Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), Vol. 14, No. 2, September 2011, 145-171

Noticing Request-Realization Forms in Implicit Pragmatic Input: Impacts of Motivation and Language Proficiency

Zia Tajeddin [a]
Associate Professor, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Saman Ebadi [b]
Ph.D. in TEFL, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Received 14 March 2011; revised 23 July 2011; accepted 6 August 2011

Abstract

This study explored EFL learners' pragmalinguistic awareness in processing implicit pragmatic input and the extent to which their awareness of the target features was related to motivation and proficiency. It was carried out in an EFL context to explore the roles of these two variables, particularly intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, in noticing bi-clausal request forms in implicit pragmatic input. The participants in this research were 121 advanced EFL learners from a language center, participating as members of intact classes. All participants took a proficiency test and completed a motivation questionnaire in order to explore the factorial structure of motivation. Then, out of them, 35 learners were randomly selected to form the treatment group. They then took part in a noticing-the-gap activity as a treatment task. The degree of learners' awareness of the target pragmalingustic features was assessed through a respective awareness questionnaire administrated immediately after the treatment. However, the current study shows that EFL students are rather extrinsically motivated and instrumentally oriented to notice

[a] *Email address*: zia_tajeddin@yahoo.com
Corresponding address: Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, South Allameh Street, Modiriat Bridge, Chamran Highway, Tehran, Iran

[b] *Email address*: samanebadi@gmail.com

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

pragmalinguistic features, which is incompatible with what Takahashi reported on students' intrinsic orientation to notice pragmaliguistics in the Japanese EFL context. This suggests that learners in different contexts have different motivational dispositions to pragmalinguistic awareness.

Keywords: Attention; Noticing; Proficiency; Motivation; Pragmalinguistic features; Bi-clausal request forms

Introduction

Pragmatic acquisition can be affected by input, the type of instruction, and learner variables. Among learner variables, language proficiency and motivation stand out in view of not only their contribution to pragmatic acquisition but also their role in second language acquisition. Despite research on the role of both variables in noticing pragmatic features, the findings are still far from conclusive. To bring to light the effect of these two variables on noticing request forms in English by EFL learners in the Iranian context, the present study was conducted.

Review of Literature

Approaches to Attention in SLA Studies

A general finding of research on attention and noticing is that attention is necessary for learning to take place (for reviews, see Robinson, 1995; Schmidt, 1990, 1995, 2001; Tomlin & Villa, 1994). Three positions have been put forth in the SLA literature regarding attention. The first one is Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 1995, 2001), which simply states that "people learn about the things that they attend to and do not learn much about the things they do not attend to" (Schmidt, 2001, p. 30). Schmidt (1995) argues that Noticing Hypothesis is concerned with the initial stage of input processing. He claims that for input to become intake, the detection of relevant input in the state of awareness and attention is required.

Schmidt (1990) contends that awareness at the level of "noticing" is necessary for learning," which counters claims by other researchers arguing that learning a language is a primarily an unconscious process (Chomsky, 1965, 1986, 2000; Gregg, 1984; Krashen, 1982; Seliger, 1983). Schmidt (2001) pointed out that, to acquire interlanguage pragmatics, global alertness to target language input is not

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

sufficient. In other words, "in order to acquire pragmatics, one must attend to both the linguistic forms of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated" (p. 30). According to Schmidt (1990, 1993), for pragmatic strategies to be processed and implemented, the initial detection by the learner is needed. Schmidt also emphasized the importance of motivation, acculturation, and other affective factors in learners' pragmatic development.

The second position was proposed by Tomlin and Villa (1994), who distinguished between the alerting, orienting, and detection functions of attention during the allocation of selective attention. Alertness, for them, refers to an individual's "general readiness to deal with incoming stimuli or data" (p. 190). Clearly, of the three functions of attention, detection is most similar to what Schmidt (1990) termed "noticing." Detection is responsible for encoding in memory and is, therefore, the attentional level at which Tomlin and Villa claimed learning must begin. Contrary to Schmidt's belief that conscious noticing is necessary for learning, Tomlin and Villa pointed out that detection does not necessarily imply awareness. To reconcile these conflicting positions, Robinson (1995) redefined noticing as detection plus rehearsal in short-term memory, prior to encoding in long-term memory.

In the third position, Robinson (1995) reconciles these conflicting views by redefining noticing as detection plus rehearsal in short-term memory, prior to encoding in long-term memory. He further adds that short-term memory is a subset of long-term memory in a currently active state. Thus, Schmidt's (1990) noticing is defined as what is both detected and then further activated as a result of the allocation of attentional resources from a central executive system. As pragmalinguistic forms and sociopragmatic rules are often not salient enough for learners to notice by mere exposure to these rules in action, some form of awareness-oriented instruction is necessary (Kasper & Rose, 2002).

