12-2019

The Role of Environment on Second Language Pragmatic Comprehension: A Case Study of Intensive English Program Students in Homestays

Sarah McGregor
University of San Francisco, sarahmcgregor@yahoo.com

The University of San Francisco

THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENT ON SECOND LANGUAGE PRAGMATIC COMPREHENSION: A CASE STUDY OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM STUDENTS IN HOMESTAYS

A Dissertation Presented
to
The Faculty of the School of Education
International and Multicultural Education Department

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Sarah McGregor
San Francisco
December 2019

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Dissertation Abstract

There is insufficient research on the role of homestay accommodations on the development of pragmatic comprehension of students in intensive English programs (IEPs). This case study conducted in San Jose, California explored the experiences and perceptions of four IEP students in response to these questions: (1) In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development? (2) What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures? Research data included separate pre- and post-interviews with four students and a member of their host families, five student journals, and pre-and post-Pragmatic Listening Test scores.

The study found that students who understood the value of participation and the importance of observation in their language socialization within the host family were satisfied with the homestay experience and the degree to which they perceived their English had improved. Another finding was that the host doesn't necessarily have to be a native speaker of English but does have to dedicate time to spend with the student. The research showed that large, multicultural and multilingual families provided the most opportunities for language socialization. Finally, hosts would have liked more training on how to help their students improve their language skills. The research suggests a number of practices that can be employed by all stakeholders (student, host, homestay provider, and IEP) to ensure active participation in the language learning process.

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Sarah McGregor, Candidate	December 13, 2019

Dissertation Committee:

M. Sedique Popal, Ed.D., Chairperson	December 13, 2019
Rosa Jimenez, Ph.D., Committee Member	December 13, 2019
Patricia A. Mitchell, Ph.D., Committee Member	December 13, 2019

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my dear husband, Les, who couldn't wait for me to finish.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my professor, advisor and dissertation chairperson, Dr. Sedique Popal. His mentorship, guidance, good humor, and patience were invaluable during this process. I am also especially grateful to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Rosa Jimenez, and Dr. Patricia Mitchell, whose constructive feedback and thoughtful insights made my research stronger. I am very honored to have worked with four students and host family participants in this study and sincerely thank them for sharing their experiences and time with me. Thanks also to my colleagues Michaele, Sakeena, Nadia, Michelle, and Jean for their helpful input on the data collection instruments. Finally, I truly appreciate the encouragement of Ruth, Lee, and Patrick who helped me stay focused until the very end of this journey. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

International students on American universities and colleges are big business. In 2017, 1.09 million international students were estimated to add more than 42.4 billion dollars to the US economy (Institute of International Education, 2018). At the institutional level, university administrators are eager to recruit more international students because this population not only pays higher tuition than local students but also provides valuable cultural diversity and international perspectives to campus. This has led to the development of conditional admission programs where applicants are admitted to the university on the condition that they attend an affiliated Intensive English Program (IEP) until they meet the university's English language proficiency requirement.

IEP enrollment has grown 11 per cent since 2010 (Institute of International Education, 2018) in part due to the increasing number of conditionally admitted students. This indicates the growing importance of pre-academic language programs to universities to ensure the retention of these students until they matriculate into degree programs.

Statement of the Problem

For international students in general, the lack of language proficiency, community acceptance, and socio-cultural knowledge are among the greatest challenges to adjustment to US university life (Andrade, 2006; Telbis, Helgeson, & Kingsbury, 2014). Yet, for IEP students, these factors are exacerbated by the limited time students have to meet language proficiency requirements. These time pressures may be imposed by the

university's conditions for admission, by a sponsor's length of scholarship, or by the parent's or student's own perception of the optimal time they feel is needed to meet the language requirements. With their lower levels of English and fear of making mistakes, these students may experience anxiety. This lack of confidence is magnified because they do not have a social network to help them make sense of the "norms, rules and regulations" of the new culture (Andrade, 2006). Consequently, in a vicious cycle, Sokolik (2015) found that the "lack of friends and social connections slowed social and language growth" and led international students to stay within their own language groups or with co-nationals (p. 29).

As a result, students may leave the IEP before meeting their goal of matriculation into a university degree program. While there are no national statistics on the student retention from IEP to university, research shows that students who do not meet the language proficiency requirement while in the IEP often transfer to other language programs or community colleges (Zhang, 2015) and consequently lose their conditional admission to the university. This is a problem not only for the students themselves but also for the university and IEP that invest resources into recruiting and training students.

Another growing segment of the IEP population are international university students who come to the IEP for study abroad. Although their goal may not be to matriculate into the host university, they share many of the same pressures to improve their English proficiency in a short period of time, typically only a semester, for university credit or professional purposes.

Background and Need for the Study

In order to build their confidence in language learning through social connections, IEP students need to develop their pragmatic competence to interact appropriately with others.

Pragmatic competence can be defined as "the awareness of how language forms and discourse structures are used in socially appropriate ways to create meaning and index social roles, relationships, and identities" (Shively, 2011, p. 1820). In every interaction there is the opportunity for a successful exchange or misunderstanding depending on the speakers' knowledge of the appropriate grammar and vocabulary, the relationship between the speaker and hearer, and the context in which the interaction takes place. Pragmatic competence is composed of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic elements (Leech, 1983). Pragmalinguistics looks at the resources (i.e. grammar, vocabulary, content, forms and strategies) a language uses for expressing certain speech acts or communicative actions such as requests, apologies, refusals, suggestions and rejections, invitations, complaints, and compliment responses (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 14). Chang (2011) defines sociopragmatic competence as "knowledge of how to vary contents, specific linguistic forms, choice of interpersonal meanings to convey (e.g. politeness value) and the type of action to take, e.g. whether to perform a given speech act at all according to social contexts" (p. 787). Sociopragmatics is culture-specific and context-sensitive compared to pragmalinguistics which is considered to be more language oriented, so it has received less attention in the literature (Fukushima, 2011, pp. 549–550). For IEP students to build confident social relationships, they must develop both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence.

Yet, current IEP curricula provide little explicit pragmatics instruction, focusing more on other aspects of academic English. "There is no tradition of explicit pragmatic teaching the way there is in grammar teaching" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, p. 73). Moreover, the current IEP textbooks that do cover pragmatics lack authentic examples in context (Bardovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2015). These texts typically cover the pragmalinguistics of speech act production such as refusing an invitation or making an apology. Pragmatic comprehension is rarely taught despite the fact that the listening comprehension section of the TOEFL ITP, an important test that is often administered in IEPs for exit testing, includes 30 questions of pragmatic comprehension and understanding of conversational implicature (*Official Guide to the TOEFL ITP test*, 2014, p. 10).

IEP students typically spend only 4-6 hours per day in class, but few studies investigate the development of pragmatic comprehension outside of class time. Kasper and Rose (2002) found that the conditions for learning pragmatics outside of the classroom are not well understood (p. 192). In one case study, Kaloustian (2014) reported on a yearlong program designed to develop pragmatic skills and social support for students in an IEP. The program featured courses in English language, university preparation skills, and university courses for credit, but there was no explicit pragmatics instruction. One aspect of the program required students to engage regularly with a "local family" for conversation and social interaction. Each "family" included a local community member, an alumnus of the program, a domestic student, and/or a program faculty member. While most students in the program were eager to practice their English with native speakers, many did not understand the rationale for these interactions or the

benefit in developing their pragmatic competence and requested more explicit pragmatics instruction (Kaloustian, 2014, p. 138).

One area that holds promise for the study of L2 pragmatic comprehension of IEP students is to examine the experiences of students living in different environments within the target culture, typically in a Study Abroad (SA) context. Traditionally, SA literature has focused on language and culture programs with homestays as part of the cultural immersion. Evidence suggests that living in a homestay environment may provide students with the sociocultural context and pragmatic practice to develop their overall language proficiency (Di Silvio, Donovan, & Malone, 2014), feel more confident in their language abilities (Wong, 2015) and, as a result, improve overall language proficiency (Shiri, 2015). In a study of Korean students at Canadian universities, Lee and Wesche (2000) found that homestay accommodations were shown to ease acculturation and increase language development (Lee & Wesche, 2000). They suggest that in terms of future research, a "more detailed study of students' living arrangements might uncover links between specific contexts of social interaction and English language development" (Lee & Wesche, 2000, p. 675). Similarly, Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004) note that homestay is the least studied aspect of the SA experience, although it is often thought to "provide the students an immediate entrée into the cultural and linguistic environment while protecting them in a smaller, 'caring' unit" (p. 254).

Research also shows that there is a correlation between length of stay and the benefits of homestay. Students who stay in a homestay for a semester or longer tend to report fewer adjustment problems than those in short-term programs, primarily because the students feel more invested in the relationship with the host family and are more

amenable to working through any difficulties (Grieve, 2015; Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004). Since students typically spend at least one semester in the IEP, the environment of a homestay is an ideal setting to investigate the development of pragmatic comprehension in these students. Taguchi (2011) notes that "exposure to the target pragmatic input, combined with opportunities to engage in social interaction and practice pragmatic functions, is indispensable to pragmatic growth" (p. 906).

This study focused on the students' understanding of implicature and other implied meanings through their interactions with the host family. First introduced by Grice (1975, 1981), conversational implicature is the "inferential process through which the meaning of any utterance is understood in terms of the context in which it occurs" (Bouton, 1994, p. 88).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this research was to examine the construct of interlanguage pragmatic comprehension in IEP students living in homestays. The goal of this case study is descriptive in nature. The study chronicled the participants' lived experiences within the homestay environment by gathering qualitative data in the form of dialogue journals and interviews. By using a case study methodology, the intensity of exposure, the communicative interactions, and overall relationship between learners and host family were examined. In this way, the study tried to link the participants' descriptions of their sociopragmatic experiences within the homestay context with the changes in pragmatic comprehension (Taguchi, 2011a, p. 613). Changes in pragmatic comprehension, specifically in the ability to comprehend conversational implicature over time, were

measured by scores of a pre- and post-test of pragmatic listening from the beginning of an academic term to the end.

Through weekly dialogue journals with the researcher, students were asked to reflect on their daily conversations with the host family: types of topics, cultural issues, and any miscommunications they encounter and how they deal with them. These misunderstandings, termed pragmatic failure by Thomas (1983), may occur between them and their host family "from an inability to recognize the force of the speaker's utterance when the speaker intended that this particular hearer should recognize it" (p. 94). While students may not be aware of what specifically causes a pragmatic failure, they are likely able to articulate the experience of a misunderstanding in a specific context.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development?
2. What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures?

Theoretical Framework

To investigate pragmatic development in IEP students living in homestays, the research was informed by three theoretical frameworks: 1) situated learning theory and legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) and 2) language socialization (LS) and 3) Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis. The first two of these are sociocultural theories based on the notion that language is co-constructed with others in different situations. These

theories also take into consideration naturalistic (i.e. non-classroom) environments where the actual and expected level of engagement between learner and expert affects the learner's identity within the community. The third, Noticing Hypothesis, relates to the cognitive processes that language learners use to take linguistic input into meaningful understanding. Each of these frameworks are discussed in turn.

Situated Learning and Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) developed the theory of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) to shift the focus away from traditional teaching to learning through community resources. Their research on the situated learning of groups of tailors, butchers, and midwives, among others, showed how apprentices learned increasingly complex tasks in order to gradually participate as full members of the community. Lave and Wenger (1991) posit that "learning is an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice" (p. 31) and the "social structure of this practice, its power relations, and its conditions for legitimacy define possibilities for learning" (p. 98).

The development of identity is an essential aspect of LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 109). A number of studies in second language acquisition show how the concepts of power and legitimate identity in the community are linked to LPP. Young and Miller (2004) analyzed the turn-taking in conversations during writing conferences between a tutor and ESL student. They found that the participation of both changed "in a way that showed mutual co-construction of their roles" from purely directive roles by the tutor in the beginning to a more equal exchange at the end of the four-week period (Young & Miller, 2004, p. 593). In this discursive practice, the student moved from peripheral to full participation.

Lave and Wenger (1991) note, however, that "to become a full member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, old-timers, and other members of the community; and to information, resources and opportunities for participation" (p. 100). When this access is not available from the community or is perceived to be unavailable, the possibilities for learning are limited. Norton (2001) found that two immigrant language learners in Canada withdrew from their ESL program because they felt their marginalized identity prevented their full, legitimate participation. Similarly, in her examination of two Ecuadorian musicians, one indigenous and one mestizo, learning Quichua, Back (2011) found that the co-construction of their own individual identities as language learners and the community's perception of legitimacy resulted in fuller participation by the indigenous musicians (p. 1055).

For the purposes of this study, the environment of the homestay can be considered a community of practice in which an IEP student would gradually learn the "house rules" and increasingly take part in the cultural practices of the host family as a legitimate participant. LPP is especially relevant here as the student is a newcomer to a community where the practices and values may differ greatly from his own.

With respect to "the co-constructed nature of both learning and participation, it is the learner *and* the teacher…that determine full participation in the community" (Back, 2011, p. 1040). It should be noted that when a student chooses to live with a host family, the student has already demonstrated a certain level of commitment to their language and cultural development; how much engagement/participation the student and the host family desire or expect will influence the student's sense of belonging in the community of practice, and as a result, their identity and overall confidence in their English abilities.

Language socialization

Language socialization (LS) theory provides another important lens with which to examine this study of pragmatic development. LS, the simultaneous process of acquiring language and sociocultural knowledge (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984), was conceived of by Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, two cultural anthropologists who compared the language of children and their caregivers in Western Samoa and Papua New Guinea with white, middle-class Americans. They noted that "the primary concern of caregivers is to ensure that their children are able to display and understand behaviors appropriate to social situations" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984, p. 276). Through language interactions in different social settings, the child learns how to become a competent member of the community either implicitly or through direct instruction. "All normal children will become members of their own social group, but the process of becoming social, including a language user, is culturally constructed" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984, p. 285). Shively (2011) notes that the LS process continues throughout life as individuals join new communities and develop new social relationships (p. 1820). Duff (2007) further defines LS as "a process mediated by language whose goal is the mastery of linguistic conventions, pragmatics, the adoption of appropriate identities, stances (e.g. epistemic and empathetic) or ideologies, and other behaviors associated with the target group and its normative practices" (p. 310). L2 socialization is complicated by the fact that second language learners already possess L1 linguistic and cultural knowledge that may be different and may cause unintentional pragmatic failure in interactions in the new community (Duff, 2007; Shively, 2011).

Similar to LPP, LS theory argues that linguistic and cultural knowledge are co-constructed through each other, and learners are active participants in this process (Watson-Gegeo, 2004). As newcomers are socialized into the practices of the group, they develop the pragmatic competence to be able to "socialize more expert members into understanding their own needs" (Shively, 2011, p. 1820).

LS in the study abroad context may be explicit or implicit. Culture is learned through verbal cues and "the construction and learning of syntax, semantics, and discourse practices is especially fundamental to learners' socialization" (Watson-Gegeo, 2004). In her 2011 study of the pragmatic development of US students in Spanish service encounters, Shively noted that explicit socialization occurred through the host family responses to students' inquiries about address terms and implicit socialization took place through negative reactions from service providers and by observing Spanish customers (Shively, 2011, p. 1832).

Researchers have argued for the use of second language socialization as a useful theoretical framework to better understand study abroad student experiences living in a homestay (Kinginger, 2008; Shiri, 2015; Wang, 2010). Wang (2010) notes that second language socialization is especially relevant in this context due to "the complexity of language acquisition and the dynamic nature of self-identity formation and adjustment" during study abroad (p. 60). Most sociocultural information is gained implicitly through observation and participation in everyday activities (Shively, 2011, p. 1820). Since a large number of learners' interactions with host families involve daily activities, the socialization that occurs during dinnertime has been an important context for research (Shiri, 2015); mealtimes were a key setting for this study as well.

Noticing hypothesis

Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990a, 1990b, 2010) is the third theory that served as a framework for this study as it looks at the role of consciousness and SLA. The Noticing Hypothesis states that "input does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, that is, consciously registered" (Schmidt, 2010, p. 721). In order to learn L2 pragmatics, attention must be paid to linguistic forms, functional meanings, and relevant contextual features (Schmidt, 1990a, p. 1).

Schmidt based his hypothesis on his own learning of Portuguese while in Brazil and his 1986 study of an otherwise successful Japanese adult learner of English, "Wes," who demonstrated discourse and strategic competence in many aspects, but was not able to produce grammatically correct utterances. Schmidt (2010) hypothesized that the lack of morphological development over the three-year period of study was mostly due to "an over-reliance on an implicit learning strategy, learning through interaction alone with little attention to language form and little conscious reflection about language structure" (p. 722). In terms of his sociolinguistic competence, Wes relied heavily on formulaic expressions to convey intentions (for example, using 'please' for requests and 'maybe' for suggestions) in lieu of more complex forms, resulting in only rudimentary pragmatic development (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 37).

Noticing can be considered a "private experience … operationally defined as availability for verbal report," even if the phenomenon is difficult to describe; "for example, we may be able to notice that someone has a regional accent, but not be able to describe it phonetically" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 132). Noticing pragmatic comprehension in the homestay environment is a similar phenomenon. In this study, the student participants

were asked to respond weekly to journal prompts which allowed them to describe not only conversations they participated in directly but also those they overheard. The assignment to reflect on their comprehension helped students in this process since "task demands are a powerful determinant of what is noticed" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 143). Simply noticing pragmatic features, however, may not lead to immediate or accurate production or comprehension (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 40).

Limitations and Delimitations

This case study provides an in-depth understanding of how pragmatic comprehension develops in the homestay environment for IEP students. The study focused only on the cultural interactions and sociopragmatic experiences of the participants in relation to their host family. As a result, this research had a number of delimitations that restricted the scope of the study. The participants were taken from a convenience sample of IEP students at the researcher's institution. Although the sample intended to mirror the current population of IEP students in terms of gender, first language and home country, this research included only four student participants and four host families. Of the student participants, all three were female, native speakers of Japanese and were from the same Japanese university. Finally, since the interactions of each host and student are unique, the findings are not generalizable to other IEP students living in homestays.

There were also limitations with respect to data collection. A post-interview was not able to be conducted with Mrs. Clark and post-TOEFL scores were not obtained for some of the participants. Participants' self-reports in their journals can be subject to response bias which may have influenced the validity of the data (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Moreover, IEP students may not have had the metacognitive skills to understand what occurs during a conversation or the language skills to describe the context in which a sociopragmatic misunderstanding took place. Triangulation was used to mitigate these limitations by collecting data of various types such as interviews with both IEP student and host family participants at various times during the research. However, Duff (2008) notes that even interviews that are designed to collect participants' perspectives of their interactions must be analyzed carefully since an interview is a specific type of speech act that may differ between cultures and may involve a power differential between interviewer and interviewee (p. 134). It is believed that by interviewing the student and their host family any kind of bias was mediated.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant to a number of constituents interested in the experiences of IEP students: IEP administrators, university housing directors, and university admissions officers. The results of this study can inform IEP curriculum with an understanding of the communicative interactions and contexts that cause pragmatic difficulties for IEP students. IEP administrators and curriculum developers can use the findings to create pragmatics materials for use in the IEP classroom. Bardovi-Harlig and Mossman (2015) note that there are few commercially available materials that include authentic pragmatic examples and show how corpus excerpts, such as data from this research, could be used in instruction.

