

Aspects of Communication and Pedagogy: A Descriptive Analysis of EFL College Teacher-Student Interaction on Making Requests in Classroom Settings in Taiwan

Chiung-Chiuen Chen¹

Abstract

This study aims to examine college teacher-student interactional processes of making requests as well as how they respond to each other's requests in the English as a foreign language classroom. This study was part of a larger study of unpublished doctoral dissertation (Chen, 2015), in which five English classes from five Chinese-speaking EFL college teachers in central Taiwan were observed, video-taped, and audio-taped. Findings showed that students responded to teachers' requests by giving short or one-word answers, by keeping silent, or by using clarification requests, and teachers responded to their student's requests by giving answers and feedback and making more requests. Further analysis found that teacher-student interaction on making requests and responses were affected by social factors. This study has theoretically and pedagogically significance. EFL college students have limited ability in making appropriate requests (e.g. making a clarification request) and responses in English. It is suggested that teachers consider EFL classrooms as a social communicative context similar to the contexts outside the classroom, and besides pedagogical purposes, it implies that teachers need to make requests and responses for communicative purposes in the classrooms.

Keywords: teacher-student interaction, making a request, making a response, social factor, social communicative context

1. Introduction

This study aims to examine college teacher-student interactional processes of making requests as well as how they respond to each other's requests in the English as a foreign language classroom. This study also explores whether teacher-student interaction on making requests and responses are influenced by social and contextual factors in the classroom settings. Both teachers and students make requests for various purposes across different situations in the ESL/EFL classrooms (Doughty and Pica, 1986; Ellis, 1992; Dalton-Puffer, 2005). Certain types of requests by teachers may maximize student requests and responses. How EFL college teachers and students respond to each other's requests has still remained unexplored. In addition, it is theoretically informative to explore certain factors, including social and contextual factors, which may affect teacher-student interaction in requesting behaviors in the EFL classroom settings. Research questions posed in this study are: (1) How do teachers and students make requests and respond to each other's requests in the English classroom? (2) How is teacher-student interaction on making requests and responses influenced by social factors and contextual factors in the English classroom?

College EFL Education in Taiwan: The Status Quo English courses (generally called Freshman English or General English) in Taiwan have been usually offered as a required subject for the first-year college students. However, the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Taiwan has not established English curriculum guidelines at the university level.

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of English, National Changhua University of Education, Changhua City, Taiwan.

There are no nationally unified college English syllabi, instructional approaches, teaching materials, testing, and credit hours. Although the government allows autonomy in the teaching of English at the university level, it does suggest the common goals that aim at developing students' communicative competence.

For a decade, in Taiwan the nature of General English courses has been changing – shifting from reading (particularly, the literary works) and grammar translation to integrated language skills or content-based instruction (e.g., English for Specific Purposes, abbreviated as ESP) (Chern, 2003, 2010). Chern's (2010) research, investigating the implementation of the English curricula at the tertiary level, reveals that university English curriculum has placed more emphasis on developing college students' ability to communicate in English in the situations of actual language use rather than on solely reading skills and grammar translation. In Taiwan, change has followed this theory of Communicative Language Teaching, aiming at developing college EFL students' communicative competence. Indeed, in the era of the global village, students need to develop their ability of using English for communication (Chang, 2011; Yu, 2011). To achieve this goal in the course, in college English classrooms, students need to be provided with opportunities to interact with one another in order to improve their communicative proficiency in English (Liao, 1997; Lin & Chen; 2006; Lin, 2009). The main goal of Communicative Language Teaching is to develop L2 learners' communicative competence (Brown, 2007). Learners of English as a Second Language (ESL)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL) need to appropriately use and understand the target language to convey specific communicative functions in various contexts, such as requesting (Brown, 2007; Ellis, 2008). Research (e.g., Yu, 2003, 2004; Lin, 2009; Chen, et al., 2010) has shown that when compared to the requests performed by native speakers of English, Chinese college EFL students have certain problems in their making of English requests. Students seem to be limited in their ability to vary the use of English requests according to different social situations (Yu, 2004). It is suggested that in the EFL classroom, students should be provided with opportunities of learning English requests via teacher-student interaction and peer interaction for the improvement of making appropriate requests (Cited from Chen, 2015).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical framework