Motivation and Attention in SLA

Most research on the effects of motivation on second language learning is based on the seminal works of Gardner (1985, 1988). Integrative and instrumental motivations are the best known constructs in Gardner's framework. Integrative motivation is defined as a desire to learn the second-language in order to meet and communicate with members of the target group, whereas instrumental motivation indicates the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from learning an L2

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

(Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Closely related to integrative/instrumental motivation is the extrinsic/intrinsic dichotomy, which is associated with doing something for obtaining external and internal rewards, respectively. Schmidt (2001) argued that the extrinsic-intrinsic distinction is somewhat similar to the instrumental-integrative distinction, but the two distinctions are not identical. As both instrumental and integrative motivations involve goals or outcomes, they are seen as subtypes of extrinsic motivation. Several scholars (Dörnyei, 1990, 1994, 2005; Lamb, 2004; McClelland 2000; Yashima, 2000) have questioned the validity and relevance of integrativeness. McClelland (p. 109, as cited in Dörnyei, 2005) called for a definition of "integrativeness" that focuses on "integration with the global community rather than assimilation with native speakers," highlighting a "need to reappraise Gardner's concept of integrativeness to fit a perception of English as an international language." In a recent qualitative study in Indonesia, Lamb concluded that it is difficult to differentiate between integrative and instrumental orientations. He failed to detect a motive that could be labeled as "integrative" in Gardner's original sense. Schmidt (1996) stated that though Gardner consistently emphasized the support that integrative motivation offers for language learning, this does not seem to be the case in all language learning settings. Dörnyei (1994) asserted that foreign language learners have a different kind of integrative motivation which is more culture-general than culture-specific.

Svanes (1987) carried out a study of foreign adults who were learning Norwegian. She found that the Middle Eastern, African, and Asian students were more instrumentally motivated than European and American students, who were found to be more integratively motivated. Dörnyei (1990) studied adult EFL learners in Hungary. The learners in his study had voluntarily registered and paid for English courses. He found that instrumental goals did indeed play a prominent role in the learning of English, but only up to the intermediate level.

In view of these findings, Dörnyei (2005) reiterates the need to reinterpret integrativeness in Gardner's (1985) framework. He claims that to account for the daily ups and downs of motivation to learn, i.e. the ongoing changes of motivation over time, a process-oriented paradigm should be adopted. Dörnyei asserts that, in this paradigm, motivation is not regarded to be a static trait but is a dynamic learner variable constantly changing. Motivation is a key factor in the allocation of attentional resources (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Crookes and Schmidt highlight the fact that there is a definite link between attention and motivation. They state that learners may

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

voluntarily decide to devote their attention to a learning task and "it is this kind of voluntary control of attention for which motivational factors are most obviously relevant" (p. 484).

Motivation and Pragmatic Awareness

Schmidt (1993) argued that L2 learners with integrative motivation who desire to establish relationships with native speakers are on a more advantageous footing to notice pragmatic features of input than those lacking such motivation. In fact, motivation may be one factor that highly constrains pragmatic attention and awareness. Niezgoda and Röver (2001) suggested that motivation might influence Czech-speaking English learners' sensitivity to grammatical and pragmatic errors. Learner-internal factors may control the conversion of input to intake and consequently hinder or boost the development of pragmatic competence. Schmidt argued that because of the close connections among pragmatic realization strategies, social power relationships between speakers and personality engagement in interaction, it is likely that there is a stronger relationship between motivation, acculturation, and other affective factors in the development of pragmatic and discoursal ability than in other aspects of language learning, such as syntax.

In the area of interlanguage pragmatics, Kim (2000) studied how motivation affects students' attention in processing specific pragmalingustic features. She found a relationship between students' motivation profiles and their level of pragmatic awareness. Takahashi (2001) was the first to investigate systematically the impact of motivation on L2 pragmatics. She speculated that motivation could play a significant role in explaining variation in learners' noticing of the request speech act. The investigation revealed that highly motivated learners were more likely to adopt target pragmatic norms than less-motivated learners. It can be assumed that learners with higher L2 learning motivation exhibit more metapragmatic awareness and therefore outperform those with lower L2 learning motivation in the areas of speech act production and comprehension. To explore the effects of motivation and proficiency on pragmalinguistic awareness, Takahashi (2005) built on her previous study in examining whether students' noticing of target request strategies was affected by their motivation rather than their L2 proficiency and what subcomponents of the multidimensional motivation construct contributed to such an effect. The results of her seminal study revealed that, in the Japanese EFL context, pragmalinguistic awareness was associated with the learners' motivation, particularly with their intrinsic

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

motivation, rather than with their proficiency. She pointed out that "the nonsignificant correlation of awareness with proficiency suggests that motivation overrides proficiency in learners' attentional allocation" (p. 114). This is due to the fact that motivation construct is highly context-bound and culture-specific.

Proficiency and Pragmatic Awareness

The relationship between language proficiency and pragmatic ability has been investigated in an abundance of research (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Liddicoat, 2002; Niezgoda & Röver, 2001; Rose, 2000; Takahashi, 2001, 2005; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989). The results of these studies generally provided rich evidence of a marked imbalance between general proficiency and pragmatic knowledge.

Exploring the relations between pragmatic production and proficiency, Takahashi and DuFon (1989) found that high-proficiency Japanese ESL learners consistently used more target-like requests. Rose's (2000) study of Cantonese-speaking EFL learners corroborated Takahashi and DuFon's results, showing a similar increase in target-like conventional indirectness in requests with proficiency. In the same line of inquiry, Liddicoat (2002), comparing high- and low-proficiency ESL learners' pragmatic awareness of requests with that of NSs of Australian English, concluded that ESL learners with a higher level of proficiency may acquire a greater ability to correctly identify target-like request utterances. These findings support the claim the L2 learners' high proficiency level does not necessarily results in the better achievement of interlanguage pragmatic competence.

Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) did research on American and Hungarian learners' grammar ability and pragmatic awareness. American ESL learners considered the pragmatic violations to be more serious, whereas Hungarian EFL learners perceived the grammatical errors to be more salient. The study also investigated the role of participants' length of residence in the target community in the ratings of their pragmatic errors. They found that the ESL participants who had only recently arrived in the United States assigned lower severity scores to the pragmatic items than those ESL learners who had spent at least 3 months in the target environment prior to taking part in the research.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Niezgoda and Röver (2001) replicated the above experiment with Czech ESL learners. In contrast with Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's (1998) results, the EFL learners in their sample recognized a higher number of pragmatic violations than the ESL participants. The students in the Czech Republic also assigned higher severity ratings to both the pragmatic and grammatical violations than did the participants in the United States. However, their results also revealed that EFL learners had stronger awareness on both grammar and pragmatics than did ESL learners.

The findings of these studies indicated that three factors play an important role in the learner's linguistic awareness: the proficiency level, the learning environment, and the students' access to authentic L2 input. Thus, the results supported both Bialystok's (1991, 1993) processing model and Schmidt's (1993, 1995) Noticing Hypothesis.

Bialystok's (1993) information processing theory highlighted the relationship between learners' proficiency and their selective attention in L2 input processing. Bialystok proposed that more proficient learners are able to give selective attention to the target pragmatic features more accurately (and faster) than less proficient learners. The information processing model thus suggests that proficiency is among the essential determinants of learners' attentional allocation in processing L2 pragmatic input (Takahashi, 2005).

Takahashi (2005) explored the possible interrelationship between motivation and proficiency and their joint operation on attention and awareness in pragmatic input. She concluded that motivation and proficiency operate on pragmatic awareness independently and motivation overrides proficiency in pragmalinguistic awareness.

The Study

Aiming to shed more light on pragmatic acquisition, though in a different EFL context, and drawing on two previous studies by Takahashi (2001, 2005), the current investigation focused on the relationship of motivation and proficiency with EFL learners' awareness of L2 pragmalingustic features under an implicit input condition. It examined what EFL learners actually attend to, how they process L2 request realization forms through implicit input, and to what extent their noticing of the target features is related to motivation and proficiency. Since motivation is multi-dimensional

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

motivation and highly culture-bound and context-specific and previous findings have been inconsistent in linking motivation sub-scales to pragmatic learning, the current study also aimed to examine the influence of EFL learners' motivation sub-scales on their pragmalinguistic awareness of request forms.

To achieve the above aims, the following three research questions were addressed:

1. Do EFL learners notice bi-clausal request forms to a greater extent than other pragmalinguistic features in request discourse in the implicit input condition?
2. Does motivation affect EFL learners' noticing of request-realization forms in the implicit input condition?
3. Does language proficiency affect EFL learners' noticing of request-realization forms in the implicit input condition?

Method

The characteristics of participants, instrumentation, data collection procedure, and data analysis are described below.

Participants

The participants in this research were 100 advanced learners of English, participating as members of intact classes. They had already studied English for about 14 20-session semesters. Among them, 35 students attended treatment sessions. Their mean age was 17.43. None of them had ever resided in an English-speaking country, and all of them had received formal English instruction for four to five years.

Materials and Instruments

Four kinds of data eliciting instruments were employed: (1) materials for the immediate retrospection session, (2) a proficiency measure, (3) materials for the treatment session, and (4) a motivation questionnaire.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Treatment Materials: Appropriate materials were used for the treatment session. The following two situations were used as the input situations for the treatment: the "Violin" and the "Questionnaire" situations. Both of them were request situations in which requests were made from a lower status person to a higher status one. In the "Violin" situation, the requester asked her next-door neighbor to stop her daughter's violin practice at night. In the "Questionnaire" situation, the requester asked her next-door neighbor to fill out a questionnaire and to return it as soon as possible. In both scenarios, previous studies had shown that native-speaker requesters used bi-clausal complex request forms as the most appropriate request head acts (Takahashi 1987, 1996; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989). The following three types of treatment materials were prepared: (1) transcripts of NS–NS role-plays for the two situations; (2) transcript of NS–NNS role-plays for the same situations; and (3) an instruction sheet. The role-play data were obtained from Takahashi (1987) and Takahashi and DuFon.

Motivation Questionnaire: The first instrument was the Motivation Questionnaire, adopted from Schmidt, Boraie, and Kassabgy's (1996) motivation measure which was developed for Egyptian EFL learners; however, some of the items were changed so that they would be more suitable to the EFL learning context in Iran. Schmidt et al.'s motivation questionnaire was chosen because it was developed based on models in motivational and educational psychology which specifically referred to the motivation/attention interface.

Proficiency Measure: The second instrument was the proficiency measure. It consisted of the Structure and Written Expressions as well as the Reading Comprehension sections of the TOEFL. The former consisted of 30 items and the latter included the same number of items. The raw scores were subsequently converted so as to make 100 the full score for each section.

