University of Central Lancashire
UCLan

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Longitudinal benefits of pre-departure pragmatics instruction for study abroad: Chinese as a second/foreign language
Type	Article
URL	https://clok.uclan.ac.uk/id/eprint/28475/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.38216
Date	2019
Citation	Wang, Jiayi and Halenko, Nicola (2019) Longitudinal benefits of pre-departure pragmatics instruction for study abroad: Chinese as a second/foreign language. East Asian Pragmatics, 4 (1). pp. 87-111. ISSN 2055-7760
Creators	Wang, Jiayi and Halenko, Nicola

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.38216

For information about Research at UCLan please go to http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the http://clok.uclan.ac.uk/policies/

‘Knowing what to say and how to say it is really important’: Longitudinal benefits of pre-departure pragmatics instruction for study abroad

Jiayi Wang and Nicola Halenko

Abstract

Whilst the study of second language pragmatic development in study abroad (SA) contexts has gained momentum in recent years, research on L2 Chinese pragmatics, in general, remains in its infancy and is therefore limited. Longitudinal studies on the effects of instruction before, during and after SA remain scant. Following a short pre-SA pragmatics intervention on formulaic expressions with a group of UK undergraduate learners of Chinese, qualitative data in three phases (before, during, and after a year abroad in China) were collected and analysed to shed light on the perceived benefits of the treatment. The findings show that in all three phases, learners highly valued the instruction provided, but they seemed to benefit from the sociopragmatic input the most, particularly in the pre-departure stage and after completion of the SA period. The findings will be discussed in relation to the learners’ accounts of their SA experiences and the implications for pre-SA instruction.

KEYWORDS: PRE-DEPARTURE STUDY ABROAD; LONGITUDINAL; CHINESE AS A SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE; PRAGMATICS INSTRUCTION

1. Introduction

There is an ever-growing consensus amongst many foreign-language researchers and educators that pragmatics is vital to foreign-language teaching and learning (Taguchi & Roever, 2017). As noted by Kecskes (2000a. p. 145), language learners of "high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily show concomitant pragmatic skills", and "although grammatical errors may reveal a learner to be a less than proficient language user, pragmatic mistakes reflect badly on him or her as a person" (Thomas, 1983, p. 97). Nevertheless, the area of second language pragmatics is relatively under-researched and the sub-field of second language pragmatics instruction even more so (Taguchi & Roever, 2017).

When it comes to teaching Chinese as a foreign language, whilst it began in universities in English-speaking countries over a century ago (Tsung & Cruickshank, 2010), pragmatics in Chinese language education has not been specifically explored until recently. With increasing attention being directed towards pragmatics in second language acquisition, in general (e.g. Taguchi & Roever, 2017), researchers have just begun to address it in the L2 Chinese context (see, for example, Taguchi & Li, 2017 for a thematic review of pragmatics research in L2 Chinese, and Taguchi, 2015 for a summary of Chinese as a foreign/second language pragmatics studies). Most of the existing studies are developmental in nature in a study abroad (SA) (Taguchi, Li, & Xiao, 2013) or non-SA context (Taguchi, Li, & Tang, 2017; Wen, 2014). Little work has been done on interventions (explicit or implicit) for developing L2 Chinese pragmatics. This study is a first step in this direction and the qualitative results are presented here. This article specifically addresses learners' perceptions of the effectiveness of teaching L2 Chinese formulaic language to prepare L2 Chinese learners for a SA stay The following three research questions are the main focus of this study:

1. What are the perceived benefits of explicit instruction on formulaic expressions *prior* to a study abroad stay in China?
2. What are the perceived benefits of explicit instruction on

formulaic expressions *during* a study abroad stay in China?
3. What are the perceived benefits of explicit instruction on formulaic expressions *after* a study abroad stay in China?

2. Literature review

2.1 L2 Chinese pragmatics research on formulaic competence

Formulaic competence refers to knowledge of and the ability to use formulaic expressions (Gong & Jiang, 2017, p. 282). Whilst formulaic expressions have various labels, such as Situation-Bound Utterances (SBUs) (Kecskes, 2000a, 2000b, 2003, 2014, 2016), conventionalised formulae, and chunks, among others (e.g. Coulmas, 1981; Schmitt & Carter, 2004; Wray, 2002), it is generally agreed that they are fixed or semi-fixed syntactic strings whose occurrence is closely bound to specific recurrent situations and pragmatic functions. Significantly, formulaic competence is especially important to L2 Chinese learners. Kecskes (2016, p. 117) has pointed out that "[we] cannot ignore the existence and importance" of formulaic expressions in Chinese, even though "most textbooks and grammar books pay little attention to them". The production and comprehension of formulaic language are seen as a fundamental part of successful communication.

Interest in the pragmatics of Chinese as a second/foreign language is only very recent, with minimal empirical investigations focusing on pragmatic development (please note that the latter is often subsumed under the former, so we use the generic label L2 to refer to both). A series of classroom-based studies, limited to the speech act of L2 Chinese requests, investigated the influence of different amounts of practice on receptive and productive skills (Li, 2012) and, later, the influence of different treatment conditions and practices in terms of accuracy and fluency (Li, 2013; Li & Taguchi, 2014). Another classroom study (Taguchi, Li, & Tang, 2017) reported on the effectiveness of a scenario-based interactive online platform which guided L2 Chinese learners through the completion of a dialogue task, requiring Chinese formulaic expressions to fill the gaps. Overall, the findings of these studies concur with those of research in a range of other foreign

languages which demonstrate the positive outcomes of instruction on pragmatic development.

More relevant to the present study are the few works that report on the development of formulaic expressions in L2 Chinese through exposure to the L2 environment alone. In Taguchi, Li and Xiao's (2013) study, 31 American learners of Chinese developed a mix of convergent and divergent pragmatic practices over a 10-week sojourn in Beijing. Whilst significant gains were highlighted in the learners' appropriacy scores over time, these still fell short of native-like norms. Furthermore, whilst the frequency of use in relation to target language formulae increased over time, the production of exact formulaic expressions was still very limited, even at the end of the SA period. Their study thus ended with a call for instruction on formulaic expressions. Focusing on proficiency as a determining variable, Bardovi-Harlig and Su (2018) reported that an at-home group of 57 American learners of Chinese produced more conventional expressions and were able to adopt more "native-like selection" (Pawley & Syder, 1983) of these more frequently as proficiency increased. These positive findings were in contrast to that of Yang's (2016) examination of an at-home participant group. Although Yang found a positive link between increased instruction, exposure via SA and performance levels, this link was limited to the recognition of formulaic language rather than production. Yang concluded that, in terms of production, "learners' ability to produce native-like pragmatic routine formulae in corresponding real-life situations in China is not promising" (p. 39). We see this as a call to investigate this conclusion further.

