

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉： 透過臉書學習英文寫作

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：NSC 102-2410-H-004-083-
執行期間：102年08月01日至103年07月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學外文中心

計畫主持人：劉怡君

計畫參與人員：碩士班研究生-兼任助理人員：尤啟鴻
大專生-兼任助理人員：游智凱
大專生-兼任助理人員：韓名
大專生-兼任助理人員：李昆儒
博士班研究生-兼任助理人員：Leon van J

報告附件：出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：

1. 公開資訊：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中華民國 103 年 10 月 15 日

中文摘要：本研究探討非正式學習對學生正式學習之影響

中文關鍵詞：臉書、非正式學習、網路學習、

英文摘要：Online technologies have dramatically influenced not only formal learning, but also knowledge acquisition in a more incidental and informal manner (Gray, 2004; McFerrin, 1999; Pennington, 1989). Therefore, it is imperative to explore the impacts of internet-mediated informal learning that significantly affects one's formal education. This study examines what EFL students, including those who do not perceive FB as helpful to their English learning, can incidentally learn. Two research questions were explored: 1. What is Taiwanese students' perception of using FB on learning English? 2. What can EFL students informally learn through facebooking? A qualitative study was conducted. Multiple data were collected, including perceptual data and performance data. It was found that students perceived FB participation as course work, disinclination, and power negotiation. Although 45% participants perceived FB community ineffective for their English learning, this study revealed that students could informally improve their academic knowledge and skills, social and collaboration, and motivation. These findings argued that learning can occur even when meaning-making process is perceived to be meaningless to an individual. Teachers' role is not merely to scaffold students' formal learning, but also to create a context that can draw learners' informal learning.

英文關鍵詞：Key words: Facebook, informal learning, online learning

科技部專題研究計畫成果報告

正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉：
透過臉書學習英文寫作

計畫編號：

MOST 102-2410-H-004-083-

執行期間：

2013年8月1日至2014年7月31日

執行機構及系所：

國立政治大學

計畫主持人：

劉怡君

正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉:

透過臉書學習英文寫作

關鍵字: L2 writing, online learning, informal learning, learning transfer, facebook

中文摘要

語言的學習發展無法端賴課堂上的短暫接觸與正式學習的訓練，也無法完全依賴老師在課堂的正式授課與規劃好的教材。一般學習者的學習中，八成的學習是來自於「非正式學習」(Attwell, 2007)。在 Web 2.0 科技便捷發達、資訊快速交換的時代，每一個個體，在日常生活中，都不可避免的暴露於各式各樣的資訊影響下。隨著社交網的普及與科技產品的日新月異，這些唾手可得的大量資訊與網路社交互動使學習者比以往更容易經歷非正式學習的機會。臉書社群網因著強大的同步(synchronous)與非同步(asynchronous)多元溝通功能，顯然已成為二十一世紀最受歡迎的社群網路溝通工具之一 (Boyd, 2007; Hargittai, 2007; Thelwall, 2008)。網際網路所帶來的豐富的非正式學習資訊已經對學習者在閱讀上、資訊處理上、思維上產生了微妙的改變 (Bull, Thompson, Searson, Garofalo, Park, Young, & Lee, 2008)，也因此對傳統學習模式產生了不可輕忽的影響。

然而，將這些透過網際網路習得的非正式學習移轉來協助學生的正式學習的過程，並非如想像中的理所當然，卻是當代教育的首要與終極目標之一。對於大多數的教師學者而言，教育的終極目標不僅僅是協助學生學習新知，因為，教室所習得的知識永遠難以應付教室外的實際生活、工作上的各種情境需求。教育的最終目標是要能協助學生可以將所學得的新知移轉應用在不同的情境、用以解決不同的問題。當非正式學習的影響力已透過網際網路無遠弗屆、非正式學習的重要性與日俱增，要探討學生在教室內正式學習下的成效，不可避免的要瞭解非正式學習在正式學習上所可能產生的影響，要探討非正式學習對正式學習的影響，不可避免的要探討認知移轉的策略。許多專家(Greenhow 和 Robelia, 2009; Hofstein & Rosenfeld, 1996)強調，非正式學習會影響學習者的正式學習，他們並呼籲，學者、教師應該擴張非正式學習的應用境界，並協助學生將非正式學習有效應用於學生的正式學習上。但是，學者們卻發現，這些透過網際網路所提供的非正式學習機會並未被教師們(digital immigrants, Prensky, 2001)有效的引用到正式學習的教室內，正式學習與非正式學習間有著極待幫補的鴻溝(Trinder, Guiller, Margaryan, Littlejohn, Nicol, 2008)。本研究就是要探討非正式學習對正式學習的影響，以及兩者移轉的關聯。筆者提出的研究問題如下:

1. 學生如何移轉正式與非正式學習上所獲得的訊息?
2. 臉書的非正式學習在正式英文寫作學習上會產生何學習成效影響?

透過質性研究的紮根理論研究方法，筆者收集多元資料，包括：問卷、面談資料、反思日記、臉書文字檔，以及參與研究學生的期中期末考卷等等，來交叉分析比對。根據資料比對分析後，筆者預期研究成果是可以歸納出透過臉書非正式學習到的經驗知識如何影響正式英文寫作的學習；這些非正式學習的經驗知識是如何移轉來協助正式學習。此外，筆者期待可以將歸納出的認知移轉、正式、非正式學習的相互關係以認知關係圖架構呈現出來。

英文摘要

Interrelationships and Transfer between Formal and Informal Learning: Learning English Writing through Facebook

Key words: L2 writing, online learning, informal learning, learning transfer, facebook

ABSTRACT

As one of the most popular online social networking sites (SNS), Facebook (FB) has over 700 million global users, and the number continues to rise. More than 10 million FB accounts have already been registered in Taiwan. This prominence of surging users has aroused enthusiasm among educators to explore the application of FB in teaching and in engaging learners. Proliferating studies have illustrated the significance of FB and suggested its potential for effective academic practice due to its reflective qualities, mechanisms of peer feedback and collaborative models. However, incongruent findings are also emerging. Many researchers reported that FB is beneficial for students' social lives and informal academic learning rather than formal educational purposes. Since learning can be pervasively enriched and shaped by technologies, it is imperative to explore the impacts of FB on formal and informal learning.

This study attempts to explore the following questions:

1. How did students transfer formal/informal learning through Facebook application?
2. What is the impact of informal learning from FB on formal learning of L2 writing?

A qualitative study was conducted, and 120 Taiwanese university freshmen participated in this research. Besides teaching English writing in the traditional classroom, the teacher researcher registered a FB account to encourage students' extra practices of English writing. Multiple data were collected including students' FB text exchanges, reflections, surveys, interview responses and students' exam papers. Analysis about the interplay of formal and informal learning will be discussed. Moreover, the cognitive interrelationship between transfer, formal and informal learning will be illustrated.

結案報告

Exploring Informal Learning through Facebooking

Web 2.0 applications on the social networking community (SNC) have encouraged pedagogical transformation that continually facilitates both formal and informal learning. Facebook (FB), one of the most compelling SNCs, has increased in popularity over the past 6 years, with about 85-99% of college students world-wide users (Hargittai, 2008; Jones and Fox, 2009; Junco, 2011; Matney and Borland, 2009; Smith and Caruso, 2010). This prevalence has aroused enthusiasm amongst educators to explore potential implications for language teaching and learning (Godwin-Jones, 2008). Although many researchers have shown skepticism on the teaching application of Web 2.0 technologies (Lohnes & Kinzer, 2007; Salaway, Caruso & Nelson, 2007; Waycott, Bennett, Kennedy, Dalgarno & Gray, 2010), considerable studies have suggested FB's potential for effective academic practices in motivating students (Blattner and Fiori, 2009; Mazer, Murphy and Simonds, 2007; Mills, 2009; Northcote, and Kendle, 2001; Shi, 2011; Ziegler 2007), enhancing collaborative learning (Maloney, 2007), promoting critical thinking (Bugeja 2006), encouraging social interaction (Haverback, 2009; Mason, 2006), supporting cross-cultural communication (Blattner and Fiori, 2009; Wang, 2012), improving EFL learners' English writing skills (Shih, 2011), and developing a sense of learning community and socio-pragmatic competence (Blattner and Fiori, 2009). Moreover, emerging empirical studies also reveal that the nature of students' FB-use contributes to informal learning (Greenhow and Robelia, 2009; Madge, Meek, Wellens and Hooley, 2009; Selwyn, 2007, 2009; Usluel and Mazman, 2009). Its interactive, communal and situated contexts offer discursive and non-discursive elements which may enhance out-of-school literacy (Reid, 2011) and change the traditional way students gather, apply and construct knowledge (Conole, de Laat, Dillon, and Darby, 2006). Because online technologies have dramatically influenced not only personal and interpersonal learning, but also knowledge acquisition in a more incidental and informal manner (Gray, 2004; McFerrin, 1999; Pennington, 1989), it is imperative to explore the impacts of internet-mediated informal learning that significantly affects one's formal education. While much attention has been given to the implications of FB in formal academic settings, informal learning has received relatively less attention (Livingstone, 2001; Selwyn, 2007) due to its slippery and incidental nature compounded with methodological and philosophical difficulties. Eraut (2004) indicates the barricades of studying informal learning: it is usually (1) tacit, taken for granted or not recognized, (2) implicitly acquired and regarded as one's inherent capability, and (3) difficult to describe due to its lack of codified-proposition (p. 249).

