

## Students' Responses to Scaffolded Learning in the Asian University ESL Classroom

**Dr. Paul C. Talley**

Department of International Business Administration  
I-Shou University  
No. 1, Sec. 1  
Syuecheng Road  
Dashu District  
Kaohsiung City (84001)  
Taiwan

### Abstract

*This article reports on student responses to scaffolding in Asian university ESL classrooms. Scaffolding is an instructional style which provides intellectual support to offset students' unfamiliarity with classroom social discourse. Inexperience with culturally-divergent methods of language learning often creates hesitancy that is viewed negatively and inhibitive of learning by others. Teachers' scaffolding allows reticent students to perform tasks slightly beyond their capabilities without repetitive guidance. One-hundred, twelve first-year non-English majors from four English communication classes answered a 47-item questionnaire containing ten items specific to scaffolding. Data analysis revealed: (a) students regard scaffolded ESL instruction as significantly beneficial because of the positive learning environment it engenders; (b) supportive scaffolding offers students opportunity to overcome the social barrier of speaking during class; and, (c) teachers' awareness of students' thoughts on scaffolding insures acceptance of its beneficial principles. Based on these findings, implications are discussed to enhance scaffolding's implementation and thereby mitigate reticence.*

**Key Words:** scaffolding, reticence, participation, teacher-student interaction

### 1. Introduction

The dialogue which occurs between the teacher and the language learner cannot be underestimated. Teachers can provide authentic experiences for their students through regular verbal interaction by utilizing instructional scaffolding which will promote students' thinking and preparation for the future workplace where social interaction during teamwork is considered to be the norm (Hogan, & Pressley, 1997). The greatest challenge facing teachers who wish to scaffold is to create a convivial atmosphere where students will feel at ease to take intellectual risks and speak. Nowhere is this task said to be more challenging than in the Asian ESL classroom (Liu, & Jackson, 2009).

It is said that most Asian students' reticence and passivity is real. However, it has also been considered as "over-characterized" (Li, & Jia, 2006, p. 192), "over-generalized" (Cheng, 2000, p. 441), "exaggerated" (Cheng, 2000, p. 445), "limited-in-scope" (Liu, 2001, p. 42), "misperceived" (Watkins & Biggs, 2001, p. 437), "stereotypical" (Belchamber, 2008, p. 59), or "cliché" (Debashish, 2010, p. 153). Regardless, Jackson (2003) portrayed Chinese learners of English in an English-medium undergraduate business course in Hong Kong as both reticent and quiet. Because of contextual elements related to students' general lack of confidence stemming from an inability to participate orally in class. Likewise, Tsou (2005) also approved to some degree with the general notion that Asian students were as a group "more reserved and reticent" (p. 47) in the amount of their oral classroom participation. Further, Lee and Ng (2010) stated, "Reticence is a common problem faced by ESL / EFL teachers in classrooms, especially in those mainly with Asian students" (p. 302). Fwu (2013) reported in a National Science Council of Taiwan study that "more than 70% of Taiwanese students are too shy to ask questions in class" (p. 11). Therefore, the allegation of reticence represented in the literature which considers that Asian students, as a whole, are reticent continues unabated despite arguments against common attribution or calls for remediation.

To deal with the problem of alleged reticence, ESL students need teachers' scaffolding to assist development of learner autonomy to remediate its negative effects. Instructional scaffolding is useful in mitigating reticence and instilling independent language learning. Students unfamiliar with classroom social discourse will often hesitate in response to the teacher or to fellow students. This hesitancy is at once viewed as negative and inhibitive of the learning process. Teachers' scaffolding allows reticent students to perform tasks that would be slightly beyond their capabilities without the guidance of the teacher. Nevertheless, neither ample research has been conducted to approve the impact on the effect of scaffolding on students' English speaking ability, nor has there been much in the way of assessment made regarding the value of scaffolding on English language learning for Asian students.