As can be seen from the small number of publications on formulaic language in L2 Chinese, interest in this line of inquiry is only very recent, producing a limited number of empirical reports which offer only an initial glimpse into formulaic development in L2 Chinese. Moreover, these studies focus on the acquisitional development of formulaic competence only. No pre-SA departure instructional studies have examined Chinese formulaic expressions or tracked instructional benefits before, during, and after SA. This study aims to fill this gap by adopting a longitudinal focus on learners' experiences and

perceptions of L2 Chinese pragmatics instruction over one academic year in China.

2.2 Study abroad pragmatics instruction

SA instructional studies are still few compared with research on acquisitional pragmatic development during SA. Existing SA instructional studies can be categorised into either those focusing on *in-country* instruction during the SA experience or those which include a *pre-departure* instructional stage, with the presence or absence of further instruction once the learners are in the target country. The former category of studies can combine participant instruction with direct and immediate exposure to the target language, an advantageous addition to the at-home language-learning experience. Guiding learners to become ethnographers themselves, who record or discuss their observations and personal experiences, adds a further valuable dimension to exploit the advantageous position that the SA experience brings. Studies using these methods include research in L2 Chinese (Winke & Teng, 2010), L2 Spanish (Shively, 2011), and L2 (British) English (Halenko, 2008, 2016; Halenko & Jones, 2011). All of these in-country instructional studies consistently report significant pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic gains regardless of treatment lengths, which range from 5 hours (Halenko & Jones, 2017) to 32 hours of one-on-one tutorial support (Winke & Teng, 2010).

Pre-departure instructional studies, on the other hand, are even fewer. Some of these studies are those of Cohen and Shively (2007), Halenko and Jones (2017) and Hernandez and Boero (2018). This small collection of studies has the distinct benefits of being able to directly compare before and afterinstructional performance, in addition to later correlating this with the effects of exposure to and engaging in the host environment. This longitudinal approach provides a much richer data set of the learners' experiences and associated pragmatic development. Operationally, these studies have administered different lengths and modes of pre-departure treatment, but all still report considerable learner benefits. For instance, Hernandez and Boero (2018) reported that a pre-departure instruction as short as 90 minutes was beneficial for

heightening pragmatic awareness prior to SA, although there was no control group for comparison. From the verbal report data, the authors were able to ascertain that the pre-departure instruction was helpful with request planning and production during SA. Halenko and Jones (2017) did use a control group and established significant short-term post-instructional gains between the instructed and uninstructed groups when also investigating request language. Specifically, in the short term, the experimental group outperformed the control group in request modification, expanded their range of request formulae and showed greater sensitivity to the imposition of the request with their language choices.

2.3 Qualitative data collection in instructional studies

Several pragmatics studies have balanced quantitative data collection with qualitative participant feedback. These mixed-methods designs have been approached in several ways. Hernandez and Boero (2018) complemented the pragmatics instruction of L2 Spanish requests with post-test retrospective verbal reports (RVR) to ascertain participants' thought processes of their pre-test and post-test performance. Participants reported in the RVRs that, when planning appropriate request responses, they paid particular attention to ensuring that the requests were clear, persuasive, and sufficiently polite, and that the responses observed the local sociopragmatic rules of social distance, power, and appropriateness. Periodic written reflections of the participants' personal experiences over time have also been used to capture the results of pragmatics in action. Shively's (2011) and Winke and Teng's (2010) journal entries, for instance, provided rich evidence of learners' thought processes as they observed authentic encounters of pragmatics in the target environment, and illustrated the extent to which they were able to successfully apply the pragmatics training received. Finally, the semi-structured interviews conducted by Taguchi, Li, and Tang (2017) and Halenko and Jones (2011) reported that learners found contextualised, targeted pragmatics instruction to be beneficial. Specifically, the instruction improved the learning of formulaic expressions in an interactive computer-based

platform (Taguchi, Li, & Tang, 2017) and improved sociopragmatic awareness and staff–student interactions during an academic SA (Halenko & Jones, 2011).

The accompanying qualitative data in all of the above studies were able to provide a more varied and insightful data set into learners' cognitive processes, perceptions, and behaviour. Critically, the qualitative data also highlighted the learners' prior knowledge and linguistic/cultural assumptions before the treatment, suggesting that first-language transfer is an influential factor for pragmatic divergence. The studies' qualitative results captured the positive influence of explicit pragmatics interventions on areas, such as heightened pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic awareness (Halenko & Jones, 2011; Hernandez & Boero, 2018; Shively, 2011), confidence in L2 pragmatic production (Shively, 2011), a deeper appreciation of cross-cultural differences (Halenko & Jones, 2011; Winke & Teng, 2010) and an improved awareness of formulaic expressions in the target language (Winke & Teng, 2010). Triangulation of data, by including a qualitative dimension, allows for critical insights into online/offline thought processes and planning strategies which inform pragmatic development, which is a technique also applied to the present study for the same purposes. In this study, qualitative data were collected in three phases: (1) pre-SA, immediately following instruction, (2) during SA in China at two time periods, and (3) on return to the UK after one academic year. This study's focus is on the qualitative results from these three critical phases during one academic year on SA in China.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

An underexplored group of British and European university students (N = 18) studying Chinese as a second language at degree level were recruited for the study. All were due to start their year abroad in China, in the third year of their undergraduate course, when the intervention was conducted. The students were assigned to either an explicitly instructed group or a control group, receiving no instruction, prior to SA. Group performance was measured based on a pre- and

immediate and delayed post-test structure for the quantitative aspects of the study by using a computerised oral task (COT). Qualitative data, which is the focus of this study, were collected post-instruction at the time phases outlined above.

3.2 Background to the pragmatic intervention

This section provides an overview of the instructional intervention to provide the contextual background of the qualitative data collection. Further details of the quantitative effects of the explicit instruction and the oral test measuring performance will be reported elsewhere. In summary, the larger longitudinal project used a concurrent mixed-methods approach (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2010) in which both quantitative and qualitative data were captured at similar points over different time periods to gain a greater breadth and depth of understanding of the data, and to consider the full picture of the learners' development in the SA context as it occurred (House, 2018). Because of the amount of data obtained, the quantitative and qualitative data sets are reported in separate studies. The present study focuses on the qualitative perspective.

