/EFL learners to have selective authentic material to facilitate them in language instruction and self-education on pragmatics.

Definition of the terms

1. *Pragmatics*

Pragmatics is defined as the study of communicative action in its socio-cultural context (Kasper & Rose, 2001). According to Kasper (1997, 2000), pragmatics is the study of how an utterance uses language in social interaction and its influence on the interlocutors in the communication. Moreover, Crystal (1997) expressed that pragmatics is "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication (p. 301). This study adapts Crystal's concept and investigates the possibility of EFL learners' pragmatic competence development through pragmatic instruction and online video clips viewing.

2. *Pragmatic Competence*

Pragmatic competence is defined as "knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out" (Kasper 1997a, p. 2). In addition, it is regarded as "the competence

in conveying and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force" (Celce- Murcia et al. 1995, p. 17). According to Bachman (1990), illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence were two subcategories incorporated into pragmatic competence. Illocutionary competence refers to interlocutor's ability to deliver speech acts and the functions of the speech. In addition, sociopragmatic competence refers to interlocutors' assessment of the context where such resources are completed. In this current study, sociopragmtic competence is the main concern to investigate Vocational Senior High Students' (VHS) appropriateness in speech act usage.

3. *Speech Acts*

A speech act is an utterance serving as a functional unit in communication (Searle, 1969). To perform speech act, one demands the knowledge and appropriateness in the culture of using the target language (Miller, 2008). In the current study, request and refusal speech act are mainly focused.

4. *Video Clips for Pragmatic Instruction*

Videos providing rich contextual cures for language learners have long been applied and advocated in pragmatic education for decades (Vellenga, 2008). According to Stempleksi and Tomalin (1990), videotapes contain contextual information,

including interlocutors' relationship, posture, gesture, clothing, as well as settings to language usage. All of them contribute to appropriateness in interlocutor's conversation and are very important to ESL/EFL learners. Ishida (2009) stated that learners are likely to be aware of the pragmatic features and sociopragmatic variables of specific speech aspects (such as settings, participants' relationships) through video or audio viewing or listening. This study presents the variations in context and social factors contained in video clips to investigate the possibility of enhancing EFL learners' pragmatic competence development through online video clips viewing.

5. Online Video Clips in Pragmatic Instruction

The online clip is one of the materials that provides a variable environment for learners to develop pragmatic competence (Sykes & Cohen, 2008). According to Muniandy and Veloo (2011), online video is "a norm among the web surfers as it had become a platform for the Internet users often known as Net Gens to share and upload their video creations" (p. 225). In this study, the researcher applies videos extracted from eight popular movies which presenting the sociopragmatic features (e.g., situation in each conversation, social power, social distance and imposition) to the participating students on YouTube.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, some related literatures have been reviewed to understand theoretical and empirical bases of the study. First, the theory of pragmatics, pragmatic competence, and speech act are described. Second, the teachability of pragmatic competence is reviewed. Third, application of traditional video and online video clips viewing in ESL/EFL pragmatic instruction are documented.

Interlanguage Pragmatics

According to Schauer (2009), Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP), which comes with the field of second language acquisition research and pragmatics, applies pragmatic theories, principles and frameworks to investigate how ESL/EFL learners encode and decode the meaning in their target language. Bardovi-Harlig (2001) and Kasper (1997) expressed that second language (L2) learners, regardless of their proficiency level, display a remarkably different pragmatic system than that of native speakers of that language – in both production and comprehension of the language. A common phenomenon occurred among the ESL and EFL learners were L1 pragmatic transfer and pragmatic failure.

A central feature frequently engaged in ILP researches is transfer. Transfer occurs when ESL/EFL learners consider that certain norm, strategies and phrases that are

applied in their L1 to accomplish a certain goal, can also be employed in the target language to complete the same purpose (Schauer, 2009). Researchers distinguished transfer as positive and negative transfer. According to Kasper (1992), positive transfer refers to ESL/EFL learners' L1 pragmatic norm, strategies, and phrases which match with the target language and can transfer successfully. For example, when having dinner with English-speaking classmates, an EFL learner says "Pass me the pepper, please". The EFL learner's direct transfer "請給我胡椒" leads to successful communication (Liu, 2010). Native transfer, on the other hand, refers to ESL/EFL learners' L1 pragmatic norm, strategies, and phrases can't match with L2 usage and therefore can't be transferred to L2. For instance, some Chinese learners use the expression—"Never mind", when responding to "Thank you". For those Chinese EFL learners, they regard "never mind" as "沒關係". As the result, those Chinese EFL learners cause pragmatic failure (Liu, 2010). Schauer (2009) stated that "Interlocutors' familiarity with the pragmatic norms and rules of a particular language and culture is highly important for successful communication" (p. 13). To closely investigate the pragmatic gap between native and non-native speakers, researchers engaged in a wide variety of studies and came out with different definitions.

A group of researchers define interlanguage pragmatic by referring to L2 learners' comprehension, production and acquisition. For example Kasper (1992) defined

interlanguage pragmatic as "a branch of second language research which studies how non-native speakers (NNS) understand and carry out linguistic action in a target language, and how they acquire L2 pragmatic knowledge" (p. 203). Similar definition echoed in Kasper and Rose (2002), they stated that "interlanguage pragmatics examines how nonnative speakers comprehend and produce action in a target language" (p. 5). Moreover, Kasper and Dahl (1991) defined interlanguage pragmatics as "nonnative speakers' comprehension and production of pragmatics and how that L2 related knowledge is acquired" (p. 216). Then, it is defined as the study that "non-native speakers' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge" (Kasper, 1996, p. 145).

Another body of researchers put more effort on linguistic patterns and strategies use in interlanguage pragmatic field. According to Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993b), linguistic patterns should be highlighted in ESL/EFL language learning. They defined ILP as the study of "non-native speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic patterns in a second language" (p. 3). As to Kasper and Schmidt (1996), they regarded interlanguage pragmatics as "the study of development and use of strategies in linguistic action by nonnative speakers" (p. 150).

In short, interlanguage pragmatics is a study not only focusing on L2 learners' comprehension, production, acquisition of target language pragmatic, but also on L2 learners' linguistic patterns and strategies in target language. Through examining the

appropriateness of the learners' comprehension, linguistic patterns and strategies, the current study investigated the effects of online video-based instruction on EFL learners' pragmatic competence development.

Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence is one of the fundamental elements in language competence and has been widely investigated (Bachman, 1990, 2000; Eslami- Resekh, Z. & Eslami- Resekh, A., 2008; Kondo, 2004). Pragmatic competence, also called actional competence, had been defined as: "the competence in conveying and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force" (Celce- Murcia et al., 1995, p. 17). Taguchi (2009) expressed that pragmatic competence, which is the capability to reveal and interpret meaning congruously in a social situation, has become a subject in a wide range of research domain, such as linguistics, and applied linguistics, sociology, cross-cultural and many others. According to Bialystok (1993), pragmatic competence besieges a diversity of abilities in the application and interpretation of language in context. These include interlocutors' ability to apply the language for different purpose, adapt or

change language depending on the needs or expectations of the interlocutors or situation, and adhere to the accepted rules.

13

In the interlanguage field, interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) competence researchers are mainly concerned with the ways NNSs' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge varies from that of native speakers (NSs) and those ESL/EFL learners with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). ESL/EFL learners should possess pragmalingustic and sociopragmatic knowledge well to develop a successful utterance. Leech (1983) indicated that pragmalinguistics refers to the linguistic resources available to perform language functions, and sociopragmatics refers to the language user's assessment of the context in which such resources are implemented (see also Thomas 1983). As Paulston (1977) expressed, it is equally important to master both social usage and linguistic forms in the target language to become a proficient and successful second language speaker.

To investigate ESL/ EFL learner's pragmatic competence, a group of researchers examined pragmatic transfer and failure (Li, 2011; Liu, A., 2006; Liu, J., 2010; Thomas 1983; Zheng & Huang, 2010). The results revealed that despite ESL/EFL learners' language proficiency, they commit the pragmatic transfer and failure. As Davies (2004) indicated, "Pragmatic failure is not only to commit […] a grammatical but also a social error" (p. 208). Mostly, the social errors are more severe than language-related errors, and less likely to be forgiven (Thomas, 1983). This statement reveals that facilitating ESL/EFL learners to develop pragmatic competence is very important and has been an

interest of researchers in pragmatic knowledge instruction.

Speech Act Theory

Speech acts can be regarded as "a communicative act, performed through speech, which demonstrates how meaning and action are related to language" (Sykes, 2005, p. 403). The study of speech acts began with Austin (1962) who illustrated his assumption in the monograph, *How to Do Things with Words*. As cited in Thomas (1995), Austin (1962) presented his three-fold distinction.

Locution	the words that the speaker delivered
Illocution	the attitude/impetus or meanings behind the words that the speakers deliver
Perlocution	the feeling or reaction that the hearer gained after hearing the illocution

Based on Austin's concept, to have a successful communication, interlocutors need to understand the literal meaning of the utterance (Locution), then interpret the implied information (Illocution), and finally, respond to the message they comprehended accordingly (Perlocution).

Later on, Searle (1969) developed the view that language should be seen as a form of action. He expressed that when we speak, we 'do' things like making requests, statements, offering apologies and so on. Speech acts are the minimal units of

communication (Searle et al., 1980). Searle categorized speech acts into five major categories, including representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. According to the functions assigned to each speech act, Cohen (1996) who based on Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theory, identified five categories of speech acts as follows (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Categories of the Speech Acts

Representatives	Directives	Expressives	Comissives	Declaratives
assertions	suggestions	apologies	promises	decrees
claims	requests	complaint	threats	declarations
reports	commands	thanks	offers	

Searle (1976) classified speech acts and expressed that if an utterance is a directive, it indicates that the *speaker* wants the *listener* to do something. The commissive refers that the speaker will do something in future. As to expressive, the speaker is expressing his/her feelings or emotional response. A representative is for the speaker to express his/her belief about the truth of a proposition. Finally, declarative speech act is the utterance results in a change in the external non-linguistic situation. Based on Searle's statement, the request speech act belongs to directives category which refers to speakers wants the listener to perform an action. The refusal speech act belongs to the category of the commisive because they commit to (not) responding an action, which signals for

ample cultural and linguistic competence on the part of the refuser (Searle, 1977). In this current study, request and refusal speech acts are mainly focused on.

Within the interlanguage pragmatics domain, speech acts are the most extensively examined object (Kasper, 2006). A cross-cultural and a developmental perspectives in diversity contexts are the main focus when researchers investigate speech acts (Alcón Soler, & Guzman-Pitarch, 2010). Sykes (2008) stated that when classifying speech acts in the analysis of natural speech, it is more complex than originally theorized in Austin and Searle's theories. For example, utterances might carry multiple functions at the same time. The utterance, "My parents are too stingy to buy me a beautiful dress," could present both a complaint and a request speech act. In addition, it is not easy to analyze a language function simply from an isolated utterance. As LoCastro (2010) promoted that "language use is embedded in the contextual framework each speaker brings" (p. 7). Moreover, sequence is another issue that should be mapped over a series of turns to investigate interlocutors' belief and values. According to Locastro (2010), normally, an initiating speech act would follow by a responding act, such as offer-acceptance, request-refusal. This study mainly focuses on the request and refusal speech acts.

To make request and refusal speech acts appropriately is difficult for ESL/EFL language learners (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987). These two speech acts, request and refusal, are face-threating acts and are likely to cause misunderstanding and threaten

the interlocutor's face. Specifically, they are found not having proper development in ESL/EFL learners and not well presented in high school textbook. Through course design and instruction, participants might have chance to perform the speech acts appropriately in a variety of contexts. As a result, the current study aims to investigate the effects of pragmatic instruction in request and refusal speech act on ESL/EFL learners' pragmatic competence development.

The Speech Acts of Request

Requests are widely investigated, defined by researchers and the core of politeness theory in Brown and Levinson's research in the field of cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics. According to Blum-Kulka, Danet, and Gherson (1985), a request is a pre-event act that expresses a speaker's expectation about some prospective action verbal or nonverbal, on the part of the hearer (cited in Eslami & McLeod, 2010). Kahraman (2006) defines request expressions as "asking a hearer to do or to quit doing something for a speaker or someone else who stands in relation to the speaker. Hence, the hearer will physically or psychologically have made efforts and the speaker will have gained benefits". Other than that, Brown and Levinson (1978) defined requests as face-threatening acts. They stated that the speaker impinges on the hearer's claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. In order to assure the hearer's compliance with a request, it is necessary to formulate it in a socially and culturally appropriate way

(Ogiermann, 2009). Blum-Kalka et al (1989) investigated request and apology speech acts and distinguished nine types of request strategies as well as classified them into three levels of directness.

According to Blum-Kalka et al (1989), those three main categories are direct requests, conventional indirect requests, and nonconventional indirect requests. A direct request refers to grammatical, lexical, or semantic items (e.g., "Please lend me a pen.") in the utterance. A conventional indirect request is the expression of the illocutionary force used settled linguistic conventions (e.g., "Could you lend me a pen?"). Finally, a non-conventional indirect request is that speakers apply partial reference to the requested act (e.g., "Do you have a pen?"). Brown & Levinson (1978) indicated that the factors that influence the directness level is determined by contextual factors, including social power, social distance between the interlocutors, and the involved degree of imposition (see also Thomas, 1983; Taguchi, 2006). Gu (2011) expressed that pointing out different social context and cultural meanings can facilitate ESL/EFL learners to develop their pragmatic competence in English.

The Speech Act of Refusal

Differing from many of the speech acts, a refusal is a responding act—acts uttered in response to initiating acts such as invitations, suggestions, requests, and offers (Felix-Brasdefer & Bardovi-Harling, 2010). Searle and Vandervken (1985) defined the speech

act of refusal in terms of the negative counterparts to acceptances and consents (cited in Mohammad, Alireza, & Shirin, 2013). Refusal speech act belongs to the category of commisives because they commit the refusers to or not respond with an action that signals for ample cultural and linguistic competence on the part of the refuser (Searle, 1977).

Additionally, Al-Eryani (2007) stated that refusal is a face-threatening act to the listener/ requester/ inviter. As stated in Al-Eryani (2007), a refusal controverts the interlocutor's expectations, and is often apprehended through indirect strategies. Cohen (1996) indicated that direct refusal, "No", was not a regular strategy applied in any language. In line with this statement, Cohen expressed that the Chinese speaker is likely to use the expression of regret which actually is an expression of refusal in English speaking countries and might cause unpleasant feelings between interlocutors in an English speaking context.

Moreover, Refusal strategies are frequently categorized in two ways—direct and indirect acts employed in different situations. The factors that affect strategies used are complicated and influenced by several social factors including gender, age, education level, power, and social distance (Fraser 1990; Smith 1998). Therefore, the importance of speakers to develop a high level of pragmatic competence is needed so that the interlocutor's negative face remains unthreatened.

Studies on Request and Refusal Speech Act

Studies on Request Speech Act. An accumulation of empirical studies in request

mainly investigated three major issues, 1) the appropriateness of the request production

made/rated by ESL/EFL learners, 2) request strategies, and 3) the social factors. For

example, Kahraman and Akkus (2007) investigated the appropriate usage of request in

Japanese request expression by Turkey learners. Eighty-two undergraduate students

completed DCT test. The result showed that learners though might make a request

sentence appropriately to their teachers, they failed in making a request appropriately

with friends and classmates. The authors indicated that the learners' inappropriateness

in request making might cause by the lack of pragmatic learning and insufficient

pragmatic information in the textbook context.

Different from investigating appropriation in request expression, request strategies

were investigated in a body of researchers. In a DCT questionnaire designed study,

Konakahara (2009) investigated Japanese learners' English request strategies.   Forty-

six graduate participants, including sixteen British native speakers, thirteen Japanese

learners of English and seventeen Japanese speakers. All participants needed to

complete a discourse completion task (DCT). The DCT contained four situations with

different rank of imposition and power between communicators. In addition, it was

designed to elicit participants' ability for completing request strategies, including direct,

conventional indirect and internal modifications. The result showed all groups performed well in conventional indirect strategy. However, in internal modifications strategy, it is obvious that Japanese English learners and Japanese speakers were lacking internal modification strategies.

Another study on request strategy was conducted by Ahangari and Shoghli (2011). The researchers investigated request strategies based on various social situations. Different social factors such as distance, power, and the rank of imposition were included when the DCT designed. Forty-three participants (27 Iranian and 16 Canadian) were included in this study. The result showed that Iranian EFL learners overused the indirect strategies in performing request speech act. Moreover, instead of non-conventionally indirect strategies, a conventionally indirect strategy with a subcategory of query-preparatory strategy was preferred by both Iranian EFL learners and Canadian native English speakers. Once more, it showed that EFL learners were insufficient in their pragmatic knowledge of the target language.

Some findings indicated that social factors play an important role in participants' request competence. In Jalilifar, Hashemian, and Tabatabaee's (2011) findings, sociopragmatic knowledge would affect participants request usage. Participants in this study included ninety-six Iranian EFL learners studying B.A. and M.A. and 10 native speakers of English. A DCT test was implemented in this study. The results showed that

compared to the native English speakers, higher proficiency participants tended to overuse indirect request strategies, while lower proficiency participants were more likely to employ direct request strategies. Moreover, Iranian EFL performed better in social power than social distance. It is possible that Iranian EFL participants are lack of sociopragmatic knowledge to interact appropriately.

Studies on Refusal Speech Act. Among refusal studies, a group of studies focus on cross-culture analysis and L1 transfer (Al-Kahtani, 2005; Campillo, Safont-Jorda, & Codina-Espurz, 2009; Li, 2010; Mohammad, Alireza, & Shirin, 2013; Wannaruk, 2008). Others shed lights on the strategies applied in different languages (Abed, 2010; Al-Eryani, 2007; Muhammed, 2012; Sattar, Lah, & Suleiman, 2011; Yang, 2008). Lin (2010), two writing Discourse Completion Tasks/Tests (DCTs), including Chinese and English versions, were applied to present the evidence of L1 transfer. Thirty senior undergraduate students participated in this study. The researcher investigated their knowledge about refusal in both Chinese and English. The result displayed that though L1 transfer really occurred in refusal responses, participants had a certain degree of English pragmatic usage, such as positive opinion, empathy and pause filler. Specifically, these pragmatic usages were only in English version, and seldom showed in Chinese writing DCT. This means participants noticed the difference between English pragmatic usages with Chinese pragmatic usage. Additionally, participants

would adjust their refusal response depending on social status and distance and context, especially in the English version. However, less specific excuse would be delivered in response sentences which might cause by sociocultural transfer. For this, the researcher indicated that participants might pay less attention to different situation and social etiquette. She suggested that a later study might focus on those issues.

Sattar et al. (2011) focused on semantic formulaic and refusal strategies in requests in forty Malaysia university learners. Based on the data collected from DCT, the results indicated that learners tend to implement their L1 strategy to target language. For example, participants were likely to apply the apology strategy that started with the phrase "sorry" transferred from "maaf" in their mother tongue. Different from previous study, participants tended to apply cooperative strategies to maintaining face when interacted. In addition, participants would frequently apply suggesting alternative strategies rather than simply employing an apology when they were interacting with elders. It displayed that the L1 culture and sematic formulaic usages have great influence on target language.

Taking status and setting into consideration, Sarfo (2011) examined refusal strategies in college community. Observation and digital voice recording served as the ways to collect data. The results showed that cultural background knowledge influenced the two refusal strategies participants were likely to apply, including direct and indirect

strategies in this study. Direct strategy refers to 1) simply "no" without any expression, 2) applying "no" with some other expressions, and 3) negative expressions without uttering "no". As for indirect strategies, participants would implement "excuses/reason", "request for information or clarification", and "suggesting alternatives". The researcher stated that direct refusal mainly was produced by the elders or higher status while indirect refusal strategies mostly came from inter- and intra-age and status-based. The researcher suggested that future studies should focus more on the issues of status, ages and setting on participants' pragmatic knowledge.

Refusal formulas and strategies were mainly concerned in Mohammad et al. (2013) study. No participants were included in this study. By closely observing 50 Persian movies and 50 English movies, the researchers obtained their findings. The results showed that both formulae and gender had similar findings. For example, "excuse" was employed more in Persian speakers than English speakers. In addition, refusal strategies—regret, non-performative statements and enthusiasm were less applying in Persian speakers than English speakers.

The Teachability of Pragmatic competence in EFL/ESL Education

Teaching pragmatic competence has received considerable attention as instruction has great effect on the ESL/EFL learners' pragmatic development (Kasper, 1997; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Tateyama, 2007). Kasper (1997), in a speech entitled "Can

Pragmatic Competence Be Taught" delivered in Orlando, Florida, prompted the investigation of pragmatic instruction to increase. He pointed out that "without some forms of instruction, many aspects of pragmatic competence do not develop sufficiently". Bardovi-Harlig (1999) expressed that it is necessary to investigate the role of instruction in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) development to make the link between interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) with second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Tateyama (2007) stated that "most aspects of L2 pragmatics are teachable and instruction helps in developing L2 learners' pragmatic competence" (p. 1191). Collectively, reviewing the empirical studies and book publications, plenty of evidence reveals that pragmatic competence can be taught through 1) the theoretical construct of pragmatic competence and its central features, 2) instructional methods and materials (Taguchi, 2011).

In the domain of instructional intervention, researchers investigated the effect of instruction methods, including explicit instruction, implicit instruction, and combined both explicit and implicit instructions. Explicit instruction involves teachers' direct explanation of the pragmatic features in the target language followed by practice (Taguchi, 2011). In contrast to explicit instruction, there is no pragmatic feature explanation in implicit instruction. Implicit instruction contains input and practice opportunities in which learners can grow inferential understanding of pragmatic

features and uses (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Recently, researchers engage in combining

explicit instruction with implicit instruction instead of a dichotomy (Takahashi, 2010a).

Studies on Teachibility of Different Speech Acts

Applying both explicit and implicit instructions were widely investigated by

researchers (Dastjerdi & Rezvani, 2010; Fukuya & Martínez-Flor, 2008, Salehi, 2011,

Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012, Ülbeği, 2009). Fukuya and Martínez-Flor (2008) is an

example of an intervention study that investigated the effect of explicit and implicit

instruction and assessments in pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy.

Forty-nine intermediate Spanish participants were involved in this study. The explicit

instruction group received not only teacher's explanation in target language suggestion

forms and sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspect, but also multiple choice

questions to access participants' pragmatic knowledge. The implicit group participated

in videotape and recast activities to gain pragmatic knowledge. Role play served in both

explicit and implicit group. E-mail and phone tasks were employed as pretest and

posttest. The result displayed that both explicit and implicit instruction had significant

improvement in participants' pragmatic knowledge. The explicit group outperformed

the implicit group both in e-mail and phone tasks. The explicit group acquired explicit

rule-based knowledge while implicit group gain implicit example-based knowledge.

Other than that, chunk information combined with meaning, situation, and

sociolinguistic variable were accumulated in participants of the implicit group. As for the two tasks, e-mail and phone call, both groups were able to designate acceptable attention to retrieving and monitoring the appropriate and accurate target forms, especially in e-mail task.

Salehi (2011) examined the effect of explicit and implicit instruction on L2 learners' speech act of request and apology. Forty participants were engaged to perform the DCT questionnaire. The midterm examine was served to indicate participants' grammatical competence. The results displayed that L2 learners had improved their pragmatic competence after receiving explicit and implicit instruction. However, the implicit instruction group outperformed on the speech act of request and apology compared with the explicit instruction group. The findings presented that applying explicit and implicit instruction would upgrade L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge.

Dastjerdi and Rezvani (2010) explored the impact of explicit and implicit instruction in learners' ability of request making. Ninety intermediate participants were divided into three group, explicit group, implicit group, and control group. Short audio conversations, direct awareness-raising activities (teacher's explanation), scripts reading, and role playing were employed in the explicit group. The implicit group received short conversation listening, scripts in which target forms were in bold. Control group received short conversation listening with transcripts but without explicit

instruction or bolded target from. The result showed those explicit and implicit groups have positive impact on acquiring request form. The findings indicated that explicit instruction which provides metapragmatic information is effective to enhance learners' request production in linguistically accurate and pragmatically appropriate. The authors suggested that material developer and teacher should engage pragmatics into their instruction.

Salemi et al. (2012) also explored the effect of explicit and implicit instruction with explicit/implicit feedback and role play as their activities in participants' pragmatic competence development. One hundred intermediate EFL learners were included and randomly assigned to five groups, including explicit instruction with explicit feedback group, explicit instruction with implicit feedback group, implicit instruction with explicit feedback group, implicit instruction with implicit feedback group and control group. Role play was employed in this study. Control group didn't receive any treatment. The result showed that explicit instruction outperformed the other two groups. Group with feedback outperformed the control group. But there were no different between explicit feedback group and implicit feedback group. Moreover, there was no retention presented in all of the groups. The findings indicated that explicit instruction and explicit and implicit feedback all promote L2 learners' pragmatic competence.