Speech act theory

The speech act theory (SAT) states that "speakers do not merely use language to say things, but to do things and that thus utterances could be regarded as speech acts" (Schauer, 2009, p. 7). The term "speech act" is defined as an "attempt by language users to perform specific actions, in particular interpersonal functions such as compliments, apologies, requests, or complaints" (Ellis, 2008, p. 159). Using a language to performing speech acts in particular contexts appropriately can be considered as one kind of pragmatic ability (Paltridge, 2006). Searle (1975a) also distinguishes two types of speech acts: the direct speech acts and the indirect speech acts. In a direct speech act, "there is a transparent relationship between form and function", and in an indirect speech act, "the illocutionary force of the acts is not derivable from the source structure" (Ellis, 2008, p.161). For example, in making a request, saying "I request you to pass the salt" is a direct speech act, in which an imperative is used, while saying "Can you pass the salt?" is an indirect speech act (Huang, 2009, pp.100-111). In pragmatic theories, speech act theory has been broadly applied to explain the language use in social contexts (Chen, 2015).

Theory of Contexts

Theoretically, context can be broadly defined as "any relevant features of the dynamic setting or environment in which a linguistic unit is systematically used" (Huang, 2009, p. 13). Context plays a role in how language functions. That is, language is variously understood and interpreted by the people involved in the interaction in different contexts (Paltridge, 1996). Paltridge (1996) divided context into three types: the situational context, the background knowledge context, and the co-textual context (p. 54). The situational context refers to the context in which "people know about what they can see around them," the background knowledge context refers to the context in which "people know about each other and the world", and the co-textual context refers to the context in which "people know what they have been saying" (Paltridge, 1996, p. 54). Similar to Paltridge's definitions of context, Huang (2009) defines three types of context: the physical context, which refers to "the physical setting of the utterance," the linguistic context, which refers to "the surrounding utterance in the same discourse," and the general knowledge context, which refers to the background knowledge context shared by the speaker and the addressee (p.14). The communicative purpose of an utterance would be determined by contexts and, therefore, the theory of contexts can be applied for explanations of language uses in terms of pragmatic perspectives (Chen, 2015).

2.2. Requesting in the English Classrooms

Requesting behaviors have been seen as a typical sociolinguistic phenomenon (Blum-Kulka, 1983). Theoretically, it is assumed that people make requests for performing various functions or purposes in different social contexts (Grundy, 2008). For example, the performance "Can you pass the salt?" is regarded as a request made for help rather than as a request for asking one's potential ability (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.133) in certain contexts. Chen (2015) states The performance of the same request type (e.g., "What time is it?") may serve as more than one pragmatic function. A speaker may make a request to give an order, to encourage people to work, to express wishes, to get information, to warn, and to complain (Grundy, 2008). The pragmatic functions performed in requests vary depending on different social contexts. Requesting behaviors occur in the classroom settings (e. g., Cazden, 2001; Doughty & Pica, 1986; Dalton-Puffer, 2005). Classrooms are considered as a "communication system," in which "spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place, and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned" (Cazden, 2001, p. 2). Cazden states that, both teachers and students, identified as social actors, perform certain pragmatic functions by using requests. Teacher and student requests are determined by certain factors, such as social and contextual factors (Chaudron, 1988). Teachers make requests for pedagogical purposes (Cazden, 2001; Tsui, Marton, Mok, and Ng, 2004). Cazden (2001) states that in the classrooms, "the teacher is responsible for controlling all the talk that occurs while class is officially in session controlling not just negatively, as a traffic officer does to avoid collisions, but also positively, to enhance the purposes of education" (Cazden, 2001, p. 2).