This study implements a FB community of English in an EFL university context to shed new light on FB's informal and incidental learning opportunities. It examines what EFL students, including those who do not perceive FB as helpful to English learning, can incidentally learn. To be specific, two research questions will lead the discussion:

1. What is Taiwanese students' perception of using FB on learning English?
2. What can EFL students informally learn through facebooking?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Informal learning

Online applications with multimedia tools have been considered effective for incidental learning (Cahoon, 1995; McFerrin, 1999; Kabilan, Ahmad and Abidin, 2010; Pennington, 1989), as they offer users the opportunity to acquire online knowledge (Northcote and Kendle, 2001), in addition to other skills, such as "critical analysis of resources, effective online communication, and filtering and deciphering information" (Kabilan, Ahmad and Abidin, 2010, p. 180).

Given that not every learning stimulus is equally salient, and learning can take place beyond planned instruction, both formal and informal learning should be taken into account to better explore students' learning (McCormick, 1990). When individuals learn incidentally, this learning may be tacit or unconscious (Marsick and Watkins, 2001). The intangible nature of informal learning makes it difficult to define. In his pioneering study of self-directed informal learning, Tough (1978) used the metaphor of an iceberg, with the majority submerged part identified as informal learning that occurs both in and outside of traditional schooling. Attwell (2007) confirms the importance of informal learning, indicating that informal learning represents almost 80% of one's knowledge of his/her working environment. Informal learning also explains the nature of learning, significantly influencing how one perceives and interprets the ever-changing environment (Livingstone and Sawchuk, 2004). This, in turn, affects one's ability to make sense of new knowledge and to solve problems. However, informal learning usually is not easy to recognize, and often taken for granted as one's reflective perception. Researchers have strived to distinguish informal from formal learning, but found it difficult and problematic (Livingstone, 2001). Some researchers defined informal learning from the context-based perspective to activities involving any pursuit of understanding, knowledge or skill that takes place outside a dedicated learning setting (Livingstone 1999; McGivney, 1999). In general, it refers to horizontal knowledge acquired through everyday social practices (Bernstein, 2000), such as observation, trial and error, asking for help, interacting with others, listening to stories, reflecting on a daily events, or being stimulated by general interests (Cross,

2007; Selwyn, 2007). However, some researchers (Eraut, 2004; Marsick and Watkins, 2001; Hodkinson, Colley and Malcolm, 2003) argued that informal learning might also take place as a by-product of formal education, and vice versa.

Some researchers have attempted to define informal learning by contrasting it with formal learning and the attributes of learning. Marsick and Watkins (1990, 2001) regarded informal and incidental learning as related concepts of learning “en passant” usually taking place without being specifically structured. Greenhow and Robelia (2009) defined informal learning as “spontaneous, experiential, and unplanned” (p. 122). Nevertheless, Eraut (2004) and Hodkinson et al (2003) argued that the attributes of formal and informal learning can be present concurrently and inter-relatedly.

Eraut (2004), instead of seeing formal and informal learning as two dichotomies, defined informal learning as “learning that comes closer to the informal end than the formal end of a continuum” (p. 250). Three levels of intention were suggested in his “Typology of Informal Learning,” which are “implicit learning,” “reactive learning” and “deliberative learning” (Eraut, 2004, P. 250). In contrast with the formal end that has a definite learning goal guided by a preset curriculum, the informal end features “implicit, unintended, opportunistic and unstructured learning and the absence of a teacher” (p. 250). In this study, the “informal learning” inclines more to implicit or incidental learning.

Facebook and Language Learning

The affordances of FB community of practices have been gaining attention. A number of researchers have attempted to understand the natural use of FB by students. Selwyn (2009) observed the FB activities of 909 UK undergraduate students for 18 weeks. Analyzing 68,169 students’ wall postings, Selwyn finds that though “only a minor constituent” (p. 170) were education-and university-related, FB is important for students’ informal learning to perceive the roles, values and identities of Self.

Along the same line, Madge, Meek, Wellens and Hooley (2009) conducted an empirical study through a multi-model approach. Collecting 213 responses via Facebook and Email surveys, they found that only 10% of respondents used FB for academic related discussion, with 43% disagreeing that Facebook could enhance teaching and learning. Based on their findings, Madge et al (2009) suggested that Facebook is beneficial for students’ social lives and informal academic learning. However, they did not specify what students can informally learn through FB.

Kabilan, Ahmad, and Abidin (2010) surveyed 300 Malaysian undergraduates, studying how FB affects language learning. They found that FB improves students’ English language skills, confidence, motivation and positive attitude to communicate in English, suggesting that

FB as a community promotes the acquisition of incidental knowledge through sharing information, collaborating, and socially networking. They concluded that “from the perspective of incidental learning...learning of English in FB is feasible” (p. 185), and “learning can also take place anywhere as long as there are meaningful interactions between learners that lead to knowledge construction” (p. 181). Therefore, Kabilan et al (2010) suggested that English teachers should incorporate FB into planned learning objectives in order to bring learning to students’ awareness. Their theoretical framework, method, and finding are however problematic. It is improbable that surveys, a self-reporting method, can detect students’ incidental learning, which usually is tacit and self-unaware. It is also contradictory to suggest teachers predetermine explicit learning objectives to make students’ informal learning experience meaningful, as informal learning usually has no deliberate learning goals. The deficiency of this research revealed the difficulty and complexity of studying informal or incidental learning.

METHOD

Participants and contexts

A qualitative study was conducted at a national university in Taiwan to explore students’ informal learning of English as a foreign language in a FB community. Convenience sampling was used. Forty Taiwanese freshmen taking the one-year course, “College English”, taught by the teacher-researcher, participated in this study. The participants’ English proficiency fell into the range of intermediate to high-intermediate. As the teacher-researcher, I opened a FB community “College English,” to provide an alternative platform where students could have more opportunities to interact in English and acquire English literacy through community of practices (Wenger, 1998). Data collection started in the second semester, giving students time to become acquainted. This FB community was a semipublic context, with all profiles viewable by only “friends.” Students could either create a new account or use their existing ones. Due to low participation, I changed FB participation to include 3% of the total grade in the second semester to serve as incentive but without creating high-stakes. To encourage interaction, I regularly posted course related information, articles, films, music, pictures, questions, comments, and suggestions to students’ writing exercises. With the exception that participants should use English, they were free to interact in whatever way they felt most comfortable. Taking Eraut’s typology for the continuum of learning formality, this FB community characterizes a more unstructured learning context where participants could have opportunistic and reactive interaction for informal learning.

Data Collection

Multiple data were collected, including perceptual data (two reflection journals, one survey, and one interview) as well as performance data (midterm exam papers, and FB texts). The quantitative data were used to support the qualitative data analysis.

During the second semester, participants were first asked to turn in one reflection paper, designed to elicit students' deep reflective responses to their perception of FB practices (see Appendix 1). One survey was conducted after the midterm exam, surveying students about the effects of FB on their English learning, motivations and attitudes toward the FB community. Adapting Eraut's (2004) eight indicators of informal learning, I designed the survey questionnaire (see Appendix 2) on eight constructs: (1) task performance (e.g. speed and fluency), (2) role performance (e.g. supporting other's learning), (3) awareness and understanding (e.g. contexts and situations, problems and strategies), (4) personal development (e.g. self-evaluation, disposition to consult, disposition to attend to other's perspectives, disposition to learn and improve one's practice, ability to learn from experience), (5) teamwork (e.g. facilitating social relations, collaborative work), (6) academic knowledge and skills (e.g. accessing formal knowledge), (7) decision making and problem solving (e.g. when to seek expert help, formulating and evaluating options), and (8) judgment (e.g. quality of performance, output and outcomes, value issues) (p.268).

Moreover, a semi-structured interview (see Appendix 3) was conducted after students' midterm exam to assess what they had learned and how. Given that students might be sensitive to cues relating to FB but insensitive to their incidental learning, I carefully and intentionally avoided asking any question about Facebook. To solicit students' tacit learning, but avoid misleading, I adopted Eraut's (2004) suggestion by asking circular questions about their learning attitudes and habits. For example, I asked students to start by delineating their learning habits and attitudes, and then to recall the differences in these during the school year. Students were also interviewed about what types of knowledge, skills, or competence were needed to do their school work, how they prepared their midterm exam, solved their learning problems, came up with their learning strategies, and what and how they would like to change their learning strategies for their final exam (p. 249). If students voluntarily mentioned FB's impact on their learning, their informal learning and perception of using FB would be elicited.

Data analysis

To answer RQ 1, I investigated students' perception about the FB learning community based on interview data, reflection journals, and the survey. To enhance the reliability of data analysis, two trained assistants examined the collected data. First, the two assistants scrutinized the collected qualitative data and marked each meaningful chunk with summary words. Exhaustive data analysis was used for categorization, grouping similar comments. If

the existing category did not fit the data, a new category was created. After sorting categories, the two assistants compared and discussed inconsistencies with the researcher to reach consensus. The inter-coder reliability is 92.5%.

Second, to explore what students could informally learn via FB (RQ2), I triangulated students' perceptual data with their performance data. For example, if one claimed in a journal reflection that FB did not enhance his/her English learning, I would triangulate this with the other data to confirm his/her perception or elicit incidental learning from data scrutiny.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

RQ 1. 1. What is Taiwanese students' perception of using FB on learning English?

1.1 FB participation as course work

Survey data reveals that 93% of students visited the FB community for the sake of their English grade. This is however contradictory as only 5% of students posted messages to indicate their participation. Furthermore, 85% of participants considered the FB community beneficial to their midterm and final examinations. Oftentimes, students clicked the "like" button on my posts or tagged me with a note for help, such as, "please help me correct places where i put question marks...and please do me a favor to make the traslation more smooth and accurate. thanks" (Kun-Ru , FB texts retrieved 5/14/2012). The following excerpts illustrate students' perception of FB participation:

"On Facebook, I could both practice writing and reading. Because I just tag teacher, a simple movement, my teacher can read my writing and tell what's wrong in few minutes...it helped me to prepare my final exam very much."

"In fact, I seldom go to facebook. If this week we have a topic to write an essay, I'll go on facebook maybe twice a week to put my essay on it. And after few days, I will go on facebook to look other classmates or teacher's comments."

"I go to FB about once a week, mainly hand in my homework or get some information about the class."

Although I did not assign any homework in this FB community, students took my encouragements of sharing their writing exercises or commenting on peers' posts as "homework." Their responses revealed a perception of this community as a virtual "classroom" where they could exercise test-related writings, and expect to receive the teacher's comments or corrections.

1.2 FB participation as disinclination

According to the survey, over half of the participants (63%) spent 2 or more hours on their personal FB every day, with 98% claiming that they spent less than one hour per day on

the FB community. Most of the students explained their infrequent participation as inconvenience and indisposition:

“I don’t login in to the FB for College English often because it’s troublesome to use English to chat. I can’t chat with my friends in English...”

“Most of my friends are at my personal Facebook. If I want to social, I go to my Facebook. Occasionally, I go to the College English FB, but not many people there and not so many updates there. The English FB is boring to me.”

“I am very busy and lazy. Usually after I log off from my personal Facebook account, I don’t feel like to go to the College English Facebook. It’s inconvenient.”

Their attitude of using this FB of College English was very different from that of using their own FB. Based on students’ responses, the major reasons are (1) anxiety to socialize with friends in a target language, (2) uncomfortableness to socialize in an unfamiliar context, and (3) low motivation in using a learning tool.

1.3 FB participation as power negotiation

The majority of participants (N=35; 88%) admitted that they often lurked around in the FB community. When surveying their general behavior in the FB community, only one and four respectively reported to be the FB active users who preferred to “actively posted articles as well as read and respond to the others” and “actively post articles, but occasionally read and respond to the others.” Besides the 5 active participants, the other 35 self perceived as inactive participants. Ten (25%) students “inactively posted articles, but often read other’s articles,” fifteen (38%) “inactively posted articles, but often read others’ articles and responded with ‘like,’” and ten (25%) “seldom posted and read articles” in the FB community.

Regarding their low participation rate, the factor of power was observed. All participants came from different disciplines. They knew one another, but were not well acquainted. Since they were required to use English in the FB community and register with their real names, this made their English proficiency discernible and made them feel face-threatened. Based on the survey, over half (56%, mean=2.7) considered their English not good enough to make comments on others’ posts, while the others were not comfortable to offer comments in English (18%), and it was time consuming to reply in English (17%). In other words, most students seemed to identify themselves with low confidence in their English proficiency. Their personal identity, in turn, defined the relative power relationships. The following survey responses disclose power negotiation:

“I never provide comments on other’s writings because I think I don’t have the ability, and I’m afraid of leaving something wrong and absurd.”

“Some classmates’ posts were written excellently. My English is not as good as them, so I usually feel pressure to reply in English.”

“It makes me feel annoyed to use Facebook on English. If I have to use Facebook in English, I would rather choose not to post anything at all because I can’t use English to express what I want to say.”

“Though I like to read the others’ posts, I am afraid of making comments because I think I am not qualified to do so. I am not an expert, and I don’t want to provide wrong opinions that would mislead my friends, and it is embarrassing.”

“My English is not good so usually it takes me a lot of time to write responses in English. Since not so many people log in the College English FB, my response may not be seen and replied. So, why bother to write and post it?”

Most participants preferred reading the posts quietly. Their lurking, or sparing voice, expressed their virtual identity, which reflected concerns of power negotiation. French and Raven (1959) believed that the extent of power depends on the relationship of the involved parties. They proposed a typology of social power including reward, coerciveness, expertise, legitimacy, and referent. Power of expertise refers to knowledge in a specific domain, leading some to be perceived as more powerful than others. Referent power refers to desire for maintaining relationships that makes one willing to defer to the other for acceptance. Author (2011), Zuengler’s (1989) and Woken and Swales’ (1989) found that students who possess domain-related knowledge could be more discourse dominant. That is, those students who considered themselves as “unqualified,” “unprofessional” or “pressured” had positioned themselves as inferior to those perceived to have better English proficiency. For example, one student reflected in her journal, “Though I don’t dare to post anything, I go to Facebook about once a week. The main purpose is to see others’ writings, especially Lee’s. His posts really deserve to be read and learned by us.” Lee indicated that he liked to share his thoughts, but surprisingly did not feel comfortable to make critiques or comments, because he did not want to be labeled as priggish. He said, “when I reply, usually I say nice words or only click ‘Like.’ I don’t like to give comments because I don’t like to offend people if we have different opinions.” This reveals that Lee, on the one hand had expert power to actively participate, and on the other hand, perceived referent power from his peers. To be accepted as one of the members, he restrained his expert power by posting few comments. In this study, however; participants’ English anxiety in FB is incongruent with Kabilan’s et al (2010) finding of Malaysian students, who considered FB an online learning environment where they could freely and more confidently use English. This incongruence may result from students’ different language proficiency, or power relations. The Malaysian students were using their

personal FB to “socialize,” rather than to “learn” English (p.184), and their English teacher seemed unlikely to access their FB. In this study, the expert power holders, such as teachers and high English proficiency participants, created power tension that restrained FB participation to both high and low English proficiency students. Further research is needed to investigate how contextual power perception and negotiation affect online artifacts and users’ involvement.

RQ2. What EFL students can informally learn through facebooking?

While asking about the effectiveness of FB on students’ English learning, over half of the participants (N=22; 55%) agreed that the FB English community was effective for English learning, but almost the other half (N=18, 45%) disagreed. However, other data revealed an inconsistent perspectives. Based on the survey results, in regard to their “English learning,” 63% of all the participants claimed their reading ability has improved, and 78% believed it contributed to writing improvement. Moreover, 98% reported that reading other students’ posts helped them gain different perspectives, and 83% reported that it helped the development of their own opinions. During the interview, asking how students prepared for their midterm exam, without any leading hints, twenty students (50%) mentioned that they posted their writings to FB to get comments or read classmates’ posts to gain their writing ideas. Furthermore, among the 18 participants who perceived FB as ineffective, eleven (61%) considered FB as beneficial to their self-evaluation. Nine participants (50%) perceived that FB had facilitated their autonomous learning, 5 (28%) agreed that FB had helped their teamwork, 4 (22%) reported that FB had helped them solve problems, and 2 (12%) respectively reported that FB was beneficial to their social relationships and transformation from high school to university. These results imply that students, including the lurkers and those who did not perceive learning through facebooking as helpful, could still learn, even without being aware. This hypothesis is further proved and clarified by data triangulation, where three types of incidental learning deductively emerged: Academic knowledge and skills, social and collaboration, and motivation.

2.1 Academic knowledge and skills

Although about half the participants perceived FB ineffective to their English learning, informal learning of academic knowledge was detected from 35 (88%) participants through data triangulation.

For example, Ming considered the FB community barren and meaningless. In his frankly reflected:

“I really don’t think that Fb is that important of a tool when it comes to facilitating my writing. Take critical thinking for example, how on earth can FB aid critical thinking?”

Pressing “like” cannot do that. Neither can pressing like solve world hunger btw, true FB increases community participation, but it doesn’t solve anything. Moving on to organizing & synthesizing information, these skills are definitely not facilitated by FB, of course with the exception of an intelligent friend helping you via FB. Overall FB not helpful when it comes to writing” (Ming, Reflection, 2012).

Ming’s perception was coherent to Yancey’s (2009) finding that informal writing on FB has little to do with students’ learning of writing, because most students regard FB writing as “communication,” and school writing as “writing.” However, I found that Ming posted a few writing exercises on the FB of College English, where he asked me questions about how to compose an appropriate topic sentence. He also posted his writing exercise and requested correction. We had a few discussions through facebook until he composed correct topic sentences. In his midterm, Ming successfully structured topic sentences. Ming’s case suggests that FB offered him an informal alternative to learn academic knowledge outside the classroom, although he did not recognize FB as meaningful to his learning. His case accounted to the amorphous nature of informal learning. Even those who were aware of informal learning could hardly delineate it. For example, Ling voluntarily mentioned FB in her interview about test preparation: “I posted my writing in the Facebook. I read the criticisms and suggestions provided by the teacher and classmates. I think it helped a lot...” (Ling, Interview, 2012). I followed up by asking what help exactly she had gained from FB. Ling could not identify “the help” explicitly, but said after pondering, “I think I had better ideas about how to write my own paper, and through reading the others’ writing posts, I can learn their writing strength.” That she could not clearly articulate the benefits gained informally echoes Eraut’s (2004) suggestion that tacit knowledge can be used, but not articulated (p.253).

Lurking students also learned skills indirectly and informally by observing interaction between students and students, or students and the teacher. Chen, a FB lurker with no posts, mentioned in her interview that she acquired the writing convention of topic sentence and thesis statement, “I didn’t really understand what topic sentence was when the teacher taught us in class, but I got it through reading the writing samples and discussions posted by the other students.”

Jeng was a low proficiency student who was quiet in class and only lurked at FB community. Without reading his reflection paper and interviewing him, I would simply regard him as a passive learner. However, in the interview, he mentioned how FB helped his learning, “the FB of College English helped me solve problems though I have never asked any question. I visited the FB community almost every day. Through reading their writing posts and the

teacher's comments, I could solve my own problems" (Jeng, Interview, 2012). In his reflection, Jeng said, "if I encountered any questions, I would usually surf on the Internet to find solutions. Unlike others, I think I'm less creative. Thus, I sometimes can't come up with the content to write my own article. At this moment, I would go online to watch how other people comment on the same topic, and then figure out my own opinion." (Jeng, Reflection, 2012). I cross checked with his writing test and noticed a few clues to prove what he reported. His writing, although was still below average, borrowed a few ideas and vocabularies from FB discussions. I realized that Jeng was an autonomous learner, not a passive learner. FB community allowed him to participate and gain legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger 1991). Based on these data, it is worthwhile to note that students' quietness or learning outcome may mislead teachers' perception about their learning. Considerable learning can take place outside of classrooms through various channels not seen by teachers; moreover, implicit learning outcomes can usually be overlooked by both the learners and the teachers.

2.2 Social interaction

According to the survey, even though 70% agreed or strongly agreed that the FB community offered an alternative for teamwork, it was surprising that only 22% of the participants considered it social. For example, Yu indicated in her reflection, "the FB of College English seems unnecessary and useless because most of us usually socially interact or contact each other via our own FB" (Yu, Reflection, 2012). Most students regarded that their one-way postings, quiet reading, commenting on peers' posts, or pressing the "Like" button has little to do with social interaction. For example, Chang reflected in her journal, "As for social function, my original FB does play the role, but the FB for English class no... I only go to the College English FB once a week. I usually write the exercises, check the replies others give to me, go through the articles other students write and sometimes I give some feedbacks" (Chang, Reflection, 2012). Apparently, Chang did not consider her writing, checking, reading, feedbacking as social.

Another incongruent result is that 78% (mean= 3.0) of all the participants agreed or strongly agreed that peers' comments were helpful, which suggests that at least 78% had social interactions with peers. These contradictories suggest that many Taiwanese students associate the concept of social with communication on casual life events, rather than on learning. Wong reflected her disfavor of the FB community, "...But I don't regard the College English FB helped me maintain friendship or social because I go there to study English..." (Wong, Reflection, 2012). However, any action that participants have done in social contexts, including one-way or mutual interaction, is social, for their actions, discourses, and

interpretations may influence what is noticed and remembered (Eraut, 2004). In this study, both those who directly (e.g. correspondents) and indirectly (e.g. lurkers) participated could have social interaction, although most disagreed.

2.3 Motivation

The survey shows significant result on self-evaluation; 83% (mean= 3.85) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that reading others' posts allowed them to contrast and self-evaluate their English proficiency. This sense of self-evaluation motivated participants' learning. For example: "I can see others' writings and compare them with mine. By this way, I can know my learning situation. Even though I didn't post my writings on FB (I was too lazy to type), I could know where should be noticed from teacher's comments on others' writings. Then, I will check if there is the same mistake in my writings" (Reflection from Kei). "As I read others' articles on the Facebook, I can compare how I will write with others. And I can know whether the words or the grammar they use I can use when facing the same questions. ...I can test myself whether I can realize the meaning in the articles without looking up in dictionary..." (Reflection from Wen). "When reading some good works, some people really shocked me by their level of English. That motivated me to study hard to catch up" (Reflection from Yen). Those who perceived this FB community effective admitted that it was a motivating platform to exchange writing exercises, read shared writings and comments, discern problems or errors, model good grammar and vocabulary usage, avoid repeating mistakes, or to catch up. Besides these, I noticed that this FB community motivated participants' improvement on higher-order thinking skills, including amongst those who perceived FB ineffective. The following is a case for illustration.

Lai, a student from law school, claimed that the FB community did not help his English learning, because "it only provides another way to get feedback" (Lai, survey, 2012). Regarding the reflection question, "what are the aspects that the FB community helped you?" He replied similarly, "...in fact, I think it just provides me a way to post my writings and get feedback. It didn't help me do other things" (Lai, Reflection, 2012). I scrutinized his FB data and noticed that he had interacted with both his classmates and me several times. One of his most compelling interactions was a heated discussion on the controversial issue of media freedom and privacy. He took the position for privacy, and defended why speech freedom should not violate privacy:

TW's Constitution No.22 involves privacy protection:

http://www.judicial.gov.tw/constitutionalcourt/p03_01.asp?expno=603

And the "Fourth Estate", so-called mass media's freedom of speech, does not exist. The word "Estate" means social classes: noble, clergy and civilian. Where is the "Fourth

Right"? It's just a power that does not really exist, not being protected. Even the western countries don't have a concrete Constitution or law to protect this "Fourth rihgt".

The only thing being protected is the freedom of speech. But as the freedom of speech and Privacy are both "Rights" in the Constitution class, these two rights' use should be confined by each other (Lai, FB texts, 2012).

First, from his post, it was clear that he was autonomously following the discussion. Second, various voices from other participants had prompted him to defend his position. Being motivated, he researched the issue to share and argued his position. As a law school student, he demonstrated his professional knowledge with authorial voice. Finally, in his midterm-writing test, he successfully adopted other students' opinions to develop his own arguments, also borrowing information from students' posts which he considered professional or academically appropriate. Others likewise adapted his shared information and opinion in the midterm writing test. The FB discussion motivated Lai to do research, consider opposing opinions, read and analyze information, share and comment, and make judgment to take a position.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This study focuses on the students who did not perceive meaningful learning through FB. Most educators regard learning as meaning-making in a community of practice. Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective underpinned this conception that individuals develop meanings through language and other semiotic mediators. The central role of a teacher is to encourage exploration or development of meaning through scaffolding. This current study challenges this perspective, arguing that learning can occur even when meaning-making process is perceived to be not meaningful to an individual. Moreover, teachers' role is not merely to scaffold students' formal learning, but to create a context that can draw learners' informal learning.

While informal learning has been understudied, it is argued to be of equal, if not more, importance than formal learning (Colley et al. 2003; Kirkpatrick, 2005). This Facebook community allowed participants to informally exercise English with flexibility, but without time constraints and other limitations that exists in a physical classroom. Although one artifact can hardly satisfy all the learners, this study disclosed dynamic learning; some are explicit but some takes place in a tacit manner. Many EFL students could not perceive their informal learning, possibly because they were used to education with planned objectives and quantifiable outcomes. The transfer from tacit/meaningless to explicit/meaningful learning can not occur automatically especially when learning involving higher-order thinking skills.

Therefore, teachers' guiding in the heuristic relationships of learning and community of practices is vital. Further research is needed to explore how teachers can drive informal tacit learning to maximum meaningful learning.

A few limitations of this study need readers' attention. Generally speaking, the participation of this FB community was low. Students would pragmatically place an informal learning community, which was not high stakes, as low priority. Furthermore, This FB community did not reflect the natural context of FB but was regarded as a course extension; therefore, findings in this study need to be applied with caution.

REFERENCE

- Abramson, L. (2011). Can social networking keep students in school? NPR: Morning Edition, Retrieved May 25, 2012 from: <http://www.npr.org/2011/02/09/133598049/can-social-networking-keep-students-in-school>
- Attwell, G. (2007). The personal learning environments: The future of eLearning? *eLearning Papers*, 2, 1, 1-8.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. Lanham, USA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Blattner, G., & Fiori, M. (2009). Facebook in the language classroom: Promises and possibilities. *Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 6, 1, 17-28.
- Bugeja, M. (2006). Facing the Facebook. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52, 21, C1-C4.
- Conole, G., de Laat, M., Dillon, T. & Darby, J. (2006). LXP: Student experience of technologies. Final report. JISC, UK. Retrieved from: www.Jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/elearning_pedagogy/elp_learneroutcomes.aspx
- Colley, H. et al. (2003) 'Informality and Formality in Learning' London: LSRC
- Cross, J. (2007). *Informal learning: Rediscovering the natural pathways that inspire innovation and performance*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26, 2, 247-273.
- Facebook Newsroom. <http://newsroom.fb.com/Key-Facts>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gray, B. (2004). Informal learning in an online community of practice. *Journal of Distance Education*, 19, 1, 20-35.
- Greenhow, C. & Robelia, B. (2009). Informal learning and identity formation in online social networks. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34, 2, 119-140.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). Mobile computing technologies: Lighter, faster, smarter. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12, 3, 3-9.
- Hargittai, E. (2008). Whose space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 1, 276-297.
- Haverback, H. (2009). Facebook: Uncharted territory in a reading education classroom. *Reading Today*, October/November, 1.
- Hodkinson, Ph. Colley, H. & Malcolm, J. (2003). The interrelationships between informal and formal learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15, 313-318.
- Jones, S., & Fox, S. (2009). *Generations online in 2009*. Data memo. Washington, DC: Pew

- Internet and American Life Project.
- Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N. & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *Internet and Higher Education*, 13, 179-187.
- Kirkpatrick, G. (2005) 'Online 'chat' facilities as pedagogic tools: a case study' *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 6, 2, pp.145-159
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0-521-42374-0
- Author (2011). Power perceptions and negotiations in a cross-national email writing activity. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 20, 4, 243-314.
- Livingstone, D. W. (1999). Exploring the icebergs of adult learning: Findings of the first Canadian survey of informal learning practices. Wall Working Paper NO. 10. Centre for the Study of Education and Work. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.
- Livingstone, D. W. (2001). Adults' informal learning: Definitions, findings, gaps and future research. Wall Working Paper No. 21. Centre for the Study of Education and Work.
- Livingstone, D. W. & Sawchuk, P. H. (2004). *Hidden Knowledge: Organized Labor in the Information Age*. Garamond Press: Canada.
- Lohnes, S. & Kinzer, C. (2007). Questioning assumptions about students' expectations for technology in college classrooms. *Innovate*, 3, 5, <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=431>
- Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J. & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, social integration and informal learning at University: it is more for socializing and talking to friends about work than for actually doing work. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34, 2, 141–155.
- Madge, C. Meek, J., Wellens, J., & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, social integration and informal learning at university: 'It is more for socializing and talking to friends about work than for actually done work.' *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34, 2, 141-155.
- Maloney, E. (2007) 'What Web 2.0 can teach us about learning' *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53, 18, January 5th, p.B26
- Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 89, pp. 25-34. A Publishing Unit of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mason, R. (2006). Learning technologies for adult continuing education. *Studies in*

- Continuing Education, 28, 2, 121-133.
- Matney, M., & Borland, K. (2009). Facebook, blogs, tweets: how staff and units can use social networking to enhance student learning. Presentation at the annual meeting of the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators, Seattle, WA.
- Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on "Facebook": The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication Education*, 56, 1, 1-7.
- McCormick, K. (1990). The cultural imperatives underlying cognitive acts. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W.C. Peck (Eds). *Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp. 194-218) New York: Oxford University Press.
- McFerrin, K. (1999). Incidental learning in a higher education asynchronous online distance education course. *SITE 99: Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference Proceedings*. Charlottesville, VA: Association for the Adapting in Education.
- McGivney, V. (1999). *Informal learning in the community: A trigger for change and development*. Leicester: National Institute of Adult and Continuing Education.
- Mills, N. A. (2009). Facebook and the use of social networking tools to enhance language learner motivation and engagement. Paper presented at the Northeast Association for Language Learning Technology (NEALLT) Conference, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 30–31 October.
- Northcote, M., & Kendle, A. (2001). Informal online networks for learning: Making use of incidental learning through recreation. Paper presented at the International Education Research Conference, December 2–6, Fremantle, Australia.
- Pageviral, Facebook audience analytics. *Statistics & Insights: Taiwan*. Retrieved in 2013, 7, 18. <http://www.pageviral.com/facebook-stats.php?cc=tw>
- Pennington, M. (1989). *Teaching languages with computers: The state of the art*. La Jolla, CA: Athelstan.
- Reid, J. (2011). "We don't twitter, we facebook": An alternative pedagogical space that enables critical practices in relation to writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10, 1, 58-80.
- Salaway, G., Caruso, J. & Nelson, M. (2007). *The ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology, 2007*. Boulder, Colorado: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research.
<http://www.educause.edu/ECAR/TheECARStudyofUndergraduateStu/161967>

- Selwyn, N. (2009). Faceworking: exploring students' education-related use of Facebook. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34, 2, 157-174.
- Selwyn, N. (2007). Web 2.0 applications as alternative environments for informal learning—A critical review. OECD CERIKERIS International expert meeting on ICT and educational performance. Cheju Island, South Korea: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Retrieved from: <https://www1.oecd.org/edu/ceri/39458556.pdf>
- Slater, D. (2002). Social relationships and identity online and offline. In *Handbook of new media*, (eds.) L. lievrouw and S. Livingstone, 533-546. London: Sage.
- Smith, S. D., & Caruson, J. B. (2010). Research Study. ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology.6. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, Retrieved May, 25, 2012, from: <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ers1006/rs/ers1006w.pdf>
- Shi, R. C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating Facebook and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27, 5, 829-845.
- Tough, A. (1978). Major Learning Efforts: Recent Research and Future Directions. *Adult Education*, 28, 250-263.
- Usluel, Y. K. & Mazman, S. G. (2009). Adoption of Web 2.0 tools in distance education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 818–823.
- Wang, C. M. (2012). Using facebook for cross-cultural collaboration: the experience of students from Taiwan. *Educational Media International*. 29, 1, 63-76.
- Waycott, J., Bennett, S., Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B. & Gray, K. (2010). Digital divides? Student and staff perceptions of information and communication technologies. *Computers & Education*, 54, 4, 1202-1211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.11.006>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN 978-0-521-66363-2
- Yancey (2009)
- Ziegler, S. (2007). The (mis)education of Generation M. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 32, 1, 69-81.

APPENDIX 1 Journal Reflection Guiding Questions

1. Usually how often do you go to Facebook? Usually what do you do there?
2. Do you think Facebook motivates your English learning? If yes, in what way? and Why? If no, why not?
3. What do you think Facebook help you in English? (reading, writing or others?) Why? Please explain in detail.
4. Do you think Facebook help you the followings or something else? Please identify in details. (self evaluation、autonomous learning、maintaining relationships、collaborative work、problem solving、transfer from high schoolers to university students, be familiar with university learning context, and others...)
5. How are you preparing your writing for your English classes and your final?
6. Are you interested in using Facebook again in the next semester? Why or why not? Why do you like/dislike to use the FB of College English?

APPENDIX 2

College English—Survey of FB usage

本調查純為教師研究教學使用，絕對不會影響學期成績，請放心誠實作答。

1. _____ 我平時上自己的 FB 時間: A. 0-1 hr. B. 1-2 hr. C. 2-3 hr. D. 3 小時以上
 2. _____ 上大學英文的 FB 時間: A. 0-1 hr. B. 1-2 hr. C. 2-3 hr. D. 3 小時以上
 3. _____ 我生活中花最多時間在社交網路上是在: A. MSN B. 自己的 FB
C. 大學英文 FB D. NCCU- BBS E. blog F. skype G. email
H. 其他 _____ (請說明)
 5. 在大學英文 FB 上我的行為大致上是: A. 貼文積極，也樂於閱讀並回應他人文章 B. 貼文積極，但是不太閱讀他人文章 C 貼文不積極，但常閱讀他人文章 D 貼文不積極，但常閱讀並回應他人文章 E 貼文不積極，但是經常閱讀他人文章並起按讚 F 偶而貼文，偶而閱讀他人文章 F 其他 (請說明)
-
6. 大學英文的臉書學習社群對你的大學學習能力上有何助益? (1) autonomous learning 自學, (2) critical thinking 批判思考, (3) team work 團隊合作, (4) community participation 社群參與, (5) extensive reading 大量閱讀, (6) organizing & synthesizing information (歸納分析資料), (7) problem solving 解決問題的能力, (8) accessing information 查考資料, (9)

creativity 創意 (10) 其他_____請說明

*以下問題請以下列選項作答: A.非常不同意 B.不同意 C.同意 D.非常同意

7. _____ 和上學期比起來，我覺得我在大學英文的 FB 上的閱讀速度有進步
8. _____ 我覺得大學英文的 FB 有助於我的寫作訓練
9. _____ 我覺得大學英文的 FB 有助於我的聽力訓練
10. _____ 我覺得大學英文的 FB 有助於我的期中、期末考試
11. _____ 和上學期比起來，我覺得我比較可以克服上學期無法經常使用大學英文 FB 的困難
12. _____ 大學英文 FB 使我可以看到其他同學的表現，進而知道自己在班上英文的程度
13. _____ 大學英文 FB 使我可以看到其他同學的表現，使我產生較強的學習動機
14. _____ 大學英文 FB 使我可以看到其他同學的意見，使我瞭解不同的看法
15. _____ 大學英文 FB 使我可以看到其他同學的貼文，使我產生自己的觀點
16. _____ 我上大學英文 FB 的目的是為了練/學英文
17. _____ 我上大學英文 FB 的目的是為了維繫友誼
18. _____ 我上大學英文 FB 的目的是為了英文分數
19. _____ 我上大學英文 FB 的目的是為了了解課堂上發生的事
20. _____ 我覺得自己的英文不好，用英文分享不好意思
21. _____ 我覺得自己生活中沒甚麼好分享的
22. _____ 我覺得去評論別人寫的文章會讓人覺得我自以為是
23. _____ 我英文不夠好，沒有資格評論別人寫的文章
24. _____ 我會去閱讀別人寫的文章，但不會評論
25. _____ 我喜歡閱讀並評論別人的文章
26. _____ 對於我作品上的評語，我不太相信同儕的評語，我比較喜歡老師給評語
27. _____ 同儕給我的作品評語讓我有收穫
28. _____ 大學英文的 FB 提供另一管道可與老師溝通
29. _____ 大學英文的 FB 提供另一管道可與其他學生互動
30. _____ 大學英文的 FB 提供管道使我可以練習課堂相關的英文
31. _____ 我英文有問題時會上大學英文 FB 發問
32. _____ 我需要 team work 時會上大學英文 FB 聯繫溝通
33. _____ 我覺得大學英文 FB 對我的英文學習有幫助
34. _____ 我覺得大學英文 FB 對我的英文自主學習有幫助

35. 我不喜歡貼文或評論別人文章的原因是:

36. 我覺得大學英文 FB 目前最大的缺點和優點是:

37. 我覺得大學英文 FB 目前對我英文學習上的影響是:

APPENDIX 3

Interview Guiding Questions:

1. Please delineate your high school learning habits, methods and attitudes in general.
2. Please delineate your learning habits, methods and attitudes at NCCU. What are the differences??
3. What are the types of skills or competence needed to do your university school work? (e.g. autonomous learning, critical thinking, team work, community participation, extensive reading, organizing & synthesizing information, problem solving, accessing information, creativity...etc.) Why?
4. What are the impacts of this English course on your learning?
5. What are the difficulties you encountered in learning English? And how did you come up with your solutions when you encountered problems or difficulties in English?
6. How did you prepare your writing test and final test? Please provide details.

附件一

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告

(期中進度報告/期末報告)

題目：正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉：透過臉書學習英文寫作

計畫類別：個別型計畫 整合型計畫

計畫編號：MOST 102-2410-H-004-083-

執行期間：2013年8月1日至2014年7月31日

執行機構及系所：國立政治大學

計畫主持人：劉怡君

本計畫除繳交成果報告外，另含下列出國報告，共 1 份：

執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

出席國際學術會議心得報告

期末報告處理方式：

1. 公開方式：

非列管計畫亦不具下列情形，立即公開查詢

涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，一年二年後可公開查詢

2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否 是

3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考 否 是，_____（請列舉提供之單位；本部不經審議，依勾選逕予轉送）

中 華 民 國 103 年 10 月 1 日

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否有嚴重損及公共利益之發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

- 達成目標
- 未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）
- 實驗失敗
- 因故實驗中斷
- 其他原因

說明：

研究計畫內容與原計畫相符合。筆者原計畫乃探討臉書的使用與學生非正式學習的關係。透過觀察與分析，自認為沒有透過臉書學習到英文的學生仍有學習成效。因此說明，許多學習成效並無法明顯的被教師或學生所查覺。這些不容易被察覺的隱密性學習，卻與正式教室內的學習息息相關，並且佔人類學習的絕大部分。然此隱密性學習雖如此重要，卻因隱密不容易被察覺，因此不容易被研究探討。本研究透過實驗設計與資料交叉比對，驗證出隱密性的非正式學習，即便當學生不覺得再從事有意義的學習互動，也可以產生。

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

- 論文：已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無
- 專利：已獲得 申請中 無
- 技轉：已技轉 洽談中 無
- 其他：（以 100 字為限）

*已經撰寫完畢，也已經投稿，目前正在依據編審意見修改中

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性），如已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現，請簡述可能損及之相關程度（以 500 字為限）

本研究嘗試探索非正式學習之重要性。非正式學習佔個人之總學習 80% 以上，然而主流研究往往以正式學習為研究目標，非正式學習雖有零星探索，但並未獲得廣大學者之注目。本研究發現，自認為沒有透過臉書學習到英文的學生仍有學習成效。因此說明，許多學習成效並無法明顯的被教師或學生所查覺。這些不容易被察覺的隱密性學習，卻與正式教室內的學習息息相關，並且佔人類學習的絕大部分。然此隱密性學習雖如此重要，卻因隱密不容易被察覺，因此不容易被研究探討。本研究透過實驗設計與資料交叉比對，驗證出隱密性的非正式學習，即便當學生不覺得在從事有意義的學習互動，也可以產生。

本研究發現，臉書在非正式學習的隱性學習刺激有三方面：專業科目相關的知識、社交、學習動機。參與的學生即便否認有此三方面的成長，但是實驗結果卻證明臉書非正式學習促使學生們在此三方面有卓越的進步。也就是說，即便學習過程並未使學習者當下產生"意義" (meaning making)，但並不代表學習無法發生。教師與學生如何更能有意識的查覺非正式學習，並將之提升于學習意識層面，以具化加深學習，是值得更深入探索的議題。

4.

附件五

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：__年__月__日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-004-083-		
計畫名稱	正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉：透過臉書學習英文寫作		
出國人員姓名	劉怡君	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學
會議時間	2013年10月17日至 2013年10月21日	會議地點	Shandong University, Jinan, China
會議名稱	(中文) 國際第二外語寫作教學研討會 (英文) Symposium on Second Language Writing		
發表題目	(中文) 台灣英語教學寫作困境與挑戰 (英文) English Writing Education in Taiwan: Crossing the Gap between High Schools and Universities		

一、參加會議經過

筆者受邀為國際知名的寫作會議，SSLW 2013，大會主講人(Plenary speaker)，配合大會會議主旨，演講題目探討台灣英文寫作教學之困境。雖為主講人，因大會經費主要依靠與會者的註冊費用，所以來回機票必須自費，但是大會主辦單位提供免費住宿，機場接送並免除註冊費用。SSLW 是一個國際研討會，每兩年再不同的國家舉辦，2013年由中國的山東濟南大學主辦，為期五天。本屆大會主旨是：L2 Writing in the Global Context: Represented, Underrepresented, and Unrepresented Voices

由不同國家的外語寫作學者專家說明該國英文寫作教學現況與問題。受邀知名講者有：John Bitchener, Yeon Hee Choi, Alister Cumming, Fatima Esseili, Icy Lee, Yichun Liu, Paul Kei Matsuda, Diane Pecorari, Melinda Reichelt, Lukasz Salski, Miyuki Sasaki, Tony Silva, Neomy Storch, Junju Wang, Tetyana Yakhontova.

二 與會心得

暨南大學是中國的 985 工程重點大學，校園內軟硬體設備頂尖酷炫，學生素質也非常優秀，多場會議論文報告是濟南大學研究生的發表，內容紮實、數據漂亮，偏向語言學、資料庫、電腦補助教學或言詞分析量化性研究，很讓來自台灣的我小小的驚艷卻又憂心。中國學者對台灣議題頗有興趣。在我發表論文後，許多學者主動認真的在會後與我討論，有幾位目前仍保持著連絡，希望有更深入的跨校交流與研究互動，算是本次會議過程中收穫的部分。此外，在這場會議中，聽了許多有趣的論文發表，以下是幾場的簡單心得：Zhu, H. 的“A study of Lexical Richness in English Writings by Chinese EFL students” Zhu 使用大量 corpus 來分析寫作的 lexicon 發展五層面：lexical variation, lexical density, lexical sophistication, word length and word frequency distribution. 此外，該五層面彼此之間在寫作上有何影響？橫斷面言就與長時間研究在 lexicon 上的變化有何差異？在他的文獻探討中，羅列出各種 lexicon 的檢測方式，該作者發現，橫斷面研究的學生在自會上的發展情況是，lexical density 有顯著進步，lexical variation 有增加傾向，但會在進步後進入瓶頸期。字彙長短有使用較短的自知傾向，在 frequency distribution 的部分，學生有從使用高頻字彙轉移到使用低頻字彙。但若透過多年觀察研究（四年），lexical density 卻並沒有顯著的成長，大多數的學生依賴 84%最頻繁使用率字彙來寫作。Zhu 建議字彙應該要與寫作融合教授，教師應協助學生克服字彙學習瓶頸，此外，字彙的 corpus 可以做為教學參考教材。

Zhang, X. 發表了”Use of Lexical Chunks in English writings by students with different L2 backgrounds” 研究問題是：不同 L1 背景之學生英文寫作使用的 chunk 特色為何？差異性為何？該作者收集了 824 篇寫作練習，來自於中文、阿拉伯文、西班牙文、英文的學生作品做為分析資料。研究發現，chunk 的使用可

以提高寫作者的寫作正確度、流暢度、和內容複雜度。其中，對中文為母語者的影響最顯著。Chunk 的使用頻率高低也發現語寫作者的語言程度成正比。

Zhu, Y. 發表了 “A corpus-based study on the genre patterns and variations of metadiscourse use in Chinese EFL student writing.” Meta-discourse 根據 Williams (1981) 的定義，是指言詞中提及自己的立場與想法、在結構中列出順序、以及提醒讀者須採取之行動。此外，根據 Hyland (2005) 年的 interpersonal model，言詞引導讀者的分類有：transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential code glosses; hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self mentions, engagement markers。Zhu 從七所大學收集了 narration, exposition, argumentation 各 168 篇，分析後發現，narration 的 metadiscourse 使用頻率較低於其他兩者，其中 self mentions, engagement markers, transitions, frame markers, hedges, attitude markers 在此三種文體彼此之間的使用差異最大。Argumentation 和 exposition 之間最大差別在於 attitude markers, self mentions, and engagement markers。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Yichun Liu, National Chengchi University

English Writing Education in Taiwan: Crossing the Gap between High Schools and Universities

In Taiwan, the English writing instruction in high schools usually begins from the practices of sentence translation to paragraph writing; however, the instruction in universities usually heavily depends on the imported pedagogy of L1 or L2 writing from Anglo-American countries. Taiwanese university students not only need to tackle the challenges of linguistic deficiency and Western textual conventions, but also negotiate genre expectations commonly found in Anglo-American contexts, which unfortunately are drastically different from what they had learned in high schools. Therefore, tracing learners' early training on English writing back to their senior high schools, when Taiwanese students begin to learn English composition, can reveal what writing knowledge students may bring into their university writing classrooms and what writing problems Taiwanese university students may encounter.

This study contributes to the understanding of the issues of English writing education in Taiwan by (1) exploring the transitional gaps of English writing between high schools and universities in Taiwan, (2) investigating the issues of English writing in Taiwan from both the perspectives of the high school and university students and teachers, and (3) discussing and generating possible solutions to facilitate students' gap-crossing skills in learning English writing. Hopefully, this study can shed some lights on L2 writing education in other EFL countries.

四、建議

我個人的研究偏向質性小型的研究，這次聽了多場大規模量化資料庫處理的研究，以語言學為基礎，分析寫作言詞，讓我印象深刻。電腦科技日新月異，建立寫作資料庫，不但在研究上有其必要性，在教學應用上的效果也不容小覷，但是國內資料庫的收集端賴老師各人的努力，若無此方面的經費或經驗，在運用資料庫作研究與教學上並不容易上手，如果在升等、評鑑與發表上可以鼓勵有更多的跨領域合作型的研，或可突破個人單打獨鬥的狹小格局。但是反觀目前台灣學術圈為防堵假研究、亂掛名的歪風，也更縮緊了跨領域合作研究的空間。

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

大會手冊。

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：__年__月__日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-004-083-		
計畫名稱	正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉：透過臉書學習英文寫作		
出國人員姓名	劉怡君	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學
會議時間	2013年10月17日至 2013年10月21日	會議地點	Shandong University, Jinan, China
會議名稱	(中文) 國際第二外語寫作教學研討會 (英文) Symposium on Second Language Writing		
發表題目	(中文) 台灣英語教學寫作困境與挑戰 (英文) English Writing Education in Taiwan: Crossing the Gap between High Schools and Universities		

一、參加會議經過

筆者受邀為國際知名的寫作會議，SSLW 2013，大會主講人(Plenary speaker)，配合大會會議主旨，演講題目探討台灣英文寫作教學之困境。雖為主講人，因大會經費主要依靠與會者的註冊費用，所以來回機票必須自費，但是大會主辦單位提供免費住宿，機場接送並免除註冊費用。SSLW 是一個國際研討會，每兩年再不同的國家舉辦，2013年由中國的山東濟南大學主辦，為期五天。本屆大會主旨是：L2 Writing in the Global Context: Represented, Underrepresented, and Unrepresented Voices

由不同國家的外語寫作學者專家說明該國英文寫作教學現況與問題。受邀知名講者有：John Bitchener, Yeon Hee Choi, Alister Cumming, Fatima Esseili, Icy Lee, Yichun Liu, Paul Kei Matsuda, Diane Pecorari, Melinda Reichelt, Lukasz Salski, Miyuki Sasaki, Tony Silva, Neomy Storch, Junju Wang, Tetyana Yakhontova.

二 與會心得

暨南大學是中國的 985 工程重點大學，校園內軟硬體設備頂尖酷炫，學生素質也非常優秀，多場會議論文報告是濟南大學研究生的發表，內容紮實、數據漂亮，偏向語言學、資料庫、電腦補助教學或言詞分析量化性研究，很讓來自台灣的我小小的驚艷卻又憂心。中國學者對台灣議題頗有興趣。在我發表論文後，許多學者主動認真的在會後與我討論，有幾位目前仍保持著連絡，希望有更深入的跨校交流與研究互動，算是本次會議過程中收穫的部分。此外，在這場會議中，聽了許多有趣的論文發表，以下是幾場的簡單心得：Zhu, H. 的“A study of Lexical Richness in English Writings by Chinese EFL students” Zhu 使用大量 corpus 來分析寫作的 lexicon 發展五層面：lexical variation, lexical density, lexical sophistication, word length and word frequency distribution. 此外，該五層面彼此之間在寫作上有何影響？橫斷面言就與長時間研究在 lexicon 上的變化有何差異？在他的文獻探討中，羅列出各種 lexicon 的檢測方式，該作者發現，橫斷面研究的學生在自會上的發展情況是，lexical density 有顯著進步，lexical variation 有增加傾向，但會在進步後進入瓶頸期。字彙長短有使用較短的自知傾向，在 frequency distribution 的部分，學生有從使用高頻字彙轉移到使用低頻字彙。但若透過多年觀察研究（四年），lexical density 卻並沒有顯著的成長，大多數的學生依賴 84%最頻繁使用率字彙來寫作。Zhu 建議字彙應該要與寫作融合教授，教師應協助學生克服字彙學習瓶頸，此外，字彙的 corpus 可以做為教學參考教材。

Zhang, X. 發表了”Use of Lexical Chunks in English writings by students with different L2 backgrounds” 研究問題是：不同 L1 背景之學生英文寫作使用的 chunk 特色為何？差異性為何？該作者收集了 824 篇寫作練習，來自於中文、

阿拉伯文、西班牙文、英文的學生作品做為分析資料。研究發現，chunk 的使用可以提高寫作者的寫作正確度、流暢度、和內容複雜度。其中，對中文為母語者的影響最顯著。Chunk 的使用頻率高低也發現語寫作者的語言程度成正比。

Zhu, Y. 發表了 “A corpus-based study on the genre patterns and variations of metadiscourse use in Chinese EFL student writing.”
Meta-discourse 根據 Williams (1981) 的定義，是指言詞中提及自己的立場與想法、在結構中列出順序、以及提醒讀者須採取之行動。此外，根據 Hyland (2005) 年的 interpersonal model，言詞引導讀者的分類有：transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential code glosses; hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self mentions, engagement markers。Zhu 從七所大學收集了 narration, exposition, argumentation 各 168 篇，分析後發現，narration 的 metadiscourse 使用頻率較低於其他兩者，其中 self mentions, engagement markers, transitions, frame markers, hedges, attitude markers 在此三種文體彼此之間的使用差異最大。Argumentation 和 exposition 之間最大差別在於 attitude markers, self mentions, and engagement markers。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Yichun Liu, National Chengchi University

English Writing Education in Taiwan: Crossing the Gap between High Schools and Universities

In Taiwan, the English writing instruction in high schools usually begins from the practices of sentence translation to paragraph writing; however, the instruction in universities usually heavily depends on the imported pedagogy of L1 or L2 writing from Anglo-American countries. Taiwanese university students not only need to tackle the challenges of linguistic deficiency and Western textual conventions, but also negotiate genre expectations commonly found in Anglo-American contexts, which unfortunately are drastically different from what they had learned in high schools. Therefore, tracing learners' early training on English writing back to their senior high schools, when Taiwanese students begin to learn English composition, can reveal what writing knowledge students may bring into their university writing classrooms and what writing problems Taiwanese university students may encounter.

This study contributes to the understanding of the issues of English writing education in Taiwan by (1) exploring the transitional gaps of English writing between high schools and universities in Taiwan, (2) investigating the issues of English writing in Taiwan from both the perspectives of the high school and university students and teachers, and (3) discussing and generating possible solutions to facilitate students' gap-crossing skills in learning English writing. Hopefully, this study can shed some lights on L2 writing education in other EFL countries.

四、建議

我個人的研究偏向質性小型的研究，這次聽了多場大規模量化資料庫處理的研究，以語言學為基礎，分析寫作言詞，讓我印象深刻。電腦科技日新月異，建立寫作資料庫，不但在研究上有其必要性，在教學應用上的效果也不容小覷，但是國內資料庫的收集端賴老師各人的努力，若無此方面的經費或經驗，在運用資料庫作研究與教學上並不容易上手，如果在升等、評鑑與發表上可以鼓勵有更多的跨領域合作型的研，或可突破個人單打獨鬥的狹小格局。但是反觀目前台灣學術圈為防堵假研究、亂掛名的歪風，也更縮緊了跨領域合作研究的空間。

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

大會手冊。

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2014/07/29

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉: 透過臉書學習英文寫作
	計畫主持人: 劉怡君
	計畫編號: 102-2410-H-004-083- 學門領域: 英語教學研究
無研發成果推廣資料	

102 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：劉怡君		計畫編號：102-2410-H-004-083-				
計畫名稱：正式與非正式學習間的相互關係和認知移轉：透過臉書學習英文寫作						
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比		
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	1	100%	篇
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%	
	研討會論文	4	0	100%	<p>1. Liu, Y. C. (May, 18-19, 2013). Using Facebook for Learning Writing: EFL Students' Perceptions and Challenges. The 30th International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the R.O.C. National Cheng Kung University (NCKU), Tainan, Taiwan</p> <p>2. Liu, Y. C. (April, 25-28, 2013). The impact of informal learning on formal learning. Learning</p>	

							Penang English Language Learning & Teaching Association 4. Liu, Y. C. (5, 26, 2012). Creating a Facebook Learning Community: Exploration on the Effect of Virtual Identity. The Eleventh Annual Wenshan International Conference. EFL Learning Communities that Make a Difference. National Chengchi University.
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 (本國籍)	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 (外國籍)	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		

<p>其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p>無</p>
--	----------

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

■達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

說明：

研究計畫內容與原計畫相符合。筆者原計畫乃探討臉書的使用與學生非正式學習的關係。透過觀察與分析，自認為沒有透過臉書學習到英文的學生仍有學習成效。因此說明，許多學習成效並無法明顯的被教師或學生所查覺。這些不容易被察覺的隱密性學習，卻與正式教室內的學習息息相關，並且佔人類學習的絕大部分。然此隱密性學習雖如此重要，卻因隱密不容易被察覺，因此不容易被研究探討。本研究透過實驗設計與資料交叉比對，驗證出隱密性的非正式學習，即便當學生不覺得再從事有意義的學習互動，也可以產生。

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文：已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利：已獲得 申請中 無

技轉：已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

文稿已撰寫完畢並投搞，目前正在依據編委意見修稿中。

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

本研究嘗試探索非正式學習之重要性。非正式學習佔個人之總學習 80% 以上，然而主流研究往往以正式學習為研究目標，非正式學習雖有零星探索，但並未獲得廣大學者之注目。

本研究發現，自認為沒有透過臉書學習到英文的學生仍有學習成效。因此說明，許多學習成效並無法明顯的被教師或學生所查覺。這些不容易被察覺的隱密性學習，卻與正式教室內的學習息息相關，並且佔人類學習的絕大部分。然此隱密性學習雖如此重要，卻因隱密不容易被察覺，因此不容易被研究探討。本研究透過實驗設計與資料交叉比對，驗證出隱密性的非正式學習，即

便當學生不覺得在從事有意義的學習互動，也可以產生。

本研究發現，臉書在非正式學習的隱性學習刺激有三方面：專業科目相關的知識、社交、學習動機。參與的學生即便否認有此三方面的成長，但是實驗結果卻證明臉書非正式學習促使學生們在此三方面有卓越的進步。也就是說，即便學習過程並未使學習者當下產生『意義』(meaning making)，但並不代表學習無法發生。教師與學生如何更能有意識的查覺非正式學習，並將之提升于學習意識層面，以具化加深學習，是值得更深入探索的議題。