"No" — A Case Study in Corrective Feedback in a Secondary Chinese Language Classroom in Australia

Xinxin Li
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Hui Huang
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Abstract—**Corrective feedback has been studied for decades in classrooms both for children and adults. Among different subjects, language learning, especially second language (L2) learning is one of the significant targets of corrective feedback studies. Compared to English and other European languages, however, Chinese as L2 classroom has get little attention. This paper investigates what types of corrective feedback (CF) a teacher of Chinese working at a secondary school in Melbourne provided to what kinds of errors made by students, and the effectiveness of each CF type. The data was obtained from 2 random lessons and the parts involving CF were transcribed to further analyze. The results suggest that Chinese beginners made more mistakes in pronunciation and vocabulary than in grammar, however, the teacher provided feedback to all of the lexical and grammatical errors, ignoring nearly half of the phonological mistakes. In addition, the overall effectiveness of CF was not satisfactory, especially for elicitations and recasts, which were used the most commonly by the teacher. Some pedagogical implications for Chinese teaching and Chinese teacher training are also provided.**

Index Terms—**corrective feedback, Chinese as L2, secondary Chinese language classroom**

I. INTRODUCTION

Classroom interactions have long been of interest to many L2 education practitioners and researchers (Allwright, 1984; Ellis, 1984; Kern, 1995; Llinaries & Lyster, 2014; Mackey, 2006). Of those researchers, many are interested in teachers' corrective feedback (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). However, only a small number of studies have been conducted in Chinese L2 classrooms (e.g., Fu and Nassaji, 2016; Yang, 2016). In this study, we perform a classroom-based case study from a prescriptive perspective investigating how Chinese teachers provide corrective feedback to L2 students' responses in the classroom. By so doing, we also intend to provide some diagnostic information for teaching Chinese in an Australian secondary school context.

Chinese has been taught in Australian schools for some time. Chinese has been identified as a national priority language by both the Australian government and the public, causing another surge of Chinese learning and therefore Chinese teaching in schools. However, a recent report on Chinese Language Education in Australian Schools (Orton, 2008) has demonstrated alarmingly low participation, achievement and retention rates in secondary school Chinese programs: Only 3% of Year 12 students take Chinese and 94% of Chinese learners quit before Year 10. As indicated by many scholars, problems such as those in curriculum, teacher education, and quality of Chinese classroom teaching in secondary schools deserve further study (Scrimgeour, 2014). Many local researchers have investigated issues from a macro perspective (e.g., Chen & Zhang, 2014; Huang, 2011; Scrimgeour et al., 2013). There is, however, limited research on what is happening within the classroom, an important factor for the development of Chinese teaching and learning as well as the Chinese curriculum.

II. CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

A. Classroom Interactions

Classroom interaction has been long considered important in L2 acquisition, and has attracted a lot of scholarly attention (Allwright, 1984; Ellis, 1984; Kern, 1995, Gardner, 2013, Jenks & Seedhouse, 2015). Early studies focused on teacher talk, as L2 acquisition relies on comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985), and investigated the relationship between interaction and L2 development (Mackey 1995, 1999). More recently, researchers have tried to tackle "how interaction creates opportunities for learning" (Mackey, 2012, p. 8), and paid more attention to the social and cognitive factors that affect learning (Mackey, Abbuhl & Gass, 2012).

Spada & Lightbown (2009) argued that "classroom-based studies are most likely to lead to a better understanding about the kind of interaction that occurs in classrooms where the teacher is the only proficient speaker and interacts

with a large number of learners" (p. 159). A typical complete classroom interaction includes teacher questioning, student responses, negotiation of meaning, and teacher feedback. Five aspects of interaction have been well examined from an L2 acquisition perspective: noticing, comprehensive input, L2 production, negotiation of meaning, and negative or corrective feedback (Gass, 1997; Krashen, 1980, 1982; Swain, 1995, Nassaji, 2016, Lee & Lyster, 2016). CF is considered to be an essential contribution to the classroom interaction because the feedback learners get outside the classroom is rarely corrective (Seliger, 1983), with Gass (1997) contending that explicit CF is most effective.