To investigate students' responses to scaffolding in the Asian ESL classroom that were a part of this study, a questionnaire on 112 student responses to English language instruction and scaffolding was administered. The questionnaire contained the focus of this study (i.e. English language instruction and scaffolding). The questionnaire describes 10 items concerned with the subjects' responses to perceived scaffolding during English communication skills instruction in a classroom setting. Questions used a 5-point Likert scale and were designed to elicit the subjects' awareness of personal English speaking proficiency and familiarity with western learning conventions / expectations expressed throughout instruction. The information from this questionnaire informed the qualitative analysis of this study.

## **2. Literature Review**

Scaffolding is a discursive mechanism which occurs in "the social interaction that a knowledgeable participant can create, by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence" (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976, cited in Lantolf, & Appel, 1994, p. 40). It helps promote an understanding of how teachers may assist learners to perform and internalize their co-constructed knowledge in shared activity. Learners are permitted to participate in the complex process of speaking before they are able to do so unassisted by the use of scaffolding in the ESL classroom. This process involves the setting up of "temporary supports, provided by capable people" (Peregoy, & Boyle, 1997, p. 81). These "capable people" include not only the teacher, but they also include more knowledgeable classmates and peers who will assist the learner to acquire nascent language skills.

In the ESL classroom, teachers can scaffold English learners' language in a number of important ways. Verhoeven (1997) suggested that teachers who implement scaffolding EFL students by the following principles:

1. Motivating the learner to work on a given task in the target language
2. Defining the number of task steps related to the learner's current ability
3. Diagnosing discrepancies between the learner's production and obtainment of the ideal solution
4. Controlling learners' frustration and risk to find new solutions (p. 395)

To be specific, teachers trigger ESL students' motivation to do a practical task that will require use of the targeted language skill that is being instructed. Second, the teacher can interpret logical steps to complete a selected task. Third, the teacher can assess the students' understanding of what makes the task difficult or impractical to complete. Once the assessment is made, the teacher can demonstrate a constructive approach to overcome the problem of task completion by helping the students to interpret their own feelings and related classroom experiences.

As ESL students become proficient at doing more complex English language tasks, the amount of teacher and peer supports can be decreased or removed entirely. This part of scaffolding is known as "fading". The component of "fading" is characterized as the continual revision of the scaffolded parameters in response to emerging capabilities of the novice (Rogoff, 1990). A second component of scaffolding is called "internalization" (Wertsch, 1991). The internalization of scaffolded performance is said to occur whenever the learner experiences an internalized dialogue which is supposed to promote his or her use and acquisition of knowledge as it is co-constructed in a shared activity. The theoretical basis for scaffolding in EFL is well-established.

Scaffolding as a strategy was first predicated on a social constructivist approach that linguistic development takes place through social interaction in a historical-cultural context. In the social constructivist theory, Vygotsky (1986) claimed that all children learn through some sort of interpersonal activity, and that learning manifests itself first as social interaction and secondly as internalization (cited in Ellis, 1997).

The theory of social constructivism founded in Vygotsky espoused that newly acquired knowledge is actively constructed by learners and not passively received. The constructivist approach to language learning considers that learners will be instrumental in developing cognition through an adaptive process that assists learners' to organize their educational experiences in the classroom. Vygotsky (1978) stated, "Higher mental functions have a social origin and defines language as a sign system that can be used for symbolic activities permitting intellectual accomplishments" (cited in Verhoeven, 1997, p. 394). In other words, scaffolded performance resulting from the notion of an inner-directed form of speech is both social in origin and mediated through language. This kind of practical self-reflection can easily serve as a bridge between the regular social interaction of learning and with self-direction as a whole.