Finding comfortable, safe housing is one of the most basic needs of new students as they arrive at the university. As on-campus housing is becoming less available, homestays may be a potential option for IEP students as a safe place to build their

confidence. The findings of this study can assist Housing Directors to better understand the dynamics of the homestay environment. With knowledge of the specific situations that cause pragmatic failure and misunderstandings, Housing Directors can improve the preparation of both IEP students and host families. Di Silvio, Donovan, and Malone (2014) cite the importance of pre-arrival orientations to include "discussion of potential areas of identity negotiation" and training on strategies for both students and families to encourage proactive communication and mutual engagement (p. 180). More generally, the research can help university administrators and international student advisors identify acculturation issues of IEP students and, as a result, develop appropriate support programs for this population.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have been operationalized for this study.

Communicative competence: The concept defined by Hymes and further developed by Canale and Swain that allows people "to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts" (Brown, 2007, p. 219). Communicative competence is comprised of four components: grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence (which includes pragmatic competence), and strategic competence.

Implicature: Implicature refers to indirect, non-literal utterances that are implied but not stated in conversation in order to maintain politeness with the other person (Leech, 1983, p. 81). Conversational implicature may take the form of indirect refusals, conventional indirect opinions, and nonconventional indirect opinions (Taguchi, 2011b, p. 909).

Intensive English Program (IEP): IEPs are educational programs accredited by a regional or national accrediting agency recognized by the Department of Education to provide full-time English instruction to international students studying on an F-1 student visa (NAFSA.org, 2012).

Interlanguage pragmatics (ILP): Defined by "Kasper and Dahl (1991, p. 216) as a branch of SLA that studies 'nonnative speakers' (NNSs') comprehension and production of speech acts, and how their L2-related speech act knowledge is acquired" (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 5).

Conditionally admitted students: International students who have been admitted to a university based on their academic transcripts on the condition that they meet the English language proficiency requirements while studying in an affiliated IEP. Conditional admission is defined by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Student and Exchange Visitor Program as "an agreement between a school and a student to admit the student into a program of study for which the student does not meet all standards for admission. This agreement is contingent upon the student successfully completing a specified set of prerequisites determined by the school that will fully qualify the student for the program. The student does not begin the program until completing the required prerequisites" ("U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement," n.d., pp. 1–2).

Language socialization (LS): "LS represents a broad framework for understanding the development of linguistic, cultural, and communicative competence through interaction with others who are more knowledgeable or proficient". "LS is a process that is mediated by language and whose goal is the mastery of linguistic conventions, pragmatics, the adoption of appropriate identities…and other behaviors

associated with the target group and its normative practices" (Duff, 2007, p. 310). This case study researched the students as they socialized into the practices of the host family.

Pragmatic competence: Pragmatic competence is the sociolinguistic aspect of communicative competence, distinct from grammatical, discourse, and strategic competencies (Taguchi, 2011b).

Pragmatic comprehension: Pragmatic competence is made up of both production and comprehension. Pragmatic comprehension refers to "the ability to comprehend speakers' intentions conveyed in nonliteral, indirect utterances (Taguchi, 2008a, p. 34).

Pragmatic failure: Pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983) is a misunderstanding that affects appropriate and effective communication. Kaloustian argues, rightly, that while "the definition of *pragmatic failure* well explains the communication breakdown occurring as a result of pragmatically incompatible attitudes and/or behaviors, the term itself places the burden on the individual entering the new culture by suggesting failure on his/her part" (Kaloustian, 2014, p. 62) and prefers the term *pragmatic incompatibility*. However, in this study, the more common term *pragmatic failure* is used.

Second language (L2): "later-learned language both in a naturalistic environment and instructional settings" (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 13).

Study Abroad: "one type of host environment experience (e.g. in contrast to immigration or vacation) where students at secondary or university level attend classes in a country that speaks the target language" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, p. 80).

Summary

This chapter argues that research is needed on the effects of the homestay environment for international students who must improve their English within a relatively short period of time for academic or personal reasons. Previous studies with students learning languages other than English in non-English speaking countries, suggest that students who choose to live in a homestay environment, experience more satisfaction, feel more confident in their language abilities, and, as a result, improve language proficiency.

This chapter also highlighted another purpose of the research to examine how pragmatic comprehension, operationalized as the comprehension of conversational implicature, develops for IEP students living in homestays. The chapter explained the concept of implicature and how the research focused on the participants' understanding of implicature through their interactions with the host family. The chapter noted how this case study filled the gap in the existing literature about pragmatic comprehension of conversational implicature and can give credence to the educational significance of conditionally admitted students to the IEP and university administration. Other areas covered in the first chapter included the delimitations and limitations of the study and definitions of key terms used throughout the study.

Chapter II focused on a review of literature in two areas: the effects of homestay living on second language development and pragmatic comprehension of implied meanings and implicature. Prior to this case study, there were few studies that focused specifically on the IEP student living in homestays and their pragmatic comprehension.

In Chapter III, Research Methodology, the researcher provided details of how the case study was administered at her home institution. The chapter explained the rationale for a case study research design and described the research setting, the IEP where the target IEP student participants were recruited. The data collection procedures are described in detail so that they are replicable to any researcher. In the data collection and analysis sections, emphasis was paid to collecting and understanding the data in order to answer the research questions. Finally, the chapter ends with information on how the researcher maintained the protection of human subjects and conducted the research in an ethical way.

Chapter IV presented the findings of the case study including descriptions of the student and host family participants and observation by the students about the experience. Three themes emerged in answer to research question one: a) students who were receptive to learning different aspects of English while living in a homestay were satisfied with the degree to which their language had improved, b) the quality of language-related communication between host and student positively impacts the students' satisfaction with English acquisition, and c) a diverse homestay environment allows for greater interlanguage pragmatic gains.

Finally, Chapter V concluded by relating the findings to previous literature in the field and made recommendations for further quantitative research into the benefits of homestay for L2 pragmatic comprehension. The chapter also included a discussion of the implications of the research findings on the homestay practices of placement, student orientation, and host training.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Conditionally admitted students in an IEP face a number of sociocultural and linguistic challenges that may prevent them from matriculating into the university as planned. This study will focus on how IEP students living in homestays develop pragmatic comprehension, specifically the awareness and understanding of conversational implicature and indirect meanings. Being able to understand the intentions of a speaker when the utterance is not stated overtly can be difficult for native speakers as well as English learners (Thomas, 1983). However, for an IEP student interacting with a new family in a new culture and language, the ability to understand indirect meanings is crucial to avoiding miscommunications and pragmatic failure and building learner confidence.

One setting that may hold promise for IEP students as a way to gain communicative competence and build confidence in their second language abilities is for them to live in a homestay while in the IEP. However, despite the 'homestay effect,' the longstanding assumption that the homestay is considered the optimal environment for second language acquisition and cultural understanding, the literature shows some findings to the contrary. The literature on homestay accommodations during study abroad will be examined in the first section of this chapter.

Furthermore, pragmatic competence is an area that is rarely taught in IEP curricula, but is critical to developing appropriate social relationships in and outside the classroom. While pragmalinguistic production of specific speech acts has been studied extensively over the past two decades (Barron & Warga, 2007; Bouton, 1994; Chang, 2010; Jiang, 2006; Roever, 2006; Thomas, 1993), the literature on pragmatic comprehension is more limited. This section will review empirical studies on learners' comprehension of conversational implicature and implied meaning.

This proposed study will combine interest in interlanguage pragmatics with research on language learning during study abroad. Few research studies have examined the effect of the homestay setting on the development of pragmatic comprehension for IEP students in IEPs in the US. This section will provide a foundation for the proposed study by reviewing relevant research literature in two areas: 1) the effect of homestay on second language development, 2) L2 pragmatic comprehension of implied meaning.

The effect of homestay on L2 development

Traditional study abroad research has focused on programs for learning a second language and culture in the target country; however, homestays are the least studied aspect of the cultural immersion experience. Much of the study abroad literature has focused on target languages other than English: Arabic (Shiri, 2015), French (Kinginger, 2008), Chinese (Lee, Wu, Di, & Kinginger, 2017), Japanese (Hashimoto, 1993; Iino, 2006; Kobayashi & Viswat, 2015), Spanish (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Shively, 2011), and Russian (Di Silvio et al., 2014; Rivers, 1998). English has been the target language in fewer studies, such as those undertaken in New Zealand (Sage & Tanaka, 2007), Australia (Hashimoto, 1993), and the United States (Martin, 1980; Woodall &

Takeuchi, 1999). In this section, research about homestay for study abroad will be reviewed with a focus on four areas: 1) L2 proficiency outcomes, 2) student satisfaction, 3) the quality and quantity of student-host family engagement and 4) sociopragmatic issues of language use.

L2 proficiency outcomes

The homestay environment "provides the students an immediate entrée into the cultural and linguistic environment while protecting them in a smaller, 'caring' unit" (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004, p. 254). This, in turn, allows students to improve overall language proficiency (Di Silvio et al., 2014; Hashimoto, 1993; Kinginger, 2008; Martin, 1980; Shiri, 2015). In one of the first empirical studies on homestay, Martin (1980) compared the rate of English acquisition for two groups of students in an IEP in Louisiana: those living in homestays and those living in other types of accommodation, such as dormitory or apartment. Each group of participants were matched with members of the other group with similar Michigan placement test scores, L1, and gender to control for previous language ability. The IEP included 22.5 hours per week of classes in Spoken English, Grammar, Reading and Composition. All students were given the TOEFL at the beginning of the 14-week program and at the end. Total TOEFL scores and subscores in Listening Comprehension, Structure, and Reading and Vocabulary sections were analyzed. Findings showed that the homestay group made significant gains in the overall TOEFL scores and highly significant improvement in Reading and Vocabulary section (Martin, 1980, p. 109). Moreover, the researcher found that students living in homestays received significantly higher grades in their Spoken English, Reading, and Composition classes than the non-homestay students (Martin, 1980, p. 109). This study confirms the

positive impact of homestay on proficiency for students in an IEP, such as those in this proposed study.

In a case study of 24 Americans in France in Spring semester 2003, in which two-thirds of the participants lived in homestay accommodations, Kinginger (2008) reported that all participants made statistically significant gains in overall French proficiency, as measured by overall scores on the *Test de Français International (TFI)* and in pragmatic tests of sociolinguistic awareness and sociopragmatic variability (Kinginger, 2008, p. 107). The TFI is a standardized multiple-choice test of grammar, reading and listening comprehension administered by Educational Testing Service assessing global proficiency of French (Kinginger, 2008, p. 28). The pre-test was given in November 2002 prior to departure and the post-test was administered in September 2003 after the participants returned to campus. In addition to overall proficiency gains, participants demonstrated greater improvement on the listening comprehension subtest than on reading, which is consistent with previous studies (Kinginger, 2008, p. 37).

In another study on the effect of homestay on L2 proficiency and patterns of interactions between students and members of the host families, Shiri (2015) compared proficiency gains of Arabic learners living in homestays during an eight-week summer program in Tunisia with similar programs in other Arabic-speaking countries where the participants stayed in dormitories or hotels. Pre- and post-program proficiency was measured by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Tunisian Arabic (Shiri, 2015, p. 6). Learners in the homestay group not only demonstrated greater gains

in speaking proficiency of Modern Standard Arabic, but also of Tunisian Arabic as well when both languages were used by the host family.

Although it would seem that the homestay experience would intuitively benefit the language learner especially in oral and aural skills, a number of research studies report contradictory findings. For example, Rivers (1998) found that "homestay is a negative predictor for speaking gain, has no apparent effect on Listening, and is a positive predictor for reading gain" (p. 496). Using longitudinal data from the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) Student Records, he compared proficiency in Speaking, Listening and Reading of students in dormitory placements from 1976 to1994 and students in homestays from 1994 to 1996. Prior to 1994, almost all study abroad participants in Russia were required to stay in dormitories. In Fall 1994, ACTF adopted a policy of homestay placement (Rivers, 1998, p. 494). Although this study analyzed a large data set, one of the limitations of the study was that there was no concurrent data of homestay and dormitory accommodation. Other than different housing environments, the participant groups had no significant difference in gender, age, overall experience in language learning, or length of time studying Russian. Rivers (1998) found that the homestay group was less likely to gain in speaking proficiency and more likely to gain in reading proficiency; homestay had no effect on listening. Rivers (1998) explained the surprising results by noting the nature of homestay and individual differences of learners (p. 496).

The potential reasons that the homestay context does not always improve proficiency were addressed by Sage and Tanaka (2006). In their study of Japanese university students studying in a six-week intensive English program in New Zealand, the

authors found that while students were satisfied with the homestay placement, they did not "necessarily advance their L2 proficiencies" (Sage & Tanaka, 2007, p. 840). Although no proficiency testing was conducted as part of the study, the authors conducted open-ended interviews with the sixteen participants at the end of the study abroad period about their overall homestay experience. Responses were coded as positive or negative and characterized by content: physical environment, non-language communication with host family, and language related communication with the host family. The researchers found that the majority were positive comments about non-language communication (e.g. "My host mother is very cheerful, and she took me to many places)" (Sage & Tanaka, 2007, p. 851). They concluded that students perceived fewer language gains in part because host families were expressly told that language lessons were not a necessary part of the homestay requirement (Sage & Tanaka, 2007, p. 853). Another possible reason could be the relatively short time, 6 weeks, that the students were in New Zealand.

Length of residence (LoR), also known as length of stay, does have an impact on linguistic gains. Research suggests that learners generally adopt some pragmatic norms of the host country "often becoming more target-like pragmatically after four to nine months in the host country (Shively, 2011, p. 1821). Grieve (2015) investigated the acquisition of adolescent language as measured by the pragmatic markers of approximation ("kind of", "like") and intensifiers ("like", "really", "so") by German teenagers on both a 5- or 10 month exchange to Australia which included homestay accommodations. Students on the 5-month program used fewer of these markers than those who stayed in the 10-month

program indicating a lower level of investment and integration into the local adolescent community (Grieve, 2015).

Research also shows that there is a correlation between length of stay and the satisfaction with the homestay; students who live in a homestay for a semester or longer tend to report fewer adjustment problems than those in short-term programs, primarily because the students feel more invested in the relationship with the host family and are more amenable to working through any difficulties (Grieve, 2015). Similarly, Iino (2006) noted that short-term homestay experiences differ from 'natural' families in "the salient knowledge of their mortality", i.e. an understanding that it is only a temporary living arrangement, which may negatively impact the relationship between hosts and students and consequently the amount of language gained (Iino, 2006, p. 155).

Student satisfaction with homestay experience

Although the majority of students are generally satisfied with their homestay immersion, Diao, Freed, and Smith (2011) noted that the experience is more nuanced: "As other recent studies have suggested, the family home stay experience is not a positive experience for *all* students, nor is it *always* a positive experience for any one student" (Diao, Freed, & Smith, 2011, p. 128). In their study of 70 American learners of French on a semester study in Aix-en-Provence, France, they administered questionnaires weekly to gauge student satisfaction with the amount of interaction with their host family and their perceived gains in French. They analyzed fluctuating positive and negative feelings over the period of the semester and "by the end of the semester students appeared to have arrived at a level of seeming objectivity, a point where they were able to express both satisfaction and regrets with respect to their experiences" (Diao et al., 2011, p. 126). The

weekly interaction with the participants provided the researchers with more detailed data at every stage of the semester than a simple pre- and post-questionnaire would. Consequently, in this study, weekly dialogue journals were employed so that IEP students could reflect in real time on any sociopragmatic experiences they encountered.

Another example of mixed feelings, in a study of four IEP students from Japan, Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) found that although the students were satisfied with the cultural aspects of the homestay experience, they were very dissatisfied with their language growth. As noted during semi-structured interviews, the participants experienced too much exposure to the L2, resulting in what the authors call 'immersion response': "the desire to flee or tune-out from the all-English environment" (Woodall & Takeuchi, 1999, p. 38). While all participants had a similar low level of English which made communicating with a host family challenging, each reported different reasons for their dissatisfaction. For example, Kenji, who actively participated with his host family in activities inside and outside the home in order to converse with them, nevertheless, expressed the burden of "thinking of what to talk about" with the host family at dinner (Woodall & Takeuchi, 1999, p. 43).

Quality and quantity of student-host family engagement

Previous literature took a mainly emic view of students' experiences, but increasingly focus is shifting to the perspective of host families and homestay coordinators/housing directors (Di Silvio et al., 2014; Kinginger, 2008; Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010; Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Shiri, 2015). Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) further believed that "differences in the perspectives of the host parents and the homestay student could provide data for potential causes of miscommunications,

misunderstandings, and conflicts," (p. 37). The literature highlights a disconnect between student and host family estimates of the quantity and the quality of the engagement. Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) noted that while students felt that they didn't have enough exposure with host families, they nevertheless estimated longer interaction time than did their host families (p. 38). By researching the perceptions of students, host families, and housing directors involved in programs in Spain and Mexico, Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004) found that both participants and families stated that they would have liked to spend more time together. However, in reality, there was a discrepancy about who should take responsibility. Host families felt that students spent more time in their rooms or at school and housing directors reported that students often traveled during weekends (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004, p. 260). Conversely, the perceptions of the students were that the hosts didn't invite them to participate in family activities (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004, p. 261). Learner agency and host hospitality need to be in balance for L2 pragmatic development.

Not only is the amount of interaction key to the successful homestay placement for language learning, but so are the people with whom the student engages. Shiri (2015) compared the impact of the homestay environment for learners of Arabic in an intensive summer language program in Tunisia with similar programs in other Arabic-speaking countries where the participants stayed in dormitories or hotels. The author found that the mutigenerational families or extended families of the hosts in Tunisia gave students the opportunity to expand their social networks and interact with people of various age groups (Shiri, 2015, p. 20).

Hashimoto's descriptive case study of an Australian high school student in Japan also focused on her interactions in a variety of situations and Japanese speakers (Hashimoto, 1993). The goal of the study was to investigate in what ways the host family was a source of input in the student's development of communicative competence, so it is especially relevant to this proposed research. Four conversations with members of the multigenerational host family were recorded over a period of one week in a variety of situations: dinner, a party at the host family's home, playing card games and watching a video, and playing a computer game with her host brothers. While the research provided interesting examples of student/host family interactions in different settings, the lack of longitudinal data makes the study less relevant to the proposed case study.

Sociopragmatic issues of language use

What can be learned from these studies about the language used in the homestay? As we have seen, it is the responsibility of both the host family and the student over time, not the setting per se, that determines the outcome of the homestay for language learning. In this section, examples of both positive and negative sociopragmatic experiences from the literature are examined.

The language spoken in the home (standard, non-standard, dialect, slang etc.) and the accommodation made by the host family towards the learner's interlanguage can play a positive or negative role in sociopragmatic development. The homestay can provide learners with an opportunity to be exposed to a variety of linguistic forms. For example, Shiri (2015) found that the Arabic learners in a homestay were exposed to the local Tunisian dialect in addition to Modern Standard Arabic (Shiri, 2015). Similarly, the American learners of French in Kinginger's 2008 study became more aware of French

slang and its appropriate uses, even when they were hesitant to using it themselves (Kinginger, 2008).