B. Corrective Feedback

CF has been defined as "responses to learner utterances containing an error" (Ellis, 2006, p. 28). It not only points out the mistakes in learners' output, but also acts as a scaffold to promote students' L2 growth (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six different types of CF in their descriptive study of French immersion classroom interactions. These types were further classified into two categories: reformulations and prompts (Ranta & Lyster, 2007). The reformulation includes recast and explicit correction, as these "supply learners with target reformulations of their non-target output" (p. 152). Elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, and teacher repetition are classified as prompts, as the correct form is withheld to encourage self-repair.

Based on Lyster and Ranta's classification, Sheen & Ellis (2011) proposed a similar taxonomy, which not only distinguished the conception of reformulations and prompts, but also labelled each type of corrective feedback as implicit or explicit. In addition to the six CF types Lyster and Ranta proposed, Sheen and Ellis introduced 'paralinguistic signal' as a new type, as well as combining explicit correction and metalinguistic explanation into a new type. According to their study, 'recast' consists of two different types, conversational recast and didactic recast, the former belonging to the implicit category while the latter is seen as explicit. Repetition and clarification requests are also labelled as implicit, while explicit correction, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation are classified as explicit.

In the majority of descriptive studies, recast is shown to be the most commonly used CF type in different language classes in various countries (e.g., Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen 2001; Lee, 2007; Lyster & Mori 2006; Sheen, 2004; Tsang, 2004; Yang, 2009). In some studies, explicit corrections are found to share a similar proportion of use to recasts (Vicente-Rasoamalala, 2009) or, in some cases, make up nearly half of all CF types found (Simard & Jean 2011). In Kamiya's study (2016), three English as a second language (ESL) teachers in the USA held the belief that creating a comfortable environment for students was more important than the use of CF. As a result, they refrained from using explicit CF types and favoured recasts as they are implicit and would not humiliate students. However, depending entirely on implicit CF may cause some problems as students may not notice their errors and thus no uptake will occur. Although the uptake or effectiveness of CF was not the focus of Kamiya's study, it revealed that students did not always attempt to fix their errors, and sometimes teachers did not give the students the opportunity or time to repair.

C. The Effectiveness of CF

Lyster (2004) argued that learners should be encouraged to self-correct by way of prompts, and that recasts may be less effective because learners may perceive them as a way to communicate, rather than providing correct forms. Although prompts are more likely to elicit students' responses, it may be not helpful when students lack the linguistic knowledge to respond. Ellis (2010) provided a solution, namely the prompt-then-provide approach. This approach requires teachers to use a prompt to promote students' self-repair, and provide a correction if this fails.

To address the effectiveness of CF in classroom interactions, there are two main streams of research. Some research examines whether teachers' choice and students' preferences for CF match, while other studies examine the relationship between different types of CF and learners' uptake and response. Lyster and Saito (2010) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the effectiveness of oral CF using 15 classroom-based studies in various language classrooms. The result shows that prompts were more effective than recasts.

Exploring learners' preference for CF types is of importance to classroom interactions because CF is likely to be ineffective if teachers' intentions for using CF are inconsistent with learners' expectations. Yoshida's study (2008), which investigated seven learners and two teachers from three classes of a second-year level Japanese language course at a university in Australia, found that most learners preferred to have an opportunity to think about the correct forms on their own before teachers' recasts.