2.3. The Interaction between Teachers and Students in Requests Teachers and students respond to each other's request in the EFL classrooms (Chen, 2015). Some studies have found that students used clarification requests, gave short answers, or kept silent in response to teacher questions in the classrooms (Durham, 1997). Durham observes that the teachers' responses to the student questions include "replies, ignores, defers substitutes, redirects, clarifies, and counter-questions" (p. 262). Different types of teacher requests and questions may have different effects on students' responses. Some studies have revealed that certain types of requests (e.g., requesting by using inferential questions) can create more interaction (Shomoossi, 2004; David, 2007).

3. Research Design

Participants

The participants consisted of EFL college students from five intact classes of Freshman English at five different universities in central Taiwan. Students were required to take the Freshman English for one academic year (two hours or three hours per week for a total of 18 weeks per semester), to fulfill their graduation requirements. Five Chinese-speaking college EFL teachers were invited to participate in the study. They've had much Freshman English teaching experience. Their teaching styles were communication-oriented and they used English as the main instructional medium. Their English courses - utilizing both lecture and group work - mainly aimed at developing students' English communicative competence, covering the development of four language skills in English- listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All teachers used four-skill based English teaching materials.

Data collection

This study used classroom observation as the method of data collection. Over a 4-week period, two lesson units of teaching were observed, video-taped, and audio-taped for each class. A total of 39 periods, 50 minutes each, were observed.

4. Findings and Discussions

The results showed that these teachers and their students responded to each other's requests. A qualitative analysis revealed that students responded to teachers' direct and indirect requests by giving short or one-word answers, or keeping silent. Examples of direct teacher requests are "Which sentences are false?", "Which word is wrong?", "Tell me something about her.", "How long is the old wall?" Examples of indirect teacher requests are "Are you satisfied with the cloth you bought online?", "Do you mean five?"

Examples of teacher-student interaction are presented as follows

1. Teacher: ...Ok. Which sentences are false? (Direct request) Student: Uh, 第2 跟4。 'Uh, number one and number two'
Teacher: 2 and 5, right? Uh, 2 should be, which word is wrong? (Direct request) Student: Thirty. (Teacher A)
2. Teacher: Are you satisfied with the cloth you bought online? (Indirect request) Student: Not really. (Teacher B)
3. Teacher: ...OK, tell me something about her. (Direct request) Student: interesting. Teacher: how interesting? (Direct request, request for clarification) Student: Fat. (Teacher C)
4. Teacher: How long is the old wall? How long is it? How long is it? (Direct request) Student: Fifth. Teacher: Fifty feet long. Do you mean five? (Indirect request, request for clarification) Student: Five. (Teacher C)
5. Teacher: ...誰? Hello? 要點了喔。來, XX, 第四題有沒有答案? Do you have the answer? 'Who? Hello? I'll call your name. Ok, XX, Do you have the answer to question four? Do you have the answer?' (Direct request) (Teacher D)
6. Teacher: 你的答案是...? 'Your answer is...?' (Direct request) Student: C. Teacher: Ok, 答案是C, 對不對? 你剛剛說為什麼是C? 'Ok, the answer is C, right? Why did you think is C?' (Direct request, request for clarification)
Student: (Silent) (Teacher E) In Examples 1, 3, and 4, the student responded to teacher request by giving one-word answer, in Example 2, by giving a short answer, and in Example 6, by keeping silent. In these examples, students responded to teacher requests while teachers were making requests in lecturing or checking the answers. In teacher-student interaction, it was also found that sometimes the teachers initiated a request, the students responded it, and then the teachers continued to give responses by using a clarification request such as, "How interesting?" (Example 3), "Do you mean five?" (Example 4), and "Why do you think is C?" (Example 6). In these examples, the teachers subsequently responded to students by using requests for clarification. These findings also showed that the students responded to teachers' direct and indirect requests by making a request or by using a full sentence. Examples are presented below:
7. Teacher: Did you do the assignment? Yes? You come up here please. Just read your answer, OK? (Direct request) Student: 我可以在這裡就好了嗎? 'Can I just read here?' Teacher: 好吧好吧。 'Ok, ok.' (Teacher A)
8. Teacher: Could you introduce your best friend to me? (Indirect request) Student: Oh, he is 大二。 'Oh, he is sophomore.' (Teacher B)
9. Teacher: Not really. Why? (Direct request) Student: 質感不好。 "The quality is not good." (Teacher B)
10. Teacher: 同學們聽得到嗎?.. 你們沒有聽到廣播的聲音? 'Class, did you hear me? Did you hear anything from the speaker?' Student: 用麥克風嗎? 'Did you use the microphone?' Student: 老師音量開大一點。 'Teacher, turn the volume up louder.' (Teacher D) In Examples 7 and 10, the students responded to the teacher requests by using clarification requests, and in Examples 8 and 9, the students answered the teachers' questions by giving full sentences. It can be seen from these examples that students responded to teacher requests while both the teachers and their students were in everyday conversations. Moreover, further analysis from the data found that students responded to teacher requests by performing various pragmatic functions. They made requests for clarification such as "Which girl?", "Read this?" and "Huh?", and for want, such as "Would you mind if I write numbers, Teacher?" and "Where do I write?", and "What is the average score?" to respond to their teachers. For example:
11. Teacher: 為什麼他 get more money? 你就照它上面寫的啊。... 'Why did he get more money? You can just follow the instructions.' (Direct request) Student: 老師會不會介意我寫數字? 'Teacher, would you mind if I write numbers?' (Request for want) (Teacher A)
12. Teacher: 好, 看那個女生, 你覺得她是哪一國人? 'Ok, look at that girl. What do you think was she from?' (Indirect request) Student: 哪個女生? 'Which girl?' (Request for clarification) (Teacher B)
13. Teacher: Line up here, Lin up here. Line up here. (Direct request) Student: 念這個嗎? 'Read this?' (Request for clarification) (Teacher C)
14. Teacher: Ok, homework, homework on page 17...all questions here, all the questions on 17. (Direct request) Student: 甚麼? 'Huh?' (Request for clarification) Teacher: 十七頁全部做 'Do all the exercises on page 17.' (Teacher D)

