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ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study examined the lived experience of adult English Language Learners (ELLs) in classrooms led by native-speaking teachers, compared with their experience in classrooms led by non-native teachers. The socio-cognitive approach to language and emergent common ground framed the development of the English classroom as a Community of Practice, in which students produced varying levels of complex, formulaic, metaphorically dense speech.

Both written and oral language production, in conjunction with teacher practices and student behaviors and opinions, served as evidence of differences between the two types of teacher, as well as providing measures of teacher effectiveness. The findings suggested: 1) Native speaking and non-native speaking teachers have different advantages in the classroom, 2) Student success is more closely related to teacher practices than to inherent features such as teachers’ native status, and 3) Students felt a connection to their non-native teachers as fellow ELLs, and expressed this relationship through the use of pronouns to position themselves as members of a common community. These findings have led to the conclusion that there is no empirical evidence to support the practice of preferring native speaking English teachers to their non-native counterparts.

Based on the findings, several recommendations for effective teacher practice and implications for further research are suggested, particularly regarding: 1) Effective methods for including natural language and authentic materials in the classroom, 2) The value of play in language learning, and 3) The connections between metaphorical speech and speakers’ language and culture of origin.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background of the study

A commonly held belief in the superiority of the native speaker has long existed among language learners, educators, and businesses that provide language-learning services. This belief is the foundation for the practice of limiting English teaching positions to instructors possessing native or native-like proficiency. Language schools “proudly advertise” that they hire only native teachers of the target language (Moussu, 2010, p. 746), as a native-speaking teacher (NST) is commonly deemed preferable to a non-native speaking teacher (NNST) of any proficiency or experience level (Medgyes, 1992). Particularly in English-speaking countries, students enter their classrooms expecting to learn appropriate ways of communicating in the society around them, by virtue of the language transmitted by their (expert) NSTs. This belief is in line with the paradigm of language as a cultural icon; a community’s language of majority cannot be separated from its culture (Kayman, 2004), and successful communication with native speakers in the community is the primary goal of language learners in inner circle countries. It stands to reason that this goal is most easily achieved through language education provided by lifelong community members.

However, as the use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) continues to expand with globalization, fewer English teachers than ever before have experienced the target culture or attained a level of proficiency deemed adequate for providing “good target language models” (p.275) to English Language Learners (ELLs) (Snow, Kamhi-Stein, & Brinton, 2006). In addition to the numerous inner circle countries (Kachru, 1985) in
which English is the primary language, outer-circle countries have developed their own varieties of the language, and the expanding-circle practice of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) has become nearly universal (see Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Kachru, 1985; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Medgyes, 1992; Seidlhofer, 2004). And in spite of assertions that English language teaching can no longer “privilege inner-circle varieties…as the only acceptable standard” (Kamhi-Stein, 2014, p.599) and must reconsider the “key precepts that have guided our teaching and practices” (Pickering, 2006, p. 227), those English teachers whose features (including speech patterns) label them as NNSTs still find their professional qualifications called into question. This ongoing tension between ideals and definitions of effective English language educators has led to increasing research in the area of NST-NNST classroom practice (see Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Llurda, 2005a; Moussu, 2010; McNeill, 2005; Pacek, 2005; and Seidlhofer, 2004; among others). Many of these studies not only address issues of effective teaching, but also expand the definition of effectiveness to include measures such as student beliefs and behaviors.

**Statement of the problem**

In response to the spread of ELF as a “language use mode” (Kecskes, 2007, p. 213) including as a mode of educational interaction (Pohl, 2004; Seidlhofer, 2004; Snow, Kamhi-Stein, & Brinton, 2006), many voices have been raised against the “myth of the native speaker” (Graddol, 2006; Jenkins, 2000; Kravchenko, 2010; among others). The strict dichotomy of native vs. nonnative speakers of English is eroding in the face of these and similar challenges, causing researchers to question the very terminology at the
heart of the issue, noting that “the notion of native speaker lacks clarity and poses a number of methodological questions” (Kravchenko, 2010, p. 678). The use of “native speaker” may “ascribe power” (Pacek, 2005, p.243) or imply superiority in the ability to produce “correct, idiomatic utterances and to give much-needed, appropriate error correction” (McNeill, 2005, p. 107), all of which can be viewed as extremely important facets of teacher identity and effectiveness.

Regardless of recent challenges to the terms “NST” and “NNST” among researchers of language learning and education, the debate regarding such loaded terminology fails to offer a viable alternative; NST/NNST distinctions continue to exist in “the minds of general public” (Pacek, 2005, p. 243). This typically includes teachers and students of English worldwide. These primary members of the English language classroom community continue to subscribe to NST/NNST terminology, along with its conceptual load (see Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Llurda, 2005a; Medgyes, 1992).

More specifically, the bias favoring NSTs as powerful, knowledgeable users of English persists among inexperienced students, in spite of recent research showing that experience with NNSTs often eliminates such bias. In fact, participating in English classes taught by both NSTs and NNSTs can shift student opinion toward more objective measures of teacher ability, including “professional skills (such as knowledge of the subject, preparation, and the ability to motivate students)” (Moussu, 2010, p. 750; see also Cheung, 2002; Mahboob, 2003). In the end, experienced students see their teachers’ native status as less important than professional ability and practice.

Hence, the present study examines student language production as part of the “lived experience” (Creswell, 2007) of adult English language learners in classrooms led
in turn by NSTs and NNSTs. I explore concepts of emergent common ground, rapport, and teacher practice alongside teachers’ native status as variables that influence student production and opinion. The present study considers student production as well as beliefs about native teacher superiority and linguistic capability, exploring whether such concepts are vested in tradition or have any basis in empirical data produced during actual classroom experience.

**Aims of the study**

As outlined above, studies that discuss and compare NSTs and NNSTs have increased since Árva and Medgyes (2000) determined that NSTs possess “superior English-language competence” (p. 360). On the other hand, little research exists centered on student language production in the adult English classroom. Additionally, much of the research that exists has been carried out by “NNS teachers themselves, which could pose a methodological problem regarding the validity and reliability of the data obtained” (Pilar García Mayo, 2006). I hope that this study, performed from my point of view as a native-speaking teacher and researcher of English language education, will help to alleviate Pilar García Mayo’s (and similar) criticism, as it answers the call for “more empirical research in the area of non-native speaking teaching” and the “role played by the language and teaching skills” of NNSTs “vis-à-vis NSs” (Llurda, 2005b, p. 148).

Thus, the aim of this mixed-methods study is to examine student linguistic production in the classroom objectively, as a measurable artifact of the language-learning phenomenon. A mixed-methods approach is necessary to determine whether quantitative and qualitative differences exist in student language under the direction of NSTs and
NNSTs. Additionally, this study explores the factors in teacher practice that contribute to differences in student behaviors and beliefs. The dynamic qualitative aspects of language learning and emergent common ground described here inform the quantitative analysis of linguistic behaviors, affective behaviors, and beliefs of the adult ESOL students in this study.

Research questions and hypotheses

In order to fully address the question of student behaviors and opinions, as well as the effects of various pedagogical strategies and teacher practices on these behaviors and opinions, I have explored the following research questions:

1. Does language production of students differ in any way if they are taught by a NST or a NNST? If so, what teacher practices contribute to these differences?
2. Does participation in classes taught in turn by NSTs and NNSTs cause students to modify their beliefs and perceptions of teacher qualifications, as common ground emerges over the course of the class sessions?
3. Will changes in students’ affective filters be reflected in any way in their language production?

Based on the literature discussed in Chapter 2 and in relation to the research questions, I hypothesize that:

A. Native speaker teachers’ greater level of proficiency in English will encourage students to produce utterances with more lexical richness and formulaic and syntactical complexity.
B. Participation in classrooms led in turn by NSTs and NNSTs will change students’ opinions regarding what qualities are most important in effective ESOL teachers.

C. Non-native speaker teachers’ ELF classroom environments will provide an atmosphere conducive to lowering students’ affective filters though greater rapport and empathy.

Definitions

For this study, Native speaking teacher (NST) is defined as in Seidlhofer (2004), an “inner circle” instructor for whom English is the home language; every NST observed here was a native of the United States. Non-native speaking teacher (NNST) includes educators from numerous nations in outer or expanding circle locations, speakers of “World Englishes” (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 210). The specific background of each teacher will be discussed further in the “participant” section below. The affective filter, as detailed in Krashen (1982), is defined as a manifestation of anxiety that can prevent input from reaching the learner’s Language Acquisition Device (LAD), thus hindering acquired competence (pp. 29-31). Thus, as the affective filter (or anxiety) level is lowered, the potential for competent language acquisition increases. Common ground is defined as a socio-cognitive construct that includes both “a priori existing and…cooperatively constructed” facets (Kecskes, 2014, p. 159). Linguistic behaviors include sentence complexity and lexical richness, as well as the use of formulaic and metaphorical language (Kecskes, 2007; Kecskes & Papp, 2000, 2003). Affective behaviors include behaviors that indicate motivation and engagement (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Krashen, 1982), specifically, interacting with teachers and other students by taking
turns at talk and asking questions during classroom discussions. Finally, student beliefs include their opinions about the effectiveness of non-native and native speaking teachers in the ESOL classroom as well as their opinions regarding differences between the two types of teacher, and, finally, the qualities of those teachers whom students perceived as most effective (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Moussu, 2010; Pacek, 2005).

**The educational environment**

To help the reader understand the professional setting of this study, I include a brief description of the learning environment here. The intensive adult English classes that served as the setting for data collection here are offered at a university in the northeastern United States during each spring and fall semester. These classes provide both a service to adult ELLS from the surrounding community, and a means of supervised practice teaching for master’s students in the university’s TESOL (Teaching English for Speakers of Other Languages) education program. Students come from diverse age groups, educational levels, and socio-economic backgrounds. Their English language ability varies from that of recent immigrants who are true beginners, with no working knowledge of the language, to graduate students enrolled at the university needing extra communication practice. To ensure optimal learning conditions, students are divided into classes by their communicative ability, so that teachers can provide appropriate targeted instruction and comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982).

When classes begin, each session is held for two hours every evening, three days a week, for six weeks. Furthermore, although grammar, reading, and writing are all practiced to some degree, the primary focus of these classes is on improving
communicative ability through intensive listening and speaking. Additionally, while
students remain fairly consistent in their respective groups, the teachers change each
week, thereby exposing each class to four to six different teachers over the course of the
six-week session (depending on enrollment in the current MS TESOL program). I
describe the specific students and teachers included in this study in the following section.

Participants in the study

1. The teachers

To address potential threats to validity (Maxwell, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Patton,
2002) including whether differences in student production might, in fact, be more related
to latent teacher features such as level of experience than innate features such as the
teacher’s native status, a survey of teacher traits including experience and age was
performed, and the results reported in Table 1. The teachers in this study represent a
broad spectrum of experience levels, countries of origin, ages, and genders. Some were
young instructors in their first semester of graduate study, who had never taught a class of
any kind until the sessions recorded for this data. Others were middle-aged seasoned
veterans, native speakers who had taught in the US and abroad for several years without
benefit of a graduate degree, who were returning to school to obtain the Master of
Science credential. Two non-native instructors—one man, one woman—had taught
English in their home country for fifteen years, and a younger teacher had worked with
children in her native land for three years. Still other non-native instructors had lived in
the United States for several years, and had taught here exclusively.
As can be seen, the broad array of teachers in this study cannot be categorized by experience, age, gender, or any other variable as clearly as their native status—which remains the most elemental and consistent thread in both groups participating in this study. The teachers’ status as graduate student instructors in their TESOL Master’s degree program could also be cited as a common demographic. However, their diversity in all other areas of life situates each of the individual teachers somewhat differently in their experience of the program, and of the Master’s practicum. Thus, I was confident
that there were no common teacher characteristics that could serve as confounding variables to the Native/Nonnative Teacher distinction cited in this study.

2. The students

As with the instructors, there was a wide variety of ages, native languages and countries, occupations, family situations, and previous English language experience among the student participants. Both men and women were represented in all three years of the data collection, as well as those who had lived in the U.S. for several years and those who had only arrived a month or two before classes began. Some were permanent residents; others were here on student or temporary work visas. Their ages ranged from 20s through 50s, and educational levels from those who were PhD students at the University or who had already earned Doctorates in their home countries, to those who had little formal education. Although all students were proficient at either “Intermediate” or “Advanced” levels of oral English, these classifications were determined solely through conversational skill as measured during the aforementioned initial assessment of their conversational fluency and accuracy (Bohlke, 2014) and as such were very subjective. As with all classrooms, the students in the groups under study included extremely outgoing individuals who, if allowed, dominated every discussion and activity, those who barely spoke unless directed to by the teacher, and many whose levels of participation varied between the two. They represented seventeen different countries of origin, and eleven different mother tongues.

One important variable for the purposes of this study was students’ previous experience with English teachers. In line with the second research question and
hypothesis, it was surmised that students would change their opinions of NSTs and NNSTs after exposure to both types of teacher, based on the supposition that this had not been their prior experience. In fact, the majority of students had participated solely in classes taught by NNSTs in their home countries. As discussed in McNeill (2005), students tend to learn English in homogenous classes in which the teachers and students are members of a common culture and language background; this was the case for most of the students in the present study.

3. The researcher

My development as a scholar and researcher has been influenced by, as well as had a profound and inevitable influence on, the background and evolution of this study. My worldview includes the concepts of social equity and equal access to educational opportunity, manifesting as concern for people rendered voiceless by the societies in which they live. Contrary to equitable practices, newcomers to the United States are often limited by their perceived lack of proficiency in English, regardless of their grasp of key content in their chosen professions. Highly qualified colleagues often struggle to acquire enough vocabulary to communicate their expertise in their individual disciplines, as their lack of sufficient English language proficiency effectively erases their professional abilities.

The opportunity to oversee both native and nonnative ESOL educators as a teacher in the TESOL MS adult classes at my university helped to focus my interest in other educators, as I observed this linguistic bias come into play against well-trained teachers. The NNSTs in my group often suffered skepticism and disrespect from their
students, simply because of the teachers’ non-native status. On more than one occasion, the international student teachers I was overseeing ended the evening in tears after being challenged publicly by their students.

Immediately following this experience, I was fortunate to serve as an editorial assistant to Dr. Istvan Kecskes on the journal *Intercultural Pragmatics* (ICUP). Many studies submitted to ICUP were related to relationships between English speakers of different cultures, and several discussed differences between native speakers and non-native speakers in multiple environments. This ongoing scrutiny of work that often touched on interactions between native and non-native speakers in various settings helped to shape my interest in examining such relationships in the ESOL classroom.

Thus, the importance of effective English lingua franca classroom communication, as well as that of empirical research to delineate actual differences between NSTs and NNSTs, became clear over the course of several semesters observing adult ESOL classes such as those examined in this study, followed by the close reading of research on many varieties of intercultural communication.

As such, I approach the topics of native and non-native teaching from the stance of a concerned outsider, wishing to unravel the tangled threads of perception and reality in the differences between teachers of English in order to add to the body of research that informs both education and intercultural communication.

4. Ethical Issues

I have briefly described how I came to believe in the importance of investigating native and nonnative English teachers’ practices as well as students’ lived experiences in
both types of teachers’ classrooms in the interests of preserving the validity of this study (Creswell, 2007; Maxwell, 2005; Patton, 2002). Additionally, I have adhered to the ethical guidelines prescribed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of my institution, including obtaining approval for all aspects of the study, obtaining informed consent from all study participants, and offering alternative classroom experiences for teachers and students who did not wish to participate. I modified the informed-consent document to reflect IRB input,¹ and provided the opportunity for participants to withdraw from the process if desired at any point in the study.

My social justice lens had to be continually set aside throughout the course of this study, from the interpretation of existing research, to the development of research questions and hypotheses based on the work of experts in the field of English-language education, to the analysis of the data collected here. Claiming subjectivity is not sufficient in empirical research; rather, I strove throughout the study to “be aware of how [my] research [was] shaping [my] inquiry and its outcomes” (Peshkin, 1988, p.17) in order to preserve validity and credibility.

**Summary**

Situated in the debate over English as a world language and what it means to be a native speaker of English, the exploration of English education as a relevant field of research can help both NSTs and NNSTs to “reflect on our everyday work” and “overcome the hurdles we may come across in our classes” (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005, p. 235). Based first on my personal interests and experiences, and then on the

¹ See Appendix A for the IRB-approved participant consent form, collected from all students and teachers.
increasingly important discussion of ELF communication in the classroom and the world, this study expands on the existing literature by comparing NSTs and NNSTs interacting with students of multiple linguistic and cultural backgrounds, as common ground emerges in the confines of the English classroom. Additionally, this study helps to overcome the “shortage of empirical research” on NST and NNST practices and contributions to the field of language learning (Llurda, 2005a).

The impetus of this study was situated in the need for objective descriptions of student production in classes taught by both types of teacher, both to determine what differences exist, and to suggest ways for all teachers to engage students in meaningful classroom experiences. With the constantly growing use of globalized English, educators must “reexamine key precepts that have guided our teaching and research practices” (Pickering, 2006, p. 227). This study will describe student language production to discover ways that teachers encourage syntactical complexity as well as lexical and metaphorical density, and participation that leads to community in the English classroom.

The literature in Chapter 2 provides a foundation for the discussion that evolved as a result of this study. In so doing it acts as a base upon which the present research was built, adding to the work of those researchers and educators whose explorations are included here.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to demonstrate the focus and direction of this study, I include the literature described in this chapter as a basis for my exploration of English language interactions between NSTs, NNSTs, and their students. The literature provides an overview of intercultural interactions in English, explores the concept of common ground as it is created in such interactions, describes the classroom environments in which communication is situated, delves into the importance of students’ affective concerns during language learning, and, finally, discusses important aspects of teacher qualifications—including their identity as NSTs and NNSTs.

English as a lingua franca

English lingua franca (ELF) is the only possible mode of communication for the multi-lingual students and their NNSTs in this study. To arrive at any level of understanding, interlocutors from different cultures use ELF as a common basis for meaning-making. Furthermore, both the NNSTs and their students here have an L2-based concept of the language use mode; thus, neither can claim the level of “superior English-language competence” (Árva & Medgyes, 2000, p. 360) attributed to NSTs. Nevertheless, in the absence of any alternative means of communication, ELF is a well-documented necessity in the classrooms under study here, as in the global realms of business and academia. Thus, a brief overview of the foundational works related to ELF is included.
Kayman (2004) opens his discussion of English as a global language by defining it as “the international language of business, the language the world’s citizens communicate in” (p.1). As such, it is necessary to ensure that students who wish to become global citizens must also speak the global language; therefore, English—whether the standard form or some specially modified ELF form—is not an optional area of study any longer (Mauranen, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2004). In fact, so many nonnative speakers of English exist that 80% of all English speakers worldwide—about one billion individuals—have mother tongues other than English (Pickering, 2006, p.219).

On the other hand, Kecskes (2007) argues that ELF is not a language or variety of language, but rather a “language use mode” (p. 213). Common ground in ELF situations is primarily dependent on the linguistic code, since little shared background knowledge exists among individuals from multiple linguistic communities and cultures. Indeed, Kecskes’ examples show that ELF interlocutors, having little other than their knowledge of English in common, use “words and expressions whose most salient meaning coincides with their literal meaning rather than seeking what common ground and knowledge they share” (p. 204). Kecskes provides examples of ELF discourse in which meaning is created during the conversation, forming a basis for common ground within the immediate discussion so that interlocutors can get their message across (pp. 203-207). ELF interlocutors must ensure that their conversation partner will access speakers’ intended meaning as most salient, performing whatever adjustment or repair is necessary in order to be understood.
This study demonstrates how ELF is used as a tool for classroom communication, as students and NNSTs negotiate meaning and build common ground and community in their classroom settings.

**Common ground**

The concept of emergent common ground (first outlined by Kecskes, 2008) is the preeminent paradigm of this study. Since ELF speakers can bring little core common ground to the linguistic environment, some commonality between the members of the speech community—in this case, the adult ESOL classroom—must be achieved before the participants can interact. Because the participants are from many different countries, language groups, and cultures, common ground must be co-constructed on the spot for communication to succeed; and since there are few areas of overlap in the participant experience, the English language itself provides the arena for this communicative success. But before examining how common ground emerges in ELF discourse, we must understand the more general ways in which it is defined and constructed. One cannot claim that conversants develop an emergent understanding, which includes common ground as an integral part of its foundation, without a general definition of its qualities and contributions to discourse.

1. *Defining common ground*

Clark, Schreuder, and Buttrick (1992) define common ground as “shared information between speakers/listeners—their mutual knowledge, beliefs, and suppositions” (p.3). In conversation, utterances rely on *given* and *new* information (as
assumed by the speaker when formulating an utterance). Speakers must try to convey information that they think listeners already know (or can infer from what is said), differently from what they believe to be newly introduced information (p. 4). Clark & Haviland’s model, developed between 1973 and 1978, includes three properties:

1. Participants in conversation work together against a background of shared information (common ground).

2. Participants accumulate shared information during the conversation by adding to the common ground with each utterance.

3. Speakers design utterances so that listeners can identify what is known information (previously existing common ground) and what is to be added to the common ground (new information) (pp.4-5).

As a crucial core component of common ground, mutual knowledge can be classified as generic knowledge (about kinds of things—dogs, lions, birds…) or particular knowledge (e.g., our dog, Elsa the lion from “Born Free,” the birds along the Hudson River).

Community membership allows a speaker to “assume there are generic and particular things [that she and the listener] mutually know. The basic idea is that there are things everyone in a community knows and assumes everyone else in that community knows, too” (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992, p.36). A list of generic and particular “common knowledge” among educated Americans (which may include some, many, or all items unknown to individuals from other countries) follows: “Cars drive on the right; senators have terms of six years and representatives terms of two years; and steak costs more than hamburger. George Washington was the first president of the United States; Colorado is west of Pennsylvania; there was a Great Depression between World Wars I and II” (p.
36). Whether or not the listed items fit into a NNS hearer’s existing knowledge depends strongly on his or her education level, length of time in the United States, original culture/country…ad infinitum. The important point for this study is that, in ELF discourse, very little preexisting mutual knowledge can be assumed.

Delving more deeply into the common-ground based conversational foundations, Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick (1992) add:

Common ground between two people is based on…three sources of information. The first is perceptual evidence, what the two have jointly experienced or are jointly experiencing at the moment. The second is linguistic evidence, what the two have jointly heard said or are now jointly hearing as participants in the same conversation. The third is community membership. They take as common ground everything they believe is universally, or almost universally, known, believed, or supposed in the many communities and subcommunities to which they mutually believe they both belong” (p. 81-82).

2. Core common ground and emergent common ground

The focus of common ground in this study is the presence of emergent common ground among students and teachers in the ESOL classes observed here. Unlike the concept of common ground introduced by Clark and Haviland between 1973 and 1978, which relied solely on the preexisting condition of common ground within the interlocutors’ cognitive systems, Kecskes (2008) and Kecskes and Zhang (2009) explicate a dynamic view of common ground. Whereas earlier theory discussed common ground as product, Kecskes (2008) and Kecskes and Zhang (2009) expanded this concept
as ongoing *process*. To differentiate between the concepts of emergent and core common
ground, Kecskes and Zhang (2009) delineate the two sides as follows: *Core common
ground* refers to “common knowledge that belongs to a speech community as a result of
prior interaction and experience.” *Emergent common ground* “refers to the particularized
private knowledge created *in the course of communication* that belongs to the
individuals” (p. 347, emphasis mine). This is created within every human interaction,
regardless of the level of preexisting core common ground. Furthermore, as defined here,
little core common ground exists in English Lingua Franca (ELF); speakers of different
cultures may start from a position of only that “culture sense” common to the general
human experience. Speakers from extremely divergent backgrounds, including those
underlying language, culture, life experience, etc., are probably not privy to subtle
changes in the lexicon that occur in distinct subcultures in which the target language
develops. Even “common sense” is a loaded term, differing in relation to one’s cultural
paradigms. Without an advanced shared level of *core sense* (Kecskes, 2008), emergent
common ground is composed of limited *shared sense* (the particularized knowledge
about personal experiences that interlocutors share) and *current sense*, which consists of
“the emergent perception of the current situation” (p. 348).

The students in adult language classes such as those described in this study are
typically not members of a common subcommunity, except that of English Language
Learners (ELLs). They likely have little common former experience, little participation in
culturally or socially bounded activities or celebrations, little common rules for behavior
in supermarkets or subways or classrooms. It is these rules, regulations and experiences
that lay the foundation for core common ground (Kecskes, 2014). Without these, they
must rely on the currently existing linguistic community, rooted in the language of the actual situational context (Kecskes 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang 2009), in which to anchor their conversational common ground. Furthermore, language situated in common ground can be described as “social language” (Bakhtin, 1986), which has different registers depending on the relationship between interlocutors—that is, what particularized common ground the speaker shares with her or his audience. The description of an event will be filtered in one way to facilitate smooth communication with parents or teachers, as opposed to the language used when describing the same event to friends. Based on this principle, mixing registers or crossing acceptable boundaries can cause communicative misfire, resulting in a rejection of the chosen lexical item. Any two terms, while essentially the same, may be reserved for different sociocultural contexts, and as such, far from interchangeable. This type of misfire is rare in native-speaker: native-speaker communication precisely because the interlocutors are members of a common main culture. Conversely, one can easily imagine how misunderstanding can occur in ELF communication, where little mutual culture exists.

However, core common ground also takes into account the individual speakers’ varied experiences within the target culture, such as time spent in the English-language environment, how much they use the target language, etc. In addition, ELF speakers will have more core common ground if they come from similar cultural or linguistic backgrounds, as opposed to those from extremely divergent linguacultures. Therefore, the levels of core common ground that exist between speakers in this study are located on a continuum of sorts. We will further discuss what this difference means for particular
speakers in the results section, as we explore ways in which students from varied backgrounds use metaphorical speech in English.

3. Salience in emergent common ground

In this study, emergent common ground is related not only to the interlocutors’ membership in a shared core community—for example, that of “English Language Learners” shared by NNSTs and students—but to the meaning values (Kecskes, 2008) of the lexical units used for communication. In this aspect, students can find a lower level of misunderstanding in their NST-led classes, perhaps as a result of common salience between NSTs and advanced-level adult students. This is because the potential for communicative misfire has its basis in differences of salience. In conversation, speakers will use whatever lexical units they (correctly or incorrectly) believe most salient to the hearer—which, as with core common ground, depends on innumerable variables in the prior experience of both parties (Giora, 1997; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). In fact, even within the same culture, salience can vary widely both at the production level and the comprehension level, depending on what each individual brings to the conversation. What is most salient to the speaker may be very different from the same utterance’s salience in the mind of the addressee. However, salience is typically at a heightened level in intracultural conversation when compared to ELF, which includes speakers of different socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds. As seen in this study, NS-NNS communication lies somewhere between the two. Just as common ground is emergent and situated in the actual situational context of the communication, so salience emerges from and is assimilated into the emergent common ground as it unfolds. Thus,
the scarcity of shared background experience in ELF communication may create the need to cede previously salient concepts to those newly created online, through interaction with others.

For example, before an interlocutor from another culture and language group can understand references in, say, an American’s conversation about characters on the television show *Friends*, he or she must take an additional step of learning about the characters and their personality traits. Because ELF interlocutors cannot assume that their intended meaning will come to the surface as readily as it will in intracultural communication, the way that they most often “introduce information into common ground” (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick 1992, p. 94) is simply by including important information in the conversational context. Without this step, overconfident “mutual assumption of communicative competence” (Kecskes, 2014, p. 158) can cause numerous strata of misunderstanding (House, 2003), requiring hearers to take additional steps toward reconciling what is meant with what is heard — guessing the meaning, guessing but also asking for clarification, or simply asking for clarification (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick 1992, p. 98).

These additional steps are almost always required because of the inherent difficulty within intercultural communication, as compared to the latent ease of intracultural communication. Understanding speaker meaning relies heavily on common history, experience, and worldviews, and if any or all of these aspects is lacking from the speaker-hearer relationship, then the task of communicating can become a massive challenge (Gumperz, 1982; Kecskes, 2014; Tannen, 1990). Searching for core common ground to activate during ELF interaction can be a barren task; in its absence, common
ground must be constructed in the course of conversation, created within the very act of communication that requires (previously nonexistent) commonality to succeed.

Thus, one serious obstacle faced by language partners who do not share a common mother tongue and country of origin is the potential inability for conversational contributions to be assimilated into the core common ground. Davidson (2002) shows that the expression and acknowledgement of understanding “sufficient for current purposes” (p. 1277) can require several additional turns when a common linguistic foundation is absent. If any step in the presentation-acceptance-acknowledgment sequence is misunderstood, then repair must occur before conversational common ground can be successfully achieved.

4. The socio-cognitive approach to common ground

In spite of these potential difficulties in conversation, communication is accomplished and common ground progressively emerges in this study. From a social point of view, students have ELL community membership and ELF as the accepted language mode in common with their NNSTs, so can be expected to feel comfortable with this group, as they exist on a similar plane of linguistic experience. This “outgroup” membership, living on the edges of the American English culture, is in itself a commonality between students and NNSTs as learners of the language and newcomers to the NST speech community. Ways in which students and NNSTs unconsciously express this “outgroup” connection in language production are clearly demonstrated in the findings of this study. Additionally, the most salient meaning of lexical items will be the
literal meaning for ELF users, which sometimes leads to misunderstanding when the NNSTs employ less clear forms of meaning than anticipated by their students.

On the other hand, a different kind of language use pattern is demonstrated when students work with NSTs. Incorporating NST language forms into their speech as memes in the common ground is evident here—students mirror the idiomatic speech models provided by native speaking teachers, as perceived experts in conversational English. The students must adjust to the linguaculture of the NSTs; living in an English-speaking environment, they are highly motivated to learn ways of expressing themselves that mimic those of the teachers who are lifelong members of the English-speaking community. Thus, while communication does occur between nonnative teachers and students, it is seen to be lacking in the formulaic and non-literal aspects of communication that categorize “native-like” conversation.

This is in line with the socio-cognitive approach to common ground, which integrates the “communication-as-transfer-between-minds pragmatic view and the dynamic cognitive view of common ground” to arrive at the concept of “assumed common ground” (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009, p. 333). Kecskes and Zhang assert that “The construction of common ground is a dynamic process; it is the convergence of the mental representation of shared knowledge that we activate, shared knowledge that we seek, and rapport as well as knowledge that we create in the communicative process” (pp. 333-334). As Kecskes (2014) says, in intercultural communication, interlocutors “cooperate not just because this is what human beings are expected to do…but…to create understanding, common ground, and community” (p. 27).
Thus, the socio-cognitive approach provides a theoretical explanation for the different language use patterns seen among students in this study. Defining communication as “the result of the interplay of intention and attention motivated by the socio-cultural background” (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009, p. 338), it includes both the concepts of cooperation (measured by relevance) and egocentrism (measured by salience). All communication begins with some level of intention; if there were no purpose for a conversation, then no dialogue would occur. Intention is either informative (sharing knowledge of something, giving new information), performative (proposing marriage, initiating a trip) or emotive (expressing feelings or opinions). Kecskes and Zhang delineate concise differences between intention and attention in building communicative common ground, claiming that attention can be mindful, mindless, or mind-paralyzed (p. 342). Mindful attention includes: “a lot of attentional resources… evoked in a more strenuous and focused way”, mindless attention occurs in such “situations where relatively fewer resources are evoked and more automatic actions take place”, and, finally, mind-paralyzed attention exists in “scenarios where the amount…of attentional resources involved in communication are impaired by…distraction, mental illness, drunkenness, (or) shock” making “the interlocutors’ effect of attentional processing ineffective” (p.342). In the present study, the intense level of mindful attention required for ELF communication shows itself as students produce sophisticated grammatical/ syntactical language forms, but little metaphorical speech—which can be considered more “mindless,” as it is based in representative concepts not readily connected to the meaning values inherent at the lexical level.
To ensure understanding, “...communication is achieved with intentional action guaranteed by attentional processing, both motivated by the socio-cultural background” (Kecskes & Zhang 2009: p. 344, emphasis in original). Interlocutors are both cooperative (in intention) and egocentric (in attention) in the process. This is not to say that conversants are egotistical or self-centered in their attention to meaning; rather, egocentrism is an unavoidable byproduct of the human condition. A speaker cannot literally understand what is said from their hearer’s point of view, because one’s own interpretation will always be most salient, coming to the forefront of all possible interpretations and requiring that the hearer accept or discard this meaning based, in turn, on her or his own egocentric understanding. The socio-cognitive view allows for the concept of egocentrism within the social realm of conversation.

As is seen in both types of classroom setting in the present study, these difficulties in arriving at meaning do not prevent students and teachers from understanding one another sufficiently so that common ground can emerge. Kecskes’ (2008) Dynamic Model of Meaning (DMM) provides an explanation of how, in spite of seemingly great odds, meaning consistently emerges in intercultural conversation. Figure 1 demonstrates how context leads to the development of meaning in this model. Here, the DMM emphasizes that what the speaker says depends on her/his previous experience, and that this experience is shown by current word choices. On the other hand, what the hearer understands of what is said depends on her or his own previous experience with the lexical items uttered by the speaker. If there is a mismatch between the two, then communication becomes difficult and must be negotiated. However, if the speaker meaning and hearer meaning of particular lexical items included in the utterance agree,
then the conversation can move along smoothly, and communication is said to be achieved.

Figure 1: *Understanding Context* (Kecskes, 2008, p. 389)

According to Kecskes (2008), “Both the meaning construction systems and the meaning prompting systems differ in languages because both are culture-specific” (p.390). Thus, intercultural communication “requires a reconstruction of cognitive and cultural configurations that were prompted by one language and a determination of how another language would set up similar configurations with an entirely different meaning prompting system and pre-structured background” (p. 390). Given the difference in backgrounds, in spite of the fact that “both the speaker and the hearer work with lexical units from the same meaning prompting system (language)”, their “meaning construction
system may give different interpretations to the same items in intercultural communication because of cultural differences” (p. 399). Such differences at every level of conversation should make intercultural communication impossible. Yet intercultural communication does occur, with great success, every day in countless locations worldwide. Interlocutors develop common linguistic knowledge as “the result of…grammaticalization (and)…lexicalization…broadly defined as the adoption of concepts into the lexicon” (p. 392). Even when such mismatches in private context exist, the shared lexical context in the ELF classroom aids speakers in eventually arriving at understanding.

Further exploring this concept, Kecskes (2007) asserts that “Non-native speakers use the linguistic code itself as a common ground rather than the socio-cultural background knowledge that differs significantly with each participant…(resulting in) the priority of literal meaning over non-literal…This is why ELF generally lacks idiomaticity, which is so important in native-native communication”(pp.204-205).

In sum, this study shows how speakers in the English language classroom use the DMM to create meaning in classroom discourse, as interlocutors merge their most salient private contexts encoded in the language they use with the situational context to create meaningful interaction. The next section provides an overview of the English-language classroom setting, in which intercultural meaning creation takes place in this study, and the importance of both NST- and NNST- teacher-student interaction.
Classroom discourse

The findings of this study help to shed light on the ways in which students and instructors from varied socioeconomic, linguistic, educational, and age groups come together as a community in the classes observed during the course of this study. In spite of these inherent differences, through their participation in the common classroom they are able to produce enough common ground to become members of their classroom community by the end of the six-week sessions. The importance of the classroom as an independent community outside of the various subcultures in which students and teachers participate within the larger society is examined in this section.