Instead of asking learners to reflect on what form of CF is most useful for them, some studies (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004, 2006) have used learners' uptake as the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of CF, which is more objective. These researchers believe that CF is able to facilitate language acquisition if learners can first notice the error, and then repair their mis-production. For example, Sheen's 2006 study of adult ESL classrooms found that phonological errors received the highest rate of repair, followed by lexical errors, with grammatical errors being repaired the least. Another interesting study by Llinares and Lyster (2014) investigated the frequency of different types of CFs relative to students' uptake by examining 43 hours of 4th and 5th year classroom interaction in three different settings. In the study, they found that recasts were used the most in all settings, followed by prompts and finally explicit corrections. Recasts elicited the most student repair in content and language integrated learning (CLIL), English classrooms and Japanese Immersion (JI) classrooms, while prompts elicited the most repair moves in French Immersion (FI) classrooms. This study revealed that CF works differently in

different settings with different languages. However, Chinese classrooms in English-speaking countries like Australia have not drawn much scholarly attention yet.

In this study, uptake and learner repair will be used as a measure of the effectiveness of CF, drawing on several previous studies (e.g., Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Ellis et al., 2001; Mackey et al., 2003). Based on Lyster and Ranta, two types of uptake are considered. The first is repair, in which the error is repaired successfully. The other is need-repair, in which the student notices the error, hesitates, makes another error, makes the same error again etc., and their output needs further repair. In this study, the effectiveness of CF is measured by the student's successful self-repair of his/her own mistakes.

D. *Classroom Interactions and Feedback in Teaching Chinese as a Second Language*

There are less studies on the use of corrective feedback in Chinese language classes than for ESL classrooms.

Lu and Gao (2015) investigated four Chinese learners in a beginning level class, finding that recasts were the most commonly used CF type. In their study, 76.74% of recasts were followed by students' responses, while 87.50% of other types of CF were followed by students' responses. They also found that phonological errors occurred more often than lexical or grammatical errors, and that the rate of successful repair was higher for those errors. The study focused more on recasts than on the other types of CF, and as a result, other forms of CF were not analyzed or discussed in detail.

Fu and Nassaji (2016) studied teacher feedback and learner uptake in an adult Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) classroom. By investigating 10-hours of recorded classroom interaction, they identified 12 types of feedback, six more than Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified. Recast was found to be the most frequently used feedback type, followed by metalinguistic feedback. Four types of feedback received 100% uptake, namely clarification requests, directing questions to other students, re-asks, and using L1 English. Recasting prompted the least repairs from students. This study also found that students' perception of what types of feedback were effective did not match that of the teachers. This study, however, did not distinguish CF from the other forms of feedback such as redirecting the question to other students.

Another study by Yang (2016), which used quantitative and qualitative approaches to investigate Chinese language learners' preference for CF types and the relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error, found that learners generally favoured metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and recasting. Recast was also found to be more useful for correcting phonological errors than lexical or grammatical errors. As well as these findings, the study revealed that proficiency level and cultural background also played a role in CF type preference. Intermediate level students, for example, believed that clarification requests were useful for phonological errors, while beginners did not think so. Learners from Confucian cultural backgrounds favoured explicit correction when it came to pragmatic errors while learners from other cultural background did not. The study used questionnaires and interviews to reveal students' preferences, rather than investigating CF use in authentic classroom interactions. In other words, the types of CF that students favoured were not necessarily what was being used in the classroom, and neither type of feedback prompted satisfying responses from students in authentic interactions.

The study presented in this paper is aimed at filling the gaps in research into the Chinese language teaching context by examining what CF types are used and which are most effective for beginning learners of Chinese by investigating authentic interactions in the classroom. This will also provide some referential data for interactions within Australian Chinese beginner classroom using a teacher's CF as a lens. Specifically, the study will examine:

1. What kind of CF types did the teacher provide for the kinds of mistakes that Chinese beginners made in classroom interactions?
2. Which of the teacher's CF types are most/least effective for Chinese beginners when self-repairing?

III. THE STUDY

A. *Research Settings and Participants*

The school where the research was conducted was a private boy's school in Melbourne, Australia. There were only two levels of Chinese being taught in the school: Year 7 and Year 8. In order to collect the data, we chose two Year 7 lessons randomly, and both lessons were recorded in full in September, 2014. There were 24 students in the first and 21 in the second recorded group, and all were studying Chinese as an elective.