Another study employing explicit instruction was conducted by Sadeghi and

Foutooh (2012). This study examined Iranian EFL learners' compliment response strategy. Thirty intermediate participants working in an oil company were included in this study. A DCT test served as the instrument. Treatments were explicit metapragmatic instruction activities, including teacher-fronted description, explanation, discussion, small-group discussions, role playing, pragmatically focused tasks, and feedback. The results displayed that explicit instruction had positive effect on participants compliment response strategies. The experimental group would employ less non-agreement strategies in compliment response. Moreover, the teachers' role in instruction, explanation, and discussion could be scaffolding to enhance participants' metapragmatic awareness.

Additionally, pragmatic appropriateness eliciting was interesting to researchers (Alcón & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Nipaspong & Chinokul, 2010; Sadeghi & Foutooh, 2012; Taguchi, 2006; Tateyama, 2007). Taguchi (2006) stated "appropriateness of pragmatic performance depends on sufficient linguistic and pragmatic knowledge, as well as on overall strategic capacities to implement the knowledge in communicative interaction" (p. 514). Traditionally, appropriateness of L2 pragmatic performance was mainly investigated through the directness levels of linguistics forms utilized to produce speech acts (Taguchi, 2006). Seldom studies have considered other aspects of communicative competence.

Sadeghi and Foutooh (2012) examined the appropriateness of Iranian EFL learners' compliment response strategy. Thirty intermediate participants working in an oil company were included in this study. DCT test was served as the instrument. Treatments were the explicit metapragmatic instruction activities, including teacher-fronted description, explanation, discussion, small-group discussions, role play, pragmatically focused tasks, and feedback. The results displayed that explicit instruction had positive effect on participants' appropriateness on compliment response strategies. Experimental group would employ less non-agreement strategies in compliment response. Moreover, teachers' instruction, such as explanation, and discussion the role could enhance participants' metapragmatic awareness.

Nipaspong and Chinokul (2010) investigated the effect of different feedbacks on EFL learners' awareness of refusal appropriateness. Thirty-nine low intermediate participants were divided into three groups, including explicit feedback group, prompt feedback group, and the control group—delay feedback group. Multiple-choice test (MCT), role playing and interviews were applied to collect the data. The results displayed that those three groups had experienced positive improvement in pragmatic knowledge awareness on refusal appropriateness. Among those three groups, prompt feedback group performed better than explicit feedback group. The control group gained slight improvement compared with the explicit group and the prompt group. The

finding revealed that more opportunities and repair for EFL learners to engage would promote EFL learners' pragmatic knowledge awareness and refusal appropriateness.

Video Features in Pragmatic Instruction

Video is an advantageous learning source for language learning (Dufon, 2004; Fernández, & Fontecha, 2008; Moradkhan, & Jalayer, 2010). Mayer (2002) defined video as a sort of multimedia material containing both verbal and non-verbal expression presenting simultaneous images, narration and text on the screen. Çakir (2006) stated that video provides authentic language input, which facilitates learners' comprehension. According to Dufon (2004), applying video in pragmatic instruction is superior to other means of material input. First, videos contain the target pragmatic features and sociolinguistic variables of particular events (e.g. setting, participants' relationships), which serve as authentic input for ESL/EFL learner to promote their pragmatic competence (Ishida, 2009). By presenting various communicative situations, learners can observe the behaviors in different culture through videos. Target language learners would benefit from the visual clues, such as facial expression, body language, dress and details in the environment. In addition, video displays clear meaning through illustrating relationships, which is difficult for words to present. Those could be interesting, challenging, and stimulating for ESL/EFL learners (Fernández, & Fontecha, 2008).

Second, depending on the need of the class, instructors could manage the content

and length of the video clip to fit the class' need. Bardovi-Harlig (2001) suggests "if

we expect learners to use speech addressed to them as input, we need to investigate how

learners perceive and understand such input" (p. 24). Sherman (2003) pointed out that

the cultural movements are shown in videos. Thus, learners could have more chances

to acquire customs, traditions, and attitudes, which are presented in the everyday

conversation in each episode and important for learners to know if they want to have a

successful conversation with interlocutors. Another important issue is the language of

daily conversational exchange (Sherman, 2003). Videos embody wide ranges of

interactive language, including, speech acts, sound people out, hint, flatter, threatened,

etc. Additionally, Sherman (2003) mentioned that applying films in class has a problem

of time-consuming, and focus-losing. Therefore, slicing up the film and selected the

parts that relate to the lesson would be the solution. Teachers can also manipulate the

videos to meet their goal. For example, teachers can apply videos with convenience and

effectiveness by selecting useful program, running in slow motion or speed, repeating

or replying the important sections, with or without sound or subtitle.

Third, through video viewing, instructors could carefully arrange useful activities

to enhance learners' pragmatic learning. For example, videos could be useful material

for role play activities. According to Fernandez-Guerra & Martinez-Flor (2003),

instructors could present video scenarios as realistic model for learners to imitate for role play. Moreover, Dufon (2004) mentioned that instructors could raise the learners' pragmatic awareness by stopping the video at the critical moment and putting leaners into consideration about the pragmatic error/ violation in that scenario. Kasper (1996) stated that similar events or situations were shown in the videotapes. Language learners could view different scenarios, learn the particular speech act variations used in the interaction, and observed how the contextual variables affect the language used between the interlocutors.

Computer Technology in Pragmatic Instruction

With the development of technology, researchers have investigated the promise of applying computer technology in ILP instruction. Taguchi (2011) expressed that technology contains the key instruction features, including input, interaction, simulation, and multimedia environment for pragmatic learning. Through websites, interactive multimedia modules could be provided, such as video clip viewing, computer-mediated communication (CMC), and computer-assisted language learning (CALL). Sykes (2005) stated that "the connection between computer-mediated communication (CMC) and interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) development presents promising possibilities for language Learning" (p.1). CMC and CALL (computer-assisted language learning) technologies present the pragmatic-based materials not only

with a contextualized, authentic, and personalized manner, but also language skills, such as oral proficiency, listening abilities (Chen, 2009). Thus, technologies become a pragmatic learning platform in ESL/EFL environment. Especially, the environments of Synchronous CMC provide the formation of cooperative and collaborative learning context in which pragmatic instruction could be possibly presented in contextualized and socialized manner (Chen, 2009; Sykes, 2005).

The term online video is a norm among the web surfers as it had becomes a platform for the Internet's users, or Net Gens to share and upload their video creations. Language instructors and learners can surf those websites, such as Google video, YouTube, Yahoo! Video, SchoolTube, Teacher Tube, and many more similar websites offered great videos that can be downloaded instantly to be viewed and shared (Muniandy & Veloo, 2011) to get authentic materials.

Studies on Video Viewing and Computer Technology in Pragmatic Teaching

In-Class Video Viewing in Pragmatic Teaching. To closely examine the influences of pragmatic video clip viewing, a group of studies have explored the effect of video-based introduction into EFL/ESL classroom. Video clips could serve as authentic input (Dufon, 2004). A positive finding on video viewing study was conducted by Martínez-Flor (2007). The study explored the request modification devices in films and the employment in EFL instruction. Ten films were selected to

analyze the request modification devices. The results displayed that films provided EFL

learners with most request moves. Modification devices, including internal and external

devices were identified in films. Sociopragmatic variable was regarded important in the

use of modification devices. The findings indicted that films could be a valuable

resource for EFL learners to explore the appropriate language use and pragmalinguistic

features in authentic samples with variety of contexts.

Fernández Guerra and Martínez Flor (2003) investigated type, strategy, and

frequency of request between textbooks and films. Three textbooks and films were

compared and applied to the Spanish university learners. The results showed that

textbooks were insufficient in EFL request strategies; learners' knowledge were limit

in instructions and exercises, and without enough exemplification of natural dialogues.

However, in films, contextualized speech acts were provided in real-word conversations

revealing a various linguistic formulae. Participants' relationship, setting, social status

and so on were clearly presented as a natural language use and could enhance learners'

pragmatic awareness.

Alcon-Soler and Guzman-Pitarch (2010) investigated the effect of video-based

instruction on EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Different audiovisual sources were

employed for learners to identify the refusal strategies in interaction, sociopragmatic in

the context. After pre/posttest interviews, the results showed that audiovisual sources

provided pragmatic input, which would facilitate EFL learners' pragmatic awareness.

Rylander (2004) examined the effects of the video-based treatment on learners' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic awareness. The participants of various majors were recruited from a female university. The class had a ninety minutes course per week and lasted for 10 weeks. A multiple choice and writing DCT questionnaire were implemented to assess learners' pragmatic learning and their comprehension of the pragmatic material. The results showed that learners had developed formulae in certain speech acts. Moreover, they could recognize the speech acts in different materials and understand their usages. Moreover, the result showed that certain speech act like greeting is easier for learners to recognize and produce than others, such as suggestion and advice. Specifically, the author suggestion that EFL learners need to spend more time exposing in the target language environment and receive more meaningful input. Therefore, uploading video to the website was strongly recommended.

Tateyama (2007) examined the effects of instruction supplemented by video viewing on the awareness of Pragmatic features. DCT questionnaires, telephone massage tasks, role playing and a video clip rating task were applied to collect data. Six short story clips were served to measure JFL learners' pragmatic awareness by rating the difference on 7-point-likert scale. The results revealed a significant difference in JFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Based on the self-report, participants stated that

video clips served as a reflection for them to reflect the treatment, which they had received. The data collected from a number of participants' comments on the appropriate opening and closing, style shifting, delivery and inappropriate use of routine expressions displayed that participants prospected the video clips from holistic point.

Moradkhan and Jalayer (2010) compared the differences between applying audio-taped and video-taped materials on EFL learners' pragmatic competence. Both two groups (27 female intermediate learners in each group) had received scripts of the conversation and done role playing of different situation. Open-ended and MDCT questionnaires were applied to test learners' pragmatic competence development in the beginning and the end of the study. The results showed that participants in the video-tape group outperformed those in the audio-taped group in their pragmatic competence development. The authors mentioned that film clips could be a useful and effective tool to develop learners' pragmatic competence.

Silva (2003) investigated the effects of instruction on pragmatic development. Experimental and control group were provided with three video segment from 'friends' containing invitation/refusal events. Explicit discussion, semantic formulae and modifiers, and role paly were applied only experimental group. The results showed that having video clips input without explicit instruction couldn't enhance L2 learners'

pragmatic competence.

Studies of Computer Technology in Language Teaching. A group of studies was interested in investigating the effect of pragmatic instruction through computer technology, especially by using Website chat, E-mail, CMC conference and online video viewing. Baumer and Rensburg (2011) investigated the effects of CMC in pragmatic failure; Palmer (2010) examined the online video game in pragmatic development. They found that applying CMC in pragmatic education was efficient. Through CMC, the researchers could provide real situations, observe learners' pragmatic usage, and analyzed learners' pragmatic knowledge based on learners' gender, age, cultural background, and language proficiency. In Fukuya and Martínez-Flor (2008) study, they investigated the effect of explicit and implicit instruction and e-mail and phone call assessments in pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy. The result showed that e-mail task could better designate acceptable attention to retrieving and monitoring the appropriate and accurate target forms, compare to the phone call task.

In another study, Sykes (2005) examined the effect of writing chat, oral chat and face to face treatment in pragmatic (refusal speech act) improvement. Eighty-one Spanish class English native speakers were the participants in this CMC designed study. Role playing was applied as a pre- and posttest. Classroom instruction and computer

based model dialogue (short conversation filmed in video) were employed during the treatment. A reflection questionnaire and a dialogue practice were implemented in synchronous discussion groups (Writing CMC and Oral CMC group in lab, and Face to face group in classroom). The result showed that for the head act production, Oral CMC group outperformed Writing CMC group, and Face to face group performed the worst. The researcher addressed that lacking tone and voice decreases the head act performance in the Writing CMC group. As for refusal strategies, Writing CMC group outperform the other two groups.

Online Video Viewing in Language Learning. A user-friendly website for ILP pragmatic instruction and learning has been designed to support pragmatic development in ESL/EFL learners (Cohen 2007). The Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR, 2007) provides interactive multimedia modules for language learners to learn practice and assess their target language learning. Video clips were shown to demonstrate the interaction between native speakers and nonnative speakers in natural, unscripted situations. Multicultural issues were embedded in the scenarios and distributed in beginning, intermediate and advanced levels. In addition, video clips contained not only different speech acts but also activities for learners to practice and develop their pragmatic competence. Another three pragmatic websites were designed by the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language

Acquisition (CARLA). For those websites, one is for general people, another is for L2 Japanese learners, and the other is for L2 Spanish learners (Cohen, 2008). In those three websites, not only authentic materials (audio/video) but also pragmatic strategies and content are presented as learning sources for L2 learners or instructional ILP research.

In addition, Cohen and Sykes (2006) designed a website "dancing with words" (http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts), and conducted a study (in 2008) to investigate Spanish learners' pragmatic development without instruction. Eight additional modules are involved in the website, including 1) Compliments, 2) Gratitude and Leave Taking, 3) Requests, 4) Apologies, 5) Invitations, 6) Service Encounters, 7) Advice, Suggestions, Disagreements, Complaints, and Reprimands, and 8) Considerations for Pragmatic Performance. In addition, unscripted videos are embedded for participants to write down the transcription and develop their pragmatic competence. Only apologies, request and service encounters were mainly examined in this study. Ten participants were involved in this short-answer, multiple-choice and listening activities to enhance participants' strategy use study. Video transcripts and feedbacks which was given as suggested responses were provided for learners to view them at any time. Recorded participant observation and interviews were served as data collection. The results showed positive benefit to the website. Moreover, participants expressed that they recognize more strategies and pragmatic features through the video embedded

website and activities.

Jungheim (2010) developed a video-based e-Prag Test for learners to test their

pragmatic competence. Eleven Japanese university students and three native English

speakers participated in this pilot study which investigated five speech acts, including

apology, responding to a complement, request, suggestion, and a refusal. Participants

needed to role-play and film themselves at the same time. Moreover, they need not only

to view the online self-made videos and give responses toward the appropriateness of

each situation but also provide their comment about the e-Prag Test. The author stated

that the test is reliable and valid for test takers to rate speech act. Moreover, it was a

workable way to develop and administer videos as authentic pragmatic material. The

sample responses provided in each online video situation could serve as a meaningful

input for the learners. However, the lack of feedback is regarded a big shortcoming in

the e-Prag Test. Without feedback learners had difficult being aware of which

dimensions (social factors, strategies use, or sentence patterns) they violated.

Summary

Based on the studies reviewed above, some conclusions could be drawn to reveal

the important of pragmatic development, teachability of the pragmatic knowledge, and

the possibility of online video-based pragmatic instruction. First, pragmatic

competence plays a decisive role in successful conversation. To develop pragmatic

competence, learners must not only equip pragmalinguistic competence, sociopragmatic competence but also know the aspects of speech acts.

Second, pragmatic competence is teachable. Based on the results of the empirical studies, both explicit instruction and implicit instruction are beneficial in promoting EFL learners' pragmatic competence development. However, a high percentage of the learners who received explicit instruction outperformed those who received implicit instruction in their pragmatic development, especially in appropriateness of pragmatic, social pragmatic factors and strategies application.

Third, video-based instruction is a useful and effective way to facilitate EFL learners in pragmatic learning. Video clips provide image, and sounds, which are easier for EFL learners to observe the pragmatic features in the conversations. Moreover, acquiring and implementing pragmatic video clips in class is easy and efficient with some researchers' recommendation. A group of studies even indicated that video clips are superior to textbook in pragmatic learning and instruction (Dufon, 2004; Fernández Guerra & Martínez Flor, 2003; Moradkhan & Jalayer, 2010)

Although teaching pragmatics through websites in foreign language setting have been considered greatly effective, limited empirical studies with inconclusive findings have been investigated in this field. Hence, this study has great potential to fill in the gap by integrating online video viewing into explicit pragmatic instruction.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research method and designs of the study. The method and design are divided into six sections, including participants and settings, measurements and variables, instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis procedure, and pilot.

Participants and settings

The participants in this study were recruited from two classes in an EFL vocational high school in central Taiwan. Two classes in the tenth grade, Architecture and Horticulture (N=78), participated in this study. The researcher excluded one participant in Architecture class and eight participants in Horticulture class for not doing the DCT test. The number of the participants in this study finally comes to 69 in total. These two classes were selected due to the similar scores they had in the Senior High School Entrance Examination. Based on their homeroom teachers' recommendation and students' willingness, and availability, the Architecture class was assigned to the experimental group while the Horticulture class was treated as the control group. In the Architecture class, there were 17 females and 20 males. In the control group, the Horticultural class included 19 females and 21 males. The English language learners were at the beginning English proficiency level. These participants' age was between 16 and 17 years old. While vocational high school students were receiving five periods

of English instruction per week. Learners in this study received an extra period (i.e., 50 minutes) during their free activity class in each week. Overall, they participated in an eight-week treatment, except for pretest and posttest. All of those participants had been informed that their performance in the pragmatic instruction course would not have any impact on their scores in taking English as a regular course at their school.

Instructional Treatment

Online video clips and pragmatic instruction were the treatments implemented in this study. Online video clips with pragmatic aspects were served as the authentic materials and exercises in the experimental group. Online video clips are permissible according to Section 1201 (a) copyright law issued by American Office in 2010. Based on the sentence, "short portions" of video content could be legally extracted in incorporated into lectures for educational purposes. To follow the copyright rules, every video clip in this study had attached reference before they were uploaded to YouTube. In this study, the video clips were abstracted from eight movies, including, Bring It On, Click, Free Writer, Forrest Gump, The Truman Show, The Parent Trap, Sister Act, and What's Eating Gilbert Grape.

The rationales for choosing proper video clips were based on previous studies (Bahrani, & Sim, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Fernández & Fontecha, 2008; Martinez, 2002; Sherman, 2003). According to Sherman (2003), six aspects in a film were

considered difficult in making learner incomprehensible, while six features were the benefits of applying film in language classroom (see Appendix A).

Moreover, the current study took vocabulary, speed, subtitle, and video content into consideration when choosing the suitable video clips for pragmatic learning. First, the vocabulary used in those eight films was comprehensible to vocational high school students. According to Bahrani and Sim (2012), a suitable video clip should have less incomprehensible vocabulary. Thus the researcher applied the vocabulary analysis tool "VocabProfile" (http://www.lextutor.ca/cgi-bin/vp/eng/output.pl) to calculate the different levels of lexical knowledge used in each movie. As presented in Table 3.1, about 70% to 80% of the vocabularies in the eight movies were K1 words (1-1000 frequency words). Only four to six percentage of vocabulary was K2 words (1001-2000 frequency words) in those eight movies. In addition, those eight movies contained few percentages of academic and off-list words. The academic words applied in those eight movies were below two percent. As to off-list words, they were all below twenty percent in individual movies. Therefore, with high percentage of Kl words and low percentage of academic and off-list words, the vocabulary used in the eight movies would not add too great a cognitive load for the vocational high school students to understand.

Table 3.1 The Vocabulary Profile in Eight Selected Movies

Vocabulary Frequency Film	1K	2K	Academic words	Off-List words
1. Bring it on	72.59%	6.34%	1.60%	19.47%
2. Click	81.13%	5.59%	0.97%	12.31%
3. Freedom Writer	87.03%	4.06%	1.44%	7.46%
4. Forrest Gump	84.04%	4.25%	0.54%	11.17%
5. Truman show	74.43%	5.01%	1.18%	19.39%
6. The Parent Trap	73.91%	7.08%	0.61%	18.40%
7. Sister Act	83.97%	4.72%	0.59%	10.72%
8. What's eating Gilbert Grape	81.82%	5.56%	0.44%	12.18%

Second, the speed in each conversation clip was closer to that used by the average native speakers in daily lives. Martinez (2002) expressed that speed was another factor affected EFL learners' comprehension. Accordingly, the researcher had selected the videos with lower speed conversation. In doing so, this would decrease the learning loading for the low proficiency level learners.

Third, subtitles could facilitate learners to gain the linguistic forms and understand the conversation. Martinez (2002) stated that beginners may have difficulty in understanding the mixed structures they heard and vocabulary used in authentic materials. In conjunction with Martinez's argument, subtitles were provided in each clip to help learners understand the context of each conversation. As a result, the mixed structures would not interfere with the learners' understanding.

Finally, the clip contexts where the scenarios were situated would reveal the major pragmatics features investigated in the current study, such as status, distance, and

imposition. Fernández and Fontecha (2008) mentioned that clearly pragmatic factors in the content would foster EFL learners to gain the aspects of each speech act. In line with the aforementioned studies, eight movies were carefully selected to adhere to the advantages and avoid the shortcoming (see Appendix B).

As to the pragmatic instruction, both the control and experimental group received 50-minute instruction per week for eight weeks. Those two groups received pragmatic instruction delivered by the present researcher. Moreover, the explicit instruction was conducted in the control group and the experimental group. Participants could observe the sentence patterns, situations, distance relationship, and social status between interlocutors and imposition from the pragmatic video transcripts or video clips (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Instructional Treatment in the Experimental Group and the Control Group

Experimental group	Control group
	● Teacher's explicit instruction (e.g., request/refusal strategies, distance, status, imposition)
	● Cross-culture difference in request/refusal speech acts
	● Sentence patterns
	● Appropriateness
	● Worksheets and activities
● Video clip viewing	● Transcript reviewing
● Transcript reviewing	● Reading aloud

As to the different instructional treatment, participants in the control group were requested to review video clips transcripts while the experimental group had online

pragmatic video clip viewing as one of their learning activities (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 Schedule for Pragmatic Instruction

Timeline	Teaching Activities in Each Step	Exercise
Week 1	Introduce request usage toward cross-cultural difference	Worksheet 1
Week 2	Provide sociopragmatic instruction	Worksheet 2
Week 3	Present request strategies and sentence patterns	Worksheet 3
Week 4	Ask students to view video clips (transcript) and do self- evaluation exercise	Worksheet 4
Week 5	Introduce refusal usage toward cross-cultural difference	Worksheet 5
Week 6	Provide sociopragmatic instruction	Worksheet 6
Week 7	Present refusal strategies and sentence patterns	Worksheet 7
Week 8	Ask students to view pragmatic video clips (transcripts) and do self- evaluation exercise	Worksheet 8

In both control and experimental groups, the instruction in request and refusal speech act contained four phases, including 1) making students aware of cross-cultural differences in request and refusal directness usage, 2) making students identify indirectness differences in request and refusal sets from the clips, and the effects of sociopragmatic in each speech act, 3) teaching request and refusal strategies and sentence patterns in request and refusal speech acts, 4) fostering students to notice the appropriateness in the speech acts of request request/refusal types, strategies, and their comments by viewing online pragmatic video clips as their homework.

For the aforementioned, these four phases aimed to promote both EG and CG participants' pragmatic competence through different activities. The first phase was to aid participants in gaining cross-cultural pragmatic knowledge. The instructor asked participants some questions, such as "What are the differences or similarities between Chinese and English requesting and refusing? Would you make different sentences when making request/refusal sentences to higher/lower status person and people with different distance?" These questions drew participants' attention to cross-cultural issues and the appropriateness of directness usages. After that, they had an activity by completing worksheet 1 and 5 (see Appendix E and I). During the activity, the instructor had learners compare their answers with the standardized answers. Then, learners found and examined the difference/ similarity of pragmatic features used in the target language and L1. Directive sentence patterns were delivered to participants for intensifying their familiarity with the language usage. Next, the instructor applied online pragmatic video clips and asked participants in EG to answer the questions following the worksheet. The learners in the CG were requested to read the transcript out loud and answer the questions on the worksheet. Learners then viewed the online pragmatic clips first. Later, they found out the relationship between the interlocutors. Afterwards, learners wrote down the request and refusal sentences applied in the conversation. Finally, they discussed about what kind of the request/refusal questions

the interlocutor employed (see Appendix E and I).

For the second phase, the goal was to equip participants with sociopragmatic knowledge. First, background information was provided. Second, video clips were presented to the participants. Third, the instructor asked participants to indicate the relationship between pragmalinguistic and sociopramgmatic information and the directness and mitigation in request/ refusal performance from the video clips (transcripts). Fourth, the teacher applied explicit instruction on the request/refusal speech act sets, including power, social distance and degree of imposition presented in the situation from the video clips (transcripts). Fifth, the participants completed the worksheet 2 and 6 (see Appendix F and J). Finally, the instructor gave feedback to participants' answers in class.

For the third phase, the participants in the two groups were instructed to familiarize themselves with request and refusal strategies. By providing those strategies and sentence patterns, participants were likely to realize the appropriateness of them. In addition, with the instructor's strategy instruction, the participants had more chances to practice them through contexts and were aware of direct and indirect pragmatic features in advance. As Mohammad, Alireza and Shirin (2013) mentioned, "indirect strategies should be used to eliminate the offense to the hearer" (p. 53).   L2 learners, especially, should be aware of the cross-cultural differences to lessen the possibility of

miscommunication in an interlocution. In this study, request and refusal strategies and sentence patterns were adapted from previous researchers. For the request strategies, they were adapted from Eslami and McLeod (2010) and Francis (1997). As to refusal strategies, they were adapted from Ülbeği (2009) and Archer (2010) (see Appendix C and D). The instructional procedures were as follows. Request/ refusal strategies were delivered to participants first (see Appendix C and D). Then, the teacher introduced each strategy in front of the class. Next, the participants were asked to recognize the request/refusal strategies and sociopragmatic features through the worksheet 3 and 7 (see Appendix G and K). Finally, the teacher checked the answers and gave feedback to participants' answers in the worksheet.