The classroom is perhaps the most typical space in which the English language is used by nonnative speakers. In fairly homogeneous EFL (English as a Foreign Language) settings where teachers and students generally share the same culture and mother tongue, as well as in ESOL settings in countries where English is the majority language, formal English education occurs by means of structured teacher-student communication (see Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Llurda, 2005; McNeill, 2005; Moussu, 2010). Within the language classroom more than any other learning space, language “does not simply represent experience…but more importantly, it constitutes experience” (Marton & Tsui 2004, p. 25). Therefore, the type of teacher and student talk that occurs in the language classroom is if anything even more crucial to learning than in any other type of classroom. And although numerous studies have been conducted of various types of traditional and nontraditional types of teacher-student interaction, one important factor in discourse that is often overlooked in such studies is the cultural and linguistic background that each interactant (regardless of his or her role as teacher or student) brings to the
classroom. Discussing the manner in which teachers position themselves in the classroom, Hallenbeck-Nadeau (2008, p.3) states: “In the case of the classroom teacher and how he or she positions himself or herself through the use of illocutionary acts, the teacher’s goals and objectives for the class as a whole, the individual lesson, and each student certainly come into play, but these must be filtered through his or her personal cognitive processes.” This is in line with Marton and Tsui’s (2004) assertion that:

> What learners have experienced before is crucial to how they make sense of their current experience. In order to make it possible for learners to discern critical features of the object of learning, teachers must be aware of whether learners can make sense of these critical features through their previous experience. The teacher must also be aware of how much is shared between himself and the learners. In other words, what the teacher presents as ground must be shared common ground between himself and the students, so that what he presents as figure can be made sense of by students in relationship to the ground. In this sense, the space of learning is a shared space of learning. (p.32)

Teachers are generally considered the most influential interactants in classroom discourse, leading to discussions of classroom communication that include topics such as typical and much-discussed IRE (initiation-response-evaluation) sequences (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Hellerman, 2003; Wells, 1993), power struggles among teachers and students, and the like. NSTs’ perceived personal power in intercultural communication can result in behaviors such as interruption and an assumed right to hold the floor, eventually leading to misunderstanding (House, 2003). However, Candela’s (1999) examination of student power in classroom discourse found that
classroom language, instead of following teacher-initiated, carefully-plotted forms, is “overlapping, sometimes confusing, and often indeterminate…teachers revoice students’ comments and…students can have the same agentive footing in the interaction as the teacher and often even have the last word” (p. 141). In a nod to the importance of what each individual brings to the conversation, she concludes that “differences [in classroom interaction and participation] may come from cultural influences on the everyday practices of teachers” (p. 160). In other words, the teacher’s classroom practices are an artifact of his or her individual culture.

Additionally, as is seen in the present study, the classroom space creates its own culture, in which the previous experiences of all participants in conversational interaction are inseparable from their attempts at creating or discovering common ground in the present interaction. Discussing cultural differences among students and their effects on classroom discourse, Courtney Cazden (2001) says that:

One of the most important influences on all talk…is the participants themselves—their expectations about interactions and their perceptions of each other…ways of talking that seem so natural to one group are experienced as culturally strange to another. Just as all speech has an accent…so patterns of teacher-student interactions in typical classroom lessons are cultural phenomena, not ‘natural’ in any sense either. (p.67)

Therefore, not only what happens in the course of classroom conversation, but also what each participant brings to the classroom discourse, determines the tone and direction of interactions as well as the outcomes of each class session and, ultimately, the creation of each particular classroom culture.
In addition to creating meaning online through classroom discourse, even classroom interactants who belong to vastly different socio-cultural groups of origin create a “community of practice” within the space of the classroom itself. According to Wenger (1998), successful teachers invite their students to become members of such a community through meaningful engagement on a level higher than one that simply offers information “packaged” in “well-designed units” (p.9). Engaging in the classroom community includes active participation using, in this case, the language to be learned within the learning space in ways that impact meaningfully on the students’ other significant communities: their family, workplace, municipality, nation. Wenger (1998) highlights the contrast between a stale, ineffective classroom and a vibrant, living classroom:

If we believe…that knowledge consists of…information explicitly stored in the brain, then it makes sense to package this information in well-designed units, to assemble prospective recipients of this information in a classroom… and to deliver this information…as succinctly and articulately as possible. But if we believe that information stored in explicit ways is only a small part of knowing, and that knowing involves primarily active participation in social communities, then the traditional format does not look so productive. (pp. 9-10)

Certainly most teachers aim toward creating an engaging, in-depth experience for their learners in each classroom; additionally, language teachers can, if they employ best practices, maximize the advantage of the medium of instruction doing double duty as the target of instruction. But, paradoxically, the seemingly natural, spontaneous level of interaction that draws students into not only the classroom community of practice but the
*English speaker* community of practice must in reality be carefully structured. It is through creative, inventive structuring of ideas, and through careful guidance of the community as a facilitator of leaning and engagement, that the skillful teacher sees students gain in their skill and mastery of the target language. We must, as Wenger states, “open their horizons so they can put themselves on learning trajectories they can identify with…that make a difference to the communities that they value” (p.10). This is because true engagement is not a matter of simply showing up for class: “Engagement is not just a matter of activity, but of community building, inventiveness, social energy, and emergent knowledgeability” (p.237). In other words, the engaging teacher who wishes to promote successful, long-term learning among students must act as a facilitator of community building by taking himself or herself out of the way of learning, as opposed to a central actor or main character in the classroom drama. In this study, we can see that those teachers whose students produce the most complex language are those who are willing to let students take the lead, even allowing them to interrupt and redirect the teacher’s planned activities. Teachers who facilitate learning in a community of practice know that “it is more important for students to have experiences that allow them to take charge of their own learning than to cover a lot of material” (p. 272).

The Community of practice (CoP) of English speakers includes several sub-communities, two of which are labeled “NST” and “NNST”. These, in turn, belong to separate CoPs including those of ELL or NS. Furthermore, since there is more *intersection in CoPs* between NNST and students, this can explain why they produce more grammatically sophisticated language, taking more risks in their linguistic production with those teachers with whom they share a common community—the
community of English language learners, living outside of their comfort zones in a new culture. It is quite possible that the students believe that they will be judged with more lenience from members of their own (ELL) Community of Practice. As stated in my third hypothesis, this type of classroom community including English Language Learners should help create an atmosphere in which students are more relaxed, lowering their affective filters to promote effective learning. However, as discussed by students in this study, relaxation and a comfortable environment are not the only important variables in language learning. The affective concerns discussed in the following literature are certainly important factors in language production, but as we will see later, other factors such as teacher practices also influence students’ learning experiences.

**Students’ affective concerns**

The concept of motivation as vital to learning is widely embraced, yet incredibly difficult to define. Motivation is deemed responsible for why learners decide to study English, as well as for how long and how hard they will work at learning (Dörnyei, 2014). Yet, because human behavior is influenced by so many internal and external variables, it is nearly impossible to pinpoint what causes one learner to outpace another. Particularly among adult learners, personal goals are as individual as the learners who aspire to them (Cardoza, 2013). Regardless of how one defines motivation, the affective components of learning, including students’ comfort levels, are vital to cognitive development. Since, as discussed, the community of ELLs is a common thread between NNSTs and their students, I have hypothesized that students’ affective filters will be lowered in the NNST classroom.
As one of the first scholars to discuss the affective filter issue, Krashen (1982) recommends creating a warm classroom atmosphere to maximize learners’ comfort for optimal learning conditions. Since lowering students’ affective filters is now widely accepted as vital to language learning, it may follow that the potentially higher levels of rapport between students and instructors found in ELF settings create the optimal atmosphere for foreign language education.

On the other hand, one NST accomplishes an effective level of rapport in his classroom in Nguyen’s (2007) case study of a young adult ESOL class. The teacher uses teasing and humor to “index himself and the students as close acquaintances” (p. 289), employing familiarity in the classroom to change footing from the elevated level of “teacher” to the more familiar level of “peer” (Goffman, 1979, Nguyen, 2007). By shifting footings in this manner, the teacher builds rapport with his students, “conveying that…he is on [their] side” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 292). Nguyen concludes that “moments of rapport building in instruction provide…opportunities for…participation in the target language” (p. 298).

Additionally, Fiksdal (1988) found that native speakers in intercultural communication established common ground using very specific communicative practices. These included establishing eye contact, employing a reduced rate of speech, and deixis. In relation to this study, students discussed eye contact and rate of speech as two of the qualities they appreciated most in non-native teachers’ speech patterns. What is more, deixis—specifically, person deixis employed to create or reduce space between speakers—was seen as an important factor in establishing common ground here. These communicative practices are further discussed in Chapter 4.
Given recent advances in cognitive research, however, it may be a bit simplistic to leave the conversation of affect and rapport at the NST/NNST level. In fact, brain research suggests that regardless of the teacher’s native status, there is more significance attached to positive emotional experiences in the classroom than suggested by the concept of a lowered affective filter. With recent advances in brain imaging such as fMRI testing, researchers can see precisely what happens to the brain in various educational settings. Some results of this research are discussed briefly here.

Language learning, whether the focus is on grammatical structures or formulaic segments of the language, is based on factual information. Teachers provide this information in a variety of ways, and students learn (or fail to learn) it when their brains form (or fail to form) connections between the incoming information and what is already known. “If the information is not…worth remembering, it is discarded and…forgotten. If…the brain regards the incoming factual information as important, it is sent to the hippocampus… for long-term memory. If the incoming information is of an emotional nature, then it is sent to the amygdala, which also catalogs it for long-term storage” (Leiguarda de Orue, 2009, p. 25). Thus, pleasant classroom experiences, including empathic teachers, relevant games, and a feeling of personal worth and respect in the classroom, lead to intensified learning through a dual encoding within the brain’s systems. Emotions including excitement, fear, pleasure, frustration or boredom cannot be separated from the classroom experience. The most effective teachers create positive emotional experiences for their students, thereby ensuring the deep and multiplex connections within the students’ brains that translate to long-term learning. “Good learning engages feelings…emotions also engage meaning and predict future learning
because they involve our goals, beliefs, biases and expectancies. Emotions drive the threesome of attention, meaning, and memory” (Caine & Caine, 1997). In other words, an enjoyable, playful, laughter-filled classroom not only lowers the students’ affective filters, but has the potential to cause changes in the brain that allow optimal learning through complete engagement.

Positive emotional experiences in the classroom not only help to embed the target information in the students’ long-term memory, but also create a feeling of rapport between effective teachers and their students. Fiksdal’s (1988) seminal study suggests that rapport between teacher and students contributes to student success, regardless of the teacher’s native-speaker status. A more recent study of communication in the English classroom by Behrens and Jablon (2007) add the concept of communicative compatibility to Fiksdal’s rapport discussion. Behrens and Jablon found that between two groups of students, native-speakers and non-native speakers, non-native speakers rated their feelings of achievement higher than native speakers when the teacher was a bilingual native speaker. The researchers attribute this success to the increased level of metapragmatic awareness found among bilinguals (pp. 5-6).

Indeed, the shared experience between students and teachers was an important factor in Pacek’s (2005) survey. Evaluating international students at a British university, Pacek found that learners’ reactions to NS and NNS teachers were quite different upon completing their courses than they had been initially. At the start of classes, some students were disappointed to learn that their professors were NNS: “I came to England to be taught by English,” “Non-native can never be as good as native,” and “I was very surprised and disappointed” were notable comments (p. 252). However, by the end of the
course, student comments had become more positive: “She knows other languages, so she understands our problems better. Also, she is a good teacher” (p.253). Rapport was clearly a contributing factor in students’ revised judgments of non-native teachers. Therefore, rapport is an important contributing factor to the change of opinion among students who participate in classrooms where they encounter both NSTs and NNSTs.

Having examined student variables in language learning, we now turn to the final variable in this study, teacher qualification. Do students working with NSTs enjoy any objective advantages over those working in ELF classrooms, or is the common practice of preferring the native teacher based on tradition alone? Very few studies have been carried out in response to this question. Thus, the following section on teacher qualifications helps examine the issue by adding to the foundation of the work done in this study.

**Teacher qualifications**

A traditional view of language teaching holds that native-speaker teachers enjoy professional advantages over non-native speaker teachers (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Moussu, 2010). However, there are still very few empirical studies exploring the teacher’s native status as the main variable. In spite of the lack of empirical support for this view, the tradition of hiring NSTs is entrenched and well-documented; expensive, private English schools worldwide use their native teachers as a marketing tool. Furthermore, public schools and universities in formerly closed countries such as Saudi Arabia have recently begun recruiting NSTs based on this presupposition of advantage (Baniabdellrahman, 2013). One recruitment agency attempting to hire new faculty for
“various Universities and Institutes in Saudi Arabia” upholds the “absolute requirement” of the instructors’ native English speaker status, evidenced by citizenship in “US, UK, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand or Ireland” (Vitae, 2014). As Lucie Moussu discusses in her study of teacher variables on ESOL students’ attitudes, “Many English language schools proudly advertise that they only hire native-English-speaking teachers” (Moussu, 2010, p.746). In Mahboob’s (2003) study, only 7.9% of ESOL teachers in a group of 122 Intensive English Programs (IELPs) were NNSTs (p. 74).

Administrators of such language programs often believe that only NSTs could be truly proficient in English, and therefore sufficiently qualified to teach it. There is evidence of recent change in this practice in some locations, however, with IELPs now including the qualification of “proficient” to their recruitment materials; for example, requiring instructors or teaching assistants whose home language is not English to produce an acceptable SPEAK (Speaking Proficiency English Assessment) score in lieu of native status (Temple University, 2014).

Conversely, scholars such as Jenkins (2000) and Graddol (2006), who claim that native-speaker teachers may actually hinder learning in the international English classroom, pose arguments against native-speaker teachers. Graddol (2006) asserts that not only are non-native speakers intimidated by the presence of a native speaker in the classroom, but also that since few native speakers belong to the culture in which they teach, they tend to be out of touch with and incapable of empathy for their students. (p. 114-115). Agreeing that the native vs. non-native dichotomy is not the only important factor when evaluating teachers’ effectiveness, van Essen (1994) remarked that “as long ago as 1899 Henry Sweet…gave the following verdict: trained non-native teachers are
better than untrained native ones.” Additionally, if we return to the topic of common ground in the classroom as discussed above, we know that the non-native teacher in a multi-lingual classroom has the experience of learning English as a second or subsequent language in common with his or her students. This may potentially have the effect of creating a more comfortable learning space, thereby lowering student’s affective filters.

On the other side of the debate stand scholars such as Kayman (2004) who claims that one cannot separate a language from its culture and that communication must take top priority (p.19); therefore, at least in ESOL situations, the native-speaker teacher has the advantage of being a member of the target culture and completely understanding its conceptual nuances. Furthermore, Árva and Medgyes (2000), in a small-scale study comparing the two types of teacher in Budapest, found that “the primary advantage attributed to NESTs [Native English Speaking Teachers] lies in their superior English-language competence. Their superiority was said to be particularly spectacular in…using the language spontaneously and in the most diverse communicative situations” (p.360). In spite of this finding, researchers must not forget that much cultural information is encoded within the lexicon. Words or phrases containing a particularly heavy conceptual load such as “chicken out” contain the cultural information necessary to decode their meanings (Kecskes & Papp 2000). Therefore, if a student learns that “chicken out” means to surrender in a cowardly fashion, then some reference has been made to the American belief that chickens are cowardly animals, thus including a bit of cultural knowledge simply by defining the lexical item. The argument that a part of culture is embedded within the lexicon further muddies the differences between native-and non-native speakers, especially in the case of highly proficient non-native speakers.
In spite of the teacher’s native status, ELL students found the pedagogical ability of their instructors to be of primary importance in Pacek (2005). Post-instructional comments included: “… she is a good teacher,” and “her English is less idiomatic and her accent is not native, but she has good methods of explaining and teaching” (p. 253).

Further suggesting that the teacher’s qualifications and bilingualism are more vital than native-speaker status, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) found that students value NNSTs as “a resource of learning strategies throughout the process of learning English” (p. 234) and that “groups expressed their preoccupation about the lack of professional qualifications…on the part of NSTs” (p. 235).

If we consider the potential for a mismatch in what the NST and English language learner understand in terms of language, culture, appropriate classroom conduct, etc., we find that pedagogical skill becomes even more important. Discussing the significance of understanding in the classroom, O’Connor and Michaels (1996) state:

The quality of the teacher’s understanding of the student’s contribution limits…effectiveness…if the teacher cannot understand what the student is suggesting in terms of the current task, it will be very difficult to incorporate that contribution effectively…student learning will no doubt depend on the skill and the willingness with which the teacher incorporates student contributions into the ongoing building of new conceptual understanding (p. 97).

In this view, again, well-prepared NNSTs likely have the advantage over poorly-trained, less-skilful NSTs.

Adding her voice to the argument for an expanded view of teacher qualification beyond native status, Moussu (2010) proposes that “English proficiency and teaching
skills…no longer be defined by the ambiguous notion of *native* versus *nonnative* speaker, but should take into consideration the multilayered context in which the teaching is taking place” (p. 746). And even though “students assign memory and emotions to the concept of NST and NNST English teachers” (p. 750), Moussu sees student attitudes towards NSTs and NNSTs “changed by the end of the semester. The changes towards (NNSTs)…seemed to be more positive than the changes towards NSTs” (p. 760).

Moussu’s results suggest that there are numerous factors at play in students’ lived experiences in the classroom community, including teacher “personality, individual experience… background, and pedagogical skills” (p. 761), more relevant than their native statuses.

In opposition to a strict NS-NNS dichotomy, Medgyes (1992) reminds us that the practice of categorizing individuals as “native” or “nonnative” can be controversial in itself, because “there are as many…varieties of English as there are countries where English is spoken as a first or second language” (p.340). However, he goes on to assert that the distinction does exist, even if it is a case of blurred lines as opposed to sharp contrasts between categories (343). Furthermore, when one must create a classroom environment in which students can successfully learn a new language, many important considerations exist that weaken the claim of one type of teacher as superior by nature to another. “Variables such as experience, age, sex, aptitude, charisma, motivation, training, and so on play a decisive role in the teaching/learning process. As non-language-specific variables, they can apply to NSTs and NNSTs in equal measure” (p. 346).
Summary

Adult English Language Learners experience education both as individuals and as members of assorted communities of practice, including those of the EFL speaker in the society at large and student in the classrooms examined through this study. Motivated by personal and individual goals, the students who participated here represent similar adult ESOL students in classrooms across the US and Canada (Llurda, 2005b). As learners whose personal cognitive development has been varied and multiplex, they came together for the classroom sessions described here in a common desire to improve their communicative abilities in the target language. This study explored to what extent the presence of a NST or NNST in the language classroom affected these students and their learning and accomplishment of their goals.

The results of the studies included in this review led to the research questions formulated for this study, designed to examine student linguistic and affective behaviors and changes in student perceptions after instruction by both types of teacher. Thus, in this study, quantifying student production to examine lexical and metaphorical complexity and formulaic density, then viewing the statistical results through a lens of qualitative aspects of student production and, finally, examining questionnaires and revisiting student experiences through focus groups, has provided a rich description (Creswell, 2007) of the English language classrooms led by NSTs as opposed to NNSTs. This study in turn explored the effects of teachers as common ground emerged in the classroom community. It further adds to the above literature by characterizing and clarifying the student experience in classrooms led by both types of teacher.
In line with the literature surveyed above, I conclude that a socio-cognitive theoretical frame is best suited to the in-depth examination of the students’ language production and lived experience necessary to answer this study’s research questions.

**Theoretical framework**

Based on the literature, hypotheses, and research questions discussed here, I have examined the data collected for this study through a socio-cognitive lens (Kecskes, 2008, 2012, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009; Langer, 1986). The socio-cognitive view gives a strong supporting framework for the discussion of common ground in the classroom, since it merges egocentrism with cooperation to form a more complete perspective of the learner experience. Just as Grice (1957, 1975) claimed that communicative cooperation is a logical aspect of human behavior, so Keysar (2007) argues that communication proceeds in a “relatively egocentric” fashion (p. 71). In the socio-cognitive approach, both sides of natural human behavior—the cooperation designed to move communication along, and the egocentric processes ingrained in human cognition—combine in the actual situational context to create meaning on the spot. Thus, communication is considered “a dynamic process in which individuals are not only constrained by societal conditions but they also shape them at the same time” (Kecskes 2012, p. 176). As discussed above, participants in ELF communication—including the NNSTs and students in this study—make deliberate efforts to be cooperative in order to create community (Kecskes, 2007, 2014). Of course, NSTs and students also cooperate, but may do so with less conscious effort than that required by the many-layered filters that monitor speech in ELF interaction.
In other words, not only is all learning socially constructed—created in the interaction between learners and other community members in the learning environment—but also, cognition is “influenced by context and affect(s) the meanings that learners produce” (Langer, 1986). Based on both environmental and mental conditions, learning draws together the classroom participants’ preexisting thoughts, language patterns, and classroom behaviors with the effects of the environment found in each classroom. These environmental effects naturally include the presence and classroom behaviors of each individual teacher, whether native or nonnative, as well as the interaction among students, observers, and all official and unofficial members of the classroom community. Similar to the dynamism in classroom interaction outlined by Marton and Tsui (2004), the socio-cognitive approach proposes that “individuals rely both on pre-existing encyclopedic knowledge and knowledge created in the process of interaction” (Kecskes, 2012, p. 176).

In the ESOL classroom, there is rarely a common cultural base between students and teachers or even among the majority of students, who come from varied, numerous, linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The group must use the common ground found in the English linguistic system and the culture of the classroom space combined with each individual’s cognitive and linguistic contributions to create an environment in which communication and learning can occur. Thus, the socio-cognitive view is the most appropriate theoretical frame for this study because it presents a synergetic view “in which both core common ground (assumed shared knowledge, a priori mental representation) and emergent common ground (emergent participant resource, a post facto emergence through use) converge to construct a dialectical socio-cultural
background for communication” (Kecskes 2012, p. 190). The socio-cognitive approach essentially erases the debate between nature and nurture, often discussed in pragmatic research as cooperation vs. egocentrism or social constructivism vs. positivism. (Grice, 1957, 1975; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Keysar, 2007; Langer, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978). This approach allows reality to reside somewhere between these poles—neither nature nor nurture, but a bit of both. It integrates the two in a “holistic concept of communication” (Kecskes, 2014, p. 46).

As applied in this study, socio-cognitive theory sees students and instructors in the English language classroom bringing their prior understanding of cultural models and beliefs based on their L1 and (potentially limited) L2, LX… experiences. Then, all classroom participants interact to construct the classroom environment by applying the concepts, presuppositions, linguistic practices, educational experiences, and individual cultural norms that they bring with them to what they experience on the spot. This dynamic view of communication in the classroom, then, informs the analysis of students’ linguistic behaviors, affective behaviors, and opinions. We must examine all sides of student experience in order to effectively answer the research questions here. This is because the classroom contexts of both types of teacher, as socio-cultural spaces, can be considered arenas of cooperation in which teachers and students work together to perform communicative acts and achieve educational goals. The students’ ability, individual affect, preconceived ideas and previous experiences about language learning, including their opinions of teacher effectiveness and what makes a good learning environment, are brought to the experience through each one’s egocentric processes. Finally, the two sides are combined in the students’ lived experience of emerging common ground and the
development of a classroom community. The socio-cognitive approach is thus the most appropriate way to bring together two sides of the language learning and production discussion that, rather than being opposing viewpoints, are in reality two sides of the same coin.

To apply this theoretical framework to my study, it was necessary to develop a method that merged the students’ cognitive traits and processes with ongoing social interaction. The mixed methods design described in Chapter 3 was created to combine what the students brought to the classroom experience—in this case, their initial ability levels and preconceived notions of effective English teachers—along with the language they produced in the course of the classes under examination, and the conditions under which such language emerged.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I describe the research design of the present study, including procedures used to collect and analyze data. Additionally, I define the terminology and measures used here, describe the participants and setting, and specify what instruments were used to arrive at the data collected. Finally, I include an explanation of the ways in which the data collected is related to each research question.

Research design

The present study is analyzed using a mixed methods design, combining causal-comparative analysis with phenomenology (Creswell, 2007). Blending methodologies to scrutinize all sides of the important English language learning experience, this study examines not only what students produce (i.e., complex, formulaic, metaphorical language) but also how and under what conditions they produce it. In addition, using both quantitative and qualitative measures enhances the quality and credibility of the study (Patton, 2002, pp. 555-557). Specifically, in order to provide a rich description of the English classroom phenomenon (Creswell, 2007), I explore and discuss not only the linguistic product, but also the socio-cognitive processes through which this product is acquired, as interlocutors apply their personal cognitive mechanisms to the problem of social interaction.

Solving difficult problems involves a sophisticated, multi-dimensional progression of learning, which can be more readily understood through multi-faceted analysis. Similar to the microgenetic method, the present study focuses on the process of
learning as it “explores events moment by moment to capture the factors that…shape learning and growth” (Jadallah et al, 2011). This method helps to illuminate the processes that “give rise to both qualitative and quantitative aspects of change” (Siegler & Crowley, 1991, p. 606).

To properly examine the language production of the students in the present study, all classes were recorded and transcribed, then each sentence level utterance analyzed to determine the sentence complexity and metaphorical density of each student’s production as they interact with each teacher. Additionally, students provide samples of writing before and after instruction by both native speaker and non-native speaker teachers in turn, as described in the instrumentation section below. Student and teacher discourse is analyzed to examine “relevant details” (Gee, 2013) of the classroom talk—applying various aspects of how discourse is produced to make sense of what was produced. After comparing students’ performance in the two types of classroom, phenomenology is applied through the discussion group sessions in which research participants explored their “lived experience” (Creswell, 2007, p.59) as students in the classrooms of native and non-native speaker teachers. I then analyze the variables under study to compare student performance and experience in the two types of classroom (See Fig. 2).
1. Procedure

An important feature of the students’ cognitive processes is the level at which they can communicate in English upon arrival in the language classroom. This will have a noticeable impact on the socio-cultural environment in which communication takes place, as English is the lingua franca of the classroom and the solitary common mode of communication among all participants. Within the socio-cognitive theoretical frame, this is perhaps the only measurable preexisting cognitive trait brought by each individual to the group at its inception. One can imagine the confusion and perpetual misfire in communication that would occur if students had vastly different levels of English ability coming in to the six-week sessions. As discussed in Chapter 1, in the process of assigning students to various levels in the adult ESOL “clinic classes,” standardized placement testing was performed before the start of classes each semester. As part of their training
for the practicum, all TESOL Masters’ student teachers first learn consistent methods of evaluating students’ oral proficiency, put into practice during initial placement testing. This consists of evaluating basic communicative ability by requiring students to answer introductory questions (i.e., “what is your name,” “what is your hobby,” etc.) followed by increasingly more complex tasks such as using question forms in conversation, and, finally, describing activities shown in pictures.

An “advanced” level of language ability includes the presence of complex sentences, formulaic speech, and metaphorical language in the language learners’ discourse (Kecskes & Papp, 2003; Ortactepe, 2012). Using this definition, the intermediate and advanced groups observed here were made up of students with the potential to produce the linguistic features to be examined in this study. With this in mind, all students assigned to the advanced and intermediate levels were approached to provide informed consent for participation in this study (see Chapter 1, section 3.1, Ethical issues; also see Appendix A for a copy of the approved informed consent document). As directed by my university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), the focus discussion group held on the final day of classes was then explained to students, whom I then asked to volunteer as participants in these confidential discussions. An alternative classroom was provided for those students who wished to opt out of the discussion session. These consent procedures were necessary to preserve ethical treatment of the research participants, as perhaps the single most important factor in any research involving humans (Creswell, 2007; Maxwell, 2005; Patton, 2002).
2. Classroom discourse data collection

Examining the process of language production in the classroom “moment by moment to capture the factors…that shape learning and growth” as discussed above (Jadallah et al, 2010), each class session was video and audio recorded. First, a video camera was set up in the front corner of each room to record as much of the group as possible. Additionally, I made audio recordings from the rear of the room as a precautionary measure. Positioning any observers at the rear of the classroom was also designed to ensure as little researcher effect on the ordinary learning activities as possible.

After making the recordings, student and teacher interactions during the class periods were transcribed, and sentence-level utterances identified and analyzed for lexical complexity and formulaic and metaphorical density using the formulae defined below, modified from Kecskes and Papp (2003). Student language production in both the native and non-native speaker teachers’ classes was examined, combining data from the native speaker and non-native teacher speakers’ sessions respectively to control for differences in teacher experience, personality type, individual teaching style, etc. This was important because each teacher’s activities, although they were all focused on communicative language development, included varied degrees of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and grammar practice. Teachers were given a general framework for lessons, including a lesson plan template that recommended including varied activities to engage all types of learner, but the specific procedures in each classroom were determined by individual teachers in conjunction with their teams. For example, in line with a communicative,
content-based language learning approach (Snow, 2014) some teachers used classic literature as the core of their lessons, while others discussed global warming, finding a job, or culture shock. Once tentative lessons were planned, the teachers submitted them to practicum supervisors for approval. However, even though the supervisors made suggestions for improving or modifying each lesson as needed, there was still a great deal of variation based on the personal interests of teachers and students in each group.2

Once I had analyzed the sentence-level utterances for their grammatical and semantic properties, Microsoft Excel was used to find each student’s average performance with each teacher. Teacher means were then combined to determine the mean complexity, use of compound sentences, and formulaic density of each native status. This was followed by performing unpaired student’s t-tests to determine the statistical significance of each variable between NSTs and NNSTs. This quantitative analysis of each sentence-level utterance was necessary to thoroughly examine student language production with each type of teacher, in response to the first research question asking whether such production would differ depending on whether students were taught by a NST or NNST.

3. Written data collection

To collect writing samples, a baseline series of six consecutive pictures, which displayed a common scene of an injured soccer player’s trip to the hospital, was first provided to all students before their initial class session. After this original picture series, each writing prompt was carefully chosen based on the preceding teacher’s weekly

2 See Appendix H for selected transcripts, which provide examples of the types of activities and topics employed by each teacher, as well as demonstrating the coding used to analyze the data here.
topics. This was a deliberate strategy designed to help lower the students’ affective filters (Krashen, 1982) by providing a familiar topic, thereby increasing their potential to use rich and varied vocabulary in their writing. For example, when teachers discussed grocery shopping with their students, that week’s picture series depicted activities that occur in a grocery store during a typical shopping trip. After all the written data were collected, lexical richness and sentence complexity were analyzed as for the spoken data above, and the results compared to discover if student production differs in classes taught by NSTs and NNSTs. All students were given fifteen minutes to write as much as they could, and their stories collected and analyzed as detailed in the instrumentation section below. Those students who opted to participate in this study were assigned to one class, and those who chose not to participate assigned to another group, with the same educational opportunities given to both.

In the final class session of each week, after the teacher for the week had completed her or his lessons, students were given a new picture series based on the materials or topics explored during the week. Following the initial writing procedure, students had fifteen minutes to write as much as possible about the pictures. The stories were analyzed every week and results compiled to compare student production in each class and under both types of teacher. This process was repeated for each teacher, for a total of seven samples per student including the baseline. Microsoft Excel was again used as in the oral data analysis above, to provide a statistical overview of student writing samples by their teachers’ native status. Again, this level of quantitative analysis was important to ensure a full picture of the differences in student production when taught by NSTs and then NNSTs.

---

3 See Appendix G for the picture sequences used to obtain each writing sample.
4. Discussing the classroom experience

As a qualitative measure to help discover students’ feelings and opinions related to studying with NSTs and NNSTs, a focus group discussion was held during the final week of each program. Those students who volunteered for the focus group discussed their experiences and beliefs regarding both types of teacher as well as any effect the exposure to both provided by these class sessions may have had on their opinions. ⁴

This discussion was video and audio recorded and field notes taken during the group meeting. The recordings and notes were analyzed to provide an overall view of the students’ classroom experiences with NSTs and NNSTs, and to determine what, if any, differences exist between the two types of classroom. These results were then used to inform the quantitative findings, providing an overall picture of the students’ lived experience in both types of classroom.

To preserve ethical treatment of the research participants, students who did not wish to participate in the discussion group had the option of completing a short-answer form answering the same questions discussed during the focus group. These short answer responses were included in the results and discussion section in the same way as the focus group results, with the purpose of helping to inform the study regarding students’ lived experience. If students did not choose to participate in the discussion group or respond to the short-answer questions, they were offered an alternative class of the same proficiency level for the time in which this data was collected.

⁴ See Appendix F for the focus group interview questions.
Definitions and analytical models

To help clarify the terminology and methods of analysis used here, I now include the following definitions, measures, and analytical models, as key components of the analysis detailed in this chapter.

For the purpose of this study, formulaic language is defined as in Kecskes (2007): “multi-word collocations which are stored and retrieved holistically rather than being generated de novo with each use” (p.187). Formulaic expressions include the following categories: Grammatical units, fixed semantic units, phrasal verbs, speech formulas, situation-bound utterances, and idioms. Collocations differ in that they were used as grammatical units during the online discourse of the class in progress, but are not fixed semantical units; that is, not always defined in the same way in other contexts. All of the preceding units of speech are situated on what Kecskes (2007) labeled the “formulaic continuum” (Figure 3). Formulaic units produced during the course of this study often included speech formulae that had been modeled by the teachers, which students were then expected to use in the ways modeled, in addition to those previously acquired and brought to the classroom community by students.5

Figure 3: Formulaic Continuum (Kecskes, 2007, p. 193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Units</th>
<th>Fixed Semantic Units</th>
<th>Phrasal Verbs</th>
<th>Speech Formulas</th>
<th>Situation-Bound Utterances</th>
<th>Idioms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be going to</td>
<td>as a matter of fact</td>
<td>put up with</td>
<td>going shopping</td>
<td>welcome aboard</td>
<td>kick the bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to</td>
<td>suffice it to say</td>
<td>get along with</td>
<td>not bad</td>
<td>help yourself</td>
<td>spill the beans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 See Appendix B for the corpus of frequently observed formulaic language and collocations used by students during this study.
As modeled in Kecskes and Papp (2003), the level of formulaic language and collocation use was measured with a simple ratio of total instances of formulaic units divided by total sentence-length utterances, and percentages of formulaic language used in the two classrooms was then compared. For example, if a student’s complete turn at talk contains four sentences but only one use of formulaic language, the formulaic language level for this student’s turn is ¼ or .25. If the student uses formulaic language in two sentences, then the level is ½ or .50. One important detail of this analysis is that only the first instance of each speech formula or collocation in each class was considered in arriving at the ratios mentioned here. For example, some students used the term “O.K.” numerous times during a class session; nevertheless, it was only counted as one use of formulaic language.

Metaphorical density was assessed by the same comparison, namely, a simple ratio. As defined in Kecskes and Papp (2003), metaphorical density is the use of unique metaphorical (or non-literal) expressions divided by total sentences (MET/TS) in much the same way as formulaic language discussed above. Metaphorical language is an important measure of language learning, as it shows development of the conceptual base in the target language (Kecskes & Papp, 2000, 2003). By definition, “non-literal” metaphorical speech demonstrates a command of the underlying concepts as opposed to the transparent nature of literal speech. Native speakers of a language include such speech unconsciously, without effort, and as such provide “native likeness” models to L2 learners with whom they converse (Árva & Medgyes, 2000). In the absence of such models, L2 learners tend to use semantically transparent language, the safer option when one is striving to be understood. In the NST classroom, students have confidence that the
teacher—seen as an “expert” in his or her mother tongue—is providing an accurate and appropriate pattern of speech for students wishing to conform to the larger L2 environment (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Kecskes, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2004). Thus, to answer the question of whether student language will differ in the classrooms of NSTS or NNSTs, this study includes metaphorical language as an important conceptual measure of language.

To analyze the complexity of language used by students in classrooms of NS teachers and NNS teachers, students’ utterances were evaluated for the ratio of subordinate clauses to the total number of sentence-level utterances. The use of subordination “requires the formation of higher-order, complex sentences” (Nesbitt Perez, 2013, p.61) and as such is a more advanced skill among English language learners. Therefore, if a student has six sentence-level utterances during a given class session, and utters two subordinate clauses during the six sentences, her or his language complexity ratio would be 2:6, or .333. The use of coordinating conjunctions to create compound sentences was also tallied and included in the total complexity measure, contrasted with the simple sentence structures that lack either type of conjunction.

1. Analyst triangulation

One means employed to address potential threats to validity in this study was analyst triangulation (Patton, 2002). Instead of relying on one researcher’s view of the data, “multiple analysts [were] used to review findings” (p. 556). Thus, after I applied each measure described above, the transcripts were analyzed by one of three research assistants to ensure that every complex or compound sentence, speech formula,
metaphorical use of language, or collocation was counted, and the appropriate statistical measures employed during analysis. I then reviewed each of their re-coded transcripts to ensure complete coverage of each variable in this study. This was to ensure that every occurrence of the aforementioned speech features was appropriately assigned to the data analysis. Furthermore, the terms and phrases deemed “formulaic” or collocative” were collected in a corpus of formulaic speech (included in Appendix B), and all transcripts repeatedly searched for each speech formula and collocation throughout the course of analysis.

2. Combining measures for analysis

In the process of tallying student production, there was often a great deal of overlap in the use of speech formulae, collocations, and metaphorical terms, particularly in the oral data. Additionally, compound and complex sentences often overlapped in student production, predominantly in the messy realm of naturally occurring classroom speech. Thus, in the oral and written production analysis, additional guidelines for analyzing formulaic and complex speech were defined. To examine each student’s ability to produce formulaic speech, all items on the formulaic continuum (Kecskes, 2007) were combined in a third column, labeled “Total features on the formulaic continuum,” to indicate their use of natural, everyday English. Furthermore, since both complex and compound sentences demonstrate a speaker’s level of grammatical sophistication in language use, the two measures of grammatical sophistication were combined in an additional column labeled “Total complexity.” Each of the above facets of the student production is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
Sample

1. Participant selection

As discussed in Chapter 1, adult education, particularly through elective courses such as those designed to improve a language other than one’s mother tongue, often suffers from challenges inherent in the learners’ complicated and busy lives as students, regardless of their high level of motivation to learn English, balance demands placed on their time by family and job responsibilities (Cardoza, 2013; Phipps, Prieto, & Ndinguri, 2013).

The students in the adult ESOL classes surveyed here were not immune to these problems common in adult education; thus, each class had its share of sporadic attendance and attrition. In all three years of the data collection, a broad variety of demographic characteristics was seen among participating students. Both men and women attended the classes, although women outnumbered men 2:1 overall. The youngest student was 20, and the oldest in her 50s. The most students in one occupation (8) were serving as one-year au pairs to families in the surrounding community. Other students were graduate students at the university, laborers at various community industries, housekeepers, homemakers, and an elementary teacher. Among those who were permanent residents, there was a broad variety in time spent in the US.—some had arrived only a few weeks before classes began; others had lived in the U.S. for several years. The students’ educational levels ranged from those who had already earned advanced degrees in their home countries, to those who had little formal education. Furthermore, they represented numerous countries and languages of origin. See Table 2 for a list of students’ countries and languages.
Table 2: *Student Nationalities and Primary Languages*\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Primary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Swahili + French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyung-Mi</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keitaro</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho-Hee</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Mandinka + French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Student nationalities and primary languages were self-identified; therefore, one student identified as both Puerto Rican and Dominican, while two identified as bilingual in their indigenous and colonial languages.
To ensure reliability of the results, only production from those students who attended more than half of the potential class sessions was included in the statistical and qualitative analysis. Thus, all students represented in the oral data results attended at least fourteen of the possible eighteen class sessions for each year included in this study. Additionally, those students whose work was included in the written results provided at least four of the seven potential written samples. These students participated in a majority of the classes offered, and thus were considered fully invested members of the classroom community (Cazden, 2001; Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick 1992). In sum, twenty-three students were included in the oral and written data collected for this study.

2. Teacher training

As shown in the “Participants in the study” section of Chapter 1, the teachers observed here were very diverse, coming from different countries, age groups, and levels of experience, and including both men and women. The teachers’ previous training had been quite varied, as well, including those who were taught to keep strict control over the classroom by using timers and agendas, in contrast to those who had been thrust into teaching with minimal formal training. Additionally, the four teachers with no experience had no teacher training prior to enrolling in the MS TESOL classes in which the adult ESOL clinic was a practicum requirement.

This variation may have had the potential to impact English language learner students’ classroom experiences. However, the TESOL clinic was partnered with a comprehensive TESOL methodology course, taught by a university professor who had a great deal of experience teaching in US schools, using methods based on “best practices”
as seen in US educational research. During each academic year, all Master’s students participated in these methodology classes for several weeks before clinic class training began, in order to develop a common theoretical foundation.

Prior to teaching in any of the clinics, the Master’s students were then given the same training in practical strategies for teaching the adult learners they would soon encounter. They were further instructed in lesson planning and implementation, as well as ways to observe and provide feedback to their colleagues in order to help each one improve his or her classroom practice. Finally, in addition to observations by their peers, each teacher was observed and given feedback by experienced ESOL instructors tasked with overseeing the clinics and mentoring the teachers. Thus, the training process for all teachers regardless of their previous experience was consistent, thorough, and ongoing before and during the six-week class sessions.

3. Advanced-level classroom discourse samples

The adult ESOL “clinic” classes evaluated in this study are very much like those taught by TESOL graduate students in Masters’ programs at more than 170 universities throughout the United States and Canada (Llurda, 2005b, p.133). For example, programs similar to that observed in this study include teachers who are enrolled in TESOL methodology courses concurrently with their practicum experience. The student teachers plan and implement their classes under the supervision of experienced, qualified ESOL instructors, who give continual feedback and guidance to help the student teachers improve their practice as they work toward their Masters’ degrees.
Such programs are typically located in metropolitan areas with high levels of immigration, often including refugee centers and other community programs designed to help newcomers become acclimated to life in the U.S. Therefore, the students who attend English clinic classes at the participating universities come from diverse national and linguistic backgrounds, similar to those seen here.

Thus, a purposive sample of the entire population of the advanced adult ESOL “clinic class” during the spring 2010 semester was observed and recorded. A similar purposive sample was observed during the fall 2012 semester. These classes included between five and fifteen students, depending on the attendance on a given day; as discussed in the previous section, attendance was often sporadic. This factor led to the sampling methods discussed above for determining which students’ language production would be reported in this study. Advanced-level students were observed as opposed to those from beginner and intermediate programs since, based on the pilot study discussed in the instrumentation section below, their command of the English language facilitated clearer communication, thus ensuring greater test validity and reliability.

4. Written production samples

The fall 2011 students were intermediate-level adult ELLs whose writing ability and command of English writing conventions was sufficient to collect samples of meaningful written language, and to analyze the written samples for changes in the students’ lexical and syntactical complexity. Additionally, those fall 2012 advanced-level students who participated in the observational data collection were given the option of producing written samples to be analyzed for this study. All ten of the participating
students opted to provide weekly written samples. In both groups, student writing was analyzed for formulaic language and sentence complexity in the same manner as the oral production, and a final intensive writing class session, based on the students’ strengths and challenges as evidenced in the written data, was provided to participants in both cohorts on the final day of classes.

Finally, as a measure to ensure the highest ethical standards, all students were given an option to join a different intermediate or advanced level classroom in which no research was being conducted, throughout the course of this study.

**Instrumentation**

The classes observed here were adult English classes for community members held at a large Upstate New York university. As described in detail in the *Educational Environment* section of Chapter 1, these courses are offered to all residents of the region over the age of 18 who wish to improve their conversational English ability. They also provide hands-on experience for developing educators enrolled in the University’s TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) Master of Science program. As discussed above, such programs typically include a practicum or student teaching component so that pre-service teachers can plan and implement effective classes under the supervision of experienced TESOL professionals (see Llurda, 2005b). In such programs, students from around the world wishing to earn advanced degrees in TESOL or TEFL must teach several hours of adult ESOL classes before completing their degrees. The practicum that includes the adult ESOL “clinic classes” described in this study is one such language cooperative language education experience.
In the following section, I describe the specific instrumentation used to answer each research question. For clarification, Table 3 provides an overview of the data collection process.

Table 3: *Timeline of Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection period</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to classes</td>
<td>Placement testing</td>
<td>Placement testing</td>
<td>Placement testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>Initial opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>Initial opinion questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class day</td>
<td>Initial opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>Initial writing sample collected</td>
<td>Initial writing sample collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral production observed &amp; recorded</td>
<td>Weekly writing samples collected</td>
<td>Weekly writing samples collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final opinion Questionnaire</td>
<td>Final opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>Final opinion questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final class day</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relating collected data to research questions**

The quantitative and qualitative measures discussed in the previous section relate to each research question in the manner outlined below. In addition, students participated in a focus discussion group to help shed light on their lived experience in both the NST and NNST classrooms across the scope of this study. Thus, student conversation during these discussions was used to facilitate deeper understanding of the environment in which quantitative and qualitative data analyzed in response to each research question were
produced. Specifically, the focus groups included discussion of students’ previous experiences with NSTs and NNSTs, their opinions of both types of teacher, and any change in such opinions affected by their participation in the adult ESOL clinic class program under study here. Additionally, students who chose not to participate in the discussion sessions were asked to complete a short-answer form containing the questions asked during the focus group, and their responses were similarly included in the discussion of findings in Chapter 4 below. The focus group questions were based on the questionnaire used during the pilot study, discussed under research question #2. As with the first and third research questions, the quantitative change in opinion seen in response to research question #2 was illuminated by the group discussion of such change, as students explained their reactions to and feelings about each teacher and category of teacher. The level of understanding thus attained in this study would have been impossible without hearing directly from the students in the focus group setting.

I now turn to a summary of the research questions, and the procedures used to explore each one.

1. Research Question #1

To answer the first research question, “Does language production of students differ in any way if they are taught by a NST or a NNST? If so, what strategies contribute to these differences?,” the spring 2010 and fall 2012 groups of advanced adult ESOL students were observed and recorded in classrooms taught by both NS and NNS teachers, as described above. The following analytical procedures were then implemented.
1.1. Quantitative analysis of production

To quantify student language production, the classroom video recordings were transcribed and sentence-level utterances (SLUs) evaluated for lexical richness, analyzing formulaic language use as well as that of common collocations. Next, SLUs were examined to determine the level of metaphorical speech included in student production. Finally, I analyzed the transcripts for sentence complexity, evaluating student production of subordinate or coordinate clauses within each sentence, employing the in-depth quantitative measures described in the analytical model section above.

In addition to spoken language production, written production was included in my analysis to offer a fuller picture of the language students would produce under the direction of NSTs as compared to NNSTs. Students from the 2011 and 2012 samples wrote brief stories based on a series of pictures showing people engaged in everyday activities. A baseline story was written at the beginning of the first class session, before students had any exposure to either type of teacher. Weekly assessments of student writing were then collected after each teacher had finished her or his classes, and the students’ work analyzed for the same features as discussed in the preceding classroom discourse data collection section.

1.2. Qualitative analysis of production

After enumerating the students’ language production using these rigorous quantitative measures, I then examined each interaction to answer the question of what teacher practices might contribute to the differences in student production. While socio-cognitive theory includes the individual’s egocentric perspective, knowledge and beliefs
in and contributions to the conversation or interaction under study (Keysar, 2007), it also acknowledges the role of social processes in emergent common ground (Kecskes, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). The teachers’ behaviors in the classroom, then, will have an important effect on the language individual students produce. The teacher’s identity is defined on the spot as he or she positions himself in relation to the other conversational participants—in this case, the students (Harré & Langenhove, 1999). In line with Wenger (1998), who found that effective teachers fully engage students in the classroom community, Hallenbeck Nadeau (2008) found that different teacher positioning through the use of different illocutionary acts caused different classroom climates. For example, the first teacher (T1), whose classroom position was “central actor,”

- utilized directives as opposed to assertives
- utilized command forms as opposed to suggestions
- positioned himself as the classroom authority
- overall, had a greater use of commissives and greater amount of teacher talk

On the other hand, the second teacher (T2), whose role was that of “facilitator,”

- used more assertives, few directives
- had a tendency to hold off assertions until her students had given their input
- positioned herself as less authoritative
- used indirect speech acts with more frequency than T1
- preferred suggestions over commands
- encouraged more student participation in the class.
In Teacher 2’s classroom, students participated much more, including taking longer and more frequent turns. Additionally, students who were silent in T1’s class participated in T2’s class.

Based on the observations from the aforementioned study as well as “best practices” for language teaching (see Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Nguyen, 2007; Langer, 1986), the transcripts were examined to find patterns of teacher practices or behaviors, discovering that different pedagogical strategies were used in classrooms where students exhibited more lexically rich, syntactically complex, and metaphorically dense language.

These quantitative and qualitative measures were employed to explore the students’ classroom experiences at a level not possible by simply quantifying their production or examining their speech patterns during classroom conversation (Patton, 2002).

2. Research Question #2

The second question, “Does participation in classes taught in turn by NSTs and NNSTs cause students to modify their beliefs and perceptions of teacher qualifications, as common ground emerges over the course of the class sessions?” was analyzed solely through quantitative measures. At the beginning of each six-week ESOL class session included in this study, students filled out an anonymous questionnaire when they took their placement tests for the various groups. They completed a second, identical questionnaire after their classes ended on the final day of each session. As discussed next, the questionnaires administered to students for this dissertation were modified from a
questionnaire used in Thomas’ (1995) survey of learner attitudes toward NSTs and NNSTs of English, and again modified following the pilot study (detailed below) I conducted in 2009.

2.1. Pilot Study

Since the content of this questionnaire was crucial to the validity and reliability of this study, I tested its initial version in the adult ESOL classes held during the spring semester of 2009. As in the final version, the purpose of the pilot was to determine any change in student opinions after exposure to both NSTs and NNSTs. However, it also served to ensure student comprehension of the questionnaire items. During the pilot, students completed questionnaires regarding their opinions on NS and NNS teachers’ effectiveness during the first week of their classes. They were then asked to complete the same questionnaires when the program ended. The results of both surveys were compared to determine the amount and direction of change, if any, in student beliefs about English teachers.

Additionally, since the questionnaire was developed specifically for the pilot study, an analysis of the effectiveness of each item in accurately measuring student’s opinions was performed to ensure test validity and reliability.

Upon completing the pilot, I discovered that most students changed their opinions about English teachers, placing less importance on the teachers’ native status after instruction than they had before taking the course. However, one important difference between the pilot and the final study was that all students enrolled in the program, regardless of their levels of English proficiency, were included in the initial survey. The
results of the pilot indicated that many students failed to understand and respond to each question appropriately, and in fact, some students did not appear to comprehend any of the questions, but simply marked the same number for all Likert-style items across the board. The students who did this also ignored the open-ended items on the questionnaire, perhaps indicating that what was actually being tested was their English literacy level, and that they did not understand what was being asked of them.

Based on this problem with the written questionnaires, I subsequently limited the dissertation questionnaire sample to students who had begun the classes at intermediate or advanced proficiency levels. I further simplified the individual questions to increase their comprehensibility.\(^7\) Given the potential for problems with written communication seen in the pilot, the open-ended items were removed from the questionnaires. Instead, these questions were modified and added to the focus group discussions included in the final study.

Additionally, in response to the apparent confusion between the terms “native” and “non-native” noted in the pilot study, I defined these terms in the heading of the questionnaire and the first time they appeared in the focus group questions, to alleviate any further misunderstanding. These modifications were crucial to the final dissertation questionnaires as appropriate tools for measuring change in student opinion.

2.2. Analysis of the questionnaires

Therefore, the revised pre-test questionnaires were administered only to advanced and intermediate-level students during all three years of the study, and their responses compiled to find collective measures for each question. During the final week of classes,\(^7\) See Appendix E for the modified questionnaire.
students were given the same questionnaire, their responses compiled and compared to their pre-course responses, and an unpaired t-test performed to discover any significant changes in opinion. The results of this questionnaire analysis are discussed in the findings included in Chapter 5.

3. Research Question #3

In order to address the third research question, “Will changes in students’ affective filters be reflected in any way in their language production?” the recorded observational data was analyzed a second time. Since a lower affective filter should increase L2 production (Krashen, 1982; Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014), increased conversation between interlocutors should lead to emergent common ground as they communicate more and exchange ideas and concepts (Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Increased common ground results in greater rapport; in turn, heightened rapport is characterized by equal footing (Goffman, 1979; Nguyen, 2007; Tannen, 1990). Thus, students with lower affective filters should have not only longer turns, but also more substantive turns, which consist of full, complete sentences. These two facets of meaningful communication can be viewed through both quantitative and qualitative lenses.

3.1. Quantitative analysis of affective linguistic features

Overall student participation in class discussions was quantified using a ratio of the number of sentence length utterances divided by the total turns at talk (Utterances/Turns). This ratio shows the pace of student speech while demonstrating the
breadth of their contributions to the conversational common ground. Next, the number of student questions asked during class, identified in Chapter 1 as an affective indication of student engagement, was tallied and the resulting totals compared for differences between NSTs and NNSTs.

3.2. Qualitative analysis of affective linguistic features

Finally, the qualitative aspects of interaction were examined for the purpose of demonstrating lowered affective filters. These included turn-taking, interruption, and overall pace of student speech. Furthermore, the analysis included practices teachers used, in addition to setting the pace of speech, that were designed to lower students’ affective filters, and build rapport, such as humor and games (Bell, 2005; Leiguarda de Orue, 2009; Nguyen, 2007). It was also important to look at the use of positioning as students and teachers spoke, creating or discouraging rapport in the classroom (Fiksdal, 1988).

Once again, to elaborate on the features seen in the course of conversation, the short answer and discussion group responses were evaluated to further explore the affective aspects of students’ lived experience, as detailed in the research design section above. Themes relating to student experience and opinion, including comfort level, views on teacher effectiveness, opinions on native vs. non-native teachers, and thoughts about what teacher qualities and classroom practices are most important, were coded and discussed in the qualitative analysis. The focus group data was particularly important and relevant in answering the third research question, as the lowered affective filter is inextricably bound up with students’ perceptions of their experiences. The rapport and
empathy students feel, which causes them to have more confidence in speaking the target language, are in part a result of their experiences in each classroom with each type of teacher. Thus, it was vital to include student opinions as expressed in the focus group discussions in order to understand their lived classroom experience.

**Summary**

The mixed methods approach used to apply the socio-cognitive theoretical framework here is described in complete detail in Chapters 4-6. To fully describe the “dynamic process” (Kecskes, 2012) of emerging common ground in the classroom communities under study, I include the varied aspects of student production and teacher practice as outlined in this chapter. The socio-cognitive view merges egocentrism with social interaction to form a more complete understanding of the English language classroom; thus, the mixed measures included here act as lenses through which common ground developed in the classroom can be best scrutinized. And because all learning is created in the interaction between learners and other community members (Langer, 1986), I examine ways in which participation was promoted or suppressed—but also, ways individual cognition appeared as an influence in student language production described below. The students’ “lived experience” (Creswell, 2007) in the present study was one of emergent common ground, developed through the language, within the setting of the classroom community of practice, in spite of cultural and cognitive differences.

In the results that follow, then, I demonstrate how the research questions have been answered with a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, to examine
specific linguistic features students produced under the direction of NSTs and NNSTs in their respective classrooms. Furthermore, I discuss how the conditions and surrounding classroom environment influenced language production, and finally, the students’ reactions to their lived experience as common ground emerges in the linguistic environment of the adult ESOL classroom.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS:
RESEARCH QUESTION 1/ HYPOTHESIS A

In this chapter, I outline and discuss the data collected during the course of the present study as it relates to the first research question:

*Does language production of students differ in any way if they are taught by a NST or a NNST? If so, what teacher strategies contribute to these differences?*

Based on the preexisting literature reviewed in Chapter 2, I hypothesized that:

*Native-speaker teachers’ greater level of proficiency in English will encourage students to produce utterances with more lexical richness and metaphorical and syntactical complexity.*

As described in Chapter 3, I first analyze the use of formulaic, metaphorical, and complex language in relation to this research question and its corresponding hypothesis, and then present an in-depth analysis of the qualitative findings relevant to student language production in both types of classroom.

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

1. *The use of formulaic language*

   The use of formulaic language, important to “nativelikeness” but often absent in ELF communication (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Firth, 1996; Kecskes, 2007; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009), is an integral part of everyday communication regardless of the language employed. However, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, this may be a great deal more difficult in class sessions with NNSTs than with NSTs, as the use of speech formulas or other non-literal lexical items can potentially serve as a barrier to understanding. The
socio-cognitive approach demonstrates that students (as interlocutors) will bring preexisting concepts to play in classroom conversation, thus causing a deficit in core common ground that must be overcome by emergent common ground (Kecskes, 2001, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Additionally, if the student is unsure of a teacher’s or another student’s ability to understand a particular speech formula, then he or she will opt for a more literal lexical item to ensure mutual understanding (Firth, 1996). This is why, as interlocutors become more accustomed to other members of the classroom community, formulaic language use can serve as an indicator of emergent common ground (Claus, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009).

Of course, since the interaction takes place in the target language environment, students may be even more likely to consider NSTs as formulaic language experts than they would in an EFL environment. To answer the first research question, I thus hypothesized that lexical items appearing on the formulaic continuum (Kecskes, 2007) would be more prevalent in classes led by NSTs. Below, I will first examine the quantitative data showing NST and NNST classroom differences in the use of formulaic and collocative items, followed by a discussion of qualitative data to indicate the conditions and ways in which students produced formulaic language.

To clarify the concepts of “formulaic speech” and “collocations” as applied to this study, those utterances considered formulaic are found among the four highest categories on Kecskes’ (2007) *Formulaic Continuum* (see Figure 3 above). These include *phrasal verbs* (e.g., “come on,” “make up”), *speech formulas*, *situation-bound utterances*, and *idioms*. Terms of this sort are used and processed as chunks, and their components are not interchangeable with other similar parts of speech. For example, if one substitutes the
preposition “over” for “up” in a phrasal verb, the meaning of the phrase changes altogether (e.g., “pick over” vs. “pick up”). Collocations, for the purposes of this study, are grammatical units. Those frequently observed in this study include “I don’t know” and “I’m not good at (+noun)”. There are many versions of each of these collocations; although they often occur together, their parts are quite interchangeable.\(^8\)

1.1. Formulaic language production in the oral data

As shown in Table 4, features of language found on the formulaic continuum—that is, use of speech formulas and collocations—were higher in classes taught by NSTs during the first year of this study. This initially confirmed the hypothesis that students would produce more formulaic speech than was seen in classes led by NNSTs. On the other hand, striking differences between the 2012 and 2010 data can also be seen. Most significantly for the discussion here, students produced more formulaic language in NNST classes during the fall 2012 semester. This suggests that the differences noticed between the two years may be connected to other attributes and practices, rather than the teachers’ native status alone. These teacher practices and other variables will be explored further in the qualitative discussion to follow.

Finally, combining the oral production data from both the 2010 and 2012 classrooms, we can see that the mean production of speech features on the formulaic continuum, including both formulaic speech and collocations, varies little between the two types of teacher. However, in line with Árva & Medgyes (2000) and Firth (1996),

\(^8\) Appendix B includes a corpus of the most-frequently observed formulaic expressions and collocations in this study.
formulaic and collocative language production is still slightly higher when students work with native-speaking teachers, in spite of the leveling effects of the 2012 data.

Table 4: Oral Formulaic Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NST</th>
<th>NNST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NNST</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Comb St dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010(^9) formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.0442</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 collocations</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.0732</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 collocations</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined collocations</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Formulaic language production in the written data

As seen in Table 5, in the 2011 written data, in no case was there significantly more lexically rich production in students’ writing samples after working with NSTs. In opposition to the hypothesis and oral results, students were able to produce more total

\(^9\) Appendix C includes complete student production tables for all measures.
speech formulae in their writing after working with NNSTs. The 2012 written results were quite similar to those seen in 2011. Notable differences between the written and oral data were that students’ writing included not only more complex grammar but also more formulaic language after participating in classes led by NNSTs.

Finally, the combined 2011 and 2012 written formulaic language data reinforces the observation that students produced more grammatical complexity and formulaic and metaphorical density after NNST instruction, contrary to hypothesis A.

Table 5: Written Formulaic Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NST</th>
<th>NNST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NNST</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Comb St dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 collocations</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 collocations</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined formulaic speech</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined collocations</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined total formulaic continuum</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the low occurrence of formulaic language in students’ written production suggests important differences in the nature of written and oral language production, as opposed to suggesting differences in what student write after exposure to NSTs or NNSTs. As will be discussed in section 1.8, students produced very little formulaic or metaphorical language of any sort in their written work, suggesting that these measures may not be a valid indicator of the differences in teacher influence when evaluating written production in a small sample, such as that observed in this study.

Relating qualitative data to quantitative data: formulaic language

A. Teachers’ native status related to formulaic language use

One aspect of the differences in formulaic language between NSTs and NNSTs in this study includes the inability of NNSTs to engage fully in the historical and cultural foundations of the linguistic environment. Having lived in another culture, and having used another language from birth, NNSTs who have little experience with the target culture face difficulty when they try to assimilate idioms that have been handed down from one generation to the next of L1 speakers. This can result in confusion and gaps in the formulaic knowledge base of the NNST (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Kayman, 2004; Kecskes, 2007). As members of different cultures, the speakers in NNST classrooms have little core common ground; thus, there may be misunderstanding in mismatches between what interlocutors believe to be most salient to their co-conversants (House, 2003; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). In the socio-cognitive approach, these common threads will be created within the classroom culture, but initial encounters and attempts at creating understanding may be rather precarious. In the present study, when NNSTs initially tried to incorporate idioms in their lessons, students were sometimes left a bit
confused. For example, the teacher in Oral Sample 1, praised as one of the best in the 2010 cohort by several students, still experienced misunderstanding when he attempted to use idioms in his lesson. His classes were polished, his lessons were extremely student-focused, and his topic (writing résumés and looking for a job) was perfect for the mixed group of young adult learners in his class. However, students were slow to participate in the getting-to-know-you sequence in his initial lesson. In discussing student’s names and their etymologies, he attempted to include an idiom that his students had never heard. One student, attempting to guess what the teacher referred to, provided the more common ending to “Give a dog”— proffering the answer, “a bone?” The teacher’s intended phrase, although more relevant to the topic of names and their meanings, was so outdated in common American English that none of the students had ever heard of it. His awkward attempt at defining the unfamiliar formula is demonstrated by pauses at lines 6, 8, and 10, following the students’ failure to guess at its meaning.

**Oral Sample 1: From 4-6-2010: NNST “NA”**

1 T: Now, I have given you my name, and what it means, in many communities in many cultures, names mean something. Alright? So I need you to say—somebody, finish this ((writes on board)) Give a dog…
2 Fleuriste: a bone?
3 T: Nope. Give a dog? Somebody?
4 6 (3) ((general whispering, no one responds))
5 T: Give a dog a bad name—and what? How does the saying go in English? Give a dog a bad name and? (3) and hang it. OK. And hang it ((writes “and hang it” on board)). What does that mean? (.) Give a dog a bad name and hang it (2) I tend to think, that names mean things
The teacher did not find any students who understood the idiom, so he moved on in his lesson after writing in on the board.

In Oral Sample 2 below, the NNS teacher was not simply using an unfamiliar idiom, but trying to teach idioms directly. This is generally a bad idea unless the teacher is at an extremely high level of cultural fluency, as the inevitable misfires in understanding are likely to occur (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Medgyes, 1992). In this case, the otherwise excellent instructor’s students began to challenge her knowledge as the exercise developed. The misunderstanding occurred at line 7, as the teacher provided the wrong meaning for an idiom (in the soup). However, when a student tried to use this knowledge later in the activity, the teacher corrected the student’s mistake without realizing that her earlier definition had caused the problem. She then explains the correct response using an incorrect definition.

**Oral Sample 2: From 3-18-2010: NNST “QH”**

1. **Nikola:** ((reading)) “As cool as a cucumber, in the soup, full of beans, the cream of the crop.”
2. **T:** …Try to go with elimination so—which one we eliminate?
3. **Nikola:** B?
4. **T:** B? Why B?
5. **Nikola:** Why soup?
6. **T:** In a soup like--((snaps her fingers)) “In a soup.” Fast.
7. **Ruben:** ((reading)) “I explained (briefly) what my friend needed to know but he still was not satisfied.” a “in a nutshell,” b “out of the frying pan and into the fire,” c “into the soup,” d “as cool as a cucumber.”
8. **T:** OK. Very briefly.
9. **Nikola:** Very quickest?
As in Oral Sample 1, the teacher in this sample has attempted to use idioms that her students are unfamiliar with, some of which are not in common use in everyday American English conversations. The danger of attempting to teach formulaic language is that items on the far right end of the formulaic continuum, such as idioms or slang, (Kecskes, 2007, p.193) have not become lexicalized in the same way as those on the left (e.g., phrasal verbs). Idioms may quickly become outdated, and may drop out of the lexicon altogether.

Furthermore, as discussed by Árva and Medgyes (2000), McNeill (2005), and Pacek (2005), among others, non-native speakers of English who learn the language in an outer circle or expanding circle country (Kachru, 1985) typically receive their instruction from members of their own culture. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), as a “World English” form, has nuanced differences depending on where one learns it (Kayman, 2004; Mauranen, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2004). As Firth (1996) notes, ELF is “unidiomatic…marked by dysfluencies…and infelicities” (p. 239).

Here, when teachers who are not members of the target culture include idioms in their classroom activities, two infelicitous scenarios occur. In the first scenario, demonstrated here in Oral Sample 1, the (outer-circle) Kenyan instructor has adopted an idiom that has been outdated in—or perhaps never adopted by—the target culture, because
the teacher is unaware of this idiom’s absence in contemporary American English. This is because “Give a dog a bad name…” has become part of his English language learner culture, in a limited geographical region, unconnected with the originating country. The learner becomes a teacher and presents his idiom to the class in an ESOL setting, only to find that none of the students—or the native speakers with whom he attempts to use his idiom—has ever heard of the phrase at hand.

In the second scenario, recounted in Oral Sample 2, an expanding-circle Italian teacher is very aware of her limitations in the area of idiomatic speech. Thus, the teacher uses the internet to find idiom resources, such as lists of common animal-related idioms, food idioms, sports idioms, etc. However—such lists are flawed, by either being connected to a target culture different from the one in which the teacher is working, or by being simply outdated. The teacher, not being a member of the target culture, does not recognize such flaws, cannot sort common speech formulas from those that either are used only in a different culture or are outdated, and presents the material as it is written. In the end, although the teacher spent a great deal of time preparing her materials, she simply could not recognize them as flawed. Furthermore, she clearly did not know the precise meaning of each idiom she presented.

In contrast, NSTs’ seemingly effortless use of even uncommon idioms was seen in several instances. In Kecskes and Zhang’s (2009) sense, the native speaker uses idioms as a part of his or her private context, mindlessly and naturally weaving them into speech. Rather than appearing as a structured activity, idiom use is simply part of native language use, whether in classroom conversation or emerging as a descriptive alternative, used on the spot by the teacher to help students expand their inventory of figurative American English.
Because best practices in teaching includes the tenet that “teaching must be opportunistic,” English instructors with an endless supply of idioms at their disposal “become resources for learning in much more complex ways than through their pedagogical intentions” as they take advantage of teachable moments (Wenger, 1998, p. 267; also see Langer, 1986).

In Oral Sample 3, the teacher inserts a discussion of the idiom “short stack” in response to the student’s prior production. Although it is unplanned, the teacher introduces the idiom at line 2 and then defines it at line 6, demonstrating both the instructor’s command of the lexical item and his awareness of the potential that his students may misunderstand this idiom.

**Oral Sample 3: From 10-9-2012: NST “AA”**

1. **T:** I ate, er, in the morning, mm 3 pancakes? And coffee with milk?
2. **T:** *three pancakes* It’s a short stack.
3. **Yolanda:** MmHm
4. **T:** You know that term “short stack”?
5. **Ss:** Yeah.
6. **T:** a short stack of pancakes is three pancakes. I’m gonna write that down.

To more fully reinforce student learning, the instructor then adds “short stack” to other vocabulary terms on the blackboard. He revisits it with different students later in class, and finally follows up by including this idiom in a list of unfamiliar vocabulary when performing his final comprehension check.

**Oral Sample 4: From 10-9-2012: NST “AA”**

1. **T:** What are some prominent foods in America?
2. **Ss:** corn, pancakes
3. **T:** Corn, pancakes. Short stacks? Are they short stacks?
All of the above examples show that, even as the NNSTs in this study struggle with idiom instruction, the NSTs use idiomatic speech in a completely natural manner, suggesting that those instructors whose mother tongue is the target language will have a greater command of idioms and other speech items on the formulaic continuum as lifelong members of the target culture and, as such, enjoy greater success and ease in teaching this type of language. Similar to Mahboob (2003), these results showed that NNSTs had a good knowledge of grammar, enjoyed a good rapport with the students, and worked very hard, but had poor cultural knowledge. Indeed, as demonstrated in the oral samples above, it would be nearly impossible for a relative newcomer to have the depth of cultural understanding necessary to use situation-bound utterances and idioms in the seemingly effortless manner of a teacher who was a lifelong member of the target culture (Kayman, 2004). Regardless of the level of preparation, naturally occurring formulaic speech can be used effectively on the spot by those with a superior command of the conceptual base upon which the target language rests (Kecskes, 2008).

B. Students’ beliefs regarding formulaic language ability

In addition to the observed differences in language production, students’ expressed beliefs about their teachers regarding “natural” formulaic language were evidenced in their conversations about teacher differences. When discussing the strengths of both types of
teacher, the perceived ability of NSTs to teach broader vocabulary, which includes formulaic speech, came up regularly.

**From 2010 focus group discussion**

*Kusema:* …obviously they ((non-native teachers)) will not give you more details like someone who was a native speaker…they will not give you more details like a native speaker. Like, if this is a pen, and I don’t know what is a pen, there is just a way which a native speaker can just show me…

*Ruben:* yeah that-give an example I remember—couplea times when I didn’t know a meaning of the word, they ((native-speaking teachers)) find a way to explain what that means in a different way.

*Kusema:* Yeah, native speakers? it’s nothing, it’s like—piece of cake.

**From 2011 focus group discussion**

*Cho-Hee:* …even though I feel comfortable the most with that ((non-native))teacher? I couldn’t ask the—some question that I wanna know like, I couldn’t ask him the--about English expression, because I know that he couldn’t answer that question.

**From 2012 focus group discussion**

*Maria:* … a teacher, native he has more more word, synonym, so when I don’t understand he has oh more, more words. But when a nonnative teacher eh, maybe he know two or three but don’t have many synonym.

This perceived ability of native-speaking teachers to provide more vocabulary, including “English expressions”(or formulaic speech), then, was supported by the student’s oral production differences, as the combined data shows them producing more formulaic
language in classes led by NSTS. Therefore, the differences in oral formulaic language when students worked with a NST or NNST were not unexpected. However, as we have seen in tables 4 and 5, students’ written language production was not related to the teachers’ native statuses in the same manner as oral production. I discuss some important differences between oral and written production demonstrated in this study in the following section.

C. Oral speech production vs. written language: different genres

In the focus group discussions held during this study, international students of English discussed writing as their primary focus during home-country language instruction; as will be discussed further below, the prescribed structures of language—i.e., rule-bound grammar and usage—are the most comfortable area of instruction for non-native teachers, including those teaching in their home countries. Furthermore, as several students reported in relation to their previous English-learning experience, most had enough writing practice to at least pass their national exams, but little or no experience speaking.

As implied by the marked differences in production when students wrote stories as compared to their spoken classroom discourse, the differences between the spoken and written data production seen here might be discussed as a matter of spoken vs. written language production in general. Natural, oral language is produced on the spot, with little time for planning or preparation as compared to written language (Biber 1988; Halliday 2004; Tannen 1980). In oral language, “meaning is in the context,” but in the literate tradition, “meaning is in the text” (Tannen, 1980, p. 213). For some students in this study, this means that the comfortable structure of written language is a safe zone of sorts.
Based on a looser set of structural constraints, oral language is also far less formal than written production. In speech, formulaic expressions act as signals of “knowledge that is already shared” (Tannen, 1980, p. 213, emphasis mine). Moreover, since there is little a priori shared formulaic meaning in ELF communication (Kecskes, 2007, 2008), it stands to reason that students would include very little language that would be found on the formulaic continuum in their written production.

On the other hand, appearing at the left end of the formulaic continuum as a grammatical unit (See figure 3, also Kecskes, 2007, p.193), collocations—which occurred more often than any other formulaic aspects in students’ writing—can be seen as a “safe” inclusion in planned written speech. More formal than idioms or slang, less likely to be misused and then judged “nonnative” than metaphor, collocations gave students a way to use common lexical items without the level of risk involved in using idioms or metaphors. To say one must “stand in line” or “take a taxi” may not be literal speech, but these collocations occur so often in native speech that their presence in written language is not unexpected. However, extremely casual speech formulas such as “wazzup” and “oh my God”, noted in the spoken language of students here, are simply too informal for inclusion in writing.

Conversely, because oral proficiency and literacy develop at different rates and with different purposes, some very fluent speakers of English can be hesitant, fearful writers (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014). This may be evidence of a problem with time constraints, as having enough time to produce quality writing is important regardless of the students’ native status. Those who are less confident in writing may need a particularly long period of time, feeling pressured to produce a higher quality of work than when they are
engaged in conversation. Furthermore, a close examination of the oral transcripts and writing samples collected here shows that those students who are extremely fluent and seem very advanced in spoken language may still be poor writers, having developed Basic Interpersonal Communicative language skills (BICS) but not yet mastering Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1979). Conversely, they may have achieved a high threshold of academic English as required to pass national exams or achieve high grades in English as a foreign language in their home countries’ schools, without yet acquiring conversational fluency.

The samples below, taken from focus group interviews, clearly show that students had very different English language learning experiences in their home countries as compared to the classes they were engaged in during this study. Their needs had been different at home, where they did not have to use English for success in everyday life. Thus, any previous experience had focused primarily on writing, as opposed to the conversational emphasis needed for life in US culture. This was also demonstrated in the sophistication levels of some students’ writing, including both students here, who had found oral participation difficult throughout the observed classes. In contrast to Julia, whose struggles with writing are discussed in the next section, their preferred mode of English language production was written. This was the English language mode that they had been taught as children, and it was in this mode that they expressed greater complexity and syntactical sophistication.
From 2011 focus group discussion

Liang: China—when I was young, start to learn English from middle school…and our only end, is pass—passing the National exam. If the exam or the test includes listening, writing, and reading, and never spoke.

From 2012 focus group discussion

Hiroto: So to me, so, in my home country, so, learning English language is—we practice writing and reading very hard. But, we do not enough practice about uh, speaking or listening. So I uh, I have some context about writing or reading. But I do not—I have no context about speaking or listening.

These important differences in language use and development are manifest in the results we see here; namely, differences not only between individual student production, but also between the written and oral production of the same student. We will further examine these differences in light of student’s affective concerns in the following section.

D. Writing and student stress

Although students’ affective concerns are discussed at length in relation to research question 3 below, I include the case of one student in the 2012 cohort here as an example of the often extreme differences between written and oral language production. As discussed in the previous section, oral language is less formal, more spontaneous, and less likely to be produced with the level of control seen in written language. Additionally, words spoken cannot be changed, but written language can be modified—given sufficient time to do so—until the writer is satisfied with the results (Biber, 1988; Halliday, 2004; Tannen, 1980, 1982). Indeed, this element of time is vitally important to English language learners—who typically require much more time than their NS counterparts to produce good writing (Leki,
2003; Nesbitt Perez, 2013). As seen in Oral Sample 5, when teachers allow little time for writing, their students feel a great deal of pressure (Nesbitt Perez, 2013), correctly assessing their inability to produce high-quality results. Here, the instructor assigns students to write a dialog based on a video clip she has just shown, and students are taken aback by the short time allowed to complete the task. Julia, who produced very brief, simplistic writing in all of her stories collected for this study, displays anxiety when asked to produce written work in two minutes. Even though she was orally fluent and participated with great enthusiasm in nearly every class session, she clearly understands her own limitations in writing.

**Oral Sample 5: From 11-1-2012: NNST “KX”**

1. **T:** OK and then the next assignment is write down your summary or your thought and I can give you mmm two minutes.
2. **Luis & Julia:** ((both talking at once))
3. **T:** Julia? What did you say?
4. **Julia:** I just cannot ah cause two minutes is—just—short.

Julia further shows awareness of her shortcomings in writing in the following text, which she added as a post-script to one of the stories produced near the end of the six-week session:

*I’m so sorry, I know my text today’s is so bad. I really so tired.*

The mere act of writing presents such a challenge to this fluent, highly engaged student that she is shut down; rendered unable to produce language with any level of sophistication.

It can be inferred, then, that students’ written language production is distinctly different from their oral production in this study because of the differences between written
and oral language, as well as individual student differences as demonstrated here, including a clearly heightened level of anxiety and an affective filter that blocks optimal English production (Krashen, 1982).

2. Metaphorical speech: The case for egocentrism

In contrast to the findings regarding formulaic language, the students’ use of metaphorical speech in this study was much higher in NNST-led classrooms in both the 2010 and 2012 results (See Appendix C for complete tables of the oral production results). The fact that metaphorical language might be higher in NNST classes contradicts literature implying that students will find better models for metaphorical language use in their native speaking teachers (Bell, 2005; Kecskes, 2000; Kecskes & Papp, 2000). Yet in this single quantitative feature, students seem unaffected by their teachers’ native status, style or pace of teaching, or anything else that happens in the classroom. See Table 6 for differences in metaphorical density in the students’ oral production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NST</th>
<th>NNST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev NNST</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Comb St dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 met. density</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 met. density</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined met. density</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be inferred from the results that, in its role as an icon of conceptual language seated in the culture of the speaker, metaphorical language use is higher among members of similar communities of practice (CoPs). As discussed in Medgyes (1992) and Árva and Medgyes (2000), NNSTs can have greater empathy for their students, as language learners who have shared the same struggles and challenges. In this study, students absolutely identify with NNSTs as people who make them feel more comfortable and understand their struggles with the English language. Thus, it is not surprising that the students here produced more language seated in the conceptual level with their teachers who share a common CoP.

One unique feature of metaphor seen in this study is its variety among different individuals. We must remember the initial tenet of the socio-cognitive approach—that individuals first bring their personal perspectives, knowledge, and beliefs to the conversational arena (House, 2003; Keysar 2007; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang 2009). To this list, we can add habits of speaking—including conceptual, metaphorical representation—as extensions of one’s perspective, knowledge, and beliefs. This is not to say that the social space of the classroom, including teachers’ practices, has no influence on the conversation. The socio-cognitive approach provides for both the internal space of cognition and the external social space to have an impact on the dynamic of conversation; thus, both internal and external interlocutor features contribute to creating meaning in emergent common ground (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick 1992; Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009).

In the findings of this study, each individual’s level of metaphorical speech remains relatively consistent across teachers and time, whether in the first class taught by either NST
or NNST, or the final class of each period. In fact, some students rarely or never used metaphorical speech at all. Other students among the group, however, included metaphorical language in their conversations quite often.

Specifically, the most noticeable variable between students with different levels of metaphor use was their home language and culture. Students in the present study whose cultures were closest to that of the United States—primarily Western European students—consistently outperformed the rest of the class in metaphor use. Additionally, those whose cultures were least like U.S. culture and who had been in the US for a relatively short time, including students from African, Asian and Latin American nations, used the least amount of metaphorical language. For example, one student who never used metaphor was a recently-arrived immigrant from Senegal. Again, we can say, for example, that the United States and Germany share more closely related CoPs than the United States and Senegal.

To be sure, the influence of the mother tongue is an important source of difference in the use of metaphorical language in English. Because our native language cannot help but influence our L2, L3 …Lx, it follows that we will attempt to transfer our L1 cultural paradigms through the language channel of English (Kecskes & Papp, 2000; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) Additionally, our language has an influence on our culture and vice versa, and our experience of the world is related to the structure of our mother tongue (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). This must necessarily include not only the linguistic channel but also the conceptual base of our L1; thus, important concepts embedded in our mother tongue will be expressed in the metaphorical speech used when we communicate with other members of our home culture. Perhaps because of the potential for conceptual interference in from the L1, “conceptual fluency” in the target language is vital for achieving a “native-like” level of
communicative ability (Kecskes, 2000, p. 148). Consequently, if our home culture is extremely different from the target culture, it will be very difficult for us to employ metaphorical language in our conversation. As Nesbitt Perez (2013) found when comparing the first languages of academic writing students in the US, those from different language families (configurational, non-configurational, and Asian) had different features in their English production. She thus inferred that the L1 conceptual base has a strong influence on production differences in the target language.

Furthermore, Kecskes & Papp (2000) found that students in Hungary had different levels of metaphor use partly related to their mother tongue and its conceptual underpinnings. Since the L1 had a persistent influence on students’ L2 speech after Kecskes and Papp’s two-year study, it should be no surprise that home-culture influence appears here. Thus, we see that in this study, those students who employed the highest percentage of metaphorical speech were from countries in the “Global North,” including Austria, France, Germany, Poland, and Finland. Moreover, students who rarely or never used metaphor were visitors or recently arrived immigrants from developing countries of the “Global South”—far removed from the socially, and culturally aligned “Global North.” See Figure 4 below for details of which students produced the highest percentage of metaphorical speech.
This is not to say that teachers’ metaphor use has zero influence on the students. Indeed, two teachers in particular saw students adopt their metaphors and use them during the class, creating memes as common ground emerged. Rather, this study sees students who use more metaphor at the start consistently using more metaphor throughout the course of the six-week class period. I further discuss memes and examples of student metaphor use following teacher modeling in relation to the affective filter, in the findings related to research question 3 and hypothesis C below.

In sum, the students in this study have brought their own individual cognitive processes—in this case, the use of metaphor—to play in the classroom interactions. For the students here, metaphor is more related to the individual student’s culture of origin than to any of the influences found within the socio-cultural space of the classroom community, including that of the common CoP found with their NNSTs.
3. Syntax: Examining sentence complexity

In this study, as demonstrated by the statistical results and reinforced by student comments, adult ELLs produce more sophisticated, complex grammar structures when led by NNSTs than in classes where the teachers were NSTs. In opposition to hypothesis A, sentence complexity, including complex and compound sentence use, approached significantly higher usage in classes taught by NNSTs. This may be a result of the differences between L1 and L2 acquisition; one’s mother tongue is learned top-down, with little thought given to rules and structures of what is said (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Saville-Troike, 2006). On the contrary, L2 learners most often approach the new language from a bottom-up structural means of learning; they must employ the building blocks of grammar in order to become successful L2 speakers and writers.

3.1. Sentence complexity in the oral data

In the initial 2010 findings, students’ percentages of complex oral language working with NNSTs were nearly double their production in NST classes. Table 7 shows this difference between language produced working with the two types of teacher.

During the classes held in 2012, the level of sentence complexity remained higher in classes led by NNSTs. However—the level of difference was markedly reduced when compared to the previous results.

Although the difference between sentence complexity in classes taught by NSTs and NNSTs did not reach statistical significance when the data from both years were combined, students still produced noticeably more complex sentences when working with NNSTs.
Table 7: *Oral Sentence Complexity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
<th>NNST Mean</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Comb St dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 complex sentences</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 compound sentences</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 complex sentences</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 compound sentences</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined complex sentences</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined compound sentences</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Differences between the two years’ data

One notable contrast between the 2010 and 2012 classes occurred at the planning stages of the 2012 period. In opposition to the laissez-faire approach practiced by the team of instructors working together in 2010, the 2012 student teacher team worked together to provide direct grammar instruction during each class session. Every teacher still chose a topic of interest to himself or herself, but the teaching team required that each instructor include a specific grammar point to go along with the discussion topics. For example,
teacher QA included ways of forming conditional sentences in his lessons; teacher AA discussed past tense and perfect tense, using forms such as “Have you ever felt (+ emotion)” and asking students to respond with “I have felt (+ emotion)” statements. Thus, the focus on grammar was much more direct in 2012 than had been the case in 2010.

In addition, the level of sentence complexity was somewhat higher in both NST and NNST class sessions in 2012. Nevertheless, Table 7 does show that students consistently produce more complex sentences in NNST classrooms than in those led by teachers’ native-speaking counterparts, regardless of any other teacher attributes or practices.

3.3. Sentence complexity in the written data

In the 2011 written data, in no case was sentence complexity higher in student writing after instruction by NSTs, as seen in Table 8. In opposition to hypothesis A, there were higher levels of both complex and compound sentences in student writing produced after instruction by NNSTs. In fact, significantly higher overall sentence complexity was observed when the two grammatical measures (complex and compound sentences) were combined. As in the oral production data, the level of syntactical complexity was consistently higher in classes led by NNSTs.

The 2012 written results were similar to those in 2011. Similar to the oral production data, students produced higher levels of complex written language after participating in classes led by NNSTs. While the differences did not achieve statistical significance during 2012, NNSTs consistently led classes where students produced notably higher levels of complex and compound sentences. On the other hand, unlike the results in oral production the two years’ written data were not remarkably different; thus, there was no leveling effect
seen when the data were combined. Therefore, the combination of both years’ data consistently shows students achieving significantly higher levels of sentence complexity when working with NNSTs.

Table 8: Written Sentence Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NST Mean</th>
<th>Stddev NST</th>
<th>NNST Mean</th>
<th>Stddev NNST</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Comb St dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 complex sentences</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 compound sentences</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 complex sentences</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 compound sentences</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined complex sentences</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined compound sentences</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined total sentence complexity</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>3.621</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relating qualitative data to quantitative data: sentence complexity

In this section, I relate the differences in sentence complexity demonstrated in Tables 7 and 8 to teacher practices in the classroom. In both the written and oral data, the grammatical categories; that is, use of complex and compound sentences, showed persistent increase after instruction by NNSTs. Also, an increase in student use of linguistic features found on the formulaic continuum was seen in oral production during instruction by NSTs, and in written production after NST instruction, in spite of the fact that this (native-speaker) researcher collected all of the written data samples. These results uphold the concept that teacher influence is enduring, with the most recent instructor of either status having a measurable effect on student production even after the class had ended (Hallinan, 2008). Only being replaced by a new teacher changed the previous instructor’s effects on her or his students, causing the differences seen in both oral and written production data.

However, clear differences exist in the qualitative features of student speech produced in the two types of classroom. Different qualities of teacher speech, beyond a simple NST/ NNST distinction, strongly influenced student language production. Samples 6, 7, and 8 are typical of oral production seen throughout this study. Oral Sample 6 shows native-speaking teacher “AA” interacting with students.

**Oral Sample 6: 10-9-2012: NST “AA”**

29  T: ... What’s your name, please?
30  Aicha: My name is Aicha.
31  T: Aicha
32  Aicha: Aicha yes
33  T: And what did you have for breakfast please?
--- 34  Aicha: Oh, I got uh, bread with salami=}
Notice that while students are given many opportunities to speak, each turn is brief and, in the case of most students, serves only to answer the teacher’s questions or smooth over misunderstanding. In typical NST classroom interaction, as seen in sample 6 and 7, few turns at talk are sentence-length utterances, and fewer still—in this sample, only the student turn at lines 34 and 36—including sentence complexity. The speech produced in these classrooms is at a rapid pace, with little time for students to formulate language or create complexity. Thus, as seen in samples 6 and 7, the teacher immediately takes back the floor at line 37, and student interaction returns to a typical pattern of one or two word responses following teacher turns.

Oral Sample 7: 10-9-2012: NST “AA”

T: So it was OK. That’s good! Cool! and one more, please. Tell me your name?
Maria: Uh my name is Maria and for my breakfast today?=
T: Yeah.
Maria: I eat uh, yogurt with milk?
T: Yogurt and milk. Dairy, dairy. Do you know what I mean by “dairy”?
D’you all know dairy?
Maria: Yeah.
T: Dairy, milk. What else is dairy?
In contrast to this typical NST production pattern, students interacting with typical NNSTs were more likely to produce longer, more complex turns. Oral Sample 8 shows the typical interaction pattern among students and their NNST, QA.

**Oral Sample 8: 10-2-2012: NNST “QA”**

1. **T:** What do you think about female why are you female?

2. **Allessandra:** Well. I could choose another one, but I think I am female.

3. **Like, very gentle always and I mean—I like to be it so.**

4. **Catalina:** If I choose, I can choose the group that I feel good and

5. **…**

6. **T:**… who is going to present your group? Just describe like that

7. **Maria:** OK I think he is the person-the president from—Sut Africa?

8. **T:** South Africa

9. **Maria:** South Africa. I can’t say, and, I think he is friendly, he is just,

10. **and, he is good man. ((unint.)) He’s smart. Um**

Notice that students have time to produce longer and more complex sentences in the NNST class. The teacher still asks for clarification as needed, but he then pauses, giving time for students to formulate their thoughts and produce more complex speech than in the rapid-fire classroom discourse of the native teacher. In Oral Sample 8, three students have produced five different examples of complex or compound speech, at lines 2, 3, 4, 7, and 9—10. Additionally, in contrast to the NST samples 6 and 7, student turns not only follow teacher turns, but also sometimes follow other students’ turns.

It is interesting to note that this example is from the first class session of the semester, as well, in which students would not have known one another or their teacher,
having had not yet experienced emergent common ground in this setting (Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). On this first day of the class sessions, the students and their teacher had not yet had the common experience required to create meaning in interaction (Kecskes, 2008). Yet in Oral Sample 8, students are engaged with one another enough to have an authentic discussion, as opposed to the individualized, student-to-teacher, question-and-answer mode of communication seen in samples 6 and 7.

Along with this evidence in the production data, the student discussion suggests that a division in abilities exists between the strengths of NSTs and NNSTs, regardless of how prepared they are before entering the classroom (Medgyes, 1992). Reinforcing this concept, students in the focus group reported what they believed to be each group’s distinct advantages after their experiences in learning with both.

From 2011 focus group discussion:

Liang: Native teachers and nonnative teachers have different advantage. Nonnative teacher…is good at grammar… Native speaker may be good at speaking and writing.

Cho-Hee: Sometimes I feel like, I know the grammar better than native speakers.
((All Ss laugh, nod, ))

Liang: Yeah

Cho-Hee: (NNSTs) are good at grammar—they gave me what I need. What I need(ed) (in my home country) was grammar and not speaking for the tests… What I need now is to speak English with native speaker who can speak fluently.
As Medgyes (1992) said, although “both groups of teachers serve equally useful purposes” (p. 349), the NSTs in this study were best suited for modeling formulaic language production.

Confirming student opinions, the relative lack of ability of NSTs to teach grammar was upheld by the observational data. For example, in one class, the NST was asking students to practice the conditional form in their writing by finishing a sentence, and then reading what they had produced to the rest of the class. It was a fun exercise, in which they all participated with enthusiasm. Unfortunately, the teacher’s example sentence stub written on the board at the front of the class was incorrect:

“If I was rich, I would...”

Students were asked to fill in the blank with a verb or verb phrase of their own choosing. As the students read their sentences aloud, an interesting thing happened: either they changed the verb phrase to things like “If I had a lot of money, then I would....” or corrected it, to “If I were rich, then I would....”. The teacher did not seem to notice the discrepancies between his prescribed sentence stub and the students’ production, continuing with his lesson without correcting himself.

Summary

To sum up the quantitative findings in this chapter, a clear division exists between linguistic features that are found on the formulaic continuum and those that can be classified as adding to sentence complexity. As discussed in Chapter 2, English Lingua Franca (ELF) environments, including classrooms in which neither the teacher nor students are native speakers of English, tend to invite less figurative language, since literal meanings are more salient and can be readily retrieved by language learners
regardless of their proficiency (Firth, 1996; Kayman, 2004; Kecskes, 2007; Mauranen, 2003; Pickering, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2004). If students are unsure of their teachers’ or classmates’ ability levels, they are more likely to use simplified semantic structures. In the socio-cultural approach, interlocutors must ensure that what they say is understood by their hearers, and must guess what will be most salient to the listener while at the same time drawing on their own private contexts (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Communication created in the actual situational context is a combination of two seemingly polar paradigms, not a case of one or the other (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). By this measure, using figurative, non-literal speech is a high-risk practice when one does not know the comprehension level of his or her interlocutors; thus, ELF speech in the student-NNST classrooms here follows the ELF pattern in which participants typically avoid idiomatic lexical selections (Firth, 1996).

In contrast, when speaking with a native teacher the students can readily assume that their teacher will understand any formulaic, non-literal language that they choose to employ. Native speakers have a seemingly unlimited inventory of language formulas and metaphors, thus enabling their students to confidently “try out” a larger variety of semantical forms without the pressure of evaluating their potential for communicating the student’s meaning. However, individual differences definitely appear in these results, as we see only slight movement (in either direction) between students’ formulaic language when the teacher’s native status is the variable measured.

On the other hand, grammar is a rule-bound feature of language. As such, speakers in an ELF setting can use sophisticated syntactical structures without fear of being misunderstood. Understanding grammar is a far simpler task than understanding
semantic variation; because grammars’ prescriptive rules give more structure to language production than metaphor or formulaic speech can provide. Accuracy and structural soundness are the most important aspects of grammar—while it is a difficult task indeed to say whether one has used the “best” possible speech formula or metaphor to fit a particular situation. Additionally, other non-linguistic factors come into play when choosing a word to fit into a semantical opening. Fatigue, distraction, or stress may limit speaker choice, as much as the drive to get the message across.

Furthermore, both formulaic and syntactical features were different in the written language when compared to the oral speech production of students. As students discussed in the classroom and the focus groups, their varied experiences with English language learning had a meaningful influence on their production, and differences based on the form of language produced occurred in the same students as well as between students and instructors. Still, in spite of the fundamental difference in genres between written and spoken production, patterns of difference between the two types of teacher were found in nearly all of the spoken and written data.

However, the expected differences between NST and NNSTs as outlined in hypothesis A, which presumed that teacher native status would be the main factor affecting student production of formulaic and metaphorical language and syntactical complexity, do not align as clearly as anticipated. To be sure, the formulaic advantage of NSTs was upheld, if slightly, but there were some teacher practices that outweighed native status as predictors of language production ability in their students. In the classroom samples above, we have seen a difference in the interaction patterns between teachers and students, and the corresponding differences in complexity levels. These
patterns of teacher-student interaction appear more important than the difference in teacher native status in online production, as they allow or limit sophisticated student speech. Put simply, speakers must have sufficient time to incorporate longer sentences if there is to be any hope of sentence complexity.

To resolve questions left by the quantitative analysis here, I now turn to a qualitative examination of how the quantitative results occurred. Under what conditions do students produce complex, metaphorical, or formulaic speech? Rather than focus on teacher native status, I explore differences in classroom practice in the following qualitative section.

**Qualitative Data Analysis: Differences in teachers’ strategies and classroom presence**

During the course of observing classes and interviewing students, several differences in teacher practice were found. In considering the second half of research question 1, “what teacher strategies contribute to these differences” (in student language production), I have noticed is that students respond to similar teacher strategies and practices in a similar manner, regardless of whether the teacher is a NST or NNST. Thus, this section will discuss examples of student production as impacted by varied teacher practices. For purposes of clarification, teacher practice will be discussed in three categories. These are Teacher production (including rate of speech, interruption of students, use of IRE format, turn-taking); Teacher preparation (including topic and activity presentation, structure of discussions, ability to answer student questions, quality of materials); and, finally, Teacher presentation (including positioning, presentation of
self, apparent confidence). As we shall see, these had a very serious effect on the student language production.

1. *Production*

First of all, as discussed in the section 3.8 above, a teacher can set the pace for the classroom by his or her own production; in particular, through the use of turn-taking to set the pace of speech. He or she may speak for relatively long periods of time, followed by a space for equally long student turns. Or, as in oral samples 6 and 7, the teacher can speak at a rapid pace, in short sentences or fragments of sentences, thus encouraging students to follow the same speech pattern. The typical scenario portrayed in oral sample 9 is that of the typical NST, who takes short, rapid turns, and then allows students just enough time to take similar turns. Students are allowed little time to respond to the teacher’s questions, and certainly not enough time to produce any complex language.

In addition, one can notice that the teacher also relies heavily on the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (I-R-E) teacher discourse form mentioned in Chapter 2. This typical classroom discourse feature leaves little room for linguistic creativity, as the teacher has a scripted discussion in mind, designed to follow a particular pattern in order to arrive at a predetermined answer (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Hellerman, 2003; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993). As Oral Sample 9 shows, this form includes the “Initiation” (I) move at line 1, in which the teacher asks the question that initiates conversation, followed by the student’s initial “Responses” (R) at lines 2 and 3. Since the students do not immediately arrive at the intended conclusion, these two moves are repeated, with the teacher requesting another guess at the desired response in her next
initiation move at line 4. Following this clue, student X is able to give the desired response at line 6. Closing the I-R-E sequence, the teacher then gives a favorable “Evaluation” (E), as students have arrived at the correct answer.

**Oral Sample 9: From 3-4-2010: NST “SB”**

1 I T: Lance why does Lance have the worst seat?
2 R Fleuriste: Because he’s in the last row
3 R Ruben: He’s all the way back.
4 I T: He’s all the way in the back and what else?
5 R Fleuriste: Mmm, ((gestures in a circular motion)) all of them.
6 R X: By himself
7 E T: Yeah, he’s by himself right.

Although the traditional I-R-E sequence has been discussed as providing a safe and familiar structure for teachers to transmit important features of vocabulary and register in the ESOL classroom (Zimmerman, 2014), it is also seen as a rigid structure that squelches linguistic creativity (Waring, 2008, 2012). Thus, I-R-E and other traditional teacher-centered practices may not provide optimal conditions for learning authentic communication in the target language.

The opposite pattern of turn-taking is seen with the NNST in Oral Sample 10, whose brief turns encourage her students’ oral production and linguistic creativity. She barely speaks except for using the “continuers” OK and MmHmm, employed to move the conversation forward and encourage the speaker (Kidwell, 2000). Not only does teacher QH give her students ample time to produce a sophisticated level of speech, including allowing measurable pauses in student turns (as seen in line 13), but when she interrupts the student at
line 14, she apologizes and immediately returns the floor. In effect, she gives away her “teacher power” in favor of “student power” (Candela, 1999), thus enabling a higher level of complexity and lexical sophistication in student language production.

**Oral Sample 10: From 3-16-2010: NNST “QH”**

1 Sophie: …for instance this rabbit for Nesquick if you just see the rabbit
2 then you know it’s Nesquick so it keeps-it stays in mind?
3 T: OK
4 Sophie: That was first. And the second—yeah jingles are songs?
5 T: MmHmm
6 Sophie: And—they also, what makes them so effective is that they stay in
7 mind you—sometimes you have, the whole day one song from a
8 commercial in your head?
9 T: =Yeah=
10 Sophie: =and you cannot get rid of it so you
11 T: right?
12 Sophie: We—in German we call it like-earworm? so it stays in your ear?
13 (2) And number three…sometimes it’s just too much if you ((Unint.))
14 T: what if you—sorry, you=
15 Sophie: =banners, in cities, like banners or—radios sometimes.

As a result of this teacher’s discursive practices in the classroom, the sample includes all of the advanced features examined in the present study—formulaic language, metaphorical speech, and sentence complexity. Students in this class have the time and assigned authority needed to achieve their highest linguistic potential.

The next classroom example in this section is of a non-native teacher who uses a different type of discourse—even though he talks a lot, perhaps taking up more time than SB
did in Oral Sample 9 above, he also *allows time for the students to talk* for extended periods and to interact with each other.

**Oral Sample 11: From 4-6-2010: NNST “NA”**

1  T: if if you—if you have, there are three jobs you know, one, is asking for a
2    restaurant manager. The other is asking fo:or, um, school teaching
3    assistant. Ah, the other one is asking for you to be ah, um, say a
4    landscaper. Would you use the same résumé to apply to these different
5    jobs?
6    **Sophie:** no
7    **Ruben:** Oh you’re—if I if I think if I have experience on all the job? I
8    wanna sell myself that I did a good on the jobs and that wherever I go I’m
9    gonna do a good job. So I can use that same résumé=
10   **Nikola:** =but, for example if he put all of the experience, you know, the
11    same then he can use the same for the three areas but=
12    **Ruben:** =but=
13    **Sophie:** I would never use the same.
14    **Kusema:** ((unintelligible turn))
15    **T:** Why not?
16    **Sophie:** Because, maybe the, I don’t know if I wrote on the objectives if I
17    could have computer, science or whatever, and, I-maybe I write, more
18    stuff which is—much more, open. I would do that.

Sentence complexity is clearly seen in student turns at lines 7-9, 10-11, and 16-18. However, the teacher, after asking the initial question at lines 1-5, rarely speaks at all, allowing his students to control the flow of conversation and interact in a natural, unconstrained manner. In this setting, it is simply more possible for students to produce
complex, compound, metaphorically dense, sophisticated speech when the teacher stops talking.

It is important to mention here that these teacher production differences, although they tend to align with the teachers’ native statuses in this study, are not exclusively limited to either type of teacher. Indeed, during the 2012 class sessions, there was a reversal of this trend, with only one of the NSTs (highlighted in Oral Samples 6 and 7) following a rapid-paced, give-and-take style of classroom conversation. Two NNSTs, on the other hand, produced very structured teacher speech, placing the focus on the materials and the classroom activities rather than on the students and their language. In these highly structured classrooms, students were strictly timed during each activity, and were given a great deal of teacher direction throughout the lessons.

Oral Sample 12 is of a NNST who, although she does pause to allow students to respond to her questions, does not allow them to speak at any length once they begin. She effectively cuts the students off at the exact moment when they have the potential to create with the language.

**Oral Sample 12: From 11-1-12: NNST “KX”**

1. **T:** Is anyone can explain motion sickness?
2. **Catalina:** Pain
3. **T:** pain? uh. kind of. right yeah pain what kind of pain? When do you have motion sickness?
4. **Luis:** When you ride=
5. **T:** =right motion sickness is bad feeling a kind of feeling like you are about to vomit, especially when you are in a car feeling sick. You know so there’s a motion sickness pill what is pill?
6. **Luis:** Tablets=
As seen in lines 5-6 and 9-10, nearly all of this teacher’s turns are latched to student turns; she finishes the students’ sentences and expands on their answers, instead of giving them time to finish their own thoughts.

In opposition to the 2010 findings, two of the three NSTs who led the 2012 classes exhibited a longer turn-taking style combined with a slower pace of speech, and a strong focus on student production. In the 2010 data, this had only occurred among NNSTs. As discussed in section 3, this feature among teachers in the 2012 classes allowed more time for students to produce complex sentences, thus, a slight leveling effect on the study’s NST vs. NNST complexity statistics was seen. This classroom practice was extremely important, because, again, of the time and space allowed for student production to reach its highest potential for sophistication. In fact, the teacher appearing in Oral Sample 13 first provides an example for students coming from her own experience, and then steps back, allowing them to tell lengthy stories.

**Oral Sample 13: From 10-30-12: NST “MV”**

1 T: ((has just finished a story about feeling culture shock)): do you have any stories about a time you felt like that?

3 **Yolanda**: For me it’s different, ah, I’ve changed my self-image because, my first month here *especially so* my first month, I was learning? drive I was, learning all the signs, to drive, where I live…too many people is—is white? No—and when I was walking on the street or driving they—but
they smile at me? But the first impress or I don’t know but the first—at
attitude?= 
T:=MmHm=

Yolanda:=was oh! What—what are you—what are you doing here?...I was beginning to drive? Then my neighbor? Ah, asked me, the next day? Why are you driving you have license or something? And yes I have license, I have a visa, I am am legal I—and—this changed my, my self-image, because in my country is—they’re—really polite in Mexico, they’re really polite and never gonna ask you, something like that. and, never gonna see—see you for your—skin color

Just as in naturally occurring speech outside of the classroom, these stories are full of sophisticated syntax, as well as rich metaphorical and formulaic features. Yolanda is obviously capable of a great deal of linguistic expression; however, this teacher is the first of the 2012 cohort to hear this level of sophistication and intimacy in any student production—because she has given her class the time and space to excel in their English.

As shown in the examples above, those teachers, regardless of native status, who saw greater student complexity, metaphorical density, and formulaic speech levels had fewer and longer turns, between which students had more time to produce complex sentences and to formulate—perhaps also to translate—their thoughts. Additionally, teachers who encouraged a slower pace of speech were more likely than the “rapid fire” teachers to allow students to finish their turns. These teachers often flouted traditional teacher-as-conversation-leader models (Candela, 1999; Cazden, 2001) even allowing students to interrupt them and assume the floor. Thus, student utterances were more advanced in classes where they were given more time to speak.
2. Preparation

In the area of teacher preparation, students mentioned that variety was important in helping them to learn, and that lessons they perceived as having been well-prepared were more varied and effective. Further, students saw teacher preparation as evidence that they were invested in their students’ learning. Creating differentiated lessons that incorporate a variety of learning activities to engage all types of learners can be a very complicated undertaking for teachers, regardless of their experience level. Therefore, it is not unreasonable that students felt the teachers who brought a number of varied and interesting tasks to the classroom had spent more time preparing to teach. In the focus groups, among classes mentioned as memorable, students perceived some NSTs to have spent less time on lesson preparation than some NNSTS.

From 2011 focus group discussion:

Maidali: Is, sometime, is ah, is—variation.

…
Silvia: Is a very nice experience because you need writing, paint, and later speak, is very nice.

Cho-Hee: I’m sorry I cannot remember his name, but, he prepared the class very carefully, I mean, he made a course in detail, but, that—girl who taught in the first time? She bring some dice?

Rs: Dice?

Cho-Hee: Yeah I don’t know why we use some dice? Yeah but the lesson was so terrible, I think she just made it before the class?

Kyung-Mi: Not perfect.

Cho-Hee: It looks not good.

Rs: Oh, I see, so this was memorable for you ((All laugh))

Cho-Hee: Yeah maybe, because she didn’t prepare the class very well…
As seen in this study, both the instructor’s ability to respond to student questions and to provide the activities and facts needed for a variety of learning activities are impacted by the level of teacher preparation. In the focus group example here, not only do students perceive the less-favored teacher as being poorly prepared, but, as indicated, state that they are unsure what purpose her materials served. Note the students’ discussion of the importance of preparation as they mention positive and negative impressions made by different instructors.

Providing another example of the importance of teacher preparation, one of the NSTs confessed to her class that she made some mistakes that she might have avoided, had she been adequately prepared. Accordingly, trouble arose with the vocabulary in her materials. Oral Sample 14 demonstrates that this instructor was taken by surprise at the group’s need for extensive vocabulary instruction to enable them to read her chosen literary passages. Unfortunately, the teacher made errors in defining some of the texts’ archaic vocabulary.

**Oral Sample 14: From 3-24-2010: NST “KA”**

1. **Kusema**: What is adorned?
2. **T**: Hmm?
3. **Kusema**: Adorned
4. **T**: Yeah this is kind of a complex sentence isn’t it a lot of weird words going on, adorned with **coveted** adornments. So adorned and adornments do those look—similar?
5. **Leisel**: =Yeah.=
6. **Kusema**: = I don’t know=
7. **T**: =so adorn means—to place upon. Or to put on someone else. But it’s something really important. Like a crown?...you usually say adorned with jewels, adorned with jewelry? And **coveted**, when you covet something it means you keep something sacred it’s sacred it’s really important to you.
Had the teacher prepared a list of vocabulary and definitions to be used in her lesson, she could have avoided incorrectly defining “covet” as “keep sacred” in lines 11-12. Of course, teachers cannot possibly plan for all potential student questions, but as can be seen from the focus group discussion examples, the students were definitely aware of this NST-NNST difference in preparation. Their perception of teacher preparedness was important enough to their classroom experience that they referred to it as memorable.

The problem of insufficient preparation was not exclusive to NSTS, however. The following oral sample shows a NNS teacher floundering to answer a students’ vocabulary question—this time, in regard to a specific phrasal verb which the teacher intends to incorporate into her lesson—but which, in line with the established shortfall in NNS formulaic speech (Firth, 1996; Medgyes, 1992), she does not fully understand.

**Oral Sample 15: From 10-23-2012: NNST “TI”**

1  T: OK. Take over. Taking over. So I took over this class…You guys. …
2  Yes. It means like, um, taking over, my responsibility. to someone.
3  Gabriela: ((unint.)) something—that you did wrong, maybe?
4  T: yeah. ownership.
5  Gabriela: Assume? assuming? assuming so—is not the same?
6  (3)
7  T: mmm, umm, OK let’s find((unint)) actually.
8  (2)
9  Oh , isn’t it—hot?((opens door))
10 Observer ((NS)): You could say, United Airlines took over Continental airlines.
11 T: Mmm did you guys hear?
12 Nella: I hear but I don’t understand
Faced with the teacher’s inability to fully comprehend “take over,” a native-speaking observer tries to give the teacher an example of how to use the term. The instructor is clearly uncomfortable, evidenced by pauses at lines 6 and 8 and her sudden attention to the heat in the room at line 9. She appears to be stalling for time, unsure of how to proceed, and in the end promises to bring a better definition on the following day.

Because of the impression the teacher’s unpreparedness has left with students in this example, her lack of formulaic proficiency returns as an important point during the focus group discussion, as one of the students’ examples of an area in which students perceive NNSTs at a disadvantage in the classroom.

**From 2012 Focus group discussion**

**Maria:** So then a teacher, native has more more word, synonym, so when I don’t understand he has oh more, more words….Do you remember when we have the teacher…oh, she don’t know what is the meaning for one word and she say “Oh let me see in my computer ” or “tomorrow , I say for you ”. So I think this is ah, wrong?

**Gabriela:** I just wanna say that if you don’t say —know-- the meaning of the word you not gonna know what you are talking about.
Thus, the students in this class have been left with the impression that the teacher doesn’t “know what (she is) talking about” because of her failure to adequately prepare the vocabulary she intended to teach.

3. Presentation

In addition to being well-prepared, teachers who created community in the classroom by engaging with students in a relaxed, comfortable manner impressed students as more capable than their uncomfortable colleagues. Furthermore, those teachers who were comfortable enough in their roles and confident in the students’ abilities to direct their own learning focused on the students as collaborators in the classroom. The NNST in Oral Sample #16 created rapport in the classroom by positioning himself as a “close acquaintance,” (Nguyen, 2007, p.289); he enacts the classroom as a social community in which all members actively participate (Wenger, 1998), and engages students as a teacher-facilitator rather than a central actor on the classroom stage (Hallenbeck Nadeau, 2008).

**Oral Sample 16: From 10-2-2012: NNST “QA”**

1. **Yolanda:** Yes inside the-tequila bottle, inside the bottle, there is a little
2. **bug, or animal**
3. **T:** I never drank tequila so I **don’t know** what they put inside
4. **Luis:** a worm, it’s a worm
5. **T:** a WORM there’s a WORM?
6. **Luis:** It’s a small one
7. **T:** that would be disgusting!
Indeed, this NNST is an excellent example of the teacher as facilitator. Particularly at line 3, by saying “I don’t know,” he readily admits that he has no knowledge of the discussion topic. As opposed to posing as an authority on all things in the classroom, the NNST encourages students to discuss their own cultures, empowering them as members of the emerging classroom community. Throughout the activity, he allows much discussion among students, and asks them to solve one another’s problems. Thus, this instructor takes steps toward building a community of learners through emergent common ground (Hallenbeck Nadeau, 2008; Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009; Wenger, 1998).

Other teachers, demonstrating their social power, were so focused on their lesson plans that any divergence on the students’ part had the potential to cause a serious misfire in communication. In House’s (2003) discussion of misunderstanding in intercultural university encounters, teachers assumed the right to the floor, interrupting students as needed to direct the course of the conversation. Rather than having the desired effect of moving the conversation forward, this level of teacher control resulted in communicative collapse.

Similarly, one NNST in this study who employed highly structured activities in her classroom found serious misunderstanding when the students’ English levels were higher than she had anticipated. In the vocabulary discussion below, she attempts to demonstrate the term “absolutely” by setting up a male student with a socially awkward question.
Oral Sample 17, 11-1-2012: NNST “KX”

1 T: when can we use this word “absolutely?” (5) Luis? do you think Nella
2 is pretty?
3 Luis: ((shrugs, speechless))
4 (5)
5 Nella: ((shakes head)) no
6 Ss: ((all laugh))
7 T: You don’t have to like uh take it seriously just, yes or no
8 Luis: No but I don ’t know what you want me to. say=
9 T: = uh just uh your answer yeh?=  
10 Luis: she absolutely—were?
11 T: no no no just very, simple yes
12 ((more silence, shrugging from all Ss))

When the conversation continues in Oral Sample 18, the teacher admits that she intended for Luis to say “yes,” so that she could then say, “absolutely.” However, his advanced level of both the English language and American culture—as well as previous experience with instructors whose classes include “correct answers” to their questions—led him to explain his reticence at line 8: “I don’t know what you want me to say”.

Oral Sample 18, 11-1-2012: NNST “KX”

13 T: just read this—
14 Luis: ((reads)) “absolutely”
15 T: OK
16 ((general chaos all laughing & talking at once for ~5 sec.))
17 T: you know what I—I just think about he said it, yes, and then way I
18 could say, “no, absolutely!” but he said I-I mean he knew my intention.
19 Absolutely which means, to emphasize yes, which means more than yes.
In addition to misinterpreting the teacher’s intention, both students who were the foci of this discussion were visibly embarrassed, as it was culturally awkward for young adults in this setting. Both students demonstrated a great deal of head hanging and blushing, and were notably absent the following day. This level of misunderstanding is not surprising in light of the literature, including Firth’s (1996) claim that ELF communication is marked by “infelicities,” (p. 239) and Kecskes’ (2014) assertion that “not sure” behavior is common in situations where one speaker is native and the other nonnative (p. 168). In this case, although both the teacher and Luis are NNSTs, the student had been in the US for a long period of time, and had developed a more native-like cultural base.

In the focus group discussions, students mentioned aspects of their teachers’ presentation of self, or positioning (Goffman, 1959; Harré & Langenhove, 1999; Hallenbeck Nadeau, 2008) in the classroom as traits that created comfortable (or uncomfortable) classroom atmospheres. Students found these types of differences in teachers important; they cited the ability to engage students in a community, based on their individual needs, as one of the most important qualities of effective teachers.

**From 2010 focus group discussion:**

**Ruben:** Well, I think the best thing that a teacher can do with a student is make them participate in classes, and talk in class, write, and things like that.

**Kusema:** For me, for them to be the best teacher… they can just try to—what am I interested in. And then figure out what these six people they have in common, and then they can start teaching on that subject.
Furthermore, students were very impressed with teachers who involved everyone in the classroom, building community and common ground by allowing opportunities for each member of the class to fully engage with the group. In fact, the combination of patience and preparation were mentioned most frequently, as in the discussion below.

**From 2012 focus group discussion:**

_Nella:_ I think to have patience like to take it slowly…you have to take the time to each one to study the English so you need for a teacher to have patience and take the time to teach something.

_Hiroto:_ I think the important thing is to make students feel we can—we can—we have progress in our English learning. See because if we feel there is progress, only step by step, we can keep going forward.

_Gabriela:_ Um, they gotta be prepared for class, make sure that they teach what they know, they know what they gonna teach, and…

_Allessandra:_… about patience and being prepared—I think the two makes a good teacher.

Further examining ways in which teacher presentation influenced the learning environment, students mentioned that when teachers spoke slowly and made eye contact, students understood more and learned new vocabulary better. In fact, one benefit of NNSTs was their understanding of the learner condition (Snow, Kamhi-Stein, & Brinton, 2006). Students stated that their NNSTs enunciated more clearly and carefully, and spoke more slowly, making sure to show students their mouths.

**From 2011 focus group discussion**

_Maidali:_ They (NNSTs) can, uh, have a contact—visual with every student? We need to see the articulation for new word…is very important to talk
slowly. …When I go to learn a new word—a new vocabulary, we need that the teacher talk slowly.

**Keitaro:** I think that native speaker, speaks, very very fluently, um, example between words—is–continuously. For example, nonnative speakers, speak, for example, “do you have”— native speakers, speak, “d’you’ave”

((All laugh, nod))

**Keitaro:** For me, uh, for example “do you have” is easy to listening.

**Summary**

As we can see, research question 1 was not answered as simply as anticipated. There were, indeed, differences between student production in classes with NSTs as opposed to those led by NNSTs. However, the greater level of grammatical complexity produced in and following NNST classes and the advantage in formulaic language when students worked with NSTs line up with the concept of NSTs and NNSTs each having their own advantages. According to the quantitative and qualitative data as well as the adult ESOL students’ opinions, NSTs have a marked advantage in the areas of formulaic and non-literal language, while their NNST counterparts enjoy a significantly better grasp of grammatical structure; hence the students’ opinions supported the quantitative and qualitative findings in this section.

Viewed through the socio-cognitive theoretical lens applied to this study, the qualitative material adds to the evidence that both cognition and the socio-cultural environment contribute to successful conversational interaction as well as successful student experiences in the English classroom. All of the differences in individual teacher strategies and traits, including differences in production, preparation, and presentation, contributed to the students’ production, as well as to their perceived level of comfort and success in each
individual teacher’s classroom. Looking at the students’ lived classroom experience, then, we can see that these various teacher practices all contributed to the development of *emergent common ground* (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009) in the ELF classroom. Indeed, teacher differences in personality and cognition are important aspects of what they bring to the table as egocentric participants (Keysar, 2007) attempting to create a meaningful conversational environment in which their students can successfully learn English.

Consequently, based on the evidence presented in this section, we can say that *teacher practice has a stronger effect on student production than the teacher’s native status alone*. 
CHAPTER 5 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2/ HYPOTHESIS B

In this chapter, I discuss the findings relevant to the second research question:

Does participation in classes taught in turn by NSTs and NNSTs cause students to modify their beliefs and perceptions of teacher qualifications, as common ground emerges over the course of the class sessions?

Based on the previous research described in Chapter 2, hypothesis B postulates that:

Participation in classrooms led in turn by NSTs and NNSTs will change students’ opinions regarding what qualities are most important in effective ESOL teachers.

To discover changes in student opinion, I administered a Likert-style questionnaire based on Thomas’ (1995) instrument, as well as previous studies on student opinion in NST-NNST English classrooms (Cheung, 2002; Mahboob, 2003; Moussu, 2010; Pacek, 2005), and, finally, on the pilot questionnaire administered in 2009 (see Chapter 3 for a full discussion of the pilot study). On the first day of classes, each advanced and intermediate-level student filled out a Likert-style questionnaire before participating in the course, followed by another copy of the same instrument after their six-week session had ended. The questionnaires asked students to indicate their opinions on each of the twelve items by circling #1 (strongly disagree), #2 (disagree), #3 (neither disagree nor agree), #4 (agree), or #5 (strongly agree). The quantitative results of this pre- and post-class survey are discussed here, followed by a brief illustration of the students’ related practices and opinions.

---

10 Appendix E includes both the revised questionnaire and complete student responses.
As a reminder, “common ground” among a group of people, such as the community members of the English classrooms examined here, is based on current (perceived) experience; evidence posed by the conversation including what each conversant is or has said, and is or has understood; and finally, membership in a common community (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). We will discuss the concept of community further below, but briefly, very little common ground existed among the teachers and students in this study before participating as members of the classroom community. As discussed in the participant descriptions in Chapter 1, very few of the students had any prior experience with NSTs; most commonly, they had studied English in their home countries with members of their home cultures. They based their initial questionnaire responses on this rather limited experience. Thus, I make the first claim related to research question 2, based on the results of the questionnaires detailed below.

Claim #1: Students see less difference between NSTs and NNSTs after working with both.

As highlighted by the focus group discussions later in this section, by the end of their courses students found that qualities other than native status, such as the inclusion of high-participation activities like student presentations and games, were most important in effective English teachers—although initially they had expected native speakers to be more capable teachers of English.
1. 2010 pre- and post-class questionnaire data

In line with hypothesis B, student opinions decidedly changed on the 2010 questionnaires, in some cases quite dramatically, after participation in classes led by both NSTs and NNSTs.

Table 9 shows the details of the initial t-test based on the questionnaire results. As seen in Table 9, the only item that showed statistically significant change was #11 (“Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class”). However, some discussion of the items approaching significance is also in order. These include item #3 (“Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers”) and #10 (“Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class”).
Table 9: Spring 2010 Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Pretest mean</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest mean</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant at 0.05?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.998</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-1.232</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-1.518</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.732</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.83666</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-2.804</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the questionnaires reported here, items related to teacher attributes were posed to indicate how students felt about specific features of teacher performance in their analysis. Students believed that both groups were more likely to encourage students to speak in class than had been previously believed (#10 and #11), were more patient than students expected (#8 and #9), and used suitable teaching methods to a greater degree than anticipated (#6 and #7). Yet, little movement was observed from their initial stated beliefs that “It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach” and that “Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.”

2. 2011 pre- and post-class questionnaire data

Adult students taking the 2011 ESOL classes answered the same 12-item questionnaire, using a Likert-type scale as in the 2010 results shown above. As seen in the earlier results, many student opinions in the 2011 cohort changed after working with both NST and NNST teachers. With this group, however, there was less change in some items than there had been with the former students. See Table 10 for details of the 2011 questionnaire t-test analyses.
Table 10: *Fall 2011 Questionnaire Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire item</th>
<th>Pretest mean</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest mean</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant at 0.05?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-2.298</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-1.098</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.786</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though the 2011 students did not find differences at the end of the course in whether NSTs or NNSTs motivated students to speak in class (#11), the one item showing significant change (#7) was again related to NNST teacher practice. In this case, students came to believe that NNS teachers were significantly more likely to use suitable teaching methods after working with both teacher groups. In support of Claim #1, the major change in opinion was related to an improved perception of NNST ability to teach English. As with the 2010 cohort, few students represented in 2011 were permanent U.S. residents. The majority of the 2011 group included international students who had been in the U.S. for only one semester, some of whom were enrolled in graduate programs, and others who were undergraduate students. Only three students had previously studied English outside of their home countries.

3. 2012 pre- and post-class questionnaire data

Students in the 2012 adult ESOL “clinic classes” followed the same procedure for completing pre and post-test questionnaires as had been practiced during 2010 and 2011. Each student who agreed to participate in the study filled out an initial questionnaire, and those who remained in the class answered the same questions again on the final day of classes. The data were analyzed to determine if student opinions had changed at all over the course of their six-week classes.

As seen in Table 11, student opinions, particularly those related to non-native speaking teacher’s ability to successfully lead English classes, once again showed changes that sometimes approached significance.
Table 11: Fall 2012 Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Pretest mean</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest mean</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant at 0.05?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.650</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.705</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.605</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.870</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.536</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1.186</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.380</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.488</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Combined pre- and post-class questionnaire data

The combined questionnaire results showed quite a bit of similarity to the separate class results above. See Table 12 for details of the pre- and post-test data when the three years’ questionnaire results were combined.

Table 12: Combined Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Pretest mean</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest mean</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significant at 0.05?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>-0.407</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-1.390</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.586</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-2.266</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-2.259</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>-1.284</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-2.889</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in the individual classes, there were some significant results in the combined data shown above. First and most obviously, items number 3, 7, 8, 9, and 11 all show statistical significance. The students overwhelmingly changed their minds to conclude that nonnative teachers do use suitable teaching methods, are patient with their students, and motivate students to speak in class. Additionally, the students came to believe that native speaking teachers were understanding and patient with their students, perhaps indicating a generally higher level of patience between both categories of teacher than students had previously experienced.

Let us highlight the significant change in item #11 here (Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class). As in item #7, these inexperienced students initially were not sure whether NNSTs could motivate them to speak in class, as evidenced by a mean that was very close to “neither agree nor disagree.” However, after working with their NNS teachers, students experienced a significant change in opinion, concluding that even non-native teachers could motivate them.

Discussion of the questionnaire results

As mentioned, this diverse group of students had been taught primarily by members of their own linguistic and cultural communities in their countries of origin. Few of the students represented lived in the United States; the rest were short-term residents in the country for temporary employment or educational opportunities. Thus, very few students had experienced English lessons taught in line with contemporary American paradigms of language education—including the concept that students must be active participants in their linguistic development, and not simply memorize rules of grammar and lists of vocabulary
for an exam. Additionally, all of the teachers in this study were Master’s students in the TESOL program, which typically attracts individuals who empathize with language learners because of their own previous struggles in learning a language other than their mother tongue. The second claim of this section is in line with the students’ limited previous experience.

Claim #2: The ESOL students in this study did not expect, given their limited experience with NSTs, to find a high level of empathy among their native teachers.

After their classroom experiences, significant change was seen in students’ responses to question #8, “Native-speaking teachers are very patient with their students”. Perhaps based on their own feelings of shortcoming in the language and the entrenched belief in NST superiority, students were very favorably impressed with their native teacher’s patience, and discussed this as one of the most important attributes of good teachers in the focus group conversations. Furthermore, a significant decline in the students’ level of belief that their NNSTs understood their needs better than NSTs (in response to item #3) indicates that the students found their NSTs more sympathetic and understanding than they had expected. In opposition to Medgyes (1992), in these classes, the NNSTs were not seen as having particularly more patience or understanding for their ELL student than the NSTs.
Claim #3: Student bias in favor of NSTs is hard to uproot, regardless of actual experiences.

To circumvent the typical pro-NST bias discussed in chapter 2, items related to specific teacher attributes were posed to indicate how students felt about narrow features of teacher performance. Consequently, the combined results showed that students believed that both NSTs and NNSTs were more likely to encourage students to speak in class than had been previously believed (#10 and #11), were significantly more patient than students had anticipated (#8 and #9), and used suitable teaching methods to a greater degree than expected (#6 and #7).

Thus, a lack of significant change in items #1 and #2, “It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach” and “Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers,” combined with a definite change in specific, performance-related items, points to an illogical foundation for the pervasive belief that native speakers make better teachers of their own language. This third claim is in line with Árva & Medgyes (2000), Moussu (2010), and Pacek (2005), who discuss the sometimes irrational but intractable aspect of anti-NNST bias.

Nevertheless, regardless of the type of experience students previously had with English teachers—whether at home or abroad, with teachers of their own mother tongue or those from native-speaking English groups, the students clearly revised their opinions over the course of these classes.
Emergent common ground

In spite of their initial differences, exposure to both types of teacher using similar methods and in the same setting caused students to question previously held stereotypes of native-teacher superiority as language teachers. Perhaps related to the capacity for empathy among NNSTs (Medgyes, 1992) as implied by the results of questions #8 and #9, students revised their preconceptions, seeing greater patience among teachers who had struggled with the language themselves.

Along with the exposure to new types of teachers in a new educational setting, emergent common ground played an important part in the student’s opinions. Initially, they had very limited core common ground among members of the classroom community (Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). But as time passed, students became connected to one another and to their instructors. In addition to teaching one week apiece, instructors were often in the classroom as observers, frequently engaging in the community and contributing to the emergent common ground of the classroom whether they were leading the classes themselves or merely observing. The shared sense of common personal experiences (Kecskes, 2008) knit each group together, so that by the end of each session, students had far more relevant personal experience on which to base their judgment of the instructors’ abilities and practices than at the start.

Undoubtedly, from the earliest classes of each session, both NSTs and NNSTs worked to create community in the classroom. As one example of a teacher’s attempt to build common ground from early in the class sessions, native-speaking teacher “AA” led an activity where he listed traditional foods enjoyed in the students’ home cultures. Tallying common ingredients and features of the traditional dishes on the board, he stated, “We all
eat food” (Oral Sample 19, lines 1-2) to show that all participants had eating in common.

Despite this effort to introduce a common thread in the classroom, Oral Sample 19 also shows the disconnect between the NST as a member of American culture and his students as members of the ELL community.


1. **T:** Cooking. Does that make sense? Cooking? Cooking food. We all eat food.
2.  
3.  
4. **Julia:** a sweet the sweet breakfast= That is typical American food.
5. **T:** That’s very American, you are right. You’re right. Um, I’m gonna add one, my dad has this every morning because he’s very American. Every morning. But can you think of another breakfast? That Americans= 
6. **Maria:** =breakfast?
7.  
8. **T:** I’ll give you a hint, it’s round and it’s sweet.
9. **Jun Lin:** Waffle
10. **Julia:** Sweet very sweet.
11. **T:** Waffle that’s close. Another hint? There’s a hole in the middle.
12. **Jun Lin:** doughnuts, doughnuts.
13. **T:** Yeah. My dad eats doughnuts EVERY morning, every morning.
14. **Nella:** For breakfast, doughnuts?
15.  
16.  

As the students discuss American breakfast, this teacher identifies his family as “very American,” evidenced by their eating habits. These are so different from what the students consider normal that it takes several turns for them to figure out what food the teacher is referencing. Even after the teacher confirms at line 15 that his dad eats a doughnut for breakfast, a student questions this (at line 16) as normal behavior. In this case, students are challenged early on to expand their previous concepts of U.S. cultural norms, laying a foundation for greater understanding and community.
Regardless of the level of common ground or community engagement felt by students, there were clear changes in student opinion after they completed their class sessions, confirming hypothesis B.

I include a few of the students’ focus group comments here to help to shed more light on these changes. Most commonly, the students believed that *what each individual teacher brought to the classroom community was more important than native status*, regardless of whether this had been their belief before classes began.

**From 2010 focus group discussion:**

*Kusema:* “Yeah (one NNST)…tried to challenge us…”

*Ruben:* “I don’t think it (whether the teacher is native or nonnative) would make any difference.”

**From 2012 focus group discussion:**

*Allessandra:* I don’t think it matters if is native or not.

At the end of their classes, students were pleased (if also a bit surprised) that their teachers had all found ways to engage their interest—and most expressed a belief that this was not related to the teachers’ native status.

**From 2010 focus group discussion:**

*Ruben:* I think both nonnative and native, they tried to make you participate in classes somehow.

*Kusema:* I can say just—they didn’t try but they did. So, they did really show us that we can all talk.

*Ruben:* Yeah. They all tried to make us participate somehow.
From 2012 focus group discussion

Allessandra: Before I thought a nonnative teacher could not be that good, so now I think they can be, they only have to be prepared for it. But now I think they can be good too. But, maybe they can teach better than the native but they have to be prepared for it.

Catalina: And I think it is about experience because you learn another culture you meet another person your English improve a little.

Reinforcing Claim #1, the students’ previous experiences with NNSTs in their home countries had been very different from what they found in these classes, where all teachers encouraged participation by all students. This was certainly reflected in their change of opinion after exposure to both types of teacher.

NNST performance in different settings—EFL vs. ESOL

In addition to their lack of prior experience with NSTs of English, most students had studied with NNSTs in their home language and culture. The differences between teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in another country, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in an inner-circle country are legion (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014). For the purposes of this study, I mention only that it is less difficult to learn or teach a language when one is living in the target culture, surrounded by interlocutors who automatically engage the learner with both the target language and its underlying conceptual base. Thus, the NNST in a target language country is rather different than the NNST in an outer or expanding circle country; he or she is not only a teacher but also a learner, and as such is exposed to the same cultural influences as the students.
In this vein, some students mentioned that teachers in their home countries spoke English “not very well.” If a student is not confident of the linguistic ability of his or her instructor, then it will be difficult to judge whether the teacher will understand what is said in any classroom contributions. This insecurity in the level of the teacher’s communicative ability in the target language must necessarily limit the amount of student participation in the classroom.

Thus, students definitely noticed the distinction between NNSTs in the EFL setting of their home countries and NNSTs their current ESOL setting. They posed a theory that the environment makes the difference in the effectiveness of NNSTs, discussing these differences in the sample below.

**From 2012 focus group**

**Nella:** In Finland it’s more they speak Finnish but they teach English so, they teach English in Finnish.

**Allessandra:** I think—when they teach English here is a lot different, the nonnatives teach different than when they teach English in my country because here the accent is better.

**Julia:** You have to talk English here you know?

**Allessandra:** That’s what I mean like if you teacher in your country gonna teach you, if, he or she was or were, teaching here, is gonna be better.

In opposition to the majority of participants in this study, one student emphatically pointed out that her feelings toward NNSTs had changed in a negative direction after exposure to her instructors in these classes. She had originally believed—without having had any experience with NNSTs—that there were no important differences between NSTs and
NNSTs. However, after classes with one of the less proficient NNSTs in this study, the student came to prefer NST-led classes.

**From 2012 focus group**

**Gabriela** Um, I don’t take a class before with native and non-native speaker teacher? um, for me, I prefer native speaker, cause I understand better plus-uh-I mean nonnative they teach in good way, but, I don’t understand. all of them.

Gabriela mentioned later that she did not think it was more difficult to learn from a NNST than an NST; rather, that differences in what and how teachers prepared, perhaps related to their personalities, caused difference in student learning. Still, she held on to her stated preference for the native-speaking teachers.

**From 2012 focus group**

**Rs:** Do you think it’s because they are nonnative or=

**Gabriela:** no, no, maybe personality.

…

**Gabriela:** Yeah because when I came here I was thinking it doesn’t matter if the teacher is native or nonnative. But now I say is better if the teacher is native.

Her comments, which seem contradictory to each other, reinforce **Claim #3** of this section—that student bias in favor of NSTs is hard to uproot—and is based on no logical factors.
Summary

Regardless of whether students believed native or nonnative teachers to be preferable, or if they expressed no preference at all, student’s opinions had definitely changed after exposure to both types of teacher. In line with Baniabdelrahman (2013), Moussu (2010), and Pacek (2005), many of the beliefs students held about native speaking teachers of English and non-native speaking teachers were based on limited experience, and changed after they engaged in the classroom community including both types of teacher.

Therefore, hypothesis B, “Participation in classrooms led by both NSTs and NNSTs will change students’ opinions regarding what qualities are most important in effective ESOL teachers,” was upheld in this study.

I continue the discussion of community building, including affective aspects of students’ experience in the language classroom, in Chapter 6.
Chapter 6 explores the final research question:

“Will changes in students’ affective filters be reflected in any way in their language production?”

Based on the English Lingua Franca (ELF) and affective research examined in Chapter 2, its corresponding hypothesis states that

“Non-native speaker teachers’ ELF classroom environments will provide an atmosphere conducive to lowering students’ affective filters though greater rapport and empathy.”

In this study, student participation in classroom activities including games, joking, and discussions indicates a lower affective filter, which in turn allows for greater language learning opportunity (Krashen, 1982). Rapport is increased between students and NNSTs through their common status as ELLs (Medgyes, 1992) and, as we will see in this chapter, rapport is related to a slower rate of speech and fewer interruptions (Fiksdal, 1988; Meierkord, 2000). However, contrary to the suppositions in the ELF literature, both types of teacher achieve rapport using these linguistic tools.

Furthermore, community is built through joking and games as teachers position themselves and their students as “close acquaintances” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 289) and create memorable experiences in which students “feel free and—start talking” (Kusema, 2010 focus group). We see the results of the lowered affective filter and community building in the students’ ability to produce sophisticated language, as well as to engage in the higher-level
practices of joking and play (Bell, 2005). In turn, positive emotional input of the type experienced by active students at play reinforces long-term storage of the factual linguistic information that the teacher wishes his or her students to retain in “good learning” (Caine & Caine, 1997; Leiguarda de Orue, 2009; Weiss, 2000). Thus, as common ground emerges in the classroom community through shared sense (Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009), students’ experiences of rapport and community in learning help them to assimilate the positive classroom experiences into their private contexts, in a cycle of meaning creation that then enhances their conceptual-level understanding, thereby increasing the sophistication of their linguistic contributions.

In short, the importance of lowering students’ affective filters has been, if anything, undervalued and oversimplified in previous research. The rich and varied types of student experiences described and observed in this study have largely been rooted in emotional experience. Sharing inside jokes and memes to build rapport and aid in memory (Bell, 2005; Blackmore, 2000; Nguyen, 2007), giving students the floor to allow questions and stories to emerge, and employing a slower pace of speech to help all community members gain understanding all combine to give students a feeling of success—which in turn leads to further learning (Fiksdal, 1988). As learning increases, changes to student’s language production also increase. Also, communicative ability as seen between students and teachers in the results adds to the common ground, creating a sense of community and shared purpose in the classroom environment (Behrens & Jablon, 2007).

Therefore, even though the students did not recognize its value until given opportunity to reflect on their experiences, the sense of shared community and common struggle in the ELF classroom was clearly reflected in their linguistic production as well as
in the focus group discussions at the end of classes. Furthermore, students were able to produce complex, formulaic speech in both types of classrooms when teachers used strategies designed to let students “feel free” and create with language.

I discuss these specific strategies used by successful teachers in this study, and their effect on the affective features in student speech, in the following sections.

Teacher practices designed to lower students’ affective filters

In this study, teachers use several strategies to lower the affective filters of their students, including but not limited to establishing rapport, including humor in lessons, positioning themselves as student-focused facilitators as opposed to central actors of the classroom community, and, perhaps unintentionally, initiating and perpetuating memes and joking as rapport deepens in the common ground. All of these practices, if successful, can help students to maximize participation by providing a comfortable classroom atmosphere. These strategies can be risky, however, as they can create misunderstanding and greater distance between teachers and students if they go awry. For example, teachers must know their students well—their personalities, interests, and English abilities—to include humor successfully. In the end, a successful English language classroom can be seen as one in which students produce a large volume of formulaic, metaphorical, and complex target language. After all, in the language classroom, talk is not only the vehicle of learning, but the product of the lessons as well. Thus, a quantitative look at student participation in the classroom can be instructive as to the student’s comfort level, as well as illustrating the level of community evident in the classroom. I examine first the students’ sentence-level utterances and turns at talk to discover how often their participation encourages complete,
sentence-level thoughts. Then I compare the number of student questions in both types of classroom, to see whether students are actively engaged in the classroom as indicated by asking questions.

**Quantitative data analysis**

1. **Student participation in class discussion**

As mentioned above, the students recognized good teachers as those who were perceived as skillful in drawing all students into the class activities. However, teacher skill is merely one factor influencing language production in a class of many different personalities. It takes a great deal of focus and experience for teachers to learn how to facilitate good classroom discussion— for example, directly calling on students who rarely participate, or squelching overly loquacious students’ tendencies to monopolize all conversation; variation will exist in any classroom, regardless of the teacher, based on the many factors individual conversants bring to the table. In the socio-cognitive view, this includes students’ and teachers’ “private contexts,” which limit their contributions to the classroom community as they work to create shared meaning. This naturally includes teachers’ ingrained beliefs about what is appropriate in the classroom setting, as well as students’ prior learning experiences and individual tendencies.

In the tables that follow, individual differences in students’ level of talkativeness are clearly evident, as the number of student turns and utterances shows.
1.1. 2010 differences in utterances and turns at talk

To compare student production when working with NSTs to that in classes led by NNSTs, we will first consider Table 13, which shows a difference in the percentage of sentence-level utterances to total turns at talk present in the 2010 oral data set.

Table 13: 2010 Utterances/Turn by Teacher Native Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>NSTs</th>
<th></th>
<th>NNSTs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utt.</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Utt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clear differences between the two types of classroom evidenced in the tables above. First, most students, regardless of how talkative they were, had slightly more turns at talk in the NST classrooms. However, in cases of both reticent and chatty students, everyone enjoyed more utterances per turn—that is, longer student turns—in the NNST classrooms. As discussed in Fiksdal (1998), there is a difference in the pace of ELF speech. All of the teachers had varied and interesting activities, all classes had plenty of humor, all teachers made sure that each student spoke, at least a few times—but the NNST-run classrooms operated at a much slower pace than the NST-run classrooms. Students had, in
the words of one focus group participant, “more time to just think.”

Nowhere was this more striking than in the case of Leisel, who spoke less in every class than any other student. Leisel is naturally a quiet person, whose voice was rarely heard in whole group or even smaller group activities. Teachers frequently had to call on her explicitly before she would speak, and she alone among all of the students observed never once asked a question in whole-class discussion. Yet Leisel produced a staggering number of utterances per turn in working with the NNSTs. It should be noted here that she also had a high percentage of utterances per turn with NSTs, in part due to her lack of “filler” or “backchanneling” speech acts. She was rarely heard to say “MmHm,” “Um,” “Yep,” “Like,” or “OK,” as most of her peers did. Leisel’s only spoken contributions in English had meaning and substance. Regardless, working with the NNSTs clearly and dramatically increased her level of production.

1.2. 2012 Differences in utterances and turns at talk

Similar to the 2010 cohort, the 2012 production data again shows clear differences in talkativeness among individual students. There were those who seemed to speak constantly, regardless of the topic, the teacher, or the activity, and others who nearly always required the teacher to call on them directly before speaking. We can see from Table 14 particularly that one student (Julia) had as many as 380 turns in three classes, while another (Aicha) had a remarkably low number of 41 turns. Best practices call for teachers to control these differences by structuring classes so that each student has a turn to participate in each activity (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Langer, 1998; Applebee et al, 2003). However, although all teachers include appropriate classroom management strategies as
seen in both the 2010 and 2012 data, classroom interaction is again largely dependent on the interlocutors’ personalities.

Table 14: 2012 Utterances/Turn by Teacher Native Status

| Student | NSTs | | | NNSTs | | | | | | |
|---------|------|---|---|------|---|---|---|---|
|         | Utt. | Turns | %  | Utt. | Turns | %  | p    | t    | sd   |
| Julia   | 405  | 380   | 1.066 | 186  | 210   | 0.886 | 0.057 | 2.185 | 0.190 |
| Catalina| 108  | 151   | 0.715 | 93   | 123   | 0.756 |
| Nella   | 288  | 272   | 1.059 | 76   | 122   | 0.623 |
| Aicha   | 56   | 96    | 0.583 | 29   | 41    | 0.707 |
| Gabriela| 72   | 112   | 0.643 | 58   | 102   | 0.569 |
| Maria   | 143  | 151   | 0.947 | 134  | 168   | 0.798 |
| Yolanda | 162  | 203   | 0.798 | 110  | 141   | 0.780 |
| Luis    | 92   | 184   | 0.500 | 50   | 123   | 0.407 |
| Hiroto  | 90   | 105   | 0.857 | 54   | 90    | 0.600 |
| Allessandra| 258 | 252   | 1.024 | 184  | 189   | 0.974 |
| Average | 167  | 191   | 0.819 | 97   | 131   | 0.710 |

An additional similarity to the 2010 data is that once again students spoke more in NST-led classrooms, with slightly more turns at talk seen with most NST sessions, leading to a slightly higher average for their classrooms.

Nevertheless, there are some notable differences in teachers that seem to contradict the 2010 results. Most importantly, the percentage of utterances per turn—that is, length of student turns—is actually higher, on average, in classes led by NSTs as compared to those taught by NNSTs in the 2010 data set. If we consider each teacher individually, we can see
that even though one NST (AA) definitely conforms to our above NST “norm” of rapid-fire, back-and-forth turn taking among all members of the classroom community, the two other NSTs do not follow this pattern. Rather, they follow the previously identified NNST or ELF norm of longer, slower-paced, uninterrupted turns. Native-speaking teacher MV, in fact, elicits long, in-depth stories from students as opposed to the traditional I-R-E teaching pattern discussed above (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Hellerman, 2003; Waring, 2008, 2012; Wells, 1993). We will explore these features of classroom interaction further in the qualitative section that follows the examination of questioning behaviors here.

2. Asking questions in the classroom

Student’s questions, when viewed from an affective perspective, may indicate feelings of ease or relaxation in the classroom (Candela, 1999; Cazden, 2001). This in turn may enable them to achieve their highest linguistic potential. Furthermore, authentic discussion, including questions used to explore different understandings, is an indicator of emerging understanding in the classroom (Applebee et al., 2003; Langer, 2004) and as such, an important part of the successful experience in the classrooms observed here. We have all experienced the sensation of being nervously “tongue-tied,” that is, so unsure of what we are saying that we say little or nothing at all. In this study, most students asked questions of every teacher, and all but Leisel asked some questions of at least one teacher. Table #21 shows the total number of student questions per teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>KA*</th>
<th>NS total</th>
<th>QH</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NNS total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2010 Average**: 2.429 8.000 10.4 3.286 1.000 4.29 0.045 2.52 4.707

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>NS total</th>
<th>QA</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>KX</th>
<th>NNS total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2012 Average**: 3.5 3.7 1.8 9 5.9 4.8 3.3 13.78

**Combined Average**: 9.588 9.625 0.867 0.170 6.533

*Teacher KA organized specific activities in which Ss played a 20-question style guessing game. Thus, many of the questions in this column were related to the game.*
In the data here, many questions may be related to student confusion or, as in the case of teacher KA above, to specific activities designed to elicit or encourage questions. Other team activities or games may lend themselves more readily to questions as well. However, students must still be comfortable enough in the classroom space to ask questions (unless, of course, called on directly), as well as believing that the teacher is capable of supplying them with accurate answers.

The students’ discussion during the focus group sessions implied that they did appreciate the comfort level they found with NNSTs, particularly when teachers were members of the students’ home cultures. Having the classroom conversation led by a fellow Korean, for example, allowed Cho-Hee to feel more comfortable than at any other point in the class sessions. However, when discussing questioning behaviors, the same student was quick to add that she also recognized the importance of NSTs in the classroom. As in Árva and Medgyes (2000) and Medgyes (1992), native teachers were seen here as expert sources of vocabulary knowledge, which students knew they needed to broaden their repertoire of English.

**From 2011 focus group discussion:**

*Cho-Hee:* Even though I feel comfortable the most with that teacher ((from the Ss home country))? I couldn’t ask the—some question that I wanna know like, I couldn’t ask him the—about English expression, because I know that he couldn’t answer that question.

Thus, according to student questioning behaviors combined with their focus group statements, there was a pervasive belief that NSTs could answer questions about vocabulary and English expressions that NNSTs were incapable of explaining. The students believed
that they would get the vocabulary they needed through the NSTs extensive inventory of the English lexicon (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Firth, 1996; Medgyes, 1992).

In the analysis of qualitative results that follows, we will explore affective differences in NST- and NNST-led classrooms, which affected the quantitative data examined here. As we will see, students participated differently in the two types of classroom not only based on their personalities and beliefs, but also on teachers’ classroom practices.

**Qualitative data analysis**

1. **NST and NNST differences in pace: turn-taking style**

As shown in the quantitative results, similar to Fiksdal (1988), regarding discursive differences in intercultural communication, the two types of teacher here also show differences in pace of speech. Furthermore, the pace was set by the style of turn-taking they encouraged: NSTs tended to fill every conversational gap, while NNSTs used fewer “fillers” (including backchanneling). NNSTs spoke more slowly, with more pauses in their speech. In line with Meierkord (2000), the EFL interaction in this study showed little overlapping talk, as well as far less interruption. Additionally, the types of activities favored by NNSTs encouraged longer student turns, which in turn led to more substantive, complex utterances.

Brief examples are given here of the difference in classroom pace. In NST Oral Sample 20, the teacher turns are latched (marked by the equals = sign) at lines 2-4. Furthermore, the teacher continues to talk at line 9, even after admitting that she is keeping students from their work by interrupting them.
Oral Sample 20: From 3-24-2010: NST “KA”

1 T: What’s your favorite Tim Burton movie?

2 Fleuriste: Uh, Big Fish? I love Big Fish=

3 T: = I don’t know if I could choose one=

4 Fleuriste: = I also love uh, um, eh, Sleepy Hollow it’s wild.

5 T: Oh Sleepy Hollow yeah, I forgot he did that!

6 ...

7 T: That was one of my first favorite movies—alright get to writing.

8 Fleuriste: Sorry I--((bends down & starts writing))

9 T: I keep interrupting you

10 Fleuriste: ((laughs))

11 ((Ss write quietly, T continues to talk…))

To illustrate the slower pace of typical NNST speech, note the measurable pauses in teacher speech at lines 7 and 15 in Oral Sample 21 below, shown in length of seconds (e.g., (2) indicating a 2-second pause). In contrast to Oral Sample 20, which is representative of common NST patterns, we can see that this teacher takes his time, creating a space for students to do the same.

Oral Sample 21: From 4-6-2010: NNST “NA”

1 T: Why did you leave?

2 Ruben: Ah, I-I worked there—for five years, and I left because I would

3 come to the US.

4 T: Ohh! Did you rise up to management?

5 Ruben: Yeah. I-I started as ah-regular worker and I finished as same—

6 main manager there. I was in charge of the place. with another person.

7 T: Cool! (2) How do you find—when you came to the US? (3) This is—I

8 don’t want to be personal—were you able to get the same kind of job?
Ruben: No. So i-it, I came here, basically you’re gonna find a job—like, good English. So um, I—I have to study.

T: Yeah

Ruben: I’m going to, ah, school, ah, learn some English, maybe find um—start-some training, um, from a training company.

T: You had to, change careers, you had to—start somewhere, so you could take—a job, that (2) any job that you could find.

In sum, these oral samples demonstrate clear differences in pacing between NST and NNST speech. As discussed in the literature and by the student participants in this study, a slower pace of speech allows hearers and speakers to monitor the conversation more effectively, both on the comprehension side and the production side of communication. The slower rate of speech in NNST classrooms can serve as a relaxing, soothing environmental feature, in which learners can feel confident and successful.

Along with the rapid-fire pace of speech, NSTs also displayed a different focus from NNSTs in their classroom discussion with students. A discussion of these differences follows.

2. Differences in teacher focus

Another notable difference in these samples is the focus of the exchange. While in Oral Sample 20, there is equal focus on the teacher and student (both give their opinions of and experiences with various movies), in Oral Sample 21 the focus is entirely on the students. At no time does the NNST offer his opinion, instead asking questions designed to elicit more details about the students’ experiences. His language also showed sensitivity to student’s privacy, as in the phrase “This is—I don’t want to be personal—were you able to
get the same kind of job?” He acknowledged the student’s potential discomfort with the subject, which was alleviated when the student responded to his question immediately.

Furthermore, returning to Fiksdal’s (1988) discussion of deixis used to build rapport, a key component of emergent common ground (Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009), “person deixis” in the form of the pronouns “I” and “you” is very enlightening in these oral samples. Remarkably, the only time during the exchange in Oral Sample 21 when the NNST used the word “I” was to soften what he saw as a potentially invasive question: “I don’t want to be personal” (lines 7-8). In fact, the focus of this “I” was only on the teacher as related to the student—he did not wish to force the student to discuss private information. At no other time during this discussion did this teacher use “I” or “me”; focusing on his students, he used “you” eight times in the short passage above.

Note the clear difference between this teacher’s use of personal pronouns, compared to that of the NST in Oral Sample 20. She uses “you” or “your” twice, but “I” or “my” four times, pointing to herself as the focus of her exchange. In line with Wenger (1998), Harré and Langenhove (1999), and Hallenbeck Nadeau (2008), the teachers in this study position themselves differently in the classroom space, as either the central figures of the classroom or collaborators working in an educational community of practice.

Thus, the focus, whether on the student or teacher, along with the pace of speech during the conversation, clearly affects student production, as demonstrated by much longer student turns in Oral Sample 21 than those seen in Oral Sample 20. In essence, the slower pace of verbal exchange and focus on the student in Oral Sample 21 allows time for students to formulate their thoughts, as well as reassurance that their contributions to the
conversation will be valued by the teacher. As mentioned by a student in the focus group discussion, the perception of teacher interest helped pupils to produce more English:

**Cho-Hee:** When they …make me think that they wanna talk with me, your English—can talk more.

The NNSTs’ more even, relaxed pace of classroom discourse, combined with their primary focus on the students, contributed to an atmosphere in which the students were able to “talk more” as well as using more sophisticated, complex language. However, neither of these models of teacher behavior is exclusively limited to either type of teacher. The following section demonstrates important differences in the 2012 classrooms that flouted these NST and NNST patterns.

### 3. Differences between the 2010 and 2012 NST and NNST teaching styles

When we compare the examples that follow to teacher behavior in the 2010 classrooms, it becomes clear that our discussion must be more complex than an analysis of student performance in classes led by NSTs vs. NNSTs. Rather, teacher practices such as length of student turns and activities designed to elicit (or prohibit) long stories and stretches of talk are far more relevant when examining language production.

As discussed above, one important difference between the 2010 and 2012 oral classroom data was that the types of teacher interaction—whether they allowed for long student turns, or focused on rapid back-and-forth discourse—was varied between NSTs and NNSTs. In opposition to the NST discourse pattern seen in 2010, the following teacher elicits a great deal of complex, sophisticated language from her students—because of the pacing and focus of her classroom exchanges.
In Oral Sample 22, NST “MV” used a complex and in-depth personal example to elicit extremely compelling stories from her students. Although she speaks at length while telling her story, its performative purpose is to model storytelling for the students. Furthermore, even though the teacher gives positive feedback at line 15 following the student contribution (Waring, 2012), it is based on the student’s improvised, personalized contributions—not on her ability to arrive at the correct, teacher-determined response inherent in traditional I-R-E exchanges.

**Oral Sample 22: From 10-30-12: NST “MV”**

1. **T:** So, I do some volunteer work with a medical team in Guatemala.
2. ((Lengthy discussion of culture clash omitted))
3. **T:** That—mean anything t’anyone do you have any stories about a time you felt like that?
4. (4)
5. **Gina:** ((raises hand))… I work in a day care so, one thing, it was funny I don’t know if it’s (. ) the culture or not? But, we kiss a lot in my culture so, my kids, I kiss my kids then they were like ((wiping face off with hand)) “what are you kissing me all the time you are kissing to me” I’m like woah so now, I’m more—have no kisses, only hugs? …I don’t know if it—every American person like that but, it was so funny because, it was this moment was, more than one….So, was this kind of thing, made me shame of my—I don’t know like that.
6. …
7. **T:** That’s a very good example.

A high level of sentence complexity in the student production, as well as evidence of common ground between this NST and student situated in their experiences as members of different non-native cultures, can be seen throughout the exchange in Oral Sample 22.
In another example of differences between the 2012 and 2010 classrooms, two of the 2012 NNSTs, “TI” (presented below in Oral Sample 23) and “KX” (presented in Oral Sample 17 above), structured classroom discussion in a very rigid manner. They follow traditional I-R-E patterns, calling on students turn-by-turn for participation instead of encouraging naturally occurring conversation, and thus seeing very low sentence-level utterances per student turn.

Although these instructors kept the attention of their students and ensured that each student would have opportunities to speak, in line with the positive effects of I-R-E structures (Zimmerman, 2014), the overall classroom climate was far less open than those of NNSTs in 2010, and lent itself to less natural conversation (Waring, 2008, 2012). The level of sentence complexity was lower in these teachers’ classrooms than in those where students had longer turns at talk.

Furthermore, differences in individual NNSTs proficiency do affect the students’ classroom experience, regardless of whether the instructor uses “typical” NST practices in her classroom (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Firth, 1996; Medgyes, 1992, Snow, Kanhi-Stein, & Brinton, 2006). In addition to a low level of sentence complexity, Oral Sample 23 shows a misfire in classroom conversation that occurred when students failed to understand what was expected of them, because of a flawed question form produced by the instructor at lines 2-3.

**Oral Sample 23: From 10-16-2012: NNST “TI”**

1. **T**: Ok …Let’s read aloud together. Ok let’s start.

2. **T and Ss** ((together)): “How asking personal questions means in your home country?”

3.  …

4. **Maria**: Your home, in your home country right?
Because there is considerable disparity between the private context situated in the individual cultural bases of her students and this teacher, the students must attempt to find meaning in the lexical level of her question (Kecskes, 2007, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Creating an infelicitous ELF exchange (Firth, 1996), the teacher’s flawed question form renders her students unable to determine what is required of them in response. In the end, they produce questions in their mother tongues. Finally, at line 19, the teacher realizes that misunderstanding has occurred and must dismiss the question in order to move her class forward.
As was seen in Oral Sample 17, highly structured teacher-student exchanges can be fertile ground for misunderstanding, based on the students’ elevated level of awareness that what is most salient to them in the interaction may be less so to their teacher interlocutors (Giora, 1997; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Because of the power inherent in the teaching role (House, 2003; Pacek, 2005) students are under a great deal of pressure to perform as their teachers expect—which can sometimes be very difficult in intercultural classrooms. As Luis said in Oral Sample 17:

_I don’t know what you want me to say._

Clearly, such pressure is the exact opposite of a lowered affective filter. In this case, if they don’t know what their teachers want them to say—students may say nothing at all. Thus, I repeat the premise stated above, that _teacher practice_ is far more important than native status in encouraging sophisticated language production among students.

As demonstrated in Oral Samples 20-23, even though some students talk a great deal and some rarely contribute to the discussion, all members of the language-learning classroom community have more to say, producing more thoughtful, authentic speech, when given sufficient time and space to express themselves and their beliefs. Students in this study simply produced more advanced English when allowed the freedom to formulate their thoughts and explore their ideas. They also produced more complex and authentic language when teachers avoid directing the conversation so strictly that any digression from the expected or desired response to their questions causes a breakdown in understanding. The teacher who shows interest in the students as “close acquaintances” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 289),
who prioritizes students as collaborators in community building, who allows the space and time for students to produce higher-level language, consequently sees students engaged as community members, as common ground emerges in the ESOL classroom.

4. Common ground and the classroom Community of Practice (CoP)

In this section, I explore key evidence of common ground and community in the ESOL classroom. First, I examine concepts of Community of Practice (CoP) and emergent common ground in reference to the participants in this study. Then, I discuss signs of community inclusion and exclusion present in the participants’ intercultural communication; specifically, through interlocutors’ use of deixis (Fiksdal, 1988). Finally, I turn to evidence of ways that both NSTs and NNSTs interact with students to foster existing community and build the new “English Classroom” CoP, employing teacher practices designed to lower the affective filter by raising common ground.

4.1. English language learners and native speakers: “we” vs. “they”

Even though the students who participated in this study sometimes felt that NSTs could understand their language production and pronunciation better, thus providing rich lexical experiences in the classroom (Firth, 1996; Medgyes, 1992), they identified most closely with the NNSTs experiences of learning English, asserting that this gave the NNSTs a level of empathy impossible for NSTs to achieve. They emphasized the NSTs kindness and helpfulness, but stressed that true comprehension of the ELL struggles could only come through common experiences. In accordance with the common ground discussion in Chapter 2, students and teachers come from different backgrounds and prior experiences, bringing
their individualized understandings to play in the current situation (Claus, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). There is little core common ground to begin with; thus, emergent common ground is based primarily on the actual situational context of the English classes. As opposed to students in EFL classes, who may belong to a common linguistic or cultural community that provides a common foundation for conversation (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Medgyes, 1992), interlocutors in ESOL classes come together from a variety of external “communities of practice” (Wenger, 1998). Depending on the level of shared cultural and linguistic experience between participants in the classroom, this may or may not include core common ground among students and teachers.

Therefore, when the classes consist of students and teachers from many different countries, this cultural commonality is almost nonexistent. One must define “Community of Practice” more broadly. Specifically, students in this study did not perceive their native-speaking teachers, who may certainly have experienced their own language learning struggles in other cultures, as facing common challenges; thus, they did not believe that they shared a mutual CoP. Rather, at the time participants in these classes met, the NSTs were perceived as privileged members of the target language culture. On the other hand, we can identify all students and all non-native speaking teachers as members of one general CoP; i.e., they enter the classroom as ELLs. The students discussed this empathic connection between themselves and their NNS teachers in short-answer and focus group responses.
**From 2010 Focus Group:**

**Kusema:** They (non-native teachers) have even sometimes more ability
because they can understand when we learn, they thought that too.

**Ruben:** Yeah they know how it feels

**Kusema:** And you are trying to talk with them, they don’t get frustrated,
because they know-ah, “I’ve been there”

The students above realized that they and their nonnative professors shared in the
CoP of “English language learners” before the classes had begun. Although they identified
positive qualities in both types of teacher, and discussed several favorable aspects of each,
this “ELL” core common ground gave students a sense of security in their NNS teachers’
ability to understand them, to empathize with their experiences in the classroom.

One student from the 2011 cohort discussed an even deeper cultural connection to
one of her teachers.

**Cho-Hee:** . . . the most I feel comfortable and the most I participate
class was by a nonnative teacher . . . he was from same country? So he made
me feel comfortable.

A teacher who shared no common ground but the present classroom community could never
imbue this student with an equal sense of comfort or well-being. When compared to one
who not only participated with the student in the “English language learner” (ELL) CoP, but
also in the CoP of her home country, this teacher’s connections to his student gave her the
security to participate more actively in his classes, which, in turn, promoted greater language
learning.

Figure 5 shows this connection between students and teachers in the two CoPs
discussed in this section. The intersection of the two includes students and both types of
teacher, in membership in the English classroom community. In the present study, this most relevant group is created by all of the classroom members participating together to build emergent common ground. The classroom experiences, the language of instruction, and the various relationships that develop within this community together serve to connect all of its participants.

Figure 5: *Two Communities of Practice*

As seen in Figure 5, we find both the NNSTs and the students in the CoP of ELLs. This membership in the same initial community causes a strong connection between the students and their NNS teachers. However, the NS teachers are alone as members of the second community of origin represented in the classes here. Even though these teachers can participate with their students in the classroom community, the lack of shared core common ground should imply that they can never quite connect to one another on the same level as that experienced with the NNS teachers.
In addition to the focus group examples, student language production in the classrooms shows awareness of this cultural difference. Both students and teachers used deixis of person, employing pronouns that distanced them from the surrounding culture, referring to themselves and other non-native speakers as “we” and calling native speakers “you” or “they.” (Fiksdal, 1988). This was reversed in NST speech, providing a distinct difference between “typical Americans” (we) and members of other groups (they or you). On the other hand, NNSTs used language that was more inclusive with their students, identifying themselves as part of a common “newcomer” group.

**Oral Sample 24: From 3-25-2010: NST “KA”**

1. **Fleuriste:** And they, when I say something, they just say, “what”? like,
2. hard, for hard, I just say h- I say ar-
3. **T:** =Yes,=
4. **Fleuriste:** = and they, “what? do you mean hard?” and I, “oh, hard”—or
5. “hot”?=
6. **T:** Anything with an “h” at the beginning?= 
7. **Fleuriste:** = Yeah, I don’t pronounce that “h”=
8. **T:** = I think a lot of Americans recognize that though, so if you—don’t say
9. the “h”, we s=
10. **Fleuriste:** ((shakes head)) =you know some of them don’t because when I
11. say, “ot cho-co- late”, “ot cho-co-late” they say, “what
12. **T:** when you say it like that it’s not that you’re saying , “ot cho-co-late”
13. like that you’re saying, “otchocolate” really fast, we say “hot choklit”=
14. **T:** So we’re like, “what?”That’s what...
15. **Kusema:** ((speaking French to Fleuriste))

The above extract is particularly telling in that, initially, at line 8, the NST is expressing empathy for a student who has complained that Americans often cannot understand her pronunciation. She asserts that “a lot of Americans” recognize that French
speakers don’t pronounce the “h” at the beginning of words. However, the student corrects her sharply, interrupting, saying “you know” for emphasis, and giving a concrete example of the problem. The teacher then shifts her stance, identifying with other NSs and effectively creating space between herself and the students as she says, “when you say it like that it’s not that you’re saying, ‘ot cho-co-late’ like that you’re saying, ‘otchocolate’ really fast, we say ‘hot choklit’.” The student promptly turns to a fellow Francophone and creates even more linguistic space by code switching to French, reasserting the core common ground between two members of the same linguistic CoP.

As seen in Oral Sample 22 above, one 2012 teacher invited students to discuss their experiences of “culture shock.” One student’s extreme story, in particular, provides a glaring example of how such conceptual differences between the non-native “we” and the American “you” or “they” are first embedded in newcomers’ minds. As this was one of the later sessions, occurring after the group had been together for nearly six weeks, emergent common ground had grown among the classroom community members. Nevertheless, the student uses “you” to discuss Americans, and in so doing, separates herself from those born in the U.S. It is important to note that this student has been a resident of the US for several years, unlike many of her peers who are here temporarily. Regardless of her longtime residence, this student still feels differences between the CoP of “immigrants” and that of “natives”. Her story provides a prime example of the divide between “we” and “they.” The teacher acknowledges this difference at line 16, validating the student’s feelings of ostracism as a member of the NNS community.
Oral Sample 25: From 10-30-2012: NST “MV”

1 Alessandra: There was a woman, that woman, he said look like me…and this woman was stealing stuff from the neighborhood so,

2 T & Ss: oh wow, oh!

3 Alessandra: yeah. and. then they put me in front of those peoples, ask those if it was I if if they, they saw me steal something, and then they told no is not her, and then they, like, look at my bag, how much money I had, and, I never learned everything about it.

4 T: Do you feel like that—changed your self-image at that time that you had to=

5 → 11 Alessandra:=Oh I think so, I think so the way—the way (2) you Americans. sometimes look at us. you know what I mean?

6 T: Mm hm ((nods))

7 → 14 Alessandra: like it’s, of course it’s not everybody else but …

8 T: That’s a very good example of changing your self-image and very different in a new country where you don’t have the same power the same control

9 Alessandra: of course they say, they say, I’m sorry, but—not enough

Even though the student tempers her initial statement, “the way you Americans sometimes look at us” (lines 11-12) by adding, “of course it’s not everybody” at line 14, both her language and powerful example show that the difference in status between members of the NS and NNS communities cannot be erased by time or apology. “Of course they say I’m sorry, but—not enough” (line 19).

The above story was one of several similar accounts of misunderstanding and native-speaker bias that students told during this class session. In light of these early experiences, it is no surprise that, even though they acknowledged that “not everybody” treats non-native
speakers badly, the students in this study were automatically more relaxed and found more immediate common ground with their NNS teachers than their NS teachers. While on the one hand this teacher gave students ample respect as community members entitled to share long and complex stories, the content of students’ stories exemplified their awareness of differences between themselves and “you Americans,” reminding them of the wide gap between natives of the United States and newcomers. This gap created a condition in which NSTs had to employ deliberate practices designed to show common human experience in order to lower the students’ affective filters and build community.

In another example, showing that not only students but also instructors are sensitive to this cultural gap, the NNST shows solidarity with her students by emphasizing the differences in food choice and dietary practices between Americans and the NNS members of the class. She uses “they” to describe Americans and their food options. The students in turn identify with this, using “we” and “our” when talking about people or foods from their own countries and “they” discussing Americans, segregating themselves from the surrounding population.

**Oral Sample 26: From 3-17-2010: NNST “QH”**

1. **T:** Ok what is the national food?
2. **Panawasa:** Our best dish is the rice and curry.
3. **T:** Ok we do—curry is starting to become in fashion in Italy now. So is there-others?
4. **Sophie:** I don’t know the English word I know the Italian word cutaleta?
5. **…**
6. **T:** I don’t think that they have cutaleta
7. **Fleuriste:** I think--in France we have croque monsieur
8. **T:** OK and--what about you? In your country?
Kateryna: Oh we have a lot of uh like—special national dishes

T: I brought a recipe from my home district. I make this pasta every week for my American friends, they love it.

The teacher and students have found common ground in that their national favorites are different from what is typically eaten in the U.S., and from what their “American friends” are used to—or, in fact, capable of—cooking in this country.

In one case, a NNS teacher addressed the non-native connection between herself and the students directly. The students were completing a worksheet asking questions about positive thinking in their lives, and some were struggling with the third questions, “When do you think you have negative thinking in your life?” The instructor asserted that they might understand how a person in an overwhelmingly negative situation felt, because they, like she, had been in a situation where they felt like outsiders in society—namely, their experience with culture shock in the United States. The teacher additionally implies that English language learners may feel like they have made a mistake in coming to the U.S.

Oral Sample 27: From 11-1-2012: NNST “KX”

T: I mean, me, I’m standing here but all of us are non-native speakers.

yeah. I’m also in the same situation as you are, so, we feel more vulnerable. Yeah in a way, so, we might be—feel—more often depressed.

Oh! What am I doing here, I mean—I can do better in my own country but here, frustrating. It’s like a—oh I cannot find what just vulnerable.

The instructor’s words showed that she and her students were absolutely part of a common community outside of the classroom, which had been in existence before the classroom community began to develop and would continue after the classes ended. The
elevated level of rapport seen in the above ELF classrooms exists in an atmosphere of empathy and common ground that is very difficult to replicate in those led by NSTs (Fiksdal, 1988; Medgyes, 1992). Nevertheless, in the following section, we will examine teacher practices, employed by both NSTs and NNSTs, that successfully helped students to participate in the classroom CoP.

4.2. Emergent common ground in the classroom Community of Practice

As common ground emerges in the classroom CoP, games, play, joking, and humor are important means of creating rapport via a fun, relaxed classroom environment (Bell, 2005; Nguyen, 2007). Indeed, many instructors incorporate play into their classes, whether naturally, as an extension of their own personalities, or deliberately, as a tool to engage and include students in the classroom community. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 2, strong emotional memories, such as those associated with laughter and play, have been proven to aid memory, which is vital to student success in the language classroom (Leiguarda de Orue, 2009; Weiss, 2000). In this study, NSTs were especially adept at incorporating fun in the classroom, including modeling speech formulae (Árva & Medgyes, 2000) that served as memes, replicating themselves as important features of the emergent common ground. Over the course of the class sessions, the memes discussed here helped knit students and teachers together as members of the classroom CoP.

Memes, first defined by Richard Dawkins (1976) as replicators “that convey the idea of a unit of cultural transmission or a unit of imitation,” are elements of culture passed from person to person by imitation, as opposed to physical traits that are passed along genetically. They are particularly perpetuated through imitation (Blackmore, 2000), as members of the
same CoP copy one another in style of clothing, food preferences, musical tastes, and, most important for our discussion, catch phrases or elements of formulaic speech. In this vein, *memes may be said to indicate the existence of common ground in a community*, since members exhibit similar behaviors or non-genetic traits. Specifically, reoccurrences of memes in speech have a single point of origin known to all members of the community—thus giving their meanings an equally high level of salience among all community members each time they occur. This unnaturally high level of salience can, in itself, be a trigger for humor, as we will see in the oral samples that follow.

As leaders whose job includes the important task of socializing other community members, teachers, according to Kamhi (2004), are “one of society’s officially sanctioned meme spreaders.” Moreover, as discussed in relation to research question 2, students continue to regard NSTs as particularly valid language authorities, regardless of their actual educational experiences. The “native speaker” concept is simply too entrenched in many English language learners’ psyches—not to mention in the common English lexicon (Pacek, 2005)—to be dislodged after a few weeks of classes. Thus, in this study, the use of memes in the classroom culture is initiated by the native speaking teachers, whose frequent repetition of formulaic terms quickly leads to the assimilation of these terms by their students. In an example take from the 2010 classes, Oral Sample 28 demonstrates a native-speaking teacher’s use of the term “awesome,” later followed by student use of the same term. In this sample, students first include “awesome” when they are asked to role play scenarios using “typical American humor” to interact in various social situations.
Oral Sample 28: From 3-23-2010: NST “KA”

1  T: Awesome. OK so today we’re going to talk about—conversation, natural conversation. Because that’s what you want to do right when you speak English? When you speak with native speakers, you want to be understood right?
2  …
3  T: You understand? Awesome…
4  …
5  Nikola: Oh hi cutie! How are you-- it was awesome last Friday, can you remember me? Awwww (rubs Fleuriste’s hair, laughs)
6  ((Ss & T are laughing))
7  Fleuriste: yeah it was great, I had a great time with you. Yeah the, Irish party was so awesome—but what were you doing last Friday-- I was in Verona then.

The role play, which begins at line 8, includes both playful behaviors (one student rubbing the other’s hair) and topics (a case of mistaken identity) as well as the “awesome” meme. This element of play helped to embed the “awesome” meme in the students’ memories and lexicons, even though they had not used it in the class before this lesson.

In a 2012 example of an even stronger meme, the NS instructor (AA) initiated the term “cool” in his first class session. As demonstrated through the oral and written examples that follow, “cool” proves to be a meme woven throughout the fabric of this classroom community’s common ground. As is seen here, production of a metaphorical term like “cool,” is a skill to be emulated by all who strive to become part of the “ingroup” in the classroom (and larger) community. Given the overrepresentation of young adults in the classrooms observed here, it should be no surprise that the “cool” meme modeled by the first NST to lead the group took hold with tenacity. Initially appearing during the second week,
the “cool” meme examined in Oral Sample 29 is very successful in its self-replication and longevity over the duration of this English course. It survives—along with its attached humor—throughout the final weeks of the class, not necessarily in relation to anything in the current activity, and regardless of the instructors’ lesson plans, level of rapport with the students, or native statuses.

**Oral Sample 29: From 10-23-2013: NNST “TI”**

1. Maria: **Cool**
2. T: Yeah **cool**, right?
3. Ss ((all laughing))
4. Julia: ((laughing)) **cool**.
5. T: good, yeah **cool**
6. ((entire class, observers, all laughing))

In this interaction, as demonstrated by the whole classroom community’s laughter at lines 3 and 6, the “cool” meme has taken on a life of its own as a source of humor in the class. All of the students, observers, and teachers laugh every time it is used—because as a meme, the conceptual base for this lexical item is commonly held by the *entire community*, and enjoys the same most-salient meaning for each person in the group.

The following oral sample shows that the “cool” meme survives even to the final classroom interaction—the focus group discussion that takes place after the formal classes have ended.
Oral Sample 30: 11-7-2012 (Rs MHN Focus Group)

1  Nella: for me this is the first time I had a native speaker teacher? I’ve
2       always=
3       =(interruption as new Ss arrives)=
4  Nella: = but I thought it was cool, because=
5       ...
6  Yolanda: Yeah um, in my experience I think it’s um, exercises, or,
7  grammar exercise and examples about them? They explain in very good
8  way how I’m learning and give paper and writing and I’m practicing.
9  Rs: Cool. As you say.
10  ((all laugh))

Even this researcher is not immune to the pervasive nature of memes in speech.

In contrast to the typical lack of metaphorical or formulaic speech in written
production previously discussed (Biber, 1988; Halliday, 2004; Tannen, 1980, 1982), the
“cool” meme begun during the second week of classes was so tenacious that it even
appeared in a student writing sample after week five. One of the more fluent students, who,
regardless, used little metaphor in her oral or prior written production, included this
description of Halloween:

Everyone else wears different kind of costume. It’s so cool!

This was exactly the same phrasing used by the teacher who initially modeled the “cool”
metaphor (see Oral Sample 31, line 3 below), offering further evidence for its identification
as a meme— cool + ranking; in this case, “so cool.”

Of course, such mimetic speech—or indeed, any formulaic speech—runs the risk of
being misunderstood by those who are not present at the time of its introduction, risking the
exclusion of absent community members through its use as a type of “inside joke”. Such
misunderstanding need not result in complete failure of common ground, however, as long as an explanation is provided to new or returning members. The following extract shows teacher “AA” providing a framework for the use of “cool” for a student who had been absent on the day of its inception. This both served to add humor to the classes, and to reinforce the use of the “cool” meme.

**Oral Sample 31: From 10-10-2012: NST “AA”**

1. T: What I want to do first is to write down your name again, just like your first time, write down your cool number again. How cool are you? I’ll give you 8-10 very cool not so cool or somewhat. So maybe you’re cooler since yesterday, you maybe came today, really COOL or not cool.
2. Hiroto: I have a question. Cool, it means what?
3. T: Cool! Good question. I didn’t define it. So this is really a good question because, How are you cool? I will give you some direction: I am not looking for appearance. I’m looking for the inside. That’s all we can say ((laughs)).

The student nodded and was able to complete his “cool” rating after hearing the teacher’s explanation. The foundation of humor reinforced in part by the “cool” meme ensures its survival as an independent linguistic phenomenon throughout the remaining 2012 class session.

In addition to memes, other forms of joking as a rapport-building feature of speech common among “close acquaintances” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 289) were seen in the classes here. As discussed, effective teachers employ games, play, joking, and humor in their fun, relaxed classrooms, thus lowering students’ affective filters and creating memorable emotional experiences (Bell, 2005; Leiguarda de Orue, 2009; Nguyen, 2007). In some cases, the
simplest interaction between instructor and student can be humorous in itself, particularly if the instructor has a naturally playful personality. On the other hand, carefully structured humor can sometimes go awry, if teachers misjudge their students’ levels of comprehension of the target language or its cultural conceptual base. Below, we see illustrations of humor that sometimes worked and sometimes did not.

Instructor “AA”, whose personality was very outgoing and active, used humor in all of his class sessions. Humor made his classes some of the most memorable when the students reflected on them during the focus groups. Oral Sample 32 shows the students laughing after teacher “AA” uses humor through incongruity.

**Oral Sample 32: From 10-9-2012: NST “AA”**

1. **T:** My name is Andy.
2. **Nella:** Just Andy?
3. **T:** Yeah. I don’t know what you wanna call me we can keep it formalanyou can call me Mr. Andrews.
4. **Julia:** No, Andy.
5. **T:** You like-you like Andy? Alright! Well this is how you spell “Andy”.
6. **T:** Some people spell it with an “i”? But I think that’s a-a female thing, that’s not-that’s not me. Not at all.
7. **(Ss all laugh)**

The humor seen here is completely unrelated to the teacher’s native status. The amusement at the simple mismatch in gender roles (lines 7-8) starts the class laughing. This instructor produces several more incongruous, amusing statements, carrying the thread of humor through the class session, creating instant rapport as community develops (Bell, 2005; Nguyen, 2007). Students continue to laugh throughout this class session, and laugh about this session when they recall it during later classes.
On the other hand, native teacher “KR” tried starting with a sophisticated joke, using a political cartoon that related to her topic of environmental change. Unfortunately, the students did not understand her cartoon, and she had to explain it after a lengthy pause (line 4).


1. \text{T:} Um, I’ve got this little cartoon here where it’s saying why don’t the greenhouse gases escape through the hole in the ozone layer. Does anyone know kind of what’s that’s referring to? Or no?

2. \text{4} (8) Um, well with global warming, there’s a lot of controversy about the ozone layer which is in the atmosphere, the last layer of the atmosphere and all the carbon dioxide’s kinda causing the hole in it and they’re making a joke with that.

After the failed humor, students began this teacher’s sessions less engaged in her class, with fewer turns at talk, and instead of watching the presentation were often seen looking at their watches or whispering to friends on the side. However, failed humor does not necessarily lead to a failed class, and in this teacher’s sessions, students’ interest in the topic under study draws them in. By the time students come together for the focus group, this teacher’s exemplary level of preparation and choice of a compelling discussion topic leads to students naming her as one of the most prepared and “best” teachers of the session.
From 2012 focus group discussion

Rs: What is most important in a successful English teacher?

Gabriela: Um, they gotta be prepared for class, make sure that they teach what they know, they know what they gonna teach, and

Maria: I think similar too because I remember one teacher I don’t remember the name but that class I most, I understand one teacher—I remember the one teacher the environment pollute? That pollute?

((Other Ss)) pollution

Maria: Yeah. So three days he explained the same topic. So I understand. Right now.

In spite of the failed initial attempt at humor, students found this instructor’s lessons most memorable and claimed to have learned most from her, because of her excellent preparation.

One example of humor that engaged students, perhaps contributing to their higher levels of sentence complexity in the NNST instructor’s sessions, was seen in an early class, when the teacher and students are exploring cultural differences together. The instructor has directed students to tell each other what they know about their classmates’ native cultures, and the spontaneous, naturally occurring, collaboratively constructed humor served to build community by including all students—and the instructor—in the joke:

Oral Sample 34: From 10-2-2012: NNST “QA”

1 Yolanda: Yes inside the-tequila bottle, inside the bottle, there is a little bug, or animal
2 T: I never drank tequila so I don’t know what they put inside
3 Luis: a worm, it’s a worm
4 Yolanda: Worm? ((turns back to teacher)) a worm?
5 T: a WORM there’s a WORM?
6 Luis: It’s a small one
On this first class of the semester, the NNST and students have worked together to include humor in the lesson, showing that humor has contributed to rapport so that students engage as full members of the classroom community even at this early stage (Bell, 2005; Nguyen, 2007). Furthermore, the specific humor form—“it tastes like chicken”—succeeded partly because of its high risk factor. To the student who introduces it into the classroom lexicon, the salient meaning of “tastes like chicken” is that this is a joke, used whenever the speaker wants to make light of some particularly unusual, potentially unsavory meat product. However, on this first day of classes, the student has no way of knowing whether her NNST and fellow students will also understand this level of her utterance. Her private context turns out to be a good match for the other community members’ private contexts, as “tastes like chicken” is correctly interpreted as humor in the actual situational context (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009).

Shedding further light on the presence of humor in the emergent common ground of this classroom community, focus group comments gave the definite impression that students were engaged and ready to learn when the teachers provided fun, varied activities, such as games that targeted their different learning styles and interests.
From 2011 focus group discussion:

Silvia: So, is very interesting y-uhen-then, is meant, for the teacher, too, because when she is funny? The class is more interesting. Is no-uh—maybe, if the teacher is boring, the class is boring.

***

Maidali: Yes, I like the=

Silvia=the man, the man Korean.

Maidali: Yes, he is the exc—he is, ah funny.

Rs: …if you could say one thing that’s most important for a teacher to be a good English teacher what would it be?

Keitaro: ((smiling)) I think—a, funny class.

From 2010 focus group discussion

Rs: Do you think those things helped you to learn? As well as being fun?

Kusema: Yeah

Ruben: Mm Hmm ((nods))

Kusema: First of all they just they makes you just—they will calm you. You feel like free.

Ruben: Yeah

Kusema: Instead of feeling that you fear this work. You feel free and—you start talking.

Ruben: Yeah that was fun they help you get comfortable

Clearly, the “fun factor” in these classes helped to lower the students’ affective filters, thus building rapport and laying the groundwork for student learning, as well as improved memory, leading to a successful English educational experience as students “feel free—and start talking.”

Finally, returning to the topic of students’ prior experience with English teachers, adult ELLs in this study indicated that they had not previously had fun, playful, varied
experiences with NNSTs, again suggesting that their current NNSTs ability to have fun in the classroom was a pleasant surprise. This was certainly a contributing factor to the students’ changes in opinion related to NNSTs examined in relation to research question 2, and as such helped to promote a positive environment in which learning could be maximized.

One final example of humor occurred when a student teased one of the former teachers, who had returned as an observer, at the beginning of a later class session. Her “inside joke” is directed toward the instructor’s tendency to arrive late for class; this is a tendency that the members of the classroom community have incorporated as *coresense* in their shared common ground (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009).

**Oral Sample 35: From 11-1-2012: NNST “KX”**

1  ((Observer QA enters))
2  **Julia:** Quentin you are not lost I’m surprised
3  ((Ss, T, Obs. all laugh))
4  **QA:** No I am not lost tonight
5  **Julia:** No lost, sorry. wrong word. late.
6  ((Even more laughter))
7  **Julia:** sorry, no lost, late. *You are late always*

The effects of a lowered affective filter among the majority of the students, especially those who have persisted throughout the classes and remain at the end of the six-week session, can be seen as students interact with teachers, observers, and former teachers in a close-knit community. Along with their NS and NNS teachers, the students have
become “close acquaintances” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 289), and the rapport they enjoy in the shared classroom humor has aided them in their language learning experience (Bell, 2005).

Summary

As we have seen in the data above, there was definite variation in students’ linguistic production when working with different teachers, most markedly in the percentage of sentence-level utterances along with complex and compound sentences seen in the NNST classrooms. To be sure, the students and NNSTs in this study demonstrated a clear connection through their mutual empathy, demonstrated through what they said as well as the use of deixis to position themselves outside of the target culture. However, it must also be noted that students produced more questions in NST classes, possibly in line with their stated belief that NSTs are more capable of giving them lexical information and vocabulary needed for their everyday lives (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Medgyes, 1992). Additionally, I have shown here that while students declare themselves more comfortable with their fellow English language learners at the head of the class, their success depends on teacher advantages that are not related to native status. Based on the analysis here, it is clear that teacher practice is more important to lowering students’ affective filters than teacher native status. Perhaps, as Pacek’s (2005) title aptly suggests, teacher capability is more closely related to “personality, not nationality” (p. 243).

Thus, the third hypothesis, that nonnative- speaker teachers’ ELF classroom environments will provide an atmosphere conducive to lowering students’ affective filters though greater rapport and empathy, was not fully upheld by the results of this study. Rather, the teacher practices intended to establish rapport, including using humor in lessons,
positioning themselves as student-focused facilitators, and initiating and perpetuating memes and joking, all served to lower students’ affective filters, allowing them to achieve their highest potential in the classroom. All teachers, regardless of their native status, can employ effective pedagogical practices in the ESOL classroom.
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study explored a number of variables in teacher practice and presence, as well as in students’ lived experience, during the development of emergent common ground in the adult English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classroom. I completed this mixed-methods investigation in response to Llurda’s (2005) appeal for “more empirical research” regarding the “role played by the language and teaching skills” (p.148) of native-speaking teachers of English (NSTs) compared to their non-native speaker counterparts (NNSTs). Viewed through a socio-cognitive lens to evaluate student language production, the research findings suggest several practical applications relevant to supporting sophisticated levels of both written and oral English production in the language classroom. The linguistic features demonstrated by student participants give a clear picture of the influence teacher strategies have on students’ lived experience within the confines of the classroom community of practice (CoP). In line with Llurda (2005), the adult ESOL classes examined for this study share similar attributes with over 170 programs across the United States and Canada (p.133); thus this relatively small sample can be considered representative of adult students in comparable programs.

Specifically, I first examined quantitative aspects of student language, observing their sentence complexity, metaphorical density, and formulaic speech, in both NST and NNST-led classrooms. Next, this study explored qualitative aspects of student-teacher interaction and student language production in the “lived experience” of the classroom CoP (Creswell, 2007; Wenger, 1998). Finally, I analyzed changes in student opinion regarding both types of teacher, in line with Pacek (2005) Moussu (2010), and others (see also Cheung, 2002; Mahboob, 2003), discovering that there are many teacher features more
important to a successful student language learning experience than whether the teacher is a native speaker of the target language or not.

Thus, this study adds to the discussion of the effectiveness of language instructors drawn from both NST and NNST populations as well as students’ opinions regarding both types of teacher; and finally provides examples of and recommendations for best practices in a successful language classroom.

**Quantitative differences in student production**

**Finding #1: Native and nonnative teachers have different advantages**

As I examined the differences in student’s language production, it was clear that differences in complex, metaphorical, and formulaic speech did exist when they interacted with different teachers. However, this was not a clear-cut as I had expected; that is, not all of the indicators of more advanced language usage were higher in classes led by NSTs. In line with Medgyes (1992) and Árva and Medgyes (2000), the NSTs and NNSTs in this study each had their own advantages.

First of all, as anticipated, students did produce slightly *higher levels of formulaic language in classes led by NSTs*. This was expected; as had been seen in previous studies (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Firth, 1996; Medgyes, 1992; Seidlhofer, 2004) ELF communication in classes led by NNSTs lacked the same level of idiomaticity present in NST to student communication. NNSTs often struggled with formulaic language, including incorrectly defining some idioms and using outdated or uncommon speech formulas. Similar to previous literature (House, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2004), I found that native speakers served as good models of formulaic speech, effortlessly including idioms and other formulaic
language in their classrooms and seeing a higher level of formulaic language among their students.

On the other hand, contrary to my expectations, the sentence complexity percentages in this study showed exactly the opposite effect as students produced more complex sentences when led by NNSTs. As demonstrated in the classrooms and mentioned by students in the focus group discussions, the general belief that NSTs were less qualified to teach grammar was upheld as the language students expected NSTs to understand was grammatically less sophisticated.

“Sometimes I feel like I know the grammar better than native speakers” (Cho-Hee, 2011)

Since students felt this way even after instruction by both types of teacher, it is no surprise that they produced their highest level of complex language with NNSTs.

Most importantly, the differences in student production when the analysis was divided by teachers’ native status were rarely significant in classroom conversation. A look at the quantitative aspects of the classroom experience has helped to shed light on what teacher practices enabled students to produce the most sophisticated language.

**Finding #2: Some differences in student production are personal, not social**

In the socio-cognitive view, interlocutors work together to develop common ground as a result of both what they bring to the conversation and how communication is socially constructed on the spot (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992; Kecskes, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Nowhere is the influence of individual “knowledge, beliefs and
suppositions” (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick 1992, p. 3) more evident in this study than in the case of metaphorical language use. Students from similar cultural backgrounds to the US—namely, other highly developed countries of the “Global North”—began and remained the highest producers of metaphorical English throughout the course of their classes. In light of this finding, metaphor can be considered a linguistic icon of speaker culture. As seen in Kecskes & Papp (2000), those students whose home language and culture shared the greatest similarities to the target language and culture most often included the highly conceptual, culturally defined feature of metaphor in their speech. As the study progressed, students’ greater socialization and emergent common ground did not have an effect on which students used higher levels of metaphorical speech. Those who used little metaphor at the beginning of each six-week session continued to do so at the end, and there were some—primarily, recently arrived students from developing countries—who never used metaphorical language at all. Thus, although students in this study used more metaphorical language with NNSTs than with NSTs, their use saw no influence from the classroom Community of Practice.

**Finding #3: Student opinions change after working with both types of teacher**

As anticipated, student opinion changed after experiencing classes taught in turn by NSTs and NNSTs. This was the first time most had worked with NSTs, and for all students, the first time they had the opportunity to make the type of comparison allowed by working with both types of teacher in turn. Furthermore, they were sharply aware of the differences between language learning in the US compared to their home countries as well as the
differences between teachers in both locations. In fact, many students discussed the possibility that the more important difference was not whether teachers were native or nonnative, but whether the outside environment supported their language learning. After the classes had ended, the larger context of studying English in the US was more important to the students than the native status of the teacher. Three related claims, put forth in the results of the pre- and post-test questionnaires, were advanced in light of the survey results.

Claim #1: Students see less difference between NSTs and NNSTs after working with both.

I found that student opinion was more connected to the teachers’ levels of proficiency and ability to make themselves understood, rather than their native statuses. In this study, when responding to questions about distinct features of both types of teacher, students had a more favorable opinion of NNSTs after these classes were completed. For example, one student’s opinion had changed because in his home country, the English used by his NNSTs English was “not very good,” but here, he could understand them “most of the time” (Jun Lin, 2011 focus group). Overwhelmingly, the questionnaire items related to NNST practice changed in a positive direction after the classes had ended.

Claim #2: The ESOL students in this study did not expect, given their limited experience with NSTs, to find a high level of empathy among their native teachers.

When the adult ESOL students completed their initial questionnaires, they were not sure whether NSTs would be patient instructors. This is related to the students’ nearly nonexistent prior experience with NSTs, perhaps as well as to their perceptions of native-speakers as English experts. Thus, after classes ended, the students revised their opinions,
finding that their native speaker teachers were very patient. Furthermore, in response to questionnaire item #3, “Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers,” students agreed with this statement far less after working with both types of teacher. This seems contradictory to Medgyes’ (1992) claim that NNSTs are “more empathetic to the…problems of their learners (p. 347). Once again, the setting of the ESOL classes, as well as the individual personalities of the students and teachers involved, may have as much of an effect on student beliefs regarding teacher patience and empathy as does teacher native status.

Claim #3: Student bias in favor of NSTs is hard to uproot, regardless of actual experiences.

This study saw overwhelmingly positive change in student opinions about the abilities of NNSTs. The post-test results showed that students believed that NNSTs were more likely to encourage students to speak in class than had been previously believed (item #11), were significantly more patient than students had anticipated (item #9), and used suitable teaching methods to a greater degree than expected (item #7. However, in spite of their favorable assessment of NNSTs particular teaching attributes or practices, student responses to item #2, claiming that “Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers,” actually changed in a slightly positive direction. In line with previous studies (see Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Moussu, 2010, Pacek, 2005), these results suggest that the belief in NSTs as superior instructors of the target language is a myth with no foundation in actual student experience, but nonetheless, a myth that is difficult to displace after only a few weeks of classes.
**Finding # 4: Oral fluency does not equal written competency**

I noted many differences between written and oral language production in this study. First of all, regardless of the teacher’s native status, very little formulaic language and even less metaphor were used in writing. This is because in oral language, formulaic speech is “the repository of wisdom” (Tannen, 1980). In spoken communication, the “meaning is in the context,” but in literary expression, “the meaning is in the text” (Tannen, 1980). The student participants here produced far more complex language in writing than in speaking, suggesting that having sufficient time to formulate their thoughts was extremely important in the ability to produce sophisticated language. This also adds evidence to the importance of longer turns in spoken discourse; if students are only given a minute to respond to other interlocutors, their language must necessarily be abbreviated and simplified. One student expressed these limitations when asked to write quickly:

Julia: I just cannot ah ‘cause two minutes is—just—short.

Still, the level of formality in writing was a source of comfort for some students, particularly those whose previous experience with English had primarily been in academic settings. Additionally, since each student had the same amount of time to produce written texts at each data collection point, personality differences had less influence over written production.
Qualitative findings in the lived experience

Finding #1: Teacher practices are more important than native status

Regardless of teacher native status, those classes in which the students were permitted to have longer turns at talk, thus giving them more time to formulate their production, saw the highest level of sentence complexity. Teacher production, preparation, and positioning were vitally important in this study.

Production: Teacher production, particularly including their pacing of classroom interactions, was an important factor in successful student production. When teachers took longer turns and then gave the floor to students for a relatively extended time, engaging in rapport-building as facilitators of a common community rather than as central actors, student talk was far more sophisticated (Hallenbeck Nadeau, 2008; Nguyen, 2007; Wenger, 1998). In these exchanges, the focus was placed on the learners, who were able to produce in-depth, complex stories including sophisticated, formulaic speech.

On the other hand, instructors who employed strict timing and traditional methods of classroom discourse, such as I-R-E sequencing, often limited student creativity (Waring, 2008, 2012). The relaxed, flowing form of interaction, as well as the rigid, scripted, teacher-centric form of classroom communication, were seen in both NST and NNST classrooms.

Preparation: Teachers who were highly prepared had smoother classroom interactions, included variation that involved all types of learners in the classroom experience, and were able to respond better to student questions, particularly including discussions of unfamiliar vocabulary. In the classes observed for this study, as in Árva and Medgyes (2000), “the success of the lessons was ensured by thorough preparation” (p. 365).
Students were fully attuned to this aspect of teacher quality, as well; particularly when they felt that the teachers were not well-prepared. Indeed, teacher preparation is most obvious in its absence; if a lesson is meticulously planned, the plan is virtually invisible. The absence of preparation was mentioned in focus group discussions as one aspect that caused students to judge their teachers as “not good.” Students in the 2011 cohort had this to say about one teacher:

**Cho-Hee:** the lesson was so terrible, I think she just made it before the class?

**Kyung-Mi:** Not perfect.

**Cho-Hee:** It looks not good…she didn’t prepare the class very well

As seen in variations of teacher production, both NSTs and NNSTs demonstrated different levels of preparedness in their lessons and classroom activities.

*Positioning:* In opposition to a collaborative, relaxed atmosphere in which students lower affective filters enable sophisticated language production, high-pressure environments in which teachers assert the power inherent in their roles have little potential for creating emergent common ground. Instead, misunderstanding is more likely when teachers flaunt their authority by holding the floor or interrupting students (House, 2003; Pacek, 2005), delaying the establishment of a classroom CoP in this study. In the socio-cognitive view, all participants in intercultural communication must participate in the actual situational context in order to foster mutual understanding and salience in the common ground (Clark, Schreuder, & Buttrick, 1992; Kecskes, 2007, 2008, 2014; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). In this study, when the teacher was the primary focus and main speaker in the classroom, little
understanding was able to emerge. As with the features of teacher production and preparation, both facilitators and central actors were found among NSTs and NNSTs.

**Finding #2: “Personality not nationality”**

As teachers and students spend time together, their production and comprehension become more closely aligned, and they share more common salience in communication. In the actual situational context of the adult ESOL classroom, meaning is created as all members of the CoP interact on line (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). To this end, the most effective teachers are those who employ a variety of discussion-based practices to foster student comfort and encourage advances in language learning (Applebee et al, 2003).

The importance of encouraging participation in discussions by lowering the affective filter (Krashen, 1982) was clearly seen in this study. All teachers, regardless of native status, practiced a variety of techniques designed to encourage their students to feel comfortable and produce more advanced language. In addition to providing a relaxed atmosphere, joking and humor helped to build rapport (Nguyen, 2007) and advance language learning (Bell, 2005) in the classes observed here. For example, friendly, approachable teachers who used humor to index themselves and students as “close acquaintances” (Nguyen, 2007, p. 289) were found in both NST and NNST groups. These teachers relaxed, fun approach helped their students to “feel free and—start talking” (Kusema, 2010 focus group). As Pacek (2005) said, in this study, the most important teacher attribute in creating a classroom atmosphere conducive to student success was “personality, not nationality” (p. 243).
Finding #3: The English language learner connection exists

In spite of most students’ claims that they believed NSTs to be better language instructors than NNSTs, there was a clear “ELL connection” between NNSTs and their students. This was demonstrated most significantly in the qualitative findings through the use of deixis as a strategy of rapport-building (Fiksdal, 1988). In this study, students and NNSTs regularly identified with each other using the pronoun “we” to describe themselves, but using “they” or “you” in contrast with NSTs and other native speakers of English. In effect, students found more core common ground with NNSTs than NSTs in the classroom. The non-native teacher and her students shared rapport based on common experience, demonstrated by their use of pronouns to align with each other and against the members of the target culture, as seen in this example:

T: I don’t think that they have cutaleta  
Fleuriste: I think--in France we have croque monsieur  
T: OK and--what about you? In your country?  
Kateryna: Oh we have a lot of uh like—special national dishes  
T: I brought a recipe from my home district. I make this pasta every week for my American friends, they love it.
Along with the connection demonstrated in the language, students in the present study expressed comfort and perceived empathy in their relationships with the NNSTs, as discussed in Medgyes (1992).

**Kusema:** They (non-native teachers) have even sometimes more ability because they can understand when we learn, they thought that too.

**Ruben:** Yeah they know how it feels

**Cho-Hee:** …the most I feel comfortable and the most I participate class was by a nonnative teacher…it was from same country? So he made me feel comfortable.

Taken as a whole, the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study suggest that there are advantages and benefits for students who work with both native and nonnative English speaking teachers in the adult ESOL classrooms. The students here demonstrated a wide variety of language traits and production practices, as well as classroom behaviors, which sometimes correlate with the teacher’s native status but just as often show student response to particular teacher practices. And although some teacher practices appear with more frequency among NSTs than NNSTs, there is no evidence of an inherent barrier to either type of teacher successfully adopting positive practices.

Additionally, in line with the socio-cognitive theoretical framework, we have seen emergent common ground and a budding Community of Practice built not only upon the social space of the classroom (Wenger, 1998), but also incorporating what teachers and students bring to the setting in their private contexts (Kecskes, 2008; Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Particularly in the aspects of student production, teacher practice, affect, rapport, and empathy explored here, there is no clear advantage to the practice of favoring native
speakers of English as expert instructors. Teacher practice, not native status, is the most important factor in determining student success in the language classroom.

**Recommendations for teacher practice**

I observed a broad variety of types of teacher, teacher practices, and classroom styles throughout the course of this study. As noted by Langer (2004), “best practices” are less related to the curriculum or the materials used by good teachers, and more dependent on the environment “in which school life gets orchestrated…class is experienced, and students learn” (p.6). Nowhere is this more important than in the language classroom, where communication is not only the means of learning, but also the classroom content. Thus, based on the quantitative and qualitative differences in this study I include several recommendations for optimal student language production.

**Recommendation #1: Listen more; speak less.**

Students must produce as much speech as possible in order to improve their level of complexity, as well as their use of formulaic and metaphorical speech. To encourage participation, teachers of language need to be better listeners than speakers. They must ask open questions, as opposed to formulating I-R-E-style interactions with one “correct” answer. Classes should focus on discussion and interaction between students, to facilitate emergent common ground and classroom community. The best teachers ensured that every student spoke in every class, and used pair or group work to allow less confident, shy students to speak.
**Recommendation #2: Give students time to think.**

In effective classrooms, teachers use authentic discussion to “develop understandings rather than to test what students already know” (Applebee et. al 2003, p. 691). With this in mind, language teachers need to give students ample time to think about their interactions and to respond to any discussion with honest, well-considered opinions. In this study, I saw teachers whose students produced more sophisticated language speaking very little, even allowing their students to interrupt and take the floor. The most effective teachers were facilitators of learning as opposed to actors on the classroom stage.

**Recommendation #3: Be prepared, but be open to change.**

Effective teachers were well prepared, but flexible in response to their students’ production. The effective teachers of both native statuses entered the classroom with an understanding of their own limitations and provided extensive examples, in-depth definitions, and good language models as they anticipated student needs. In support of developing common ground, effective teachers responded on the spot to questions or to unanticipated opportunities for student learning—seizing the “teachable moment” to provide the vocabulary and formulaic language students required to create with language.

**Recommendation #4: Play a little; laugh a lot.**

To lower students’ affective filters, effective teachers included a variety of activities incorporating games and humor in the classroom. They encouraged laughter and, employing these effective means of creating positive emotional experiences to maximize retention in
memorable times of play, they built rapport by including every community member in the fun, explaining humor as needed to help build students’ cultural comprehension.

**Recommendation #5: Know your limitations.**

Finally, understanding their own limitations, the most effective instructors monitored their own speech, not running words together in the manner of everyday native speech. They understood their limitations and worked hard to provide comprehensible communication, showing an awareness of how difficult it was for their students to understand varieties in pronunciation. Those who were less confident in grammar worked together with a team of teachers to plan specific grammar foci for each lesson, ensuring that students would gain the skills they needed to advance in their level of English communication.

**Implications for further research**

Several implications can be drawn from this study related to further research in both emergent common ground and language education. First of all, it is important to see the ways that language learners’ metaphorical density was connected to their original culture—not necessarily to the language, but as conceptual icons of the speaker’s specific culture.

Additionally, the results of this study suggest that metaphorical speech, having its foundations in culture, appears more in contexts where the speakers feel part of similar communities of practice (CoPs). This appeared as a higher use of metaphor when students worked with NNSTs, with whom they shared core common ground as a community of ELLs. However, because metaphorical language was seen very little in this study, the
connections between metaphor and cultural or community membership require further research.

Furthermore, as discussed in Leiguarda de Orue (2009) and Weiss (2000), the results of this study suggest that play and laughter in language learning may have deeper value than the surface function of lowering the affective filter. More research is needed on the effects of strong, pleasant emotions as related to memory, cognition, and language learning.

Memes appear briefly here and act as cement in the common ground. In this study, it seems that mimetic language—speech formulas or metaphors that self-replicate, taking on a life of their own long after their initial introduction—is a product of the teachers’ instinctive humor. Future research may be useful to see whether this is related to the teacher’s native status, proficiency, or personality, or whether less proficient instructors can replicate the same effect, as a means of rapidly building highly connected CoPs in the classroom. Future studies designed to discover ways that teachers include natural speech, using corpuses, recorded classroom sessions, or other authentic materials, may inform teaching by less proficient instructors in the target language.

Given the importance of community in the emergent common ground, further research in the apparent barrier between English language learners and NNSTs as members of the “we” ingroup, and NSTs as members of the target culture “they” outgroup should be explored. One native speaking teacher in this study was very successful in encouraging students to share their stories, by giving an example that showed them common problems and common human experiences shared by herself and her students. Deliberate inclusion of empathy and solidarity may be helpful in quickly gaining common ground among diverse groups such as seen in this study, thus encouraging sophisticated language production.
It is hoped that this study will inform and enrich teacher experiences in the ESOL/EFL classroom. By understanding what factors create a learning environment in which students are comfortable and able to hone their linguistic and communicative skills, teachers can better promote effective language learning among ESOL and EFL adults. It is also hoped that this study will present a number of variables that are important to TESOL practice, thereby building greater understanding of what practices define good English teachers regardless of their native status.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: IRB-approved informed consent document

University at
Informed Consent in Exempt Research
Version 08.22.08

Office of Regulatory Research Compliance Approved IRB Consent Form for Exempt Research

Title Of Research:
Adult learners of English interacting with native-speaker teachers and nonnative-speaker teachers: Exploring classroom differences

Name, Department, Phone Number of Investigator and Faculty Supervisor (If Applicable): Melody S Nadeau, ETAP, 518-618-0740; Dr. Istvan Kecskes, ETAP, 518-442-5030

You have been asked to participate in a research study that has been reviewed by an Institutional Review Board. The purpose of the study, terms of your participation, as well as any expected risks and benefits, must be fully explained to you before you consent to participate in this research study.

You should also know that participation in research is entirely voluntary. Even after you agree to participate in the research, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. You should also be aware that the investigator may withdraw you from participation at his/her professional discretion.

The optional focus discussion group, in which you will discuss your opinions regarding ESL teachers, will take 45 minutes to one hour, and will be held during the last week of classes. Your decision regarding whether to participate in the focus group is completely confidential, and will not be shared with any of the classroom teachers. You may leave the discussion group at any time if you wish without penalty.

After the observations are recorded, they will be transcribed using false names for each student to preserve your confidentiality. Therefore, there will be no way to identify any of the participants from the transcripts or final written documents.

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board, the sponsor of the study (e.g. NIH, FDA, etc.)and University or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

If at any time you have questions regarding this research or your participation in it, you should contact the investigator, faculty advisor or research assistants who must answer your questions.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at 518-442-9050 or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

THIS FORM IS FOR USE WITH EXEMPT RESEARCH WITH ADULTS 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER
Appendix B: Sample of corpus: Most commonly used speech formulae and collocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulaic expressions</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>A nice (good) day (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot (of)</td>
<td>Dream/ dream job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>Eat between meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the way</td>
<td>Emotional eater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>Good communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And so on (forth)</td>
<td>(I’m, you’re…) good/not good at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you free?/I am free/ feel free</td>
<td>I am from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome</td>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad habit</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be (I am, s/he is) able to</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be right back/ BRB</td>
<td>I don’t think so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear right (left)</td>
<td>I know/ knew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By himself (herself, myself)</td>
<td>I don’t remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bye-bye (bye)</td>
<td>I don’t speak English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can (may) I help you?</td>
<td>I (we, they, etc.) don’t understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch my (your, the) eye</td>
<td>I’m a good (cook, tennis player, teacher…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check (bags, facts)</td>
<td>(____)is important (in my [your] life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come on</td>
<td>I tried/ we try (our best, our hardest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Is there someone(is someone there)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Couple of…</td>
<td>It was (sunny, rainy, windy, snowing…other weather terms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut (eliminate, reduce)</td>
<td>It’s (my, our, your, his, her) turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress up</td>
<td>It was a good plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive (him, her, me…) crazy</td>
<td>I understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dude</td>
<td>Knock (on) (a door, wall, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each other</td>
<td>Maybe another time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse me</td>
<td>Meet (new, other) people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>Most important meal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fine thank you (thanks) (may include “and you?”) | (My) favorite ____ (noun) ____ /
<p>| (someone is) Fine with that | favorite ____ (noun) ____ |
| Free time | My name is |
| From time to time | My partner/friend |
| Get over it | (to be) named after ____ (noun) ____ |
| Get stuck (confused, lost, etc.) | No one there/there is no one |
| Good morning/ morning (afternoon, evening, night) | Not that good |
| Hang out | Not yet |
| Hang up | On earth |
| Hello (“are you listening?”) | One (two, three, etc.) time(s) a week (day, month, year, etc.) |
| How are you (doing)? | Show interest |
| I (you, he, she) changed my mind | Stand in line |
| I see (meaning understand) | Stuff/ something like that/this (or noun) |
| I’d like to ( + verb it) | Super power |
| I’d love to ( + verb it) | Take a (taxi, cab, train, plane, bus…) |
| I (he, she, you) get(s) it (don’t get it) | Take (took) an x-ray, photo… |
| I guess | Talk about (someone, as in gossip) |
| | Text (message) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I’m afraid that…</th>
<th>To go out for (dinner, lunch, coffee, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m (just) kidding (you’re kidding)</td>
<td>Tomorrow is a new day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In spite of</td>
<td>Wait one’s turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the sense that (before clarification)</td>
<td>What’s your name? (without “again”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of</td>
<td>What time (is it, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let (me, you, us, anyone)down</td>
<td>Wonderful time (place, experience, day…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (filler)</td>
<td>You’re lucky (if, to, when)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look forward to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it (non-literal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make up (face, [or] after argument)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice to see (meet) you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh my God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK (Okay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On (by) my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the left (right)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the other hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, scissors, stone (rock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece of cake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save (spend) money (time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See what I (you) mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See you! (see ya!) (tomorrow, later, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to you later /TTYL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a left (right)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take (took) off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you/thanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s it (I’m done, the end, good job)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trick-or-treat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to (accustomed to)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s your name again?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who cares (knows)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(it, this, that) Would be great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You guys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Oral production tables

### 3/2/2010 SB NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3/3/2010 SB NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3/4/2010 SB NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>33.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3/16/2010 QH NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3/17/2010 QH NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>5.143</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3/18/2010 QH NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3/23/2010 KA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3/24/2010 KA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>41.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3/25/2010 KA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4/6/2010 NA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4/7/2010 NA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>22.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4/8/2010 NA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10/2/2012 QA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 10/3/2012 QA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### 10/4/2012 QA NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF C</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/9/2012 AA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF C</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10/10/2012 AA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/11/2012 AA NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>3.556</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10/16/2012 KR NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/17/2012 KR NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>22.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 10/18/2012 KR NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/23/2012 TI NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10/24/2012 TI NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/25/2012 TI NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10/30/2012 MV NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF C</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10/31/2012 MV NST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF C</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11/1/2012 KX NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11/2/2012 KX NNST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>TFC</th>
<th>%TF</th>
<th>CX</th>
<th>%CX</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>%CP</th>
<th>SLUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>24.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUs</td>
<td>Total Complexity</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Total Formulaic</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>Formulaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.627</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.386</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.378</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>St Dev NST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.800</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.571</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>KX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.801</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>St Dev NNST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>1.647</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.258</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>St Dev Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Participation tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Participation by teacher</th>
<th>SB NST</th>
<th>QH NNST</th>
<th>KA NST</th>
<th>NA NNST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Participation percentage by native status</th>
<th>NSTs</th>
<th>NNSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikola</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisel</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusema</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleuriste</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2012 Participation by teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>QA NNST</th>
<th>AA NST</th>
<th>KR NST</th>
<th>TI NNST</th>
<th>MV NST</th>
<th>KX NNST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utter.</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Utter.</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Utter.</td>
<td>Turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Participation percentage by native status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>NSTs</th>
<th>NNSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>Turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aicha</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroto</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allessandra</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Questionnaire and results

Questionnaire: Comparing native speaking teachers of English to non-native speaking teachers of English.

For this survey, native-speaking teachers are considered those whose mother tongue or home language is English; for example, teachers from the United States whose parents speak English at home. Non-native speaking teachers are considered those whose home language is not English; for example, teachers from European, Asian, or African countries whose parents do not speak English at home.

Please give your opinion by marking the most appropriate number based on the following scale:

1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.
1……….2……….3……….4…………5

2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5

12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.
1…………2……….3……….4…………5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2010 Initial questionnaire results (10 students)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. *Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. *It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Seven students responded to questions #11 and #12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2010 Posttest questionnaire results (6 students)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors. *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five students answered Question #5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fall 2012 Initial questionnaire results (12 Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 Posttest questionnaire results (9 students)</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010, 2011, 2012 Combined initial questionnaire results (28 Students)</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. **Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. **It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 27 students answered Question #5
** 25 students answered Questions #11 and #12
## 2010, 2011, 2012 Combined posttest questionnaire results (21 students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It is important for language teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Native speakers are better language teachers than non-native teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Non-native speaker teachers understand language students’ needs better than native speakers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Native speakers usually let students speak without interruption.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is good when non-native speaker teachers correct student errors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers use suitable teaching methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers are very patient with their students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Non-native speaking teachers motivate students to speak in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>It is more important for a language teacher to have good teaching skills than to be proficient in the language taught.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Focus group interview/open-ended short answer questions

1. Before taking these classes, what was your experience with English teachers?
   Possible follow-up: Did you ever work with native speaking (such as American or British) teachers, or only with nonnative speaking teachers—those who have a mother tongue other than English?

2. Did you ever feel that your teachers had problems communicating or teaching in English?
   Possible follow-up: Previous English teachers? Teachers in the clinic classes?

3. Do you feel that there is a difference between how native-speaker teachers and nonnative-speaker teachers understand and respond to your needs as a student?

4. Tell me about one experience you had with native-speaker teachers in your clinic class.

5. How, if at all, did this affect your opinion of native-speaker teachers in general?

6. Now let’s talk about your experience with non-native speaker teachers.

7. How, if at all, did this affect your opinion on nonnative-speakers’ ability to teach English?

8. After experiencing these classes, what do you feel is most important for a teacher to be effective in the English classroom?

9. Anything else anyone would like to add to the discussion?
Appendix G: Picture sequences used as writing prompts

Picture Sequence 1
Picture Sequence 2
Picture Sequence 3
Picture Sequence 6

TITLE:
Appendix H: Selected transcripts

Transcription conventions:
Latched speech:  =
   Nikola:  /Can’t afford=  
   T: =yes=  
   Nikola: =pay for it/
Measurable pauses, in seconds:
   I don’t know (2)why?
Prolonged phoneme: :
   you had to say;—either sitting in section--what is it? Everyone should be sitting in section
Emphasis indicated by caps
   reMEMber
Extremely quiet speech: * *
   T: *3 pancakes* It's a short stack.
Sentence-level utterances marked by slash
   /Oh maybe I decide—to be a doctor./
Transcription notes: (( ))
   ((gives candy to Kateryna))

Coding key:
Italicized text: Utterances not under consideration for coding (Ts , observers,  Ss with sporadic attendance)
Formulaic expressions: Code each student’s FIRST use of a particular formula.
Collocations: Code each student’s FIRST use of a particular collocation.
Non-literal (metaphorical) expressions: Code each student’s FIRST use of a particular metaphor.
Subordinate clauses (complex sentences):
Coordinating clauses (compound sentences):
Multiple categories shown by repeated words or phrases:
   Kusema: /It’s a good plan (It’s a good plan), he said/
Formulaic expressions: *** (Code each student’s FIRST use of a particular formula.
Note subsequent use by #2, 3, 4, etc.)
Collocations: Code each student’s FIRST use of a particular collocation. Note subsequent use by #2, 3, 4, etc.)
Non-literal (metaphorical) expressions:
Subordinate clauses (complex sentences):
Coordinating clauses (compound sentences):
Transcript 3/4/2010
Teacher: SB-NS
From pages 18-20 of 21

X: ((unint. reply aside to Kusema both look at the floor between their seats))
T: How 'bout Andrew? Her boyfriend Andrew is Andrew sitting really close?
((Several Ss)) no
Fleuriste: ((pointing at board)) wrong-wrong, N
Sophie: ((looking at board)) N, N, not M, N
T: ((goes to board, changes her last entry)) N, sorry, it is N. very good. OK how 'bout—Andrew?
Nikola: /Andrew is sitting in row N—seating—twenty-two. /
Kusema ((quietly to X)): next one? Is the next one/
T: row N—seat twenty-two.
X: Sitting left—
T: and then—who is sitting by himself?
((Fleuriste, Nikola, Kateryna)): Lance.
T: Lance. where is Lance?
Nikola: Last row.
T: What is last row?
Leisel: Row R
((X and Kusema are chatting on the side))
T: Row R ((Walking toward board, glances at X and Kusema))
X: ((raises arm))
T: ((writing))seat eighteen.
X: ((moves arms around as if stretching, laughs))
Kusema: ((laughs))
T: X—
X: ((stops moving around)) Hmm?
T: excuse me. OK? ((walks to other side of room))
X & Kusema: ((Stop laughing & look toward board.))
T: So who has the best seat? Do you think?
X: Lance.
Kusema: Sarah.
Sophie: ((nods)) Sarah
T: Sarah and—
X: That's it
Ruben: /That's it/
T: just Sarah?
Sophie: /Ya because she is in the middle also/
T: She's in the middle right? So what about her friends why aren't her friends sitting—they're sitting in the same row though? Why are—don't they have the best seats
Sophie: ((gestures off to the side)) /yeah but they, always have to look—over the re. /
((X and Kusema are chatting on the side again))

T: OK, so they’re too far off—to the right? OK—who has the worst seat? ((walks closer to X and Kusema))

Fleuriste, Nikola, Kateryna: Lance!

Nikola: of course

((X and Kusema have stopped chatting, are looking @ T))

T: Lance why does Lance have the worst seat?

Fleuriste: /Because he’s in the last row/

Ruben: /He’s all the way back/

T: He’s all the way in the back and what else?

Fleuriste:/ Mmm, ((gestures in a circular motion)) all of them/

X: By himself

T: Yeah, he’s by himself right so he’s sitting=

Sophie:= also Meghan and Andrew

T: Yeah, Meghan and Andrew why don’t they, they don’t have anyone to—stay next to them right? And they’re boyfriend and girlfriend so they’re like ((waving)) Andre:w=

X: So—he-he can text message((gestures as if texting))

Kusema ((laughing loudly))

T: (Looks at X when he says “so” but away again to other Ss))

Nikola: /can you bring me the popcorn?/

T: yeah, you can bring the popcorn

X: He can text message with Sarah

Kusema ((laughing continually))

T: ((Looks @ X)) Oh he can text message with Sarah…well that’s different Sarah’s not his girlfriend

X: and Carey

T: and Carey? Alright

X: “What do you see?”((continues to pantomime texting))

T: Oh--((nods, laughs)) oh, yeah so they’re gonna text--Sarah, Carey and Brian “what do you see because I’m sitting too far back” ok

X: Can you get something for me? ((holds out hands))

T: Yeah I’ll get something for you. ((turns toward other Ss, back is to X))

X: I’ll give you penny

T: Alright and then, who do you think has—Ok seats?

Kateryna: huh?

((Ss look @ their papers))

T: not good not bad,

Nikola: Tracy and Emily

T: Tracy and Emily?

Nikola: /Yeah, not so bad/

T: not so bad. OK. ((turns to the front)) So—these are real seats, actually. OK. So if you go to the stadium, and they say, um, I can tell you, you can go to section 222, row R, seat—ah, one person can sit in seat two, and one person can sit in seat 22

((X and Kusema are chatting on the side again))
Nikola: /No way ((laughs))/
T: No way. Right? ((walks back toward board)) alright, very good.
X: ((says something under his breath, laughs))
T: ((looks @ watch)) Alright, umm, we can take a break, see if you boys—((gestures away from X and Kusema))

We’re gonna go on a break, and I brought some food for you guys, Ok cause I know that=
X: It’s a good plan!
T: What was that? It’s a compliment? What’s a compliment?
X: It’s a good plan!
Kusema: /It’s a good plan ((It’s a good plan)), he said/
T: Oh, it’s a good plan
X: yep.
T: OK so we have—I have some snacks I brought in for you, some chips and salsa and—cookies, and I want you to come back around—8:10. OK?
Kusema ((to X))/ we have break now, and ((unint.))/
T: ((shows snacks to girls on the other side of the room, takes them back to front where the small table is))
T: OK so why don’t we talk about together....
Kateryna: OK. (5) /So we decided that companies create, like, ah, spokescharacters, to communicate with customers so, to create attention to their product. / And ah—ah, we decided the jingles is the characters as it represent a specific product and—that’s—that’s it. /((that’s it))
T: That’s it?
Kateryna: Yeh.
T: OK. What did you guys come up with? ((to group B))=
Sophie: /=At the first one, we said that it’s—that animals are—they attract kids? /They also attract kids because then also kids maybe would like to have that kind of—cereal or whatever—
T: MmHm
Sophie: =and that—yeah because for instance this rabbit for Nesquick if you just see the rabbit then you know it’s Nesquick so it keeps—it stays in mind?/
T: OK
Sophie: /That was first. /And the second—yeah jingles are songs?/
T: MmHmm
Sophie: /And—they also, what makes them so effective is that they stay in mind you—sometimes you have, the whole day one song from a commercial in your head?= ((in your head))
T: Yeah
Sophie:—and you cannot get rid of it so you/
T: right?
Sophie: /We—in German we call it like-earworm? so it stays in your ear?/ (2) And number three, “which advertising strategy do you think works best?” /We said like to-TV commercial?= T: MmHmm
Sophie: =newspapers or something that gets sent home? /But not always because sometimes it’s just too much if you ((Unint.))/
T: what if you—sorry, you=
Sophie:==banners, in cities, like banners or—radios sometimes./
T: Did you—ever think like, especially people that live overseas? Or, here like the winter is very long...
T: Alright so for the second lesson, we will write an healthy menu, and we will talk about food idioms OK? And before that I have a video, and I am going to ask you some questions about it OK? ((Video from 46:53-44:32))
T: so what did you guys think about—fast food?
Fleuriste: /Yeah I like it./
T: OK. Where do you like to go?
Fleuriste: Ummm Burger King,
T: Do you have that in France? Fast food?
Fleuriste: /Yep. /Like it--yeah, we have in France, but we, ah, we don’t have a Burger King. /We have—McDonald and ah, quick—and say, quick but ah, French way./ Is McDonald but—in French. /

T: OK. And—who else?

Sophie: /I like it /((laughs))

T: You like to go to fast food?

Sophie: Yeah.

T: Why do you choose to go to a fast food...?

Sophie: /It’s cheap, it’s fast/

T: It’s fast so it makes you save time

( Several Ss): Yeah

T: OK,

Sophie: /It’s good./

Nikola: /We especially go there if we haven’t got any time if-if we haven’t got free time for- for more time to prepare food=/

T: MmHmm

Nikola: /=So for example you’re in city and someone feels hungry so, you know just go-go there and=/

Kateryna: /=You have no choice=/((laughs))

Nikola: /=yeah drive through/

T: isn’t that awesome? We don’t have that in Europe the drive though. Do you have it in France (to Fleuriste)?

Fleuriste: /MmHm we have it at McDonald’s/

Sophie: /Yeah, we have it at McDonald’s/

T: Really? We don’t have it in Italy, how about that?...So, what about instead, staying home and ordering food? You still prefer to go...

Fleuriste: /You know, sometimes I can go to fast food just to—to eat fast food- even I have food on my—plate. /

Nikola:/ But that’s why even if choose, I like very salad, every kind of salad, and, even I choose a salad in for example (#2) McDonald’? t?=/

T: MmHm

Nikola:=/It tastes different and I you know eat salad and I feel like hamburgers cheeseburgers, everything. on the salad. /It’s not the same. /

T: Ok. so none of you likes to order food home?...

Kusema: Chinese food

T: Chinese food, OK,

Sophie: /Yep and pizza/

T: Pizza, love pizza yes?

Fleuriste: Japanese

T: Japanese yes

Kateryna: /In Ukraine we never order like, food from somewhere we usually cook by themselves but here-my host family they order food four (like) times per week or
T: Awesome. OK so today we’re going to talk about—conversation, natural conversation. Because that’s what you want to do right when you speak English? When you speak with native speakers, you want to be understood right? And you want them to understand you. And when you read English you learn English from a textbook right it’s what we call Standard English or academic English? People don’t really talk like that do they?… “I don’t understand what you’re saying” anyone had a situation like that?

Ss : Yes=

T: can you think about a time like that a time when people had no idea what you were saying, and tell it to the class? Hm? Nikola-Kateryna? No? OK well when we speak, right, what are some troubles….when you hear a native speaker speak?

: /Because maybe other speakers have a different pronunciation accent=

T: =Mm hm accent=

Nikola: =So, ah, we don’t understand them. (we don’t understand )

T: So can you think of different accents, accents you’ve heard, accents you had trouble understanding=

Nikola:= yeah=

T: = what’s an accent that you had a problem with?

Nikola: /Ahh…there was one guy from….Burma? so, I am very, ah, /


T: But he’s—but is he a native speaker do you guys know native speaker?

((Several Ss )) Yes

Sophie: /He is not a native speaker/

T: So native speaker of English means—English is their first language ((writes it on the board))

((points to Ruben)) so are you a native speaker of—Spanish?=

Ruben:= yes=

T: native speaker of Polish ((points to Nikola)) so if I were to speak Polish with you you could tell, I’m not from Poland not a native speaker because I have an accent and some accents are heavier than others right=((Some Ss nod, say “mmhmm”))=but there are also English accents right. You went to New York you went to New York City? Kateryna?= Kateryna: =MmHm New York=

T: =Did you hear different accents?

Kateryna:/ Yeah because all the people there are like—no Americans just—just foreigners ((laughs))/

T: yeah so there’s foreign accents and then there’s also there’s like the =

Kusema: /Yeah how they=

T: = the New York City accent mmhmm?=

Kusema:= how they talk is their mouth is like open half open/
T: =How about a chronicle? Chronicle everyone know what a chronicle is? Story?
((Ss nod))
Fleuriste: Yeah
T: like Chronos, from Greek, time? So it’s a story in time=
Fleuriste: /Say that—it’s a story that everyone, can read and=
T: =MmHm. What is the famous one in English, The Chronicles of Narnia?
Sophie: Yeah.
T: The stories of Narnia
Kusema: /What is adorned?/
T: Hmmm?
Kusema: Adorned
T: Yeah this is kind of a complex sentence isn’t it a lot of weird words going on, adorned with coveted adornments. So adorned and adornments do those look—similar?
Leisel: =Yeah.=
Kusema: /=I don’t know/= 
T:=so adorn means—to place upon. Or to put on someone else. But it’s something really important. Like a crown?...you usually say adorned with jewels, adorned with jewelry? And coveted, when you covet something it means you keep something sacred it’s sacred it’s really important to you. So he’s putting on something that’s really awesome? Um, they can’t put them on because—she doesn’t have the hair so he can’t adorn her with the comb, and she can’t adorn his watch with the chain...
T: OK so, what was your homework last night? To think about—a story or fairy tale that—excellent. So what I want you to do now, is, I want you guys to write it. How do you feel about writing?
Sophie: Good!
T: Good you feel awesome?
Sophie: Awesome!
T: ((writes his name & contact info on board)) Umm... I think we’re ready to start the class. I um, want to welcome you back from the break, sure you had a good time... as- can—you’re sharing too much so I’m gonna give you, break—a 15-minute break to continue. Umm... I’m going to be your teacher today. And, I’m gonna know your names in a minute—let me introduce myself, my name is ((*****)) Umm: m, (4) ((*****)) in the language that I first speak my first language? It means unmixed, something that is pure and, ((*****)) means fine powder. So, the combination of these is like pure fine powder. So I like to think of myself as special, ‘cause usually eh-ne- you know whe- whenever you touch some powders? there’s like some grains in it and stuff? Mine has no grains, it’s all: smooth... you know like ah, wheat flour like, just nice, smooth like—the stuff that they use to make, ah, cake? Umm... that’s all about me. I’m um, a graduate student? at the ah, department of education here, and I’m taking, um, teaching of English and other foreign languages um... teaching of English and other languages as foreign languages. And there’s a difference between teaching um, English? for example as a second language, and there’s a difference between that and teaching English as a FOReign language. And we-you can talk to me about the difference at the break. Alright? Now, I have given you my name, and what it means, in many communities in many cultures, names mean something. Alright? So I need you to say— somebody, finish this ((writes on board)) Give a dog...

Fleuriste: a bone?
T: nope. Give a dog? Somebody?
Ss (3)((general whispering, no one responds))
T: Give a dog a bad name—and what? How does the saying go in English? Give a dog a bad name and? (3) and hang it. OK. And hang it ((writes “and hang it” on board)). What does that mean? (. ) Give a dog a bad name and hang it (2) I tend to think, that names mean things, names mean a lot. Because if you give a dog a bad name, you HANG it, you kill it! ‘Cause if you give a dog a name like... Satan or... ah, thief or, something you don’t like (2) then every time you see it, you don’t like it! You know, and, people have a tendency like, they don’t like it they, they will, will give up
Ruben: ((enters class)) how are you?/
T: ((nods to Ruben, closes door)) alright. I’m gonna ask—gonna ask the class to—give their names, and if the—na-name means something? in their culture? or not.
Leisel: /My name is Leisel but—it doesn’t mean, anything (/laughs)/
Sophie: ((laughs))
T: Leisel.
Leisel: yes.
T: That’s a big name, where I come from.
Leisel: /It is?/
T: Do you want me to, tell you, what it means?
Leisel: yea.
T: Leisel—how do you spell it?
Leisel: L-E-I-S-E-L
T: ((has written “Leise” on the board)) this?
Leisel: /with an L at the end/
T: Oh with an L at the end ((adds the L)) (2) anyone speak any Hebrew here? Anybody speak Hebrew?
((Ss shake heads, nobody speaks))
T: You need to find a Hebrew friend, a person who speaks Hebrew, or Yiddish, and ask them what that name means. It is big. ((points to Sophie))
Sophie: /My name is Sophie, and it doesn’t have any meaning/.
T: Sophie. Are you sure?
Sophie: /I don’t know any meaning so ((giggles))/
T: ((goes to board, writes)) you—Sophie—how do you spell it? Like this? ((Writes S-O-P-H-E))
Sophie: /Instead of E an I-E/
T: ((erases the E)) oh I-E?
Sophie: Yep.
T: O:ohh. You need to go to names.com ((writes address on board))
((Ss laugh))
Sophie: /Ok, I will do that/
T: and find something nice there. or big. If it’s small—Take an issue with it. call them up. How dare you make my name small? ((points to Kusema))
Kusema: /My name is Kusema. K-U-S-E-M-A/
T: ((writes it on board, paces a bit, looking at students))
Ss: (laugh softly)
Kusema: /Ah, I don’t know—the meaning bu:ut, I ask them why they, they called me that name/. And, they told me=
Sophie & Fleuriste: ((both turn to look at Kusema, laugh softly))
Kusema:=those’-cause, among those people who ((unint)), so this big ship ((gestures making large circle with hands)) So, he was one, founder, people who just made that boat.
T: Aa:h
Kusema: /But the meaning, I don’t know
Teacher: QA - NNS
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T: any more question about Brazil or any sentence—what do you know about Brazil that’s the activity it’s like sharing our background and uh, trying to connect with others, to know our countries more so what else do you know about Brazil—yes?

Yolanda: /Are you dancing every day?/
Ss: ((all laugh))
Allessandra: /Not all of the days, every kind of dance--we love to dance, yeah, all kind of dance you can ask and we can just start if=/
Joao: =I don’t want to get in the middle of this
(4)
T: mmnobody knows any more—about Brazil?
(2)
Jun Lin: Coffee is[,] very famous (.) in Brazil?
Joao: yeah we have—good coffee there=
Allessandra: =coffee yeah. we do. a lot. /
Joao: is like Kenyan coffee, good too.
Ss: ((yeah, mmhmm, nodding…))
T: OK what about—Colombia what do you know about Colombia
Allessandra: /They have very good coffee too right?/
Ss: ((all laugh))
Catalina: ((nods)) /yeah. that’s best coffee in the worl—but the WORld—the best coffee in the world./
Allessandra: /And they love dance too, right? To dance?/
Catalina: /To dance?/
Allessandra: Yes, they=
Catalina: /ah it mean, to dance? ’Scuse me—dancing?/
Allessandra: /Yes/
Catalina: /Yes. I love dancing. Salsa, um—Cumbia/
Allessandra: /I got it./
T: Ah, somebody is from—Peru here, Maria?
Maria: /yeh./
T: What do you know about Colombia?
Maria: /(3) Oh, actually Colombia is close my country (.). so (.). I think Colombia is famous for—
for the coffee/. But I don’t know more./
T: Thank you that’s good.(3) And what do you guys know about Mexico?
(3)
Allessandra: Tequila!
Ss: ((all laugh))
Yolanda ((nods, smiles)) Tequila tequila
Joao: Beautiful girls
Ss: ((all laugh))
Yolanda: /Yes uh, we-we drink tequila—and* is really ((grasps front of throat, rolls eyes)) hot or /(.) I don’t know it’s—I don’t like-tequila? Because I-I’m like allergic ((fanning face w/ hands)) to alcohol? and (.) I’m allergic I can’t drink but-its good? Like we make tequila is good but /=
T:=OK tequila is good but it’s hot
Ss: (all laugh)
Catalina: /But is true that tequila has one (.) a little-animal inside the—inside? /
Yolanda: /Yes, the, a—bug? /=
Luis: =*worm*=
T:=it’s=
Yolanda:=It’s—a bug? /=
Luis:*=a worm*=
Yolanda: /=a bug? bug? A little uh/, Allessandra: /Yeah he knows about tequila/ Ss: (all laugh)
Yolanda: /Yes inside the-tequila bottle, inside the bottle, there is a little bug, or animal/ T: I never drank tequila so I don’t know what they put inside Ss: (all chatting over each other, Yolanda turns to look at Luis))
Luis:/ a worm, it’s a worm/
Yolanda: /Worm? ((turns back to teacher)) a worm?/
T: a WORM there’s a WORM? Luis: /It’s a small one/
T: that would be disgusting!
Yolanda: /Well, no=
Allessandra: /=and you can eat it=/
Yolanda: (nods) is—it’s good! The worm/That chicken—it tastes—like chicken ((Ss laugh)), and with chili, is good ((nods)) ((sprinkling motion))/ Chili, we eat—the worm and drink tequila at same time, its good ((nodding))/
T: Wow ((Ss all chatting)) Japan what do you guys know about Japan?
(5)
Yolanda: Um 
XueXin: I know Japan near China, ah island ah, country 
T: Anything about Japan?
Yolanda: Sushi, or?
Hiroto: (nods, smiles) sushi yes we do eat sushi ((laughs))/
Yolanda: /So you don’t eat—you don’t. eat. sushi every day? (2) like we think or-/
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   We got some cool people in this class. I like that.(to the newcomer)Hello! Please come in. You have to write your name here. My name’s Andy. It’s written on it. Those other lines are not my name. You have to write down how cool you are on a scale of 1-10.
T: Who’s next You’re next please.
Yolanda: /My name is Yolanda=/
T: =Yolanda=.
Yolanda: =Yolanda. And I ate, er, in the morning, mm 3 pancakes? And coffee with milk?/
T: *3 pancakes* It’s a short stack.
Yolanda: MmHm
T: You know that term “short stack”?  
Ss: Yeah.
T: a short stack of pancakes is three pancakes. I’m gonna write that down. That’s good for everybody to know. Short stack. Why is it … It’s all right. I got so excited about pancakes I forgot what else you had what is it, pancakes and what else?
Yolanda: /Oh uh, pancakes, with syrup? And ((shakes head))/
T: You all know what “short” means right? 
Ss: Yeah.
T: Short, is short. Stack. Short stack. What’s a stack? You got it. Short stack makes sense, right?
   Please tell me your name?
Gabriela: /My name is Gabriela./
T: Can you say it again?
Gabriela: Gabriela.
T: How do you spell it?
Gabriela: G-A-B-R-I-E-L-A
T: What did you eat for breakfast?
Gabriela: /I ate oatmeal with *black coffee*./
T: Oatmeal? With what?
Gabriela: black coffee.
T: Black coffee. What kind of oatmeal was it sweet oatmeal or was it=?
Gabriela: /=yes, sweet/
T: Sweet oatmeal Black coffee black coffee is straight with no cream, no sugar.
Gabriela: MmHm
T: Nice.
T: Alright what’s your name?
Luis:/My name is Luis./
T: Luis
Luis: /For breakfast, I got cereal.=
T: OK!
Luis: =er, with milk and juice./
T: What kind of juice?
Luis: Capri Sun Juice
T: What is that?
Luis: /Capri Sun the pouch?/
T: Oh, yeah yeah yeah. You know what, it’s kind of warm in here? But it’s also loud. Yeah, close it? ((closes the door))
Luis: Yeah.
T: Yeah. Can you do that?.
What’s your name, please?
Aicha: /My name is Aicha./
T: Aicha
Aicha: Aicha yes
T: And what did you have for breakfast please?
Aicha: /Oh, I got uh, bread with salami=
T: Salami?
Aicha: =And, hot milk and coffee./
T: Hot milk and coffee? But separate? The milk is not in the coffee?
Aicha: Yes.
T: It was oh OK.
((All laugh))
T: So it was OK. That’s good! Cool! and one more, please. Tell me your name?
Maria: /Uh my name is Maria. and for my breakfast today?=
T: Yeah.
Maria: =Eat uh yogurt with milk?
T: Yogurt and milk. Dairy, dairy. Do you know what I mean by “dairy”? D’you all know dairy?
Maria: Yeah.
T: Dairy, milk. What else is dairy?
Yolanda: cheese.
T: cheese. What else?
Yolanda: Yogurt.
T: Yogurt. What else? We get it.
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T: Yup, and then you like-fold it. Alright. So like I said, the overview for today is just climate change and global warming. Um, we’ll learn kinda about human impact on it and natural causes of it and how it might affect the future. Um, I’ve got this little cartoon here where it’s saying why don’t the greenhouse gases escape through the hole in the ozone layer. Does anyone know kind of what’s that’s referring to? Or no? (7)

Um, well with global warming, there’s a lot of controversy about the ozone layer which is in the atmosphere, the last layer of the atmosphere and all the carbon dioxide’s kinda causing the hole in it and they’re making a joke with that. So our activities for today, uh, we’re going to introduce some new vocabulary, um, I’m gonna show you guys a video on climate change and then we’ll discuss it and then we’ll do a group activity on its causes and effects and possible solutions to global warming, um, then we’ll have a grammar introduction then we’ll kinda have a debate between the two sides on whether it’s caused by human activity or natural causes. So, for a warm up, I just want you guys to spend one minute writing down all the words you associate with global warming or climate change or any you can think of. So we just want to take a minute and get that from you.

Julia: Um, can I get, uh, you speaking a little slowly? /
T: Sure. Yep, no problem.((laughs))
Julia: Thank you so much sometimes it’s just a little ((laughs))/
T: My fault. Um, do you guys know what global warming is? I should probably start with that. Gabriela: Yes.
T: Yes? Can you explain it?
Gabriela: No ((laughs))
((All Ss, T laugh))
T: Does anyone else have a good idea of what it is?
Ss: No.
Nella: The weather is getting warmer, and it’s a bad thing. /
T: Yes. Do you know why it’s bad?
Maria: Cause it’s getting warm too fast, we can’t *kinda* keep up. It’s getting too warm too fast. /
T: Sure, yep. So if you guys just want to spend a minute writing down things that you think of, either words or phrases or places even that kind of remind you of the climate change.
(Ss work silently from 7:05 to 7:35)
T: Did you have another question? Sure.
Student: ((inaudible))
T: (quietly, to one Ss on the side)) The world is like getting warmer so it’s leading like to kinda like the ice caps on the poles, ya know like the north pole, like Antarctica, the arctic ....inaudible....yes, very good. It’s melting so it’s getting hotter and getting wetter and our weather is kinda ...going out of whack....
Catalina: / Another question./ I think we write about the environment?/
T: Just the words, not like sentences or anything you know, just words like polar bears or just words that kind of think, make you think of the issue. Unless you guys don’t want to want to know the issue too well.
Catalina: /The whole world means—the world means?/
T: Yeah just--the world or the weather.
Hiroto: ((enters class, late)) Sorry.


T: Okaaay um, let’s get started. This is um, we’re going to do? for today? Um, first, we’re going to watch a video interview with a Hollywood movie star. And then uh, we’re going to have ah, interview, pretend as if we’re like ah, movie star. And then, we’re going to learn how to ask direct and indirect questions. Ummm...Kai Lei, can you memorize what I said what I just told? what I just said? what we are going to do=
Kai Lei: =you want to interview. Mm (2) Um. Hollywood movie star. You will interview.
T: MmHm
Kai Lei: and ah, (5) and maybe you want for us, to present ah, movie star(2). You ah have this video, and ah we will talk about the direct—uh we will learn how to ask direct and indirect question.
T: Yes. Basically we’re going to watch a interview, a real interview, and then we are going to have an interview like them, and then we are going to learn the grammar. Direct and indirect questions. Is it clear?
Nella: Sure.
T: Ok ah, in pairs—two people—I’d like you guys discuss these two questions. Let’s read aloud together. Ok let’s start.

T and Ss ((read together)): “How asking personal questions means in your home country?”
T: Second question
T and Ss ((read together)): “What kind of questions are considered to be rude in your home country?”
T: is there any, um new vocabulary or difficult words for you guys? Just ((unint))=
Nella: = ((unint)) the first
T: Hmmm?
Nella: /The first question/
T: OK. Um, do you guys have any idea about um, personal questions like asking personal questions? Like, it could be like, “what’s your favorite color?” “what’s your favorite—animal?” It could be personal. To-some people? But it could not be, not so personal to somebody, it’s little bit (2) yeah. it’s little bit-not clear but, you know like, you—you guys have general idea about what persona questions are right?
Maria: /Your home, in your home country right? /
T: yes. In your own country.
Maria: /Example, the season are in your country./ What is that season right now in your country. / (3)
Maria: /No? some like this question?/
T: Mmm—
Maria: As no personal/
Gabriela: personal
T: mm let’s do it this way. More easily, um—asking what your favorite things means in your home country. What is it considered to be? Is it rude to ask is it polite is it normal? Is it OK? (3) And the second question I guess—understand?
Kai Lei: Yeah.
T: OK. Umm, OK. ((walks over to students, indicates pairs)) Two, two, two, two, two—three. Three. Ok let's start. Guys—move ((claps hands)). I will give you—five minutes. Five minutes? ((Ss begin talking in groups))
T: Is it hard? Guys Guys attention please. Asking personal questions could be—are you married? Are you single? It could be personal it could be a really direct question. These kind of question, how does it feel to you? OK guys?
Julia: /In my country?/
T: In your home country.
Julia: Yuck.
((Ss all laugh))
((pairs discuss together, all talking at once through 18:20))
T: Guys! Time is over! ((Ss still chatting)) Ok guys, I want to hear your answers. To these questions. Ok this group first (indicates Jun Lin, Julia & Nella).
Jun Lin: The first question?
T: yeah.
Jun Lin: (2) Have difference ((gestures, open hand, toward Jus. & Pet.)) We have three countries. Three ideas about how to ask—how to ask these questions.
T: yeah
Jun Lin: First is Yak.
Julia: Yak
Jun Lin: That means, how?
Just: How, how
Jun Lin: How.
Julia: /Yak. Yak Shimaj, how are you?/ ah, ((speaks Polish)) /how is your best color? /Ah, this is—my mine is very difficult? but this is the possible ((unint))./ Yak.
Jun Lin: Next we have Finnish.
Nella: ((nods)) Finnish
Jun Lin: ((looks at his notes, hands the paper to Nella))
Ss ((laughing))
Nella: /“How” is like “mitan?”/ Mitan is like how ((nods))/
T: I’m sorry guys, this first questions makes—a lot of confusion. To you guys right?
Ss ((yeah, yes, etc))
T: Actually my intention was—asking personal questions like, for example, “Are you married?” How does your—does feel to you? Uncomfortable, or comfortable, or it’s OK or—no it’s so rude. So that was my intention. So let’s forget about the first question. just move on to the next one.
Ss : ((all laughing))
T: OK ah from this group, can you tell us the second answer?
Just.: /Uh, we take a decision ah, rude is a when asking about privacy information=
T: =Oh yeah certainly=
Julia:= ah really personality or privacy information, yeah and, what was your example ((to JL)) about pin number?/
Ss ((all laugh))
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T: That’s a very good example. (1) Think about when you first came to this country or another country, and things something probably felt a little—strange or a little different than it was where you lived, would anybody like to tell anything about that?

Yolanda: /For me it’s different, ah, I’ve changed my self-image because, my first month here * especially so* my first month, I was learning::? drive/ I was, learning all the signs, to drive, then where—where I live it’s in Georgetown, and too many people is-is white? /No—and when I was walking on the street or driving they—but they smile at me? /But the first impress or I don’t know but the first—attitude?=

T:=MmHm=

Yolanda: =was oh! What—what are you—what are you doing here? /It’s my first impression? the-the-I can better then, I was beginning to drive? /Then my neighbor? Ah, asked me, the next day? Why are you driving you have license or something? /And yes I have license, I have a Visa. I am am legal I—and—this changed my, my self-image, because in my country is—they’re—really polite in Mexico, they’re really polite and never gonna ask you, something like that./ and, never gonna see—see you for your—skin color=/

Catalina: ((nodding))=for your color= Yolanda:= /for your color or something yes./

T: Mm hm that’s a really good exam=

Yolanda:=/ Yeah but, now they are really, they’re really polite with me?/ Because, they know what—what is my situation but, they first impression ((shakes head)) “what are you doing here?” what—uh:WHAT?! Huh! So they=

T: =that made you, uncomfortable? or=

Yolanda:= /Uh sometimes, not not, not every because I know what is my situation but, ah, but why are you, asking me that? /No? Is not not—not comfortable but I feel good, now./

T: That’s a good example of this Catalina you’re—looking like you had something like that happen to you or, that made sense to you

Catalina: Mmm. I am thinking ((laughs)).

...

T: Those are really good examples.

Allessandra: /I have a very very, ah weird experience about that./

T: alright tell us the story

Allessandra: /When I first get here I say it’s about—I think two weeks?/

T: OK

Allessandra:/ And then, I was alone I was walking alone at my home./ I used to be (unint)) at that time!? And uh, I was, just I would—walk around, and I saw a police car. /That cops car./ And I saw they lookin’ at me, and I saw they get—in another car. /A little car. and I was just walking so, the cop get a new and then he out they—how this called? ((gestures to wrists)) /

Luis: handcuff

Allessandra: /Yes they pulled, they just put it they get me, and then, I could not say anything cause I could not speak any English! /And he just put it me in my—in the car with him. In his car
and, start to ask me a couple questions? / And I used to—to have a little dictionary there?
translation? and then I start talk with him, with that little book? / And he say, I just get one week
or-- here, and that’s why I’m just getting here, and then they drove me some-somewhere else,
somebody house / And then that’s what happened. / There was a woman, that woman, he said look
like me, she was long and (unint) and this woman was stealing stuff from the neighborhood so./
T & Ss: oh wow, oh!
Allessandra: / Yeah. and then they put me in front of those peoples, ask those peoples if was, if it
was I if if they, they saw me steal something, and then they told no is not her, and then they, like,
look at my bag, how much money I had, and, I never learned everything about it/
T: Do you feel like that—changed your self-image at that time that you had to=
Allessandra: / Oh I think so, I think so the way—the way (.) you Americans. sometimes look at
us. you know what I mean?/
T: Mm hm ((nods))=
Allessandra: /= like it’s, of course it’s not everybody else but=/
T: = but it’s about how you feel from=
Allessandra: /= Some of the people they treat just like that, that’s the only problem I always had=/
T: = that’s a good example= Allessandra: = / I always had but just like I feel a little confused. / And I had only two weeks here.
/And I could not tell nothing to my brother, and no one came to get me so, that’s a very very hard
situation. /
T: That’s a very good example of changing your self-image and very different in a new country
where you don’t have the same power the same control
Allessandra: / Of course they say, they say, I’m sorry, and I apologize but—not enough./
((Observer QA (former teacher) enters))
Julia: /Quentin you are not lost I’m surprised /
((Ss, T, Obs. all laugh))
QA: No I am not lost tonight
Julia: /No lost, sorry, wrong word. late./
((Even more laughter))
Julia: /Sorry, no lost, late./ You are late always./
T: Really? Let me—before—before we start the class then I just want to show you some pictures um, which we took yesterday so yesterday was Halloween so how was the class? How was Marnie’s costume?
Nella: /Oh Marnie came in costume?/
T: so yesterday also my daughters they did some trick-or-treat? They just came some—actually we live in apartment so one other—one of my first daughter’s friend invited us to her house, and so they did trick-or-treat in her neighborhood, and so they got this amount of candy ((shows candy)) so I brought some to share, OK=
Nella: /yes thank you !=
T:=and, yesterday Stewart I will pronounce this right Stewarts, offered ice cream cone for just 45 cents. If we enter in costume. So we went there and enjoyed a (. ) almost a free ice cream cone. It was so nice, so yeah this is all about our Halloween, and—and this is one of the activities that we are going to do, this is, mmm, called three two one ((passes out worksheets)) it’s not—it’s not the same words.

((Pages 2-9 omitted ))

T: You know? Yeah question three, question three if you can come up with your own, situations or some answers uh it’s gonna be perfect but, if you cannot think of, just think about it in this way we are in a foreign, living in a foreign country so, we might feel, (2) I mean, me, I’m standing here but all of us are non-native speakers, yeah. I’m also in the same situation as you are, so, we feel more vulnerable. Yeah in a way, so, we might be—feel—more often depressed, Oh! What am I doing here, I mean—I can do better in my own country but here, frustrating. It’s like a—oh I cannot find what just vulnerable. This what I have been thinking about myself. And also my position? So, in that way you can come up with some, ideas. I think. Number three.
((Group work continues 44:55-49:46))
((alarm beeps))
T: Is it fun?
Ss ((laughing))
T: Is it annoying?
Julia: /I don’t like its voice=/
T: = you don’t like it?=
Julia: = in the morning it chhh chhh chhh you know?/
T: Oh you don’t like to hear it in the morning.
Julia: /This is very similar./
Ss ((laughing))
T: OK sorry.
Julia: /Yeah I hate it actually./

T: so I think I’m gonna give you one more minute OK? One more minute,
Ss (continue group work all discussing questions on handout))
((Group work 50:17- 51:17; alarm sounds))
T: Julia doesn’t like it so just stop it
Ss ((laugh))
T: OK everybody. Mmm one—only one person from each group come up here, two write down only number four. And number four you see—good effect OK? And groups decide one person, just one person come up here
(10)
Allessandra: /OK I will./
T: OK Allessandra, you are the best—and Nella ((Nella has risen from seat, going to front of room)) and who?
Luis: Catalina.
T: OK Catalina.
Allessandra: /Just one or should I—should I all/
T: Yeah all of the list here. You write your group—what your group came up with?
Nella: /Just for question four?/
T: ah four. Only four. The answers.
((Ss writing on board))
Nella: /Do you guys have anything to add?/
Julia: umm…mmm…I’m thinking…mmm…number four uh,
T: yes number four
Hiroto: /Yes. so. just. always happy./
Nella: /Be happy!/ 
((All Ss & T talking together until 53:54))
Julia: /And when you have positive emotion you have very nice life. /
T: you’re finished OK thank you!
Allessandra: /Making sure, you can be happy when you have good—helping each other/