According to a questionnaire about the students' demographic information, all boys were 12- or 13-year-old non-background speakers except two students who were heritage learners. These two students were born in Australia and had never received education in China. In addition, the two heritage learners spoke English at home, but attended community schools to learn Chinese on weekends. The other students had few opportunities to speak Chinese outside the classroom. The majority of students had learned Chinese at primary school, but their Chinese skills were very limited because the aim of Chinese class at primary schools was to motivate students, not mastering the language. All of the students were beginners in writing and reading Chinese, and, except for the two heritage learners, were at the beginner level in speaking and listening.

One full-time teacher of Chinese from a non-Chinese background and one Chinese-background teaching assistant looked after these two groups. The full-time teacher took charge of the Chinese program, writing lesson plans, preparing the teaching materials, and delivering each lesson. In addition, there were no official Chinese textbooks in

this school, and they used the materials developed by their teacher and different teaching assistants. The teaching assistant was a master's student studying at a Chinese university and was asked to attend every Chinese class to help students with their questions. This study focuses on the Australian Chinese teacher's interactions with students, to find out what kinds of corrective feedback this teacher uses and which ones are more effective for Chinese beginners.

B. Data Collection and Analysis

During each 50-minute lesson, the teacher and students interacted for about 30 to 35 minutes. The data used for this study were two randomly selected lessons in Term 4 in 2014 because classroom interactions were limited in the first three terms for these beginners. These classes were recorded and carefully transcribed by a Chinese native speaker.

A three-step data analysis was conducted based on the transcripts of 100 minutes of recording. First, all the mistakes produced by students were identified and classified into phonological, lexical, grammatical and contextual errors (see Example 8 in Results). Second, after each mistake, we carefully examined if and what feedback the teacher provided. All the teacher feedback was classified based on the model provided by Lyster and Ranta (1997). During the analysis, however, we found one type of corrective feedback that did not fit in any of the types identified by Lyster and Ranta, which was labelled *linguistic clues* in this study (see Example 10 and 11 in Results).

Finally, we examined if the student that was the target of CF was able to repair the mistake, which was taken as a sign of uptake of the feedback and showed the effectiveness of the teacher's feedback. The process of data analysis not only indicates the weaknesses of the CF provided to students, but also facilitates the understanding of the effectiveness of that feedback.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE I:
FREQUENCY OF TEACHER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' REPAIR

	Phonological			Vocabulary			Grammar			Context			Total		
	Mis	CF	RP	Mis	CF	RP	Mis	CF	RP	Mis	CF	RP	Mis	CF	RP
Recast	13	7	4	3	3	0	1	1	0				17	11	5
Elicitation				8	8	3	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	10	4
Explicit correction				1	1	1	1	1	1				2	2	2
Clarification request										1	1	0	1	1	0
Teacher repetition										1	1	1	1	1	1
Linguistic clue				4	4	2							4	4	2
Total	13	7	4	16	16	6	3	3	1	3	3	2	35	29	14

Table 1 gives an overview of the frequency of the feedback the teacher provided in response to student errors as well as the students' self-repair after the teacher's corrective feedback. The total number of feedback instances provided to incorrect answers was 29, and 6 mistakes were ignored: i.e., the teacher only provided corrective feedback in response to 83% of student's mistakes. After the teacher's feedback, students only repaired 14 (48%) times. As we can see from the Table 1, these beginner students made vocabulary mistakes most often, followed by phonology and grammar errors. While the teacher provided corrective feedback to all mistakes in vocabulary and grammar, he left almost half of the phonological mistakes without feedback. This means the teacher might not have been aware of, or paid enough attention to, the mistakes in pronunciation. Among all of the corrective strategies, the teacher used recasts and elicitations most, followed by linguistic clues. They only used explicit correction and clarification requests one or twice. In terms of repair, students were only able to self-repair some of their mistakes, with the highest proportion of repair found in contextual mistakes and the lowest in grammatical errors. All of these will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

A. Recast

The teacher used recasts when students produced errors in pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. The data showed that the teacher tended to recast students' phonological errors the most, and more than half the time the students repaired their pronunciation mistakes after teacher's recasts:

Example 1[1] (Lesson 1):

S1: 我的爸爸四十二<xi1shi1er2>岁。 (My dad is 42 years old.)