However, Iino (1996, 2006) found that when American Japanese learners in Kyoto tried to use the regional dialect they heard within the home instead of standard Tokyo Japanese, they were regarded with skepticism by their host families. The host families believed that this was not the appropriate language for non-native speakers: "What they believe to be correct Japanese is not necessarily the authentic Tokyo dialect. In fact, it tends to be neither Kyoto dialect nor Tokyo dialect, but instead, FT (foreigner talk)" (Iino, 2006, p. 168). This dialectical code-switching was viewed by the students as condescending and confusing, reinforcing their status of *gaijin* (foreigner) since it is considered inappropriate for a non-native Japanese to speak like a native (Iino, 2006, p. 160). While FT and linguistic accommodation by the host families may be unconscious and intended to be helpful, it may nevertheless be perceived as negatively judgmental by the learner and impair L2 learning (Iino, 2006, p. 171). As noted by a participant in the study: "I was a pet in the home. As long as I appreciated whatever they did, everyone was happy even though I didn't speak well" (Iino, 2006, p. 162).

While the concept of Japanese hospitality is based on an understanding of superior-inferior relationships which prescribe certain behaviors and sociolinguistic norms (Kobayashi & Viswat, 2015, p. 475), foreigner talk can exist for English learners as well. Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) noted that all of the American host parents in their study of Japanese students of English reported simplifying their speech to provide more comprehensible language for the student without realizing that their FT could

prevent students from being exposed to authentic English, or be perceived as insulting by the student (p. 41).

Conversational style and turntaking between host family and learner is another aspect of the homestay environment previously studied in the literature. Pryde (2014) confirms Kinginger (2008) and Segalowitz and Freed's (2004) findings that conversations with host families became repetitive and formulaic over time. In his study of Japanese students in New Zealand, he also noted that hosts dominated the conversation and the most common conversational style was the initiation, response, feedback model typical of the language classroom (Pryde, 2014).

Getting appropriate linguistic feedback is another challenge met by students in many of the studies. Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) noted that one of the Japanese students living with an American host family felt that she was not being challenged to improve her conversation skills because her host mother could understand her broken English and didn't provide any correction. Yet, in the descriptive case study of an Australian girl studying in Japan, Hashimoto (1983) noted how the learner demonstrated metalinguistic consciousness when asking the meaning of words, phrases, the appropriate context for slang, and appropriate style for different situations, such as a formal speech she was to deliver at school (p. 214). Shively (2011) also reports that American students in Spain asked for clarification on the correct way to address a shopkeeper in a service encounter (p. 1832). These examples show the impact of learner agency and explicit pragmatic socialization. Although pragmatic socialization can be both implicit and explicit, corrective feedback is typically made on grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, not pragmatic issues. As Shively (2011) notes, while host families may

not want to provide corrective feedback about pragmatics in order to be polite, the "lack of negative feedback may provide evidence to students that their behavior is pragmatically appropriate when it is not" (p. 1821).

Summary

From this review of literature on the effect of homestays on L2 development, it is clear that living in a homestay does not automatically guarantee target language acquisition. As we have seen, it is the interaction between the host family and the student over time, not the setting per se, that determines the outcome of the homestay experience for language learning. In this section, four areas were investigated: the effect of homestay on proficiency, student satisfaction with the homestay experience, the quality and quantity of student-host family engagement, and sociopragmatic issues of language use within the homestay environment.

The research findings are mixed about the relationship between homestay and gains in L2 proficiency on standardized tests. Martin (1980) reported a significant improvement in overall TOEFL and course grades of all the IEP students who lived in homestays compared to those who lived in other types of accommodation, regardless of placement level or L1. Kinginger's (2008) research found comparable gains in French proficiency as measured by the *Test de Français International* for American students living in a French homestay. Similarly, in a study of 152 students of Spanish, Chinese, and Russian, Di Silvio et al. (2014) noted significant correlations between oral proficiency as measured by a Simulated Oral Proficiency Instrument and students' satisfaction with their homestay. However, the results from Rivers' 1998 study comparing students of Russian who lived in homestays and dormitories were

contradictory. He found that the homestay group was less likely to improve speaking ability and likely to gain in reading proficiency, but homestay had no effect on listening proficiency as measured by standardized tests of Russian. The author notes that "these results stand counter to the intuition that greater auditory target language input [found in a homestay environment] would result in greater gains in Listening and possibly Speaking" (Rivers, 1998, p. 493).

Satisfaction with the homestay placement is mostly based on how well students' perceptions of the environment met their expectations. As might be expected, over a period of time students face a number of acculturation issues which may cause fluctuating positive and negative feelings (Diao et al., 2011). Length of stay correlates with satisfaction; students who live in a homestay for a semester or more tend to adjust to the homestay better than those in short-term programs because the students often feel more invested in the relationship and are willing to work through any potential problems (Grieve, 2015). Finally, Woodall and Takeuchi (1999) reported that, for beginning level students like the Japanese IEP students in their study, the all-English environment was overwhelming at times and caused dissatisfaction with the homestay experience. It should be noted that in the proposed study, students of intermediate and higher level will be selected as participants to avoid this potential issue.

Research shows that there can be a significant difference in the reported time spent and quality of interactions between the student and host family (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Woodall & Takeuchi, 1999). Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004) found that while students and host families stated that they would have liked more time together, neither group felt the other took responsibility for initiating the contact (p. 261).

Also, the quality of the engagement is improved when students are given the opportunity to communicate with extended families or friends (Hashimoto, 1993; Shiri, 2015).

Whether intentional or not, host families' use of foreigner talk and other forms of language accommodation, such as use of L1, may interfere with the student's L2 development or worse, make them feel ostracized (Iino, 2006; Shively, 2011; Woodall & Takeuchi, 1999). Similarly, hosts may not provide corrective feedback especially about sociopragmatics in order to be polite (Shively, 2011, p. 1821). In sum, the role of the homestay environment in study abroad has become an important topic for researchers to explore. Future research, including the proposed case study, will continue to examine the process of SLA as it happens in the homestay environment focusing on the expectations and experiences of both the students and host families and "the nature of the linguistic demands placed on students and the difference in their responses to these demands that result in enhanced or diminished language and cultural learning" (Diao et al., 2011, p. 129).

Pragmatic comprehension of implied meaning

L2 pragmatic comprehension has been a growing field of interlanguage pragmatics since the 1990s, but has been much less studied in the literature than pragmatic production of speech acts (Taguchi, 2008a, p. 34). This section will review significant literature on L2 pragmatic comprehension, specifically the awareness and understanding of implied or indirect meaning and conversational implicature. Implicatures are of interest to L2 pragmatics because they are so common in everyday conversation (Bouton, 1994, p. 88).

The term conversational implicature was coined by Grice (1975) for "the inferential process through which the meaning of any utterance is understood in terms of the context in which it occurs" (Bouton, 1994, p. 88). For example, the expression *It's cold in here, isn't it?* could be interpreted as a simple statement of temperature or as a request to close the window, depending on the interlocutor and the situation. According to Grice's Cooperative Principle and his four 'conversational maxims', all conversations are expected to be "truthful, appropriately informative, relevant and clear" to both parties (Bouton, 1994, p. 89). As Taguchi and Roever (2017) explain, the Maxim of Quantity states that the interlocutors will express only the minimum of what is required. The Maxim of Quality asserts that the speakers be truthful to the best of their knowledge. The Maxim of Relation states that the conversation will be relevant to the topic; the Maxim of Manner refers to the assumption that the conversation will be brief, orderly and clear (p. 20). When the literal meaning of an utterance does not follow these assumptions, the maxim is flouted (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 20), and the competent hearer assumes that the speaker is expressing himself indirectly and will try to infer an appropriate meaning using problem solving and 'heuristic analysis' (Leech, 1983, p. 41). Taguchi and Roever (2017) cite several examples of flouting: flouting the Maxim of Quality by answering the question 'How was the meeting?' with 'I nearly died of boredom' to indicate that the meeting was extremely boring; flouting the Maxim of Quantity by giving only part of the information requested when asked 'How do you like my outfit?' with 'I like your hat' to mean that the respondent doesn't like the rest of the outfit, but doesn't want to be impolite. Similarly, the Maxim of Relation may be flouted by answering the same question with an off-topic response: 'What do you think they'll serve for dinner?'

An example of flouting the Maxim of Manner could be responding to the question 'Would you like to come over for tea?' with the overly long, non-committal answer 'Well, I'd love to but I have to pick up Joey from school and then do some shopping and take mother to the doctor, and after that I've got to get dinner ready' (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, pp. 20–21). In all of the cases above, it is assumed that both interlocutors share a common perception of Gricean maxims which, though universal, may be interpreted differently by those of different languages and cultures (Bouton, 1994, p. 89). How much these implied meanings are understood by L2 learners is the foundation of L2 implicature research (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 21).

Types of implicature

The most comprehensive study of implicature and how it is interpreted in cross cultural interaction was completed by Lawrence Bouton at the University of Illinois (Urbana Champaign) from 1986 to 1993. He identified five different types of implicatures which are categorized by their level of conventionality or transparency to the hearer (Bouton, 1994). The (in)directness of the implicature has an effect on L2 comprehension. Conventional or idiosyncratic implicatures are based on either a semantic, structural or pragmatic formula (Bouton, 1994; Taguchi, 2008b) and include such expressions as indirect refusals and routine expressions, e.g. 'For here or to go?'. Indirect refusals are considered formulaic because they follow "a common, predictable discourse pattern (giving a reason for refusal)" (Taguchi, 2011b, p. 912). Refusals are considered impolite according to Brown and Levinson (1978) because saying *no* directly will threaten the speaker's face (i.e. the desire to be accepted) (Taguchi, 2008d, p. 430). It

is considered common conventional social practice in refusal situations to minimize this threat, using indirect strategies such as those as seen in this example:

Bill: Do you want to go to a movie with me next Friday?

Judy: Friday? I've got to wash my hair.

However, nonconventional implicatures are much more difficult for an L2 learner to grasp since these expressions don't follow a set formula (Bouton, 1994; Taguchi, 2008a). Indirect opinions are probably the most common types of idiosyncratic implicature (Bouton, 1994). "For example, indicating a negative opinion of a movie by saying 'I was glad when it was over' illustrates that linguistic options for how to express the opinion are virtually unlimited" (Taguchi, 2008d, p. 430). Taguchi (2008c) cites the Hamblin and Gibbs (2003) study of comprehension speed of implied meaning in L1 which had similar results to those of second language learners' speed; for both groups extra time was required to comprehend non-conventional implicatures because of the "need to recognize multiple intended meanings and identify the correct one"(Taguchi, 2008d, p. 522).

Cultural interference is another reason that indirect criticism is so difficult for L2 learners to comprehend such as in this example of a conversation between two professors:

Professor James: What did you think of Luke's essay?

Professor Sinclair: I thought it was well-typed.

In an American university setting, this would be generally understood as a negative statement about the quality of the writing. However, Roever (2014) cites an example of a Japanese student who misunderstood this response because "neatness of appearance is

highly valued in the Japanese academic system" so that a well-typed paper should be a compliment (Roever, 2014, p. 107).

Similarly, relevance implicatures are considered nonconventional because of shared knowledge in a particular situation such as the hazards of smoking in this example of a conversation between two joggers:

"Wendy: I can't keep up with you, Rachel. I'm out of breath.

Can you slow down?

Rachel: I'm glad I don't smoke" (Bouton, 1994, p. 98).

Another type of nonconventional implicature, Pope Q or Pope questions signal agreement with the speaker by answering affirmatively with an obvious question such as 'Is the Pope Catholic?' or 'Does the sun come up in the east?'. Despite the fact that similar expressions are found in many languages other than English, these types of implicatures may be difficult for L2 learners because of the cultural or background knowledge required for comprehension (Bouton, 1994). With respect to Pope questions on a pragmatic listening test, "it is fairly obvious that an implicature that relies exclusively on background knowledge will measure first and foremost whether test takers have this background knowledge" (Roever, 2014, p. 111). In this sample conversation between two students about renting an apartment, Mike assumes that Jane shares his understanding that rents are expensive:

Jane: Is the rent high?

Mike: Is the Pope Catholic?

In addition to type of implicature, previous empirical studies analyzed the following factors that impact L2 pragmatic comprehension of implicatures: proficiency,

length of residence, formal instruction. Each of these variables will be examined in the following sections.

Proficiency and pragmatic comprehension of implicatures

The effect of proficiency on comprehension of implicatures has been the most studied. Roever (2006) explains the importance of proficiency in this way:

> if a listener's proficiency is low, they may simply ascribe their inability to interpret the utterance to their lack of linguistic comprehension. However, if their proficiency is sufficiently advanced, they notice that an utterance violates a Gricean maxim and needs deductive work. (p. 249)

For example, in her study of 35 international students at a university in the southwest, Garcia (2004) found that high level students (in graduate level MA TESL and Applied Linguistics PhD programs) significantly outperformed low level students (undergraduates enrolled in the intensive English program) in their understanding of all types of implicatures on a pragmatic listening comprehension test. This corroborated the findings of Cook and Liddicoat's study: "As language learners acquire greater proficiency, the ability to process contextual knowledge simultaneously with linguistic knowledge becomes automatized…the Low group, not having achieved the high level of automaticity required to comprehend pragmatic meaning, relied more on bottom-up linguistic processing"(2002, p. 4). These findings are in line with Roever (2006) who conducted a web-based assessment of pragmalinguistic knowledge including routines, implicatures, and speech acts with 267 ESL learners in Hawaii and EFL learners in Germany ranging in proficiency from beginner to advanced (Roever, 2006). The implicature section tested 8 items containing idiosyncratic implicature and 4 items containing formulaic implicature. He found a significant L2 proficiency effect on both

the ESL and EFL groups over both types of implicature, independent of exposure to the L2 environment (Roever, 2006, p. 21).

In investigating the effect of proficiency on the comprehension of implicatures, Taguchi (2008b) studied listening proficiency specifically and found that the multiple levels of processing required for listening comprehension affect pragmatic comprehension of implicatures differently. Listening skill is comprised of "lower-order processing of perceiving and discriminating sounds, segmenting words, assigning words into grammatical categories, and decoding utterances (Rost, 2002; Scovel, 2001)" and the "higher-order processing of supplementing acoustic information with non-acoustic information (e.g. prior knowledge) to make inferences of speaker intentions behind utterances (Rost 2002; Smith, 1975)" (Taguchi, 2008b, p. 523). In her 2008 study of thirty-five Japanese ESL students, the accuracy and speed of comprehension of indirect refusals was found to be significantly higher than of indirect opinions. The participants were given five tasks (a pragmatic listening test (PLT), a phonemic discrimination test, a listening section of the institutional TOEFL, a working memory test, and a lexical access test) to determine the relationship between accurate and speedy comprehension of conversational implicatures and cognitive processing skills and general listening proficiency (Taguchi, 2008b, p. 517). Taguchi found a significant relationship between the participants' TOEFL listening scores and accuracy scores on the PLT as well as between lexical access speed and comprehension speed, but not phonemic discrimination. This shows that as learners' overall listening proficiency develops, "they are better able to apply their general listening skill to pragmatic listening, which involves making inferences of speakers' intentions encoded in utterances" (Taguchi, 2008b, p. 531).

In another study, Taguchi (2011c) investigated whether L2 proficiency and study abroad experience affect pragmatic comprehension of implicature with respect to accuracy of comprehension and processing speed. 25 native speakers of English and three groups of Japanese EFL students participated: Group 1with lower proficiency with an average score of 443 as measured by an institutional TOEFL with no study abroad experience, and two higher proficiency groups with similar average TOEFL scores of 554: Group 2 with no study abroad experience and Group 3 with a minimum of one year of study abroad in an English-speaking country (Taguchi, 2011c, p. 918). All participants were given a computerized pragmatic listening test (PLT) with conventional and nonconventional implicature test items. All EFL groups showed lower accuracy scores and slower response times on the nonconventional implicatures than conventional implicatures (Taguchi, 2011c, p. 922), With respect to proficiency effect, Taguchi found significantly higher accuracy scores for Group 2 and Group 3 than for the lower level Group 1 especially for the conventional implicatures and to a lesser degree for nonconventional implicatures. The native speaker group scored highest on all items, supporting previous findings on the significant effect of proficiency on comprehension of implicature (Bouton, 1994; Garcia, 2004; Roever, 2006; Taguchi, 2008b).

Length of residence and pragmatic comprehension of implicatures

Length of residence (also known as length of stay) refers to the amount of time spent in the target country, typically in a study abroad context. In addition to proficiency, previous research in the development of the comprehension of implicature has investigated the variable of length of residence.

In Bouton's (1994) first longitudinal study from 1986-91, 436 nonnative English-speaking international students were tested twice on their comprehension of a variety of implicatures. The tests were normed with a group of 28 native English speakers. The proficiency of the nonnative speakers was not a factor. The findings showed that the nonnative speakers were able to correctly interpret the implicature 79.5% of the time upon arrival in the United States and 91.5% after a period of four and a half years. This indicates that nonnative speakers could develop a near-nativelike level of comprehension of implicatures over time (Bouton, 1994, p. 91). A further study was conducted by Bouton to ascertain more specifically at which time the nonnative speakers' comprehension became nativelike. In his second longitudinal study from 1990-1993, Bouton administered a similar instrument to three different groups of nonnative English-speaking international students. All were tested upon arrival and Group 1) after they had been in the United States 17 months, Group 2) tested again after they had been in the US for 33 months. The scores of these two groups were benchmarked against a group of students who had been on campus between 4-7 years. Bouton found that the scores for both 17-month and the 33-month residence groups improved significantly compared to the scores upon arrival. However, there was not a significant difference in the scores between the 17- and 33-month groups, indicating that significant pragmatic comprehension of implicature developed mostly within the first 17 months of residence. This also supported the results of Bouton's first study in that, even after four years, a statistically significant difference between the performance of the nonnative speaking groups and the native speakers was reported (Bouton, 1994, p. 92). This suggests that

the variable of length of residence may only have a limited, short-term effect on the development of accurate comprehension of implicatures.

Instruction and the comprehension of implicatures

As noted earlier, pragmatic comprehension of implicatures is not typically addressed in current ESL textbooks or coursework (Bardovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2015; Bouton, 1994). Although many researchers had compared pragmatic development of implicatures in EFL environments with ESL environments (Roever, 2006, 2014; Taguchi, 2008e, 2011b; Taguchi & Roever, 2017), Bouton (1994) conducted one of the only studies to find out if explicit classroom instruction in implicatures would enhance students' awareness and correct understanding of conversational implicatures. Participants were international students taking different sections of the same university English course. All students were given a written implicature test at the beginning and end of the semester. Students in one of the sections received six hours of instruction on the five different types of implicatures over a period of six weeks. The post-test scores indicated that the experimental group had a statistically significant improvement over the pre-test; moreover, the control group showed little progress in implicature comprehension during the study. Bouton concluded that nonnative speakers could attain the same level of accuracy after six hours of formal instruction as those who had spent three years or more of immersion in the target language and culture (Bouton, 1994, p. 105).