Awareness Questionnaire: The third instrument was used for the immediate retrospection session. It included the Awareness Retrospection Questionnaire, which had two forms: Form 1 for the "Violin" situation and Form 2 for the "Questionnaire" situation. Presented along with filler expressions, the expressions were categorized into the six target features of REQ-1, REQ-2, REQ-3, DMA, IDE, and N-IDE (Takahashi, 2005), as described below:

(i) Request head acts:

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

1. Request form 1 ("REQ-1"): for example, "I was wondering if you could VP."
2. Request form 2 ("REQ-2"): for example, "Is it possible to VP?"/ "Do you think you could VP?"
3. Request form 3 ("REQ-3"): for example, "If you could …"

(ii) Non-request features:

4. Discourse marker ("DMA"): for example, "well," "you know," "maybe"
5. Idiomatic expression ("IDE"): for example, "This has to do with," "How ya doin'?"
6. Non-idiomatic expression ("N-IDE"): for example, "I live next door," "I don't want to bother you"

The task required the participants to point out distinctively native English usage in the requestee's discourse, in addition to the requester's; thus, the fillers came from both the requester's and the requestee's turns. Form 1 contained 11 target expressions and 27 fillers; 10 target expressions and 24 fillers were contained in Form 2. The degree of awareness was assessed on the following seven-point scale:

-3 I did not detect it at all (and thus was not interested in it at all).
-2 I did detect it but was hardly interested in it.
-1 I did detect it but was not so interested in it.
0 I did detect it, but cannot say whether I was interested in it or not.
+1 I did detect it and was a little interested in it.
+2 I did detect it and was interested in it.
+3 I did detect it and was very interested in it.

Furthermore, for both input situations, role-play transcripts were also prepared in which all expressions included in the awareness questionnaire were underlined.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected in the regular English classes for advanced levels. At the beginning of the semester, all of the 100 participants completed the motivation questionnaire. They completed the questionnaires in a single class period during the first week of the semester. Three weeks later, 35 students randomly selected out of the participants took the proficiency test and were asked to do the treatment/retrospection tasks. The treatment/retrospection sessions were held over

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

three weeks (90 minutes per week). In the first week, the participants performed the warm-up task, in which they listened to the NS-NS role-plays for the two input situations while reading the transcripts and then wrote summaries of the interaction (in their L1) by focusing on the relationship between the interlocutors. In the second week, the participants carried out the form-search task for the "Violin" situation, which consisted of two sub-tasks: Sub-tasks A and B. In Sub-task A, the participants read the transcripts at their own pace, compared the NS requester's English with the NNS requester's English in the corresponding situation, and listed the NS expressions that were distinctive from the NNS English expressions. In Sub-task B, the participants examined NS requestees' English in the role-play transcripts and listed any expressions that they thought they were not able to produce with their existing L2 competence. This form-search task could be considered as a kind of noticing-the-gap activity. Immediately after the task, when the memory for the thought sequences was still available, the participants were asked to fill out Form 1 of the Awareness Retrospection Questionnaire while reading the role-play transcripts in which all the questionnaire items were underlined. In the third week, the same procedures as those for the second week were repeated for the "Questionnaire" situation. As the research design was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, no attempt was made to investigate the dynamic interplay between motivational factors and what went on in the foreign language classroom day by day.

Data Analysis

The effect of pragmalinguistic features on awareness was analyzed by means of one-way repeated measures ANOVA. Correlations between the pragmalinguistic features in terms of awareness were analyzed by performing a Pearson product-moment correlation. To evaluate the internal consistency of the entire motivation questionnaire, Cronbach alpha coefficients were used. Then, for each participant, the mean rate was computed for the questionnaire items and factor loadings of the items for each motivation subscale were extracted. The means for awareness, motivation, and proficiency were converted to standardized scores (z scores) for each participants. The standardized data were then analyzed by performing a Pearson product-moment correlation for the relationship between pragmalinguistic awareness features and the individual variables of motivation and proficiency.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Results

Noticing Request Forms

To investigate Research Question 1, the effect of pragmalinguistic features on pragmatic awareness, for each participant, the awareness rates of the questionnaire items (from both Forms 1 and 2) were averaged for each of the six target features. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was performed on the means of the target features, with the awareness rate as the dependent variable.

The results of the Mauchly test (Table 1) indicate that the assumption of sphericity is not violated (W = .59; p>.05). Thus there is no need to adjust the degrees of freedom.

Table 1
Mauchly's test of sphericity

Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon[a]		
					Greenhouse-Geisser	Huynh-Feldt	Lower-bound
PRGLX	.590	16.946	14	.260	.824	.952	.200

The results of the repeated measures ANOVA (Table 2) show that there are significant differences among the mean scores of six pragmalinguistic features (F=4.78; p=.000). However, the effect size of .123 indicates that the significance of the F-value is of moderate importance. Following the criteria proposed by Cohen (1988), an effect size of .06 to .013 is considered moderate.

Table 2
Repeated measures ANOVA: Effect of pragmalinguistic features on awareness

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
PRGLX	Sphericity Assumed	36.144	5	7.229	4.788	.00	.123
Error(PRGLX)	Sphericity Assumed	256.650	170	1.510			

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

The means and standard deviations for the effect are presented in Table 3. The highest mean belonged to the awareness of idiomatic expression (IDE) (Mean=1, SD=1.07), while the lowest was related to request form 3 (REQ-3) (M=-.15, SD=1.27). The targets are ranked in terms of levels of awareness, from the highest to the lowest, as follows:

IDE > REQ-1 > DMA > N-IDE > REQ-2 > REQ-3

Table 3
Means and standard deviations for the awareness of pragmalinguistic features

	M	SD	N
IDE	1.0000	1.07615	35
REQ1	.9000	1.49411	35
DMA	.5048	1.63374	35
NIDE	.1857	1.11200	35
REQ2	.1429	1.32049	35
REQ3	-.1524	1.27915	35

Notes: REQ-1= "I wonder if you could VP," REQ-2= "Is it possible to VP?," REQ-3= "If you could VP," DMA=discourse marker, IDE=idiomatic expression, N-IDE=non-idiomatic expression




Figure 1: Awareness ratings of pragmalinguistic features

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

This study provided evidence that REQ-1 is attended more than DMA by EFL learners (Figure 1). This highlights the fact that learners in different contexts have different attentional allocation to pragmalinguistic features. It is assumed that Iranian EFL learners treated REQ-1 mostly as a kind of idiomatic expression rather than a complex request form. These findings run counter to Takahashi's (2001, 2005) findings, based on which Japanese EFL learners were found to be more likely to attend to IDE and DMA than to bi-clausal complex request forms.