In the fourth phase, both EG and CG students were asked to practice pragmatic features in week four and week eight for one hour. Participants viewed the online video (transcripts) first and did the worksheet 4 and 8 related to the pragmatic competence (see the Appendix H and L). They needed to realize the appropriateness of each interlocution in the clip. Then, they had to answer the questions based on 1) the appropriateness of the strategies, 2) the words choice, and 3) level of formality, politeness, and directness. The four phases and the detailed instructional treatments were as follows (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Treatment Features of Each Group Adapted from Takimoto (2007)

WK	Treatment	EG	CG
1	A. Request cross-cultural pragmatic awareness (10 minutes). Explicit information (10 minutes to deliver the direct strategies and sentence patterns for request). Pragmalinguistic -- sociopragmatic connection activities (20 minutes to complete worksheet 1). Reinforcement activities (10 minutes to check and give feedback for each group's answer on the worksheet 1).	Yes	Yes
	B. Material: Video clips, transcripts, worksheet 1	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
2	A. Explicit instructions on pragmalinguistic focus— request indirect sentence pattern (15minutes). Sociopragmatic features focus— distance, social status relationship between interlocutors (15 minutes). Pragmalinguistic— sociopragmatic connection activities (10 minutes to complete the worksheet 2). Reinforcement activities (10 minutes to check and give feedback for each group's answer on the worksheet 2).	Yes	Yes
		VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 2		
3	A. Explicit instruction on pragmalinguistic focuses—Request strategies on direct and indirect (20 minutes). Pragmalinguistic-sociopragmatic connection activities (judge the appropriateness from the sentence applying and sociopragmatic features on worksheet 3, 20 minutes). Reinforcement activities—give feedback to participants' answers on the worksheet 3.	Yes	Yes
	B. Material: Video clips, transcripts, worksheet 3	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
4	A. Request pragmatic features practice		
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 4	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS

WK		EG	CG
5	A. Refusal cross-cultural pragmatic awareness (10) minutes. Explicit information (10) minutes (direct strategies and sentence patterns for refusal). Pragmalinguistic-sociopragmatic connection activities (20 minutes to complete worksheet 5). Reinforcement activities (10 minutes to check and give feedback for each group's answer on the worksheet 5).	Yes	Yes
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 5	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
6	A. Explicit instruction on pragmalinguistic focus— refusal indirect sentence pattern (15minutes). Sociopragmatic features focus— distance, social status relationship between interlocutors (15 minutes). Pragmalinguistic—sociopragmatic connection activities (10 minutes to complete the worksheet 6). Reinforcement activities (10 minutes to check and give feedback for each group's answer on the worksheet 6).	Yes	Yes
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 6	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
7	A. Explicit instructions on Pragmalinguistic focus—Refusal strategies on direct and indirect (20 minutes). Pragmalinguistic-sociopragmatic connection activities (judge the appropriateness from the sentence applying and sociopragmatic features on worksheet 7, 20 minutes) Reinforcement activities—give feedback to participants' answer on the worksheet 7.	Yes	Yes
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 7	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS
8	A. Refusal pragmatic features practice		
	B. Material: Video clips , transcripts, worksheet 8	VC, TS, WS	TS, WS

Note. WK= Week; EG=Experimental Group; CG= Control Group; VC=Video Clip; TS=Transcript WS= Worksheet

Research Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study to collect data. The first instrument was the multiple-choice Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire employed as the pretest and posttest, which aimed to investigate participants' L2 pragmatic competence. The second instrument was a student learning experience survey. This survey contained two parts. One was a 34-item, 4-point Likert scale survey which was applied and only employed in the experimental group. The purpose aimed to investigate learners' attitude towards online pragmatics video viewing. The second part of the survey was a twelve-item open-ended questionnaire which was also only implemented in the experimental group. The function of the questions was to investigate the participants' perspectives toward pragmatic teaching and learning. The design of these instruments was based on sociopragmatic factors highlighted in previous studies. All situations were varied based on the socioprgamatic factors of social status, social distance and imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In addition, the researcher took three levels of social status (i.e., low, equal and high) and social distance (i.e., stranger, acquaintance and intimate) into account when designing the research instruments.

DCT Questionnaire

Discourse Completion Test/Task was a useful assessment to evaluate participants' pragmatic competence (Kondo, 2001; Safont, 2005). It was easy for researchers to

present and control the context of the scenarios. Other than that, according to Nurani (2009), DCT presented several decisive strengths. First, researchers could gain a large amount of data in a comparatively short time through DCT questionnaire. Second, the model responses designed in DCT questionnaire were prone to show in spontaneous speeches. Moreover, stereotypical responses designed in DCT questionnaire were provided for a socially appropriate response. In addition, in line with Kwon (2004), DCT questionnaire presented not only interlocutors' pragmalinguistic knowledge (i.e., strategies and linguistic forms) but also their sociopragmatic knowledge (i.e., context factors affect strategies appropriately) in a communicative acts. Likewise, sociopragmatic features (e.g., setting, social distance, status and imposition) were clearly presented (Kasper, 2001). In this study, different sociopragmatic features were presented in the DCT, including 1) situation description; 2) different participants' roles, 3) social status, and 4) social distance (see Table 3.5 and Table 3.6).

Table 3.5 Request Variable Distribution in the Twelve Situations

Sit.	Context	Participants' roles	Social status	Social distance
1.	At library	A student asks librarian to show her how to surf the library web.	Low	Stranger
2.	Dormitory	A girl asks her brother's friend to lend her a ski-coat.	Low	Acquaintance
3.	Teacher's office	A student invites his teacher for dinner.	Low	Acquaintance
4.	At bus station	A student asks his classmate a favor.	Equal	Intimate
5.	On the Internet	A customer demands the refund on unsatisfactory items.	High	Stanger
6.	Your girl-friend's house	A mom asks her daughter's boy-friend to have some soup.	High	Acquaintance
7.	At dormitory	A son asks his dad to send him a passage.	Low	Intimate
8.	At school	A student wants to borrow a cellphone from her classmate.	Equal	Acquaintance
9.	On the street	A girl asks for direction.	Equal	Stranger
10.	On the MRT	A person asks a passenger to keep her voice down.	Equal	Stranger
11.	At home	Your aunt asks you a favor.	High	Intimate
12.	On the street	Your father's colleague asks you favor.	High	Acquaintance

Table 3.6 Refusal Variable Distribution in the Twelve Situations

Sit.	Context	Participants' roles	Social status	Social distance
1.	One the hallway	A girl refuses a boy's invitation	Equal	Acquaintance
2.	At teacher's office	A student declines her teacher's offer	Low	Acquaintance
3.	At a friend's home	A woman refuses her friend's mother's offer	Low	Acquaintance
4.	At home	A boy refuses to her grandmother's request	Low	Intimate
5.	On the street	A passerby refuses to a salesperson's request	High	Stranger
6.	At home	A brother refuses to get a drink for his sister.	Low	Intimate
7.	At home	A mother refuses to raise her daughter's allowance	High	Intimate
8.	On the street	A student refuses to buy chewing gum	High	Stranger
9.	One the street	A neighbor refuses to help the boy	High	Acquaintance
10.	One the hallway	A student refuses to help a student's parent	Low	Stranger
11	At school	A student refuses to lend money to his school brother	High	Acquaintance
12.	On a hill	A hiker refuses to help other hikers	Equal	Stranger

Note. Sit. = Situation

.

There were four major elements in each DCT item. In the first element, situational descriptions followed by a short conversation were presented. In addition, in each conversation, a request/refusal speech act was underlined for participants to judge the appropriateness in each conversation context. The second element was a 5-point Likert scale. After the participants read the description and speech act, they had to select the degree matching to the appropriateness of the underlined sentence. In the third element, the students gave reasons for why they considered this underline sentence appropriate or not. Finally, the participants wrote a response which they regarded as appropriate (see the following examples). Please refer to Appendix N for a complete DCT questionnaire. Furthermore, to avoid exhausting the participants' willingness, twenty four (twelve from request and twelve from refusal) items were chosen and served as pretest and posttest.

Example 1 : Making a request.

You were sick yesterday and didn't come to the class. Today, you want to borrow the math note from your classmate, Mary.
At classroom
You: Mary.
Mary: Yes, what's the matter?
You: <u>I want to borrow your math note.</u>
Mary: Okay. Here it is.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	very appropriate	No idea
	⬭			

Reasons: 雖是同學也要客氣點尋問，說明原因再請別人借你。或該加"請"這字
Your answer: Oh! You know, I was absent yesterday. I want to know what math teacher taught yesterday. Could I borrow your math note?

Example 2: Making a refusal

> Your classmate whom you are close to invite you to dinner after school.
> However, you want to go home earlier today to study.
> Classmate: Hi. What's up?
> You: Nothing special.
> Classmate: Hey, There is a good cafeteria around the corner. Do you want to go there and get a bite?
> You: I can't. I need to go home now.
> Classmate: OK. Maybe next time. Bye!
> You: OK. See you.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	very appropriate	No idea
		⬯		

Reasons: _____雖然是好朋友講一下原因或理由會好一點_____
Your answer: I am afraid that I can't. I need to study for the math exam.

Student Learning Experience Survey

A questionnaire was one of the quantitative data collection instruments for researchers to gain a broad perspective from their subjects. The advantages of applying questionnaire in a study were 1) an efficient method for researchers to collect and analyze data and 2) the convenience for respondents to reflect their perspectives (Dörnyei, 2007).

Student Learning Experience Survey

To closely examine learners' perspectives toward the online video learning and

instruction, in this current study, learners received a 34-item survey and 12-item open-ended questionnaire. First, the 34-item learners experience survey was a 4-point Likert scale survey. It was adapted from Muniandy and Veloo (2011) to investigate the participants' attitude toward online video clip viewing. Through the data collected from this instrument, the researcher gained the participants' perspectives toward online video clip viewing, including the attitude toward the online video clip viewing (7 items), student's engagement (8items), context of online video clips (7 items), and online video clip instruction (12 items) (see Appendix O).

Second, an open-ended question questionnaire was another type of the research method. This kind of survey enabled the respondent to express their own opinion without being influenced by the researcher (Foddy, 1993). In this study, a 12 open-ended questionnaire were designed by the researcher to investigate experimental group (EG) learners' perspectives toward online video-based pragmatic learning and instruction. Four main issues were investigated in these questions, including 1) the teacher's pragmatic instruction, 2) online video-clip viewing on learners' pragmatic competence development, 3) the willingness of applying online video clips into future learning, and 4) learners' self-evaluation on pragmatic knowledge development (see Appendix O).

Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

In this study, data collection lasted for ten weeks, including pretest, instructional treatment and posttest. In the first week, the DCT questionnaire was delivered as the pretest in two classes. From week 2 to week 5, participants in both groups received request speech act instruction. Next, from week 6 to week 9, refusal speech act instruction was the main focus. Finally, in the week 10, the participants had the same DCT questionnaire as posttest. Additionally, the experimental group received a student learning experience survey, including a 34-item survey and 12 question open-ended, question at the end of this study (see the Table 3.7)

Data analysis was completed in two phases (see Table 3.8). In the first phase, quantitative analysis was used to analyze the pretest and posttest data, including descriptive statistics and independent *t*-test (see Table 3.8). As to the second phase, the researcher applied qualitative analysis to find out the learners' perspectives toward the online video-based pragmatic instruction and learning.

Table 3.7 Data Collection Procedure

Week	Stage	Instruction	Purpose
1	Before the treatment	DCT (questionnaire)	To investigate students' pragmatic knowledge of appropriateness and pragmatic competence
2	Request treatment 1	Cross-culture pragmatic awareness	To raise participants' cross-culture pragmatic awareness
3	Request treatment 2	Sociopragmatic features	To raise participants' awareness in the sociopragmatic features
4	Request treatment 3	request strategies	To deliver request strategies in target language
5	Request treatment 4	Pragmatic features practice	To have request speech act activities
6	Refusal treatment 1	Cross-culture difference in refusal	To raise participants' cross-culture awareness between L1 refusal and target language
7	Refusal treatment 2	Sociopragmatic features	To raise participants' awareness in the sociopragmatic features
8	Refusal treatment 3	Refusal strategies	To teach refusal strategies to learners
9	Refusal treatment 4	Pragmatic features practice	To have refusal speech act activities
10	After treatment	Closed-ended questionnaire (DCT) Students' learning experience survey toward online video clips viewing	1. To investigate the effects of pragmatic instruction on participants' pragmatic competence 2. To explore learners' perspectives toward online pragmatic video viewing in pragmatic instruction.

In order to answer research question one, quantitative data analysis and Independent *t*-test were applied in this phase to analyze the data collected from the pretest and posttest of the two groups to answer the research question— "Are there any significant differences in (VHS) EFL students' pragmatic competence between those who engage in the online video pragmatics viewing and those who do not?" First, quantitative data analysis was completed by collecting data from the pretest. The descriptive statistics analysis aimed to present participants' pragmatic competence before receiving pragmatic instruction. Second, Independent *t*-test was implemented to analyze the data collected from the posttest. Data analyzed at this phrase was to examine the similarities or differences, if any, in EG and CG participants' pragmatic competence after receiving different treatments.

To ensure the validity of the measure in this study, four English-native-speaker raters (one from Canada, one from British, one from America, and one from South Africa) and two professors were invited to review and make comments on the DCT questionnaires. The questionnaire items were finalized based on these reviewers' validity judgment and consistent answers to each DCT situation.

Table 3.8 Two Phases of Data Analysis

Phases	Research Questions	Analyses
Phase I Analyze DCT Questionnaires	R1	Descriptive statistics analysis Independent *t*-test analysis
Phase II Analyze Students Learning Survey	R2	Descriptive statistics analysis Pearson Correlation analysis
	R3	Descriptive statistics analysis

Additionally, for those inconsistent items, two more native speakers were invited to further double check the validity judgment; and then two professors were included to reconfirm the validity of those inconsistent items. In total, 24 selective item questionnaire was applied to evaluate participants' pragmatic competence. Based on three sociolinguistic factors—social distance, social status, and imposition, the participants were required to read the situation and indicate how appropriate the underlined speech act sounded to them. Each underlined speech act was labeled from one to five, including "No Idea", "Very Inappropriate", "Inappropriate", "Appropriate", and "Very Appropriate". Except for "No Idea", one point would always be assigned as its score. Other four scales (i.e., Very Inappropriate, Inappropriate, Appropriate, and Very appropriate) had different score assignment based on the validity given by native speakers and professors.

The raters assessed the DCT items by referring to the following procedure. When the raters assigned the underlined speech act as "Appropriate", it was scored five points. Then, the second most appropriate answer, "Very Appropriate", was assigned four points. Then, three points was assigned to "Inappropriate", and two points was to "Very inappropriate". Finally, "No idea" was assigned to one point.

Accordingly, students' performances in each DCT item were assessed as follows. When the student's answer matched to the raters' assignment, he/she eared five scores. Down to this appropriate, it was given, too. If the most appropriate choice or answerer was "Inappropriate", then, down to this appropriate was "Very inappropriate". As the result, "Inappropriate" answer was scored five points, and "Very inappropriate" was scored four points. Following up was "Appropriate" which was scored three points, and then two points was for "Very appropriate". Finally was "No idea" for one point. Thus, when the student's choice to the DCT item was "Inappropriate", the given scores was four based on the correct raters' answer for that item (See Example one: Making a request). Moreover, if the student's choice to the DCT item was "Appropriate", based on the raters' answer, three points was scored (see Example Two: Making a refusal).

Example 1 : Making a request

You were sick yesterday and didn't come to the class. Today, you want to borrow the math note from your classmate, Mary.
At classroom
You: Mary.
Mary: Yes, what's the matter?
You: I want to borrow your math note.
Mary: Okay. Here it is.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very Appropriate	No Idea
	⬭			

☞ The best answer is very inappropriate

Answer	Very Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very Appropriate	No Idea
Points	5	4	3	2	1

Example 2: Making a refusal

Your classmate whom you are close to invites you to dinner after school.
However, you want to go home earlier today to study.
Classmate: Hi. What's up?
You: Nothing special.
Classmate: Hey, There is a good cafeteria around the corner. Do you want to go there and get a bite?
You: I can't. I need to go home now.
Classmate: OK. Maybe next time. Bye!
You: OK. See you.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very Appropriate	No idea
		⬭		

☞ The best answer is inappropriate.

Answer	Very Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very Appropriate	No Idea
Points	4	5	3	2	1

The second phase aimed to answer research question two and three. To answer research question two—"2. What are the participants' perspectives towards the online video clips viewing in pragmatic learning?" Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis were used to analyze the data collected from experimental group's student learning experience survey. Totally, 34-item questionnaire was designed to investigate participants in the experimental group's perspectives toward pragmatic video clips viewing. The questionnaire contains four categories—attitude toward video clips, content in the video clips, participants' engagement, and video clip instruction. To respond to the questionnaire items, the participants in the experimental group gave their answer based on their feeling to the level of agreement or disagreement with a commensurate agrees-disagree scale for a sequel of statements. Examining the mean and standard deviation gained from the data, the researcher could investigate participants' attitude toward online pragmatics viewing.

Moreover, descriptive statistics was again used to analyze the data collected from experimental group's open-ended question to answer research question three—what are the participants' perspectives towards the video-based pragmatic instruction? The 12 question open-ended question was applied to gain more information about learner's perspectives toward online video-based instruction, including 1) the teacher's pragmatic instruction, 2) online video-clip viewing on learners' pragmatic competence

development, 3) the willingness of applying online video clips into future learning, 4) learners' self-evaluation on pragmatic knowledge development, and 5) the learners' suggestions.

Based on the above data analysis, this study could acknowledge the effects of treatments designed and participants' pragmatic competence development.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in October, 2013 and January, 2014. Forty-one grade-ten students majoring in Agricultural Product Marketing participated in the pilot study. Among them, 21 students were piloted with the request items and the other 20 with the refusal items. As to the survey, 40 students cooperated with filling out the items and made suggestions on what the survey and open-ended question could be improved.

Based on the participants' opinions and suggestions, the instruments were revised in light of the recommendations made by the participating students. For the DCT, 40 items were considered too overwhelming for the VHS students to complete, and some items were drafted by too difficult vocabulary. Additionally, the students found it very challenging to write an alternative answer to each DCT item if they regarded the underlined part is not appropriate (see Example 1 and 2). Therefore, the present researcher selected 24 DCT items and revised the language usage to match the VHS students' English proficiency. As to the survey and open-ended questionnaire items,

some students came across a few unclear statement (see Example 3 and Example 4)

which made them misunderstand the essence of the item. Accordingly, the researchers

revised all these items based on the students' suggestions.

Example 1: Making a request

> 10. You are a freshman of XYZ University. Today, your dad helps you move in the dormitory.
>
> Dad: Here we are. And this is your stuff. Are you sure you don't need me to carry those things into your room?
> You: Yes, I think I can do it.
> Dad: Then, I need to go back to work. Call me whenever you need me OK.
> You: I will. Dad, I think that if I can have my Teddy here, that would be wonderful. **Could you please sent it to me as soon as possible?**
> Dad: I see. I will. Don't worry and take care of yourself.
> You: I will. Bye.

If the underlined part is not appropriate what your alternative answer is:

_____

Example 2: Making a request

> 5. Your birthday is coming and you want your father to buy you an iPhone.
>
> At home
> You: Dad! You know what? My birthday is coming soon. It is next Sunday.
> Dad: Yes, and?
> You: Dad, buy me an iPhone for my birthday, OK?
> Dad: I don't think you need such an expensive item. Maybe next time when you pass the JCEE.

If the underlined part is not appropriate what your alternative answer is:

_____

Example 3: A sample of revised survey items

Before:

A	**Attitude Of Online Video Clips**	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	The videos can help me promote my language learning.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I am positive about the benefits of using videos in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I am interested in using the videos	1	2	3	4	5

After:

A	**Attitude Of Online Video Clips**	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
1	The videos can help me improve pragmatic learning.	1	2	3	4
2	I am positive about the benefits of using videos in pragmatic learning.	1	2	3	4
3	I am interested in using the videos in my pragmatic learning.	1	2	3	4

Example 4:

Before:

II. Open-ended Question

1. What do you learn from the lesson？請問你在這課程中學到甚麼？

＿＿
＿＿

1-1 What's your opinion about pragmatic learning？請問你對語用學學習的看法如何？

＿＿
＿＿

1-2 What's your opinion about speech acts (request/refusal) learning？請問你覺得學習請求及拒絕之言語行為的看法如何？

＿＿

1-3 What's your opinion about the instruction of making a request/refusal? 請問你對

教導請求及拒絕之言語行為的看法如何?

_____

_____

After:

II. Open-ended Question

1. What's your opinion about the teacher's instruction of making a request/refusal? 請問你對老師教導請求及拒絕之英語用法有何想法?請說明三點原因。

_____

_____

a. What do you think about teacher's instruction on social factors (status, distance, imposition) related to your pragmatic learning? Please explain.請問你覺得老師教導社會因素(談話者間的關係,社會地位,及聽者的感受)對你學習使用請求及拒絕的英語用法有是否有所關聯?請舉例說明。

_____

_____

b. What do you think about teacher's instruction on request and refusal strategies? Please explain.請問你對於老師教導同學請求以及拒絕的策略所使用的教學方法,有何想法?請舉例說明。

_____

_____

CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS

In the previous chapter, the method of the current study was presented. In this section, the data were collected and analyzed to investigate learners' pragmatic development and perspectives toward the online video-based instruction. For the first part of this chapter, learners' background information was presented. Next, learners' DCT questionnaires were analyzed with paired simple t-test and independent t-test were applied to present the learners' development of pragmatic competence and the effectiveness of the online video-based instruction. The third part of this chapter investigates learners' perspectives toward online video clip viewing and pragmatic instruction through the learners' learning experience survey. Finally, the learners' responses toward the open-ended questions were examined to get learners' perspectives toward online video-based clip instruction and learning.

Participants' Demographic Information

Based on demographic information questionnaire, learners in two groups had similar English learning experience and English study resource. The brief summary of the participants' background information was presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Summary of Participants' Demographic Information

| N=69 | Participants | |
Group	Experimental	Control
Number of students	36	33
Average years of learning English	7.5	7.2
English study resource		
School curriculum 1hr/pw	31(86%)	24(72%)
3hrs/pw	5(13%)	9(27%)
Watching English soap opera/ movies	16 (44%)	11(33%)
Reading English magazine or listening to the broadcast	4 (11%)	7(21%)
Have ever been to English-speaking countries for travel	0	0
Have foreign friends	2 (5%)	2(6%)

On average, participants in both groups (the experimental and control group) had

learned English as a foreign language for about seven years. About 86% of participants

in experimental group and 72 % in control group claimed that they had spent at least

one hour a week studying English (school curriculum) at home. About 13% of learners

in the experimental group and 27% in the control group disclosed that they had spent

more than three hours a week studying English. As for using extra English learning

materials to improve their English ability, participants showed different preferences. In

the experimental group, over 44% of participants watched English soap operas and

movies to practice their English while 33% of participants did so in control group. Moreover, a different percentage of participants' preference also showed Reading English and Listening to English magazine; only four participants (n=11%) in experimental group and seven participants (n=21%) in control group were fond of magazine reading and English broadcast. Furthermore, not a single student from either group had travelled to an English speaking country. Only two students in each group had made foreign friends. However, they reported that they have never practiced English with their foreign friends.

In summary, the learners in the two group had similar English learning experience and habit. Accordingly, their learning experience and habit would not be a factor in this study.

DCT Questionnaire Results

In the following section, data analysis of EG and CG's pragmatic DCT items will be presented to examine the effects of online pragmatic video viewing on learners' pragmatic competence development, the DCT questionnaire was given as a pretest and posttest to collect the necessary data. In addition, paired sample *t*-tests were applied to analyze the improvement, if any, of the pragmatic competence in the experimental group and the control group. Then, the independent *t*-tests were conducted to examine the difference between the results of the pretests and posttests of the DCT of the EG

and CG before and after the pragmatic video viewing instruction. The results will be showed in the following sections.

The Performance of the Experimental Group

To know the learners' pragmatic competence development, the 24 item DCT questionnaire was applied as pretest and posttest in before and after the treatment to examine the effectiveness of the online video-based instruction in the experimental group.

DCT Pretest Performance of the Experimental Group

Data analysis on learners' pretest DCT items shows initial pragmatic competence before the instructional treatment. Learners' initial pragmatic competence in detail is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental Group's Pretest

DCT Item	Mean	SD	Range	Max	Mini	No. of Items
Request	41.58	6.90	33.00	50.00	17.00	12
Refusal	39.25	7.71	31.00	49.00	18.00	12

N=36

The analysis' results reveal that learners gained higher scores than the statistic average. For example, in the 12 request DCT questionnaire items, the average score is 41.58 points, and the standard deviation is 6.90 points. Though none of the participants in the experimental group achieved the highest score of 60, the maximum scored is up to 50 points and a minimum of 17 points.