Learning environments for comprehension of implicatures

As we have seen, pragmatic comprehension develops differently across learning environments. In a cross-sectional study of the comprehension of implicatures, Taguchi (2008c) found that general learning environment has a complex relationship to accuracy

and fluency. Her study tracked two groups of Japanese learners of English at the beginning level: 60 students at an English-medium college in Japan (EFL group) and 57 students in an intensive English program at a college in Hawaii (ESL group) who were administered a computerized pragmatic listening test before and after receiving approximately 125 hours of classroom instruction in academic English. There was no explicit instruction on pragmatics in general or on implicature specifically as part of the classes. Comprehension was analyzed for accuracy and speed of response on conventional (indirect refusals) and nonconventional (indirect opinion) types of implicatures (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 423). Consistent with other research on the effect of proficiency (Garcia, 2004; Roever, 2006; Taguchi, 2008b, 2011b), both groups showed improvement in accurate comprehension and speed over time, indicating that "as learners receive more instruction on their general L2 skills, the ability to comprehend nonliteral meaning develops in terms of both accuracy and speedy processing of meaning" (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 441). Moreover, both groups of learners were able to comprehend the indirect refusal items more accurately and quickly than the indirect opinion implicature (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 439), results in line with Bouton (1994) and Roever (2005 and 2014).

However, when effect size was considered, the ESL group showed a greater gain in comprehension speed, but only a marginal improvement in accuracy while for the EFL group the effect was much less for speed than for accuracy (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 423). The author hypothesized that this was due to the advantage of the 3-4 hours per day of intensive classroom instruction for the EFL group which likely impacted their listening comprehension ability, including inferential listening; the ESL group in Hawaii, on the other hand, lived in the target language environment and stayed in homestays with

English speaking families and so were able to show gains in comprehension speed as a result of more overall L2 contact and practice in processing the target language (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 443). In conclusion, different learning environments support different aspects of pragmatic comprehension of implicatures (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 444).

In considering the optimal learning context for pragmatic comprehension, Bardovi-Harlig notes that "environment in itself is a complex variable that determines other variables including the quantity and quality of the input available to learners and the opportunities that learners have to use the language communicatively and consequentially" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, p. 80).

Summary

Conversational implicature, according to Grice (1975) refers to "the inferential process through which the meaning of any utterance is understood in terms of the context in which it occurs" (Bouton, 1994, p. 88). Implicatures are a common feature in everyday conversation often used by a speaker to avoid being impolite. Bouton (1994) identified five types of implicatures categorized by level of conventionality. Indirect refusals, for example, are considered conventional implicatures because they follow a predictable pattern of giving a reason for the refusal which is common across many cultures (Bouton, 1994; Taguchi, 2008b, 2011b). Nonconventional implicatures are much more difficult for an L2 learner because they don't follow a formula. Indirect opinions are a common type of nonconventional implicature in which there might be an endless number of possible responses to the question "How did you like the movie?" The degree to which an L2 learner can comprehend the implied meaning of a response such as

"I was glad it was over" is the focus of L2 implicature research (Taguchi & Roever, 2017, p. 21)

Researchers found proficiency had a significant effect on the comprehension of implicature (Bouton, 1994; Garcia, 2004; Roever, 2006; Taguchi, 2008b). This is due to the fact that as L2 learners gain proficiency "the ability to process contextual knowledge simultaneously with linguistic knowledge becomes automatized" (Garcia, 2004, p. 7). In his longitudinal study of nonnative English speaking students, Bouton (1994) also found that L2 learners could develop significant pragmatic comprehension of implicature within the first one and a half years of residence (p. 91). In a further study of the explicit instruction of implicature, L2 learners who received six hours of formal instruction could reach the same level of comprehension of those with residency of three years or more in the U.S. (Bouton, 1994, p. 105).

Different learning environments support different aspects of the pragmatic comprehension of implicatures. Comparing the accuracy and speed of response on a pragmatic listening test by a group of Japanese learners of English in Japan and another in an IEP in Hawaii, Taguchi (2008c) found that those who studied in Hawaii showed greater improvement in comprehension speed, but a minimal improvement in accuracy, while the EFL group in Japan gained in accuracy, and less so in comprehension speed. Because the ESL group in Hawaii lived in homestays and had more overall L2 contact, they had more practice in processing the target language and were able to make significant gains in comprehension speed (Taguchi, 2008b, pp. 443–444).

In conclusion, empirical studies about two separate areas, second language acquisition while in a homestay environment as part of study abroad, and the

development of L2 comprehension of implicatures, have been reviewed in this chapter. The goal of this proposed research is to combine these two research domains and investigate to what extent IEP students living in a homestay environment can appropriately interpret implied meaning in conversation and to determine which sociopragmatic experiences and contexts impact the development of their pragmatic comprehension. Since there are few extant research studies in this combined area, the proposed case study will provide rich description and analysis to fill the gap in the literature.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Research Purpose

The purpose of this case study was to examine how pragmatic understanding, operationalized as the comprehension of conversational implicatures, develops for IEP students living in homestays over the period of one academic term in an intensive English program. The research explored the extent to which students perceive English language benefits to living in a homestay while studying in the IEP. The findings will help the IEP determine if more resources are needed to develop housing options, such as homestays, which promote English language development and what training might be needed.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development?
2. What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures?

Research Design

A case study design was chosen for the research. The case study explored the communication encounters between four IEP students and their host families in each homestay and examined if there was a perceived change in awareness and comprehension of implicatures. Case studies allow for an in-depth exploration of a particular phenomenon, such as IEP students' pragmatic development, that is "bounded" by time and place. Moreover, the longitudinal nature of case study allows for description of learners' development over a period of time (Mackey & Gass, 2005). One advantage of

a case study is that it provides the researcher with an understanding of "how the learners' developmental pathways affect them as individuals within particular communities" (Duff, 2012, p. 101). Another advantage is that the researcher can collect detailed accounts of phenomena from both the insider (emic) and outsider (etic) perspectives within the socio-cultural setting (Friedman, 2012, p. 182), in this case, the student and host family respectively in the homestay environment. By documenting the participants' pragmatic development over an eight-week period through their journal entries, the research focused on sociopragmatic experiences as they happened within the homestay environment.

Case studies can be considered a 'tradition' rather than a method since both qualitative and quantitative methodologies can be employed (Casanave, 2010, p. 66). Case studies in L2 pragmatics have strong precedent, such as Siegal's 1996 study of two women's development of Japanese polite style, Hassall's (2006) diary self-study of leave-taking expressions in Indonesian, and Kinginger and Blattner's (2008) study of colloquial expression use by French learners (Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011, p. 358).

Research Setting

The research took place in the IEP on the campus of a large metropolitan university in the western United States where the IEP students were studying and the surrounding area where the host families live. The IEP was established in 1975 and its Academic English program is focused on preparing students for degree programs. The program is accredited by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) until 2024 and is certified by the Department of Homeland Security Student and Exchange Visitor Program to issue the Form I-20 for students to obtain an F1 Student Visa for English Language Training. In Fall 2018 the Academic English program had a

total enrollment of 101 students. The Institutional TOEFL Program (ITP) is used to place students in the appropriate level upon arrival and to determine proficiency gains at the end of each term. A score of 500 is the university requirement for undergraduate admission; 550 is the university minimum for graduate admission.

The intensive English program offers eight levels of instruction. Each student is required to attend a total of 20 hours of class per week, consisting of the following: Written Communication (six hours), Oral Communication (six hours), Reading Skills (four hours), and an elective course (four hours), such as TOEFL Preparation, American History, or Hot Topics.

The IEP has a full-time staff of 12 with approximately 15 hourly instructors. All of the instructors have at minimum a Master degree in TESOL or related fields. In addition, the IEP has a Housing Coordinator who assists all new students in finding housing. Students have the option of living on campus in residence halls, off campus in an apartment or room in a private home, with their own family or relatives, or in a paid arrangement with a homestay family. The IEP refers students interested in homestay accommodations to a third-party provider of homestay placements.

Host families were typical of the diverse population of the Silicon Valley city in which the university is located. Hosts may be single or families and were paid according to their location and the type of program for which they are hosting students. Most families provided one or two meals per day as part of their service. All hosts are required to provide an English-speaking home and a "safe, supportive, and stable" environment (https://www.isphomestays.com/hosts/).

Research Participants

The student participants in this case study were selected because they were living in a homestay while attending the IEP. Additional selection criteria were that all student participants had recently arrived in the United States and were enrolled in their first term of study at the research site. The participants were selected from the intermediate and advanced levels of the IEP, that is levels 5-8, out of 8 levels. For initial placement, the IEP typically uses the range of 435 to 473 on the Institutional TOEFL (ITP) for placement into level 5.

A call for participation in the study was made to IEP students living in homestays via email during the first week of the program. Students notified the IEP of their local address and type of accommodation during program check-in. Once the IEP students had agreed to participate, an invitation to participate was sent via email to their respective host family participants. The researcher in conjunction with the host family determined which family member(s) would be interviewed for the research. Both groups of participants, IEP students and host families, were fully informed of the procedures and risks of the study before they agreed to take part. Copies of the Informed Consent documents can be found in Appendix A for student participants and Appendix B for host family participants.

Instrumentation

Two assessment instruments were used as part of this study. The first was the TOEFL ITP developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS). The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) ITP assessment series, also known as the Institutional TOEFL Program, is used by the researcher's intensive English program to assess

students' proficiency for level placement at the beginning of the term, for monitoring progress, and for end-of-course decision making. As part of new student orientation, all IEP students are required to take the TOEFL ITP. Students may elect to take another TOEFL ITP at the end of the term. Scores from IEP student participants' TOEFL ITP were collected at the start of the study.

The TOEFL ITP is administered in a paper format with an audio component by the university's Testing Services department and takes approximately two hours to complete (Educational Testing Service, 2018a). The test includes multiple-choice questions with four answer choices each. The test consists of three sections: Listening Comprehension (50 questions), Structure and Written Expression (40 questions), and Reading Comprehension (50 questions) for a total score of 310 – 677 (*Official Guide to the TOEFL ITP Test*, 2014, p. 2). The Listening Comprehension section is especially relevant to this research on pragmatic comprehension because in Part A, Short Conversations, one type of question tests information not explicitly stated in the recorded dialogue (*Official Guide to the TOEFL ITP Test*, 2014, p. 10). Conversational implicatures may appear in the dialogues of this section of the test. When available, participants' pre- and post-subscores for the Listening Comprehension section of the TOEFL ITP were collected as well as total scores.

Reliability and validity are important criteria for measuring the quality of a research instrument. "Tests with high reliability yield consistent scores across different test forms" (Educational Testing Service, 2018). According to the ETS TOEFL ITP Reliability Table, there is a 0.96 reliability with a standard error of measurement (SEM) of 13.0 based on data from test scores between January 2009 and December 2009.

Reliability data for Section 1 Listening Comprehension show a 0.93 reliability with a 1.8 SEM (Educational Testing Service, 2018b) based on the same data.

"Validity is the degree to which all of the evidence points to the intended interpretation of test scores for the proposed purpose" (Creswell, 2012, p. 159). ETS conducts validity research on all versions of the TOEFL to determine "how well the test tasks measure the important English-language skills required for academic success" (Educational Testing Service, 2018c). In terms of the TOEFL ITP, the intensive English program determines minimum scores for each level of placement and the university determines the minimum scores for admission to its own undergraduate or graduate program by IEP students. Since the TOEFL ITP is being administered as part of the regular IEP program, no special permission is needed to include the scores in this research.

The second instrument used in this study, a Pragmatic Listening Task (PLT), (Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008c), assessed student participants' ability to comprehend implied meaning. The instrument has participants listen to short dialogues between a male and female native English speaker followed by a yes/no question and has 60 total items: 2 practice items, 10 distracter items and 48 experimental items: 24 indirect opinion and 24 indirect refusals. The items used in the PLT were adapted from items in previous studies on the comprehension of conversational implicatures (Bouton, 1992, 1994; Hotgraves, 1999; Kotsonis, 1981; Roever 2005) (Taguchi, 2007, p. 322) and the test development yielded a reliable and valid instrument.

Taguchi (2007) ensured reliability of the instrument in several ways. First, each dialogue was kept to a mean of 44.8 words in length and the number of words

in each question was written with 6-7 words. All vocabulary in the items came from Longman's 2000-defining word list of common, frequent and basic English words. The PLT was also piloted with a group of native speakers whose scores were almost 100% accurate and much faster in their responses compared to the L2 learners. Finally, half of the indirect opinions items are written to illustrate negative opinions and half were written to imply positive opinions in order to prevent response bias (Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008c). "The internal consistency reliability of the PLT was estimated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding .85 for the full test (k=58), .72 for refusal items (k=24), and .71 for opinion items (k=24)" (Taguchi, 2008a, p. 46).

The scores from the PLT are valid for this research since the instrument includes a balance of interlocutor relationships (college friends, housemates, co-workers, teacher-student and family members) and situational settings (school, company, and home) (Taguchi, 2008b, p. 437) that an IEP student might encounter. Taguchi (2008) noted that in her study of the development of pragmatic comprehension of ESL and EFL learner groups the PLT was first administered to the ESL group two weeks after arrival to give the students time for orientation programming, placement exams, and time for adjustment to the university and local community (Taguchi, 2008c, p. 447).

The PLT was used by permission of the author. See Appendix C for a copy of the email allowing use of the instrument for this study and Appendix D for the PLT test items. The dialogues in the PLT were recorded by one female and one male native English speaker from the researcher's department. They were not familiar with the participants.

Two semi-structured one-on-one interviews were conducted by the researcher with each IEP student participant and host family participant at the beginning and at end of the study. The second interviews were based on questionnaires developed by Di Silvio et al. (2014) to measure language activities and host-student relationships in the homestay (Di Silvio et al., 2014, pp. 184–188). In their research on the effect of homestay placements on the perceptions and proficiency of learners of Spanish, Mandarin, and Russian, the authors administered surveys in English to 151 students and in the local language to 87 host family representatives (Di Silvio et al., 2014, p. 174). Reliability or validity data were not specified for this instrument. The questionnaires were used with permission from one of the co-authors, Margaret Malone. (See Appendix E for a copy of the email and Appendix F for the survey questions).

In the first interviews with the researcher students were asked about their previous English language study and any travel to the United States as well as their expectations of the homestay. The initial interviews with the host families discovered their previous hosting experiences and motivations for hosting an international student. At the end of the study, students and hosts were asked to describe language activities conducted at home and to describe the student-host family relationship. In addition, in the final interviews students were asked to assess any change in perception of their pragmatic comprehension and their overall confidence in English competence. Each interview took approximately 25 minutes. (Interview protocol for the student participants can be found in Appendix G and for the host families in Appendix H.)

Kinginger (2008) notes the importance of obtaining "systematic documentation of linguistic repertoires (p. 13) and so, in this study, the final type of data collected was

weekly dialogue journals, “writing journals in which students respond to instructor prompts and in turn initiate topics for further written discussion” (Dressler & Tweedie, 2016, p. 939). For example, the first journal prompt asked the participants to describe the host family and to identify which family member they interacted with the most. Each week the researcher responded to the participants’ posts and posed a follow-up question for discussion. Students were asked to describe incidents in the homestay when they had difficulty understanding the conversation. Participants were told that their journal entries could be in L1 or English and that the focus was on communication rather than correct writing; however, all entries were written in English. Despite the fact that data from journals "represent a participant's view of an event, not the event itself" (Friedman, 2012a, p. 190), the journal entries were a useful way to document participants’ interactions with the host family over time and offered an opportunity for participants to reflect on those experiences.

To create reliable and valid journal prompts for the IEP student participants, a total of twelve prompts were reviewed by a panel of TESOL and international education professionals to determine the five weekly prompts that were used in the study. When there was a difference of opinion between two reviewers, a third was used to select the most appropriate prompt, thereby assuring interrater reliability. The dialogue prompts can be found in Appendix I.

Data Collection Procedures

In this section, the researcher describes the step-by-step procedures that were followed to collect the data using the aforementioned instruments. Data collection took place in the researcher’s intensive English program from September 15 – December 5,

2018. To simplify data collection, a course entitled Homestay and Conversation Study was created in the learning management software Canvas by Instructure and all student participants were enrolled in the course.

The Pragmatic Listening Tests (PLT 1 and PLT 2) were uploaded to the Canvas course with a time limit of 60 minutes each and set up so that participants would be shown the correct answers immediately after each test item (k=56). Students completed PLT 1 online between September 29 – October 4, 2018 and PLT 2 between November 25 – 30. The post-test was a different form of the pre-test; that is, it included the same questions as in the pre-test but in a different order.

During the second week of the study, face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted by the researcher. These 20-minute interviews took place in the researcher's office on campus for the student participants and at the home of the majority of host families. Since the initial face-to-face interviews were administered a few weeks into the semester, all students already had some familiarity with the homestay environment and experience communicating with their host families. One host, Mrs. Clark., did not participate in the interviews, but responded to the initial interview questions in writing. Visits to the homes of the other host families provided the researcher with rich description of the environment in which the student was living.

The majority of the data collection took place online through the Canvas course. Each Sunday student participants were assigned a journal prompt for their response and reflection by the following Friday. Each journal assignment took about 20 minutes to complete. When appropriate, the researcher reacted to journal entries with follow up questions in order to elicit more details about the students' experiences.

Data Analysis

This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development?
2. What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures?

Data from the two interviews with the IEP student participants and their host families as well as the journal entries of the students informed the answers to Research Question 1. Although the results from the students' pre- and post-PLT formed the majority of the data to answer Question 2 regarding comprehension of conversational implicatures, the interviews and journal entries also provided valuable insight into the students' awareness of implicatures.

The researcher analyzed the quantitative and qualitative data separately. For the pre- and post- TOEFL and PLT, descriptive statistics were tabulated for the total score and subscores. Item Analysis and Student Analysis reports were run in Canvas for each quiz in the course. These reports were reviewed to analyze each PLT item by each participant and to examine the comprehension of each type of conversational implicature: indirect refusals and indirect opinions.

For the qualitative data analysis, an iterative procedure was used to develop a rich, detailed description of each participant and their homestay environment. To ensure valid interpretations of the participants' interview data, the researcher employed member checking "in which the researcher allows participants to read and comment upon the

researcher's interpretations, with these comments subsequently being incorporated into the final analysis" (Friedman, 2012b, p. 182).

NVivo 12, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), was used to transcribe the interviews and code emergent themes from the various types of data. An advantage of CAQDAS is that it provides the researcher with flexibility in data management, coding, and analysis while ensuring transparency to the process and the chains of evidence (Baralt, 2012, p. 228; Duff, 2008, p. 109).

Additional Information

Background of the researcher

After receiving her MA TESOL at Teachers College, Columbia University, the researcher spent two years as the English Teaching Fellow at the Centro Cultural Costarricense-Norteamericano in San Jose, Costa Rica where she taught all levels of courses to adults and children, developed course assessments, and mentored teachers. The researcher also taught in Shanghai, China, where she served as an Instructor of Technical English as part of the United Nations Development Program's English for Specific Purposes program.

In the United States, the researcher has taught in a variety of settings including refugee resettlement agencies, community colleges, technical universities, and corporate training. She received her Master of Business Administration from the Thunderbird Global School of Management where she further honed her intercultural communication skills.

The researcher has held instructor and administrative positions in university-based intensive English programs for over 17 years. During that time, she has worked closely

with the conditionally admitted student population and focused on the challenges these students face in the transition from English language students to fully matriculated degree-seeking students. In 2008, she co-presented a paper entitled "Helping Chinese Students Succeed as American Freshmen" at the TESOL International conference in New York. The researcher has also served on the CATESOL (California Teachers to Speakers of Other Languages organization) board as the Chair of the IEP Level, and as Secretary.