Additionally, a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed to identify the degree of association among the six target features in terms of awareness (Table 4).

Table 4

Correlations among the pragmalinguistic features in terms of awareness

	DMA	REQ-2	IDE	NIDE	REQ-3	REQ-1
DMA	1					
REQ-2	.493**	1				
IDE	.149	.220	1			
NIDE	-.086	.053	.086	1		
REQ-3	.429**	.428**	.012	.168	1	
REQ-1	.110	-.037	-.043	.096	.117	1

Notes: N=35, ***p*<.01, REQ-1= "I wonder if you could VP," REQ-2= "Is it possible to VP?," REQ-3= "If you could VP," DMA=discourse marker, IDE=idiomatic expression, N-IDE=non-idiomatic expression

Table 4 presents the correlations among the target features in terms of awareness. In this study, the following two points were found

(i) The learners who noticed DMA were significantly more likely to attend to REQ-2 (r=.49) and REQ-3 (r=.42).

(ii) Unlike Takahashi's study (2005), which reported the low correlation coefficient of r=.235, this study reports coefficient of r=.428 which indicates that the learners who noticed a particular request head act in a bi-clausal form were likely to notice the other complex request head act(s) as well.

These two findings are inconsistent with those reported in Takahashi (2005).

To sum up, as to Research Question 1, the above findings show that the target pragmalinguistic features were differentially noticed by the learners. The bi-clausal

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

complex request forms were generally less likely to be noticed, whereas the participants attended more closely to the other pragmalinguistic features. In addition, a significant correlation among some of request forms was found.

Motivation and Pragmatic Noticing

To investigate Research Question 2, the motivation questionnaire was administered. To study the relationship between motivation and noticing pragmalinguistic features, the first necessary step was to find the factors making up the motivation variable. To this end, the data were factor analyzed (principal component analysis with oblique rotation) to extract the underlying factors. It should be noted that the factor analysis was carried out for the sample size of 121, not 35, due to the fact that a factor analysis requires a sample size no less than 100. Questionnaires from subjects who failed to complete at least 80% of the items were discarded, resulting in a total of 100 questionnaires used for initial analysis. Specifically, the motivation data from 35 participants for the present study were combined with those available from 65 participants in this research. This procedure was judged not to be problematic because the additional data were elicited from Iranian students enrolled in the same institute as the participants for the current study. Then, for each participant (N=35), the mean rate was computed for the questionnaire items loading on each extracted factor. The means for awareness, motivation, and proficiency (the means for structure scores, reading scores, and total scores, respectively) were converted to standardized scores (z scores) for each participant. As shown in Table 5, a nine-factor solution was obtained.

Table 5
Factor analysis for motivation

Components	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Factor1 Determination	5.760	12.256	12.256
Factor 2 Extrinsic motivation	3.803	8.092	20.348
Factor 3 Sociability	2.558	5.443	25.790
Factor 4 Class anxiety	2.312	4.919	30.710
Factor 5 Attitudes to TL community	2.236	4.757	35.467
Factor 6 Failure attribution	2.113	4.495	39.962
Factor 7 Self-confidence	1.955	4.159	44.121
Factor 8 Interest in TL community	1.890	4.021	48.142
Factor 9 Intrinsic motivation	1.669	3.550	51.692

Notes: N=100, TL=target-language

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Table 6 presents the factor loadings for the questionnaire items for each factor, along with the Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability for each subscale.

Table 6
Cronbach alpha, questionnaire items, and factor loadings of the items for each motivation subscale

Subscale Cronbach	Item Loadings
Factor 1: Determination α=.68	
45. I plan to continue studying English for as long as possible.	.600
47. I can honestly say that I really put my best effort into trying to learn English.	.569
46. I often think about how I can learn English better.	.560
4. I don't enjoy learning English, but I know that learning English is important for me. (reverse coded)	-.555
44. My attendance in this class will be good.	.506
27. I expect to do well in this class because I am good at learning English.	.459
5. I wish I could learn English in an easier way, without going to class.	-.438
Factor 2: Extrinsic motivation α=.71	
8. I want to do well in this class because it is important to show my ability to my family/friends/teachers/others.	.549
7. The main reason I am studying English is that my parents (my family or someone close to me) want me to improve my English.	.480
10. Being able to speak English will add to my social status.	.461
6. English is important to me because it will broaden my view.	.414
9. Everybody in Iran should be able to speak English.	.442
Factor 3: Sociability α=.70	
24. This class is important to me because if I learn English well, I will be able to help other people learn English.	.594
30. If I learn a lot in this class, it will be because of the teacher.	. 569
23. One of the most important things in this class is getting along with the other students.	.545