To further explain how social interaction in the classroom scaffolds language learning, Long (1985) posited the interaction hypothesis which considered that comprehensible input is the result of modified interaction, which is itself created in order to make complex input accessible to learners. The significance of Long's research was that he suggested that the traditional ESL classroom was no longer an educational setting for the practice of form-related "grammatical structures" and "rote learning". Instead, classrooms are for conversation and other forms of interactive communication that will lead students to develop linguistic rules on their own (Brown, 2000). This position was approved by van Lier (1996), who laid out the principles of awareness, autonomy, and authenticity which would ultimately lead the language learner into constructing new language elements through socially-mediated interaction based on carefully designed contexts.

The process of scaffolding in the language classroom is not without its drawbacks (Gibbons, 2002). Scaffolding requires the teacher's utmost attention to detail and observation. Students are constantly placing the teacher into the challenging position of whether or not to scaffold supportively when errors, misunderstanding, or confusion arises; or, to remove the opportunity for students' self-discovery through trial and error. Scaffolding is ongoing and is not considered to be a quick fix option for correcting errors or achieving immediate language learning goals. In addition, scaffolding necessitates learners to engage in near-authentic or cognitively challenging tasks to avoid the risk of imposing a reductionist curriculum to meet students' interests with lower expectations. Finally, the use of scaffolding requires an entirely different orientation to learning tasks and qualitative results by some teachers.

Tsui (1996) reported study findings of how students considered the teacher to have the central role and complete initiative in controlling the amount and the quality of the scaffolding process as it occurred. From the responses described above, an over-dependence on teachers, teacher-centered learning agendas, and even the teacher's inability to perform proper scaffolding techniques was much in evidence. Subjects reported that scaffolding was ineffective as far as they were concerned since there was already so little time to speak in class. They also considered that class sizes precluded the teacher's full attention to address specific learning needs during the time of instruction. Most responses were related to how students considered that teacher's contradicted their own scaffolding efforts by reverting to the mutually-shared Chinese language for purposes of explanation or explication. About 8% of subjects' were focused with how their idea of scaffolding encouraged passivity in the classroom since students perceived it as "the teacher doing all of the work for you".

The progressive pedagogy which utilizes scaffolding for purposes of engendering independent thinking and resulting learner autonomy was considered as "embarrassing" by 8% of the students since it called attention on one's own developmental shortcomings. This finding was affirmed by Pennycook's (1997) statement that learner autonomy may not be seen as a universal good in every learning context. The imposition of a well-established and predominant learning style within Chinese-speaking culture may explain why typically unquestioned or sometimes unconsciously-held beliefs were held about instructional practices (Yang, 1992). The different experiences that students' possess while learning a foreign language within the context of their cultural belief system may explain why learner autonomy differs in value from culture-to-culture.

According to Hogan and Pressley (1997), norms for interpersonal interactions vary from culture to culture, so it requires different approaches to make sure that over-direction did not occur which could confuse the student rather than facilitate communication and precipitate a loss of face because of the teacher's directed attention at the student when calling upon him. According to Gudykunst, & Kim (2003), the student's desire to maintain face would lead him or her not to speak in order to save face. In addition, scaffolding has the potential of making him too dependent on the teacher's scaffolding efforts.

Eventually, the aspect of fading should compensate for this kind of feeling; however, there must be a balance achieved between the students' and teacher's ownership of learning outcomes and goal-setting. Moreover, the adverse effect of the teacher's imposition of their own understanding or interpretation which might discourage potential discussion. Scaffolding is supposed to hone students' thinking abilities, but since some students have a hard time understanding and articulating their thinking processes (Flowerdew, Miller, & Li, 2000) teachers must step in occasionally. To circumvent the over-direction of students' efforts through scaffolding, teachers must make an effort to teach the meanings of their labels for cognitive processing as well as the content to be presented. Finally, the frequent inclusion of Chinese language in the classroom environment might have a deleterious effect on her learning. The L1 interference of Chinese in the English language classroom is easily recognized by the student because it will inhibit English speaking practice.