In the 12 refusal DCT questionnaire items, the finding shows that learners' average

score is 39.25 with a standard deviation of 7.71. The learners got a maximum score of

49 and a minimum of 18points.

DCT Posttest Performance of the Experimental Group

The results of posttest DCT performance reveals the learners' pragmatic

competence after receiving eight weeks of online video-based instruction. Table 4.3

displays the results of the participants' achievement.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Posttest in the Experimental Group

DCT Item	Mean	SD	Range	Max	Min.	No. of Items
Request	45.41	4.62	18.00	53.00	35.00	12
Refusal	45.77	5.23	23.00	56.00	33.00	12

N=36

For the request speech act performance, the mean score is 45.41 Moreover, the

standard deviation is 6.90. Specifically, although no participant gained the highest score

of 60 points, one participant scored 53 points. Other than that, the lowest score is 35.

As to refusal speech act performance, the learners have mean score 45.77.

Additionally, the standard deviation is 5.23. Moreover, one learner got 56 high scores

while one participant got the lowest score 33 points in the 12 refusal items.

The Results of Paired-sample *t*-test in the Experimental Group

The results of paired-sample *t*-test shows that the participants in the experimental

group have improved their pragmatic competence after receiving eight weeks online

pragmatic treatment. Table 4.4 presents the comparison of performance in the

experimental group.

Table 4.4 Comparison of Performance between Pretest and Posttest in the Experimental
Group

DCT Item	Pretest		Posttest		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Request	41.58	6.90	45.41	4.62	-2.54	.016
Refusal	39.25	7.71	45.77	5.23	-4.22	.000

* *p*<.05 **p*<.001

The results present that the learners in the experimental group performed better in

the posttest than pretest. For the request speech act performance, the mean score in the

posttest is 45.41 which is 4 points more than the mean score in the pretest. Moreover,

the standard deviation is shortened from 6.90 to 4.62. Specifically, although no

participant gained the highest score 60 points, one participant had the best score 53

points which is higher than the maximum score 50 in the pretest. Other than that, the

lowest score is 35 which is a far better than the performance of 17 in the pretest.

Statistically, there were significant difference between pretest and posttest (t = -2.54, *p*

=.016 <.05) in the 12 request items and *(t* = -4.22, *p* = .000<.01) in the 12 refusal items.

The learners' refusal mean score is 45.77 which is 6 points more in comparison to the

score in the pretest. Additionally, the standard deviation have shortened from 7.71 to

5.23. Moreover, one learner got 56 high scores which is 7 points more than pretest.

Furthermore, one participant got the lowest score 33 points which is 15 points more

than the minimum score in the pretest in the 12 refusal items.

DCT Pretest Performance of the Control Group

The descriptive statistics results illustrate the learners' pragmatic competence in the beginning of the study. Table 4.5 displays the results of the pretest of the control group.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics of the Pretest in the Control Group

DCT Item	Mean	SD	Range	Max	Mini	No. of Items
Request	38.60	7.70	26.00	50.00	24.00	12
Refusal	37.60	9.14	29.00	52.00	24.00	12

N=33

As shown in the above table, the participants had a mean scores of 38.60 with a standard deviation score of 7.70. In addition, in the statistic result of request DCT questionnaire items, the maximum and minimum score are 50 points and 24 points.

In refusal DCT questionnaire items, the participants had a mean score of 37.6 with a standard deviation score of 9.14. Additionally, two learners gained the maximum score of 52 points on the refusal items. Yet, some gained as low as 24 points in refusal items.

DCT Posttest Performance of the Control Group

After analyzing the descriptive statistics, the results of DCT posttest in the control group were present in the following section (See Table 4.6). The learners had an average mean score of 41.33 for the 12 request items and 41.42 for the 12 refusal items. Although, there was not any participant got the highest score of 60, some learners got

the best score 52 points on both the 12 request and refusal items. Meanwhile, the lowest

score is 27 points on the 12 request items and 28 points on the 12 refusal items.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of the Posttest in the Control Group

DCT item	Mean	SD	Range	Max	Mini	No. of Items
Request	41.33	6.50	25.00	52.00	27.00	12
Refusal	41.42	5.08	24.00	52.00	28.00	12

N=33

The Results of Paired-sample t-**test** *in the Control Group*

To measure whether or not any improvement was made in the control groups, a

paired samples *t*-test was implemented to compare the participants' performance

between pretest and posttest.   Table 4.7 showed the results of the paired-sample *t*-test.

Table 4.7 Comparison of Performance between Pretest and Posttest in the Control
Group

DCT Item	Pretest		Posttest		*t*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Request	38.60	7.70	41.33	6.50	-1.72	.094
Refusal	37.60	9.14	41.42	5.08	-1.85	.073

* *p<.05 **p<.001*

The results indicate that the participants in control group didn't improve their

request and refusal speech acts ability. As shown on Table 4.7, there are no significant

difference between pretest and posttest (*t* = -1.72, *p* = .094 >. 05) in the request items,

and (*t* = -1.85, *p* =. 073 > .05) in the refusal items. Even though the mean scores in the

posttest are about 4 points higher than pretest in both request and refusal speech acts;

and the standard deviation in two speech acts shorten apparently (there are one point

less in request, and four points less in the refusal speech acts), learners failed in

pragmatic competence development during the eight weeks courses.

Comparisons between the Experimental and Control Group

In the previous section, the overall posttest scores are significantly better than

pretest in the experimental group, but not in the control group. In this section,

Independent-sample t-test is applied to investigate whether 1) there is any significant

difference of pragmatic competence between two groups before the treatment, and 2)

whether or not the improvement the improvement in the experimental group is greater

than that of the control group.

First, the results of the Independent-sample t-test in pretest in two groups indicate

that the participants in two groups had similar pragmatic competence.

Table 4.8 and Table 4.9 illustrate the results of the pretest in the 12 request items and

12 refusal items in both groups.

Table 4.8 Independent-sample t-test Results of the Pretest in the Request items in the
Experimental and Control Group

Group	Number	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Exp.	36	41.58	6.90	1.69	0.95
Con.	33	38.60	7.70		

* $p<.05$

Table 4.9   Independent-sample t-test Results of the Pretest in the Refusal Items in
the Experimental and Control Group

Group	Number	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Exp.	36	39.25	7.71	0.810	0.42
Con.	33	37.60	9.14		

* $p<.05$

In terms of the results shown in Table 4.8, there is no significant difference between the request competence in the experimental group and control group ($t = 1.69$, $p = 0.95 > .05$). In other words, the request competence in the experimental group is similar to that of in the control group. Meanwhile, Table 4.9 displays the results of the refusal competence in the pretests in the experimental group and the control group ($t = 0.810$, $p = 0.42 > .05$). The results shows that the experimental group's refusal competence is similar to that of the control group. Similar to DCT pretest scores in the experimental and control groups indicates that the participants in both two groups have similar pragmatic competence. Consequently, their initial pragmatic competence would not be the focus in this study.

By comparing the learners' pretest scores and the scores in the posttest, the researcher could measure the impact of online video clips viewing on leaners' pragmatic development. Table 4.10 and Table 4.11show the results of the independent t-test in DCT posttest performance in two groups.

Table 4.10 Independent-sample t-test Results of the Posttest in the Request Items in the Experimental and Control Group

Group	Number	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Exp.	36	45.41	4.62	3.02	0.04
Con.	33	41.33	6.50		

*p<.05 **p<.001 (2-tailed)

Table 4.11 Independent-sample *t*-test Results of the Posttest in the Request Items in the Experimental and Control Group

Group	Number	Mean	SD	*t*-value	*p*-value
Exp.	36	45.77	5.23	3.49	.001
Con.	33	41.42	5.08		

*p<.05 **p<.001 (2-tailed)

The DCT posttest results reveal that there are significant difference between request and refusal performance in the experimental group, but only minimal improvement in the control group. For example, the independent *t*-test results in the 12 request items show that the participants in the experimental group performed much better in both request and refusal speech acts than those in the control group ($t = 3.02$, $p = 0.04 < .05$). Similarly, the results of the refusal DCT posttest display that the experimental group performs better than the control group ($t = 3.49$, $p = 0.001 < .05$). Additionally, other evidences present in the mean score and standard deviation. The DCT posttest mean score in the EG is 45.41 in the request and 45.77 in the refusal which is much higher than that in the CG (41.33 in the request and 41.42 in the refusal). As for standard deviation in two groups, in comparison with DCT pretest, both two groups reduced their standard deviation range in the posttest. The request score range in the experimental group is much smaller than that in the control group though the refusal score range in the experimental group is slightly greater than that in control group.

In summary, the participants in the experimental group significantly had a far better performance than those who without online video clips viewing in the control group. First, the result of paired-samples t-test shows that there is a statistical difference in the experimental group's pragmatic performances before and after the treatment. In contrast, the result of paired-samples t-test reveals that the learners in the control group did not improve their pragmatic competence after eight weeks of treatment. Second, the results of independent-samples t-test also illustrate that the experimental group's posttest scores are significantly higher than the control group. The findings in this study echo the previous studies that applying online video-based pragmatic instruction really can develop ESL learners' pragmatic competence (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Ishihara, 2007; Jungheim, 2011; Rylander, 2005; Yang, 2013).

Learners' Perspectives toward Online Video Clips

To perceive learners' perspectives toward online video clips viewing, a 34 item questionnaire with four-point Likert scale was delivered to investigate EG learners' perspectives toward online video clip viewing. The four categories of this survey included were 1) learners' attitude toward the video clips viewing, 2) learners' engagement, 3) video clip content, and 4) video clip instruction. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to investigate learners' attitude toward online video clip viewing.

Table 4.12 presents the Pearson correlation analysis results concerning learners'

perceptions of online video clip viewing in pragmatic learning.

Table 4.12 Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations

Categories	2	3	4	M	SD	Sig.(2tailed)
1. Attitude	.726**	.591**	.725**	20.36	2.39	.000
2. Engagement		.696**	.878**	24.38	2.53	.000
3. Content			.667**	20.97	2.37	.000
4. Instruction				37.30	3.36	.000

*p<.05, **p<.01

Significant relationship exits in the four category survey. For example, there are

significant relationships between how learners regard attitude and engagement ($r = .726$,

$p = 0.000 <. 001$), how learners regard attitude and video clips content ($r = .591$, $p =$

$0.000 < .001$), how learners view attitude and pragmatic instruction ($r = .725$, $p = 0.000$

$< .001$). Consequently, significant relationships among these four categories reveal that

the more (less) positive attitude the participants possess, the more (less) active the

participants throw in the online video clips learning, including the video content

learning, engagement and pragmatic video instruction. Apart from attitude, participants

also perceive significant relationship between engagement and attitude ($r = .726$, $p =$

$0.000 < .001$) and video clips content ($r = .696$, $p = 0.000 < .001$), and pragmatic

instruction ($r = .878$, $p = 0.000 < .001$). In other words, once the participants engaged

more (less) in the online video clips viewing to learn the pragmatics, they would have

positive (negative) attitude toward and be fond (less fond) of the video content and the

pragmatic video instruction. Additionally, the numerical correlations illustrate great relationships between content with other three categories, including attitude ($r = .725$, $p = 0.000 < .001$), engagement ($r = .878$, $p = 0.000 < .001$) and pragmatic instruction ($r = .667$, $p = 0.000 < .001$).

Correspondingly, the statistical results indicate that some participants might regard the content as appropriate material in pragmatic learning and have an influence on their willingness on attitude, engagement and pragmatic instruction reception. Yet, some participants might not take issue with the phenomena above. Finally, pragmatic instruction also associates strongly with another three categories, including attitude ($r = 725$, $p = 0.000 < .001$), engagement ($r = .878$, $p = 0.000 < .001$) and video clips content ($r = .667$, $p = 0.000 < .001$) (See the Table 4.12). This statistical result suggests that the more (less) favorable activities the participants involve on the pragmatic video instruction, the more (less) confirmed the participants have on their attitude, engagement and content agreement.

Composite Mean Scores of Each Scale

In term of learners' learning survey, the results show that the learners' perspectives toward pragmatic video clips learning is related to each category. Table 4.13 shows the composite mean scores of each four-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree and 4= strongly agree).

Table 4.13 Composite Mean Scores of Each Scale

Categories	Attitude	Engagement	Content	Instruction
Composite Mean Scores	2.90	3.04	2.99	3.10
Standard Deviation	0.34	0.44	0.33	0.26

Based on the scale design, while the response of each item is over 2.5 or up to 4, it shows that the participants agree with the item's statement (the closer to four, the more strongly participants agree with the item). By contrast, once the learners' response is 2.4 or lower, it indicates that the participants disagree with the item statements (the closer to one, the less participants agree with the item). For the consistency, learners' responses toward the negatively worded items, including item 13, item 25, and item 33, were reversely recoded. The descriptive analysis result on table 4.13 shows that the composite mean score of each category is attitude (CM=2.90), engagement (CM=3.04), content (CM=2.99), and instruction (CM=3.10).

Moreover, the learners' responses vary in different items as the standard deviation of each scale ranges from 0.26 to 0.44, there are attitude (SD=0.34), content (SD=0.33), engagement (SD=0.44), and instruction (SD=0.26). The results indicate that most participants agree with all the scales, but some learners might disagree with the scales, particularly in the scale of engagement (composite mean scores= 3.04, SD=0.44). The participants consider themselves to have not engaged in the pragmatic learning enough.

Overall, the results suggest that the participants' perspectives toward the online video clips viewing in the pragmatic learning is related to each other.

Learners' Perspectives toward Video-Based

Pragmatic Teaching and Learning

Data analysis of open-ended questions revealed the learners' perspectives toward video-based pragmatic teaching and learning. Overall, the participants held both positive and negative perspectives toward the various aspects on video based pragmatic instruction. Examining learners' responses toward open-ended question, the results showed that learners seem have diverse ideas toward each question. Table 4.14 shows the total responses collected from the open-ended question questionnaire.

Table 4.14 demonstrates the learners' response attitude, rate, as well as similar and diverse perspective. Based on the learners' answers, the participants held positive attitude in doing this questionnaire. Most of them provided more than one answer to each question item. In total, the participants tended to hold positive answers toward each open-ended question item, only few had negative ones. Because the learners provided their own individual answers toward each item, it is too difficult to describe each unique answer toward every item. Therefore, the researcher mainly examined the related higher frequent responses toward each item.

Table 4.14 Learners' Responses toward Open-ended Question

Response Proportion / Item Description	Total response	Positive response	Negative response	frequent response	Diverse fragment response
1. Online Video-based instruction	104	99	0	44	45
1.a. Social factor instruction	66	64	2	47	17
1.b. Strategies instruction	68	66	2	40	26
2. Online video clip learning	74	71	3	37	34
2.a. Preferable video section	47	42	5	29	13
2.b. Dispreferred video section	45	8	37	37	8
2.c. Beneficial video section	43	42	1	28	14
2.d. Difficult video section	38	4	34	27	7
3. Willingness	58	49	9	25	14
4. Acquisition	61	52	9	50	2
4.a. Acquired request speech act	63	54	9	54	0
4.b. Acquired refusal speech act	61	52	9	54	0

Furthermore, the participants seemed to have difficulty distinguishing between

question item 2.a and 2.c as well as question item 2.b and 2.d. They gave similar

responses toward these two sets of question items. As a result, the researcher reallocated resources into learners' positive and negative perspective toward video clip viewing in pragmatic learning.

The major findings illustrates in the following sections, including 1) learners' positive perspectives of the teacher's pragmatic instruction, 2) learners' perspectives of acquiring speech acts via online video clip viewing, 3) learners' self-evaluation on pragmatic knowledge development, and 4) learners' suggestions for the online video clip viewing instruction.

Positive Perspectives of Teacher's Pragmatic Instruction

As a whole, around 95% of participants had positive perspectives regarding the teacher's pragmatic instruction. Based on their responses, they learned the pragmatic aspects through overall pragmatic instruction, social factors instruction, strategy instruction and the online video clip viewing.

Overall Pragmatic Instruction. The results of the qualitative analysis showed that around 90% of learners held positive perspectives toward pragmatic instruction. In total, the participating students came up with 104 answers to the first open-ended question, including 99 positive and 5 unrelated ones. In terms of the positive responses, 44 of them reveal convergent opinions while the rest appear divergent but still match the issues under investigation. For the 44 convergent responses, the participants addressed

that the pragmatic instruction 1) facilitated them to become aware of the appropriateness of making a request and refusal, 2) enhanced their English ability, and 3) was clear and helpful. Table 4. 15 illustrated the results of learners' perception based on the overall ranking.

Table 4.15 The Learners' Positive Perspectives toward Overall Instruction

Features	Appropriateness awareness	English ability enhancement	Clear and helpful lesson
Number of responses	24	12	8

First, 24 responses showed that the learners were aware of the appropriateness of making a request and a refusal after receiving the teacher's instruction. For example, one learner mentioned that "I would not offend my interlocutors with inappropriateness usage" (S28). Another learner said that "I could have good relationship with others by making a request and refusal politely" (S19).

Second, 12 responses displayed that the instruction enhanced the learners' English ability. For instance, one student claimed that "the instruction enhanced my English communication ability" (S4). Also, another learner commented that the "teacher's instruction facilitated my grammar learning and built up my vocabularies" (S5).

Moreover, 8 students mentioned that the teacher's instruction was clear and helpful. For example, one learner expressed that "The lessons were fully explained in detail" (S6). Another learner stated that "The instruction was easy to understand" (S23).

Social Factor Instruction. Learners reported positively on social factor instruction. The participants gave 66 responses toward this question item. 47 out of 66 responses were convergent. Table 4.16 presents the participants' opinions of the social factor instruction.

Table 4.16 The Learners' Positive Perspectives toward Social Factors Instruction

Features	Overall politeness	Status	Imposition	Distance
Number of responses	18	13	9	7

The results showed that the majority of learners had been aware of applying sociopragmatic knowledge into speech act performance. They would pay attention to the interlocutor' status, imposition and distance. Most learners expressed that they could make a request and refusal appropriately without offending their hearers.

Specifically, 18 participants expressed that they would pay attention to the appropriate issues (e.g., status, imposition, and distance) in a conversation. Learners stated that they had more concrete concept of appropriateness when making a request/refusal in a conversation. For example, one learner said that "I wouldn't offend the interlocutors in a conversation" (S26). Another learner addressed that "I would pay more attention to my speaking attitude and become more polite when communicating with others" (S20).

Additionally, for the status aspect (the ranking or social station of interlocutors), 13 learners expressed that they would consider the interlocutors' status when making a

request or refusal. For example, one participant declared that "after receiving the instruction about social factors, I knew how to make a request/refusal politely to the interlocutors by using different tone and strategies according to the interlocutors' status" (S9). Another learner addressed that "I knew how to make a request / refusal politely to others, especially when I talk to the elders or superiors" (S22).

Moreover, nine students regarded it important to pay attention to the imposition issue (the feelings of the interlocutors). They expressed that the hearers' feeling was worthy of considering in a conversation. For example, one learner declared that "I should use different ways to make a request or refusal when the relationship of the speaker was different" (S11). Another learner stated that "I knew how to talk politely to the interlocutors by paying attention to the interlocutors' relationship" (S10).

Furthermore, for the distance aspect (the familiarity of interlocutors), seven learners said that they knew how to keep polite to make a request and refusal by paying attention to the social distance. For instance, one learner claimed that "I should use different ways to make a request or refusal when the relationship of the speaker was different" (S11). Another learner stated that "I know how to talk to the interlocutors politely by paying attention to the interlocutors' relationship" (S10).

The Strategy Instruction. Remarkably, over 97% of the students responded to the request and refusal strategy instruction positively. The participants gave 68 answers

toward this question item. 40 responses were conterminous while the rest were not.

Table 4.17 displays the leaners' responses to the request/refusal strategy instruction.

Table 4.17 The Learners' Positive Perspectives toward the Request/Refusal Strategy Instruction

Features	Useful activities	Appropriateness instruction	Great intelligibility
Number of responses	18	12	10

Some learners particularly emphasized the advantage of the practice exercises. Other learners thought that it is beneficial for them to learn pragmatic features through viewing the online video clips, strategies instruction, and appropriateness instruction.

There were eighteen learners who were fond of the strategy instruction with speech act analysis activities. For example, one learner stated that "I could learn the usage of the two speech acts through repeated practice" (S19). Another learner said that "I liked the part that the instructor listed out the request and refusal strategies on the worksheet which help me learn the lesson" (S27). Another learner addressed that "comparing to oral explanation, it was easier for me to understand the meaning of the conversation or the request/ refusal usage through the online video clips viewing activities" (S11). Another learner mentioned, "The instructional way that the instructor used helped me learn the knowledge well. For example, she would offer us questions to think about and give us some feedback after we answered the request and refusal strategy" (S13).

In addition, 12 answers pointed out that applying strategy instruction was beneficial to becoming aware of the importance of appropriateness. The learners expressed that they learned how to make a request and refusal adequately in various situations as well as to use different tones and sentence patterns. For instance, one student acknowledged that "I benefited on how to make a request and refusal appropriately, especially knowing to use different usages according to different situations" (S31). Another learner stated that "I benefited from receiving the request and refusal sentence pattern instruction which helped me know how to interact with others politely" (S9).

Moreover, 10 students expressed that the instruction was of great intelligibility to be understood. For example, one learner said that "I liked the way that the instructor taught us step by step" (S35). Another learner commented that "all lessons were fully explained in detail by the teacher" (S4). Another learner commented "comparing to oral explanation, it is easier for me to understand the meaning of the conversation or the request/ refusal usage through the online video clips viewing activities" (S11).

Learners' Perspectives of Acquiring Speech Acts
via Online Video Clip Viewing

In terms of learners' responses to learning speech acts via online video clip viewing, there are three major findings, which will be presented in the following section.

There are 1) learners' overall feedback on video-clip learning, and 2) learners' responses to the (positive and negative) preference of the parts of the video-clip learning, and 3) learners' (positive and negative) attitude toward applying online video clips into future learning.

Overall Feedback to Video-clip Learning

Learners expressed positive feedback toward video-clip learning. In total 74 responses were given by the learners to answer this question item. 37 out of 71 positive answers were convergent to this question item. Table 4.18 displays the participants' feedback to the practice of the online video clip learning.

Table 4.18 The Learners' Overall Feedback on the Video Clip Learning

Features	Effectiveness	Motivation
Number of responses	25	12

First, 25 students expressed that online video clip viewing could be an effective alternative in learning the request and refusal aspects. Some students expressed that they could observe sociopragmatic aspects through the video clip viewing and manage their time to learn effectively. Accordingly, they could practice their pragmatic knowledge in daily life based on the input they absorbed in the online video clips viewing. For example, one student stated that "Every day, I could practice the request/refusal usages many times at home until I completely learn it" (S16). Another learner expressed that "It was much more effective in understanding the important of

96

the tone differences when viewing the online video clips" (S11). The other learner stated that "through the video viewing, I could observe the usages which the characters used in different situation and context" (S19).

Moreover, some learners (N=12) claimed that the video clip viewing could enhance their English learning motivation. For example, one learner acknowledged that "I would be motivated by the video clips viewing and become willing to learn the pragmatic features" (S10). Another said that "watching online video clips was more attractive than reading books" (S17).

Positive Perspectives for the Online Video Clips Learning

Overall, over 89% learner expressed positive perspectives on learning the request and refusal aspects through the online video clips viewing. The learners gave 47 answers toward this question item. 42 responses were positive. 29 out of 42 positive responses were joined. Table 4.19 shows the qualitative analysis results on learners' preference on the online video clips learning. Based on their responses, they addressed that they enjoyed 1) viewing the clips, 2) observing the characters' language use and expression, and 3) doing video clip viewing exercises.

Table 4.19 The Learners' Preference on Online Video Clips Learning

Features	Viewing the online video clips	Observing characters and the English usages listening	Doing Video Exercise
Number of responses	16	7	6

First, 16 learners stated that the video clips were interesting and familiar to them. They reported that viewing the online clips helped them get the meaning on the content. For example, one learner addressed that "the content, plot and conversation in the online video clips are interesting and can promote our motivation to learn" (S36). Another learner stated that "the situation in the video clips was similar to those happened in the daily life" (S32). Moreover, the other learner said that "having English subtitle on the video clips helped me understand the meaning of the content" (S16).

Additionally, seven learners expressed that they liked to observe the characters' expressions and learned more pragmatic knowledge through that. For example, one learner expressed that "through the video viewing, I could observe the usages which the characters used in different situation and context" (S19). Another learner stated that "I liked to observe the tone used by the characters in the video clips" (S12).

Moreover, six learners addressed that they enjoyed the analysis exercises which allowed them to seize the features of the request and refusal knowledge. For instance, one learner said that "the exercises helped me learn the appropriateness of each strategy and the effects of social factors on the request and refusal" (S28). Another learner claimed that "I liked the part of viewing the online video clips at home and found the request and refusal usage, strategies and social factors" (S9).