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Factor 4: Class anxiety α=.63	
39. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.	-.647
40. I don't like to speak often in English class because I am afraid that my teacher will think I am not a good student.	-.498
Factor 5: Attitudes to TL community α=.61	
35. The British are conservative people who cherish customs and traditions.	.461
34. Americans are very friendly people.	.427
Factor 6:Failuer attribution α=.68	
28. If I don't do well in this class, it will be because I don't try hard enough.	.498
32. If I don't learn well in this class, it will be mainly because of the teacher.	.441
Factor 7: Self-confidence α=.53	
26. If I do well in this class, it will be because I try hard.	.480
27. I expect to do well in this class because I am good at learning English.	.459
Factor 8: Integrative orientation α=.70	
37. American culture has contributed a lot to the world.	.431
36. Most of my favorite actors and musicians are Americans.	.427
Factor 9: Intrinsic motivation α=.52	
25. This English class will definitely help me improve my English.	.517
1. I enjoy learning English.	.627
14. I am learning English to become more educated.	.421

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

As Table 6 shows, the study yielded a nine-factor solution, including extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. The EFL learners were more extrinsically than intrinsically motivated in noticing pragmaliguistic features; besides, they were concerned about their sociability status with peers and teacher and felt confident about their language learning experience. This contradicts Takahashi's study in which learners were found to be intrinsically oriented in noticing pragmaliguistics in the Japanese EFL context. However, there are some similarities between Takahashi and the present study in terms of the structural components of L2 motivation. Specifically, Takahashi's "attitudes to TL community" and "class anxiety," and Schmidt *et al.*'s factors of "determination," "sociability," and "intrinsic motivation" almost corresponded with factors obtained in this study but with different loadings. In line with Schmidt's (1996) research, the current study showed more extrinsic motivation and instrumental orientation for pragmalinguistic awareness, contradicting Takahashi's findings in the Japanese EFL context. The point worth noting is that the replacement of the "self-devaluation" factor in Takahashi with "self-confidence" factor in the present study highlights the differences between Iranian and Japanese EFL learners.

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for the questionnaire items loading on each of the identified nine motivation subscales (N=35). It was found that the EFL learners in the current study had a relatively strong disposition to improve their L2 ("determination") (M=4.79, SD=1.37). They were willing to maintain good relationships with their teachers in the process of L2 learning ("sociability") (M=4.40, SD=.98) and were confident about their language learning abilities ("self-confidence") (M=4.20, SD=1.04).

Table 7
Means and standard deviations for the motivation subscales

Motivation Subscales		M	SD
Factor1	Determination	4.79	1.373
Factor 2	Extrinsic motivation	3.85	.460
Factor 3	Sociability	4.40	.989
Factor 4	Class anxiety	3.70	.874
Factor 5	Attitudes to TL community	3.81	.624
Factor 6	Failure attribution	3.58	.723
Factor 7	Self-confidence	4.20	1.042
Factor 8	Integrative orientation	3.66	1.597
Factor 9	Intrinsic motivation	3.96	.700

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

After determining the factors comprising motivation, a correlation analysis was run to investigate the relationship between the learners' awareness of the target pragmalinguistic features and motivation. Table 8 shows the result of correlation analysis.

Table 8

Correlations between the awareness of pagmalinguistic features and the individual variable of motivation

	DMA	REQ-2	IDE	NIDE	REQ-3	REQ-1
Factor 1	-.082	-.237	.012	-.249	-.203	-.231
Factor 2	-.139	-.166	.488**	.114	-.426**	.046
Factor 3	.005	-.072	.085	.257	.122	-.119
Factor 4	-.151	-.238	.039	-.138	-.063	.041
Factor 5	-.105	-.496**	.371*	.135	-.341*	.045
Factor 6	-.097	-.093	.097	.233	-.130	-.049
Factor 7	-.229	-.004	.386*	.115	-.249	-.097
Factor 8	.195	.035	-.027	.107	.188	-.111
Factor 9	-.241	-.180	-.142	-.074	-.055	.063

Notes: N=35, **p*<.05, ***p*<.01

REQ-1= "I wonder if you could VP," REQ-2= "Is it possible to VP?," REQ-3= "If you could VP," DMA=discourse marker, IDE=idiomatic expression, N-IDE=non-idiomatic expression

Factor 1= determination, Factor 2=extrinsic motivation, Factor 3= sociability, Factor 4=class anxiety, Factor 5=attitudes to TL community, Factor 6=failure attribution, Factor 7=self-confidence, Factor 8=integrative orientation, Factor 9=intrinsic motivation

As shown in the table, only REQ-2, REQ-3, and IDE were significantly correlated with three of the motivation subscales (Factors 2, 5, and 7). Specifically, learners' extrinsic motivation (Factor 2) was involved in their noticing of REQ-3 ('If you could VP') (r=-.426, *p*<.01), and IDE (r=.488, *p*<.01), respectively. Likewise, learners' positive attitude toward the target-language community (Factor 5) was related to their awareness of REQ-2 (r=-.496, *p*<.01), IDE (r=.371, p<.05), and REQ-3 (r=.-.341, p<.05). Furthermore, students' self-confidence (Factor 7) was correlated with IDE (r=.386, p<.05). While all of these correlations were found to be significant, the correlation between Factor 5 and REQ-3 (-.341), Factor 5 and IDE (.371), and Factor and IDE (.386) were significantly negative. Hence, salient relationships were identified only between Factor 2 (extrinsic motivation) and REQ-3 and IDE, and factor 5 (attitudes to TL community) and REQ-2.