In summary, the teaching of speaking in the ESL classroom requires teachers to scaffold students in order to ensure that every student has equal access to related information. The main point of scaffolding in the teaching of speaking is that ESL teachers should try to identify how much support students need in order to learn speaking skills and to provide sufficient support while working towards the eventual goal of student independence. In an effort to best identify how ESL teachers may identify student perceptions of instructional scaffolding, this study was generated. The students' responses to scaffolded instruction presented in this study aim to further promote the interaction and awareness among the instructor, the learners, and the content of ESL instruction.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Participants**

This study included the administration of a questionnaire (N = 112; 63 female and 39 male) first-year non-English majors from four English communication classes enrolled at a university in southern Taiwan. Participants answered a 47-item questionnaire containing ten items specific to scaffolding which are reported in this portion of the overall study.

#### **3.2 Instruments and Materials**

All questionnaires were administered in English and were completed and then returned within the same two-day period. The questionnaire consisted of a sequence of ten questions (derived from a longer survey instrument) related to the respondents' personal experience and perspective of the teacher's scaffolding efforts in the ESL classroom. The study was conducted during the first and second 18 week terms of 2012. The students were asked to voluntarily answer the survey in 30 minutes at the beginning of a normal teaching period in the second-half of the term.

### **4. Results and Discussions**

The questionnaire was comprised of ten questions and aimed to explore participants' individual responses to scaffolding in the ESL language classroom. Questionnaire results indicated as follows.

#### *1. My teacher encouraged me to take responsibility for my own learning objectives and set goals.*

Student responses to Item 1 indicated that their teacher's encouragement and assistance in goal setting, defining content, and selecting methods for classroom instruction is significantly beneficial. This finding conformed to Schmidt and Frota's (1986) notion that those who notice most learn most. For responses to Item 1, 56% of the students (36% agreed and 20% strongly agreed) acknowledged that the direct intervention of the teacher encourages them to take responsibility for their own learning objectives or to set learning goals for themselves. The students generally positive response to this item might suggest that the student's generally expect the teacher to take this role rather than for them to act dependently.

#### *2. My teacher helped me to define the content and progress of my own learning.*

Regarding the responses to Item 2, the students overwhelming considered that the role of the teacher must be to define the content and progress of students' learning, rather than any independent course of action being taken. As a result, 87% (62% agreed and 25% strongly agreed) of the students affirmed the notion that the teacher had provided for such a definition through the imposition of the scaffolding and prepared lesson plans. Gibbons's (2002) proclaimed that the role of the teacher in scaffolding instruction is to first create a meaningful context for language learning to occur without resorting to formal direction and micro-management of students.

As Wegerif and Mercer (1996) previously stated, the real role of teachers is “to stimulate ‘thinking aloud’ or ‘exploratory talk’” (p. 48). The elicitation of spoken discourse through the think-aloud protocols (Færch, & Kaspar, 1987) form the basis for the scaffolded instruction.

3. *My teacher helped me to select the methods and techniques I will use in my English class by myself.*

In the responses to Item 3, 45% (37% agreed and 5% strongly agreed) of the students did not consider that their teacher had helped them to select the methods and techniques that they would use independently in the English class by themselves. Once again, it may be assumed that the students preferred some form of traditional and overly scripted page-by-page content that would conform to traditional notions of text-based instruction.

4. *I think the English teacher gives everyone an equal chance to take turns in speaking.*

In response to Item 4, 41% (25% agreed and 16% strongly agreed) of students responded that the teacher had chosen to call on some students more than others. The perceived equal opportunity to take turns in a classroom situation also enhances a sense of personal responsibility in students taking part in overall classroom discussion (Seliger, 1977). Therefore, each student is considered to have an equal share of participating in and managing the discussion at hand, regardless of whether they choose to act.

5. *I think the teacher calls on some people in class more than others.*

In response to Item 5, 31% (29% agreed and 2% strongly agreed) of students responded that the teacher had fairly apportioned turn-taking throughout the scaffolded instruction. Brown (2001) claimed that students’ “language ego” caused even highly intelligent language learners to feel fragility because they had to “fend for themselves with paltry linguistic batteries that left them with a feeling of total defenselessness” (p. 61). This possibly meant that students did not consider that their teacher had paid sufficient attention on who to call on or who to ask to volunteer.