15. Teacher: Now I want you to turn back your answer sheet and try to answer my question..你得這個headline 是難還是ok 用中文寫一下，這個考題啊...寫寫寫 'Now I want you to turn back your answer sheet and try to answer my question. Do you that the headline is difficult or ok? Please write in Chinese. These test questions. Write, write, write'. Student:寫在哪裡? 'Where do I write?' (Request for want)(Teacher E)
16. Teacher:我跟你說啊，這些考題完全是從考卷一樣出來的，Y我就不知道妳 什麼會不會，然後那個分數還會這麼高，妳們覺得還滿意嗎? 'I want to tell you. These questions are same as the ones in your quizzes, then I don't understand why you cannot answer them. You got good grades. Are you satisfied with your grades?' (Indirect request) Student: 平均多少? 'What is the average score?' (Request for want) Teacher: 平均45分... 'The average score is 45.' In these examples, it can be seen that these students responded to their teachers' requests in different situations of the classroom sessions, including lecturing, discussion, classroom management, and homework assignment. The findings of this study showed that these teachers responded to student's requests by giving answers and feedback and making requests. For example:
17. Teacher: 來 give you ten minutes 給妳們十分鐘... 'Ok, give you ten minutes, give you ten minutes' Student: 寫footballers 會比較好嗎 'Is it better to write footballers?' (Indirect request) Teacher: 可以阿可以啊 你認為寫你的 但別人認為不同的也OK 啊 (OK) 。 'Sure, sure. You write in your own words and it is ok if the others write indifferent words.' Student: 對啊 就再寫我的 'Right, writing in my own.' Student: 老師只要寫一個是不是? 'Teacher, write one only?' (Indirect request) Teacher: 沒有 不是只要寫一個 你可以寫兩個三個四個都沒有關係啊 'No, write more than one. You can write three or four. Student: 老師會不會介意我寫數字 'Teacher, would you mind if I write numbers? Teacher: That's ok. 不會啊 你寫30 ok 'That's ok. No. You can write 30. That's ok.'(Teacher A) In this example, the teacher responded to the student requests by giving answers, such as "Sure, sure...", "No, write more than one", and "That's ok."
18. Teacher: 好,看那個女生,你覺得她是哪一國人?'Ok, look at that girl. What do you think was she from?'16 Student: 哪個女生? 'Which girl?Teacher: G 啊! 'G'. Student:韓國人! 'Korean'. Teacher:韓國人雙眼皮喔? 'Do Koreans have double-fold eyelids?' Student: 為什麼不可以雙眼皮? Why can they not have double-fold eyelids?' Teacher:可是一般他們好像單眼皮比較多 'But, Koreans usually have single-fold eyelids'. Student:可以用割的 'They can make it'. Teacher: F,你來猜猜,像哪個人種? 'F, you take a guess. What is her nationality?' Student: FM 嗎? 'FM?' Teacher:你說什麼?我還100 勒!FM, 我說的F 那個圖。'Pardon me? I will say 100. FM, I meant picture FStudent: F 嗎? 'Is it F?'. Teacher:對阿,我說很像中東人,我覺得啦,他的膚色很像,F 可以搭配哪個答案?就他有鬍子,鬍子怎麼說?下面的絡腮鬍beard,有沒有? 你幫我念好不 好?'Yep, I think he is a middle easterner. Quite similar in skin. What answer matches? He has beard. How to say it? Beard below. Beard, did you see? Could you help me read?'Student: Beard (Teacher B)
19. Teacher: 所以下禮拜交我還有時間可以幫你改。'I will have time to help revise your writing if you turn it in by next week.' Student: 老師等一下可以看嗎? 'Teacher can I take a look at it later?' Teacher: 看什麼? 'What to look at?' Student: 看這個啊! 'Just look at this.' Teacher: 看甚麼? 'What to look at?'Student: 幫我看啊 'Help me look at it.'Teacher: 等一下去幫你看嗎? 'Help you look at it later?' (Teacher B) 20. Student: 這個有題型嗎? 'Is there any question type for this?' (Indirect request) Teacher: 甚麼有題型? ...題型你要到網路上去看...listening and reading。'What do you mean by question type? You have to check the question type on the website...listening and reading' (Teacher E) In the above examples, these teachers made requests such as, "Pardon me?" and "What do you mean by question type?", and provided feedback "But, Koreans usually have single-fold eyelids" to respond to the student requests. To sum up, in teacher-student interaction, the findings of this study showed that the students responded to teacher requests by giving short and one-word answers, answering in full sentences, keeping silent, or making requests. It was also found that the teachers responded to their student requests by answering, providing feedback, or making further requests. The findings of the study revealed that teacher requests were affected by such social factors as social power (social status and authority), social distance (familiarity), and the rank of imposition.