Prior to the three phases of qualitative data collection reported in this article, the experimental group participated in six hours of instruction over a two-week period. It was the year-abroad returners' repeated feedback that they did not feel adequately equipped to use the Chinese language to do everyday things in China that motivated us to conduct a pre-SA pragmatics instructional period. Moreover, it has been found that length of stay in China may have a significant effect on the recognition of formulaic language but not on production (Yang, 2016). This study, therefore, aimed to better prepare students to produce formulaic speech for their SA in China. The input comprised a balance of the pragmalinguistic input (a focus on formulaic expressions) and sociopragmatic aspects of Chinese language and culture.

3.3 Instruction and testing material

Chinese textbooks do not usually pay special attention to formulaic expressions and competence, but "Chinese language

learners do, especially if they study abroad" (Kecskes, 2016, p. 117). The formulaic expressions used in this study were developed through consultation with the literature, SA returners, and native and non-native speakers of Chinese. Following Taguchi, Li, and Xiao (2013) and Bardovi-Harlig (2009), 26 situations and their target formulae were selected for the COT, as the following example illustrates:

> Scenario 2: Asking for Professor Li over the phone
> You are calling the School Office. You would like to speak to Professor Li. You hear someone pick up the phone and say "Wéi". You say?

In the COT, the participants were asked to read and listen to each scenario, imagine themselves in these situations in China and provide an appropriate oral response in Chinese when they hear the prompt 'You say?'. The task was administered three times with both the experimental group, which received the instruction, and the control group, which did not: (1) before and (2) after the pre-SA instruction and (3) following the completion of their SA, one year later. The COT contained the same scenarios in each test stage, but the order of the scenarios was changed each time to mitigate against any test effects.

3.4 Qualitative data collection

In addition to the quantitative data mentioned above, the researchers also collected the following sources of qualitative data in three phases over a one-year period: (1) retrospective verbal reports (pre-SA departure, immediately following instruction), (2) critical incident reports (adapted from Spencer-Oatey's (2002) rapport incident report) and written reflections (during SA in China at two time periods), and (3) semi-structured interviews (on return to the UK after one academic year). The three phases are individually described in detail below, as these are the focus of the present study.

Phase 1 qualitative data collection *(pre-departure RVRs, immediately following intervention)*

This study elicited written responses to a perception questionnaire as a form of post-instruction RVR. Immediately

after completing the six hours of instruction and oral test, the nine experimental group participants were then guided through a series of open-ended questions and were prompted, through discussion, to record their learning experiences as a result of the intervention. The participants were asked to report on the differences between their pre-test and post-test pragmatic knowledge of the Chinese language (pragmalinguistic) and Chinese culture (sociopragmatic), in addition to finally evaluating the value of the instruction received. The primary aim of the verbal report followed Cohen's (2011) rationale for "providing access to the reasoning processes underlying cognition, response and decision making" (p. 98). For the purpose of improving validity and reliability, the verbal report was first administered immediately after the post-test to avoid any unnecessary memory strain; then, the purpose of the participant retrospective accounts was made clear, and, finally, a systematic discussion of the points acted as prompts (Cohen, 2011). Each participant was directed to provide an individual written record of his/her thoughts in the appropriate section on the questionnaire as the guided group discussion took place. The six questions related to (1) the value of instruction, (2) the perceived gains in language, (3) the perceived gains in cultural knowledge, (4) the phrases anticipated to be the most useful for a year abroad stay, (5) the cultural information anticipated to be the most useful for a year abroad stay, and (6) any final comments. The series of short responses recorded on the questionnaires were then thematically analysed in the corpus software Lextutor (2013). A keyword analysis was also undertaken to investigate the extent to which words occurred more often in the data set than in a general reference corpus. Lextutor (2013) provided the 10-million-word spoken section of the British National Corpus (BNC) as a means of achieving this. The software produces a list of all keywords which occur at least 10 times more frequently in the input data than in the reference corpus and makes a calculation of *keyness* based on the occurrences in the reference corpus and the input data.

Phase 2 qualitative data collection *(weekly cross-cultural records and written self-reflection essays during SA in China at month 5 and month 10 of one academic year)*

Prior to SA, all the participants were strongly encouraged to complete a weekly cross-cultural record adapted from Spencer-Oatey's (2002) rapport-sensitive incident report, either in English or in Chinese, throughout the year. Learners could record and reflect on anything unexpected, either positive or negative (see Appendix 1). In addition, all the participants (both the experimental and control groups) were required to submit a 1,500- to 2,000-word reflective essay in Chinese at the end of each semester (month 5 and month 10) during their year abroad in China. Learners from the experimental group were strongly encouraged to link their reflections to the scenarios from the COT and consider the use of target formulaic expressions.

In total, this phase yielded 313 weekly reports (see Table 1) and 36 self-reflection essays with an average length of over 1,500 words. It is worth noting that, whilst the weekly report was optional, each participant submitted multiple reports during their year abroad, ranging from 8 to 33 reports per person. The instructed group's weekly reports and reflective essays, which are marked in grey in the table below, were analysed in relation to the theme of this paper.

Table 1: Breakdown of the weekly cross-cultural records submitted during the SA.

Participant	Month 5	Month 10	Year total
P1	12	11	23
P2	12	3	15
P3	12	9	21
P4	12	7	19
P5	11	7	18
P6	11	3	14
P7	13	0	13
P8	0	13	13
P9	10	6	16
P10	12	21	33
P11	14	8	22

P12	5	8	13
P13	13	16	29
P14	12	9	21
P15	10	6	16
P16	3	5	8
P17	4	5	9
P18	10	0	10
Total (Instructed group)	92	70	162
Total	176	137	313

Phase 3 qualitative data collection *(semi-structured interviews on return to the UK after one academic year in China)*

Upon their return to the UK after one academic year in China, the participants were invited by the researchers for an individual interview. Five of the nine participants from the experimental group, who received the pre-SA instruction, accepted the invitation. The interviews were conducted using a mixture of Chinese and English, although the respondents seemed to prefer to use Chinese. The interviewees first completed the delayed post-test before having their individual interviews, so they were not exposed to the expressions again after the SA. The 12 semi-structured interview questions included both general questions, such as "Did you find the preparatory sessions helpful?" and more specific questions, such as "What other formulaic expressions would you like to include in the pre-departure sessions?" Ranging from 20 to 45 minutes each, the interviews were analysed around the theme of pre-SA instruction.