6. *The teacher provides our class with lots of cultural information besides what we learn about the language.*

In response to Item 6, 45% (41 % agreed and 9% strongly agreed) of the students responded that the teacher had provided the class with ample amounts of cultural materials in addition to the language which was being taught. Despite the culturally-oriented format of the scaffolded instruction, students chose to ignore this aspect possibly since they lacked sufficient background knowledge to recognize the cultural interchange implications of problem-solving situations involving foreigners and locals. Therefore, as Gibbons (2002) postulated, it is up to the teacher to make sure the notion of a mode continuum is followed in a classroom wherever scaffolding occurs. The mode continuum serves as a linguistic framework from which teachers can design a variety of teaching activities that were sequenced from most situation-embedded (i.e. scaffolding), or most spoken-like (i.e. easiest for EFL students to comprehend), to situation-dependent (i.e. written discourse).

7. *The teacher gives us lots of tips on how to improve our language skills and correct our mistakes by ourselves.*

Regarding to the response to Item 7, 28% (12 % agreed and 16% strongly agreed) that the teacher had given the students lots of tips on how to improve their English language skills and explained how students should self-monitor to correct language errors from their own initiative. This result supports Oxford’s (1999) claim that in some learning cultures where students are very anxious about being corrected in front of others, so much so that it might preclude speaking, the teacher should include discussion about language difficulties and conditions that might minimize errors.

8. *My teacher is patient in helping me understand corrections to my speaking.*

In response to Item 8, 41% (29% agreed and 12% strongly agreed) that their teacher showed patience while helping them understand the nature of their errors during scaffolded instruction in the EFL classroom. One of the guiding principles of getting quiet students to speak is for the teacher to show infinite patience during their students’ error corrections (Martin, 2003).

This further supports the basic premise that Lee and Van Patten (2003) patently assume, “students actually do learn from the explanations instructors provide” (p. 9).

9. *My teacher is patient to explain things when I make mistakes or if I am confused.*

In response to Item 9, 28% (12% agreed and 16% strongly agreed) that their teacher had shown patience during explanations and periods of student confusion. It is often the students' sentiments that correction should be welcomed as an opportunity for self-correction. The best correction is that which is frequently balanced with direct and indirect instances of praise. This form of scaffolded instructional technique helped students to take responsibility for their portion of the "scaffolding partnership" (Hogan, & Pressley, 1997: p. 103) because it would be a rewarding experience. As Krashen (1985) suggested, if the teacher responded to corrections naturally, reformulating patiently, the students would be comfortably exposed to language they could understand, and which is at the edge of their current lexical repertoire. It should be understood that how a teacher imposes corrections on students has the marked potential to inhibit students' speaking in the language classroom. According to Carter (2001), the teacher's response to the correct form of English to be taught is always a question of whether or not these forms are the kind which a teacher would want to teach their students and in what context. Students sometimes place reliance upon the teacher's instruction because of their own inexperience with learning English at the university level. The initial disposition of the student is to await instruction according to some prescriptive form of knowledge transfer (i.e. "ask us", or "tell us"). The purpose of scaffolded instruction is to break this paradigm and initiate learner autonomy to occur. It is possible to observe that the students involved in this student were well aware of their purpose in learning; however, while scaffolded instruction obviously occurred, there is still no direct admission of learner autonomy having taken place. The above excerpts of the students' responses indicated that students reportedly experienced a real sense of encouragement to learn and to speak through the receipt of the teacher's praise. As the teacher's focus during scaffolded instruction followed basic CLT protocol that considered meaningful output over hyper-corrected examples (Lee, & Van Patten, 2003), students had every reason to feel more secure.