For example

1. Teacher: Did you do the assignment? Yes? You come up here please. Just read your answer, OK? (Direct request)
 Student: 我可以在這裡就好了嗎? 'Can I just read here?' (Indirect request) Teacher: 好吧好吧。 "Ok, ok." (Teacher A)
 2. Teacher: ...為什麼他get more money 你就照它上面寫的啊。 ... 'Why did he get more money? You can just follow the instructions.' Student: 老師會不會介意我寫數字? 'Teacher would you mind if I write the numbers, Teacher?' (Indirect request) (Teacher A)
 3. Teacher: 就是你沒有寫... 你就給我這裡寫... 我就讓你在這裡寫... 'If you don't write..., you just write down in the classroom... I want to ask you to write here.' (Direct request) (Teacher A)
 4. Teacher: 所以你就下禮拜交我還有時間幫你改。 'I will have time to help revise your writing if you turn it in by next week.' Student: 老師等一下可以看嗎? 'Teacher can I take a look at it later, Teacher?' (Indirect request) Teacher: 看甚麼? 'What to look at?' Student: 看這個啊。 'Just look at this.' (Teacher B)
 5. Teacher: (Student's nickname), 你幫我傳一下。 Thank you. 'You help me pass this. Thank you' (Teacher B)
 6. Teacher: 每一組的人等一下要叫過來問問題喔。 'I want to call for people by group to answer questions later.

Students: (making noises) (Teacher E) In Examples 1 and 3, the teachers made direct requests by using the imperative type, "You come up here", and "You just write down in the classroom." It can be seen that a teacher with a higher social status tended to use more direct requests. In Examples 3 and 6, the teachers made direct requests by using the want statement type, "I want to ask you to write here", and "I want to call for people...." The findings showed that the teachers with more authority tended to use more direct requests in the classroom. In Example 5, the teacher made a direct request, "You help me pass this." The finding revealed that there was less social distance or more familiarity between teacher and student. It is interesting to note that the teacher request "You help me pass this" referred to the lower degree of imposition. That is, helping pass papers is never a heavy task in the classroom. Further analysis found that teachers performed a request for completing a task by using an indirect request, "Ok now... can you just go through the whole paragraph for us?". Due to the higher degree of imposition in this task, the teacher made an indirect request to ask the student to complete it. The qualitative analysis from the data showed that these teachers' requests were influenced by different social factors. This qualitative analysis also showed that student requests were also influenced by such social factors. In the above examples, the students with a lower social status tended to use more indirect requests, such as "Can I...?" (Examples 1 and 4), and "Would you mind...?" (Example 2). In Example 4, the student made a direct request, "Just look at this", to respond to the teacher request. The student's use of a direct request was influenced by the social factor imposition as revising students' writings was considered as teachers' obligation. The qualitative analysis from the data showed that in fact student requests were influenced by other different social factors. Further analysis from the data also revealed that the social factor cannot solely explain students' requesting behaviors in the classroom. Surprisingly, the findings of this study revealed that students did not use an appropriate request. Specifically, they probably did not consider being polite or face-saving important while they were making certain requests. For example: 7. Teacher: 你說我薪資很高是嗎? 怎麼可能!。 'You said I got paid more, didn't you? Impossible!' Student: 薪水多少? 'How much do you earn?' Teacher: 甚麼多少? 'What do you mean?' (Teacher E)
 8. Teacher: ...不會妳們這幾個都沒有寫吧? 有寫嘛 有好來。你也要在原位 置來念嘛? 還是要來這邊? 'Don't you guys write the answers? You did. Yes. Ok. Will you read there or here?' Student: 我不要, 在這邊就好 'No, I want to read here.' Teacher: 不要喔 好, 那就發揮你唱歌的聲音. 你選第幾個? Which one?

Three? 好 Good. 'No? Ok. And try to do your best singing. Which one do you choose? Which one? Three? Ok, Good.' (Teacher A) In Example 7, the student made a direct request, "How much do you get paid?" which is an inappropriate request. In Example 8, the student answered by using a direct request, "I want to...", in which the student did not probably consider the face-saving aspect in the interaction. It can be seen that although teachers' and students' requesting behaviors are influenced by these social factors, the data are not sufficient to explain whether and how these teacher and student requests are affected by these factors. Other factors may explain teachers' and students' complex requesting behaviors in the English classrooms.

5. Conclusion

EFL college teachers and students respond to each other's direct and indirect requests in the English classrooms in Taiwan. Specifically, it is evident that both the teachers and students respond to each other's requests by making clarification requests.

In addition, the teachers' and students' uses of request types at the directness level are influenced by such social factors as social power (social status and authority), social distance (familiarity), and the rank of imposition. This study indicates that teachers' request types may influence students' responses and subsequent teacher-student interaction. It is, therefore, implied that teachers can consider using different types of requests to maximize students' responses to teacher requests across different situations in the classrooms. As requesting is a sociolinguistic behavior, it is suggested that teachers consider classrooms as a social context similar to the contexts outside the classroom. It is also suggested that college teachers make requests for communicative purposes in the English as a foreign language classrooms.

Acknowledgment

Chiung-Chiuen Chen thanks Dr. David S.D. Tseng, from Providence University, Taiwan, for his great help and excellent feedback in this study

References

- Blum- Kulka, S. (1983). Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language—a cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 36-55). Rowley, MA: New House Publishers, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Chang, Y. F. (2011). Refusing in a foreign language: An investigation of problems encountered by Chinese learners of English. *Multilingua* 30, 71-98.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, C.C. (2015). *College EFL Teachers' and Students' Requesting Behaviors in the English Classrooms: A Pragmatic Study*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan.
- Chen, C. C. & Tseng, D. S. D. (2013). Requesting behaviors in the college EFL classrooms: A Pilot Study. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on English Language Teaching: ELT in a Globalization Era, held in Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan. November 22, 2013.
- Chen, C.-F. (2011). A study of EFL teachers' beliefs in questioning strategy use in industrial vocational senior high schools. Unpublished MA thesis, Providence University, Taiwan, R. O. C. Chen, Y.-S., Chen, C.-Y. D., & Chang, M.-H. (2010). The effects of instruction on Chinese university students' productions of complaint behaviors in American English. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 7(1), 29-65.
- Chern, C.-L. (2003). English language teaching in Taiwan today. In H. W. Kam and R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (pp.427-439).
- Chern, C.-L. (2010). General English programs at universities in Taiwan: Curriculum design and Implementations. *Chang Gung Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 253-274.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2005). Negotiating interpersonal meanings in naturalistic classroom discourse: directives in content and language integrated classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1275-1293.
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 305-325.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two learners' requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 1-23.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *Studies of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Education.

- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. (2011). Strategy and linguistic preference of requests by Cantonese learners of English: An interlanguage and crosscultural comparison. *Multilingua* 30, 99-129.
- Lee, Y.-C. (2011). Comparison of politeness and acceptability perceptions of request strategies between Chinese learners of English and native English speakers. *Asian Social Science*, 7 (8), 21-35.
- Liao, C.-C. (1997). *Comparing Directives: American English, Mandarin, and Taiwanese English*. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing Co.
- Li, S. (2012). The effects of input-based practice on pragmatic development of requests in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning*, 6(22): 403-438
- Lin, Y.-H., & Chen, H.-L. (2006). The interlanguage of Chinese EFL requests—The direct strategies. *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China*, 892-909. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing.
- Lin, Y. -H. (2009). Query preparatory modals: Cross-linguistic and cross-situational variations in request modification. *Journal of pragmatics*, 41: 1636-1656.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. New York: Continuum.
- Pica, T., & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day. (Ed). *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85-98). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Searle, J. R. (1975a). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In J. R. Searle, *Expression and meaning*, 1979 (pp. 1-29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shomoossi, N. (2004). The effect of teachers' questioning behavior on EFL classroom interaction: A classroom research study. *The Reading Matrix* (Vol. 4, pp. 96-104).
- Soler, E. A. (2008). Investigating pragmatic language learning in foreign language classrooms. *IRAL*, 46, 173-195.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Pragmatic development as a dynamic, complex process: General patterns and case histories *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 605-627.
- Tsui, A. B. M., Marton, F., Mok, I. A. C. and Ng, D. F. P. (2004). Questions and the space of learning. In F. Marton & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Classroom discourse and the space of learning* (pp. 113-137). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Yang, X.-J. (2009). *Pragmatic development in a second language: A cross-sectional study on the acquisition of English requests by Chinese learners*. Beijing: Defense Industry Press.
- Yu, M. C. (2004). A study of Taiwanese college students' performance of pragmatic behaviors in an L2 and their psychological processes (Part 2). A Final Report of a National Science Project. Department of English, National Chengchi University.
- Yu, M. C. (2011). Learning how to read situations and know what is the right thing to say or do in an L2: A study of socio-cultural competence and language transfer. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1127-1147.