4. Findings

In this study, we focus on the qualitative data of the learners' own perceptions of the pre-SA instruction before, during, and after their one-year SA. We report the findings of the three phases in sequence.

4.1 Phase 1 findings (prior to SA)

Qualitative data were first collected immediately following the end of the instructional period. The participants' perceptions of the specific benefits of instruction and the extent to which they felt more prepared for their upcoming SA stay in China were the main goals of the verbal report administered.

Question 1 was evaluative of the usefulness of L2 Chinese formulaic language instruction, and Question 6 offered an open-ended space for final commentary. All of the participants believed the instruction would be 'useful' or 'highly valuable' for their SA stay. Of the seven participants who qualified these statements, 86% reported improved sociopragmatic awareness through exposure to formulaic phrases, including knowing "the normal behaviour of Chinese people and what to expect", ensuring "we don't make a fool of ourselves in China", and "giving a pre-warning of the importance of pragmatics over grammar". For Question 1, only one participant highlighted the pragmalinguistic benefits of the 'survival phrases' introduced during instruction (although this comment appears in other areas of the verbal report). Three participants acknowledged the value of the formulaic instruction in Question 6, and one participant suggested integrating the instruction into the formal academic programme for the benefit of all students on the course.

The verbal report data for Questions 2 to 5, which prompted specific examples of language or cultural benefits as a result of the formulaic input, were subsequently analysed for emergent themes. The pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic themes are presented and quantified in Table 2.

Table 2: Emergent themes from the verbal report data

Pragmalinguistic themes	**%**	**Sociopragmatic themes**	**%**
Directness	45	Politeness/face	85
L1 transfer of language	30	Social conventions	75
		Behaviour	70
		L1 transfer of sociocultural knowledge	60

Note: N = 9

A keyword analysis comparing the verbal report data with the spoken BNC corpus was then performed. The aim was to provide objective evidence of the sociopragmatic or

pragmalinguistic features which learners noticed and which therefore became more salient as a result of the formulaic instruction. Table 3 shows the keywords taken from the verbal report data set.

Table 3: Keywords from the verbal report data

Rank	Word	Keyness
1	polite	5138.75
2	China	1240.39
3	phrase	585.85
4	behaviour	273.20
5	transfer	256.94
6	direct	90.21
7	English	64.46
8	public	52.95

What we can surmise from the data in Tables 2 and 3 is that, whilst there was a balance of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic input through the formulaic language during treatment, the participant data mostly reported examples of sociopragmatic input as being of the most benefit to them for an SA stay. Of the participants, 85% noted greater clarity and understanding of cross-cultural politeness conventions and how to avoid losing face, areas which they were able to articulate at a conceptual level, but not at the practical level, during the instruction. Discussions such as these emerged as a part of the L1/L2 comparisons of formulaic language. Terms such as 'politeness' and 'polite', 'making a fool of ourselves' and '[in] public' were all key concepts recorded. Being more fully prepared in terms of demonstrating appropriate behaviour in formal and informal interactions, as well as knowledge of the underlying social conventions, were also areas of self-reported improvement for 70–75% of the participants. Examples of advancing understanding of cross-cultural norms are evident from the use of 'how-to', 'how-not-to-be', and 'do-not' statements from the verbal reports. Finally, 60% of the participants also had a heightened awareness of the potential problems with simply inappropriately applying L1 language and L1 cultural norms to L2 situations, as noted in the prominence of the word 'transfer' in Table 2 above.

4.2 Phase 2 findings (during SA)

The analysis of the 18 reflective essays and 162 weekly cross-cultural records of the instructed group collected during the participants' year abroad sheds more light on the benefits of the pre-SA pragmatics instruction. All the participants of the instructed group (9, 100%) confirmed the frequency of use of the scenarios in their essays and/or written records.

All the participants (9, 100%) reported a deeper appreciation of cultural differences, such as in the following:

> *meici wo qu shitang ren feichang duo, wo wen 'zheli you ren zuo ma', shunli de zhaodao le zuowei, yiqian wo hui shuo 'wo keyi ma' ... Gengjia liaojie zhongguo wenhua he yingguo wenhua de chayi*
> 每次我去食堂人非常多，我问‘这里有人坐吗’，顺利地找到了座位，以前我会说‘我可以吗’…更加了解中国文化和英国文化的差异
> 'There were so many people every time I went to the canteen. I asked "Is anyone sitting here?" [the target formulaic expression in Chinese] and successfully found a seat. In the past, I would say "May I" [a literal translation of the English expression] ... know more about the differences between Chinese and British culture.'
>
> P9, Semester 1 reflective essay

Eight participants (89%) pointed out that the ability to produce the target formulae enabled them to use language to do things successfully, and six participants (67%) also identified the benefit of alleviating their anxiety of target language use whilst abroad, as shown in the following representative example:

> *lai zhongguo yiqian chuguo liuxue zhunbei ke feichang youyong, wo dao zhongguo jiu yongshang le. zai jichang dache, chuzuche siji wen wo qu na, wo shuo qu X daxue, ta tingdong le, wo tai gaoxing le, yinwei wo diyici lai zhongguo, tebie jinzhang le, chuzuche siji tingdong le, wo chenggong dao le X daxue, ganjue tebie hao, jishi zhiqian wo hai yizhi huanyi zhongguoren neng dong wo de hanyu.*
> 来中国以前出国留学准备课非常有用，我到中国就用上了。在机场打车，出租车司机问我去哪，我说去 X 大学，他听懂了，我太高兴了，因为我第一次来中国，特别紧张了，出租车司机听懂了，我成功到了 X 大学，感觉特别好，即使之前我还一直怀疑中国人能懂我的汉语。
> 'The preparatory sessions before SA were very useful. I used [what I learnt] immediately after I arrived in China. [I] hailed a taxi at the

> airport. The taxi driver asked me where to; I said "to X University", and he got it. I was so happy because this is my first time in China. I was very nervous. The taxi driver understood me. I arrived at X University successfully. I felt extremely good, though I always doubted whether Chinese people could understand my Chinese or not.'
>
> P1, Semester 1 reflective essay

Whilst P1's level of Chinese was relatively high in the cohort, and she had successful interactions with native Chinese-speaking language tutors and language buddies in England before she went to China, she still had self-doubt as to whether she could be understood in the target country. Clearly, being able to apply the target expression that she learnt in order to tell the taxi driver where to go (Scenario 4) upon her arrival in China, no matter how small the success might be, seemed to give her an immediate sense of satisfaction, wipe out her self-doubt and boost her confidence immensely.