Negative Perspectives on the Online Video Clips Learning

Despite that learners positively addressing online video clips learning, around 37 responses presented that the participants were not satisfied with certain parts of the online video clip learning, while the total responses toward this question item were 45. Among the learners' responses, one learner stated that he was suffering from lacking of the teacher's supports on the video viewing learning and exercises. The others claimed that they have difficulties in 1) the speed in the conversation, 2) some difficult language use, 3) video choices, and 4) technological problems (See Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 The Learners' Negative Perspectives on the Online Video Clips Learning

Features	Speed in the conversation	Language use	Movie choice	Technical problem
Number of responses	10	8	5	4

First, ten participants felt that the speed in the conversation was too fast to be understood. Due to lack of comprehending the meaning, they felt frustrated to learn the request and refusal usage.

Second, eight learners addressed that the language used in the video conversation is beyond their ability. They had difficulty getting the meaning as a result of complex grammatical structure and vocabulary usage. For example, one learner addressed that "the grammar used in the video clips conversation was too difficult" (S5). The other student expressed that "some vocabulary was too difficult to be understood" (S8).

Third, five learners complained about the inadequate video clip content and quality. They expressed that the films chosen had bad influence on their willingness in pragmatic learning. For instance, one learner stated that "the films are old and boring, I had seen them before" (S6). Another learner remarked that "I didn't like the setting and plots in the video clips" (S17). The other learner addressed that "some language used in the films are rude (too direct), I don't like it" (S34).

Fourth, four learners mentioned that some technical problems also decreased their willingness in learning. For example, one learner expressed that "the color which the projector projects on the screen is very strange" (S11). Another student addressed that "the flickering film images in the clips decrease my learning motivation" (S36).

Attitude toward Applying Online Video Clips into Future Learning

The majority of learners expressed their anticipation in using online video clips as their English learning materials in the future, with only few stating that they were unsure about that. There were 58 answers given by the participants toward this question item. 49 responses were positive. And only seven learners declared that they would not apply online video clips, and the other two were not sure about using it as their English learning material after their study. Table 4.23 presented the learners' attitude toward online video viewing in the future pragmatic learning.

Table 4.21 The Learners' Feedback on Their Willingness of Applying Video Clips as Learning Materials in the Future

Features	Total response	Positive response	Negative response
Number of responses	58	49	9

Positive Attitude. In total, 84% learners had positive opinion toward using the online video clip as a learning material of learning the expressions of the request and refusal due to the following reasons. First, some leaners acknowledged the advantage of the video-clip learning. For example one learner thought that "I thought this was the easiest way to learn how to make a request and refusal" (S27). Another learner stated that "It was more interesting than listening to the instructor's lecture" (S12). Second, some learners claimed that online video-clip learning was practical. It is easy and accessible for the learners to utilize at home and repeatedly view the video clips. For example, one learner stated that "the situations in the video clips were similar to our real life, I could apply the usage learned from the video clip in daily life" (S29). Another learner expressed that "It was convenient and practical. I could find out the request and refusal usages at home by viewing the online video viewing by myself" (S34).Third, they commented that the online video-clips learning was helpful. For instance, one learner declared that "viewing online video clip increased my learning motivation" (S19). Another learner stated that "I built up my English ability and memorized the lesson through online video clips viewing" (S36).

Negative Attitude. Nine participants declared that they would not use online video clips as their future learning material. Based on the learners' responses, they expressed that some factors prevented them from applying online video clips viewing in pragmatic learning, including difficult language usage and their own preference. For example, one learner said that "No, I wouldn't not use online video clips to learn. Then conversation speed was too fast for me to understand" (S5). Another learner mentioned that "I didn't want to spend money on them. There were many ways to learn English through the Internet today" (S22). Another learner stated that "I don't like learning English, so I wouldn't surf the Internet to view the video clips" (S21).

Learners' Self-Evaluation on Pragmatic Knowledge Development

Over the learners gave high percentage of positive responses to express that they have acquired the two speech acts investigated in this study. Only nine responses showed that the learners are not sure about their achievement. Table 4.22 shows the results of learners' perspectives toward their achievement. The detail information about learners' acquisition toward two speech acts is presented as follows.

Table 4.22 The Learners' Evaluation on the Acquisition of the Request and Refusal Appropriateness

Features	Total response	Positive response	Negative response
Request	63	54	9
Refusal	61	52	9

Speech Acts Acquisition

With regards to the self-reported acquisition of pragmatic knowledge to make a request, 54 out of 63 responses showed that learners believed that to some extent, had acquired that knowledge. For example, one learner stated that "Yes, I thought I had learned the request usage. People should be polite and apply indirect strategies when speaking to the elders. However, for the youth, the elders could use direct strategies to make a request" (S6). In addition, some learners expressed that they had learned how to put social factors into consideration when the conversational situations were different. For example, one learner said that "we should apply different strategies and usage according to different situations" (S15). Moreover, learners learned to vary the language usage. For examples, one participant expressed that "I learned various sentence patterns and strategies to make a request or the response" (S3).

According to learners' response toward the self-reported acquisition of pragmatic knowledge to make a refusal, 52 out of 61 responses displays that the participants learned not only the sentence patterns, strategies, but also the social factors. Some learners stated that they had acquired the refusal strategies. For example, one learner stated that "Yes, I had learned the refusal usage. I knew that we could compliment other people's offer or proposal first, before we make a refusal to them" (S2). Additionally, some learners were aware of social factors in a conversation. For example, one learner

expressed that "I would pay attention to the setting, content and the social factors and also strategies in making a refusal. For example, I can use the refusal strategies like 'maybe next time' (S18). Another learner addressed that "I knew that applying different sentence patterns and strategies would make the interlocutors sound more polite" (S24).

Perplexity Concerning Their Achievement

Among the participants, nine learners were perplexed about whether they have learned the appropriateness of two speech acts examined in this study. For request acquisition, nine responses showed that the learners were not certain about whether they have learned the appropriateness of making a request. Some learners express that they only learned some concepts of the request usage. For example, one learner said that "I only have limited concept on how to make a request in the conversation" (S8). Others revealed that they were lacking of confidence in evaluating the appropriateness of the expression of request in a conversation. For example, one learner acknowledged that "sometimes I was not sure if the request sentence was appropriate used in the situation" (S12). The other learner addressed that "I have hard time distinguishing the request sentences from the appropriateness level to the very appropriateness" (S20).

As to refusal speech act learning, nine responses displayed that learners were not sure whether or not they had learned the appropriateness of the refusal usage. Again, they claimed that they only had rough concept in the appropriateness of making a refusal. For example, one learner said that I only had little concepts on strategies used

in a conversation. Also, they were not confident in telling the appropriateness in a conversation. For example, one learner acknowledged that "I was not sure whether I had completely learned the appropriateness or not. Especially, when I didn't know the meaning of the conversation, I had difficulty judging the appropriateness of the refusal usage" (S12).

Learners' Suggestions for the Pragmatic Instruction

Though high percentage of the learners showed positive perspectives on pragmatic instruction, some students provided several suggestions based on the difficulties their encountered during the pragmatic instruction. Their suggestions include 1) more instructor supports, 2) more practice, 3) more variety in video selection and solving technical problems, and 4) Chinese subtitle inclusion.

First, some learners suggested that the pragmatic learning could have the teacher's supports. For example, one learner stated that the class should have time for learners to ask questions when they met difficulties. Then, they would not feel confused" (S26).

Additionally, four learners hoped to have more output activities. For example, one learner addressed that "maybe the instructors can have role plays as exercises to deepen the learners' impression" (S29). Another learner mentioned that "I hoped that I could not only view the video clips, but also had oral practice with the pragmatic instruction, so that I could enhance my pragmatic competence" (S32).

Moreover, seven learners expressed that they hoped to have more video clips as examples and less technical problems. For example, one learners remarked that "I hoped the instructor used more online video clips as reference" (S10). Another learner said that "the image in the film should be stable. Then, they would not be annoyed when viewing the online video clips" (S20).

Furthermore, some learners indicated that they preferred bilingual subtitles in the video clips. For example, one learner stated "if the video clips had bilingual subtitles (with Chinese and English), I could know the meaning of the sentences" (S12).

To sum up, based on the analysis results, online video-based instruction can promote EFL learners' pragmatic competence. For example, the participants in experimental group outperformed those in control group. By applying paired simple t-test on the learners' DCT questionnaires data, the results showed that the participants in experimental group have significant difference in the pragmatic competence after receiving eight-week online video-based treatment. Contrastingly, there was no significant difference in the result of paired simple t-test in the control group. Additionally, according to the learners' responses toward learners' learning experience survey, the majority of the participants in the experimental group held positive perspectives toward their learning attitude, the online video clip content, learning engagement and pragmatic instruction. Specifically, the learners had positive responses

toward the open-ended questions. Based on their statements, the learners considered online video-based instruction was helpful and effective, especially in social factors and strategies instructions. Most learners were praised on the online video-based instruction though few learners were frustrated in some problems and gave their suggestions. These findings echoed to the previous studies that online video-based instruction could promote EFL learners in pragmatic competence development (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Ishihara, 2007; Jungheim, 2011; Rylander, 2005; Yang, 2013).

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is divided into several parts. First, a summary of the results is illustrated according to the research questions previously mentioned in chapter one. Second, the discussion of the major findings is elaborated by referring to the relevant literature. Third, the pedagogical implications are delineated based on the major findings of the current study. Finally, the limitations of the study and some suggestions are listed and discussed for language educators and future researchers.

Summary and Discussion

In broad terms, this current study aimed to investigate the effects of applying online video clips viewing on EFL learners' pragmatic development through online video-based instruction in experimental group, compared to paper-based instruction on the control group. Not only had the study examined the EG and CG learners' pragmatic development, it but also explored EG learners' perspectives toward online video clips viewing and instruction. The following discussions and conclusions are based on the research questions (RQ) in this current study.

RQ 1: Are there any significant differences in (VHS) EFL students' pragmatic competence between those who engage in the online video pragmatics viewing and those who do not?

Overall, the statistical results showed that the learners in the experimental group

performed much better in the selected speech acts, compared to the control group. First,

the result of paired-samples t-test indicates that there is a positive statistical difference

in the experimental group's pragmatic performances before and after the treatment ($t =$

-2.54, $p = 0.016 < .05$ in the request items; $t = -4.22$, $p = 0.000 < .001$ in the refusal

items). As to the paired-samples t-test results in the control group, the t value was -1.72

in the request and -1.85 in the refusal. Regarding p value, it was 0.94 in the request

items, and 0.73 in the refusal items. The paired-samples t-test results indicated that

learners in the experimental group had developed their pragmatic competence.

Additionally, the results of independent-samples t-test also illustrated that the

experimental group's posttest scores were significantly different from those in the

control group ($t = 3.02$, $p = 0.04 < .05$ in the request items; $t = 3.49$, $p = .001 < 0.001$

in the refusal items). In line with the results, the way of pragmatic instruction with

online video clips viewing might be much more beneficial to EFL learners' pragmatic

learning than that with transcript reading.

The findings of the current study support the previous studies that video clips

viewing had the potential to enhance L2 learners' pragmatic competence (Cohen &

Ishihara, 2005; Ishihara, 2007; Jernigan, 2011; Rylander, 2005; Yang, 2013). Echoing

the studies of Cohen and Ishihara (2005) and Ishihara (2007) on the effects of video

teaching, the online video-based pragmatic instruction in the current study provided L2 learners with rich real-life pragmatic inputs. The learners could be aware of pragmatic aspects by learning activities with video clips viewing. With these meaningful inputs and reflection questions designed in this study, learners could not only observe both the strategies usage and sentence pattern application but also the appropriateness of each speech act. Moreover, according to the participants' expression, each video clip showed the situations clearly that learners were given a great chance to observe the social factors, including power, social distance and imposition between each interlocutor. Consequently, learners could recognize pragmatic features and speech act formula of different speech acts in a conversation. Similar findings were also depicted in Jernigan (2011) and Rylander (2005).

In this study, different activities and pragmatic instruction fostered the participants to have significant improvement in applying the request and refusal strategies, social factor aspects, and appropriate pragmatic awareness. Such an instructional treatment was different from Silva (2003) who depressed the learners for merely having students viewed the video clips without any activities or instructions.

RQ 2: What are the participants' perspectives towards the online video clips viewing in pragmatic learning?

Based on the analysis of learning experience survey, the participants held positive perspectives toward online video clips viewing on their pragmatic learning in four main categories, including 1) learners' attitude, 2) video content, 3) learners' engagement, and 4) the teacher's video-based instruction. The results revealed that learners gave a high agreement on the four categories. According to this survey design, the total agreement range on each survey statement was from one to four. Specifically, the composite means of participants' responses to all the items were higher than 2.5. The composite mean scores in individual categories were learners' attitude (CM=2.9), engagement (CM=3.04), video content (CM =2.99), and the teacher's video-based instruction (CM= 3.10).   Moreover, the findings indicated that those four categories were strongly correlated ($r = 0.591$ to 0.878, $p = 0.000 < 0.01$). This may show that the learners agreed with most of the 34 items. However, the differing range of standard deviation of individual scales showed that learners might have different perspectives toward the online video clip learning (online video clips instruction, SD=0.26; content, SD=0.33; attitude, SD=0.34; and engagement, SD=0.44). In terms of the range of standard deviation, some learners agreed with the benefits of video clips instruction and the video content while others might have some different opinions about them. This may influence learners' learning attitude and the willingness of engagement in this video clips learning.

According to the above findings, most learners have a positive perspectives toward video-based pragmatic learning. Such findings echoed the significance of applying visual aids to language education which may facilitate learners' pragmatic aspects of learning and learning motivation (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Fernández, & Fontecha, 2008; Jernigan, 2011; Jungheim, 2011; Rylander, 2005; Yang, 2013).

Specifically, the composite mean score of online video-based instruction was 3.10 out of 4.0 points. This result showed that learners acquiesced in the effect of video-based instruction in different speech act learning, including sociopragmatic features and pragmalinguistic aspects (Fernandez & Fontecha, 2008; Jungheim, 2011; Rylander, 2005). Moreover, learners accepted the survey statements that the instruction was appropriate and helpful in their pragmatic learning. In terms of the findings in the current study, learners considered the online video contents were appropriate in pragmatic learning. The video contents in this study provided them with situation, sentence patterns and social factors, which facilitated them in speech act reorganization and pragmatic appropriateness awareness. Therefore, learners showed a positive attitude and engagement. Likewise, learners held positive attitude toward this video viewing learning. Learners' response indicated that they were not only fond of learning pragmatic aspects through the online video viewing but also become motivated and willing to take part in the video clip learning in the future.

RQ 3: What are the participants' perspectives towards the video-based

Pragmatic instruction?

The EG learners' answers to the open-ended questions presented that learners held positive perspectives toward the teacher's video-based pragmatic instruction, including 1) the explicit instruction, 2) video-based learning and 3) pragmatic competence development. First, regarding the explicit instruction, 90% of the participants expressed positive agreement with the explicit pragmatic instruction they had received. The learners mentioned that this kind of useful instructional method could not only facilitate them to be aware of the appropriateness of the request and refusal speech acts but also to enhance their English ability. In addition, the learners stated that social factors and strategy instructions were profitable. Social factor instruction provided them with knowledge not to offend their interlocutors. Based on the various situations and social factors, learners were aware of the application of different appropriate strategies.

Regarding the benefits of video-based learning, over 72% of learners made positive comments on integrating online video clips in pragmatic instruction and learning. Learners considered the online video-based learning as an effective and motivating learning method. Among the video clips learning, learners were fond of three parts of pragmatic learning, including 1) speech acts judgments on the video clips,

2) observing the characters' language use, and 3) pragmatic practice activities. The learners claimed that viewing online video was much easier for them to realize the social factors in the situations and notice the usage of speech acts. They enjoyed viewing the video clips and were motivated to learn the aspects of the request and refusal speech acts. In addition, around 70% of the learners expressed that they were willing to apply online clips viewing outside the classroom.

In terms of learners' self-evaluation, there were around 70% of the learners expressed that they had acquired the usage of request and refusal speech acts. Through the video-based instruction and learning, they were not only familiar with the sentences pattern but also acquired the strategy use and the importance of social factors in request and refusal speech acts.

The findings above corresponded to the extant literature that online video-based instruction and learning affected learners' pragmatic competence development and learning motivation (Cohen, 2007; Jungheim, 2011; Yang, 2013). Namely, the explicit instruction is beneficial in raising the students' awareness of pragmatic appropriateness. For instance, learners in this current study indicated the inappropriate routine expression, politeness and style shift after they had the online instructional package (Tateyama, 2007). Moreover, explicit instruction could facilitate the participants to understanding the sociopragmatic norms and pragmalinguistic features in the refusal

speech act (Silva, 2003). For example, learners shifted their strategies from direct refusal to more indirect after receiving the explicit pragmatic instruction. Other than that, learners applied multiple strategies, including expresses positive opinion, regret, and reasons providing in refusing an invitation. This result indicated that learners had made improvement on their sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic abilities through online video clips viewing.

In addition to learners' pragmatic development, online video clip learning motivated learners' willingness in pragmatic learning by providing them a pragmatic environment to closely observe different situations and gain speech acts strategies (Cohen, 2007). The learners stated that this technological innovation increased their learning motivation and pragmatic skills. For example, learners mentioned that the video visuals made the difficult passage easier to understand. Based on their statements, videos' content provided them with examples to make their real life interactions look natural. Second, the online video clips presented situations and social factors, which facilitated their sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects learning. Finally, learners could surf the Net and learn the pragmatic aspects repeatedly without time limited (Moradkhan & Jalayer, 2010).

According to the learners' self-evaluation results, learners were willing to apply the online video-based instruction in their future learning. Echoing several previous

studies (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Jungheim, 2011; Yang, 2013), the learners regarded that this website learning could benefit both pragmatic learning and English ability development.

In comparison with previous studies on online video clip pragmatic education, learners' perspectives toward online video clips instruction was positive in the current study. These learners stated that they appreciated to gain explicit instruction and feedbacks from the instructor in class. Based on learners' expressions, they regarded online video clips as self-instruction materials, and viewing online videos with pragmatic features raising activities benefited them in pragmatic competence development (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Jungheim, 2011; Yang, 2013). However, they still claimed that instructors should provide them with enough feedbacks and support, which would assist them to clear their doubts about what they didn't acquire in the online activities (Jungheim, 2011).

Pedagogical Implications

Several pedagogical implications can be offered based on the results of the current study. According to the findings of DCT, learners' experience survey, and open-ended question, online video-based instruction could promote ESL learners' pragmatic development. Several suggestions for the pedagogical implications are presented in this session for researchers, English teachers and textbook publishers as an instructional

framework.

First, online video clip viewing with explicit instruction promotes ESL learners' awareness of the pragmatic features. After the social factors and strategy instructions, the learners considered it much easier to view the video and distinguishing the appropriateness of the speech act. The situations in the video are much clearer to notice the interlocutors' social status, social distance and the imposition in a conversation (Jungheim, 2011). Consequently, the learners expressed that it was easy to recognize the "direct requests and conventionally indirect requests", and make the judgment on the pragmatic appropriateness. However, they had difficulty in identifying certain strategies, such as "intention derivable—you'll have to head to the station", "strong hint—your room is such a mess", and "mild hint—it's already a quarter past 11". The reason could be that the learners stereotype certain strategies and sentence patterns. When they were viewing the authentic material, they had trouble recognizing those strategies from the situations. Thus, it is important for instructors to implement diverse pragmatic strategies as well as to offer various sentence patterns, and diverse video contents, which would help learners become aware of different pragmatic aspects and usages.

Second, integrating diverse online video clips into pragmatic instruction is potential to arouse the learners' motivation. The various situations and speech acts are

available in a majority of films and TV sitcoms. It is easy for instructors to collect appropriate vignettes for each speech act. Additionally, the interesting and real-life vignettes are proved to increase the learners' learning motivation. In line with Fernández and Fontecha (2008), audio-vision materials attracted the learners' attention and increased their interest. As a result, the learners would involve themselves in the tasks and continue learning the pragmatic features. Furthermore, according to Li's (2013) study, website was a great tool for learners' self-learning outside the classroom. The learners could make good use of the online video to study pragmatic based on their available time and place (Jungheim, 2011).

Third, learners provided their feedbacks to each activity could not only collect their production but also reflect their pragmatic knowledge. While the learners make their answers toward each video clip situation, they go through each social aspect and strategy. Meanwhile, they can re-examine their own pragmatic knowledge, including pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features, and remove the uncertain concept of the target forms. In line with Salemi et al. (2012), the feedback performed an important role in informing ESL learners' output in this study. Pragmatic instructors could diagnose learners' awareness of the pragmatic appropriateness, strategies and pragmatic aspects in each speech act.

Fourth, creating an online video-based tool facilitates EFL learners and instructors in pragmatic learning and teaching. Several studies had shown that online video clips provided learners with authentic language input, time saving, and interesting learning material (Chen, 2009; Jungheim, 2011; Yang, 2013; Rylander, 2005). Pragmatic instructors could apply institutional settings like "YouTube" easily to provide EFL learners with plenty online video database examples via streaming video server. In addition, there are abundant of sources available on the Internet. Pragmatic instructors could aim at the certain speech act and situations, and extract clips based on the larger online conversations to help learners improve the awareness of the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects found in the films, TV series, or other video conversations. With this kind of authentic resource, language instructors would have seemingly endless resources to develop their own pragmatic material specifically for the speech acts studies.

Fifth, applying extracted film/TV series clips was better than self-made video. Though dialogues in a film/a sitcom may not be regarded as 100% authentic language, most of the main aspects of authentic language were taken to show daily and natural expressions (Fernández & Fontecha, 2008). Several advantages were found in film /TV series clips. For example, a film/TV series has higher quality films because they were produced by professional teams, including director, technology, and actors/ actress.

Additionally, because all of the characters were performed by trained actors and actresses, they had fluent interaction and splendid performance, including the movement, conversation, and facial expression. While instructors may make videos to meet their special need for a certain speech act or situation, they would have to cope with the actors' bad performers, such as errors in pronunciation and mistakes in sentence structure, camera quality and other problems. Such an instructional design supports Tateyama's (2007) argument; the conversation in the films and TV series are recommended for the language instructors to implement when they would like to integrate authentic material into their teaching.

Limitations of the Study

The findings in the experimental group showed that the EG learners had made significant improvement in pragmatic competence development, compared to the CG learners. There are still some limitations in the current project, which need further investigation to fill in research gaps. First, the sample size is not large enough (each group in this study included only thirty-six participants in the EG, and another thirty-three in the CG). In future research, a larger sample size may bear more power inferential statistics and contribute to more generalizable results. Second, the time for pedagogical intervention was limited (four weeks for request instruction and another four weeks for refusal). With longer instructional time in the future studies, some

different findings will be explored. Learners could have more time to receive more pragmatic instruction, practice, and feedback to acquire the different aspects of social factors. Third, the pragmatics output performance was not included in this study, and learners complained about this shortcoming. If they had had chances to do some role play or writing activities, they would have known their pragmatic competence on applying speech acts in daily life. Fourth, the treatment period in each week was shortened due to prescribed class activities, so learners could not observe a greater number of online video clips and receive enough feedback from the instructor. These participating students felt frustrated about not getting frequent feedbacks from the instructor to clear their doubts when they did the online video clips activities at home. They expressed that they were not sure about the answers they made on the appropriateness rating activities. To further investigate the autonomous learning, the researcher could set up a discussion platform in each online video clip. The learners could write down their questions and discuss with their classmates online. The instructor can acknowledge the difficulty which the learners encounter and provide more supports on the same platform.

Suggestions for Further Research

As previous mentioned, online video-based instruction in EFL vocational high school students is evidently absent in the related literature. The findings and limitations

of this study suggest the following directions for future researchers.

First, to acknowledge EFL learners' pragmatic competence development through online video-based instruction, there is a need for researchers to recruit more participants in different settings to possibly draw more generalizable results, if any. Second, to give learners more time to practice and gain more feedback from the instructor, it is recommended to prolong the invention time span in future research. Only when the learners have enough time to digest the knowledge and clear their doubt on the appropriateness of the speech act, they have better chance to apply them in their daily life and promote their pragmatic competence. Moreover, to keep track the percentage of the participants' online video viewing frequency, researchers could find more evidence regarding the development of learners' pragmatic competence development with exposing themselves to more online video clips viewing. Thus, a long-term investigation is recommended to record the learning process. Third, to know the participants' exact pragmatic competence, output performance should have been included in research design. In addition to making judgment on pragmatic appropriateness, it would be better for the learners to have real communication with different appropriate interlocutors. With this concern, it is of great importance for future researchers to investigate the effects of online video-based instruction on learners' output performance. Finally, getting feedbacks and supports from the instructors is

important for the EFL learners. The feedbacks and supports help learners to clear their

doubt and gain confidence, especially after they finished each activity. It is then

recommended that future instructors can provide more feedback and support to the

participants.

References

Abed, A.Q. (2011). Pragmatic transfer in Iraqi EFL learners' refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics 1*(2), 166-185.