Contrary to what has been reported in Takahashi (2005), that intrinsically-motivated learners are most likely to notice some forms of bi-clausal complex

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

request forms, this study indicates that extrinsically-motivated learners with instrumental orientation are more likely to notice target request forms, particularly the REQ-3 ("If you could VP") and L2 idiomatic expressions. In light of these findings, the answer to Research Question 2 is partially positive: when pragmatic input is presented implicitly, learners' noticing of the target pragmalinguistic features is associated with some factors underlying L2 learners' motivation. Extrinsic motivation is related to the noticing of the target features to the greatest extent; in particular, it is related to bi-clausal request forms realized in question forms and L2-specific idiomatic expressions.

Language Proficiency and Pragmatic Noticing

The results of the means and standard deviations for structure (M=57.18, SD=17.97) and reading (M=66.75, SD=16.90) sections of the proficiency test are presented in Table 9. The mean of the overall proficiency scores was also calculated by combining the structure scores with the reading scores. The EFL learners in the current study obtained relatively high reading scores. Moreover, the standard deviation for each skill section was quite large. Thus, the L2 proficiency of the learners in the present study was characterized by relatively unbalanced skill development (as a within-subject feature) and wide variation in both skills (as a between-subject feature).

Table 9
Means and standard deviations for English proficiency

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	M (out of 100)	SD
Reading	35	66.75	16.90
Structure	35	57.18	17.97
Overall proficiency*	35	61.96	17.43

Notes: N=35, *full score adjusted to 100

Further, the correlations between the learners' awareness of the target pragmalinguistic features and language proficiency were calculated (Table 10).

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Table 10
Correlations between the awareness of pragmalinguistic features and the variable of language proficiency

	DMA	REQ-2	IDE	NIDE	REQ-3	REQ-1
Reading	-.190	-.206	.229	.196	.244	.225
Structure	.014	-.222	-.050	-.023	-.132	-.012
Overall proficiency	-.122	-.209	.002	.094	.109	.167

Notes: **p*<.05, ***p*<.01, N=35,
REQ-1= "I wonder if you could VP," REQ-2= "Is it possible to VP?," REQ-3= "If you could VP," DMA=discourse marker, IDE=idiomatic expression, N-IDE=non-idiomatic expression
Factor 1=Determination, Factor 2=Extrinsic motivation, Factor 3=Sociability Factor 4=Class anxiety, Factor 5=Attitudes to TL community, Factor 6=Failure attribution Factor 7=Self-confidence, Factor 8=integrative orientation, Factor 9=intrinsic motivation

As Table 10 shows, there were no significant correlations between awareness of the target features and any of the proficiency subcomponents or overall proficiency. In light of these findings, we can conclude that, when L2 input is presented implicitly, learners' noticing of the target pragmalinguistic features is not associated with L2 proficiency.

Discussion

The results of this study revealed that IDE and DMA were more likely to be noticed than bi-clausal request head acts except for REQ-1. In the EFL context, learners were highly attentive to REQ-1 ("I wonder if you could VP"), which is not in line with Takahashi's (2005) results. This might be in part due to the idiomatic structure of REQ-1 that has been treated by EFL learners as IDE. A possible explanation is that EFL learners in their instructional settings are less likely to learn colloquial English and have fewer opportunities to be exposed to longer stretches of native-speaker discourse containing a large number of discourse markers. During the form search in treatment sessions, EFL learners gave attentional priority to discourse-level interactional markers, such as "you know," "well," and "maybe," to express linguistic politeness required for effective communication. This may reflect their interest in acquiring native speakers' interactional strategies resulting in greater attention to such pragmatic markers. Similarly, the high awareness ratings for IDE also indicate that the learners felt a necessity to master such expressions. Takahashi (2005) holds that, in her study, the learners apparently believed that these idiomatic expressions helped them communicate more naturally

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

in English. Learners' interest in DMAs might refer to the lack of exposure to authentic interactions involving features of colloquial English and effective use of DMAs while receiving instruction in language institutes. The novelty of these interactions in native speakers' speech may reflect learners' attentional allocation to DMAs and IDEs. This study corroborates Takahashi's (2001, 2005) findings that the learners were barely aware of REQ-3 ("If you could VP"). An explanation given by Takahashi (2005, p. 111) is that "this form is not recognized as a 'request' because of its elliptical form and the primary meaning of subjunctive if-clauses. Both of these features may render the form too opaque to convey the pragmatic meaning of requesting."

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) assert that motivation is a multidimensional cognitive construct, which is closely related to attention and awareness in processing L2 input. The correlational analysis in the present study revealed that, among the nine motivation subscales, three factors were related to the awareness of three of the six pragmalinguistic features in L2: Factor 5 (attitudes to TL community), Factor 2 (extrinsic motivation), and Factor 7 (self-confidence). Factors 2 and 7 are somehow revealing in that they highlight the difference between the learners in this study and the Japanese learners in Takahashi's (2005) study. The results of this study reinforce the complications involved in the relationship between learners' motivational dispositions and attentional targets at the pragmatic level.

Unlike Takahashi's (2005) study, extrinsic motivation (Factor 2) was found to be greatly involved in noticing REQ-2 ("Is it possible?"), IDE, and, to a lesser degree, REQ-3 ("If you could VP"). This finding is in line with Dörnyei (1990) study on adult EFL learners in Hungary in which he concluded that instrumental goals did indeed play a prominent role in the learning of English, and Svanes's (1987) study in which the Middle Eastern, African, and Asian students were found to be more instrumentally motivated while European and American students manifested more integrative motivation. The results of present study confirm Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy's (1996) argument that instrumental factors are of greater help to adults study English privately than young learners who take English as a school subject without being concerned with career choices. The present study identified the factor of sociability as part of foreign language learning motivation which corresponds to the findings of Schmidt (1996). The sociability factor may

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

contribute to the fact that Iranian and Egyptian contexts are closely related with common backgrounds and shared values.

