

Talk 1: Teacher and Learner Beliefs about Corrective Feedback: A Meta-Analysis and a Narrative Review

There have been a number of research syntheses on the incidence and effectiveness of oral corrective feedback (CF), including both meta-analyses (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010) and narrative reviews (Ellis, 2010; Nassaji, 2015). One crucial area awaiting a comprehensive review is student and teacher beliefs about CF, the importance of which lies in the links between student beliefs and second language (L2) proficiency (Peacock, 1999), the possible detrimental effects of the mismatches between students' and teachers' beliefs on students' motivation (Horwitz, 1990), and the finding that students' CF beliefs are separate from their beliefs about other aspects of L2 learning and are therefore "domain specific" (Loewen et al., 2009). Using both meta-analysis and narrative review, I provide a comprehensive synthesis of the research on teachers' and students' CF beliefs.

26 studies were retrieved, out of which five investigated student beliefs about CF, three examined teacher beliefs, and six compared student and teacher beliefs. The remaining studies explored other aspects of CF beliefs, including whether teachers' beliefs and practices are congruent, whether teachers' beliefs can be changed through some type of training, and whether students' CF beliefs relate to CF effectiveness. The results showed that (1) learners were keen to receive CF while teachers were hesitant to provide CF; (2) teacher-training programs incorporating hands-on practice activities had a favourable impact on teachers' CF beliefs; (3) teachers showed congruence and incongruence between their CF beliefs and CF practices; and (4) students' CF beliefs were predictive of the effectiveness of explicit feedback.

I conclude by discussing the implications of the findings for teachers, teacher educators, and researchers. I explore how to bring about changes in students' and teachers' belief systems and bridge the disparities between them, discuss ways future researchers may benefit from the synthesized studies, and identify issues to be addressed and pitfalls to be avoided.

Talk 2: The Effects of Pretask Grammar Instruction on Task Performance and L2 Development: A Process-Product Study

A continuing source of debate in task-based language teaching is whether performance of a task should be preceded by explicit grammar instruction. Proponents of task-supported language teaching argue that it will enable learners to perform the task successfully (Swan, 2005) whereas proponents of task-based language teaching claim that this will predispose learners' attention to linguistic forms and subvert the meaning-primary principle of task-based teaching (Ellis, 2003). This study investigates whether explicit teaching affects task performance and whether it results in better learning.

72 eighth-grade Chinese EFL learners were randomly assigned to three conditions: Explicit Instruction + Task (ET), Task Only, and Control. The two experimental groups attended a two-hour treatment session where they performed two narrative dictogloss tasks, each followed by a reporting phase when they told the narrative to the class. The ET group received explicit instruction about the English past passive before performing the tasks, the Task Only group only performed the communicative tasks, and the Control group did not receive any instructional treatment. The learners' task performance was assessed in terms of whether they attempted to produce the target structure and through measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Learning gains were measured by means of a grammaticality judgment test (explicit knowledge) and an elicited imitation test (implicit knowledge).

The results showed that (1) pretask instruction led to more frequent use of the target structure but had detrimental effects on syntactic complexity and fluency; (2) pretask instruction resulted in higher learning gains, but the effects were restricted to explicit knowledge; and (3) global measures of accuracy and fluency, correct passive use, and pretest scores were significantly related to the learners' posttest scores. The results suggest an adverse impact of pretask instruction on task performance and the importance of general proficiency and prior knowledge in affecting the outcomes of task-based learning.