10. *I follow the learning example set by my teacher.*

In response to Item 10, 62% (54% agreed and 8% strongly agreed) that they followed the teacher's example in learning their English language. Whether it is proper speech patterns, precise grammar, new vocabulary, or correct pronunciation, teachers set the standard for what is standard spoken English. The role of the teacher is to be an exemplar and as a model (Richards, & Rodgers, 2001).

The teacher's correction and practical guidance were perceived as the most gain. This finding was supported by Gibbons (2002) who indicated that spoken correction was one of the primary benefits second language students desired most from their instructor during the scaffolding process. Likewise, students are said to welcome the facilitative nature of the scaffolding because it is believed to speed up the learning process while offering both method and focused efficiency to the learner. Motivation to direct one's own learning may best be related to learning style (Ehrman, 1996).

It is Lee and VanPatten's (2003) notion that the teacher may act as a "resource person" (p. 68) to give directions, make no assumptions, and who responds to specific student needs by providing more information to clarify what is initially misunderstood.

Survey results indicated that teachers were thought by their students to have the greatest control over how scaffolding is perceived during instruction. Students viewed scaffolding negatively because it created too much dependency on the teacher's relative input. However, this did not take into account the notion of "fading" that is so much a part of scaffolding. Once the scaffolding is removed through gradual fading, then the student is thought to become a more independent learner as a result. The excerpts indicated that students were also quite aware of the inherent drawbacks of too much scaffolding because of the conflictive, directive, or overly influential way teachers may choose to apply this support. In addition, according to Student-14, the imposition it places on the students' creativity and imagination was not entirely lost on students considering the above comments.

## **5. Conclusions and Implications**

The results of this study add to the literature in several ways. In addition to advancing knowledge towards the influence of scaffolding and learner autonomy on reticence in the EFL classroom, the results can inspire teachers to be aware of the problem of the cultural barrier of reticence of the students in a hospitality and tourism university. The teachers may compare the impacts of differences in the eastern and the western cultures on classroom participation of their students.

In addition, the students in a hospitality and tourism university are expected to overcome their classroom reticence with the help of the teachers' scaffolding. As well, they may improve their learning confidence after they develop their own learning autonomy. Last but not least, educators may reassess the overall western teaching approach in English teaching, such as the communicative teaching approach on students in different language and cultural backgrounds. Though it is ideal to implement communicative language teaching approach to students, some Asian students may be conservative to adopt it or adapt it in their English language learning. Accordingly, some alternative or adapted English teaching approach may be innovated.

Based on the analyses and discussion presented above, the following conclusions can be reached. Scaffolding should be taken into consideration in EFL classes. To be specific, teachers have to understand individual learner's strengths and weaknesses, and then to provide him or her with the necessary assistance through instruction so that he or she may meet the challenge independently the next time around. According to Liu (2009), teachers should re-examine their interaction in English speaking. Due to the time limit involved in this study, frequent interactions among peers that are scaffolded by the teacher during instruction. Numerous means of teacher-student interactions may be promoted within the classroom setting that will create opportunities to speak in English. Horwitz (2001) and Zou (2004) suggested teachers instruct students' language through the use of regular class discussions. Throughout the discussion scaffolding can be applied so that the teacher may facilitate students' articulation of their understanding or confusion during English speaking performance. As suggested in earlier studies of scaffolded English instruction and reticence in Asian ESL classrooms (Tsui, 1996; Zou, 2004), teachers can promote students' active participation in English-language lessons by enhancing students' interest in and motivation to speak the language. Scaffolded topical matter may assist students to feel more relaxed, less anxious, and far more willing to participate (Prégent, 1994).