In total, eight participants (89%) reported the psychological benefits of boosting their confidence and self-assurance; for instance, one participant said '我更有自信心了 (I became more self-confident)' in the example in Appendix 1, and another said '真用上了 ([I] really used it)' (P4, cross-cultural record).

In addition, two participants (22%) touched on gaining sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic awareness through the pre-SA instruction and reinforcing their awareness through the SA experience, as shown in the following excerpt:

> *qu zhongguo yiqian, yingguo de laoshi gaosu women zai zhongguo youshihou yao gengjia zhijie … women de Wi-Fi feichang man, wo zai qiantai baoyuan, jiedaiyuan fanfu shuo 'mei banfa', zhege hen xieqi … women zhidao qiantai huanqian meitian baoyuan … guanyu kongzi xueyuan jiangxuejin … zai bangongshi tamen shuo 'mei banfa', danshi women jiushi xuyao daan. zhongyu … women bang henduo jiangxuejin xuesheng shoudao qian. suoyi wo juede youshihou bixu 'hen' yidian, buran zhongguoren bu tigong daan.*
>
> 去中国以前，英国的老师告诉我们在中国有时候要更加直接 … 我们的 Wi-Fi 非常慢，我在前台抱怨，接待员反复说 '没办法'，这个很泄气 … 我们直到前台还钱每天抱怨 … 关于孔子学院奖学金 … 在办公室他们说' 没办法'，但是我们就是需要答案。终于 … 我们帮很多奖学金学生收到钱。所以我觉得有时候必须' 狠' 一点，不然中国人不提供答案。

> 'Before going to China, my teachers in the UK told us to be more direct sometimes in China … I was not happy that our Wi-Fi speed was very slow. I complained to the front desk. The receptionist repeatedly said, "Nothing can be done", which was frustrating … I complained again and again every day until the front desk refunded the money … Regarding the Confucius Institute Scholarship … in the office, they said, "Nothing can be done", but we insisted that we needed an answer. Finally … we helped many scholarship students get their money [living stipend]. Therefore, I think [that] sometimes, [I] need to be a little bit "harsh"; otherwise, Chinese people won't give an answer.'
>
> P8, Semester 2 report

In the above excerpt, P8 vividly depicts that the pre-SA instruction in the UK raised her awareness of the need to be more direct sometimes in China in order to get things done, and a series of real-life encounters during her year abroad reinforced her awareness of this. Table 4 below summarises the main emergent themes from the essays and the written records in relation to the benefits of the instruction.

Table 4: Emergent themes from the reflective essay and cross-cultural report data

Emergent themes from the essays and reports	**Frequency in essays**	**Number of participants***	**Frequency in reports**	**Number of participants ***
A deeper appreciation of cultural differences	59	9 (100%)	8	7 (78%)
Example comment *wenhua chayi … jiuxiang zai yingguo keshang jiao de, neiwaiyoubie, zai ditie shang moshengren cai wo jiao, meiyou daoqian* 文化差异 … 就像在英国课上教的，内外有别，在地铁上陌生人踩我脚，没有道歉 'Cultural differences … just like what was taught in the sessions in the UK: differentiated treatment between insider and outsider relationships. In the underground tube/metro, strangers stepped on my feet, no apology'				
Frequency of use of the scenarios	13	8 (89%)	7	7 (78%)
Example comment *xuede zhexie qingjing feichang changjian* 学的这些情景非常常见				

'The situations learnt are very common.'

Using language to do things successfully	12	8 (89%)	6	6 (67%)

Example comment

wo shuo 'pianyi yidian ba', tongchang tanzhu dou jiangjia

我说’便宜一点吧’，通常摊主都降价

'If I say "*pianyi yidian ba*", vendors often reduce the price.'

Self-confidence and self-assurance	7	7 (78%)	8	8 (89%)

Example comments

wo gengyou zixinxin le

我更有自信心了

'I became more self-confident.'

zhen yongshang le

真用上了

'[I] really used it.'

Alleviating anxiety of the target language use	7	6 (67%)	4	4 (44%)

Example comment

diyici zuo gongjiaoche, wen siji qu zhongguancun nayizhan xiache, siji mingbai wo le, wo like jiu buname danxin le

第一次坐公交车，问司机去中关村哪一站下车，司机明白我了，我立刻就不那么担心了

'The first time I took a bus, I asked the driver where to get off for Zhongguancun. The driver understood me. I was immediately not that anxious.'

Sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic awareness	2	2 (22%)	1	1 (11%)

Example comment

woshi yingguoren, wo de fumu congxiao jiu gaosu wo bixu zai meijuhua zuihou jiashang 'qing', zai lai zhongguo qian de zhunbei ke, laoshi jieshi youshihou zhe bufuhe zhongguo wenhua de xiguan, wo gai le henduo, danshi youyici, haishi shuo 'liangzhang menpiao, qing', shoupianyuan haoxiang juede wo hen qiguai, congna yihou, wo gengjia zhuyi

我是英国人，我的父母从小就告诉我必须在每句话最后加上’请’，在来中国前的准备课，老师解释有时候这不符合中国文化习惯，我改了很多，但是有一次，还是说’两张门票，请’，售票员好像觉得我很奇怪，从那以后，我更加注意

'I'm British, since a young age, I've been taught by my parents to add "please" at the end of each sentence. In the preparatory sessions before coming to China, my teachers explained that sometimes, this does not conform to Chinese cultural customs. I changed a lot, but once, I still said "Two tickets, please" (in Chinese). The ticket seller seemed to think I was very strange. Since then, I

became more careful.'

Note: N = 9 participants of the instructed group who produced 18 reflective essays and 162 cross-cultural records in total. * = number of participants (percentage of the group)

In short, the participants reported both tangible benefits (e.g. using language to get things done) and intangible benefits (e.g. alleviating anxiety of language use and reducing uncertainties about SA) of the pre-SA pragmatics instruction.

4.3 Phase 3 findings (after SA)

The post-SA interviews in phase 3 focused on the participants' perceptions and reflections after they completed their year abroad in China. All five interviewees (100%) felt that the pre-SA instruction was helpful and useful, reinforcing the findings of the first two phases. All the interviewees (100%) confirmed that most scenarios were very frequently used whilst they were in China, but these scenarios and formulaic expressions were not covered in the language classes they had in China:

> *wo jingchang yong zhexie biaodafa, wo jingchang qu waimian chi, 'dabao', gen pengyou shuo 'wo xianzou le' ... zai zhongguo keshang ye meiyou xueguo, keben li meiyou, suoyi qu zhongguo zhiqian xue zhexie feichang youyong*
> 我经常用这些表达法，我经常去外面吃，'打包'，跟朋友说'我先走了' … 在中国课上也没有学过，课本里没有，所以去中国之前学这些非常有用
> 'I often used these expressions. I always ate out, *da bao*, and I said *wo xian zou le* to friends … have not learnt these in class in China, neither in textbooks, so it's very useful to learn them before going to China.'
> P7, post-SA interview

This finding lends strong support to the observation mentioned earlier that Chinese textbooks do not pay much attention to formulaic expressions, but Chinese language learners do, especially when they study abroad (Kesckes 2016, p. 117). This highlights the importance of having instruction specifically focused on this aspect to facilitate learners' pragmatic development.

Specifically, all the interviewees spoke highly of the structure of the instruction, including the following: (1) the overview (three interviewees, 60%), for example,

> 开始的介绍特别重要，就可以更好的了解大的社会文化背景 … 不仅仅是只讲这些表达法
> *kaishi de jieshao tebie zhongyao, jiu keyi genghao de liaojie da de shehui wenhua beijing … bu jinjin shi zhijiang zhexie biaodafa*
> 'The introduction at the beginning is very important, so [learners] can have a better understanding of the bigger sociocultural background … not just teaching [formulaic] expressions.'
>
> P10, post-SA interview

(2) the comparison of Chinese and English norms made from a rare dual perspective (five interviewees, 100%), for example,

> *liangwei laoshi zuo bijiao, fenbie cong zhongguo he yingguo de jiaodu jiang … youqi shi yingguo laoshi tandao ta zai zhongguo de jingli, ye rang women kefu xinli de zhangai, youxie shihou keyi geng zhijie, buyao suibian jia 'qing', wo yinxiang tebie shen*
> 两位老师做比较，分别从中国和英国的角度讲 … 英国老师谈到她在中国的经历, 也让我们克服心理的障碍，有些时候可以更直接，不要随便加'请'，我印象特别深
> 'Two instructors made a comparison from the Chinese and British perspectives, respectively … the English teacher talked about her experience in China and asked us to overcome the psychological hurdle, too, to be more direct sometimes and not add "please" randomly. I was very impressed.'
>
> P4, post-SA interview

(3) the analysed knowledge followed immediately by repeated productive practice (five interviewees, 100%), for example,

> *xuewan jiu chongfu lian, jiu jizhu le*
> 学完就重复练，就记住了
> '[We] remembered the expressions because we practised repeatedly immediately after we learnt them.'
>
> P1, post-SA interview

Echoing the benefits identified earlier, all of the participants in the third phase also mentioned their gain in sociopragmatic and

pragmalinguistic knowledge and awareness through the pre-SA instruction, especially in terms of social conventions (four interviewees, 80%) and politeness (three interviewees, 60%). For example, P10 explained how the instruction raised his sociopragmatic awareness and changed his mindset:

> *wo jide laoshi gaosu women 'neiwaiyoubie', suoyi, youshihou zuo gongjiaoche wo bei moshengren cai le, bu daoqian, wo keyi jieshou le*
> 我记得老师告诉我们‘内外有别’，所以，有时候坐公交车我被陌生人踩了，不道歉，我可以接受了
> 'I remembered the teachers told us about the "differentiated treatment between insider and outsider relationships", so when a stranger stepped over my toe on a bus and didn't apologise, I could accept it now'
>
> P10, post-SA interview

The key notion here which was introduced is that differentiated politeness norms and expectations apply to insider versus outsider relationships; that is, if the interactants know one another, they will practise facework/politeness, paying attention to one another's face needs; otherwise, face/politeness does not necessarily need to be attended to (Pan, 2000). This cultural norm may help explain, for example, the 'lack of apology' in a face-to-face interaction with the Chinese from a British perspective in public spaces, such as on the street or in public transport, as illustrated in P10's comments above.

5. Discussion

We discuss our findings in relation to two main areas. First, we link the findings to the original research questions and focus on the main aspects identified by the participants as particularly beneficial in the three SA phases. Second, we present some insights into designing future SA preparation programmes for L2 Chinese learners.

5.1 The research questions

In phase 1 (pre-departure stage), the verbal report data suggest that the participants appeared underprepared for the SA stay,

and the instruction seemed to fill much-needed gaps. Sociopragmatic knowledge, particularly sociocultural conventions in relation to politeness and behaviour, appeared most frequently in their verbal reports as examples of interventional gains achieved through the formulaic input. The pre-SA instruction also drew on scholarly work on contemporary and historical Chinese politeness (e.g. Pan & Kadar, 2011), providing a broader overview of Chinese language use than simply the target formulae. The sociocultural context, such as this, was highly valued by all the participants because, as noted by P7, it made it easier for them to understand L2 differences, *geng rongyi lijie weishenme you chayi* 更容易理解为什么有差异 'easier to understand why there are differences'. What the literature tells us about sociopragmatic competence is that it is more challenging to acquire than pragmalinguistic competence (e.g. Trosborg, 2010), it develops in much later stages under natural conditions (e.g. Cohen, 2008), and it is one of the main causes of pragmatic divergence in an L2 (e.g. Cohen & Ishihara, 2010; Wang, 2011). The participants' reflections contain evidence of all these developmental features. In phase 1, a disparity was evident between the participants' sociopragmatic knowledge and pragmalinguistic knowledge, suggesting an imbalance between the two areas prior to treatment and that first language transfer was a typical (inappropriate) strategy used to fill this gap, as noted elsewhere (e.g. Cohen & Ishihara, 2010).

In phase 2 (during SA), the participants reported the efficiency and ease with which they were able to retrieve and immediately apply the formulaic expressions introduced during the instruction. It is likely that the learners were primed to *notice* (Schmidt, 1993) the formulae through the pre-departure instruction, which made exposure to and recognition of them more salient in situ. Furthermore, the learners commented on how useful the expressions were for completing everyday tasks quickly and successfully. These findings offer further support for the well-documented advantages to learning language as chunks, such as saving time (Pawley & Syder, 1983), effort (Wray, 2002), and mental capacity (Wang, 2011). In addition, the high predictability and frequency of

formulaic language, which were reported from both receptive and productive perspectives during the year abroad, suggest that the approach of basing pre-departure instruction on a set of evidence-based, highly conventionalised routine formulae should be a key principle to consider in materials design.

In phase 3 (after SA), the learners seemed to have a greater appreciation of how culture and language are inextricably linked. Comments highlighted the benefits of interventions, such as this, which incorporated a balance of the two aspects. Reflections also reported that, in the absence of any targeted help, developing this formulaic pragmatic knowledge was difficult and slow (P4, post-SA interview). The learners further reflected that textbooks disappointingly lacked a sociopragmatics focus, which they felt left them disadvantaged in terms of understanding the wider cultural context and thus failed to prepare them for their SA experience. They believed that knowledge of both language and culture was fundamental to how they approached and engaged in L2 interaction, as well as critical in terms of making appropriate pragmalinguistic choices. Despite the growing number of resources available for teaching pragmatics (e.g. Cohen & Ishihara, 2010; Tatsuki & Houck, 2010), the importance of incorporating it has yet to filter through into mainstream language textbooks, including those of L2 Chinese.

5.2 Implications for teaching and learning

The materials and instruction were co-designed and co-delivered by the researchers, the benefits of which were salient to the participants and were noted in their written and spoken reflections. The method of an NS (native speaker) and an NNS (non-native speaker) co-designing and co-teaching sets this study apart from previous ones. For example, Halenko and Jones (2017) used NSs only in their instruction of English language requests amongst Chinese L2 English learners. Predicting and identifying the main difficulties for the learners in the designing period were examples of the advantages of using this dual instructor approach. The following specific difficulties were identified for the L2 Chinese learners. Utterances need to be accurate because even a slight change in

one character in the target formula may completely alter the meaning, as reported in other studies (e.g. Taguchi et al., 2013; Yang, 2016). Moreover, imparting sociocultural knowledge and raising awareness may sometimes be inadequate. Learners may demonstrate resistance to change, because as noted by Kesckes (2016, p. 122), learners may not be willing to adopt L2 norms. The latter aspect tends to be overlooked in language teaching, but resistance to change has been reported before as a feature of learner behaviour (e.g. Kasper & Rose, 2002; Kesckes, 2000a; Shively, 2011). Our pragmatics instruction also attended to this aspect by acknowledging the psychological hurdles that the learners may encounter and by helping them overcome these. For instance, we observed that British L2 Chinese learners tended to add a 'please' before and/or after a request, which may not be appropriate in the Chinese language in certain contexts. Rather than simply telling the students not to use 'please', we decided to first acknowledge the psychological hurdles they might encounter in not saying 'please' (which were constrained by their existing L1 patterns of thought and behaviour) and then analyse it in the greater sociopragmatic context (e.g. sometimes, 'please' is not necessarily as frequently used in Chinese as in English when engaging in service encounters, for instance). This approach provided a more meaningful depth and analysis of the cultural gaps underlying linguistic choices. According to Malamed (2010. p. 209), learners need to be introduced to the "new and different, and even uncomfortable" cross-cultural differences before learning can begin. The findings also lend strong support to Swain's (1996) Output Hypothesis, which suggests several acquisitional roles for L2 production, namely learners may notice gaps in their interlanguage during utterance production: learners require analysed knowledge for productive language use beyond formulaic speech, and repeated productive language use is a requisite for automatisation. It is important to attend to aspects in pre-SA pragmatics instruction that have as an aim the developing of learners' pragmatic competence not only to comprehend, but also to produce formulaic expressions, as the production of formulaic expressions has been found to be more challenging than comprehension (Yang, 2016).

6. Conclusion

Whilst research on teaching second language pragmatics over the past two decades has explored several areas and languages, East Asian languages are still relatively under-researched, and pre-SA pragmatics instruction remains an uncharted territory for research and practice. Drawing on multiple sources of qualitative data, our study of pre-SA pragmatics instruction of L2 Chinese has cast light on its enduring benefits over one academic year, with reference to developing formulaic competence. This study was able to track learners' perceptions of the instructional benefits prior to engaging in a SA stay, the extent to which they were able to apply the knowledge and the psychological and practical benefits it brought them during the three phases.

Overall, the pre-SA pragmatics instruction was highly valued by the participants, before, during, and after their year abroad in China. The learners' perceptions in all the three phases reinforced the benefits of the instruction, consistent with the quantitative results that will be reported elsewhere. Specifically, phase 1 (pre-SA) increased the participants' sociopragmatic knowledge of L2 cultural norms and helped them with their conflicting L1/L2 views of appropriate behaviour and politeness conventions. In phase 2 (during SA), the participants recognised the value of using formulaic expressions to achieve their day-to-day tasks in a highly efficient way, without undue strain. This not only allowed them to get things done more successfully, but also appeared to considerably boost their confidence, especially in the early stages of their SA stay. Finally, in phase 3 (after SA), the participants (1) acknowledged the benefits of developing both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge through focused, explicit instruction, (2) were able to recognise how language and culture are inextricably linked through their personal experiences and development, and (3) concluded that academic textbooks were a poor source of language and cultural input, as these did not prepare them adequately enough for a SA stay.

More theoretical and empirical studies of pre-SA pragmatics instruction would be required to advance our understanding,

but this study is a first step in this direction. Given the identified gaps and benefits, we therefore recommend further research on second language pragmatics instruction (1) to move beyond the traditional focus on Western languages as our study does, (2) to continue to investigate the psychological benefits and affective factors underlying SA periods, and (3) to further explore the area of pre-SA instruction.

About the authors

Author bios.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 59*(4), 755–795. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00525.x

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Su, Y. (2018). The acquisition of conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource in Chinese as a foreign language. *Modern Language Journal, 102*(4), 732–757. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12517

Cohen, A. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching, 41*(2), 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004880

Cohen, A. D. (2011). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Abingdon: Routledge/Pearson Education.