This study also evidenced that pragmalinguistic awareness is associated with the learners' motivation, in particular their extrinsic motivation, but not with their intrinsic motivation. This suggests that learners in different contexts have different motivational dispositions to pragmalinguistic awareness. Dörnyei (2005) argues that the close association between English speaking world and some technological advances such as the Internet and computers may explain the fuzzy line between integrative and instrumental motivation and learners' different orientations toward them in different contexts. The non-significance correlation between proficiency and motivation as to noticing pragmalinguistic features in this study confirms that motivation and proficiency operate on pragmalinguistic awareness independently and that motivation plays a more crucial role than proficiency in learners' allocation of attention to pragmatic input.

Previous research on the relationship between linguistic proficiency and pragmatic ability (Hoffman-Hicks, 1992; Ran, 2007) indicated that linguistic competence is a necessary, but not sufficient, prerequisite to pragmatic competence. Ran argues that linguistic competence is not the only factor to decide pragmatic ability, but other factors such as individual differences, culture background, language input text books and pragmatic teaching may play a role in the development of pragmatic ability. Corroborating the findings of Takahashi's (2005) study, the present study evidenced a nonsignificant correlation between linguistic proficiency and pragmatic awareness. Thus, differences in linguistic proficiency did not predict learners' levels of attention and awareness in L2 pragmatic input, thereby contradicting Bialystok's (1993) claim that learners with high proficiency pay more attention to target pragmatic features than less proficient ones. The results of the study highlight the fact that pragmalingustic awareness is largely independent of L2 learners' linguistic proficiency.

Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that unlike their motivation, the learners' proficiency level is not correlated significantly with their pragmatic awareness. Therefore, it is concluded that linguistic proficiency and motivation operate independently of each other as to noticing the target pragmatic features and that it

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

is extrinsic motivation which is highly related to pragmatic awareness. Extrinsic and intrinsic motivations are complicated concepts in SLA. Different studies have interpreted them differently. Some similar motivation items are categorized into different subscales, making them difficult to compare because of the subjective nature of factor categorization, giving rise to contradictions in SLA motivation-related research. Consequently, the definitions of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation vary across studies. Dörnyei (2005) contends that, as motivation is a dynamic and ever-changing process, its research should also evolve over time. The findings of current study gave rise to some contradictions with previous research in both bi-clausal request forms awareness and motivational subscales. This necessitates the exploration of different learning contexts and brings into light other individual variables such as aptitude, learning strategies, cognitive processing, and affective factors with larger sample sizes to conclusively verify our research claims.

Notes on Contributors:

Zia Tajeddin *is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran, and Editor-in-Chief of the TELL journal. His research interests include discourse analysis, interlanguage pragmatic instruction and assessment, dynamic assessment, and sociocultural theory.*

Saman Ebadi *has a Ph.D. in TEFL from Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran. He has taught B.A. courses at Allameh Tabataba'i University and Tarbiat Moallem University. His areas of interest include interlanguage pragmatics and CALL.*

References

Bialystok, E. (1991). Achieving proficiency in a second language: a processing description. In R. Philipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/Second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch: Volume 64* (pp. 63-78). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic vs. grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 233-259.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspect of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Crookes G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*(4), 469-512.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40*(1), 46-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 273-84.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second-language learning: Assumptions, findings, and issues. *Language Learning, 38*(1), 101-126.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gregg, K. R. (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 79-100.

Hoffman-Hicks, S. (1992). Linguistic and pragmatic competence: Their relationship in the overall competence of the language learner. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (monograph series vol.3). DEIL, UI, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

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

Kim, I. O. (2000). *Relationship of onset age of ESL acquisition and extent of informal input to appropriateness and nativeness in performing four speech acts in English: A study of native Korean adult speakers of ESL*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI. Dissertation Abstracts International.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System, 32*(1), 3-19.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel, 36*(3), 4-11.

McClelland, N. (2000). Goal orientations in Japanese college students learning EFL. In S. Cornwell & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Individual differences in foreign language learning: Effects of aptitude, intelligence, and motivation* (pp. 99-115). Tokyo: Japanese Association for Language Teaching.

Niezgoda, K., & Röver, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 63-79). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Ran, L. (2007). The relationship between linguistic proficiency and pragmatic ability. *US-China Foreign Language, 5*, 13-17.

Robinson, P. (1995). Review article: Attention, memory and the "noticing" hypothesis. *Language Learning, 45*(2), 283-331.

Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(1), 27-67.

Schmidt, R. (1983). Consciousness, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

Schmidt, R. W. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. W. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: a tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. W. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (Tech. Rep. No. 9). Honolulu, University of Hawai'i.

Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]

Schmidt, R. W., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (Technical Report #11). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Seliger, H. W. (1983). The language learner as linguist: Of metaphors and realities. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(3), 179-191.

Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 37*(3), 341-359.

Takahashi, S. (1987). *A contrastive study of indirectness exemplified in L1 directive speech acts performed by Americans and Japanese* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(2), 189-223.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 90-120.

Takahashi, S., & DuFon, M. (1989). *Crosslinguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of English as a Second Language, University of Hawai'i at Manoa (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 439).

Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*(2), 183-203.

Yashima, T. (2000). Orientations and motivations in foreign language learning: A study of Japanese college students. *JACET Bulletin, 31*, 121-133.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-24]