

## Individual differences in the EMI classroom: A study on Economics undergraduates use of pragmatic markers and anxiety level

Jennifer Ament, Carmen Pérez Vidal, Júlia Baron

Universitat Pompeu Fabra

It has been found that context of learning plays an important role in second language (L2) pragmatic capacities (Alcón, 2005) and that learners in content learning contexts show slow and steady improvement in their pragmatic capacities (Taguchi, 2012 & 2014). There is also evidence that individual differences (ID) such as motivation and attitudes have an effect on L2 pragmatics (Takahashi, 2005; LoCastro, 2001). Additionally, interpersonal PMs in speech have been shown to facilitate listeners understanding of a L2, as well as indicate the attitudes of the speaker (Neary-Sundquist, 2013). The use of interpersonal PMs supports and enables fluency in the L2 (Neary-Sundquist, 2014). This study builds upon what is known about the role PMs play in SLA, by bridging the gap and studying both the context of EMI and IDs within the same population, it examines EMI undergraduates and their use interpersonal PMs. The research questions are does progress in L2 pragmatic abilities differ depending on the amount of EMI hours, measured through use of PMs? And does progress in L2 pragmatic abilities differ depending on learner anxiety, measured through the use of PM's? In this pilot study two groups were measured on their use of interpersonal PMs (markers or shared knowledge, response tokens, and markers to indicate attitudes) (Fung & Carter, 2007). 7 Immersion (IM) students were compared to 14 semi-immersion (SIM) students. Instruments included an oral interaction task, an oral discourse completion task which included 5 different speech acts with different degrees of imposition, a pragmatic awareness questionnaire, and a language enjoyment and anxiety questionnaire. Data was analysed statistically and preliminary results show the IM group tended to use pragmatic markers more accurately than the SIM group, when analysed according to level of anxiety the less anxious group tended to use pragmatic markers more accurately than the anxious group.

### References

- Alcón-Soler, E. (2005) Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context?. *System*, 33(3), 417-435.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007) Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Settings. *Applied Linguistics* vol. 28.3: 410-439
- LoCastro, V. (2001) Individual differences in second language acquisition: Attitudes, learner subjectivity, and L2 pragmatic norms. *System*, 29(1), 69-89.
- Neary-Sundquist, C. (2013) Task type effects on pragmatic marker use by learners at varying proficiency levels. *L2 Journal*, 5 (2), 1-21.
- Neary-Sundquist, C. (2014) The use of pragmatic markers across proficiency levels in second language speech. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4 (4), 637-663.
- Taguchi, N. (2012) Pragmatic Development as a Dynamic, Complex Process: General Patterns and Case Histories. *The Modern Language Journal* 95. 605-627.
- Taguchi, N. (2014). Pragmatic socialization in an English-medium university in japan. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 157-181.
- Takahashi, S. (2005) Pragmalinguistic Awareness: Is it related to Motivation and Proficiency? *Applied Linguistics* vol.- 26-6: 90-120.