Cohen, A., & Ishihara, N. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(2), 189–212. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00540.x

Coulmas, F. (1981). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hague: Mouton.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. (2010). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gong, Z. & Jiang, H. (2017). Situation-bound utterances and formulaic competence: The case of Chinese learners of English as a foreign language. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 40*(3), 281–297.

Halenko, N. (2008). *How sorry can a person be? Teaching the speech act of*

apology in the ESL classroom (Unpublished MA thesis). Lancaster University.

Halenko, N. (2016). *Evaluating the explicit instruction of requests and apologies in the study abroad context: the case of Chinese ESL learners at a UK Higher Education Institution* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Lancaster University.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System, 39*(2), 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.05.003

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2017). Explicit instruction of spoken requests: An examination of pre-departure instruction and the study abroad environment. *System, 68*, 26–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.06.011

Hernández, T. A., & Boero, P. (2018). Explicit instruction for request strategy development during short-term study abroad. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching, 5*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2018.1459278

House, J. (2018). Authentic vs elicited data and qualitative vs quantitative research methods in pragmatics: Overcoming two non-fruitful dichotomies. *System*, *75*, 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.014

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kecskes, I. (2000a). Conceptual fluency and the use of situation-bound utterances in L2. *Links & Letters, 7*, 145–161.

Kecskes, I. (2000b). A cognitive-pragmatic approach to situation-bound utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(5), 605–625. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00063-6

Kecskes, I. (2003). *Situation-bound utterances in L1 and L2*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.v1i1.29098

Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kecskes, I. (2016). Situation-bound utterances in Chinese. *East Asian Pragmatics, 1*(1), 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.v1i1.29098

Lextutor 2013. Compleat Lexical Tutor 2013. [Retrieved 18 January 2018].Available at http://www.lextutor.ca/ .

Li, S. (2012). The effects of input-based practice on pragmatic development of requests in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning 62*(2), 403–438. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00629.x

Li, S. (2013). The effects of different levels of linguistic proficiency on the development of L2 Chinese request production during study abroad. *System, 45*, 103–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.001

Li, S. & Taguchi, N. (2014). The effects of practice modality on the development of pragmatic performance in L2 Chinese. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(3), 794–812. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12123

Malamed, L. H. (2010). Disagreement. How to disagree agreeably. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (Eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 199–216). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.26.12mal

Pan, Y. (2000). *Politeness in Chinese face-to-face interaction*. Westport. CT: Greenwood Publishing.

Pan, Y., & Kádár, D. Z. (2011). *Politeness in historical and contemporary Chinese*. London: Continuum

Pawley, A. & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 191-225). London: Longman.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 206–226. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002476

Schmitt, N., & Carter, R. (2004). Formulaic sequences in action. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences: Acquisition, processing and use* (pp. 1–22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.9

Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(6), 1818–1835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.030

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(5), 529–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00039-X

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Kádár, D. Z. (2016). The bases of (im)politeness evaluations: Culture, the moral order and the East–West debate. *East Asian Pragmatics, 1*(1), 73–106. https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.v1i1.29084

Swain, M. (1996). Discovering successful second language teaching strategies and practices: From programme evaluation to classroom experimentation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural development, 17*(2–4), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639608666261

Taguchi, N. (2015). Pragmatics in Chinese as a second/foreign language. *Studies in Chinese Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 3–17.

Taguchi, N., Li, Q., & Tang, X. (2017). Learning Chinese formulaic expressions

in a scenario-based interactive environment. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(4), 641–660. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12292

Taguchi, N., & Li, S. (2017). Introduction to a thematic review: Pragmatics research in Chinese as a second language. *Chinese as a Second Language Research, 6*(1), 1–6.

Taguchi, N., Li, S., & Xiao, F. (2013). Production of formulaic expressions in L2 Chinese: A developmental investigation in a study abroad context. *Chinese as a Second Language Research, 2*(1), 23–58. https://doi.org/10.1515/caslar-2013-0021

Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tatsuki, D. H., & Houck, N. R. (Eds.) (2010). *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Inc.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91

Trosborg, A. (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214444

Wang, V. X. (2011). *Making requests by Chinese EFL learners*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.207

Wen, X. (2014). Pragmatic development: An exploratory study of requests by learners of Chinese. In Z. Han (Ed.), *Studies in second language acquisition of Chinese* (pp. 30–56). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092093-004

Winke, P., & Teng, C. (2010). Using task-based pragmatics tutorials while studying abroad in China. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 7*(2), 363–399. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2010.016

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519772

Yang, J. (2016). CFL learners' recognition and production of pragmatic routine formulae. *Chinese as a Second Language 51*(1), 29–61. https://doi.org/10.1075/csl.51.1.02yan

Appendix 1 Cross-cultural record

跨文化记录表

Cross-cultural record sheet

姓名/Name: P14	日 期 /Date: 15th April 2018

请在跨文化记录表中记录你在中国期间遇到的事情，无论好坏，无论是发生在校内还是校外。请回答表中的所有问题，描述当时发生了什么，你当时的反应是什么，一件事请填一张表。

The aim of this cross-cultural record sheet is for you to describe events which happened to you that have a positive or negative impact for you as a visitor to China. Please complete each section below, describing the event, the person/s involved and your reactions. Use a different record sheet each time something which has a noticeable effect on you happens on campus or outside the university.

描述当时发生了什么，可以用对话或角色扮演的形式来描述。

Describe the event. Perhaps it is easier narrate it as a dialogue or role play.

第一次去商店，店员问我要什么，我说了随便看看。

'First time to go to a shop. The shop assistant asked me what I want to buy. I said *sui bian kan kan* [a target formulaic expression].'

事情在哪里发生的（例如：课堂上、公共汽车上、超市里）？

Where did the incident occur (e.g. in class, on the bus, at the supermarket)?

X 大学 Y 商店

'X University Y Shop'

现场还有其他人吗？请填写以下表格。

Who was involved in the incident? (Please complete table below).

性别 Gender		年龄 Age			哪国人 Nationality				与你的
男 M	女 F	更大 Older	类似 Similar	更小 Younger	中国人 Chinese	英国人 English	其他 Other	未知 Unknown	Relati to you
			√		√				店员

* 例如：朋友、老师、陌生人、店员

e.g. friend, tutor, stranger, shop assistant

你的反应是什么？

Your reaction/s?

很高兴能用上学到的随便看看

'Very glad to be able to use *sui bian kan kan* that I learned.'

为什么你会有这样的反应？
The reason/s for your reactions?
我更有自信心了
'I became more self-confident.'