Her interests in second language socialization and the value of homestays are based on her own experience living with host families as a study abroad student in Paris and while working in Costa Rica.

Protection of Human Subjects

In preparation for carrying out this research involving human subjects, the researcher obtained approval from the USF Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS). Approval was also obtained from the institution where the research was conducted, the university and intensive English program where the researcher is the director.

Confidentiality was maintained by having all participants (students and host family informants) create pseudonyms to be used throughout the research. To ensure anonymity throughout the research, these fictional names were used in transcribing interviews, linking pre- and post-listening test results, and in writing up the case study. All data collected has been kept in a secure location during the research and will be destroyed after the report has been accepted by the researcher's university (Roberts, 2010, p. 35).

Prior to final selection, all prospective participants were fully informed about the research study before they consented to or opted out of participation. The informed consent document followed the requirements as stated in the IRBPHS Manual from the researcher's university (The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), University of San Francisco, 2014, p. 32).

Due to the researcher's administrative position within the participants' intensive English program, special assurance was made to the prospective participants that their decision to participate would have no impact on their individual academic outcomes, such as class schedules, grades, or university admission. Also, since the participants were persons "for whom English is not their primary language…all written correspondence, consent documents, and measurement instruments was provided to the subject in his or her preferred language (The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), University of San Francisco, 2014, p. 12). However, all participants chose to conduct the interviews and completed the journal entries in English.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Overview

This study aimed to assess the role of the homestay in the overall English language development of international students in an intensive English program. The research was guided by two central questions:

1. In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development?
2. What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures?

To explore these questions, a qualitative approach was used which allowed for rich descriptions and meaningful insights of four international students living in homestays and the four host families with whom they lived. Data from pre- and post-interviews with both students and hosts as well as five reflection journals written by the students generated emergent themes that helped answer the study's first research question. In addition, students took a Pragmatic Listening Test (Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008e) at the beginning and at the end of the research period to discover the answer to the second research question.

This chapter consists of four sections; the first will begin with profiles of the eight participants, four students and four representative members of each host family. The second section will provide the findings to Research Question 1 and describe the three

themes that emerged from the findings. The next section of this chapter will report on the findings of Research Question 2 and highlight the themes based on student performance on the pre- and post- PLT and student responses in interviews and journal entries. A final summary of the emergent themes from the study will conclude the chapter.

Participant Profiles

Student participants

Four students in the Fall 2018 term of the researcher's intensive English program participated in this research. Table 1 summarizes the data about the four student participants. All names of the students and the host families in this study are pseudonyms to protect their privacy.

Table 1

Profiles of the four IEP Student Participants

Student Pseudonyms	Age	Gender	Native Language	Program of Study	Level of English in IEP (2-8)	TOEFL ITP and (Listening Sub score) at 8/14/18
Alex	19	M	Chinese	Academic English	5	460 (55)
Holly	21	F	Japanese	Academic English	5	417 (46)
Nancy	21	F	Japanese	University Coursework	8	533 (NA)
Nicki	21	F	Japanese	Academic English	4/5	447 (45)

Alex, 19, was conditionally admitted to the university's BS Computer Science. Holly, Nancy and Nicki, all 21, were studying in the IEP as part of a semester-long study

abroad program from their Japanese university where they were majoring in international social sciences. All four participants had a similar background; they had studied English in school since they were young, but had only visited the United States for brief periods. All were given the TOEFL ITP during orientation in order to help determine placement in the eight levels of the IEP. None of the students had originally planned to live in a homestay.

Alex, 19, from southern China, attended the intensive English program in order to meet the English requirement for admission to the university's BS in Computer Science, an institutional TOEFL score of 550. His entry institutional TOEFL score was 460 with a high Listening subscore of 55. He placed in the intermediate level of the program, level 5 out of 8 possible class levels in his written communication, oral communication and reading classes. As an elective, Alex chose to take a course in TOEFL Listening and Speaking to further prepare for the TOEFL. Alex had studied English in China since he was an elementary student and visited the United States once while in high school as part of a month-long class trip.

Holly had studied English formally since she was in elementary school, and had additional English practice in a cram school as a youngster. Like Alex, she placed in Level 5 based on her initial TOEFL score of 417, and her goal was to improve her English skills so she could excel in her English-medium international social sciences classes at her home university in Japan.

Similarly, Nancy had studied English in her junior high and high schools and now in university, but had reached a high enough level of English proficiency that she was able to take university courses without any English language support. Nancy took courses

in Women's Studies, Advertising, Environmental Economics, and Global Studies at the host university.

Prior to studying English in junior high school in Japan, Nicki had private lessons in English with a native speaker. According to Nicki, her mother speaks English well. Her previous visit to the United States was a vacation to Hawaii where her mother did most of the speaking in English. Like Holly, Nicki's reason for attending the IEP to improve her English skills so she could excel in her international social sciences major at her home university.

Host family participants

All of the host families were matched with the students through the same local homestay placement agency, Homestay International (a pseudonym). According to the agency's webpage, hosts are trained, background checked, and homes are visited annually. All hosts' homes are located no farther than 60 minutes by public transportation from the university campus (https://www.isphomestays.com/hosts, 2019). In a training video for hosts, the placement agency recommends that hosts provide written house rules since "students' written communication will be stronger than oral communication" ("International Student Placements," 2016). Other than that, hosts receive no specific training in English language teaching or resources in second language learning. According to the Director of Homestay International, "the majority of our students have a strong basic command of the English language so we don't get into too much host training regarding communication skills with their students" (J. Ikeda, personal communication, January 16, 2019). A description of each host family can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Host Family Participants

Student Pseudonyms	Host Pseudonyms	Occupation	Other Members of Household	Languages Spoken at Home
Alex	Mrs. Clark	Social worker	Mrs. Clark's sister	English, Spanish
Holly	Mrs. Rodgers	Homemaker	Mrs. Rodgers' 21-year old daughter, Coco	English, Japanese, Spanish
Nancy	Mr. Mason	Retired	Mrs. Mason and a female lodger from the Ukraine	English, Tagalog, Ukrainian
Nicki	Mrs. Allen	Nurse Manager	Mr. Allen and Mrs. Allen's father	English, Tamil

Alex lived in the Clark household with Mrs. Clark and her sister. Mrs. Clark was a first-time host mother who spoke English and Spanish. The researcher was not able to interview her in person or visit her home, but she did respond in writing to the pre-interview. Her biggest motivations for deciding to be a host were to spend time with a student from another culture, especially to "learn the norms, habits and educational goals of a student from another culture" and to have additional company at home (Mrs. Clark, pre-interview, September 2018). Mrs. Clark worked far from home, and Alex indicated that he didn't have much time to interact with her during the week (Alex, post interview, November 30, 2018). He characterized their relationship as friendly, though, because Mrs. Clark took Alex to a baseball game and to San Francisco early in the term.

Holly lived with Mrs. Rodgers and her 21-year-old daughter, Coco. Mrs. Rodgers estimated that in the past she had hosted about 20 students, mostly Japanese in month-long programs, rather than for a full semester. A native speaker of Japanese, Mrs. Rodgers felt that her experience living with a host family when she first arrived from

Japan 25 years ago and her knowledge of how English is taught in Japan were critical to her ability to help Japanese students (Mrs. Rodgers, pre-interview, September 30, 2018). Mrs. Rodgers was married to an American who lived in another city with their adopted son, a native Spanish speaker, so theirs was a trilingual household when everyone was together during holidays. Holly was able to spend time with Mr. Rodgers and their son during the Thanksgiving holiday. Mrs. Rodgers lived in the Japanese neighborhood of the city and maintained a traditional Japanese home.

Nancy lived with the Mason family, Mr. and Mrs. Mason and a female boarder who was a previous student in the IEP and a graduate from the university. Mr. Mason was retired and referred to himself as Mr. Mom since he spent most of his time at home. He had been a host to short-term and long-term students since 2013. He felt that he was perfectly suited to be a host because of some "built in factors." Mr. Mason said, "I got my bachelor's master's in English OK, and linguistics was my absolute favorite part of majoring in English. It changed the way I looked at the entire world" (Mr. Mason, pre-interview, October 9, 2018). In addition, when he first got married he helped his wife, a native speaker of Tagalog, with English; "I picked up a lot of skills and so did she before we got our first students" (Mr. Mason, pre-interview, October 9, 2018). The Masons had two college-aged daughters away at college.

Mrs. Allen, Nicki's host mother, was referred to the homestay placement agency by a co-worker who had been hosting students for the past seven years. The household included Mrs. Allen, a nurse manager; Mr. Allen, a security guard; and Mrs. Allen's father, all native speakers of Tamil; Mrs. Allen's father spoke little English and was at home all day. They also had an 18-year old daughter, Gabriella, who attended university

in Chicago with whom Nicki spent about two weeks before Gabriella left for school and then again at Thanksgiving. Mrs. Allen thought that her daughter and Nicki "really bonded" during those times. (Mrs. Allen, pre-interview, September 19, 2018). Indeed, prominently displayed in the home was a framed picture of Gabriella dressed in a Japanese kimono next to Nicki, both smiling broadly. Mrs. Allen noted that her interest in hosting was to help a student learn English as well as to have additional company at home (Mrs. Allen, pre-interview, September 19, 2018). In terms of training, she noted that she had received no formal training from Homestay International, but had gotten tips from the friend who had referred her as a host.

In conclusion, two of the families in the study, the Allens and Mrs. Clark, had no previous hosting experience; Mrs. Rodgers and the Masons had extensive experience. All but one of the families had college-aged daughters who spent some time with the international students at some point during the study.

Research Question 1: In what ways do IEP students and their host families understand the role of homestays as part of their English language development?

To answer this question, the student participants were asked in the post-interview and in their journal entries to describe in what ways living in a homestay had improved their English. Hosts were asked in pre- and post- interviews about their experience with the students' language learning process.

Expectations of homestay experience

All of the students in this study had originally planned to live in the dormitory on campus, but when no spaces were available, they chose to live in a homestay instead. The students had no preconceived expectations of the experience of living with an

American family; however, they quickly learned that the environment might be beneficial for them in a variety of ways. For Alex, the homestay provided access to information outside of the classroom. He said, “At first I think about a place you have to live but then I think, no, my host treat me very well so it's not bad. I can I get information from them. So I don't have to ask anything to my teacher to get information” (Alex, pre-interview, September 19, 2018). Nancy wanted to know more about American culture and the cultures of the other international boarder in her house (Nancy, pre-interview, September 20, 2018), and Nicki thought that she would have more free time living in a homestay than in the dorm; “I want to have free time to spend time”(Nicki, pre-interview, September 17, 2018). Only Holly noted the advantage of learning informal English; “…when I study English I will use textbook, but native speaker don't speak like formal English so I can learn more casual English” (Holly, pre-interview, September 21, 2018). In conclusion, although homestay was not their first choice of accommodation, at the time of the first interview, the research participants were aware of some non-language benefits of living in a homestay. Only one acknowledged that the homestay might have a positive effect on her English language development.

The post-interview with the students included questions related to the students’ perception of the host family’s help in improving their English skills and their satisfaction with the amount of English they learned. Their responses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Students' Perceptions of Host Family

Statement	Alex	Holly	Nancy	Nicki
I am glad I lived with a host family	3	5	5+	4
I felt like a member of the family	3	5	5+	5
My host family helped me improve my English skills	3	5	5+	4
I would recommend living with a host family to other students.	4	5	4	5
I learned as much English as I thought I would.	3	4	5+	4

Alex was ambivalent about the amount of English he learned from his host family, probably because he was focused on passing the TOEFL and being admitted into the university the following semester. He said "I did learn something from talk to my host, but it's just not academic, so it's not that much (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). In the final interview, Alex also mentioned that he would have liked to live with other international students, "…sometimes I would think it's better to live with my classmates; then we can share the in-class information and we can talk about the project and work like that. It's better because it's just about in class for me" (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). Alex believed that the casual conversational English he was exposed to when speaking with Mrs. Clark was not the academic English he needed to master for the university. As mentioned earlier, Mrs. Clark's major motivation to host

a student was to learn about another culture, not to help with English language. At the start of the study, Alex did not have high expectations of the how the homestay environment could help him improve his English and those expectations were met at the conclusion of the term.

Unlike Alex, the Japanese students, whose participation in the IEP was part of a mandatory study abroad program from their home university, were not worried about meeting a certain level of proficiency. As a result, they felt much more positive about the amount of English they learned from the host family. Nancy especially felt that her host family had helped her improve her English because she had a great deal of access to her host father. She noted, "My host dad always in the home so I can use English in the house every day every time" (Nancy, post-interview, December 5, 2018). Nicki was satisfied with the amount of English she learned in the homestay. She noted that it was "because in Japan I can't learn some synonym--just one word I know so but the other, for example idiom in native language here I can learn, for example 'I'm on a roll' and 'don't beat around the bush' (Nicki, post-interview, December 4, 2018). Holly believed that she had learned a lot especially from her host sister who was similar in age, and the ability to overhear and understand conversations between her host mother and her daughter. Holly told the researcher, "And sometimes my mother and daughter is fighting, but I can listen!" (Holly, post interview, November 29, 2018). The students' experiences can be summarized by this emerging theme: Students who were open to the possibility of learning different aspects of English while living in a homestay were satisfied with the degree to which their language had improved.

Importance of language-related communication

Conversations between students and hosts about different aspects of English and strategies for language learning were of critical importance to students' perceptions of their language improvement. The next section will highlight specific areas noticed and remarked upon by the hosts and their students regarding their English conversation skill and sociopragmatic development. These comments were collected from the journal entries and the post-interview. It should be noted that the linguistic accommodation strategies of the hosts may have been unconscious and were likely intended to be helpful on the part of the host whether they were received as such by the students.

Asking for Clarification

Alex noted how Mrs. Clark would ask him for clarification when she didn't understand him. Alex said "it's not like to correct you directly, it's like to ask you some question, like 'do you mean' and 'what did you just say?" (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). This strategy may also have provided Alex with model language that he could use when he didn't understand other people's conversations. However, this strategy was not always easy to employ by other students. For example, Nancy stated,

> When my family talks to me, I will ask like "what does it mean?" or "I can't understand the meaning of something" so I always understand what they supposed to say after asking. But when we (host mom, host dad, and one woman who is staying with me) discuss something, I don't say anything, I mean if I can't understand something, I don't ask them because I don't want to interrupt their conversation. I want to understand what they are talking

> about completely, but it is impossible because it requires me a lot of energy (Nancy, Journal 3, October 21, 2018).

Not knowing the appropriate ways to interrupt a conversation, Nancy had trouble asking for clarification. Nicki had similar difficulties: "I can't quit between their dialogues and ask some questions for them" (Nicki, Journal 3, October 21, 2018).

Comprehension of Different English Accents

One area that Nicki especially experienced was the difficulty in understanding the Tamil English of her host family from India. She reported:

> It is difficult for me to understand their mother language's intonation, so when my host mother talks with her father or her friends, I didn't understand switch between their mother language and English on the daily conversation. For example, when my host grandfather and my birthday party, my host mother invited their friends. Sometimes, they asked me about Japan, but I didn't understand who they want to ask because they almost talked Indian each other, so I was confused whether I should answer to them. As a result, I responded to their questions as possible, but at that time, I felt lonely (Nicki, Journal 3, October 27, 2018).

Although Nicki was aware of the family's code switching, it was still a deterrent to her language socialization and negatively impacted her confidence.

Conversely, to ensure that others could understand the students' non-native English, Mr. Mason advised Nancy to maintain her Japanese accent. He noted that "if you have an accent, people have to work harder to listen to you. And if you just sound

like everybody else, people can turn you off" (Mr. Mason, pre-interview, September 20, 2018).

Comprehension of speaker based on rate of speed

The rate of speed of the speaker was another aspect of linguistic accommodation by their host families that all students noticed. Alex said, **"**When my host talks to me, she always slows down the speed of speech, but she speaks fast to the native people." (Alex, Journal 2, October 14, 2018). Alex stated that it was easier to understand the faster speech of others' conversations at the end of the study, but that his host mother continued to speak to him with a slower speed throughout the term (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018).

Holly noted the difference in speed of conversation between her host mother and host daughter:

> I think the host mother will speak to me naturally, I mean almost the same way to other people. On the other hand, host daughter spoke to me more slowly, because I was hard to listen English first. However, now she speaks to me almost same speed when she speaks to others (Holly, Journal 5, November 15, 2018).

Nancy reported that the host family usually spoke to her in a natural speed of English. She had the most advanced level of English of the four study participants and her hosts were the most experienced. She said, "the first time I was a little... like... it was difficult for me to catch up the words. Now it was so helpful to improve my listening skills" (Nancy, Journal 5, November 12, 2018). Nancy realized that hearing authentic English spoken at a natural speed was a key to increased comprehension of conversations.

Comprehension of vocabulary, slang and idioms

Not surprisingly, the students reported that their comprehension of vocabulary and especially slang and idioms was of primary importance to their ability to understand conversations with the host family. It's also likely one of the most tangible linguistic features that students could address in this study since they would have had already developed strategies for vocabulary acquisition in their English classes prior to the homestay. Alex and Nicki, for example, were comfortable looking up unfamiliar words or expressions. Alex said "if I have something confused I will do some research on the internet or just ask a question, because the main reason why I can't understand is lack of vocabulary" (Alex, Journal 3, November 8, 2018). Nicki used a dictionary when she wasn't able to ask directly about unknown vocabulary. She said "if I didn't understand the word, I could ask [my host mom] to 'please repeat again,' or 'could you explain this meaning?' However, if I had missed the opportunity, I would have looked up using dictionaries" (Nicki, Journal 2, October 21, 2018).

Nancy noticed how overhearing conversations in the home helped identify words that she could then look up. For example, she described an incident when her host mom was "talking about the laundry and she said shrink, shrink a lot. I didn't know the words but I could search and I know the words" (Nancy, post-interview, December 5, 2018). Overhearing conversations also helped Nancy to develop her comprehension and use of common expressions. She said:

> I am not only talking with them but also listening to their conversation most of the day, so I can copy the phrases or words that they usually use. For example, "gotcha", "see?", "it is!", "I guess so", "feeling like~" and so on. I couldn't learn

these phrases at school. This is the best part of staying with a host family. I can learn English that I need to live here (Nancy, Journal 5, November 4, 2018).

Nancy's host father, Mr. Mason, also noted the importance of learning vocabulary and especially slang: "Once we see and hear our students picking up and using American slang, especially the slang for their age group, we feel our student has achieved a lot towards their future use and understanding of American English" (Mr. Mason, post-interview, January 7, 2019). In conclusion, the students' ability to notice and articulate certain pragmatic features proved important to their language socialization and consequently their satisfaction with their homestay experience. Observing how the hosts asked the students for clarification allowed the students to use that strategy consequently on their own. These experiences can be summarized by the following emerging theme: the quality of language-related communication between host and student positively impacts the student's satisfaction with their degree of English acquisition.

Importance of a diverse homestay environment

The third theme that emerged from the study is the importance of a diverse homestay environment for the students' development of pragmatic comprehension. Reflecting the multicultural composition of the metropolitan area in which the research took place, all of the host families included non-native English speakers. Mrs. Mason, Mrs. Allen, and Mrs. Rodgers had all experienced learning English themselves and so were empathetic to their students' challenges and expressed a desire to help their students improve, although the hosts may not always have known how best to help the students.

Another aspect of a diverse homestay environment is the size and composition of the family. Alex estimated that he spent only 30 minutes per day with his host mother

and remarked: "…my host is busy so sometimes, most of the time, I spent by myself" (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). Alex lived with his host mom and her sister so when they were busy, there weren't many opportunities for conversation or other interaction with English speakers in the home. The other three student participants lived with families that were larger and multigenerational allowing for more contact time and for different kinds of conversation with different members of the family. Nicki's host grandfather was in the house most of the time. They also had a college-aged daughter who was at home at the beginning of the semester and later on holiday. Holly lived with her two generations in her home, her host mother who didn't work outside the home and her daughter who had a part-time job. Nancy lived with Mr. and Mrs. Mason and a young boarder. Another benefit of host families with a larger number of family members is that it provides opportunities for student participants to overhear others' conversations in a safe environment and notice different intonation, vocabulary, and expressions they may not have been aware of when being spoken to directly. Furthermore, as the students became more acclimated to the language patterns, different varieties of global English, and vocabulary used by the family, the more they were able to comprehend and participate in family conversations, resulting in greater satisfaction with the homestay environment. Therefore, the third theme that emerged from the study is that a diverse homestay environment allows for greater comprehension of conversations.

Research Question 2: What are IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicature?

The second research question was designed to ascertain the IEP students' in homestays awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures. The findings are described in this section. The first part of this section will focus on students' awareness of implicatures in general and the two types implicature: indirect refusal and indirect opinions examined in this study. The second part will examine the students' comprehension of implicatures based on an analysis of the pre- and post-PLT.

Awareness of conversational implicatures

At the start of the study**,** student participants were told only that the research was about the impact of living in a homestay on the comprehension of everyday conversations in English. When the PLT was set up in the learning management system, Canvas, it was configured so that after each question, correct answers were shown to students. It is not known if students noticed the correct answers and if that impacted their further answers. To determine post-test awareness, the researcher looked at responses to the post-interview and journal entries.

In discussing the concept of comprehension of direct and indirect speech, Alex said that it was "not that difficult to understand because my mother is kind of direct people so she always express what she wants" (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). Regarding the occurrence of the two types of implicatures in English, Alex noted that indirect refusals were easy to understand "because it's not only American. I think it's everywhere" including in Chinese (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). Holly

agreed that indirect refusals were easier to understand because they were also commonly used in Japanese. She said "if I said directly, the person will be sad kind of Japanese" (Holly, post-interview, November 29, 2018). However, in terms of comprehending indirect opinion, Holly was aware of the difficulty. She admitted "I can't understand which if its better meaning or bad meaning. It depends on the tone or something or facial expression" (Holly, post-interview, November 29, 2018). At the end of the study, Nancy felt that she could understand indirect statements of both kinds better than at the beginning; she noted that Japanese sometimes use indirect opinion, so she was aware of conversational implicatures in her native language.

Comprehension of conversational implicatures

To answer this part of the research question, the researcher analyzed the performance on the Pragmatic Listening Test (PLT) (Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008e) by comparing scores on the pre- and post- tests as well as performance on the two different types of implicatures: indirect refusal and indirect opinion. Students completed the PLT #1 from September 29 - October 13, 2018 through Canvas. The PLT #2 was completed approximately eight weeks later from November 25 - 30, 2018. Table 4 summarizes the scores for PLT #1 and PLT #2.

Table 4

PLT Scores by Student

Student	Level in IEP (200-800)	Total Correct PLT#1 (k=56)	Total Score PLT#1	Total Correct PLT #2 (k=56)	Total Score PLT#2
Alex	500	53	95%	53	95%
Holly	500	45	80%	49	88%
Nancy	800	53	95%	51	91%
Nicki	400	50	89%	47	84%

Because there were only four student participants in this study, the analysis is descriptive and not statistically significant. With a short time frame of eight weeks between PLT #1 and PLT #2, it is not surprising that only one student participant, Holly, scored higher on the second test. However, the findings are consistent with the literature in two ways. First, the students who placed in the lower levels of the IEP, Nicki and Holly, had overall lower scores on both PLTs than students with higher proficiency (Alex and Nancy). These results are in line with Cook and Liddicoat (2002), Garcia (2004), and Roever (2006). Second, similar to the findings Taguchi reported in her 2008 research, the comprehension of indirect refusals was found to be significantly higher than of indirect opinions (Taguchi, 2008c). In this study, the participants of all levels of the IEP were able to comprehend indirect refusals better than indirect opinions. Table 5 summarizes the students' scores on the PLT based on type of implicature.

Table 5

Student PLT Scores by Type of Implicature

Student	Total Correct PLT#1	Indirect Refusals Incorrect	Indirect Opinion Incorrect	Total Correct PLT #2	Indirect Refusals Incorrect	Indirect Opinion Incorrect
Alex	53	1	0	53	0	3
Holly	45	4	6	49	0	1
Nancy	53	0	4	51	1	5
Nicki	50	2	5	47	0	8

Conclusion

Four IEP students and four host families participated in this study to answer two research questions. The first was to discover the ways in which each group understood

the role a homestay could play in a student's English language development. The second research question was to determine the students' awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures.

The four student participants were studying in the researcher's IEP during Fall 2018. All lived with host families from the same placement agency and all host families were multilingual and multicultural, reflecting the city in which the IEP was located. Alex was from China and intended to improve his English proficiency test score in order to matriculate to the host university. The other three participants, Holly, Nancy, and Nicki, were studying in the IEP as part of a mandatory study abroad semester from their university in Japan. Their goal was to improve their English to perform better in the English-medium courses in their home university.

Holly and Nancy lived with host families that had many years of experience hosting international students, especially from Japan, and had non-native speakers of English in the home who had personal experience learning English. In contrast, Alex and Nicki stayed with host families with no previous experience as hosts. The students identified a number of sociopragmatic elements that occurred during their homestays that impacted their English language development such as the comprehending different rates of speaking, asking for clarification, the importance of overhearing conversations of others, strategies for learning vocabulary, and error correction. Those students (Holly, Nancy and Nicki) who lived with diverse linguistic and multigenerational families expressed more satisfaction with the amount of English learned during their stay. Those students, such as Alex, who lived with smaller families lacked the opportunities for extended and varied interaction were less satisfied with the homestay experience.

Although students were unaware of conversational implicatures at the start of the study, the research showed that their comprehension of both types of conversational implicatures—indirect refusals and indirect opinion—was consistent with the research literature in two ways. First, the lower level students (Holly and Nicki) had overall lower scores on the PLT than higher level students (Alex and Nancy) and second, all four students were able to understand indirect refusals more easily than indirect opinion type implicatures.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

This chapter is comprised of five sections. The first will summarize the findings of the study for each of the research questions, and then the chapter will discuss the results with respect to previous studies in the field. The next section will explain the conclusions drawn from the findings. The fourth section of this chapter will describe the implications that the research suggests for practice in an intensive English program and for training future host families preparing to welcome IEP students into their homes. Finally, the chapter concludes with recommendations for future research into the role of homestays on the English language development of IEP students.

Summary of Findings

This case study investigated four international students in a university-based intensive English program (Alex, Holly, Nancy, and Nicki) and one member of the host family with whom they lived for the period of one academic term (Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Rogers, Mr. Mason, and Mrs. Allen, respectively). The purpose of the study was two-fold: first, to determine the ways in which the IEP students and their host families understood the role of the homestay in the students' English development and second, to assess IEP students' awareness and comprehension of conversational implicatures.

Findings from Research Question One

The findings from research question one produced three noteworthy themes: a) students who were receptive to learning different aspects of English while living in a homestay were satisfied with the degree to which their language had improved, b) the quality of language-related communication between host and student positively impacts the student's satisfaction with their degree of English acquisition and c) a diverse homestay environment allows for greater interlanguage pragmatic gains.

This study focused primarily on students' listening comprehension, specifically the understanding of sociopragmatic utterances in conversation, but gains in speaking were also noted. The research found none of the four participants had originally planned to live in a homestay, so they had no preconceived ideas about how the experience might help their English; however, Alex, Holly, Nancy, and Nicki reported that their overall English proficiency and listening and speaking skills had improved from the beginning of the study. Moreover, Alex, Holly, Nancy, and Nicki reported an increase in confidence in their ability to use those skills. However, students' initial impressions of the amount of English they could learn in the homestay may have influenced their overall satisfaction with the homestay environment. For example, Alex was disappointed that his host mother was not using academic English because he was focused on meeting the TOEFL requirement for entry into the university. On the other hand, Holly was happy to hear the informal English used by her family because that was not what she had learned in school back in Japan.

The findings also show that the greater the quality of language-related communication in the homestay, the more satisfied the students were with the amount of

English language learned. Language-related communication refers to explicit discussion by host and student about linguistic strategies such as asking for clarification, error correction, or learning vocabulary. For Alex, his moderate satisfaction with the homestay experience was influenced by his need to reach the required English proficiency score and be admitted to the Computer Science degree program at the university. He characterized his conversations with his host mother this way: "we usually talk and it's not academic practice, but it's very useful" (Alex, post-interview, November 30, 2018). At the other end of the spectrum, Nancy was extremely satisfied with the amount of English that she learned in her homestay. She noted that Mr. Mason helped with her essays and gave her advice about her accent. In Holly's case, her host daughter was very interested in Japanese culture and so they could exchange current expressions and slang. However, students also reported on other valuable conversational strategies that they wished they had learned from their hosts. For example, while Nancy and Nicki both noted that even though they could easily ask for clarification when speaking directly with one other person, they expressed disappointment with their ability to interrupt a group conversation to ask for clarification. As Nicki said "I can't quit between their dialogues and ask some questions for them" (Nicki, Journal 3, October 21, 2018). These examples show that explicit discussion of linguistic strategies was an area that students found helpful in their language development and when missing, impeded communication and may have caused pragmatic failure.

The third theme that emerged from the study is that the composition of the host family is critical to IEP students' pragmatic development and satisfaction with the homestay experience. In this study, three of the four host families could be described as

diverse. In the Rogers home where Holly lived, the host mother was a native speaker of Japanese, her 21-year old daughter spoke English and their adopted son who sometimes visited spoke Spanish. Nancy lived with Mr. Mason, a native speaker of English, his wife whose first language was Tagalog, and a Ukrainian boarder. In the Allen home, Tamil was the first language and Mrs. Allen's father spoke little English. These families were large, multigenerational, multilingual, and multicultural allowing the students to have more direct and indirect exposure to English conversations and more opportunities to engage in a variety of conversation styles with different members of the family. Furthermore, all three host families were comprised of non-native English speakers who could share their experiences and learning strategies.

Findings from Research Question Two

Comprehension of both types of conversational implicatures—indirect refusals and indirect opinion—was measured by a Pragmatic Listening Test (PLT) (Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008c) administered pre- and post-study on the university's Learning Management System. The PLT consisted of both types of implicatures, distractors, and filler items. None of the students showed significant improvement in their comprehension of either type of implicature. Of the four participants, Holly and Nicki, the two students with lower English proficiency and placed in lower levels of the IEP had overall lower scores on the PLT than Alex and Nancy. All students were able to understand indirect refusals more easily than indirect opinion type implicatures in part because of the existence of indirect refusals in both Japanese and Chinese.

Discussion

In general, the findings from this case study support the literature on second language learning in homestay and on pragmatic comprehension of implicatures. Previous study abroad literature notes that the amount of time spent with the host family has a significant impact on language development and satisfaction with the homestay (Di Silvio et al., 2014; Kinginger, 2008; Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010; Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Shiri, 2015a). While participants were not asked about the number of hours a day they spent together as part of the research, the findings show that Holly, Nancy, and Nicki who had more interaction with the host families than Alex expressed greater overall satisfaction with the homestay experience and the amount their language skills had improved.

Although proficiency was not measured by TOEFL at the end of the study, during the pre- and post-interviews participants were asked to rate their perceived level of proficiency in English overall and in each of the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Consistent with the literature comparing study abroad students living in homestays with those in other housing environments (Kinginger, 2008; Martin, 1980; Shiri, 2015), in this case study Alex, Holly, Nancy and Nicki reported their proficiency level improved overall and in the skills of Listening, Speaking and Reading. That all four students perceived the most improvement in Writing, rather than Listening or Speaking, may lend credence to the counterintuitive finding of Rivers (1998) that homestays have less effect on oral and aural skills than other skills (p. 496).

One of the most important findings of the study was that diverse, multigenerational families provide greater opportunities for language socialization and

interlanguage pragmatic development. This fully supports the research of Hashimoto (1993) and Shiri (2015) who found that hosts with extended families allowed students to expand their social networks and interact with different age groups (Hashimoto, 1993, p. 223; Shiri, 2015, p. 16). Unlike Alex, Holly and Nancy benefitted from living with other similar-aged people in the home, and Nicki had the opportunity to interact daily with her host mother, father, and grandfather, and sister when she visited from college. This shows that while the availability of a host for interaction is important, the quality of the engagement is improved when students are given the opportunity to communicate with extended families or friends.

Although students were unaware of conversational implicatures at the start of the study, they scored fairly well on both pre- and post- tests and showed little improvement on the second PLT. This study showed that their comprehension of both types of conversational implicatures as measured by the PLT was consistent with the literature. First, the lower level students (Holly and Nicki) had overall lower scores on both the pre- and post-PLT than did Alex and Nancy who were in higher levels of the IEP. These findings support previous research that demonstrated the strong effect of proficiency on comprehension of implicature (Garcia, 2004; Roever, 2006; Taguchi, 2007, 2008a, 2008c, 2011c).

Second, similar to the findings Taguchi reported in her 2008 research, the comprehension of indirect refusals was found to be higher than of indirect opinions (Taguchi, 2008c). In this study, Alex, Holly, Nicki, and Nancy were able to understand indirect refusal implicatures more easily than the indirect opinion type. However, due to

the small number of participants in this case study, the results cannot be considered significant.

Conclusions

IEP students living in a homestay can develop their English proficiency, pragmatic competence, linguistic confidence and cultural awareness within the short period of time that they are studying in the IEP. For this setting to be successful, however, all stakeholders (student, host, homestay provider, and IEP) need to be actively involved in the language learning process. From this case study, four main conclusions can be drawn about the role of homestays in the development of pragmatic comprehension of IEP students. These conclusions are supported by the existing literature in the field and build on the theories of Legitimate Peripheral Participation, Language Socialization, and the Noticing Hypothesis.

First, students who actively participated with the host family were satisfied with the homestay experience and the amount of their English improvement. This reinforces the theory of Legitimate Peripheral Participation where students are viewed as active participants in a community of practice and learn by doing. Nicki, for example, moved from peripheral to full participation as she spent more and more time with her host grandfather and helped him with his English. By participating in daily activities with the families, Holly and Nancy gained sociocultural knowledge and learned appropriate linguistic conventions, as part of the language socialization process as described by Duff, (2007) and Shively (2011). Since language socialization most often happens implicitly, Nicki, Nancy, and Holly were prepared to learn in a different way from the explicit teaching of the IEP classroom.

Second, when asked to reflect on their language development in the homestay, the student participants emphasized the importance of observing the conversations of others in the home. Holly, Nancy, and Nicki were able to pay attention to linguistic forms, such as vocabulary or tone of voice, and use the context to derive meaning supporting Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990a, 1990c, 2010). It is hard to know if the four student participants would have been able to reflect as much without the structure of the study's interviews or journal assignments. However, the participants were able to articulate many examples of sociopragmatic features that they noticed while listening to others in the home. For example, Alex and Nancy were cognizant of the slower speed that speakers would address them with compared to how those people spoke to others. Furthermore, Nancy, Nicki, and Holly noticed how they were able to understand vocabulary from context by listening in on conversations.

The third conclusion is that the most effective hosts are those with dedicated time to spend with the student. For example, in the Mason family, Mr. Mason was retired and spent much of his time at home so Nancy had many opportunities for conversation. For optimal language learning, the host family should include a variety of people with whom the student can converse. Multilingual, extended families and hosts that entertain friends at home, such as the Allen family, provide the student with opportunities to hear different styles of English (such as both formal and informal, and slang). Hosts with English as second language learning background (ESL), such as Mrs. Rogers, could empathize with Holly and share learning strategies from her own experience.

Finally, the study concluded that both experienced and first-time hosts would have liked more training to help their students improve their language skills. Mr. Mason

was the most experienced of the four hosts and, as noted earlier, was cognizant of sociopragmatic incidents that demonstrated Nancy's oral language skill growth. From the point of view of the other hosts, Mrs. Rodgers was interested in learning more about teaching pronunciation (Mrs. Rodgers, post-interview, November 29, 2018). Mrs. Allen also wanted to know more specifics about Nicki's IEP classes so she could help more (Mrs. Allen, post-interview, December 4, 2018).

Implications for Practice

The homestay can provide an effective learning environment for IEP students when there is collaboration from the homestay placement agency, the hosts, the IEP and the student. Acknowledging that IEP students' needs for a linguistically-rich environment might be different from other study abroad participants whose purpose is cultural immersion, the homestay placement agency should seek to match IEP students with hosts who are motivated to help with language learning. As discovered in this study, the ideal host family of an IEP student would include multilingual speakers, multigenerational family members, and a host who has the time and willingness to work with students on language-related communication. In addition, as suggested in Shiri's 2015 study, the homestay placement agency should solicit feedback on a regular basis from the hosts on the IEP student's experience to ensure continued satisfaction with the home and family throughout the student's stay (Shiri, 2015, p. 12).

Comprehensive cultural and linguistic training is recommended for both hosts and students prior to arrival. In this study, the only training for the host families was provided by the homestay placement agency in a short video (International Student Placements, 2016) with little mention of conversation strategies or intercultural

communication. In the future, this training could be administered jointly with the IEP and the homestay placement agency and include materials such as the NAFSA guide for host families (Kurker-Stewart, 2016).

The focus of the training would be on facilitating conversation in order to avoid pragmatic failure. Host families would learn some common aspects of SLA and be aware of certain unintentional linguistic accommodations, such as speaking at a slower pace, using foreigner talk, or not providing corrective feedback on sociopragmatic issues, so that they could provide meaningful feedback to students. This would also allow non-native speaking hosts, such Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Rogers, to better interpret their anecdotal experiences as language learners and become meaningful masters in the community of practice of the family.

The training could also provide hosts with strategies for having an explicit discussion about the student's desire for error correction, which types of errors to correct and how frequently. Nancy noted that she would have liked more correction in grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary (Nancy, post-interview, December 5, 2018). A discussion about error correction would accomplish two objectives: first, this would reiterate to the student that improving their English is an important aspect of their homestay experience and second, it would allow the student to consciously reflect on error correction: how it is done in general conversation with the host family and compare that with the methods employed in the classroom.

Another possible area to be included in the host family training would be a discussion of the role of verbal communication in American hospitality and typical conversation patterns (Kobayashi & Viswat, 2015, p. 479). From her perspective as a

host and as a native speaker of Japanese, Mrs. Allen noted that Japanese students are often reserved, so hosts should know how to draw them out in discussion (Mrs. Allen, post-interview, November 29, 2018). Pryde (2014) suggests providing hosts with examples of simple conversations and discussing avenues for further expansion (p. 501). In Kobayashi and Viswat's (2015) study, the authors found that the Japanese students' reticence for sharing opinions and reluctance to initiate discussions discouraged the American hosts from pursuing longer conversations (p. 479). By introducing a relational approach in the training, hosts could better understand different cultural interpretations and find options for resolving the intercultural misunderstanding through conversation (p. 485).

The implications for practice in the IEP are two-fold. First, the IEP curriculum needs to ensure that pragmatics is taught for productive and receptive skills. This added curriculum need not be lengthy. As Bouton (1994) noted, improvements in pragmatic comprehension of certain types of implicatures can be found after a minimum of six hours of instruction (p. 105). Since few IEP texts currently provide authentic examples of pragmatics in context (Bardovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2015), instructors could solicit examples of conversations from students living in homestays for examination in class. Out-of-class assignments for students to interact with native speakers have shown to enhance students' awareness of pragmatics in study abroad and could also do so for the IEP.

With respect to the instruction of pragmatic comprehension of implicatures, the curriculum should focus on the indirect opinion type of implicature which is less often found in other languages and is commonly used to express sarcasm in English.

Second, the IEP needs to provide continuous support for the students living in homestays from predeparture throughout their stay to ensure language development is an integral part of the experience. During the orientation, the IEP could provide an overview of the homestay experience to prepare students for the opportunities for language and cultural gains and manage expectations about culture shock. Materials such as the NAFSA publication for international students (Swift, 2016) could be distributed before arrival. An important aspect of the student orientation would be a discussion of learner agency and the ways in which students need to actively participate in host family interactions to maximize their language development and satisfaction with the experience. Furthermore, on-going emotional and pedagogical support for students living in homestays would allow the IEP to gauge satisfaction with the environment throughout the stay and address any issues quickly. As more students have positive experiences and see how the setting can assist in their pragmatic comprehension, word-of-mouth interest in homestays would grow.

Recommendations for Future Research

This case study investigated a small sample of students' and host families' perceptions of the role of living in a homestay on the IEP student's language; future qualitative research could compare IEP students experience living in homestays with different housing environments, such as dormitory, International House, or living with co-nationals. Since a large number of the existing studies, including this one, have focused on Japanese students in homestays, future research with students from other native languages and cultures would fill the gap in the literature. Moreover, a comprehensive quantitative research study surveying a larger population of hosts and IEP

students would produce findings of statistical significance about language development and pragmatic comprehension in the homestay environment.

Closing Remarks

In the homestay environment, IEP students can develop their English proficiency, pragmatic comprehension, and linguistic confidence as a participant in a community of practice. Lave and Wenger (1991) note, however, that "to become a full member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, old-timers, and other members of the community; and to information, resources and opportunities for participation" (p. 100). This case study identified a number of prerequisites that need to be present for a successful placement of IEP student in a homestay. First, students need an understanding of the concepts of language socialization, learner agency, and noticing. Next, task-based assignments need to be included in the IEP curriculum to provide opportunities for observation and practice. Finally, the host families receiving IEP students should understand students' goals for language learning and have the time and resources to devote to assisting the student in meeting those goals. When student and host expectations are managed and training is provided, the homestay environment can successfully support students' coursework in the IEP and build both pragmatic comprehension and linguistic confidence within the short time that student may study in the IEP.

REFERENCES

Andrade, M. S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment factors. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *5*(2), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906065589

Back, M. (2011). Legitimate peripheral participation and language learning: Two Quichua learners in a transnational community. *Language Learning*, *61*(4), 1039–1057.

Baralt, M. (2012). Coding qualitative data. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide* (pp. 222–244). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *63*, 68–86.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M.-T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *8*(3), 347–384.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mossman, S. (2015). Working with corpora: Input for the teaching of pragmatic routines. *AL Forum The Newsletter of the Applied Linguists Interest Section*. Retrieved from http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/tesolalis/issues/2015-02-06/2.html

Barron, A., & Warga, M. (2007). Acquisitional pragmatics: Focus on foreign language learners. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4*(2), 113–127.

Bouton, L. F. (1994a). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved through explicit instruction?—A pilot study. *Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series*, *5*, 88–109.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Casanave, C. P. (2010). Case studies. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Chang, Y.-F. (2010). "I no say you say is boring": The development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences*, *32*(3), 408–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2009.07.002

Chang, Yuh-Fang. (2011). Interlanguage pragmatic development: The relation between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. *Language Sciences*, *33*(5), 786–798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.02.002

Cook, M., & Liddicoat, A. (2002). The development of comprehension in interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request strategies in English. *Australian Review of Applied LInguistics*, *25*(1), 19–39.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Boston: Pearson.

Di Silvio, F., Donovan, A., & Malone, M. E. (2014). The effect of study abroad homestay placements: Participant perspectives and oral proficiency gains. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(1), 168–188. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12064

Diao, W., Freed, B., & Smith, L. (2011). Confirmed beliefs or false assumptions? A study of home stay experiences in the French study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *21*, 109–142.

Dressler, R., & Tweedie, M. G. (2016). Dialogue journals in short-term study abroad: "Today I wrote my mind". *TESOL Journal*, *7*(4), 939–967.

Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, *40*(4), 309.

Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Duff, P. A. (2012). How to carry out case study research. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 95–116). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Educational Testing Service. (2018a). TOEFL ITP® Test and Score Data Summary January–December 2017 Test Data. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/toefl_itp/research/

Educational Testing Service. (2018b). TOEFL ITP Reliability Table. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/s/toefl_itp/pdf/toefl_itp_score.pdf

Educational Testing Service. (2018c). TOEFL Validity Evidence. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/toefl/research/topics/validity/

Friedman, D. A. (2012a). How to collect and analyze qualitative data. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (First, pp. 180–200). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Fukushima, S. (2011). A cross-generational and cross-cultural study on demonstration of attentiveness. *Pragmatics*, *21*(4), 549–571.

Garcia, P. (2004). Pragmatic comprehension of high and low level language learners. *TESL-EJ*, *8*(2). Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume8/ej30/ej30a1

Grieve, A. M. (2015). The impact of host family relations and length of stay on adolescent identity expression during study abroad. *Multilingua*, *34*(5), 623–657.

Hashimoto, H. (1993). Language acquisition of an exchange student within the homestay environment. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication (Multilingual Matters)*, *4*(4), 209–224.

Iino, M. (2006). Norms of interaction in a Japanese homestay setting; Toward a two-way flow of linguistic and cultural resources. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill, *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts* (pp. 151–173). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Ikeda, J. (2019, January 16). *Training of host families*.

Institute of International Education. (2018). *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from Institute of International Education website: http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students

International Student Placements. (2016). *FAQs for College Host Families*. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/wRRQvT8h6Ag

Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System*, *34*(1), 36–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.003

Kaloustian, T. S. (2014). *Developing international student pragmatic skills and providing social support: A case study of a year-long university matriculation program for*

international students (Ed.D., University of Pennsylvania). Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.ignacio.usfca.edu/docview/1616595671?accountid=14674

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language.* (No. 0023–8333). Retrieved from Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies website: http://0-search.ebscohost.com.ignacio.usfca.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED476838&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(Supplement 1), 1–124.

Knight, S. M., & Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C. (2010). Exploring conditions to enhance student/host family interaction abroad. *Part of a Special Issue: Language Learning and Study Abroad*, *43*(1), 64–79.

Kobayashi, J., & Viswat, L. (2015). A relational approach to international education through homestay programs. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(4), 475–487.

Kurker-Stewart, N. (2016). *Friendship with an international student: A guide for host families of international students*. NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge. England: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, K., & Wesche, M. B. (2000). Korean students' adaptation to post-secondary studies in Canada: A case study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *56*(4), 637–689.

Lee, S.-H., Wu, Q., Di, C., & Kinginger, C. (2017). Learning to eat politely at the Chinese homestay dinner table: Two contrasting case studies. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(1), 135–158.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Martin, G. M. St. (1980). Effect of sojourner housing situations on second language acquisition. *Communication*, *9*(2), 104.

NAFSA.org. (2012, October 4). Practice advisory: SEVP enforcement Of IEP accreditation law. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/Resource_Library_Assets/Regulatory_Information/Practice_Advisory__SEVP_Enforcement_Of_IEP_Accreditation_Law/

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. Levine (Eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Official Guide to the TOEFL ITP Test. (2014). Educational Testing Service.

Pryde, M. (2014). Conversational patterns of homestay hosts and study abroad students. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(3), 487–506.

Rivers, W. P. (1998). Is Being There Enough? The Effects of Homestay Placements on Language Gain During Study Abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, *31*(4), 492–500.

Roberts, C. M. (2010). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Roever, C. (2006). Validation of a web-based test of ESL pragmalinguistics. *Language Testing*, *23*(2), 229–256. Retrieved from eric.

Roever, C. (2014). *Testing ESL pragmatics: Development and validation of a web-based assessment battery*. Retrieved from http://0-search.ebscohost.com.ignacio.usfca.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=809368&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Sage, K., & Tanaka, N. (2007). Can SA program students' language motivation improve further by maximizing the homestay context? A case study. *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*.

Schmidt, R. (1990a, April). *Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics*. 1–31. Thessaloniki, Greece: International Association of Applied Linguistics.

Schmidt, R. (1990b). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. Retrieved from eric.

Schmidt, R. (2010, December 2). *Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning*. 721–737. Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C., & Knight, S. M. (2004). The homestay component of study abroad: Three perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, *37*(2), 254–262.

Shiri, S. (2015). The homestay in intensive language study abroad: Social networks, language socialization, and developing intercultural competence. *Foreign Language Annals*, *48*(1), 5–25.

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

Sokolik, M. (2015). In their words: Student preparation and perspectives on US study. *The CATESOL Journal*, *27*(2), 23–32.

Swift, E. (2016). *Friendship with an American host: A guide for international students at U.S. colleges and universities*. NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Taguchi, N. (2007). Development of speed and accuracy in pragmatic comprehension in English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 313–338.

Taguchi, N. (2008a). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, *58*(1), 33–71.

Taguchi, N. (2008b). The effect of working memory, semantic access, and listening abilities on the comprehension of conversational implicatures in L2 English. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, *16*(3), 517–539.

Taguchi, N. (2008c). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *30*(4), 423–452.

Taguchi, N. (2011a). Pragmatic development as a dynamic, complex process: General patterns and case histories. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*(4), 605–627.

Taguchi, N. (2011b). The effect of L2 proficiency and study-abroad experience on pragmatic comprehension. *Language Learning*, *61*(3), 904–939.

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

Telbis, N. M., Helgeson, L., & Kingsbury, C. (2014). International Students' Confidence and Academic Success. *Journal of International Students*, *4*(4), 330–341.

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), University of San Francisco. (2014). *Manual 2014*. Retrieved from https://www.axiommentor.com/pages/irb/info.cfm

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2).

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, & Student and Exchange Visitor Program. (n.d.). *SEVP Draft Policy Guidance for Adjudicators 1210- 03: Bridge Programs and Conditional Admission*. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/Chez_NAFSA/Find_Resources/Supporting_International_Students_And_Scholars/ISS_Issues/Issues/PG_1210-03_BridgeConditionalDraft_1.pdf

Wang, C. (2010). Toward a Second Language Socialization Perspective: Issues in Study Abroad Research. *Foreign Language Annals*, (2). Retrieved from http://0-search.ebscohost.com.ignacio.usfca.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgao&AN=edsgcl.237842977&site=eds-live&scope=site

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*(3), 331–350.

Wong, R. (2015). Impact of overseas immersion homestay experience on linguistic confidence and intercultural communication strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, (37). Retrieved from http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr37/wong.html

Woodall, B., & Takeuchi, Y. (1999). Language experience in the homestay environment. *Journal of Intensive English Studies*, *13*, 35–52.

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519–535..

Zhang, Y. (Leaf). (2015). Reverse Transfer: Experiences of International Chinese Students in Intensive English Programs. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *39*(11), 1079–1083.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

(Student Participants)

Below is a description of the research procedures and an explanation of your rights as a research participant. You should read this information carefully. If you agree to participate, you will sign in the space provided to indicate that you have read and understand the information on this consent form. You are entitled to and will receive a copy of this form.

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Sarah McGregor, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco. The faculty supervisor for this study is Sedique Popal, Ed.D., a professor in the Department of International and Multicultural Education at the University of San Francisco.

WHAT THE STUDY IS ABOUT:

The purpose of this research study is to explore how living in a homestay environment might play a role in your English language development in general and in your comprehension of everyday conversations in English.

WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO:

During this study, the following will happen:

1. You will complete two tests at the beginning and the end of the study: 1) the Institutional TOEFL test as part of the ATP Orientation and 2) an online Pragmatic Listening Test.
2. You will be interviewed at the beginning and at the end of the study by the researcher and if you agree, audio recordings will be made of these conversations.
3. You will write 5 online journal entries about your experiences communicating in the homestay and submit them weekly to the researcher.

DURATION AND LOCATION OF THE STUDY:

Your participation in this study will involve two online listening tests that last 45-minutes each, two interviews that last 20 minutes each, and five 20-minute journal assignments once a week for five weeks. The study will take place both online and on the university campus.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:

We do not anticipate any risks or discomforts to you from participating in this research. If you wish, you may choose to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time during the study without penalty.

BENEFITS:

There are possible benefits to you of participating in this study. You may be able to

increase your awareness of your English language progress and to improve your comprehension of everyday conversations in English. Information from this study may also benefit future students in better understanding the homestay experience.

PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY:

Any data you provide in this study will be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In any report we publish, we will not include information that will make it possible to identify you or any individual participant. Specifically, you will choose a nickname for this study. A master list that includes your name, nickname, and any other identifiable information about you will be kept secure and separately from the collected data. All consent forms and any other identifiable data will be destroyed after a period of 3 years.

COMPENSATION/PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION:

There is no payment or other form of compensation for your participation in this study.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY:

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits. Furthermore, you may skip any questions or tasks that make you uncomfortable and may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. In addition, the researcher has the right to withdraw you from participation in the study at any time. Nonparticipation or withdrawal from the study will not affect your grades or admission to the university.

OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS:

Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you should contact my faculty sponsor: Dr. Sedique Popal at 415-422-2308 or popal@usfca.edu. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the University of San Francisco Institutional Review Board at IRBPHS@usfca.edu.

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION. ANY QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT AND I WILL RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM.

PARTICIPANT'S SIGNATURE *DATE*

Appendix B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

(Host Family Participants)

Below is a description of the research procedures and an explanation of your rights as a research participant. You should read this information carefully. If you agree to participate, you will sign in the space provided to indicate that you have read and understand the information on this consent form. You are entitled to and will receive a copy of this form.

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Sarah McGregor, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco. The faculty supervisor for this study is Sedique Popal, Ed.D., a professor in the Department of International and Multicultural Education at the University of San Francisco.

WHAT THE STUDY IS ABOUT:

The purpose of this research study is to explore how living in a homestay environment might play a role in the English language development and comprehension of everyday conversations in English of international students conditionally admitted to the university.

WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO:

During this study, You will be interviewed at the beginning and at the end of the study by the researcher and if you agree, audio recordings will be made of these conversations.

DURATION AND LOCATION OF THE STUDY:

Your participation in this study will involve two interviews that last 20 minutes each. The study will take place on the university campus and the host family's home.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:

We do not anticipate any risks or discomforts to you from participating in this research. If you wish, you may choose to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time during the study without penalty.

BENEFITS:

You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study; however, information from this study may also benefit future host families in better understanding the role of homestay experience in English language development.

PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY:

Any data you provide in this study will be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In any report we publish, we will not include information that will make it possible to identify you or any individual participant. Specifically, you will choose a nickname for this study. A master list that includes your name, nickname, and any other identifiable information about you will be kept secure and separately from the collected data. All consent forms and any other identifiable data will be destroyed after a period of 3 years.

COMPENSATION/PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION:

There is no payment or other form of compensation for your participation in this study.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY:

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits. Furthermore, you may skip any questions or tasks that make you uncomfortable and may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. In addition, the researcher has the right to withdraw you from participation in the study at any time. Nonparticipation or withdrawal from the study will not affect your ability to host students in the future.

OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS:

Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you should contact my faculty sponsor: Dr. Sedique Popal at 415-422-2308 or popal@usfca.edu. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the University of San Francisco Institutional Review Board at IRBPHS@usfca.edu.

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION. ANY QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT AND I WILL RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM.

PARTICIPANT'S SIGNATURE *DATE*

Appendix C:

Permission to use Taguchi (2008) Pragmatic Listening Test

Permission was granted via email on March 31, 2018 by Naoko Taguchi to use the items with an explicit statement that the items were adapted from [her] paper with citation.

Appendix D:

Pragmatic Listening Test Items

Source:

Taguchi, N. (2008). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *30*, 423-452.

Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, *58*, 33-71.

Taguchi, N. (2007). Development of speed and accuracy in pragmatic comprehension in English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 313-338.

Note. The items were given in a random order.

Indirect Refusal Items

1.

John:	Hey, Mary, where are you?
Mary:	I'm in the kitchen.
John:	Hey, ah.....could you clean the house this weekend? I cleaned it the last two weeks, and this weekend I have plans.
Mary:	Oh, ah...I'm going to see my parents this weekend. I won't be back until Monday.
Q:	Can Mary clean the house this weekend?

2.

Susan:	Hi Dave. How are you?
Dave:	Hi Susan. I'm OK. What have you been up to lately?
Susan:	Well, not much new or exciting, but I'm having a party this Saturday, and it should be fun. I hope you can come.
Dave:	Oh, Susan, I already have plans on Saturday.
Q:	Is Dave coming to Susan's party?

3.

Ben: Hi honey. What are we doing for dinner tonight?

Barbara: Um... I don't know...

Ben: How about if we go out to eat tonight.

Barbara: That sounds good, but don't you think we should finish the food from yesterday before we spend more money? We still have the chicken and rice.

Q: Does the woman want Chinese food?

4.

Tom: Hi Sally. Are you done with your work for today?

Sally: Well....I'm getting ready for the trip to New York. I'm leaving here at noon tomorrow.

Tom: Oh, do you need a ride to the airport?

Sally: Oh, Jim already promised to take me on his way home.

Q: Does the woman need a ride?

5.

Dr. White: You know Jane, you are not really doing well with your classes.

Jane: I know....

Dr. White: I think you should take one or two summer classes and review some of the basics.

Jane: Well, I have already made plans to go to Europe this summer.

Q: Can Jane take classes this summer?

6.

Mary: Hey John, what are you doing?

John: I'm working on my paper for the English class.

Mary: You've been working on that paper for a week. Why don't you take a break? Let's go to the movies tonight.

John: I have to finish my paper by eight in the morning.

Q: Is John going to the movie?

7.

Sally: Hi Tom. Are you busy?

Tom: Ah.....not right now. I just finished my work for today. What's up?

Sally: Ah.....I was thinking if we could go out for a cup of coffee or something.

Tom: Today is my son's birthday.

Q: Is Tom having coffee with Sally?

8.

Susan: I'm sorry, Dave. I was a little late. Were you waiting long?

Dave: That's all right, Susan. I just got here too.

Susan: Ah....I'm going to make myself a cup of coffee before we get started. Would you like some too?

Dave: I like tea better.

Q: Does Dave want to have coffee?

9.

Mary: Hi John. Do you have a minute?

John: Hey Mary. How are you doing?

Mary: Good, thanks. Ah...may I ask you a small favor? Would you mind reading my paper for the English class?

John: Oh Mary, I have a class in about 10 minutes.

Q: Can John read Mary's paper now?

10.

Dave: Oh, Susan. I'm so glad I found you.

Susan: What's up?

Dave: I have to hand in my paper tomorrow, but I'm working late tonight. Could you type my paper? It's only 3 pages.

Susan: Oh, Dave, I have to study for my test tonight.

Q: Can Susan type the woman’s paper?

11.

Tom: Hey Sally. Are you busy?

Sally: Ah...not right now. I just finished that big project.

Tom: Wow, good for you. I know that was a lot of work. By the way, can you work my shift this Friday? My son is graduating from college.

Sally: I'm having a party Friday.

Q: Can the woman work this Friday?

12.

Tom: Hi Sally.

Sally: Hi Tom. Where were you?

Tom: I just came back from the car shop. It sounds like they are gonna keep my car a day or two. Could I get a ride home with you?

Sally: Oh Tom, I took the bus to work today.

Q: Can Sally give Tom a ride home?

13.

Mary: Hi John, what's up?

John: Not much. I just found out that I have to pay for the summer school by tomorrow.

Mary: Oh....

John: Sorry to ask you again, but do you think you can lend me some money?

Mary: I don't get paid until Friday.

Q: Can the woman lend John money?

14.

Susan: Hi, Dave. What're you up to?

Dave: Hi Susan, are you going out?

Susan: Yeah, I'm going downtown. I need to buy a birthday gift for my brother. Do you wanna come with me?

Dave: I have a swimming lesson in half an hour.

Q: Is Dave going shopping with Susan?

15.

John: Hey, Mary. What's up?

Mary: Hey. I'm just checking my emails. I've got to go in about 10 minutes. I have a dentist appointment.

John: Oh, OK. Hey, Steve and I are going dancing tonight. Would you like to come too?

Mary: I'm not feeling so well.

Q: Is Mary going dancing with John?

16.

Tom: Hey Sally.

Sally: Hi Tom. What's up?

Tom: Not much. I was just checking the weather for this weekend. Cindy and I are going hiking by the lake. Do you want to come with us?

Sally: I have to finish the project report this Saturday.

Q: Can Sally go hiking on Saturday?

17.

Jane: Hello Dr. White.

Dr. White: Hi Jane, have a seat.

Jane: Thank you.

Dr. White: I was just looking at the classes you signed up for Spring Semester. I think you should take English 100 also to work on your writing skill.

Jane: I'm already taking 6 classes.

Q: Can Jane take English 100?

18.

Jane: Hello, Dr. White.

Dr. White: Oh, Jane, come in.

Jane: Thank you.

Dr. White: You know, I was just thinking. It's probably a good idea to sign up for the weekend seminar. It's a good review for the course.

Jane: I'm often out of town on weekends.

Q: Can Jane take the weekend seminar?

19.

Barbara: Hi Ben.

Ben: Hi honey. You sound terrible. What's wrong?

Barbara: I don't know.... I think I'm coming down with a flu or something.

Ben: Why don't you take some medicine and go to bed.

Barbara: I'm teaching at 7, and I really can't cancel my class tonight.

Q: Is Barbara going to bed now?

20.

Ben: Hi honey, I'm home.

Barbara: Hi.... You didn't take your car today? What happened?

Ben: The car didn't start this morning again.

Barbara: Really? I think we should get a new one. It's about time.

Ben: We really don't have money to spend on a car right now.

Q: Is the man buying a new car?

21.

Mary: Hey John. You're home early today.

John: Hey, Mary. My class got cancelled tonight. What are you doing?

Mary: I'm cooking some vegetables for dinner. Would you like to try some too?

John: I already ate. Steve and I went to the new Thai restaurant.

Q: Does John want to have vegetables?

22.

Jane: Hello Dr. White.

Dr. White: Oh, Jane, come in.

Jane: Ah.... I'm having a problem with the mid-term exam. There is so much to cover.

Dr. White: Yes, but you just need to practice solving problems. Would you like me to go over a couple of problems with you?

Jane: I don't have much time right now.

Q: Can Jane go over problems now?

23.

Tom: Hi Sally.

Sally: Hi Tom. You look happy.

Tom: Yeah, I just got engaged with Cindy. We're getting married this June.

Sally: Wow, really? Congratulations! So, what are the plans?
Would you like me to have a party to celebrate, sometime this weekend?

Tom: Cindy is going to Italy this weekend.

Q: Can Tom have a party this weekend?

24.

Susan: You look worried, Dave. What's the matter?

Dave: I need to turn in this paper by 6, but I'm still typing it. I've got to go to work in half an hour or so.

Susan: Oh... Do you want me to type the paper for you?

Dave: I think I'm almost done.

Q: Does Dave need Susan's help?

Indirect Opinion Items

1.

Jane: Dr. White, do you have time?

Dr. White: Sure. Come in

Jane: Ah.... did you have a chance to read my book report? It was my first time to write a book report, so I'd like to know how I did on it.

Dr. White: Oh, it's exactly what I wanted.

Q: Does Dr. White like the book report?

2.

Ben: Good morning, honey. I can't believe I fell asleep in the middle of the movie last night. Did you watch it till the end?

Barbara: Yeah, I did.

Ben: How was it? Did you like it?

Barbara: Well, I was glad when it was over.

Q: Did the woman like the movie?

3.

Tom: Hi Sally. How was your weekend?

Sally: Good. Mike and I went camping. How was yours?

Tom: I went to Mary's parents' place for dinner. It was first my time to meet her parents.

Sally: Oh, how did you like her family?

Tom: Well.....I still love Mary.

Q: Does the man like Mary's parents?

4.

Tom: Hi Sally . Did you have a nice break?

Sally: Yeah, I had a great vacation.

Tom: I heard you moved to a new place out in the country. How do you like your new house?

Sally: Oh, I don't want to change a thing about it.

Q: Does Sally like her new house?

5.

Jane: Hello Dr. White.

Dr. White: Oh, hi Jane. How was your spring vacation?

Jane: Ah.... My friends and I rented a car and drove to New Mexico, for about a week.

Dr. White: Oh really. Did you have a good time?

Jane: Well, our car broke down 3 times during the trip.

Q: Did Jane have a nice trip?

6.

Tom: Wow, look, Sally. There are so many different kinds of food here. I don't know where to start. Which do you think is good?

Sally: So far I've only had some of that one---the yellow dish.

Tom: Oh, that looks good. Did you like it?

Sally: Well....it's certainly colorful.

Q: Does Sally like the yellow dish?

7.

Susan: Hey Dave. What a surprise.

Dave: I was just passing by, so I thought I'd stop by to say hi.

Susan: Good to see you. Come in.

Dave: Wow, this is a great apartment. Do you like the people upstairs?

Susan: We're always visiting each other.

Q: Does Susan like the people upstairs?

8.

Jane: Hello Dr. White. Do you have time?

Dr. White: Oh, hi Jane. Come in.

Jane: I came to talk to you about my paper. I'd like to find out how I did on it. Was it OK?

Dr. White: How much time did you put into it?

Q: Does Dr. White like Jane's paper very much?

9.

Mary: Hi John, I'm back.

John: Hey Mary, welcome back. You must be really tired after rushing around for your friend's wedding.

Mary: Yeah, I'm so tired. I haven't slept much in the last three days.

John: How was the wedding? I bet it was exciting.

Mary: Well...the cake was OK.

Q: Did Mary like the wedding?

10.

Barbara: Oh, Ben, I didn't know that you're home. You're early today. What are you watching?

Ben: I'm watching the flight show.

Barbara: You always watch flight shows. Do you like flying in an airplane?

Ben: I wish I were a pilot.

Q: Does Ben like flying in an airplane?

11.

Mary: Hey, John. You're up already.

John: Yeah, I got to finish this homework for the English class.

Mary: Oh...I have to do that too.... Hey, by the way, did you like the TV show last night?

John: I couldn't wait to see what happened at the end.

Q: Did John like the TV show?

12.

Dave: Hi Susan. What are you up to?

Susan: I got to go to work in half an hour or so. I'm babysitting my neighbor's kids every Monday and Wednesday night.

Dave: Oh really. Do you like children?

Susan: I'd enjoy being a kindergarten teacher.

Q: Does Susan like children very much?

13.

Dave: Hi Susan. How was your weekend?

Susan: Busy. I worked all day on Saturday and Sunday at the bookstore. How was yours?

Dave: OK. Last night I went to Jennifer's party.

Susan: Oh, how was it?

Dave: I only stayed until ten to be polite.

Q: Did the man enjoy Jennifer's party?

14.

Dave: Hey Susan. I didn't know that you're working here on campus.

Susan: Yeah, I'm working in the Student Union cafeteria. I work there Monday through Friday starting at six.

Dave: You sound busy. Do you like the job?

Susan: My mother wanted me to take it.

Q: Does Susan like the cafeteria job?

15.

Tom: What do you do on weekends Sally?

Sally: I like the theater --- you know, plays and concerts. How about you?

Tom: Oh, lots of different things. I like books, dancing.
I like to try interesting restaurants too. Do you like eating in restaurants?

Sally: They are too expensive for me.

Q: Does Sally often eat at restaurants?

16.

Jane: Hello Dr. White.

Dr. White: Hi Jane. How are you feeling now?

Jane: I'm so glad that my presentation is over. I was really nervous. What did you think of my presentation?

Dr. White: It's really difficult to give a good presentation sometimes, isn't it?

Q: Did Dr. White like Jane's presentation?

17.

Barbara: There are so many sweaters to choose from.

Ben: Yeah.... I'll wait over there, so take your time.

Barbara: Oh, this one looks warm, and I love the color. What do you think?

Ben: I wonder if they have a different style in that color.

Q: Does the man like the sweater?

18.

John: Hey Mary. You got a package today, didn't you? From who?

Mary: It's from my cousin in Florida. He sent me a gift for my birthday. A little alarm clock.

John: Oh, that's nice of him. Did you like it?

Mary: The wrapping paper was nice.

Q: Does Mary like the gift?

19.

Sally: Hey, Tom. How ya doing?

Tom: Hi Sally. OK, thanks. I'm getting ready for today's meeting. What's new?

Sally: Not much, but I bought a new dining table on Sunday.

Tom: Oh really. How is it?

Sally: There is nothing I want to change about it.

Q: Does Sally like the dining table?

20.

Susan: Hi Dave. Did you see the movie on TV last night?

Dave: Yeah, I thought it was going to be funny, but it was really sad. Did you see that too?

Susan: No.... I watched the comedy show instead.

Dave: Oh, how was it?

Susan: I laughed for an hour.

Q: Did Susan enjoy the comedy show?

21.

Sally: I heard a new coffee shop just opened in town last Saturday. My roommate said cheesecakes there are terrific.

Tom: Oh really, I should try it sometimes.

Sally: Yeah, you should. Do you like cakes?

Tom: Last week, I ate only 3 pieces a day.

Q: Does the man like cakes much?

22.

Dr. White: Hello, Susan. How is your semester going so far?

Susan: Pretty good, but I'm still busy starting a new semester. Most of my classmates are new.

Dr. White: Do you like meeting new people in class?

Susan: I always try to get to know my classmates right away.

Q: Does the woman like meeting new classmates?

23.

Barbara: Hi honey, I'm home.

Ben: Hi, how was your day?

Barbara: Good. This afternoon Cindy and I went to see Steven's new paintings.

Ben: Oh, I was just reading about them in the newspaper. How are they?

Barbara: There must be one painting which isn't perfect.

Q: Does the woman like Steven's paintings?

24.

Barbara: I'm home, Ben. Are you feeling better?

Ben: Not really. I've been in bed all day, but the headache doesn't go away.

Barbara: Oh.... that's too bad.

Ben: How was the party anyway? Did you have fun?

Barbara: Jennifer really knows how to give a party.

Q: Did the woman enjoy Jennifer’s party?

Distractor Items

1.

Sally: You look worried, Tom.

Tom: Well, I have to pay my rent today, but I don't have the money. I hate to ask you, but could I borrow $100? I promise I'll get it back to you as soon as I get paid next week.

Sally: Sure, no problem.

Q: Can Sally lend Tom some money?

2.

Tom: Hi Sally.

Sally: Oh, hi Tom. I haven't seen you since I moved into the

city. Tom: So, how do you like Atlanta so far?

Sally: I love it. I was here in '94 before they made changes for the Olympics. It's much more beautiful now.

Q: Does Sally like Atlanta very much?

3.

Dr. White: Hello Jane. What are you doing this beautiful Saturday?

Jane: I just went to see Tim Jones' art show in the student center.

Dr. White: Oh, Mr. Jones' art show. I was there last weekend. How do you like his work?

Jane: They are so perfect. I love them all.

Q: Does Jane like Tim Jones' art?

4.

Ben: Honey, where are you? Barbara: I'm in the kitchen. What's up?

Ben: Ah...I've invited some friends over to watch the football game on TV. I think I'll go out and get some drinks before they arrive here.

Barbara: Oh, ah....we need some food too then, don't you think?

Q: Does the woman want Ben get food?

5.

Barbara: Ben, are you gonna be at home tomorrow morning? I want to clean up the garage and could use some help.

Ben: Ah... I'm free until 11:00 or so. Is that OK?

Barbara: What are you doing after 11:00?

Ben: I'm playing tennis with Jim and Tom.

Q: Can Ben help the woman before 11?

6.

Susan: Hi Dave. Long time no see. What's new?

Dave: Oh, just trying to keep up.

Susan: Me too. Oh, by the way, how was your interview for the summer job? Did you get the job?

Dave: Well, no I didn't. I think I need to improve my interview skills.

Q: Did Dave have a job interview?

7.

Susan: You look pretty happy, Dave.

Dave: Yeah, I just came from chemistry class, and I got the second highest score on the test.

Susan: Wow, good job! Who got the top score then?

Dave: Do you know Jennifer?...she got a 98%.

Susan: Yeah, I've had classes with her. What's new, right?

Q: Did Jennifer get the highest score?

8.

Barbara: Did you enjoy my family's party, Ben?

Ben: Yeah, it was great. I hadn't seen some of them since our wedding.

Barbara: That's true.

Ben: I didn't know uncle Jim plays the piano. How did you like his piano?

Barbara: I don't think he did a good job.

Q: Does uncle Jim play the piano?

9.

Dave: Can't believe it's almost half way through this semester. We have so much to do in the next two months.

Susan: Yeap, we sure do.

Dave: By the way, how are you doing in history?

Susan: Well...not so well. I got a C on the last test.

Q: Is the woman taking a history class?

10.

John: Hey Mary, is gym open 24 hours a day?

Mary: Almost. It's open from 5 AM to 1 AM Monday through Friday, and from 5 to 10 PM on weekends.

John: Oh, OK. Is the pool really crowded in the evening?

Mary: I have no idea. I usually go in the morning.

Q: Does Mary usually swim in the morning?

Appendix E

Permission to use surveys

Email permission to use survey questions from The Effects of SA Homestay Placements was granted by co-author Margaret Malone via email on April 12, 2018.

Appendix F

Student and Host Family Questionnaires

Source: Di Silvio, F., Donovan, A., & Malone, M. E. (2014). The effect of study abroad homestay placements: Participant perspectives and oral proficiency gains. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(1), 168–188. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12064

Post survey: Student Evaluation of the Homestay

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
I am glad that I lived with a host family.					
I felt like a member of the family.					
My host family helped me improve my [language] skills.					
I will keep in touch with my host family after returning to the United States.					
I would recommend living with a host family to other students.					
I learned as much [Language] as I thought I would.					

Host Family Pre-survey: Motivation

Statement	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
To spend time with a student from another culture			
To spend time with a student who speaks another language			
To help the student learn [Language]			
To have additional company at home			

Host Family Post-survey: Description of the Hosted Student

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
The student is comfortable in my home.					
The student is talkative with my family.					
The student is interested in spending time with my family.					
The student is homesick.					
The student is eager to learn.					
The student is open to new cultures and customs.					

Appendix G

Interview protocol for semi-structured interviews with IEP student participants

INTERVIEW # 1

1. How many years have you studied English before coming to the Intensive English Program?
2. Where did you study English previously?
3. Have you ever travelled to the United States before? When and for how long?
4. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest, how would you rate your current English level in
    a. Listening
    b. Speaking
    c. Reading
    d. Writing
    e. Overall proficiency?
5. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest, how confident do you feel communicating with native speakers of English?
6. Why did you choose to live in a homestay?
7. What do you expect to gain from living in a homestay?

INTERVIEW # 2

1. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest, how would you rate your current English level in
    a. Listening
    b. Speaking

   c. Reading
   d. Writing
   e. Overall proficiency?

2. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest, how confident do you feel communicating with native speakers of English?
3. Now I will ask you to evaluate your homestay. On a scale of 1-5, 5 being strongly agree and 1 being disagree strongly, how would you respond to the following statements:
   a. I am glad that I lived with a host family. (Why?)
   b. I felt like a member of the family. (Describe the relationship between you and your host family.)
   c. My host family helped me improve my English skills. (In what ways?)
   d. I would recommend living with a host family to other students. (Why?)
   e. I learned as much English as I thought I would.
4. How satisfied were you with your homestay experience?
5. Did the homestay meet your expectations?
6. How confident in your English do you feel now after living with your host family: more confident, same as before, or less confident? Why do you feel this way? Can you give an example of how your English is now compared to how it was when you first arrived?

Appendix H

Interview protocol for semi-structured interviews with host family participants

INTERVIEW # 1

1. Describe any previous experiences that you have had as a host family.
2. What are your expectations of this student based on your previous experiences as a host?
3. On a scale of 1-3 with 3 being the Very Important and 1 being Not Important, how important were the following factors in deciding to be a host family for this student:
    a. To spend time with a student from another culture
    b. To spend time with a student who speaks another language
    c. To help the student learn English
    d. To have additional company at home
    e. To have additional income

INTERVIEW # 2

1. How would you characterize your relationship with the student?
2. Did the relationship meet your expectations?
3. On a scale of 1-5 with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree, how would you agree with the following statements:
    a. The student was comfortable in my home.
    b. The student was talkative with my family.
    c. The student was interested in spending time with my family.
    d. The student was homesick.
    e. The student was eager to learn.
    f. The student was open to new cultures and customs.

Appendix I

Weekly Journal Prompts for IEP Student Participants

Week 1:

Describe your host family. Who do you usually talk to, at what times (for example, at breakfast, in the afternoon, at dinner, or in the evening) and where (for example, in the living room, in your room, at the dinner table, in the kitchen or in the backyard)?

Week 2:

What topics do you usually talk about with your host? Are some topics easier to understand? Why? Are some topics more difficult to understand and why?

Week 3:

Give me an example of when you didn't understand your host. What were you talking about? What did you do (for example, did you stay quiet, did you try to ask questions, did you ask a friend later or something else)? In what ways, if any, does your host family help you with your English understanding? How do you feel when you don't understand your host?

Week 4:

What differences do you notice between your culture and American culture? Do you talk about these differences with your host? Who starts these talks?

Week 5:

Do you notice a difference in the way your host speaks with you and the way he/she speaks with other members of the family or other people? In what ways are they different? Can you give an example of how those people speak differently?