The students' responses to scaffolding were generally favorable; they viewed the teacher's scaffolding as advantageous for enriching their English spoken content. To be specific, most of the students agreed that the teacher gives them lots of tips on how to improve their language skills and correct their mistakes by themselves. For instance, the subjects were asked to identify ways in which they could better initiate small talk with foreign guests and visitors by pre-selecting a range of suitable material (i.e. sports, weather, travel, language learning, etc.). They also participated in a regular viewing of DVD's related to English cultural affairs and travel to the UK that promoted discussion about personal experiences of travel abroad. In addition, the student responses to learner autonomy were also positive. Most of the students agreed that the teacher was patient in helping them understand corrections to their English speaking. For instance, students were requested to write down any and all questions they might have about being corrected. This allowed the students to address the teacher before or after the class to avoid embarrassment or undue attention. The findings demonstrate that scaffolding provides students with the right balance of independence and support they needed to improve their English speaking performance.

Although the scaffolded teaching would not by itself result in the mastery of fluency or proficiency in the target language, it did have a value: reinforcing input. The role of the kind of noticing facilitated by scaffolding is to transform input into intake. Therefore, the explicit nature of instruction, either by traditional or in the scaffolded instruction method, only slightly facilitated the awareness of the students in English learner autonomy. As such, it should not itself be considered as significant. While developing second language proficiency in English entails a gradual increase in one's ability to comprehend and express (Geva, & Genesee, 2006), the 16 weeks of scaffolded instruction may certainly not have been sufficiently long enough for subjects to appreciate the benefits of scaffolding and to fully develop a resultant level of learning autonomy. Roehler and Cantlon (1997) pointed out that students can obtain the goal of learner autonomy from a continued exposure to scaffolded instructional models that provide students with rules and skills to decode text and achieve meaning.

In other words, it takes time to achieve learner autonomy and it is a process of accretion. The two different approaches of tradition and scaffolded instructional methods facilitated the students' acquisition of social interaction and immediate feedback in this study. For example, classroom exercises, whereby peer learning is at the forefront of the instructional mode, are useful for raising learner autonomy. In the use of scaffolding, the learners do the thinking, or the collaborating as partners, in order to develop natural communication in the target language with the help of their peers (Hogan, & Pressley, 1997). Thus, with the help of the scaffolded instruction, the students may yet notice, and then become aware of, the learner autonomy open to them throughout their instructional coursework.

Ultimately, some students may inhibit removal of the scaffolding from taking place themselves. They may wish not to have any direct classroom exchange with the teacher because of the threat it represents in terms of calling attention to mistakes, uncertainty, or misunderstanding. Albeit stereotypic, this feeling is also much evidenced by the typical classroom seating choice made by Taiwanese EFL students. Students commonly wish to be seated as far away from the teacher's physical operating space as possible. Likewise, students seldom object if their teachers insist on using the L1 in place of the target language, since they feel they are in very little position to argue the point despite the very nature of the lesson.

## References

- Belchamber, R. (2008). The advantages of communicative language teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved January 14, 2012, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html>
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). California: San Francisco State University.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University.
- Carter, B.A. (2001). From awareness to counseling in learner autonomy. *AILA Review* 15, 26-33.
- Cheng, X.T. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System*, 28(3), 435-446.
- Debashish, B. (2010). Asian students' perceived passivity in the ESL/EFL classroom. *Language in India*, 10(10), 150-179.
- Ehrman, M.E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in inter-language communication*. London: Longman.
- Flowerdew, J., Miller, L., & Li, D. (2000). Chinese lecturers' perceptions, problems & strategies lecturing in English to Chinese-speaking students. *RELC Journal*, 31, 116-138.
- Fwu, B.J. (2013). "More than 70% of Taiwanese students too shy to ask questions in class". *Taipei Times*, Wednesday, May 01, 2013, p. 11.
- Geva, E., & Genesee, F. (2006). First-language oral proficiency and second-language literacy. In D. August, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Report to the national literacy panel on K-12 youth and adolescents*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.
- Gudykunst, W.B., & Kim, Y.Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hogan, K., & Pressley, M. (1997). *Scaffolding Student Learning: instructional Approaches and Issues*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Horwitz, E.K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Jackson, J. (2003). Case-based learning and reticence in a bilingual context: Perceptions of business students in Hong Kong. *System*, 31 (4), 457-469.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman
- Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Lee, W., & Ng, S. (2010). Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy. *ELT Journal Advance Access*. doi:10. 1093/elt/ccp080.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. Taipei: McGraw-Hill International.
- Li, X., & Jia, X. (2006). Why don't you speak up?: East Asian Students' Participation patterns in American and Chinese ESL classrooms. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 15(1), 192-206.
- Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U.S. universities: An emic perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Liu, M.H. (2009). *Reticence and anxiety in oral English lessons*. Bern: Peter Lang, AG.
- Liu, M.H., & Jackson, J. (2009). Reticence in Chinese EFL students at varied proficiency levels. *TESL Canada Journal / Revue TESL du Canada*, 26(2), 65-81.



- Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Martin, D. (2003). *Talk a Lot, Book 2*, EFL Press. Saitama, Japan.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy. In P. Benson, & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (1997). *Reading, writing, & learning in ESL*. New York: Longman.
- Prégent, R. (1994). *Charting your course: How to prepare to teach more effectively*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roehler, L.R., & Cantlon, D.J. (1997). Scaffolding: A powerful tool in social constructivist classrooms. In K. Hogan, & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Scaffolding student learning: instructional approaches and issues* (pp. 6-42). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Seliger, H.W. (1977). Does practice make perfect?: A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. *Language Learning*, 27, 263-278. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00122.x
- Tsou, W. L. (2005). Improving speaking skills through instruction in oral classroom participation. *Language Annals*, 38(1), 46-55.
- Tsui, A.B.M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- vanLier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. Harlow: Longman.
- VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in SLA. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Verhoeven, L. (1997). Sociolinguistics and education. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 389-404). Carlton, Victoria (AU): Blackwell.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Watkins, D., & Biggs, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Hong Kong: Central Printing Press.
- Wegerif, R., & Mercer, N. (1996). Computers and reasoning through talk in the classroom. *Language and Education*, 10(1), 47-64.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991) *Voices of the mind: A socio-cultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100.
- Yang, N.D. (1992). Second language learners' beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Austin: University of Texas at Austin.
- Zou, M. (2004). EFL learners' perceptions of in-class relationships and their voluntary responses. In Y. Gao (Ed.), *The social psychology of English learning by Chinese college students* (pp. 149-167). Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research.

**Table 1. The Student Responses to Scaffolding after Implementation of Scaffold Instruction**

<i>Item</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. My teacher encouraged me to take responsibility for my own learning objectives and set goals.	0 0%	31 28%	18 16%	41 36%	22 20%	112 100%
2. My teacher helped me to define the content and progress of my own learning.	0 0%	2 2%	13 12%	69 62%	28 25%	112 100%
3. My teacher helped me to select the methods and techniques I will use in my English class by myself.	0 0%	37 33%	28 25%	41 37%	6 5%	112 100%
4. I think the English teacher gives everyone an equal chance to take turns in speaking.	0 0%	9 8%	56 50%	28 25%	19 16%	112 100%
5. I think the teacher calls on some people in class more than others.	3 3%	41 37%	33 29%	33 29%	2 2%	112 100%
6. The teacher provides our class with lots of cultural information besides what we learn about the language.	3 20%	22 33%	37 37%	41 8%	9 100%	112
7. The teacher gives us lots of tips on how to improve our language skills and correct our mistakes by ourselves.	3 3%	9 8%	68 62%	13 12%	19 16%	112 100%
8. My teacher is patient in helping me understand corrections to my speaking.	0 0%	11 10%	56 50%	33 29%	12 11%	112 100%
9. My teacher is patient to explain things when I make mistakes or if I am confused.	0 0%	8 7%	72 64%	13 12%	19 16%	112 100%
10. I follow the learning example set by my teacher.	6 5%	60 54%	18 16%	28 25%	0 0%	112 100%

*Note.* SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree