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Abstract

The aim of this quasi-experimental research was to examine the role of English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers’ native language when providing corrective feedback (CF) and whether their native/non-native speaker (NS/NNS) status had an influence on learners’ English past tense performance in Chinese EFL classrooms. A total number of 92 intermediate level EFL learners were assigned to two types of classes, taught by NS teachers or NNS teachers. For each type of the class, student participants were separated into two groups and were engaged in three communicative activities with or without teachers’ CF on English past tense. Student participants’ performance of English past tense was measured through a pretest, an immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest which was two weeks after the instructional intervention. The results of the three-way mixed design ANOVA showed that all four classes improved as a result of their respective communicative activities. The two groups that received CF outperformed the two groups that did not receive CF. However, teachers’ NS/NNS status did not significantly influence their use of CF. The findings of this research also revealed that teachers’ NS/NNS status and their CF provision did not interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense. Overall, the findings of this study demonstrate the beneficial effect of oral CF from teachers of different NS/NNS status on learners’ English past tense performance.
Résumé

Cette étude quasi-expérimentale tient à examiner le rôle de la langue maternelle des enseignants de l’anglais langue étrangère (ALE) dans la rétroaction corrective (RC) dans le but de déterminer si leur statut de locuteur natif/non natif (LN/ LNN) influence l’acquisition du temps du passé en anglais dans les cours ALE en Chine. Pour ce faire, 92 apprenants de l’anglais à un niveau intermédiaire ont été répartis dans deux types de classe, enseignés par des enseignants LN ou LNN. Pour chaque type de classe, les étudiants ont été séparés en deux groupes et ont participé à trois activités de communication avec ou sans RC en ce qui concerne le temps du passé en anglais. L’acquisition du temps du passé en anglais était mesurée avant l’intervention pédagogique (pré-test), immédiatement après l’intervention (posttest immédiat) et deux semaines plus tard (posttest différé). Les résultats d’une analyse de variance (ANOVA) à trois facteurs mixtes ont montré que toutes les quatre classes se sont améliorées en raison de leurs activités de communication respectives. Les groupes qui avaient reçu la RC avaient une meilleure performance par rapport à ceux sans RC. Cependant, le statut LN/ LNN des enseignants n’avait pas d’influence significative sur l’utilisation de RC. Les résultats de l’étude ont également indiqué que le statut LN/ LNN des enseignants ainsi que leur RC fournie n’ont pas interagi pour affecter l’acquisition du temps du passé en anglais des apprenants. Dans l’ensemble, les résultats de cette étude démontrent l’effet bénéfique de la RC orale, que les enseignants soient locuteurs natifs ou non natifs, sur la performance des apprenants en ce qui a trait au passé en anglais.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

In recent years, for the purpose of understanding the process of second language acquisition (SLA) as well as equipping language teachers with effective teaching techniques and instruments, researchers have sought to identify variables and contributing factors of effective second language (L2) learning. Classroom interaction has been the focus of many studies in the field of SLA (e.g. Ellis, 2012; Seedhouse, 1996; Tsui, 2001). Inside this field, different views regarding the role of classroom have been examined, primarily with a focus on either learners or teachers, and their speech separately or collectively. When it comes to L2 teaching and learning, the main issue is the language itself and how it is appropriately dealt with in the classroom interaction occurred between teachers and students. In this regard, one of the areas that have been taken into account is corrective feedback (CF).

CF, defined by Lightbown and Spada (1999) as “any indication to the student that their use of the target structure is incorrect” (p. 171), has been the focus and prominence of many SLA researchers for the past two decades (e.g., Lee, 2013; Li, 2010; Long, 1996; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Panova & Lyster, 2002). While CF is generally recognized as a facilitative factor for L2 development (e.g., Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010), there are many variables that influence the extent of its efficacy, such as learner proficiency level, learner anxiety, learner motivation and attitudes towards CF, types and amount of CF, settings, length of intervention, and target features. However,
researchers have been focusing on examining the CF that learners receive, such as learners’ perceptions of CF, learners’ repairs following the CF, and various factors affecting the beneficial effects of CF internally and externally (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Mackey & Goo, 2007). The feedback provider, especially foreign language (FL) teachers, have received relatively little attention. Previous research demonstrated that feedback provision, as well as learners’ repair after the feedback, were influenced by interlocutor factors (Li, 2010; Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003). The present study differs from previous studies as it attempts to indicate if and how teachers’ feedback provision is connected with their first language (L1) besides the external factors shared by teachers and learners. Therefore, the present study proposes that the teacher and the language learner, as the interlocutors, should be given equal consideration.

In the English as a foreign language (EFL) context, teachers are generally composed of two broad classes, native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS). Although several studies have compared CF provided by learners and teachers, as well as by NS and NNS, language teachers’ individual differences are relatively less studied (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Oliver, 2002). In addition, little research had examined how these differences could potentially be related with CF provided by the teachers in the FL classroom. In China, there is a growing number of NS and NNS teachers engaging in communicative English courses. By investigating the differences between CF provided by these NS and NNS teachers, teachers and students’ mutual understanding could be enhanced and classroom teaching effectiveness may be improved, which can be of great
pedagogical implications for Chinese EFL education. Thus, the present study intends to examine the role of EFL teachers’ L1 when providing CF and whether their native/non-native speaker status has an influence on students’ performance in a Chinese EFL classroom.

The Dichotomy of Native/Non-native Speaker

In the present study, an NS refers to a person who learned the language as a native language or one of his or her primary languages. An NNS refers to a person who did not learn the language as a native language. The terms ‘native speaker’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ have been greatly problematized in the literature in the past two decades. In 1991, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) made a statement arguing that it was discriminatory to make employment decisions based on native language proficiency (Llurda & Huguet, 2003). The organization was committed to the ‘creation and publication of minimal language proficiency standards that may be applied equally to all ESOL teachers without reference to the nativeness of their English’ (Braine, 1999, p. xxi). Since then, the concept of ‘native speaker’ has come to be questioned. Phillipson (1992) uses the term “the native speaker fallacy” to refer to unethical treatment of qualified NNS teachers who are not assumed to be the ideal teacher of English (p. 185). What’s more, Cook (1999, 2016) questions the native speaker goal of traditional SLA and TESOL and argues the need to disregard the native/non-native dichotomy. He suggests that the goal of L2 learners is to become successful L2 users or multicompetent speakers rather than imitative native speakers. In addition, Mahboob (2010) questions the “privileging of native speakers” and calls for reassessment of NS and NNS teachers.
through a lens of NNS English teacher. Therefore, the need to go beyond the NS in language teaching and learning has been further argued for in the field.

Firth and Wagner (2007) indicate the imbalance between cognitive and sociocultural routes in SLA research. They call for more attention to the significance of interactional and contextual dimensions of language use and more studies in this area. Firth and Wagner (2007) also criticize the stereotyped view of NNSs as defective communicators, which measures L2 speakers’ competencies against the criterion of native speakers. Instead, their position acknowledges L2 speakers’ status as competent communicators in interaction and explicates the wide range of interactional resources that L2 speakers employ to participate in social practice (Firth & Wagner, 1997). However, I have chosen to retain these terms in this study because the NS-NNS dichotomy still exists in many foreign language contexts, which is the fundamental part of some earlier research. Nevertheless, it must be noted that such terms often arouse debate and controversy because they are problematic and loaded.

**Thesis Outline**

This study includes six chapters, starting from the introductory chapter presented here. In Chapter 2, I will provide a detailed review of the previous studies related to teachers’ NS/NNS status and findings revealing the potential effects of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the feedback they provide. Gaps and remaining questions in the relevant literature will be laid out and addressed in the subsequent chapters. At the end of Chapter 2, I will present the research questions of the current study. Chapter 3 demonstrates the methodology of the current study. Chapter 4 lays out the results of this quasi-experiment
and is followed by Chapter 5 discussing those results. Finally, the current study will close with a conclusion in Chapter 6, including limitations, implications of this study, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Despite numerous directions and factors in CF research in the social/cognitive debate in the field of SLA, few researchers emphasized the CF provider, especially FL teachers. Thus, it is necessary to take FL teachers’ conditions into account in CF research. In the EFL context, teachers often unavoidably fall into two categories, NS and NNS. Previous studies have compared CF between teacher-learner dyads, learner-learner dyads, as well as NS-NNS dyads. However, little attention has been paid to the individual factors of teachers, and how these factors could potentially be connected with feedback provided by the teachers in the FL classroom. Therefore, this chapter reviews a set of key studies in the area of CF and comparisons between NS and NNS teachers, and looks at the impact of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the effectiveness of the CF they provide.

Teachers’ Native/Non-Native Speaker Status

In this section, studies that have examined differences between NS and NNS teachers will be reviewed. I will sketch out the topics examined and methodologies adopted, as well as the limitations of the studies.

Most of the research focusing on exploring on the differences and similarities of the NNS and NS teachers has been limited to comparisons between the two kinds of teachers through teachers’ perceptions of themselves (Llurda & Huguet, 2003; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999), and through ESL or EFL students’ perceptions (Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005).
According to the previous studies, NNS and NS teachers and their students reported that the two kinds of teachers had some inherent differences (Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005). To be more specific, in an ESL/EFL context, NS teachers tended to be reliable, placing less emphasis on test scores and error correction, and had limited sensitivity of grammar rules. They were more likely to be voluble in their language of instruction and were rarely formally trained for language teaching. In contrast, NNS teachers had richer teaching experiences and the ability to predict difficult language points which might not be understood by students, received formal training, and were more intensive while less creative in the teaching process (Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005). Nevertheless, researchers proposed that the two kinds of teachers should not be considered distinct in their teaching abilities. Inversely, the perceived differences were regarded as inherent factors relative to the NS/NNS status. Most participants held the view that factors other than teachers’ L1 also had an impact on teachers’ decisions in classrooms, such as teachers’ educational background and teaching experience (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Cots & Díaz, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). It is important to examine these differences and whether they actually influence teacher behavior such as CF provision in the classroom. However, NS and NNS teachers’ teaching behavior has been the subject of only a few studies. Even fewer studies looked into CF provision in relation to NS/NNS status. Árva and Medgyes’s (2000) study was the only one to date that has examined the difference between the two kinds of teachers when providing oral CF.
Comparing beliefs of NS and NNS teachers. Medgyes (1994) is one of the best known comparative studies of NS/NNS teachers. As it was not an empirical study, the hypothesis in this opinion piece raised controversy and argument in the ESL and EFL research area. The author conducted three surveys on NNS teachers, a U.S. survey, an international survey, and a Hungarian survey. Medgyes examined the differences in teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers of English, and then specified the potential reasons of those differences based on peer perceptions of NNS teacher participants. The researcher suggested that most of the differences between two kinds of teachers could be explained by the disparity between their language proficiency levels, and that their behavior was inherently different. Medgyes subsequently qualified his opinion by claiming that NS and NNS teachers could be equally effective.

Reves and Medgyes (1994) demonstrated the hypothesis by placing the issue in an international setting. A questionnaire was administered to 216 NS and NNS teachers from Brazil, former Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, Sweden, former Yugoslavia, and Zimbabwe. The authors assumed that the two kinds of ESL/EFL teachers would be different regarding their teaching behavior and attitudes and the differences would be mainly due to the discrepancy of language proficiency levels (1994, p. 354). The questionnaire contained 23 questions, 18 of which were addressed to both kinds of teachers, and the remaining 5 items to NNS teachers only. Most of the questions were close-ended and aimed to elicit information of the actual circumstances when they were teaching (p. 355). Participants’ beliefs with regard to the hypotheses were elicited by open-ended questions. Results showed that 68% of the teachers perceived a discrepancy
in teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers. NNS teachers also tended to have a poor self-image due to their “relative English language deficiencies” which had affected their teaching behavior (p. 364). Findings suggested that NS and NNS teachers taught differently and an awareness of these differences affected NNS teachers’ general self-image and attitude to work (p. 363). This comparative study connected teaching behaviors with teachers’ self-perceptions and contributed to the field of ESL/EFL teaching research. There are, however, some limitations of this study. To begin with, the study surveyed a much larger number of NNS teachers than NS teachers, thus, it was impossible to make a fair comparison. In addition, the authors’ methods were biased against NNS teachers when they indirectly asked whether or not their teaching was negatively affected by their native language ability. In addition, the conclusions were largely from the self-reports of NNS teacher participants and with neither empirical evidence nor observation. Last but not least, the researchers affirmed that the discrepancy in teaching behavior and perceptions were attributed to different language proficiency levels. This was not supported by any quantitative analysis, which made the study less persuasive.

Afterwards, Reves and Medgyes’s (1994) research was replicated by Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999). Seventeen NNS postgraduates of TESOL from a university in the US participated in this research. The aims of their research were as follows: firstly, to examine how the postgraduates regarded themselves as professionals; secondly, to examine the participants’ beliefs about the difference between NS and NNS teachers; thirdly, to explore whether the participants felt restricted by their NS/NNS status or not.
Various methods were adopted for data collection, such as questionnaires, in-depth interviews with teachers, classroom discussions, and autobiography from participants (p. 424). The results suggested that the majority of the participants believed that there were differences in instructional practices between NS teachers and NNS teachers. However, participants also reported that the teaching abilities of the two kinds of teachers were not influenced by those differences. Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) also discussed the intercultural factors, stating that teaching behavior could be affected by the sociocultural and linguistic contexts rather than teachers’ language proficiency levels.

Similarly, a study by Llurda and Huguet (2003) employed questionnaires to examine NNS teachers’ beliefs. A questionnaire was distributed to 101 NNS EFL teachers in primary and secondary schools in a mid-size city in Spain. The questionnaire consisted of three five-point Likert scales questions and six closed sets of categories questions that were designed to determine the teachers’ self-awareness of their language proficiency, teaching ideology (tendencies and preferences when designing a language course), and their position with regard to the NS-NNS debate. Results revealed, on the one hand, that NNS teachers in secondary schools showed a higher regard for their teaching ability and English proficiency levels than the teachers in primary schools. NNS teachers in secondary schools also had a stronger critical awareness of their NNS status than those in primary schools. On the other hand, primary school teachers tended to be more communicative-oriented, while secondary school teachers put more emphasis on form-oriented teaching in classrooms. In response to their awareness of the NS-NNS debate, most primary school teachers had a preference for NS teachers over NNS ones. The
researchers suggested that these NNS teachers who prefer NSs over NNSs suffered from insecurity and a sense of inferiority compared to NS teachers (p. 229). Nevertheless, 73% of secondary teachers (versus only 47.4% of primary teachers) thought that being a NNS was an advantage in the EFL context. Cultural aspects of FL teaching were also discussed in this research. The authors found that both groups of NNS teachers recognized the need for language teachers’ cultural knowledge of English-speaking countries.

**NS and NNS teachers’ perceptions about the target language.** Research has also examined NS and NNS teachers’ perceptions of the target language, especially how precise teachers are on perceiving the possible difficulties and problems from students. McNeill (2005) compared NS and NNS teachers’ intuitions about language difficulty from a learner’s perspective. The researcher sought to investigate how well teachers anticipated students’ vocabulary difficulties in reading texts. Teachers were all qualified with rich experience of the ESL teaching in Hong Kong. The author presumed that the ability to predict learners’ lexical problems would vary among individual teachers. Another hypothesis was that the expertise of teaching would affect the judgements of NNS teachers positively. One controversial part of the research is that 65 English teachers were assigned to four groups according to their expertise and NS/NNS status: “non-native speaker expert (NNE)” group, “native speaker expert (NSE)” group, “non-native speaker novice (NNN)” group, and “native speaker novice (NSN)” group. NNE teachers had a postgraduate degree in TESOL or linguistics and had over two years of teaching experience in Hong Kong. NNN teachers, however, were first year undergraduate English major students, with much less teaching experience. As for NNE and NNN teachers, they
had all lived in Hong Kong for at least two years, but none of them had more than a very elementary command of Cantonese (students’ L1). Two hundred secondary school students were asked to read a passage and took two vocabulary tests which gave an indication of the students’ lexical knowledge in isolation and in context (p. 114). Teacher participants then were asked to predict words that would be difficult for the learners and explained their reasons. Learners’ answers and teachers’ word selections were compared and analyzed by the researcher.

Results showed that NNS teachers, as a group, were more successful than NS teachers at predicting learners’ vocabulary difficulties in reading texts. Surprisingly, both expert and novice NS teachers were quite incapable of making accurate predictions. However, there was no significant correlations between both NS groups’ predictions and the words difficulty levels. On the contrary, the two NNS groups demonstrated a significant correlation with the words difficulty levels. Moreover, results suggested that expertise did not necessarily improve awareness of language difficulty. Interestingly, teachers who spoke students’ L1 had a distinct advantage in predicting sources of lexical difficulty, and this was particularly evident for the novice NNS teacher group. In addition, NNS teachers found it more difficult to identify unknown contextualized vocabulary than isolated words, while NS teachers were better with the contextualized vocabulary (p. 116). However, the qualitative inquiry of the teachers’ reasoning did not show a relationship between teachers’ L1, their individual differences, and their accuracy in identifying the difficulty of the words. Therefore, the author called for more objective
measures of expertise and smaller individual differences in the ability to identify lexical difficulty.

Levis, Sonsaat, Link, and Barriuso (2016) conducted a study investigating the effect of teachers’ L1 on ratings of change in accentedness and comprehensibility in pronunciation instruction. Students were taught the same pronunciation lessons by a NNS teacher and a NS teacher. Before and after the instruction, students completed a pretest and a posttest to elicit speech samples for rating. Interviews were conducted and questionnaires were administered as well. Results showed similar ratings of the students’ comprehensibility for both teachers (p. 18). There was no significant difference between ESL students’ accentedness or comprehensibility ratings after the intervention. The authors considered that pronunciation can be taught equally well by both NS and NNS teachers, just like any other kind of language skill. They disagreed with the assumption of the nativeness principle that students will acquire native English pronunciation when they are taught by NS teachers who speak English without foreign accents, which greatly pressured NNS teachers. Levis et al. (2016) suggested that instruction on language skills is more dependent on knowledgeable teaching practices than on native language skills of the teacher (p. 25).

Overall, the studies examining NS and NNS teachers’ beliefs demonstrated that their individual differences did influence their teaching behavior. What about learners’ perceptions of teachers’ NS/NNS status?

**Learners’ perceptions of teachers’ NS/NNS status.** In the last decade, research has begun to investigate the NS/NNS status from students’ perspective. Barratt and Kontra
(2000) presented two studies in Hungary which involved 58 teachers and 116 students, and one study in China which involved 54 teachers and 100 students. Most of the learners were taught by both kinds of teachers and they were required to provide their understandings about the strengths and shortcomings of their teachers. Despite the fact that Hungary and China were distant in terms of culture and geography, students identified similar characteristics of their teachers. Most positive comments on NS teachers were concerned with authentic pronunciation, large vocabulary, and a good cultural knowledge of English-speaking countries. They tended to put less emphasis on scores and error correction. However, they were considered to lack the knowledge of students’ L1 and local culture, as well as teaching experience and qualifications. NNS teachers, on the contrary, were believed to have the ability to predict what might happen to be difficult for the students, with formal teacher training and more teaching practices. The results seemed to show a preference to NNS teachers, but learners agreed that both kinds of teachers had advantages and disadvantages.

Lasagabaster and Sierra’s (2005) research examined the students’ perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of a NS teacher. In this study, a closed questionnaire and a follow-up open discussion was administered to 76 university students of various specializations. The closed questionnaire containing 42 statements was designed to elicit students’ perceptions of NS or NNS teachers concerning language skills, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, learning strategies, culture and civilization, attitudes and assessment (p. 221). Learners were assigned to small groups and required to sum up their group discussion in English. Advantages and disadvantages were identified by students.
for both types of teachers. While the biggest advantage of NS teachers was identified as pronunciation, NNS teachers were perceived to be good in learning strategies. Results also revealed that, although students preferred NS teachers in general, they would choose to have both NS and NNS teachers when they were given the possibility. However, this study could not make much contribution to this research domain as the results were demonstrated merely by percentages and isolated opinions, which made the authors’ assertion less persuasive.

He and Miller (2011) conducted a study at four universities in different parts of China, surveying 984 college students and teachers. This study aimed to explore which kind of English teacher students preferred, NS or NNS teachers. Again, the results showed students’ perceptions of strengths and weakness of both NS and NNS teachers. Similar to findings of Lasabagaster and Sierra (2005), student participants would like to have both types of teachers in order to incorporate different advantages of them. It is suggested by the researchers that more NS teachers be hired to teach non-English majors and NNS teachers should have access to some form of teacher development, preferably in English-speaking countries (p. 440).

A similar study was carried out by Benke and Medgyes (2005) to investigate students’ beliefs about the two kinds of teacher’s teaching manners. They developed a questionnaire for 422 learners of English in Hungary who had all been exposed to English language instruction from both NS and NNS teachers for more than a year (p. 198). The authors attempted to examine the most distinguishing features as well as the differences of teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers, from the students’
perspective, and tried to compare students’ opinions with teachers’ spontaneous reactions to students’ comments. Statistical analysis revealed significant differences in teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers. It was proposed that NNS teachers were more demanding, thorough and traditional than NS ones, who were more encouraging, friendly and talkative (p. 204). Similar to previous research (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Medgyes, 1994), both NS and NNS teachers were considered as having inherent strengths and weaknesses in different aspects. The researchers left just one question that hadn’t been answered, that is, how learners’ perceptions correspond to teachers’ perceptions (p. 208). While it would be interesting to investigate whether or not learners and teachers have some overlap in their perceptions, it is necessary to examine how these perceptions affect practical learning and teaching, and if there are potential discrepancies of NS and NNS teachers’ classroom behavior.

NS and NNS teachers’ classroom behavior. There is a limited amount of research comparing classroom behaviors of the two kinds of teachers. Previous studies have examined teachers’ discourse through the usage of the word “we” (Cots & Diaz, 2005) and demonstrated the solidarity between NNS teachers and students. In addition, Macaro (2001) reported that NNS teachers code-switched more than NS teachers. While such research has been pioneering to examine differences between NS and NNS teachers in the classroom, other important factors such as CF provided by teachers, need to be emphasized as well. CF research exploring teachers’ NS/NNS status as a predisposing factor would contribute to the SLA research field.
There was only one research study that investigated the two kinds of teachers’ CF provision in the classroom of non-native language. Árva and Medgyes (2000) explored the differences between the two kinds of teachers’ perceptions on the teaching behaviors of themselves, which contained target or native language competence, the use of textbook, sternness, grammatical and cultural knowledge, and their attitude to students’ error. The two kinds of teachers in this study differed with regard to qualifications, L1, and teaching experience. The authors selected five NS teachers and five NNS teachers and video recorded ten hours of instruction, and then administered the questionnaires designed by Medgyes (1994) to compare the teachers’ recorded classroom behaviors with their self-reported behaviors, followed by an interview. The results confirmed the assumptions of Medgyes (1994) that NS teachers had linguistic superiority over NNS ones, including idiomatic expressions and a higher command of phrasal verbs. NNS teachers seemed to have more insight into and better meta-cognitive knowledge of grammar (p. 364). However, NS teachers seemed to have limited metalinguistic knowledge compared to NNS instructors. The NS teachers were also criticized for not learning the local language, Hungarian, and for their informal, casual attitude with students, which differed from their self-reported behaviors.

While Árva and Medgyes (2000) have contributed to research on teachers’s NS/NNS status, limitations made their study less persuasive in the field of SLA. Regarding methodology, the video recordings were produced with different proficiency levels in different classes where different teaching materials were used. In addition, NNS teachers were often responsible for grammar instruction, while NS teachers participated primarily
in oral instruction. Thus, a number of imbalanced variables made this research complicated and factors other than teachers’ NS/NNS status needed to be addressed, such as course objectives and language proficiency levels. What’s more, there were some subjective descriptions of NS and NNS teachers in the discussion, stating that NS teachers spoke better English than NNS teachers, and that NNS teachers were stricter but less tolerant. These subjective opinions were not further explained or operationalized by the authors.

Despite the limitations and insufficient empirical evidence, this study shed light upon the discrepancy between teacher perceptions and classroom realities. Moreover, it supported previous research stating that the root of much divergence between NS and NNS teachers lay in their language as well as their cultural background.

The research is of great importance for it was the first attempt to study the inherent differences of NS and NNS teachers in classroom in a more direct way and it has been the only research to date that focused on the differences of teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers regarding oral CF.

In all, research on the NS and NNS teachers’ classroom behavior has been paid more and more attention in the field of L2 research, although more rigorous methodologies and analyses are needed due to the various limitations of previous research. To be specific, future studies need to explore not only NS/NNS status but also other individual differences of teachers and make some adjustments on data analysis according to these potential differences. Researchers need to operate all of the constructs and refrain from subjective judgements. Last but not least, further research on teachers’ teaching behavior,
especially in relation to CF provision and the NS/NNS status, is needed. All the limitations need to be taken into consideration in further studies on teachers’ NS/NNS status as an influencing factor in L2 learning and teaching.

**Corrective Feedback and NS/NNS Status**

Feedback provision relative to dyadic interaction. In the field of SLA, there have been many studies investigating the variables that moderate the effectiveness of CF (Li, 2010). It is assumed that learners have different responses to CF depending on the CF provider, the interlocutor in the interaction. Some researchers anticipated that L2 learners might perceive CF as more valuable if it is provided by NSs or native-like speakers of the target language. A few empirical studies have provided such evidence. However, it has been suggested that students might be less inhibited working with peers and might benefit from peer feedback (Russell & Spada, 2006). Actually, according to Sato and Lyster’s (2012) study, peer CF sharpened learners’ ability to monitor both their own language production and that of their interlocutors. Thus, the majority of studies on differences of CF provision moderated by sources have targeted learners and non-teaching NSs. The language teachers with different NS/NNS status were largely ignored.

Oliver (2002) conducted a detailed study on the effect of dyads by investigating the relations between CF situations and the NS/NNS status, language proficiency, gender, as well as age of participants. Results showed that negotiation of meaning occurred more frequently and had the most different CF types between the NNS-NNS dyads than with NNS-NS dyads (p. 108). Moreover, the least amount of CF was elicited among the NS-NS dyads. Additionally, CF provided by child participants was not significantly different
based on age and gender variables. The researcher also found that as participants’ age increased, boys were more likely to provide more clarification requests and confirmation checks. Girls, on the contrary, tended to provide fewer of these types of CF (p. 104). The author concluded that as child learners were getting older, the differences in CF types might become more salient.

Oliver, Mackey, and Leeman (2003) also made a comparison between different gender dyads of NNS-NNS and NNS-NS for children and adults. They also took the developmental level of ESL learners into account. Participants were categorized based on the developmental level for the target structure. Adult NS interlocutors initiated a significantly larger number of CF moves than adult NNS interlocutors. This difference was also found within child dyads, although it failed to reach statistical significance. Regarding the opportunities for modified output following the CF, the CF provided by adult NNS interlocutors was significantly more likely to offer such opportunities than was CF provided by adult NSs (p. 50). Nevertheless, learners did not take advantage of those opportunities as much as those provided by NSs. The researchers concluded that interlocutor type (i.e., NS vs. NNS) and learner age could be influential factors to CF provision and modified output (p. 58).

Fujii and Mackey (2009) continued this field of research and introduced it into EFL classrooms. This research explored learner-learner interactions in two designated tasks. Data were collected through transcripts of paired interactions, stimulated recall, and learning journals. The researchers found very low number of feedback episodes in both tasks in spite of a large number of incorrect non-target-like utterances. Fujii and Mackey
suggested that learners might make use of their interlocutors’ non-target-like input as models for their own utterances. CF provision and use could be partially attributed to interlocutor type. In all, this study indicated the potential influence of interlocutor-related factors on the overall pattern of CF (p. 294).

**The role of NS/NNS teachers as the interlocutor.** As discussed above, the interlocutor factor seemed presumed to be a non-teaching role in previous studies. However, language teachers are the most common interlocutor who provide numerous instances of feedback to learners in FL classrooms. Among 31 studies presented in their meta-analysis, Russell and Spada (2006) reported that in 29% of the research, teachers acted as CF provider. However, the authors did not provide further information about the teachers’ NS/NNS status. Only 16% of the research reported NNS learners as peer CF provider, and non-teaching NSs as CF providers accounted for 18% of the studies.

Given the observed differences in CF in relation to interlocutor factor, researchers need to take FL learners’ primary interlocutor into account, i.e., the FL teachers. Also, it is of great importance to investigate whether learners’ L2 development as well as CF provision and use are influenced by differentiated features of the teacher interlocutor. As Russell and Spada (2006) stated, “Corrective research has focused on mainly teacher feedback in classroom settings or on native speaker feedback outside the classroom” (p. 136). The interlocutor individual differences need to be addressed as well. Mackey and Goo (2007) suggested that the effect of interaction might vary depending on the interlocutor (p. 445). They called for more studies examining the interlocutor individual difference, which was echoed by Li (2010).
Li’s (2010) meta-analysis discussed the interlocutor factor with respect to feedback. He compared 29 research examining the effectiveness of CF provided by teachers, NSs, and computers. Results revealed that CF provided by NS interlocutors was significantly more effective than CF provided by “teachers” (supposedly NNS teachers) (p. 341). The author also found that computer-based feedback was not significantly different from feedback provided by NSs and NNS teachers. Nevertheless, two of the interlocutor types, NSs and computers, appeared in laboratory settings, whereas the NNS teachers as interlocutor was presented in classroom settings only. This might have confounded the interlocutor factor and research setting variable, which made the findings about interlocutor type less persuasive. In addition, the nature of above mentioned “teachers” remained to be elucidated. While considerable detail was provided concerning many independent variables and moderator variables, relatively little information of interlocutor was mentioned. Thus, the research study reported in this thesis was designed to address these critical gaps in the existing literature. The three research questions of this study are:

1. Does teachers’ NS/NNS status influence their use of CF and, if so, to what extent do status and CF provision interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense?

2. How do EFL learners’ perceptions of CF and teachers’ NS/NNS status affect their acquisition of English past tense?

3. In the classes taught by NS teachers, does the group that performs communicative activities while receiving feedback outperform the group not receiving feedback? What about classes taught by NNS teachers?
In the next chapter, the methodology of the present study will be outlined, including research settings, the participants, instrumentation, and measurement.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter, the methodology adopted to investigate the research questions is presented. First, this chapter begins with a description of the research context. Second, characteristics of the student participants and teacher participants are introduced. Next, each step of the research design and data collection of this classroom-based experiment is illustrated and discussed, including recruitment procedures, followed by a description of the three communicative tasks employed in the current study. Participants were assigned to four groups with different feedback provision and NS/NNS status and did the same communicative tasks in class. Finally, measurement procedures, including tests and interviews, are presented. Student participants partook in a pretest, an immediate posttest, a delayed posttest, and a subsample of participants partook in an interview. Testing scores, classroom observations, and interview transcriptions were collected for analysis.

Research Setting

The present study was conducted in a private language training school in northern China. This school provides a wide range of language training programs, including English and other foreign language training, overseas and domestic language proficiency test preparation, and after-school tutoring. The present study took place in a program for students who were going to live and study in English-speaking countries within six months. The program included 112 hours of training with a language focus ranging from intensive English reading, oral English courses, to academic writing courses. The objective of the curriculum was to meet the communicative needs of the students and
equip them with necessary communication skills as well as fundamental academic knowledge for their overseas life and study.

**Participants**

**Student participants.** The recruitment of student participants took place in January 2016, following ethics approval from the McGill University Research Ethics Board. All 92 student participants in the study were informed orally by the researcher of the general procedure as well as the purpose of the research, then signed the consent form prior to the actual experiment. All of the participants were in their third year or supplementary year of senior high school and were attending this language training school after their regular school day. Their ages ranged from 18 to 20, with a mean age of 18.4. Participating students had taken the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) and received an overall band score of 6 or higher, as the minimum entrance requirement of the program.

Of student participants in the present study, 70% started to learn English as an L2 from Grade 3 in elementary school (at age 8 or 9 years old); 30% of the students reported that they started to learn English from kindergartens (part of compulsory schooling), tutors, or private language institutes, prior to Grade 3 in elementary school. The student participants reported an average of 7-12 years of experience in learning English as a second language, with an average of 8.5 years of experience. They all reported limited exposure to English outside of school. In the current study, English past tense would be the linguistic target of the intervention because it is a common yet difficult problem facing the Chinese EFL learners due to the fact that there is no past tense in Mandarin.
And according to English Curriculum Standard in the Phase of Compulsory Education set by the Ministry of Education, the learners in this research should have learned English past tense in primary school, understanding the basic meanings and usages of English past tense in certain contexts. In other words, the participants had already learned the English past tense, yet the treatment was aimed at consolidating their knowledge and enhancing their target structure accuracy.

**Teacher participants.** There were eight teacher participants in this study. The recruitment was based on their willingness to participate and their availability during the research. Four teachers were from English-speaking countries and the other four teachers speak Mandarin Chinese as their L1. The four native English speakers are referred to the “NS teachers” and the four Chinese teachers are referred to “NNS teachers.” The NS teachers who speak English as their L1 had all graduated with B.A. degrees from universities in the United States, Ireland, or Australia. They had more than two years of teaching experience in various settings. The NNS teachers are native speakers of Mandarin Chinese and fluent in English. They had all majored in English Language and Literature and received B.A. degrees. None of them had lived or studied in English-speaking countries. Due to the guiding and training by the researcher prior to the study, all of the teacher participants were familiar with the principles, procedures, and material of the treatment.

**Procedures**

**Research design.** As shown in Figure 1, prior to the study, all the student participants engaged in oral tasks that served as the pretest, which included reading and
retelling a story that happened in the past. Student participants read a story silently for
three minutes before they were required to retell the story with some word cues. The
students took the pretest individually and the test was audio-recorded, transcribed, and
coded in terms of past tense accuracy.

Since the students had shown their willingness to study in either a NS teacher’s class
or a NNS teacher’s class during the recruitment, they were assigned to the two types of
classes accordingly. Then the student participants were randomly assigned to one of the	
two classes (with or without CF) taught by NS teachers or NNS teachers. Each class
underwent the same tests and received similar instruction; the differentiating features of
each class were the teachers’ NS/NNS status and the CF they gave. Class 1 and Class 2
were taught by two NS teachers, while Class 3 and Class 4 were taught by two NNS
teachers. In Class 1 and Class 3 (treatment groups), students were involved in
communicative activities and received either prompts or recasts from their teachers. In
Class 2 and Class 4 (control groups), teachers were asked not to react to errors, which
was consistent with their natural teaching style. Otherwise, Classes 2 and 4 were identical
to Classes 1 and 3 in terms of instruction, content, communicative tasks, and length of
instruction.
As shown in Table 1, 43 student participants were assigned to NS teachers’ classes, and 49 student participants were assigned to NNS teachers’ classes. A total of 45 student participants received instruction without CF on past tense while a total of 47 student participants received instruction with CF on past tense during communicative tasks.

The treatment consisted of three sessions of 80-90 minutes each, distributed over a period of 2 weeks, during which the student participants engaged in communicative tasks designed to promote the use of English past tense (adapted from Yang & Lyster, 2010).

Table 1

*Groups and Instructional Settings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Factors</th>
<th>With CF</th>
<th>Without CF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS Teachers</td>
<td>Class 1 (n = 22)</td>
<td>Class 2 (n = 21)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS Teachers</td>
<td>Class 3 (n = 25)</td>
<td>Class 4 (n = 24)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A booklet (see Appendix A) was given to teacher participants to help their participation in the research. It contained a detailed description of CF in the instructional intervention. The booklet, together with a briefing meeting, assisted the teacher participants to understand all the activities and CF types to implement.

Immediately after the instructional intervention, the student participants took a posttest and then a delayed posttest two weeks later. To avoid the test-retest effect, two different versions were used for each test. Finally, interviews were carried out after the delayed posttest.

**Data collection.** The study was explained to all student and teacher participants first for them to decide whether or not to participate in the research. Then the consent forms were distributed to all participants and those who were willing to participate signed the consent form and also indicated whether or not to give permission to be interviewed. In all, eight English teachers were recruited from the language training school where the current study was conducted. Ninety-two students agreed to participate in the study, 16 of whom participated in the interview at the end of the study (five interviewees from Class 1; three interviewees from Class 2; six interviewees from Class 3; two from Class 4).

The institute in which the study was conducted regularly video-records all classes. These video-recordings are used as a basic means of testing and evaluating teachers’ teaching quality and are thus part of teacher training. In addition, the institute selects video-recordings of some lessons and uses them for online courses. Prior to the study, the researcher requested permission from the school, the students, and the teachers to access the video-recordings of classes. Since the school board did not allow the display of video
recordings outside the institute, the researcher was allowed to watch the video recordings of classroom interaction at the institute and to transcribe the recordings.

**Instrumentation**

There were three treatment sessions of 80-90 minutes each, during which the student participants were engaged in one of the three communicative tasks below.

**Chain story activity.** In order to practice irregular past tense, a chain story activity was implemented. The teacher started the story with a simple sentence in the past. Each student needed to add a sentence that contained a verb in the past to continue the story. Every student in the class needed to add at least one sentence in this activity. The teachers in treatment groups provided CF to students’ past-tense errors while other errors were corrected as well when necessary. However, in the control groups, the teachers did not provide feedback on past-tense errors in this activity.

**Dictogloss activity.** Dictogloss is an interactive dictation activity in EFL classrooms which typically consists of four basic procedures: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis with correction (Wajnryb, 1990). According to Swain and Lapkin (2001), the dictogloss leads students to notice and reproduce complex syntactic structures. In this study, a dictogloss task was used to help student participants notice the form of English past tense. The researcher adapted two dictogloss tasks from Yang and Lyster’s (2010) study, since the English language level and learning experience of the student participants in the two studies were similar. The material used in the dictogloss task included the fairy tale “Cinderella” and story “The Crow and the Water Bottle” (see examples in Appendix B). The two stories contained a number of verbs in past tense forms that were appropriate
for student participants’ proficiency level. The teacher read the narrative story twice. During the first story reading, the students were not allowed to take notes, whereas during the second reading, the students were required to write down what they had heard as much as possible. Student participants then were asked to compare their notes in pairs and reconstructed the story before narrating it. The teachers in the treatment groups provided CF immediately on students’ past-tense errors while other errors were corrected when necessary. However, in the control groups, the teachers did not provide feedback on errors of past tense. When students finished narrating, the teachers in all classes provided the original text with highlighted past tense forms in bold font and asked students to compare the text with their own text.

**Picture-cued narratives.** A picture-cued narrative activity was provided in which pictures illustrating the stories in the dictogloss activity were chosen and thus the students were expected to communicate with adequate information. The classes were divided into groups of 5-6 students and then 10 numbered pictures were provided to students, each showing a picture of the story. The students were given five minutes for preparation, and then told the story in chronological order. When student participants were telling the story, teachers in treatment groups provided CF on errors in the past tense, whereas teachers in the control groups provided feedback only on pronunciation errors and content errors involving comprehension and vocabulary.

**Measurements**

**Tests.** Students’ developing knowledge of English past tense was tested before the instructional intervention (pretest), immediately after the intervention (immediate
posttest), and two weeks later (delayed posttest). For each testing session, one oral test was administered individually in the school’s multimedia language lab. The oral test was adapted from the testing material in Yang’s (2008) study. Learners were asked to retell a story with a list of word cues. The testing material consisted of a short passage with English past tense forms. The students would first read the story silently for three minutes and then were given a sheet of word cues that reminded them of the content of the story. Meanwhile, student participants were asked to retell the story according to the word cues. The oral test session was audio recorded individually by the built-in microphone of headsets and then audio files were collected by computer software equipped in the multimedia language lab.

To avoid test-retest effects, two versions of the testing material were used for each test. The two versions were employed as A-B-A format, in order to avoid learners’ relying on memory or fatigue of repeated tests. Version A of the testing material was used in both pretest and delayed posttest, while version B was used in the immediate posttest. The procedures of the testing session were as follows. The teacher provided test instructions to the students and handed out the story sheets and word cues sheets on students’ desk, with both pages facing down. Then the students put on headsets and the teacher gave a signal for students to start. Students turned over the story sheets and read it in three minutes. After three minutes, the teacher took the story sheets back, required students to flip the word cues sheets, and started recording. Students were expected to retell the story according to the word cues. After the students finished retelling the story, the researcher collected all the material and audio recordings.
**Interviews.** After finishing the delayed posttest, 16 student participants who had expressed willingness on their consent forms to participate in the interview completed a semi-structured interview individually in the classroom. The 15-minute interview was intended to complement the study with potential reasons for students’ performance in different groups and investigate students’ perceptions of CF provided by NS/NNS teachers in terms of preferences, attitudes, expectations, etc. Moreover, student interviewees were given the opportunity to give additional comments and thoughts in the interview. Also, they were allowed to answer questions in either English or Chinese as they wish. Interview questions appear in Appendix E. Each interview was video-recorded by a digital recorder in the classroom and transcribed.

**Summary**

This chapter outlined the research methods adopted in the current study. A mixed design quasi-experiment with testing sessions as within-subject factor, and teachers’ NS/NNS status and feedback provision as between-subject factors, was conducted. A total of 92 student participants were assigned to four classes (NS teachers providing CF, \( n = 22 \); NS teachers not providing CF, \( n = 21 \); NNS teachers providing CF, \( n = 25 \); NNS teachers not providing CF, \( n = 24 \)). Student participants engaged in three conversational activities (chain story activity; dictogloss activity; picture-cued narratives) focusing on enhancing English past tense and received CF or not according to group settings. For the purpose of examining student participants' improvement on past tense, three oral tests (pretest, immediate and delayed posttest) were employed and then test scores were compared and analyzed. Also, in order to find out potential reasons for students’
performance in different groups and to investigate students’ perceptions of CF provided by NS/NNS teachers, a semi-structured interview was conducted and transcribed for analysis. The analyses used to evaluate the collected data will be presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter reports the results of the present study. The first section includes the statistical analyses of student participants’ performance across groups and testing sessions. The second section presents the distribution of feedback types provided by NS and NNS teachers using a chi-square test for comparative analysis. The third section presents the amount of learner errors, feedback provided by NS and NNS teachers, and learner responses across activities. Finally, the last section presents the results of the interview conducted after the delayed posttest.

The Effects of CF and Teachers’ NS/NNS Status

Each test score at the pretest, the immediate posttest, and the delayed posttest was calculated employing the following coding scheme: When the student participants adopted the correct use of past tense forms, a score of 1 was given. Otherwise, a score of 0 was given. There were a total of 27 items per test. Each test score was prepared as a percentage.

Table 2 presents the mean test scores and standard deviations according to teachers’ NS/NNS status and feedback provision condition across the three testing sessions. The mean scores by group and by test are also graphically illustrated in Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4.

In order to investigate the effects of CF and teachers’ NS/NNS status, a 2×2×3 three-way mixed design analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with an alpha level
of .05. The within-subjects factors were the feedback provision conditions (with CF and without CF), and the between-subjects factors were teachers’ NS/NNS status (NS and NNS) and testing sessions (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest). Before carrying out the analysis, statistical assumptions were also verified. For instance, there were no outliers based on the examination of studentized residuals for values greater than ± 3; student participants’ test scores were normally distributed. The insignificant Levene’s and Box’s M tests ($p > .05$) confirmed that there was homogeneity of variances and of covariances. However, a Mauchly's test of sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated, $\chi^2(1.84) = 13.46, p = .001$. According to Girden’s (1992) recommendation, therefore, degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .921$).

*Figure 2.* Group means on past tense performance over time in the oral tests (by class)
Table 2

*Descriptive Data of the Oral Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Status</th>
<th>Feedback Provision</th>
<th>Test Sessions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Class 1: Communicative tasks with CF (n = 22)</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>78.11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Posttest</td>
<td>90.74</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Posttest</td>
<td>88.22</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Class 2: Communicative tasks without CF (n = 21)</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Posttest</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Posttest</td>
<td>83.07</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Class 3: Communicative tasks with CF (n = 25)</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>78.52</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Posttest</td>
<td>93.19</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Posttest</td>
<td>90.37</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Class 4: Communicative tasks without CF (n = 24)</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>82.10</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Posttest</td>
<td>87.19</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Posttest</td>
<td>84.57</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Group means on past tense performance over time in the oral tests (by teacher’s NS/NNS status)

Figure 4. Group means on past tense performance over time in the oral tests (by feedback provision)
A main effect of testing session on student participants’ scores was significant, $F(1.84, 162.16) = 346.46, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .797$. There was a significant two-way interaction effect between testing sessions and feedback provision, $F(1.84, 162.16) = 81.73, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .482$. However, a two-way interaction effect between testing sessions and teachers’ NS/NNS status failed to reach significance, $F(1.84, 162.16) = .784, p = .449, \eta^2_p = .009$. In addition, a three-way interaction effect was insignificant, $F(1.84, 162.16) = 2.00, p = .143, \eta^2_p = .022$. Considering that the interaction effects are the main interest in the current analysis, the significant main effect of testing sessions was not pursued. Instead, as for the significant two-way interaction effect between testing sessions and feedback provision, the interaction effect was followed by simple effects analyses at each testing time (i.e., between-group comparisons) and within each group (i.e., within-group comparisons) with Bonferroni-adjusted multiple comparisons. In order to quantify the effect size, Cohen's $d$ (1988) was calculated and classified as small ($0.40 \leq d < 0.70$), medium ($0.70 \leq d < 1.00$), or large ($1.00 \leq d$) for between-group contrasts, and small ($0.50 \leq d < 1.10$), medium ($1.10 \leq d < 1.60$), or large ($1.60 \leq d$) for within-group contrasts (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014).

At the pretest, there were no significant differences between the group with CF and the group without CF, and the effect size was small ($M_{diff} = 2.50, SE = 1.35, p = .067, d = .39$). However, at the immediate and delayed posttests, the former group significantly outperformed the latter group with large effect sizes (Immediate posttest: $M_{diff} = 5.95, SE = .91, p < .001, d = 1.32$; Delayed posttest: $M_{diff} = 5.48, SE = 1.14, p < .001, d = 1.00$). Moreover, as for the group with CF, its mean score at each posttest was significantly
higher than its mean score at the pretest with large effect sizes (Pretest vs. Immediate posttest: $M_{diff} = 5.19, SE = .60, p < .001, d = 2.50$; Pretest vs. Delayed posttest: $M_{diff} = 3.00, SE = .56, p < .001, d = 1.97$). The group without CF also showed the same results, showing a higher mean score at each posttest than at the pretest with small effect sizes (Pretest vs. Immediate posttest: $M_{diff} = 13.65, SE = .59, p < .001, d = .87$; Pretest vs. Delayed posttest: $M_{diff} = 11.00, SE = .54, p < .001, d = .47$).

**CF Types**

The treatment session was video-recorded by a professional digital video recorder installed in every classroom. The classroom interaction including feedback interventions and students’ responses was clearly recorded. The video recordings were then transcribed and analyzed by the researcher. Teachers’ responses to students’ past tense errors were examined and coded according to the definition and classification of CF. Only episodes that focused on past tense errors were considered while all CF on meaning and other aspects of grammar were excluded from coding.

The feedback moves from teachers in Class 1 (NS teachers with CF) and Class 3 (NNS teachers with CF) were analyzed and categorized into six CF types (see Table 3).

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between teachers’ NS/NNS status and the type of feedback provided. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was no significant association between teachers’ NS/NNS status and CF types, $\chi^2(5) = 3.61, p = .607$. Moreover, the association was small (Cohen, 1988), Cramer’s $V = .155$. 
Table 3

*Crosstabulation of CF Types and Teachers’ NS/NNS Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CF Types</th>
<th>NS/NNS Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS (Class 1)</td>
<td>NNS (Class 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 64)</td>
<td>(n = 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit correction</td>
<td>4 (6.25%)</td>
<td>10 (11.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>33 (51.56%)</td>
<td>46 (52.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification request</td>
<td>8 (12.50%)</td>
<td>10 (11.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic feedback</td>
<td>4 (6.25%)</td>
<td>8 (9.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>8 (12.50%)</td>
<td>5 (5.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>7 (10.94%)</td>
<td>8 (9.20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers represent observed frequencies.

Preference for and the overall distribution of different CF types are displayed for teachers with different NS/NNS status in Table 3. For both NS and NNS teachers, the largest proportion of their feedback moves comprised recasts, which constituted 52.32% of the total. However, NS teachers in Class 1 tended to recast less than NNS teachers in Class 3. NS teachers provided a small amount of clarification request (12.50%), elicitation (12.50%) and repetition (10.94%). Explicit correction (6.25%) and metalinguistic (6.25%) feedback are the least popular choices for NS teachers. NNS
teachers provided a higher percentage of explicit correction (11.49%) and metalinguistic feedback (9.20%) and a lower percentage of elicitation (5.75%) and repetition (9.20%) compared to NS teachers.

**Results from Classroom Transcripts**

Finally, the classroom transcription was analyzed in terms of the students’ responses to the CF in Classes 1 and 3. The researcher modified the coding scheme of “repair” and “needs repair” from Lyster and Ranta (1997). Only teacher-initiated responses, which include students showing response or lack of response to the CF provided by teachers, were tracked and coded. Instances of student participants’ successful repair, that is, repairs toward target-like forms, were counted by the researcher.

Table 4

*Distribution of error, feedback moves, and repair across groups and activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Chain story activity</th>
<th>Dictogloss activity</th>
<th>Picture-cued narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 (NS)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 (NNS)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, a total of 78 errors on past tense use occurred during the chain story activity, followed by 62 instances of CF. Of these feedback moves, 54.8% were
followed by repair. During the dictogloss activity, a total of 44 errors occurred, followed by 33 instances of CF; 48.5% of the feedback moves were followed by repair. Finally, during picture-cued narratives, a total of 67 errors occurred, followed by 56 instances of CF; 58.9% of the feedback moves were followed by repair.

In the NS teachers’ class with CF (Class 1), there were 26 instances of CF in the chain story activity, 16 of which were followed by repair. A total of 14 instances occurred in the dictogloss activity, and 8 of the feedback moves were followed by repair. Moreover, a total of 11 feedback moves occurred in the picture-cued narratives, followed by 8 instances of repair.

In the NNS teachers’ class with CF (Class 3), a total of 36 instances of CF occurred in the chain story activity, followed by 18 repair moves. A total of 19 instances of CF occurred in the dictogloss activity, and 8 of the feedback moves were followed by repair. Finally, in the picture-cued narratives, there were 32 instances of CF, 17 of which were followed by repair.

Overall, the number of errors produced in the three communicative tasks are comparatively similar between the two groups. However, there is a difference in the number of feedback moves between the two groups. NNS teachers tended to provide more CF than NS teachers in all three activities. What is more, regarding students’ responses to the CF provided by the teachers, although they were provided different amounts of CF, students in the two groups tended to produce a similar amount of modified output.
Regarding the distribution of errors, feedback moves, and student responses across activities, it can be summarized from Table 4 that the chain story activity elicited more errors and feedback moves in comparison with the dictogloss activity and picture-cued narratives. The dictogloss activity is the least likely to elicit errors, feedback moves, and repairs.

**Results from the Interview**

After the completion of the delayed posttest, 16 student participants participated in a one-to-one interview with the researcher. Five open-ended questions were asked during the interview in order to help the student participants develop ideas and speak more broadly on issues related to their teachers and the feedback intervention in the present study.

For the first question about how their teachers correct their errors, 15 out of 16 interviewees were aware of having been provided CF. The other one student was not aware of having been corrected during the treatment session. Of the interviewees from Class 1, 80% felt that their teachers (NS teachers) liked to correct them implicitly, without interrupting their utterance, and 60% mentioned the teachers did not like to give correct answers directly but to provide elicitation and repetition. Regarding interviewees from Class 3, 100% of them reported that their teachers (NNS teachers) liked to provide the correct form explicitly, or point out where the grammatical error is by using metalinguistic feedback.
For the second question about whether teachers should correct students in class or not, all interviewees agreed that teachers’ correction would be helpful and they should correct those errors in class.

For the third question about their feelings when receiving correction from a teacher whose first language is (not) English, interviewees from different groups gave various responses. Of the interviewees from Class 1, 80% felt comfortable receiving CF from their NS teachers, while one third of interviewees from Class 3 felt a little uncomfortable receiving NNS teachers’ frequent metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests. In addition, 2 out of 5 interviewees from Class 1 pointed out that their NS teachers ignored some errors, which students noticed and thought they should have been corrected immediately.

The fourth question is about the advantages or disadvantages of their teachers having English or not as a first language of their teachers. Interviewees from Class 1 and Class 2 thought that they would trust NS teachers’ CF to a larger extent and learn more authentic expressions since English is the teacher’s first language. Another advantage of NS teachers was the perception that they did not correct all the errors and instead encouraged students to find and solve the problem by themselves. They also enjoyed the classroom atmosphere and gained confidence in speaking English. The disadvantages of NS teachers, however, was their lack of teaching ability and skills, as some interviewees reported that they did not feel significant improvement in English. Interviewees also mentioned that they got confused by some of the CF provided by NS teachers. Interviewees from Class 3 and Class 4 expressed that NNS teachers usually gave clear
explanations on grammatical errors and their lessons were more systematic and rigorous. Students felt sensitive to NNS teachers’ CF and always had a greater sense of accomplishment after NNS teachers’ lessons. The disadvantages of NNS teachers was that sometimes they expected students to produce sentences without any errors, interrupted students’ discussion in class, and put too much pressure on students.

The last question was an open-ended, supplementary question. One interviewee talked about his preference for receiving CF from teachers. This student attached great importance to NNS teachers’ systematic English language knowledge and sensitivity of key language points. And he expected to receive CF from NNS teachers in aspects such as grammar and vocabulary, while receiving CF from NS teachers in aspects concerning oral communication.

**Summary**

In terms of English past tense accuracy, all four classes improved as a result of their respective communicative activities. Student participants received higher scores in the immediate and delayed posttests than the pretest. However, statistical analyses revealed different effects of CF on students’ performance between those classes. Specifically, this effect was stronger for groups with CF than groups without CF. This effect, however, was not different between NS teachers’ and NNS teachers’ classes. Moreover, the absence of a significant three-way interaction effect indicated no relationship between student participants’ performance over time, moderated by feedback provision and teachers’ NS/NNS status.
No significant association was found between teachers’ NS/NNS status and CF types. For both NS and NNS teachers, the largest proportion of their feedback moves involved recasting. NNS teachers tended to provide more explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback than NS teachers, while NS teachers provided a higher proportion of elicitations than NNS teachers.

The number of errors produced in the three communicative tasks were comparatively similar between the NNS and NS groups with CF. However, NNS teachers tended to provide more CF than NS teachers in all three activities. Moreover, students tended to produce a similar amount of modified output, although they were provided different amounts of CF.

According to student interviewees, students had different beliefs and expectations for the two kinds of teachers. NS teachers were thought to be providing more implicit, convincing, and encouraging feedback, and so students felt comfortable with CF provided by NS teachers. But students’ perception of NS teachers as lacking teaching ability and skills led to negative feelings about their feedback. NNS teachers, on the contrary, were considered to be giving more explicit, clear, and rigorous feedback, which was perceived as more meaningful and fulfilling. However, interviewees also felt a little uncomfortable about their speech being interrupted by NNS teachers’ feedback. Overall, however, feedback provided by both NS and NNS teachers was welcomed by students and considered helpful and necessary.
Chapter 5

Discussion

In this chapter, I will present the findings and discuss the effectiveness of CF as well as findings regarding teachers’ NS/NNS status in this study and possible reasons. Cultural aspects of teachers’ NS/NNS status in certain contexts and findings about CF across the three communicative activities will also be reported. Each of the three research questions will be answered and discussed.

Discussion of Research Question 1

Research question 1: Does teachers’ NS/NNS status influence their use of CF and, if so, to what extent do status and CF provision interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense?

Findings. Teachers’ NS/NNS status did not significantly influence their use of CF. Teachers’ NS/NNS status and their CF provision did not interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense.

Implications. Overall, among classes receiving CF during communicative activities, NNS teachers gave a larger amount of CF than NS teachers. This finding is consistent with Árva and Medgyes’s (2000) research in which the researchers found that NNS teachers made more error corrections and were “stricter” than NS teachers. This might be for two reasons. Firstly, NNS teachers shared experience of being an L2 learner with their students, which made it easier to understand errors in the target language. Second, compared to NS teachers, NNS teachers in China were accustomed to strict teaching
styles in grammar classes and were sensitive to grammatical errors, which might lead to larger amount of CF.

The results also suggest that CF did not necessarily rely on teachers’ NS/NNS status in the current situation. Therefore, NS teachers and NNS teachers seemed to share some understanding of students’ errors and strategies of providing CF. Moreover, student participants in the present study have similar proficiency level and background knowledge of English, which may lead them to produce similar or recurrent errors. This could also affect teachers’ use of CF.

Although no significant differences were found in types of CF provided by the two kinds of teachers, we can find certain preferences of teachers’ use of CF. For both NS and NNS teachers, the largest proportion of their feedback moves comprised recasts, which constituted 52.32% of the total. However, NS teachers tended to recast less than NNS teachers. NS teachers provided a small amount of clarification requests, elicitation and repetition. Explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback are the least popular choices for NS teachers. NNS teachers provided a higher percentage of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback and a lower percentage of elicitation and repetition compared to NS teachers.

However, the relation between teachers’ NS/NNS status and their use of CF failed to reach statistical significance. First of all, there were only two teachers with the same NS/NNS status in each class, who took turns teaching the class. Therefore, teachers’ preference for and the overall distribution of different CF types might have been more distinct if there had been more teachers with same NS/NNS status in each class.
Secondly, as predicted in the literature (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Mahboob, 2010), one of the disadvantages of NNS teachers appeared to be their lack of confidence in their own knowledge in the target language. As a result, NNS teachers’ decisions on use of CF might be affected. In addition, though there was a difference in the number of feedback moves between two kinds of teachers, a similar number of learner repairs were elicited. Thus, teachers’ NS/NNS status and their CF provision did not interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense.

**Discussion of Research Question 2**

Research question 2: How do EFL learners’ perceptions of CF and teachers’ NS/NNS status affect their acquisition of English past tense?

**Findings.** Although the statistical analysis of the effect of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the student participants’ past tense accuracy revealed no significance, learners held different views and expectations of the two kinds of teachers. They believed teachers with different NS/NNS status had both advantages and disadvantages, which is consistent with the inherent difference acknowledged by other researchers (i.e., Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; He & Miller, 2011).

**Implications.** NS teachers and NNS teachers were different in many ways. First of all, NS teachers belong to western society and carry deep intuitions and direct perceptions of the use of English. NNS teachers in China, to a great extent, belong to eastern society and may not carry the intuition of an NS (Brown, 1994). Secondly, most NS teachers in language training schools in Mainland China obtain employment with a college degree in English language, literature, linguistics, or other social sciences subjects. NS teachers
with a bachelor’s degree in English remain relatively rare. Unlike NS teachers, most NNS teachers in China have learned English as a foreign language since elementary educational stage, usually at Grade 3. The NNS English teachers often held a bachelor’s degree or master’s degree in English language and literature, or applied linguistics (Hong & Li, 2013). Moreover, most NS teachers have certain oversea travel experiences that include intercultural communication. They choose to teach English in a non-English-speaking nations for a variety of reasons. Compared to NS teachers, NNS teachers have fewer experiences of traveling to English-speaking countries and engaging in exchange programs of languages and cultures (Ling & Braine, 2007). Regardless of the differences between them, NS and NNS teachers in China share the main goal of teaching English to speakers of other languages. NS teachers bring their educational theories and beliefs to EFL classrooms, predisposed to promote a western language learning style while teaching English. Regarding Chinese NNS teachers, they not only introduce English as an international language to Chinese students but also give assistance and guidance from their own experience as a second language learner (Hong & Li, 2007).

According to the interview data, strengths and weaknesses of NS and NNS teachers were identified by student participants. Most of the interviewees recognized the advantages of NNS teachers in grammar teaching experiences and their empathy for the English learning difficulties experienced by students. This might be attributed to NNS teachers’ past L2 learning experiences (Medgyes, 1994). NNS teachers, as advanced L2 learners, tended to have a deep and informative knowledge of the English grammatical rules and understand students’ needs and difficulties. Furthermore, NNS teachers’ shared
L1 with students was considered by interviewees as an advantage in explaining grammatical and increasing teaching effectiveness.

On the other hand, NNS teachers’ teaching styles were regarded as a weak point. As shown in the results, interviewees reported negative feelings about their speech being interrupted by NNS teachers’ CF. Students did not seem to positively view their NNS teachers’ teaching styles and way of delivering feedback. NS teachers’ teaching styles, however, were perceived positively by the. Less positively perceived by students were the teaching skills of NS teachers.

What’s more, students’ perceptions of NS and NNS teachers might be influenced by the specific EFL educational context in which NS teachers are usually assigned to phonetic instruction while NNS teachers are more likely to be involved in morphological pedagogical tasks. This might explain students’ different perceptions towards teachers’ NS/NNS status. NS teachers are not necessarily better than NNS teachers and vice versa.

In addition to teachers’ NS/NNS status, the target grammatical structure, English past tense, also needs to be discussed. First, in the current research, the researcher did not differentiate between regular and irregular past tense during data collection. This may lead to confusion between rule-based regular forms and item-based irregular forms. CF on the latter is more salient and thus easier for students to perceive compared to the former ones (Yang & Lyster, 2010). If different forms of English past tense were distinguished in this research, more distinct results could have occurred. Additionally, the ‘Lexical Preference Principle’ may help to reveal the reason why teachers’ NS/NNS status did not affect past tense acquisition. This theory stated that “if grammatical forms
express a meaning that can also be encoded lexically, then learners will firstly process lexical forms” (VanPatten, 2007, p. 116). For example, in an excerpt from the communicative tasks, in the sentence “Once upon a time, she was a young poor servant,” both the lexical item “once upon a time” and the past tense form “was” appeared. Learners may naturally process the lexical item over the verb inflection following the ‘Lexical Preference Principle’. As a result, learners might skip the morphological features because they rely on other clues (lexical items) instead. Such lexical items can be found in both communicative tasks and testing materials in the current study. According to transcripts, lexical items (e.g. “a long time ago” “last year” “yesterday” “once upon a time”) appeared 11 times in communicative tasks. Therefore, to some extent, learners’ overall performance on English past tense partially derived from lexical clues other than teachers’ feedback provision, which may have weakened the influence of teachers’ NS/NNS status.

In all, no evident superiority was found for one kind of teacher over the other. Therefore, teachers’ NS/NNS status did not significantly affect students’ acquisition of English past tense.

Cultural aspects of teachers’ NS/NNS status. One cannot separate FL teaching from culture. Language teachers, as cultural beings, hold various cultural beliefs of the process of language acquisition, teaching methods, and teachers’ roles. Brown (1994) described a dichotomous view of NS and NNS teachers whereby western cultures emphasize nondirective, non-authoritarian roles and teaching styles, while eastern cultures value directive, authoritarian roles and teaching styles. In teaching practices,
teachers are unconsciously affected more or less by their cultural beliefs of teachers’ roles and teaching methods. Their teaching styles in the language classrooms constitute an essential part of EFL classroom teaching. Holliday (1994) described the difference between the emigrant EFL teachers and the non-native teachers who live in that country. The former’s classroom teaching was built on the western-dominated “professionalism,” and the latter’s on the local educational system. In this study, student participants reported that NNS teachers shared the same cultural background with them, which was vital to the success of teaching a class. Meanwhile, NS teachers spoke the target language fluently and broadened students’ horizons with different cultural knowledge. One student participant mentioned, “I could learn a different way of thinking from NS teachers because they tended to have a different thinking style from the NNS teachers.”

The analysis of data from the interviews and classroom recordings indicates that students would like to receive CF from teachers regardless of their NS/NNS status. Moreover, students had varying degrees of anxiety when they were receiving explicit corrections and metalinguistic feedback in communicative activities, which might reflect the concept of face-saving in the Chinese culture. Teachers’ roles are largely influenced by different teaching styles as well as distinct cultures. Brown (1994) proposed a model in which western cultures were more focused on “solidarity between students and teachers” and teachers were considered as mentors, informants, and friends, of equal status. On the contrary, the “power differences between students and teachers” were underlined in eastern cultures and teachers were regarded as authority, knower, and parents (Brown, 1994). However, Brown also noticed that the stereotype of teachers’
roles and teaching styles had changed greatly. NS and NNS English teachers in the EFL context tended to be assimilated by the intercultural communication. Both NS and NNS teachers had been exploring new teaching methods and techniques to help EFL learners sharpen their English abilities. Therefore, the image of Chinese NNS teachers was no longer merely one of authorities and NS teachers adapted themselves to the unique context within Chinese educational system.

Discussion of Research Question 3

Research question 3: In the classes taught by NS teachers, does the group that performs communicative activities while receiving feedback outperform the group not receiving feedback? What about the classes taught by NNS teachers?

Findings. As shown in the previous chapter, in the classes taught by NS teachers, the group that performed communicative activities while receiving feedback (Class 1) significantly outperformed the group not receiving feedback (Class 2) in both immediate and delayed posttest. Similarly, in the classes taught by NNS teachers, the group that performed communicative activities while receiving feedback (Class 3) significantly outperformed the group not receiving feedback (Class 4) in both immediate and delayed posttests. Therefore, for both NS and NNS teachers, CF has proven to be an effective way to improve students’ accuracy on English past tense, with no significant differences between NS teachers’ and NNS teachers’ classes.

Implications. First of all, this study took place in a form-oriented context in China, where grammar instruction is traditionally emphasized. The three communicative tasks were form-focused activities that provided many opportunities to interact with teachers in
class and attracted students’ attention to the target form. Upon completion of these communicative activities, classes provided with CF significantly improved from pretest to posttest, as well as from pretest to delayed posttest, regardless of teachers’ NS/NNS status. Classes without CF provision also improved at each posttest relative to the pretest, with a small effect size. This finding demonstrates the beneficial effect of CF provided by teachers and the form-focused instruction integrating grammar instruction and communicative tasks in the Chinese EFL classroom.

Regarding CF types, according to the classroom observation, NNS teachers adopted a larger number of recasts than the NS teachers. NS teachers tended to choose elicitation to encourage students to express themselves more in classes and arouse students’ interest and thoughtful thinking. However, according to the interview, when talking about the details about the feedback, students expressed having varying degrees of anxiety when they were receiving explicit correction. When comparing the distribution of CF types provided by teachers and learners’ preferences for CF types, we can find that recasts were most widely used by NS and NNS teachers, while learners seemed to prefer elicitation and repetition of error.

According to Lyster and Saito’s (2010) meta-analysis of 15 classroom experimental studies comparing different CF types, all CF types yielded significant effects. Recasts yielded medium effect sizes whereas prompts yielded large effects. Prompts (including elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition of error) were significantly more effective than recasts in within-group contrasts. In this study, NNS teachers provided more prompts and recasts than NS teachers in the three activities. In
dyadic interaction, learners benefit from both types of CF for different reasons. Learners receiving recasts benefit from repeated exposure to positive exemplars and opportunities to infer negative evidence, which is more effective for new content. Nonetheless, learners receiving prompts benefit from repeated exposure to negative evidence and opportunities to use the target form in modified output, which would be helpful for forms that they are already familiar with (Lyster & Ranta, 2013). The linguistic target of the intervention in the current study was English past tense, which was already acquired by student participants. What’s more, because of the absence of tenses in Mandarin (learners’ L1), errors of English past tense were recurrent in the three communicative tasks. So learners needed to be pushed to retrieve and produce the target form by prompting (de Bot, 1996). Likewise, in accordance with Lyster (1998), teachers in this study used more recasts than prompts to correct grammar, the target form being English past tense. But students repaired more grammar errors after prompts than recasts. Therefore, prompts are effective for English past tense learning, especially in this context.

**CF provision across communicative activities.** Among the three communicative activities, the chain story activity elicited more errors and feedback moves in comparison with the dictogloss activity and picture-cued narratives. The dictogloss activity was the least likely to elicit errors, feedback moves, and repairs. The number of errors produced in the three communicative tasks were comparatively similar between the NNS and NS groups with CF. However, NNS teachers tended to provide more CF than NS teachers in all three activities. Moreover, students tended to produce a similar amount of modified output, although they were provided different amounts of CF.
If we look at student’s errors and the CF they received, NS and NNS teachers provided various feedback to student participants’ errors. For both NS and NNS teachers, the largest proportion of their feedback moves comprised recasts. However, NS teachers in Class 1 tended to recast less than NNS teachers in Class 3. NS teachers provided a small amount of clarification request, elicitation and repetition. Explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback were the least popular choices for NS teachers. NNS teachers provided a higher percentage of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback and a lower percentage of elicitation and repetition, compared to NS teachers.

It was observed by the researcher in the classroom and video recordings that NS teachers occasionally deviated from the teaching plans. They tended to provide some improvised knowledge and feedback to students concerning western customs and culture and drew the attention of students during the class. NS teachers were thought to be providing more implicit, convincing, and encouraging feedback, and so students felt comfortable with CF provided by NS teachers. This could possibly lead to the result that students in the NS teachers’ class produced a high percentage of modified output although they were provided relatively limited CF.

On the contrary, despite the fact that NNS teachers tended to provide more CF than NS teachers in all three activities, students in NNS teacher’s class produced basically the same amount of modified output. According to the student interviewees, they were reluctant to express themselves actively because of the NNS teachers’ abundant feedback. Moreover, some students felt a little uncomfortable about their speech being interrupted by NNS teachers’ feedback.
Overall, however, CF provided by both NS and NNS teachers was welcomed by students and considered helpful and necessary.

**Summary**

To conclude, there were differences in the CF types and feedback moves between the two kinds of teachers. However, teachers’ NS/NNS status did not significantly influence their use of CF. Teachers’ NS/NNS status and their CF provision did not interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense.

EFL learners had different beliefs and expectations regarding the two kinds of teachers. NS teachers were thought to be providing more implicit, convincing, and encouraging feedback, and so students felt comfortable with CF provided by NS teachers. But students’ perception of NS teachers as lacking teaching skills led to negative feelings about their feedback. NNS teachers, on the contrary, were considered to be giving more explicit, clear, and rigorous feedback, which was perceived as more meaningful and fulfilling. However, interviewees also felt a little uncomfortable about their speech being interrupted by NNS teachers’ feedback. Overall, however, CF provided by both NS and NNS teachers was welcomed by students and considered helpful and necessary. The findings indicate that learners recognize their NS teachers and NNS teachers as having different strengths in different aspects. A good understanding of the culture of English-speaking countries as well as high levels of English proficiency were NS teachers’ advantages. As for NNS teachers, their shared L2 learning experiences and empathy of English learning difficulties and problems with learners, as well as the sensitivity to
grammatical rules, were observed as their advantages. Learners did not have an obvious preference for either NS or NNS teachers; instead, they felt that both two kinds of teachers have unique characteristics.

In both kinds of classes taught by NS or NNS teachers, the group that performed communicative activities while receiving feedback significantly outperformed the group not receiving feedback in both immediate and delayed posttest. This finding demonstrates the beneficial effect of oral CF from teachers of different NS/NNS status on learners’ English past tense performance.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

In this chapter, I will present a brief conclusion. Firstly, the implications for L2 teaching are summarized and practical advice for the two types of teachers are provided. Secondly, limitations of the present study are presented. Finally, I will propose suggestions and directions for future studies.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The current study suggests various implications for L2 teaching as well as teacher development through its findings. As many related research studies demonstrate, CF provided by teachers plays an important role in FL teaching. Therefore, both NS teachers and NNS teachers in EFL classrooms need to be aware of how to use their feedback effectively in order to give learners optimal and comprehensible feedback and eventually enhance their L2 acquisition. Regardless of their NS/NNS status, teachers should raise their awareness of their shortcomings and be more involved in professional teacher training to improve their teaching techniques and effectiveness.

A number of pedagogical insights into EFL classrooms are also proposed by the findings of the present study. The classroom observations and data analyses reported that, with regard to classroom interaction, teachers could consider using various types of CF to enhance learners’ L2 acquisition. Both NS and NNS teachers relied more on recasts than prompts, which is not always the most effective strategy for already-acquired target structures. As Lyster and Ranta (1997) concluded, “Teachers might want to consider the
whole range of techniques they have at their disposal rather than relying so extensively on recasts” (p.56). A growing consensus among researchers holds that learners are more likely to benefit from a variety of CF types than one or two selected types (Ellis, 2012; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Therefore, teachers should consider using all types of feedback in an integrated way.

What’s more, the findings of the present study lend support to previous studies suggesting that interlocutor type could relate to feedback provision and use. Mackey et al. (2003) found that NS interlocutors provided significantly more feedback than NNS interlocutors. However, learners did not take advantage of the CF more than the CF provided by NS interlocutors. According to the present study, learners in the two groups taught by two kinds of teachers produced a comparatively similar amount of modified output even though they received more CF moves from NNS teachers than NS teachers. This might be explained by the influence of interlocutor’s NS/NNS status. Some NNS teachers were too eager to either complete learners’ utterances or to say what they thought the learner was trying to say. NS teachers, on the contrary, did not correct all the errors and rarely interrupted learners’ utterances. Moreover, as one student said, “I wish I could have a native teacher who could understand Chinese culture or a non-native teacher who speaks like a native English teacher.” The two kinds of teachers could try to borrow their counterparts’ strong points to offset their weaknesses as much as possible. NNS teachers can be encouraged to provide an encouraging and motivating atmosphere for students. As for NS teachers, they can be encouraged to develop more systematic English language knowledge and to hone their teaching skills. They need to be supported in their efforts to
understand and adapt to the local cultural and educational settings as well as students’ needs and expectations, which would be a good way to enhance their teaching practices and effectiveness.

Additionally, teachers need to challenge students to take advantage of their own linguistic knowledge. Studies relevant to form-focused instruction propose that focus-on-form facilitates higher levels of linguistic knowledge and performance (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). The processing entailed in producing the target language requires students to retrieve the correct forms from what they already know. The three communicative activities with CF provision in the present study proved to be effective for English past tense acquisition, especially given that this target form was already acquired by learners. Learners need to be challenged to retrieve and produce target forms they know but still need opportunities to practice. Therefore, in EFL classrooms, teachers could be encouraged to draw on effective CF techniques as a means to engage students in timely form-focused opportunities.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

First, concerning this study’s limitations, the relatively small number of teacher participants must be mentioned. Since only eight teachers and four classes were observed in this study, it is not possible to generalize the CF findings of to all NS and NNS teachers’ EFL classrooms and contexts. In addition, the number of student interviewees was limited. The sample size in this study is insufficient to be representative.

Secondly, the transcripts were coded manually by the researcher, who found it difficult to identify the salient characteristics of teachers’ feedback moves. Even though
the researcher had completed the manual coding three times, there were a few inevitable subjective judgments and, moreover, no interrater reliability procedures were undertaken.

Thirdly, the two types of teachers in this study were not strictly controlled for concerning differences in their age, teaching experiences, and previous education. These individual differences could be noteworthy aspects affecting their choices and decisions of CF.

Finally, the author used tests, interviews, and classroom video-recordings to provide the primary sources of data, whereas no questionnaires were administered. It is expected that even more comprehensive data sources would be useful in future research.

As for the future research, more instruments could be applied to improve the data collection process. In addition, the research subjects could be expanded and moderated by more individual differences such as previous education background and teaching experience. Furthermore, the effect of teachers’ NS/NNS status on teachers’ written CF may be investigated in the future work. Similar kind of studies can be replicated with a bigger size, which will make the findings more convictive.

In conclusion, this quasi-experimental research was an attempt to examine the role of EFL teachers’ native language when providing CF and whether their NS/NNS status had an influence on learners’ English past tense performance. Although the results suggested that teachers’ NS/NNS status was not a significant factor as far as teachers’ CF or learners’ English past tense performance were concerned, we found certain tendencies, potential reasons, and implications of these findings. First of all, NNS teachers tended to
provide more CF than NS teachers in all three communicative activities. Nevertheless, although they were provided different amounts of CF, students taught by the two types of teachers tended to produce a similar amount of modified output. Secondly, NNS teachers tended to use more recasts and a similar number of prompts compared to NS teachers. However, prompts proved to be more effective than recasts for English past tense acquisition in this context, which could be why teachers’ NS/NNS status and CF did not interact to affect learners’ acquisition of English past tense. Thirdly, students held different perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of NS and NNS teachers regarding teaching styles, linguistic knowledge, teaching skills and techniques, and cultural aspects. No evident superiority was found in one kind of teacher over the other. Finally, this study demonstrates the beneficial effect of CF provided by teachers and the form-focused instruction integrating grammar instruction and communicative tasks in the Chinese EFL classroom. It also suggests that it would be beneficial for both types of teachers to consider using the full range of CF types at their disposal.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Booklet for Teacher Participants

For teachers in treatment groups (Class 1 and Class 3):

If the student makes an error on the use of past tense, you should provide them with the correct form in a natural way so that the form becomes part of a correct utterance, or elicit the correct forms from the students, allow them to say the correct forms themselves instead of giving them the correct forms.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CF types</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit correction</td>
<td>S: On May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Not on May, In May. We say, “It will start in May.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recast</td>
<td>S: I have to find the answer on the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: In the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarification request</td>
<td>S: What do you spend with your wife?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: What? (Or, Sorry?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meta-linguistic feedback</td>
<td>S: There are influence person who.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Influence is a noun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Elicitation

S: I have watched the movie ago.

T: What’s another word for “ago”?

S: Before.

6. Repetition

S: I will showed you.

T: I will SHOWED you?

S: I’ll show you.

( adapted from Lee, 2013, p.2)

For teachers in control groups (Class 2 and Class 4):

When the student makes an error in the communicative activity, you can temporarily ignore the errors and continue with the activities. At the end of the activity, you provide the students with the list of correct past tense forms and ask the students to reflect on them.

If you would like to learn the concept and definition of corrective feedback further, please inquire of the researcher about your question, or refer to the list of references as follows:


Appendix B

Examples of Communicative Tasks

Dictogloss activity

Divide the students into pairs. Read this passage twice at a normal speed and ask the students to take down notes, then ask the students to compare their text with their partner and write up a complete story. Ask students in each pair to retell part of the story.

*The Crow and the Water Bottle*

It was a scorching hot summer day. One crow was very thirsty. "I'm so thirsty." The thirsty crow roamed around looking for water. After flying for a long time, the crow found a water bottle in one of the farmer's yard. The crow was so happy that he was able to have a drink.

The crow put his beak into the bottle. However, because the bottle was so long, he was not able to reach the water. The crow was exhausted.

'Should I go some other place for a drink?' He thought. However, because his wings were damage, he was not able to move. "What shall I do?"

The crow flew round and round the farmer's yard, and thought. "Sure, that's what I will do." The crow had an idea.

With all his strength, the crow started picking up stones. "One, two." He did this several times until the bottle was filled with stones. Then the crow drank a lot of water. Finally, the crow had enough strength to fly again.
Picture-cued narratives

Divide the students into groups of 5 to 6. Each group describes one picture and each student in the pair should say at least one sentence.

Examples of the pictures:

Cinderella's father got married again after her mother died.
Cinderella's stepmother made her do all the household tasks.

Cinderella's stepsisters were invited to the ball.
Cinderella cried because she wanted to go to the ball.

(Adapted from Cinderella Sequencing Cards:

http://abcteach.com/free/c/cinderellasequencecards.pdf)
Appendix C

Testing Material

Oral Test (version A)

Please read this story silently for three minutes. Try to remember the content of the story. After 3 minutes, this text will be removed and you are required to retell the story with the help of some word cues.

_A Crazy Beach Party_

I flew to Korea for the first time in 2000. One of the first places I visited was a beach called Sunset Beach. I met a lot of foreigners there, as well as a Korean who insisted in telling people that his name was Ricky. We sat on the beach, drank beer, and laughed a lot.

Since it was winter, we began to get cold outside. We walked to a nearby store and bought some beer. We stood near a large fire and started to sing as we drank beer. We all felt very happy. Suddenly, Ricky's hair caught on fire. Luckily, someone put it out.

Some people jumped and ran to keep warm, others smoked cigarette. A drunk girl fell to the ground and cut her knee. She bled really badly, so Ricky and I sent her to a nearby hospital. The doctor said the wound was not serious and warned us not to drink too much.

The next morning, at 6 am., the sun rose. It was another chilly winter morning. We drove home after breakfast and it only took about 30 minutes to get back to Seoul. I never expected such a crazy beach party.
(Adapted from Yang (2008) and ESL Quiz center,
http://www.eslgo.com/quizzes/irregpast2.html)

Word cues:

- Fly to Korea, in 2000
- Visit a beach, Sunset beach
- Meet foreigners, a Korean man, insist in telling people Sit on the beach, drink beer, laugh
- Begin to get cold
- Walk to a store, buy beer
- Stand near a large fire, start to sing
- Feel happy
- Ricky’s hair, catch on fire
- Put it out
- Jump and run, smoke
- A drunk girl, fall to the ground, cut her knee
- Bleed badly, send her to hospital
- The doctor, say the wound not serious, warn
- The sun rise, at 6am.
- Drive home
- Take 30 minutes
• Never expect such a crazy party

Scoring:

Correct use of past tense forms in appropriate past tense context would grant the student “1” on the scoring chart.

You should score zero if the student:

. use other past tenses

. completely miss the verb

. use of infinitive form of the verb or past participle

. use bare form of the verb in past tense context

. use wrong/hybrid past tense form of this verb

. use of present tense in obligatory past tense context

Note: In certain circumstances, the students would say a wrong form first and then self-correct. This is still considered correct if the second form used is correct. So a mark of “1” will be given to that verb.
Appendix D

Informed Consent Forms for School Board

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to invite you to participate in my thesis study in January, 2016. I am an MA student in Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University under the supervision of Dr. Roy Lyster. The purpose of the research is to investigate the impact of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the effectiveness of corrective feedback they provide. We hope that the findings would contribute to understanding the role of teacher in terms of corrective feedback and give different suggestions to NS and NNS teachers in foreign language contexts.

If permitted, the researcher will visit your institute and select 4 intact classes of the same proficiency level. For research purpose, the students will be required to participate in 3 communicative tasks which would be incorporated into your courses. Three tests and an interview will be implemented. The researcher will require the audio or video recordings from your equipment and transcribe them at your institute. The entire study will take approximately one month. The researcher will meet with the teachers and discuss the schedule.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Teachers and students may withdraw at any time during the study without any negative consequences. The audio and video recordings of the study will be used for research purpose only, accessible only to the researcher. The result of the study will be kept completely confidential. The names and any other personal information of the school, students, or teachers will not be identified or used in any publications in the future.

Should you agree with the research plan, please reply the email and give your consent. Should you have any questions or hesitations about the research, please contact me by e-mail or by phone. I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request and your support in the research.
If you have any ethical concerns or complaints about your participation in this study, and want to speak with someone not on the research team, please contact the McGill Ethics Manager at 514-398-6831 or lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca

Regards,

Xiao Han

M.A. Candidate
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 652-6696
xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster
Professor
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 398-5942
roy.lyster@mcgill.ca
尊敬的先生 / 女士，

我诚挚邀请您于 2016 年 1 月参与我的论文研究。我是麦吉尔大学（McGill University）教育综合研究系的硕士生韩笑，导师是 Roy Lyster 博士。这项研究的目的是探寻教师的本族语 / 非本族语状况对其提供课堂纠错反馈的影响。我们希望研究结果可以有助于理解课堂纠错反馈中教师扮演的角色，并对在外语教学语境中使用本族语和非本族语的教师提出不同的建议和意见。

在获得您的许可后，研究者将访问贵校并选择 4 个相同语言水平的完整班级。出于研究目的，学生将参加 3 个编入课程的交际性教学任务。除此以外，学生还需参加三次测试和一个访谈。研究者将从贵校获取音像及录像资料并在贵校转录。整个研究耗时约一个月。研究者将与教师见面并讨论具体日程安排。

您全程参与研究完全是自愿的。教师和学生可以随时退出研究，不会造成任何负面影响。音像和录像资料仅用于研究目的，仅供研究者本人使用。研究结果是完全保密的。任何关于学校，学生，或教师的姓名及个人信息都不会被公布或用于今后任何出版物中。
如果您认同这项研究计划，请回复邮件并表明同意。如果您对于这项研究有任何疑问或疑虑，请通过邮件或电话方式联系我。本人对您考虑参加研究表示衷心感谢。

如果您对参与这项研究存有任何疑问或意见，并希望联系研究项目以外人员，请致电麦吉尔大学道德委员会主管，电话 514-398-6831，或邮件联系

lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca
韩笑  Xiao Han
硕士生  M.A. Candidate
Department of Integrated Studies in
Education
McGill University
电话: +1 (514) 652-6696
xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster
教授  Professor
Department of Integrated Studies in
Education
McGill University
电话: +1 (514) 398-5942
roy.lyster@mcgill.ca
Informed Consent Forms for Teacher Participants

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to invite you to participate in my thesis study in January, 2016. I am an MA student in Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University under the supervision of Dr. Roy Lyster. The purpose of the research is to investigate the impact of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the effectiveness of corrective feedback they provide. We hope that the findings would contribute to understanding the role of teacher in terms of corrective feedback and give different suggestions to NS and NNS teachers in foreign language contexts.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time during the study without any negative consequences. Before the study, you will receive a booklet containing a detailed description of CF that will assist you to understand all the communicative activities and CF types to implement. As a participant, you will be assigned to teach in one class of approximately 30 students. During the instruction, there will be three communicative tasks aiming to enhance students’ use of English past tense. You would provide feedback to students’ errors immediately, or not react to errors until the end of the class, according to which group you are in, either treatment group or control group. In addition, it should be noted that the school has given the researcher permission to access the video recording of your teaching process, which you had already agreed in written form.
As is appropriate in research studies such as this, neither your name nor that of the school will be mentioned in any research reports. The data will be kept secure in the researcher’s password-protected computer and only the researcher will have access to the confidential data. There are no risks involved in participating in the study. You might understand the concept of corrective feedback better and enhance your teaching quality.

Should you agree with the research plan, please sign the consent form at the bottom of this letter. Should you have any questions or hesitations about the research, please contact me by e-mail or by phone. I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request and your support in the research.

If you have any ethical concerns or complaints about your participation in this study, and want to speak with someone not on the research team, please contact the McGill Ethics Manager at 514-398-6831 or lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca

Regards,
Xiao Han
M.A. Candidate
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 652-6696
xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster
Professor
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 398-5942
roy.lyster@mcgill.ca
I am aware of the purpose of the research project and have agreed to participate. I also agree to have the data from this study used for research purposes and I understand that any information that might identify me will always be kept confidential. Yes______ No______

_________________(Signature) __________________ (Date)
知情同意书（致教师）

尊敬的先生 / 女士，

我诚挚邀请您于 2016 年 1 月参与我的论文研究。我是麦吉尔大学（McGill University）教育综合研究系的硕士生韩笑，导师是 Roy Lyster 博士。这项研究的目的是探寻教师的本族语 / 非本族语状况对其提供课堂纠错反馈的影响。我们希望研究结果可以有助于理解课堂纠错反馈中教师扮演的角色，并对在外语教学语境中使用本族语和非本族语的教师提出不同的建议和意见。

您全程参与研究完全是自愿的。教师可以随时退出研究，不会造成任何负面影响。在研究开始前，您将收到一份详细介绍课堂纠错反馈对手册，以助于您理解所有交际性活动和课堂纠错反馈类型。作为参与者，您将担任一个班级的教师，学生约 30 名。教学过程包含三个交际性教学任务，旨在提高学生的英语过去式使用水平。根据您所在组别（试验组或对照组），您将即时向学生提供纠错反馈，或不即时作出纠正。需要指出的是，学校已经允许研究者获取对您教学过程的录像资料，您已以书面形式同意。在这项研究中，您及学校的名称不会公布于任何研究报告中。研究数据将保存在研究者电脑中，以密码形式保护，且仅研究者能阅读机密资料。这项研究不会为您带来任何风险。通过参与这项研究，您将有机会加深对课堂纠错反馈的认识并提高教学质量。
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如果您认同这项研究计划，请在本函下方的知情同意栏签字。如果您对于这项研究有任何疑问或疑虑，请通过邮件或电话方式联系我。本人对您考虑参加研究表示衷心感谢。

如果您对参与这项研究存有任何疑问或意见，并希望联系研究项目以外人员，请致电麦吉尔大学道德委员会主管，电话 514-398-6831，或邮件联系

lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca
韩笑  Xiao Han

硕士生 M.A. Candidate

Department of Integrated Studies in Education

McGill University

电话: +1 (514) 652-6696

xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster

教授 Professor

Department of Integrated Studies in Education

McGill University

电话: +1 (514) 398-5942

roy.lyster@mcgill.ca
我已了解此项研究的目的并同意参与研究。我同意将此项研究的数据用于研究目的并已了解我的个人信息将完全保密。是____否____

________________ (签名) ________________ (日期)
Informed Consent Forms for Student Participants

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to invite you to participate in my thesis study in January, 2016. I am an MA student in Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University under the supervision of Dr. Roy Lyster. The purpose of the research is to investigate the impact of teachers’ NS/NNS status on the effectiveness of corrective feedback they provide. We hope that the findings would contribute to understanding the role of teacher in terms of corrective feedback and give different suggestions to NS and NNS teachers in foreign language contexts.

In this study, you will be asked to participate in three oral tests in class, at the beginning and end of the treatment session, and two weeks after the session ends. You will read a story silently for three minutes and then retell it with word cues. The oral tests will take approximately 8 minutes and will be audio recorded and later analyzed for research purposes. The testing is not related to your course grades by any means.

During the class time, I will conduct classroom observations and will also view and transcribe the video recordings that will made as part of the usual procedure at your school. These observations will be limited to communicative activities and some of the transcribed data may be used for research purposes, but at not point will you be identified.

You may choose to be interviewed by the researcher at the end of the research. Your responses will not be disclosed to any of your teachers, which means that your answers will not influence your relationship with them. You are not obliged to answer all the questions. And your personal information will not be identified or used in any publications in the future.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time during the study without any negative consequences. Your decision to participate or not to participate in treatment activities will not affect your academic standing. There are no risks involved in participating in the study. Participating in this study might not benefit
you, but we hope that you would make great progress in English and understand the role of your teacher better. The data will be kept secure in the researcher’s password-protected computer and only the researcher will have access to the confidential data.

Should you agree with the research plan, please sign the consent form at the bottom of this letter. Should you have any questions or hesitations about the research, please contact me by e-mail or by phone. I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request and your support in the research.

If you have any ethical concerns or complaints about your participation in this study, and want to speak with someone not on the research team, please contact the McGill Ethics Manager at 514-398-6831 or lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca

Regards,

Xiao Han
M.A. Candidate
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 652-6696
xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster
Professor
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
Tel: +1 (514) 398-5942
roy.lyster@mcgill.ca
I agree to have the data from this study used for research purposes and I understand that any information that might identify me will always be kept confidential. Yes______ No______

I agree to participate in an audio-recorded interview. Yes______ No______

_________________ (Signature) _________________ (Date)
知情同意书（致学生）

尊敬的先生 / 女士，

我诚挚邀请您于 2016 年 1 月参与我的论文研究。我是麦吉尔大学（McGill University）教育综合研究系的硕士生韩笑，导师是 Roy Lyster 博士。这项研究的目的是探寻教师的本族语 / 非本族语状况对其提供课堂纠错反馈的影响。我们希望研究结果可以有助于理解课堂纠错反馈中教师扮演的角色，并对在外语教学语境中使用本族语和非本族语的教师提出不同的建议和意见。

在这项研究中，您们将参加三次随堂口语考试，分别在研究开始，试验结束，以及试验结束后两周的时间。您将在三分钟内默读一篇故事，然后根据词语提示复述。口语考试用时约 8 分钟，出于研究目的，考试将被录音分析。此考试不会对您对课程成绩造成任何影响。

我将在教学过程中观察课堂，仅观察交际性课堂活动。鉴于您已同意录像，录像资料将仅用于教学研究目的。

您可以选择是否参与试验结尾的访谈。您的回答不会被透露任何一位教师，所以您的回答不会影响您与教师的关系。您没有义务回答所有问题。您的个人信息不会被公布或用于今后任何出版物中。

您全程参与研究完全是自愿的。您可以随时退出研究，不会造成任何负面影响。您的教师不会知道您是否参加了研究。无论您是否参与活动，您的成绩都不会受到影响。参与这项研究完全没有任何风险。您在参与研究后有机会在英语方面取得重大进步，并能更好地理解教师的角色。研究数据将保存在研究者电脑中，以密码形式保护，且仅研究者能阅读机密资料。

如果您认同这项研究计划，请在本函下方的知情同意栏签字。如果您对于这项研究有任何疑问或疑虑，请通过邮件或电话方式联系我。本人对您考虑参加研究表示衷心感谢。
如果您对参与这项研究存有任何疑问或意见，并希望联系研究项目以外人员，请致电麦吉尔大学道德委员会主管，电话 514-398-6831，或邮件联系
lynda.mcneil@mcgill.ca

韩笑 Xiao Han
硕士生 M.A. Candidate
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
电话: +1 (514) 652-6696
xiao.han@mail.mcgill.ca

Roy Lyster
教授 Professor
Department of Integrated Studies in Education
McGill University
电话: +1 (514) 398-5942
roy.lyster@mcgill.ca

我已了解此项研究的目的并同意参与研究。我同意将此项研究的数据用于研究目的。
并已了解我的个人信息将完全保密。是_____否_____

我同意参加录音访谈。是_____否_____

________________（签名） ________________（日期）
Appendix E

Interview Protocol

1. How does your teacher correct your errors in class?

2. Do you think the teacher should correct students in class? Why?

3. Do you feel comfortable receiving correction from a teacher whose first language is (not) English?

4. What do you think is the advantages or disadvantages if English is (not) the first language of your teacher?

5. Do you have any other comments about the class, or anything else you would like to tell me?