Ahangari, S., & Shoghli, M. (2011). Investigating request strategies between Iranian EFL learners and Canadian native speakers of English in various social situations. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics IPEDR 26, 173-176. IACSIT Press, Singapore.*

Ahar, V., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2011). The effect of social status and size of imposition on the gratitude strategies of Persian and English speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research 2*(1), 120-128. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.1.120-128.

Alcón, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Alcon-Soler, A., & Guzman-Pitarch, J. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *IJES, 10*(1), 65-80.

Al-Eryani, A. A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal 9*(2), 19-34.

Al-Kahtani, S. (2005). Refusal realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University. 18*, 35-57.

Archer, E. (2010). They made me an invitation I couldn't refuse: Teaching refusal strategies for invitations. In D. H. Tatsuki & N. R. Houck (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts* (pp. 181-194). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Aydin, H., & Koch, C. (2012). Romanian second language learners of English requests and apologies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(2), 233-239.

Bachman, L.F. (1990) *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York: Oxford University Press

Bachman, L.F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *In Language Learning, 49*, 677-713.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning, 40*(4), 467-501.

Bardovi-Harling, K., Hartford, B. A. S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic aware: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal, 45*(1), 4-15.

Bardovi-Harlig, K, & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Introduction. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington D.C., US Department of State, Office of English Language Programs. Retrieved on October 16, 2006 from U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Baumer, M., & Rensburg, H. V. (2011) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure in computer-mediated communication. *Coolabah, 5*, 34- 53. Observatori: Centre d'Estudis Australians, Australian Studies Centre, Universitat de Barcelona.

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp.43-57). New York : Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., Danet, B., & Gherson, R. (1985). The language of requesting in Israeli society. In J. Forgas (Ed.), *Language and social situations* (pp. 113-139). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Blum-Kulka, House, J., & Kasper, (1989: 6). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and Apologies.* Newwood, NJ: Albex publishing Corporation.

Brock, M. N., & Nagasaka, Y. (2005). Teaching pragmatics in the EFL classroom? Sure you can! *TESL Reporter 38*(1), 17-26.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ÇAKIR, İ. (2006). The Use of video as an audio-visual material in foreign language teaching classroom. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET 5* (4), Article 9, 67-72.

Campillo, P. S., Safont-Jorda, M. P. & Codina-Espurz, V. (2009). Refusal strategies: A proposal form a sociopragmatics approach. *Revista Electronica de Linguistica Alicada 8*, 139-150.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). Harlow: Longman

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). A pedagogical framework for communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics 6*(2), 5–35

Chen, C. W. Y. (2006). The mixing of English in magazine advertisements in Taiwan. *World English, 25*(3), 467-478.

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, E. (2009). CMC Cross-Cultural Learning and Impact on Language Use: the Quality of Pragmatic Exchange. Retrieved on December 4, 2013 from ir.csu.edu.tw/.../2009 跨文化英語教學論文 CMC%20Cross-Cult....

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S.L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383 – 420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Cohen, A. D. (2007). The teaching of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. *ILI Language Teaching Journal, 3*(2), 1-28.

Cohen, A. D. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching, 41*, 213-235.

Cohen, A. D., & Ishihara, N. (2005). A Web-Based Approach to Strategic Learning of Speech Acts. Retrieved in 8 December, 2013 from carla.acad.umn.edu/.../ Japanese%20Speech%20Act%20Report

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Dastjerdi, H. V., & Rezvani, E. (2010). The impact of instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' production of requests in English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(6), 782-790. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.6.782-790.

Davies, C. E. (2004). Developing awareness of cross-cultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. *Multilingua, 23*, 207-231.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1993). Expression gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatic* (pp. 64-81). Oxford University Press.

Eslami Z. R. (2011). In their own voices: reflections of native and nonnative English speaking TESOL graduate students on on-line pragmatic instruction to EFL learners. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, *2*(15), 1-22.

Eslami, Z. R. & McLeod, K. D. (2010). It's 8 o'clock in the morning—are you watching television? Teaching indirect requests. In Tatsuki, D. & Houck, N. (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts* (pp. 19-28). Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2008). Enhancing the pragmatic competence of non-native English speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs). In E. Alcón & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 178-197). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL EJ, 8*(20), 1-12.

Farashaiyan, A., &, Tan, K. H. (2012). A Cross-cultural comparative study of gratitude strategies between Iranian and Malaysian postgraduate students. *Asian Social Science 8*(7), 139-148. www.ccsenet.org

Felix-Brasdefer, J. C., & Bardovi-Harling, K. (2010). "I'm sorry. Can I think about it?" The negotiation of refusals in academic and non-academic contexts. In D. Tatsuki & N. Houck (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts*. (pp. 163-180). Alexandria, VA: TESOL

Fernández Guerra, A. & Martínez Flor, A. (2003). A requests in films and in EFL textbooks: A comparison. *ELIA 4*, 17-34

Fernández, M. B, & Fontecha, F. A. (2008). The Teachability of Pragmatics in SLA: Friends' Humour through Grice. *Porta Linguarum 10*. 31-43.

Francis, C. (1997). Talk to me! The development of request strategies in nonnative speakers of English. Working Papers in *Educational Linguistics, 13*(2), 23-40

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 219-236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166 (90)90081-N

Fukuya, Y. & Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). The interactive effects of pragmatic-eliciting tasks and pragmatic instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*(3), 478-501.

Gu, M. (2011). Language choice and identity construction in peer interactions: insights from a multilingual university in Hong Kong. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 32*(1), 17-31

He, Z. (1988). *A Survey of Pragmatics*. Changsha: Hunan Education Press.

Hsieh, M. H. (2012). A *qualitative case study on teacher's and students' motivation-related experiences of l2 pragmatics in Taiwan*. MA Thesis.

Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of 'ne' in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351-385). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center and University of Hawaii.

Ishihara, N. (2007). Web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness-raising approach. *Language Awareness 16*(1), 21–40.

Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. D. (2010) *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman/Pearson Education.

Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request Strategies: Cross-Sectional Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Australian Native Speakers. *English Language Teaching 2*(1). 46- 61.

Jalilifar, A. R., Hashemian, M., & Tabatabaee, M. (2011). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners request strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(4), 790-803. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.4.790-803

Jernigan, J. (2012). Output and English as a Second Language Pragmatic Development: The Effectiveness of Output-focused Video-based Instruction. *English Language Teaching 5*(4), 2-14.

Jungheim, N. O. (2011). *Web-based evaluation of EFL learners' pragmatic competence utilizing video stimuli. Waseda Review of Education, 25*(1), 147- 162.

Kahraman, B., & Akkuş, D. (2007). The use of request expressions by Turkish learners of Japanese. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 3*(1), 122-138.

Konakahara, M. (2009). Request strategies and internal modifications in Japanese learners of English. *Proceedings of the BAAL Annual Conference*, 67-70.

Kasper, G. (1981). *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache*. Tübingen: Gunther Narr.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8*(3), 203-231.

Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 145-148. Doi: 10.1017/S0272263100014856.

Kasper, G. (1997a). Can pragmatic competence be taught? Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved on April 10, 2013 from http://www.nflrc. Hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In: Spencer-Oatey, Helen (Eds.), *Culturally speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London/ New York: Continuum, 316-341.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 33-60.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. In k. Bardovi-Harlig, and Z. Dörnyei (Eds), *Themes in SLA Research. AILA Review 19*, 83-99. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publish Company.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), Interlanguage Pragmatics, (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 215-247.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.1-12). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Mahwah, NJ: Blackwell publishing.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *The development of pragmatic competence. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 149-169.

Kondo, S. (2001). Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Interlanguage refusal. Paper presented at PacSLRF at University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Kondo, S. (2004). Raising Pragmatic Awareness in the EFL Context. *Sophia Junior College Faulty Bulletin 24*, 49-72.

Kwon, J. (2004). "Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English". *Multilingua, 23*, 339-364.Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* New York: Longman.

Li, H. (2007). A comparative study of refusal speech acts in Chinese and American English. Canadian Social Science *3*(4), 64-67.

Li, H. (2011). An empirical study of English pragmatic failure of Chinese non-English majors. *Theory and Pragmatic in Language Studies, 1*(7), 771-777.

Lin, H. (2010). A pragmatic study of refusals by Taiwan mandarin learners of EFL. Unpublished Master Thesis. National Yunlin University of Science and Technology.

Liu, A. (2010). Investigated in whether L1 pragmatics would transfer to L2. Focus on compliment. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly) 33*(4), 26-44.

Liu, J. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 5*(1), 1-22.

LoCastro, V. (2010) Misunderstandings: Pragmatic glitches ad misfires. In D. Tasuki, & N. R. Houck, (Eds.) *Pragmatics: Teaching Speech Acts* (pp.7-16). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Martínez-Flor, A. (2007). Analyzing request modification devices in films: implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In E. Alcón Soler, & M. P., Safont Jordà (Eds), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning.* Springer. Dordrecht.

Martínez-Flor, A. & Usó-Juan, E. (2010). The teaching of speech acts in second and foreign language instructional contexts. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Handbook of pragmatics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Mayer, R. E. (2002). Multimedia Learning. In B. H. Ross (Ed.), *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation, 41* (pp. 85-139). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ministry of Education (2003). *Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines.* Taipei: Ministry of Education.

Mirzaei , A. & Esmaeili, M. (2013).The effects of planned instruction on Iranian l2 learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. *Iranian Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 1*(1), 89-100.

Mohammad, G., Alireza, B., & Shirin, M. (2013) Investigating cross-linguistic differences in refusal speech act among native Persian and English speakers. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning 2*(4), 49-63.

Moradkhan, D., & Jalayer, B. (2010). The impact of using authentic audio-taped and video-taped materials on the level of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *JELS*, *1*(3). 33-52 IAUCTB.

Muhammed, B. J. (2012). A linguistic study of refusal strategies used by advanced Iraqi learners of English. Retrieved on Oct 17, 2013 from www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=75227

Muniandy B. & Veloo S. (2011). Managing and utilizing online video clips for teaching English language: Views of TESOL pre service teachers. *2nd International Conference on Education and Management Technology IPEDR 13*, 173-178. IACSIT Press, Singapore

Nipaspong, P. & Chinokul, S. (2010). The role of prompts and explicit feedback in raising EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 5*, 101-146.

Nurani, L. (2009). Methodological issue in pragmatic research: Is discourse completion test a reliable data collection instrument?" *Journal Sosioteknologi Edisi, 17*, 667-678.

Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research 5*, 189-216.

Palmer, D. S. (2010). Second language pragmatic socialization in world of Warcraft, PhD, Thesis.

Paulston, C. (1977). Developing communicative competence: Goals, procedures, and techniques. In J. E. Alatis & R. Crymes (Eds.), *Human Factors in ESL* (pp. 20-39). Washinton, D.C. TESOL.

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

Rylander, J. (2005). Teaching Pragmatics via Video. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT2004* Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT. 821-826.

Sadeghi, A. & Foutooh, M. (2012). The effect of explicit instruction of compliment responses strategies on intermediate Iranian foreign language learners" ability to respond to compliments. *International Journal of Linguistics. 4*(3), 385-406. doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2264 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2264. www.macrothink.org/ijl

Safont, M. P. J. (2005). Third language learners. *Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Salami, A., Rabies, M., & Kebab, S. (2012). The effects of explicit/implicit instruction and feedback on the development of Persian EFL Learners' pragmatic competence in suggestion structures. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(1), 188-199.

Saleh, M. (2011). The effect of explicit versus implicit Instruction: A case for apology and request speech acts. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics, 26*, 467-470.

Sarfo, E. (2011). Variations in ways of refusing requests in English among members of a college community in Ghana. *African Nebula, 3,* 1-15.

Sattar, H. Q. A., Lah, S. C., & Suleiman, R. R. R. (2011). Refusal strategies in English by Malay university students. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies 11*(3), 69-81.

Schafer, G. A. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development. The study abroad context*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Schauer, G. A. & Adolphs, S. (2006). Expressions of gratitude in corpus and DCT data: Vocabulary, formulaic sequences, and pedagogy. *System 34*, 119–134.

Schmitt, N. (2010). Pragmatics In H. Spencer-Oatey, and V. Zegarac (Eds), *An Interdiction to Applied Linguistics* (pp. 70-88). Hachette UK company.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper &S. Blum-Kulka, (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (PP. 43-57). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: Am essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society, 5*, 1-23.

Searle, J., R. (1977). Reiterating the differences: A reply to Derridar, In S. Weber and H. Sussman (Eds.), *Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (1980). *Speech act theory and pragmatics.* Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing.

Searle, J. R., & Vandervken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, A. J. B. (2003). The effects of instruction on pragmatic development: teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies, 22*(1), 55-106.

Smith, C. (1998). *Can adults "Just say no?" How gender, status and social goals affect refusals.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022196272006

Soler, E. A. And Pitarch, J. G. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *International Journal of English Studies (IJES), 10* (1), 65-80.

Stalnaker, R. C. (1972). Pragmatics. In D. Davidson & G. Harman (Eds.), *Semantics of natural language* (pp. 380-397). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Stempleski, S., & Tomalin, B. (1990). *Video in action: Recipes for using video in language teaching.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Sykes, J. M. (2005). Synchronous CMC and pragmatic development: Effects of oral and written chat. *CALICO Journal, 22* (3), p-p 399-431.

Sykes, J. M. (2008). *A dynamic approach to social interaction: Synthetic Immersive Environments & Spanish Pragmatics*. PhD, Thesis.

Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 English. *Pragmatics 16*(4), 513-533.

Taguchi, N. (2009). *Pragmatic competence*. Berlin, Germany: Mounton de Gruyter.

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

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

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8*, 131-55.

Takimoto, M. (2007). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(1), 1-25.

Tateyama, Y. (2007). The effects of instruction on pragmatic awareness. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT 2006 Conference Proceedings.* Tokyo: JALT. 1198-1200.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics. 4*(2), 91-109.

Ülbeği, E. (2009). The effects of implicit vs. explicit instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 22* (2), 327-356

Vellenga, H. (2008). *Instructional effectiveness and interlanguage pragmatics.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northen Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Wannaruk, A. (2008). Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals. *RELC, 39*(3), 318-337. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688208096844.

Yang, J. (2008). How to Say 'No' in Chinese: A Pragmatic Study of Refusal Strategies in Five TV Series. In Chan, M. K.M. & Kang, H. (Eds). *Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-20), 2,* 1041-1058.

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

Zheng, L., & Huang, J. (2010). A study of Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic failure and the implications for college English teaching. *Polyglossia, 18*. 41-54.

Appendix A

What Makes Films Easy or Difficult? Adapted from Sherman (2003)

Features of incomprehensible films	Description	Example
High verbal density Words don't match/are ironic, or in conflict with the action.	A lot of speech with very little action e.g., in smart dinner table conversation	Woody Allen's films Indiana Jones or Monty Python
A high degree of naturalism in the speech Cartoons	Many people are talking at once, mumbled asides, backs to the camera, breaking dialogue. Facial expression and body language are not as expressive as those of real people.	Kong Fu Panda
Dialect and regional accents Period language,	Local color in the film frequently confused the viewers. Some expressions in the past are no longer used in modern time.	Fargo Jane Austen and Dickens

Features of Comprehensible films	Description	Example
Clear conventional story line	Straight forward love stories aimed at adolescents	Bring It On
Simple plot lines and time-consuming special effects	Which lighten the verbal comprehension burden	children's film drama (e.g., Babe), ; epics (e.g., Titanic,) and science fiction drama (e.g., Star Wars)
Stylized acting	One character speaks at a time. He / She always speaks clearly and face to the camera.	Classics movies (e.g., Gone with the Wind.

134

Speech in standard accents	Dialect would not confuse the viewers.	
Film slows down the diction	One of the main characters can't communicate well (being an alien, deaf …). The director uses halting language to interpret both for the other characters and the audience.	Nell; ET

Appendix B

The Rubrics for the Film Selection

Films	Unambiguous action	Clear conventional story line	Simple plot lines and time-consuming	Stylized acting	Speech in standard accents	Film slows down the diction	Less incomprehensible vocabulary	Adequate Speed	Subtitle provided	Easy to recognize the pragmatic factors
1. Bring It On	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
2. Click	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
3. Free Writer	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
4. Forrest Gump	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
5. Truman Show	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
6. The Parent Trap	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
7. Sister Act	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
8. What's Eating Gilbert Grape	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v

Appendix C

The Request Strategies Adapted from Eslami and Mcleod (2010) and Francis (1997).

I. Direct level

1. Imperative	Utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force (e.g., "Leave me alone.").
2. Explicit request verb	Utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named (e.g., "I *am asking* you to leave me alone.").
3. Hedged requesting verb	Utterances in which naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions (e.g., "I *must ask* you to leave me alone.").

II. Conventionally indirect level

4. Intention derivable	Utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act (e.g., "Sir, you*'ll have to* move your car").
5. Want statements	Utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act (e.g., "I *want* you to move your car.; I *would like to* get a ride home with you.").
6. Suggestion formula	Utterances which contain a suggestion to do something (e.g., "*How about* cleaning up?").
7. Query-preparatory	Utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g., ability, willingness) as conventionalized in any specific language—using could you/ would you phrasing in question (e.g., "Would you mind moving your car?").

II. Non-conventionally indirect level

8. Strong hints	Utterances containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act (e.g., "Your room is a mess.").
9. Mild hints	Utterances that make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as requests by context (e.g., "We've been dating for five years.").

Appendix D

The Refusal Strategies Adapted from Ülbeği (2009) and Archer (2010)

I. Direct level	Examples
1. Performative	I refuse"
2. Non performative statement	1. "No" 2. Negative willingness. (e.g., "I can't." "I won't." "I don't think so.").

II. Indirect level	Examples
3. Statement of regret	1. I'm sorry…" 2. Sorry...
4. Positive statement	1. I wish I could help you… 2. That sounds wonderful, but… 3. I'd like love to, but….
5. Excuse, reason, explanation	1. I already have other plans. 2. I don't feel well. I have a headache. 3. I have to…
6. Statement of alternative	1. I can't do X instead of Y (e.g., "I'd rather…" "I'd prefer…"). 2. Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., "Why don't you ask someone else?"). 3. Would you want to _____ instead? 4. Maybe some other time.
7. Thanking	1. Thank you for your invitation, but… 2. Thanks, but….
8. Set condition for future or past acceptance	1. If you had asked me earlier, I would have…
9. Promise of future acceptance	1. I'll do it next time. 2. I promise I'll…

	3. Next time I'll… (-using "will" of promise or "promise").
10. Statement of principle	1. I never do business with friends.
11.Statement of philosophy	1. One can't be too careful.
12. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the request (e.g., "I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation. ").
	2. Guilt trip (e.g., "Waitress to customers who want to sit for a while: I can't make a living off people who just offer coffee.").
	3. Criticize request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion).
	4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
	5. Let interlocutor off the hook. (e.g., "Don't worry about it." "That's okay.").

Appendix E

Worksheet 1 *Request*   *Group* ____

Worksheet for Video Exercises

Episode 1

You are going see short video clips taken from a North American movie involving request speech acts. The video is about a woman who was set in a convent to be protected from killing. The Reverend Mother brought her to the dining room to have lunch with nuns in the convent.

In the dining room, during the meal, Clarence tastes the food and felt disgusted.

> Clarence: Ough, what are you people? A pritikin order? This stuff tastes like sh--
>
> Reverend Mother: Sisters, we shall spend the rest of the day in silence.
>
> Clarence: Why?
>
> Reverend Mother: Only when our lips are silent may our prayers truly be answered.
>
> Clarence: Then you don't have to eat this food!
>
> Reverend Mother: Silence begins now and ends at sundown.
>
> Clarence: How can you eat this stuff? It's terrible.
>
> Reverend Mother: Mary Clarence. I think you might enjoy a ritual fast.
>
> Clarence: A ritual—no, no I don't think I would, I'll put a little salt in it, it'll be fine.
>
>   Pass me the salt.
>
> Reverend Mother: A fast—to remind you of those who must endure without food.
>
> Clarence: No, I don't want you to take—(One sister comes to take her plate) I don't
>
>   want you to take my plate.
>
> Reverend Mother: And silence!

Exercise 1: Answer the following questions:

1.   What's relationship between those characters?

2.   Which sentences are request sentences?

3.   How does the mother's request sentence affect the possible interpretations of her questions?

4.   What kind of request questions does the Reverend Mother use?

Episode 2

Reverend Mother introduces Deloris to every nun and the sisters welcome her.

Reverend Mother: Mary Clarence comes from a somewhat progressive convent.
　　　　However, she is eager to embrace a more disciplined life... and I am sue
　　　　will make every effort to conform to our ways.

Deloris: I'll do my best.

Reverend Mother: Sister, would you like to be seated?

Deloris: Thank you.

　　　(Deloris walks to her seat).

　　　(Sister Mary Patrick raises her hand).

Reverend Mother: Yes, Mary Patrick.

Sister Patrick: Reverend Mother, on behalf of all the sisters at Saint Katherine's
　　　　I'd like to offer a great big "hi there" and "hello" to Sister Mary Clarence.
　　　　Hi, and as part of welcome, I thought "maybe our new sister could offer
　　　　　today's blessing.

Reverend mother: That's very thoughtful of you, but I really

Deloris: Oh yeah, I can do that, sure.

Exercise 2: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?
2. Which sentences are request sentences?
3. How does the mother's request sentence affect the possible interpretations　　of her questions?
4. What kind of request question does the Reverend Mother use?

Episode 3

You are going see a few short video clips taken from a North American movie involving request speech acts. The video is about a woman who complaint her boy' to two of her friends. When she is complaining, her boyfriend asks someone to send her a gift.

Deloris and her friends, Michelle and Tina, are at their dressing room. She talked about leaving Vince. Vince sent two of his man to give Deloris a gift.

Michelle: At least you got something out of all of this.

    Deloris, open this up.

Tina: Yes,

Deloris: Why should I open this?

    I don't give a damn what's in that box. I don't care.

Michelle: See what the man bought you.

Deloris: Why? Why?

Tina: I wanna see.

Deloris: Fine, let's look and see what it is.

Exercise 3: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?

2. Which sentences are request sentences?

3. How do those request sentences affect possible interpretations of her questions?

4. Which kind of request do you think this is?

Episode 4

Deloris goes out the convent to a bar.   Sister Patrick and Robert follow her to the bar, too.

Sister Patrick: What do you doing here?

Deloris: I'm here to see a man about a car … for the convent.

Both two sisters: Really? Do you mean it?

Deloris: No, I didn't and I'm gonna get you out of here.

Sister Patrick sees a jukebox.

Sister Patrick: Oh, a jukebox! One song. Do you have a quarter?

Deloris: NO, no, no, no, no!

Sister Patrick: (Look at a guy). He does. It's come back to you tenfold, Thanks.

Deloris: Hurry up.

Sister Patrick: One dance. I'll be right back, please.

Deloris: Come on, come on.

Sister Patrick: Yes, yes, yes, yes… (Dance with Deloris and way to the door).

Exercise 4: Answer the following questions:

1.   What's relationship between those characters?

2.   Which sentences are request sentences?

3.   How did those request sentences affect the possible interpretations of her questions?

4.   Which kind of request do you think this is?

Appendix F

Worksheet 2   *Request*   *Group ___*

Exercise 1

For following exercise, please view the video clips carefully first. Then according to the video clips, please answer the following questions about speakers and addressee's social distance, social status, the degree of imposition involved in this speech act and the setting in the conversation.

Episode 1

Deloris is in police office. Three detectors (detector Souter and two of his colleagues) are interrogating her.

Detector Souter 1: Miss Van Cartier?

Deloris: What?

Detector Souter: You're Vince LaRocca's girlfriend, right?

Deloris: Well, sort of, maybe. It depends on how you look at it. The guy just tried to kill me so I don't think that cements our relationship.

Detector Souter: You realize he's a major underworld figure, don't you?

Detector 1: He's into drug dealing, money laundering.

Detector 2: We've been investigating Mr. LaRocca for the last 18months. We've got videotapes surveillance photos.

Deloris: Am I…am I in any of the videotapes?

Detector2: No, no, no,.. Criminal activity.

1. Identify the characteristics of the request/refusal situation. Include the following information.
   - Speaker and addressee's social distance—intimate, acquaintance, stranger.
   - Speaker's status—high, equal, low.
   - Degree of imposition involved in this speech act—high, medium, low.
   - Setting—where the speaker and addressee are.

2. Analyze whether the request is direct or indirect.
   Request sentence: _____
   Speaker: _____
   Addressee: _____
   Speaker's social distance: _____ Speaker's status: _____
   Imposition: _____ Situation: _____
   Setting: _____ Directness Level: _____

Episode 2

Deloris is assigned to be a choir director.

Sister Lazarus: You're a ringer (that) she brought you here to place me, out with the
old.

Sister Patrick: Oh, could you help us, Mary Clarence?

Sister Lazarus, you're terrific, but we could really use some help.

Other sisters: (Look at Deloris) Please, you've heard us. We are terrible.

Please do something to help us, please.

Sister Lazarus: Well, there's a word for this. Mutiny!

So, Mary Clarence, you think you could do better?

I believe I'd like to see that.

Go ahead, Sister, make them sing.

Deloris: Okay, okay.

1. Identify the characteristics of the request/refusal situation. Include the following
   information.
   ● Speaker and addressee's social distance—intimate, acquaintance, stranger.
   ● Speaker's status—high, equal, low.
   ● Degree of imposition involved in this speech act—high, medium, low.
   ● Setting—where the speaker and addressee are.

2. Analyze whether the request is direct or indirect.
   Request sentence: _____
   Speaker: _____
   Addressee: _____
   Speaker's social distance: _____ Speaker's status: _____
   Imposition: _____ Situation: _____
   Setting: _____ Directness Level: _____

Episode 3

Vince is very angry with his lawyer and sees Detector Souther drive nearby.

Vince: How could you let them grill me for six hours?

Lawyer: I can't control how long they're gonna question you.

Vince: Did you go to law school?

Lawyer: I went to law school.

Vince: Did you graduate?

Lawyer: I'm a lawyer, of course I graduated.

(Here comes Detector Souther).

Souther: Hey! Vince, nice talking to you

      See you in court.

Vince: You got nothing on me, Souther. If you don't stop harassing me, I'm gonna...

Souther: What? You're gonna what?

Lawyer: Nothing, nothing. My client is trying to say…

Souther: That he's scared

      And you know what?

      He should be… real scared.

      See ya aroung, boys.

3. Identify the characteristics of the request/refusal situation. Include the following information.
   - Speaker and addressee's social distance—intimate, acquaintance, stranger.
   - Speaker's status—high, equal, low.
   - Degree of imposition involved in this speech act—high, medium, low.
   - Setting—where the speaker and addressee are.

4. Analyze whether the request is direct or indirect.
   Request sentence: _____
   Speaker: _____
   Addressee _____
   Speaker's social distance: _____ Speaker's status: _____
   Imposition: _____ Situation: _____
   Setting: _____ Directness Level: _____

Appendix G

Worksheet 3: Identifying Request Directness Levels (Adopted form Eslami and McLeod, 2010)   **Group:** _____

Individually, identify the following requests as either direct, indirect, or neither:

Request sentences	Your answers:
1. Turn off the television now! It's time for school.	
2. I'm asking you to turn of the television, son.	
3. I would like to ask you to turn off the television now and come to breakfast.	
4. You have to turn off that television, son.	
5. I really wish you'd turn off that television.	
6. How about turning off the television now?	
7. Son, your breakfast is getting cold. Why don't you come into the kitchen and eat?	
8. I don't want you to be late for school, son. Could you turn off the television now?	
9. I don't know why I even bother to make breakfast for you.	
10. I know that can't be the television I hear.	
11. You know how I feel about watching television in the morning.	
12. I'm sorry I forgot to make breakfast today.	
13. Oh! What's on television?	
14. That's my favorite program, son.	

Appendix H

Worksheet 4   Group: _____

Exercise 1 Evaluation Worksheet

Direction: How would most English speakers evaluate the appropriateness of a request from the on-line video viewing? Circle one of the levels that best describes your evaluation. If you think their utterances has some problems or good points, specify them and make comments. (For example: Why do you think it's a problem/good point? If anything is problematic, what do you suggest instead?)Be ready to explain your evaluations.

Episode 1

Jenny is sick. She wants Forrest to take care of her son, little Forrest. So, she wants little Forrest to meet Forrest.

1. Jenny: This is my very good friend, Mr. Gump.
2. Can you say hi?
3. Little Forrest: Hello, Mr. Gump.
4. Forrest: Hello!
5. Little Forrest: Can I go watch TV now?
6. Jenny: Yes, just keep it low.
7. Forrest: You are a mama, Jenny.

1. For the above conversation, which sentences are request sentences?

_____

		Your comments
How appropriate is their choice of request strategies? Explanation / Request / Apologizing for the trouble / Thanking for considering the request		
How appropriate is their word choice for the request?		
How appropriate is the level of formality, politeness, and directness overall? Note: Given the imposition (high, medium, low) Distance (intimate, acquaintance, stranger). Social status (high, equal, low). How appropriate is their request tone?		
Note:		

Episode 2:   Truman is looking for his wife

Truman does believe his wife. He wants to know whether his wife works in hospital or not.

---

1.   Nurse: Excuse me. Hi, excuse me. May I help you?
2.   Truman: I'm looking for my wife. Nurse Burbank. It's very important.
3.   Nurse: I'm afraid that that's not possible. She's in pre-op.
4.   Truman: Sure. Okay, fine.
5.   Truman: Can you pass along a message?
6.   Nurse: I'll try.
7.   Truman: Can you tell her I had to go to Fiji, and that I'll call her when I get there.
8.   Nurse: When you get to Fiji?
9.   Truman: You got it.
10. Nurse: Fine, I'll tell her.
11. Truman: Thank you so much.

---

1.   For the above conversation, which sentences are request sentences?

   _____

How appropriate is their choice of request strategies? Explanation / Request / Apologizing for the trouble / Thanking for considering the request		Your comments
How appropriate is their word choice for the request?		
How appropriate is the level of formality, politeness, and directness overall? Note: Given the imposition (high, medium, low) Distance (intimate, acquaintance, stranger). Social status (high, equal, low). How appropriate is their request tone?		
Note:		

Episode 3: Truman buys paper and magazine.

1. Customer: Dog Fancy, please.
2. Owner: Dog Fancy.
3. Customer: Thank you very much.
4. Truman: Give me a paper there, will you, Earl? And one of there for the wife.
5.   Loves her fashion mags.
6. Owner: Will that be all for you, Truman?
7. Truman: That's the whole kit and caboodle.
8. Owner: Catch you later.
9. Truman: Okay. Yeah.

For the above conversation, which sentences are request sentences?

_____

How appropriate is their choice of request strategies? Explanation / Request / Apologizing for the trouble / Thanking for considering the request		Your comments
How appropriate is their word choice for the request?		
How appropriate is the level of formality, politeness, and directness overall? Note: Given the imposition (high, medium, low) Distance (intimate, acquaintance, stranger). Social status (high, equal, low). How appropriate is their request tone?		
Note:		

Appendix I

Worksheet 5   *Refusal*   *Group _____*

Episode 1

The video is about that a cheerleader who comes to see a new comer and asks her to join them. Torrance is the cheerleader and Missy is the new comer.

> At the front door of the new comer's house.
> 1. Torrance: I want you on the squad.
> 2. Missy: (laughing).
> 3. Torrance: You're the best. They know it. They just reject the unfamiliar.
> 4. Missy: Thanks, but no thanks. I mean, I plead temporary insanity.
> 5.   See, I'm a hardcore gymnast. No way jumping up and down screaming
> 6.   "Go team go" is gonna satisfy me.
> 7. Torrance: Look, we're gymnasts, too. Except no beam, no bars, no vault.
> 8. Missy: Sorry, not interested.

Exercise 1: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?

2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?

3. How does the refusal sentence affect the possible interpretations of the hearer?

4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Episode 2

The video is about two girls' argument. Missy walks straight out of the room during the practice. Torrance comes angrily to find her. She sees Missy in the car and goes to talk to her. But Missy calls her a thief. Missy thinks she stole other team's cheers.

> Missy: your trophies are bullshit because you're a sad-ass liar.
> Torrance: All right, that's it. Get out of car. I'm gonna kick your ass.
> Missy: Oh, really?
> Torrance: come on.
> Missy: You're in for a rude awakening. Get in.
> Torrance: What? No way.
> Missy: For real, get in.

Exercise 2: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?

2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?

3. How does the refusal sentence affect the possible interpretations of the hearer?

4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Episode 3

The video is Monsignor asking Reverend Mother to hide Deloris, but Reverend Mother keeps refusing him.

1.	Monsignor: We can save this young woman's life and imprison a parasite in
2.	one gesture.
3.	Reverend Mother: My heart goes out with her. My concern would be she might
4.	subject the convent to danger.
5.	Monsignor: The Reno Police Department assures me you'll be protected. They
6.	promised to make a generous financial donation. Your small
7.	convent is in danger of closing.
8.	Reverend Mother: We, if they can afford to be so generous, so can we.
9.	(Reverend Mother opens the door and sees Deloris.)
10.	Reverend Mother: Excuse me.
11.	(Reverend Mother leaves the room.)
12.	Reverend Mother: Absolutely not. It couldn't possibly.
13.	Monsignor: Think of it this way. She's an ideal prospect for rehabilitation.
14.	Reverend Mother: That's not a person you can hide. That's a conspicuous
15.	person designed to sick out.
16.	Monsignor: You have taken a vow of hospitality to all in need.
17.	Reverend Mother: I lied.

Exercise 3: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?
2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?
3. How does the refusal sentence affect the possible interpretations of the hearer?
4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Appendix J

Worksheet 6   *Refusal*   *Group* _____

Episode 1: Torrance asks Missy to join the team

The video is about that a cheerleader comes to see a new comer and asks her to join them. Torrance is the cheerleader and Missy is the new comer.

> At the front door of the new comer's house.
> 9. Torrance: I want you on the squad.
> 10. Missy: (laughing).
> 11. Torrance: You're the best. They know it. They just reject the unfamiliar.
> 12. Missy: Thanks, but no thanks. I mean, I plead temporary insanity.
> 13.   See, I'm a hardcore gymnast. No way jumping up and down screaming
> 14.   "Go team go" is gonna satisfy me.
> 15. Torrance: Look, we're gymnasts, too. Except no beam, no bars, no vault.
> 16. Missy: Sorry, not interested.

Exercise 1: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?
2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?
3. How do you feel the refusal sentence affects possible interpretations of the hearer?
4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Episode 2: Missy thinks Torrance steals other team's cheers

The video is about two girls' argument. Missy walks straight out of the room during the practice. Torrance comes angrily to find her. She sees Missy in the car and goes to talk to her. But Missy calls her a thief. Missy thinks she steals other team's cheers.

> 1. Missy: your trophies are bullshit because you're a sad-ass liar.
> 2. Torrance: All right, that's it. Get out of car. I'm gonna lick your ass.
> 3. Missy: Oh, really?
> 4. Torrance: come on.
> 5. Missy: You're in for a rude awakening. Get in.
> 6. Torrance: What? No way.
> 7. Missy: For real, get in.

Exercise 2: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?
2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?
3. How do you feel the refusal sentence affects possible interpretations of the hearer?
4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Episode 3: Reverend mother refuses to hide Deloris

The video is about Monsignor asks Reverend Mother to hide Deloris, but Reverend Mother keeps refusing him.

18. Monsignor: We can save this young woman's life and imprison a parasite in
19.   one gesture.
20. Reverend Mother: My heart goes out with her. My concern would be she might
21.   subject the convent to danger.
22. Monsignor: The Reno Police Department assures me you'll be protected. They
23.   promised to make a generous financial donation. Your small
24.   convent is in danger of closing.
25. Reverend Mother: We, if they can afford to be so generous, so can we.
26. (Reverend Mother opens the door and sees Deloris.)
27. Reverend Mother: Excuse me.
28. (Reverend Mother leaves the room.)
29. Reverend Mother: Absolutely not. It couldn't possibly.
30. Monsignor: Think of it this way. She's an ideal prospect for rehabilitation.
31. Reverend Mother: That's not a person you can hide. That's a conspicuous
32.   person designed to stick out.
33. Monsignor: You have taken a vow of hospitality to all in need.
34. Reverend Mother: I lied.

Exercise 3: Answer the following questions:

1. What's relationship between those characters?
2. Which sentences are refusal sentences?
3. How do you feel the refusal sentence affects possible interpretations of the hearer?
4. What kind of refusal strategies does the speaker use?

Appendix K

Worksheet 7: Recognizing Refusal Strategies   *Group* _____

The examples in Part I include refusals used by students during advising sessions. The arrow ( ) ➢ indicates the students refusal response. Read the refusals listed in Part I (1-8) and match them with the refusal strategies in Part II (1-8). Select the strategy that best describes each refusal and complete the blanks.

Part I Students' refusals
Advisor: I'd like you most new in the area that you will be studying um
(1) Student: Yes, I have to know which area I want to study and, uh, I'm still thinking a little about that.
    Adviser: Here, American short story
(2) Student: I've taken that.
(3) Student: That might be a good idea.
(4) Student: I will think about that for the summer and come for your help.
(5) Student: That is the one that I don't want to take.
(6) Student: By the way, I could looking at the possibility of not taking the chance...
(7) Student: OK, well, I, I, I'm actually looking at doing something different..
    I think probably I'm not going take the class.
(8) Student: OK, couldn't you—just tell me more about it?

Part II: Refusal Strategies
For each example number on the left, fill in the blank with appropriate strategy letter from the right-hand column.

Example #   Strategy
_____ (a) asking for explicit advice
_____ (b) direct short rejection
_____(c) postponing the rejection
_____ (d) offering an alternative
_____ (e) requesting additional information
_____ (f) offering and unclear reply
_____ (g) making a mitigated refusal
_____ (h) offering a reason or an explanation

Exercise:

After reading the episode, please write down the refusal sentence first and then find out which strategies the characters used.

Episode 1

Truman finds that everyone behaves strange. He goes to the Market where Marlon works.

> Truman: We gotta get out of here. You ready to go?
>
> Marlon: No, I just come here.
>
> Truman: Come on, come on...
>
> Marlon: I told you I can't.
>
> (Truman makes angry sounds)
>
> Marlon: You're going to get both our asses fired. You know that?

Refusal sentence: _____

Strategy: _____

Refusal sentence: _____

Strategy: _____

Episode 2

Truman wants to know whether people are acting. He goes to a building, pretending he is visiting someone.

Guard: Can I help?

Truman: Yeah, I have an appointment at Gable Enterprises.

Guard: They went bust.

      (Truman looks into the elevator and sees people on the elevator. There is no backing on the elevator. It is just like a room for take a short break.)

Truman: What's happening?

Guard: Nothing.

Truman: Just tell me what's happening.

Guard: Got to go, sir. We are remodeling.

Truman: No, you're not. What are those people doing?

Guard: It's none of your business!

Truman: If you don't tell me what's happening, I will report you!

Guard: You're trespassing.

Refusal sentence: _____

Strategy: _____

Refusal sentence: _____

Strategy: _____

Appendix L

Worksheet 8: Refusal Evaluation Worksheet   *Group* _____

Exercise 1

Direction: How would most English speakers evaluate the appropriateness of a refusal from the on-line video viewing? Circle one of the levels that best describes your evaluation. If you think their utterances has some problems or good points, specify them and make comments. (For example: Why do you think it's a problem/good point? If anything is problematic, what do you suggest instead?)

Be ready to explain your evaluations.

Episode 1.

Being late. Truman and his wife hope Angela who is Truman's mother goes home.

1. Wife: Angela, we really should be getting you home.
2. Truman: I'll take her.
3. Wife: No, no, no, you stay, relax. Enjoy yourself. Your favorite show will be coming on.
4. Truman: You sure?
5. Wife: Besides, we have something to discuss.
6. Mom: A certain person's birthday.
7. Truman: Oh, I see.

Which sentences are refusal sentences?

_____

How appropriate is their choice of request strategies? Do they include all the following components? If not, is their choice still appropriate in the context? ● Explanation (e.g., reason for a refusal) ● Thanking… ● Apologizing for the		Your comments

158

trouble ● Direct refusal ● Alternative		
How appropriate is their word choice for the refusal? Note: Focus on the main refusal expression here. For example, how appropriate is "That sounds great, but I have to work"?		
How appropriate is the level of formality, politeness, and directness overall? Note: Given the imposition (high, medium, low) Distance (intimate, acquaintance, stranger). Social status (high, equal, low).		

Episode 2

Deloris doesn't like the life in convent. She calls Detective Souther and asks him to get her out of there.

Souther: Souther. Deloris: Eddie! You gotta get me outta here. Souther: Deloris, You can't call me here. Somebody's gonna catch on to where you are. Deloris: But, I am going insane. All these people do is work and pray. Souther: Calm down! Look, I didn't want to tell you but we got some problems. Deloris: What kind? What do you mean, problem? Souther: keeping our witnesses alive. We hide them, but there's a leak in the department and some of them end up dead. Deloris: What?

Souther: Just sit tight.

Deloris: You don't seem to understand what I'm saying. I'm in a nightmare. This is my nightmare. Get me outta here.

Souther: I mean it! Don't call me. It's not safe. I'll be in touch.

Which sentences are refusal sentences ?

_____

		Your comments
How appropriate is their choice of request strategies? Do they include all the following components? If not, is their choice still appropriate in the context? ● Explanation (e.g., reason for a refusal) ● Thanking… ● Apologizing for the trouble ● Direct refusal ● Alternative		
How appropriate is their word choice for the refusal? Note: Focus on the main refusal expression here. For example, how appropriate is "That sounds great, but I have to work"?		
How appropriate is the level of formality, politeness, and directness overall? Note: Given the imposition (high, medium, low) Distance (intimate, acquaintance, stranger). Social status (high, equal, low).		

Appendix M

Questionnaire of EFL Vocational High School Students' Pragmatic Competence
(Focus on Request and Refusal speech act in English)

高職學生英文語用能力(請求與拒絕之言語行為)之問卷調查表

各位同學你們好：

　　本問卷的目的是要了解你們語用能力的現況，答案並沒有對錯，問卷僅做為學術研究之用並非測驗，任何與本問卷相關的內容將不會影響你們的學業成績，並且資料絕不會外流。請各位同學依照你們個人的實際學習狀況誠實回答各項問題，過程中請勿與其他同學討論，並且務必每個問題都要回答以求資料之完整性及可用性。感謝你們的參與及協助！

東海大學外國語文學系碩士班

碩士生：朱美華

指導教授：劉美惠　教授

個人基本資料

1. 班級:

2. 性別:□男　　□女

3. 你的母語是? □國語　□台語　□英語　□客家語　□其他:_____

4. 你學英語有多久的時間? 共 ___年___月

5. 你覺得自己的英語口說能力好嗎?

　　□不好　　□不太好　　□還好　　　□好　　□很好

6. 你對自己的英語口語能力滿意嗎?

　　□不滿意　□不太滿意　□還算滿意　□滿意　□很滿意

7. 英文課除外,你平均一星期額外花多少時間練習英語口說?

　　□沒有

　　□有, □少於一小時　□一到三小時　□三小時以上

8. 你日常生活中有機會跟別人用英語交談嗎?

　　□沒有

　　□有,平均一星期幾次? _____　總共時間長度約_____

9. 你有去過英語系國家嗎?

　　□沒有

　　□有,共___年___月　請問待多久_____

　　原因:　□遊學　□留學　□移民　□旅遊

10. 請問學習英文的動機?

　　□課業　　□留學　□求職　□其他_____

11. 請問你有外國朋友嗎? □有　□沒有

12. 請問你接觸英文的方式有哪些? 並勾選每天接觸的時間有多少?

　　□學校課程: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　□電視、電影: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　　　　　名稱: _____

　　□廣播、CD: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　□報紙、雜誌: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　□英美人士: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　□網路: □1 小時　□1-3 小時 □4-6 小時 □7 小時以上

　　□其他方式: _____

> 請再次檢查確認每題是否勾選完整,感謝你的協助!

Appendix N

DCT Questionnaire

Request

Directions: The following test including twelves request scenarios. Please read each of the following situations and the conversation carefully and circle the rate of appropriateness toward the underline sentence. Considering the rate of appropriateness you circle, give reasons for why you circle it and write an appropriate answer in English for the given situation.

以下之測驗包含12則有關於請求的「情境對話」。請仔細閱讀以下各情境對話，並請依據「對話情境」判斷該畫線句子在此情境中是否適當。請依你覺得適當的程度圈選出你認為此句子在此情境中的適當程度。包括(1)非常不適當 (Very inappropriate); (2)不適當 (Inappropriate);(3)適當 (Appropriate); (4)非常適當 (Very appropriate)，及(5)不知道 (No idea)。最後請寫出為何選此答案的理由。再者，對於你認為不適當的句子，請寫出適合的替代句。

Example:

> You were sick yesterday and didn't come to the class. Today, you want to borrow the math notes from your classmate, Mary.
>
> **At the classroom**
> You: Hi! Mary.
> Mary: Yes, what's the matter?
> You: I want to borrow your math notes.
> Mary: Okay. Here it is.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	very appropriate	No idea
	v			

Reasons: 雖是同學也要客氣點尋問，說明原因再請別人借你。或該加"請"這字

Your answer: Oh! You know, I was absent yesterday. I want to know what math teacher taught yesterday. Could I borrow your math note?

1. You are in the library. You want to find a book but you don't know how to surf the library website. You go to the information desk for help.

You: Excuse me, Miss.

Miss: Yes, what's the matter?

| Surf the library website | 上圖書館網站 |
| Information desk | 資訊服務台 |

You: I want to surf our library website to look for a book, but I don't know how. Would it be possible for you to show me how to do it?

Miss: Of course, I would like to. Come here. Let me show you….

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

2. Emily plans to go mountain-climbing tomorrow, and she needs a ski jacket. She goes to see her brother's classmate, Kelly, and wants to borrow it form her.

At Kelly's dormitory

Emily: Hey! Kelly, I am going to go mountain-climbing with my boyfriend.

Kelly: Wow. That sounds very interesting.

Emily: Yes, I think it will be. But I am afraid that the weather will be very cold. So, lend me your ski jacket for mountain-climbing tomorrow, OK?

Kelly: Sure, here you go.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

3. Teacher's Day is coming. You and your friend, Richard, want to ask Mr. Wang, who is your favorite teacher, to have dinner.

At Mr. Wang's office

You: Mr. Wang, it is our great honor to be your students.

Mr. Wang: You are good students.

Richard: Mr. Wang, this Saturday is Teacher's Day.

You: Would you like to have dinner with us this Saturday?

Mr. Wang: Sounds great! But I already have an appointment on that day. Maybe next time.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

4. You and your friend are waiting for a school bus. During this time, you see a girl who is very pretty standing nearby. You hope your friend can get her phone number for you.

At the bus station

Friend: I hate to wait for the school bus. It is always late.

You: Yes, I totally agree. Hey! Look at that girl. She is so pretty.

Friend: Yes, I know her. She is my brother's classmate.

You: Really? If you can get me her phone number, you can have my iPod for a week. How about that?

Friend: Deal.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

5. You purchased a T-shirt from the Internet. However, when the item arrived, you found the size is much smaller than you expected. You make a phone call for a change.

Operator: Hello, ABC Company, How can I help you?

You: Hi! I am one of your customers. I placed an order on the Internet. However, it is too small. <u>You need to tell me how to return it and get a bigger one.</u>

Operator: OK! Please mail back the T-shirt with a written note with the size you really want. We will exchange it as soon as we can without any extra charge.

You: Thanks.

| Purchased 購買 |
| Item 貨品 |

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

6. You are having dinner with your girlfriend's family. Your girlfriend's mother prepared a big dinner for you.

At your girlfriend's place

You: The foods today are so delicious. I enjoyed them a lot.

Your girlfriend: Really, Mom will be glad to hear that.

You: Mrs. Lin, the dishes tonight are so delicious, especially the soup.

Mom: Really, great. <u>Do you want some more?</u>

You: Yes, please. It is tasty.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

7. You are a freshman of ABC University. Today, your dad helps you move in the dormitory.

Dad: Here we are. And this is your stuff. Are you sure you don't need me to carry those things into your room?

You: No, I think I can do it.

Dad: Then, I need to go back to work. Call me whenever you need me OK.

You: Oh No! I forget to bring my dictionary. <u>Could you please send it to me as soon as possible?</u>

Dad: I see. I will. Don't worry and take care of yourself.

| Dormitory 宿舍 |

You: I will. Bye.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

8. You are a new comer in a new school. Today you forget to bring your wallet, and want your mother to bring it to you. You see your classmate Mia and want to borrow her cell phone to call your mother.

| Wallet 錢包 |
| Actually 事實上 |

At school

Mia: Hi, Sue. How are you today?

You: Um...fine. Actually...

Mia: Yes, what's the matter?

You: <u>I need to call my mother right now, but I don't have a cell phone.</u>

Mia: In that case, maybe you can use mine.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

9. You and your friend are in a rush to go to a movie, but a girl asks you for help.

On the street

You: Phoebe hurry up, the movie will start in 10 minutes.

Phoebe: Yeah.

Girl: Excuse me.

You: Yes, what is it?

Girl: I am going to the Art Museum. Please tell me where to take the bus?

You: OK, we are heading in the same direction, just follow us.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

10. **You are on the MRT.** A girl sitting next to you is talking loudly on the phone. You want to ask her to keep her voice down.

You: Excuse me, Miss.

keep ___ voice down 聲量降低

Miss: Yes?

You: We are on the MRT, not your place. You need to keep your voice down.

Miss: Oh! I am sorry. I didn't realize I was speaking so loudly.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

11. Your cousin who is coming from America is staying with you during summer vacation. Your aunt asks you to accompany her and also teach her Chinese.

Accompany 陪伴

At your home

Aunt: Hi! May, how are you?

You: I am fine. I heard that Amy is coming to Taiwan this weekend. Is that true?

Aunt: Yes, That's right. She is 10 years old now. <u>I hope she can learn to speak Chinese well. If you can help her, I would be very happy.</u>

You: Don't worry. I will try my best.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

12. You are on your way home and come across your father's colleague, Mr. Chung. He gives you a gift and asks you to take it to your father.

come across 巧遇

Colleague 同事

On the street

Mr. Chung: Hello! You must be Betty... Long time no see.

You: Oh! Hi, Uncle Chung. How've you been?

Mr. Chung: Great! I just came back from Tainan. Here is a gift. <u>Give it to your father.</u>

You: No problem, Uncle Chung.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

DCT Questionnaire

Refusal

Directions: The following test including twelves refusal scenarios. Please read each of the following situations and the conversation carefully and circle the rate of appropriateness toward the underline sentence. Considering the rate of appropriateness you circle, give reasons for why you circle it and write an appropriate answer in English for the given situation.

以下之測驗包含 12 則有關於拒絕的「情境對話」。請仔細閱讀以下各情境對話，並請依據「對話情境」判斷該畫線句子在此情境中是否適當。請依你覺得適當的程度圈選出你認為此句子在此情境中的適當程度。包括(1)非常不適當 (Very inappropriate); (2)不適當 (Inappropriate);(3)適當 (Appropriate); (4)非常適當 (Very appropriate)，及(5)不知道 (No idea)。最後請寫出為何選此答案的理由。再者，對於你認為不是當的句子，請寫出適合的替代句。

Example:

> Your classmate whom you are close to invites you to dinner after school. However, you want to go home earlier today to study.
>
> Classmate: Hi. What's up?
>
> You: Nothing special.
>
> Classmate: Hey, There is a good cafeteria around the corner. Do you want to go there and get a bite?
>
> You:　　I can't. I need to go home now.
>
> Classmate: OK. Maybe next time. Bye!
>
> You: OK. See you.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	appropriate	very appropriate	No idea
	v			

Reasons: ＿＿＿＿雖然是好朋友講一下原因或理由會好一點＿＿＿＿＿

Your answer: ＿＿I am afraid that I can't. I need to study for the math exam.＿

1. The girl you like for a long time is standing on the hallway. Today, you decide to ask her out on a date. So you go to her and ask….

At the hallway

You: Hi, Sara, How's everything?

Sara: Pretty good.

You: Hey, I have two tickets for the Mayday concert. Do you want to go with me?

Sara: <u>I am sorry, I can't. I have to study.</u>

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

2. You are at your teacher's office. Your teacher just gave you a cup of coffee. However, you don't feel like having any. You want to say no to her.

Teacher: Hi! Susan. How's everything?

You: I'm okay.

Teacher: Have a seat. Do you want a cup of coffee?

You: <u>Not right now.</u>

Teacher: OK.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

3. Emily is a Japanese woman traveling in Taiwan. She is invited by her Taiwanese friend, Sue, for dinner at her home. Sue's mother is serving the blood of a soft-shelled turtle to her.

> the blood of a soft-shelled turtle 鱉血
> honorable 尊貴的　appreciate 感激

At Sue's house

Sue: Drink it. It's delicious and good for your health. We only give it to our honorable guest.

Emily: Oh! I appreciate that. May I ask what it is?

Sue: It's the blood of a soft-shelled turtle.

Emily: It looks interesting. But, I think I am full now.

Sue: Come on! You should give it a try.

Emily: Ok.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

4. Your grandma asks you to take out the garbage. However, you are busy doing your homework. You hope she can ask your brother to take out the garbage.

At home

Grandma: Ivan, come here.

You: Yes, what is it?

Grandma: The garbage truck is coming. Go and take out the garbage.

You: Grandma, I am busy doing my homework. It is Ian's turn. Can't you ask him to do it?

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

5. You are walking on the street. Then a salesman comes to talk to you.

Salesman: Good evening Miss.

You: Yes,

Salesman: Do you have some time? Let me introduce a magic soap to you.

You: <u>I don't think I need it. Maybe you should talk to somebody else. Bye!</u>

Salesman: OK! Maybe some other time.

| Introduce 介紹 |
| Soap 肥皂 |

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

6. Your sister is thirsty. Since she is talking on the phone, she asks you to bring her a bottle of juice.

At home

You: (come back from outside.) Anything to drink? It's so hot.

Sister: Only water.

(The phone rings, your sister picks up the phone and talks happily for a long time.)

Sister: Roy, would you please get me a bottle of juice. I put it in the refrigerator.

You: <u>Sorry, I am not your servant. Go and get it yourself.</u>

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

7. Your parents have given you NT$ 1,000 dollars each month since junior high school. Now, you hope your parents will give you more money.

You: Mom, you know… I am a senior high school student now.

Mom: Yes, and…

You: All my friends' parents give them more than NT$ 2,000 a month.

Mom: Really?

You: Yes, and they can always buy whatever they want. I hope I can be just like them…

Mom: Amy, I think NT$ 1,000 dollars is enough for you. What you need is to learn how to use your money well.

You: But...

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

8. Sue is on her way home. She sees several girls selling chewing gum for charity.

Girls: Good evening, Miss.

Sue: Good evening.

Girls: We are selling chewing gum to help the poor.

Would you like to buy some?

Sue: No, thanks.

Chewing gum	□香糖
Charity	慈善機構

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

9. Mr. Lee's office is nearby the train station. Today, Percy is in a hurry to catch a train. During this time, he sees his neighbor, Mr. Lee, is about to go to work.

Percy: Good morning, Mr. Lee.

Mr. Lee: Good morning.

Percy: May I ask if you are going to your office?

Mr. Lee: Yes.

Percy: Would it be possible to take me to the train station? I am a little bit late.

Mr. Lee: I can't. I need to pick up my wife at the hospital.

Percy: Oh! Okay. Thanks anyway.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

10. You are walking in the hallway. A students' parent walks toward you. She hopes you can take her to her son's class.

Mrs. Chen: Excuse me.

You: Yes.

Mrs. Chen: Do you know where 101- class is?

You: Oh! It's not in this building.

Mrs. Chen: Could you take me to my son's class?

You: Sorry. I can't.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

11. Steve is your classmate's brother. He wants to borrow some money from his brother, but his brother is not here. He comes to you to borrow some money from you.

At your classroom

Steve: Andy, do you know where my brother is?

You: No, I don't.

Steve: I need NT$500 dollars to spend for my book fees. Could you lend me NT$500 dollars?

You: No way. I don't have five hundred dollars.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

12. You and your friends are hiking on a hill. Suddenly your friend slips and hurts her ankle. You ask a man who is passing by for help.

Slip 滑倒

Hurts her ankle 傷了腳

You: Excuse me, sir.

Man: Yes.

You: My friend has hurt her ankle. Could you please help me carry her down the hill?

Man: Sorry, I can't. That would be too dangerous for both of us. But I can call somebody for help.

You: That would be great. Thank you.

How appropriate do you think the underlined sentence is?

Very inappropriate	Inappropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	No idea

Reasons:

_____

Your answer:

_____

請再次檢查確認每題是否勾選完整，感謝你的協助！

Appendix O

Students' Learning Experience Survey
高職學生英文語用能力(請求與拒絕之言語行為)之問卷調查表

各位同學你們好：

　　本問卷的目的是要了解你們對於利用線上英語短片教導英文用法(語用學)的看法。答案並沒有對錯，問卷僅做為學術研究之用並非測驗，任何與本問卷相關的內容將不會影響你們的學業成績，並且資料絕不會外流。請各位同學依照你們個人的實際學習狀況誠實回答各項問題，過程中請勿與其他同學討論，並且務必每個問題都要回答以求資料之完整性及可用性。感謝你們的參與及協助！其中

英文用法[語用學(pragmatics)] 的定義如下：「在特定的情境中如何正確且適當的理解以及使用語言」。而言語行為(speech act)的定義為：「人在說話的同時也在執行一種行為」。其中、本實驗只研究「請求」和「拒絕」兩個言語行為。

<div align="right">

東海大學外國語文學系碩士班

碩士生：朱美華

指導教授：劉美惠　教授

</div>

目	問卷題目	同意程度			
1	The online videos clips viewing can help me improve pragmatic learning. 看完線上英語短片可以增進我使用英文用法(語用)的能力	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
2	The contents of online video clips are attractive to me. 線上英語短片的內容對我而言是很有吸引力的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
3	The teaching procedures my teacher had in online video instruction is clear enough for me to understand the lesson.老師所安排的線上英語短片教學步驟很清楚明瞭，使我易於了解英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意

4	Online video clips can help me learn the request and refusal speech acts better and faster. 線上英語短片能幫助我更快速且有效地學習「請求及拒絕」的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
5	How the teacher compared the differences between the Chinese and English pragmatic usage can help me learn making a request and refusal. 老師透過比較中英文請求和拒絕的用法之教學方式有助於我學習英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
6	I am positive about the benefits of using online video clips in pragmatic learning.我認為使用線上英語短片能增進英文語用用法上的學習成效。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
7	The content of the online video clips are well selected and organized. 線上英語短片的內容在取材和編排上都很適當。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
8	My teacher's the video clip instruction motivates me to use different materials in speech act learning.老師使用線上英語短片之教學法，能引發我在英語用法學習上使用不同教材的動機。.	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
9	Online video clips can capture and retain my attention to the request and refusal speech acts.觀看線上英語短片能使我更集中專注力在「請求及拒絕」的英文用法上，且更能延續學習成效	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
10	The teacher's instruction about relationship between interlocutors (i.e. distance) helps me in pragmatic learning. 老師解釋談話者之間的關係之教學方式，有助於我學習請求和拒絕的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
11	I am interested in using the online video clips in my pragmatic learning.我對使用線上英語短片來輔助我學習適當的英語用法（語用學）上很有興趣。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意

12	The contents of online video clips are related to the request and refusal speech acts I am learning. 線上英語短片的內容與我所學的「如何運用英語向他人提出請求和拒絕的用法」有相關連。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
13	My teacher's video clip instruction is too difficult to be understood. 線上英語短片的教學內容太難，我無法理解。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
14	Online video clips viewing can help me realize the relationship between the interlocutors in a speech act. 觀看線上英語短片使我更了解影片中對話者之間的關係。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
15	The teacher's instruction about the effects of social status on making a request/refusal helps me in pragmatic learning. 老師教導關於談話者社會地位的影響的內容，有助於我學習使用請求及拒絕的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
16	I am motivated to use the online video clips for my pragmatic learning.使用線上英語短片能引發我在英語用法(語用學)的學習動機。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
17	The duration of the online video clips is appropriate.線上英語短片的時間長度是合宜的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
18	The teacher's video clip instruction uses enough video clips as examples for me to understand the usage of request and refusal speech acts. 老師在教學上使用足夠的線上英語短片當例子，讓我能了解請求及拒絕的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
19	Relying on subtitle helps me learn the sentence patterns covered in a speech act. 觀看有英語字幕的影片對我學習「請求及拒絕句型」是有幫助的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意

20	The teacher's instruction about the effects of the imposition helps me in pragmatic learning. 老師教導的請求或拒絕句意之內容，對聽者感受的重要性(或影響)，有助於我學習英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
21	I am enthusiastic to use the online videos for my pragmatic learning. 我積極觀看與使用線上英語短片來學習英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
22	The content of the online video clips can be easily understood. 線上英語短片的情節內容是很容易了解的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
23	Online video clips viewing helps me learn the strategies used by the interlocutors in a speech act. 觀看線上英語短片時，我能由片中對話來學習「請求及拒絕」的使用策略。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
24	It is helpful for me to learn how to make a request/ refusal after receiving my teachers' instruction about the sentence patterns covered in the online video clips.老師教導請求和拒絕的句型，對我學習英語用法是有幫助的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
25	I feel frustrated in viewing online video clips for not understanding their meaning.我觀看線上英語短片時，因不了解內容感到挫折。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
26	The context in the online video clips can be easily understood.線上英語短片中人物的對話情境是很容易了解的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
27	The situation practices using online video clips help me in learning request and refusal speech acts.使用線上英語短片的情境當作練習，能幫我學習「請求及拒絕」的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意

28	The teacher's online video clips instruction helps me become aware of the appropriateness of the request and refusal speech acts. 老師用線上英語短片教學，讓我了解適當的請求及拒絕的英語用法。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
29	I would like to use video clips as my learning material to improve my pragmatic learning. 我喜愛使用線上英語短片作為改進我英語用法(語用學)的學習教材。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
30	Viewing online video clips shows me more information than transcript (e.g. tone, facial expression) to learn making a request / refusal.觀看線上英語短片比閱讀英文劇本提供我更多訊息(如聲調，表情)，有助於我學習使用英語來向他人請求、或拒絕。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
31	After watching online video clips viewing discussing the content with peers, I feel confident about making with others in English. 觀看完線上英語短片後再與同學討相關內容，讓我以英語向他人提出「請求及拒絕」時更有自信。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
32	The teacher's online video clips instruction helps me become aware of the strategy usage of the request and refusal speech acts. 線上英語短片的教學法，幫我了解到如何正確地使用請求及拒絕的策略。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
33	I feel time consuming to viewing the online video clips. 我覺得觀看線上英語短片是很耗時間的。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意
34	The content of online video clips selected by the teacher in the instruction is well organized.老師針對線上英語短片的內容，在挑選與編排上是適當地。	非常不同意	不同意	同意	非常同意

請再次檢查確認每題是否勾選完整，感謝你的協助！

II. Open ended Question

1. What's your opinion about the teacher's instruction of making a request/refusal?

   請問你對老師教導請求及拒絕之英語用法有何想法？請說明三點原因。

   _____

   _____

   _____

   a. What do you think about teacher's instruction on social factors (status, distance, imposition) related to your pragmatic learning? Please explain.

   請問你覺得老師教導社會因素(談話者間的關係，社會地位，及聽者的感受)對你學習使用請求及拒絕的英語用法有是否有所關聯？請舉例說明。

   _____

   _____

   _____

   b. What do you think about teacher's instruction on request and refusal strategies? Please explain.

   請問你對於老師教導同學請求以及拒絕的策略所使用的教學方法，有何想法？ 請舉例說明。

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Do you think whether teacher's instruction on online video clips viewing would enhance your pragmatic competence? Why? Please explain.

   請問你覺得運用線上英語短片於英語用法的教學是否能提升你的英語用法(語用學)的能力？若你的答案為「是」請舉例說明原因。若你的答案為「否」也請舉例說明原因。

   _____

   _____

a. Do you think which part of online video clip learning you like? Why?
請問在使用線上英語短片來學習英語用法的學習過程中，哪些部分是你較喜歡的？請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

b. Do you think which part of online video clip learning you dislike? Why?
Please explain.
請問在使用線上英語短片來學習英文用法的學習過程中，哪些部分是你比較不喜歡的？請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

c. For the online video clip instruction, do you think which part of pragmatic instruction is beneficial to improve your pragmatic competence? Why?
Please explain.
對於老師提供線上英語影片來教導英語用法的學習過程中，你覺得那些部分對你的英語用法能力較有助益？請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

d. For the online video clip instruction, do you think which part of pragmatic instruction is more difficult? Why? Please explain.
對於老師提供線上英語影片來教導英語用法的學習過程中，你覺得哪些部份比較困難的？請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

e. In the future, would you consider applying online video clips as your learning material to learn other speech acts? Why or why not? Please explain.

請問未來你是否會考慮使用英語短片作為你學習其他英語用法的輔助教材？請詳細說明。

_____

_____

_____

3. After this pragmatic instruction, have you learn the appropriateness on pragmatic learning? Please explain.

請問你對學習英文用法的適當性是否已經理解？請舉例並說明原因。

_____

_____

_____

a. After receiving the four-week pragmatic instruction, have you learned the appropriateness of making a request? Please explain.

在四週的英語用法教學之後，你是否已經學會使用請求的英語用法的適當性。請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

b. After receiving the four-week pragmatic instruction, have you learned the appropriateness of making a refusal?   Please explain.

在四週的英語用法教學之後，你是否已學會使用拒絕的英語用法的適當性。請舉例說明。

_____

_____

_____

請再次檢查確認每題是否填寫完整，感謝你的協助！

Appendix P

Lesson Plan for Request

Time: March 12, 2014 at 3: 40 ~4: 30

Location: Room of Architecture I

Background of the lesson

Target learner	Ten grade of vocational senior high school EFL students
Location	At central Taiwan
Topic of the lesson	Request speech act
Overall Class Content	A conversation course with four skills integration
Class Length	One session with 50 minutes continuing for four weeks.

I.   Lesson objectives

■ Students will be able to read the text.

■ Students will know how to get information from authentic material (pragmatic video clips or transcripts).

■ Students will be able to know the meaning of the dialogue.

■ Students will be able to find out the difference between Chinese request usage from target language.

■ Students will be able to use appropriate speech acts to make a request.

■ Students will identify the appropriate speech acts from the video clips.

■ Students will discuss the speech act's (request) features and strategies in the video clips with their group member cooperatively.

II.   The Lesson Plan – Request

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching Materials

Get student to settle down

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching Materials
00-005	Group students. Introduce the lesson for what students need to learn today.	1. Group students (eight groups with 4 learners, one group with 5 learners). 2. Inform learners that they are going to learn request speech act.	1. Grouping sheet

Lead-in stage—background knowledge building

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching Materials
005-012	1. The teacher will have students to make request sentences in English and Chinese. 2. Compare the difference between English requests and Chinese requests based on the different situation. (e.g. 1) borrow a pen from classmates; 2) ask a favor from your teacher.	Students share their experience of making requests (English and Chinese) in class. e.g.: 1) A. 借我一支筆好嗎？ B. 可以借我一支筆嗎？ C. 請借我一支筆好嗎？ a. Lend me a pen. b. Can you lend me a pen? c. Please lend me a pen. 2) A. 王老師，請問這個字是什麼意思？ B. 王老師，可以告訴我這個字的意思嗎？ C. 王老師，這個字是什麼意思啊？ Excuse me, Miss Wang, a. What does the word mean?	

b. Please tell me what does the word mean?

c. Could you tell me what the word mean?

d. Would you please tell me what the word mean?

Presentation stage I—pragmatic video clips viewing (clip one)and sociopragmatic features

012-015	1. The teacher will ask few pre-listening questions about the pragmatic video clips content.	1. Students listen to the pre-listening questions.	1. Laptop
015-017		2. Students watch the online video clips, think about the questions and take notes.	2. Online video clips
	2. The teacher will describe the background of the video clips.	3. Students need to underline the words and sentence structures they don't know on the transcripts.	3. Transcripts
017-023			4. Worksheet 1 (appendix A)
	3. The teacher will have learners watch online video clips (or transcripts) twice. Between the first and second time, there will be 2 minutes for students to think or take note about the video clips content.	4. Students listen to the teacher's explanation.	
		5. Students do the exercise 3 and 4 on the worksheet 1.	
		6. Students discuss the answers with their group teammates.	
023-025		7. Students give their answers.	
		8. Students listen to the teacher's feedback	
	4. The teacher will ask learners to underline the words or sentence		
025-027	structures they don't know on the transcripts.		

187

027-32	5. The teacher will explain the underline words or sentence structures.		
032-35	6. The teacher asks learners to do the exercises with their group members (the pre-listening questions) on worksheet 1(see appendix A).		
	7. The teacher will ask learners to read their answers on the worksheet 1 and give feedbacks		

Presented stage—reading (repeated reading).

035-038	1. The teacher will guide students to identify the speech acts of request on the pragmatic video clips (transcripts).	1. Students watch the teacher's demonstration 2. Students identify the speech acts of request in the video clips (transcripts) with their group members.	1. Laptop 2. Online video clips 3. Transcripts

Practice stage—

Practice and production stage --Students do group discussion—be aware of sociopragmatic features (pragmatic online video 2 and 3)

038-043	1. The teacher asks learners to do the	1. Students do the exercise 3 and 4 on the worksheet 1.	1. Laptop 2. Worksheet

	exercises with their group members (the pre-listening questions) on worksheet 1(see appendix A).	2. Students discuss the answers with their group teammates.	1
043-048		3. Students give their answers.	
	2. The teacher will ask learners to read their answers on the worksheet 1 and give feedbacks	4. Students listen to the teacher's feedback	

Wrap-up stage

048-050	1. The teacher has learners to recall today's lesson 2. The teacher suggests learners to do the pragmatic online video viewing at home	1. Students recall today's lesson e.g. 1) different request usages in English and Chinese 2) social distance play an important role in request speech act 2. Having pragmatic online video viewing at home

Appendix Q　　Lesson Plan for Refusal 1

Time: April 9th 2014

Location: Room of Architecture I

Background of the lesson

Target learner	Ten grade of vocational senior high school EFL students
Location	In central Taiwan
Topic of the lesson	Refusal speech act
Overall Class Content	A conversation course with four skills integration
Class Length	One session with 50 minutes continuing for four weeks.

III.　Lesson objectives

■　Students will be able to read the text.

■　Students will know how to get information from authentic material (pragmatic video clips or transcripts).

■　Students will be able to know the meaning of the dialogue.

■　Students will be able to find out the difference between Chinese refusal usages and target language.

■　Students will be able to use appropriate speech acts to perform a refusal speech act.

■　Students will identify the appropriate speech acts from the video clips.

■　Students will discuss the speech act's (refusal) features-sociopragmtic features and strategies in the video clips with their group member cooperatively.

IV. The Lesson Plan –Refusal

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching Materials
Get student to settle down			
00-005	Group students. Introduce the lesson for what students need to learn today.	3. Students sit with their group. 4. Listen to the teacher's introduction.	2. Grouping sheet
Lead-in stage—background knowledge building			
005-012	3. Teacher will have students to make refusal sentences in English and Chinese. 4. Compare the difference between English refusal and Chinese refusal based on the different situation. (e.g. 1) refuse an invitation (from your classmate); 2) refuse an offer (from your aunt).	Students share their experience of making refusals (Chinese and English) in class. e.g.: 同學：要不要一起吃飯呀？ 1) A. 不好意思我吃飽了。 　 B. 不要。　我吃飽了 　 C. 不了，你去就好了。 　 a. No more, I have lots. 　 b. No, thank you. I have eaten too much already. 　 c. Oh, not today (not now, not this moment). 　 d. I really want to, but I got hundreds of things to do. 2)　你阿姨的要買給你一隻很貴的手機給你，但你不喜歡。 　 A. 這太貴了，我不能要。 　 B. 我已經有了，不必再買了。	

C. 我不喜歡

a. No, thank you, but...

b. It's too expensive.

c. I already have one.

d. It's not my style.

Presentation stage I—pragmatic video clips viewing (clip one)and sociopragmatic features

012-015		The teacher will ask few pre-listening questions about the pragmatic video clips content.	9. Students listen to the pre-listening questions.	5. Laptop
015-017	8.	The teacher will describe the background of the video clips.	10. Students watch the online video clips, think about the questions and take notes.	6. Online video clips
017-023	9.	The teacher will have learners watch online video clips (or transcripts) twice. Between the first and second time, there will be 2 minutes for students to think or take note about the content of video clips.	11. Students need to underline the words and sentence structures they don't know on the transcripts.	7. Transcripts
023-025	10.	The teacher will ask learners to underline the words or sentence structures they don't know on the transcripts.	12. Students listen to the teacher's explanation.	8. Worksheet 5 (appendix E3)
025-027	11.	The teacher will explain the underline words or sentence structures.	13. Students do the exercise 3 and 4 on the worksheet 5(see appendix E).	
			14. Students discuss the answers with their group teammates.	
			15. Students give their answers.	
			16. Students listen to teacher's feedback	

| 027-32 | 12. The teacher asks learners to do the exercises with their group members (the pre-listening questions) on worksheet 5(see appendix E). | | |
| 032-35 | 13. The teacher will ask learners to read their answers on the worksheet 5 and give feedbacks | | |

Presented stage—reading (repeated reading).

| 035-038 | 2. The teacher will guide students to identify the speech acts of refusal on the video clips (transcripts). | 3. Students watch the teacher's demonstration
4. Students identify the speech acts of refusal in the video clips (transcripts) with their group members. | 4. Laptop
5. Online video clips
6. Transcripts |

Practice stage—

Practice and production stage --Students do group discussion—be aware of sociopragmatic features (pragmatic online video 2 and 3)

| 038-043 | 3. The teacher asks learners to do the exercises with their group members (the pre-listening questions) on worksheet 5 (see appendix E). | 5. Students do the exercise 2 and 3 in the worksheet 5.
6. Students discuss the answers with their group teammates.
7. Students give their | 3. Laptop
4. Worksheet 5 |
| 043-048 | 4. The teacher will ask | answers.
8. Students listen to the | |

	learners to read their answers on the worksheet 5 and give feedbacks	teacher's feedback

Wrap-up stage

048-050	3. The teacher has learners to recall today's lesson 4. The teacher suggests learners to do the pragmatic online video viewing at home	3. Students recall today's lesson e.g. 1) different refusal usages in English and Chinese 2) social distance play an important role in refusal speech act 4. Having pragmatic online video viewing at home