T: 四十二<si4shi1er2>岁。 (42 years old.)

S1: 四十二岁<si4shi1er2>。他喜欢打 golf。 (42 years old. He likes playing golf.)

T: 高尔夫球，高尔夫。(Golf ball, golf.)

S1: 高尔夫球。(Golf ball.)

---

[1] The Pinyin is provided in triangles, and the translations are given in brackets in all examples.

In this example, student 1 (S1) pronounced the initial "s" and the tone incorrectly, but tried to fix it based on the teacher's demonstration. The student repeated the Chinese equivalent word "golf" after the teacher told them the pronunciation, which might be because the word is phonologically borrowed from English. The teacher then moved to the next question as the student's output was satisfactory. However, the student (S2) in Example 2 did not repair the sound after the teacher's recast:

Example 2 (Lesson 1):

S2: 我的妹妹爱跳舞<dao1wo2>。 (My younger sister likes dancing.)

T: 我的妹妹爱跳舞<tiao4wu3>, 跳舞 dance。 (My younger sister likes dancing, dancing.)

S2: 我爱板球<ben1kiu2>。 (I like cricket.)

T: 我爱板球<ban3qiu2>, 板球，cricket. (I like cricket, cricket.) Good job. How can we say date in Chinese?

This example shows that Student 2 did not pronounce the word 'dancing' correctly in Chinese. After the teacher recast the whole sentence, instead of repeating the word "dancing", the student ignored the teacher's recast and continued to produce another sentence where he pronounced the word 'cricket' incorrectly. This time, the teacher recast the sentence again, repeating the word "cricket", and then moved to another question without giving Student 2 any chance to fix the error. Interestingly, Example 2 is different from Example 1 in that the teacher only recast the mispronounced part in the first example, but recast the whole sentence in the second example, which resulted in a lack of repair. This may be attributed to the implicitness of the recast in Example 2 when the teacher repeated the whole sentence without directly pointing to the mistake in pronunciation. This is consistent with previous studies that indicated the success of explicit recasting is dependent on context or other factors such as the length and the number of changes (Nicholas, Lightbown and Spada 2001; Sheen 2004, 2006; Ellis and Sheen 2006; Sato 2011). Example 2 is a typical communicative recast, which is so implicit that it fails to attract the student's attention while in Example 1, the error was made more salient because only one word was recast, and the student was able to notice and repair the mistake.

Recasts turned out to be ineffective in helping to correct the students' mistakes in the choice of words or grammar:

Example 3 (Lesson 2):

T: How do you say "new car" in Chinese?

S3: 新 (New) car。

T: 新车 (New car)。小狗 (small dog), small dog, how about big dog?

Example 4 (Lesson 1):

S4: 26 日 7 月 2000 年。 (26-7-2000. – the date is in the incorrect order in Chinese)

T: 2000 年 7 月 26 日。 (26th July, 2000.)

S4: 我的生日。 (My birthday.)

Example 3 shows that the student did not know the Chinese word for a car, and just added the English word "car" after the Chinese word "new". The teacher provided the right word, and then moved to the next question directly without giving any time for the Student 3 to repeat the word. In Example 4, the student confused the date sequence in Chinese with that of English, and he continued his sentence after the teacher's recast without any correction. In this case, the student might have paid more attention to the meaning conveyed than the teacher's intention of correcting this mistake. In these two examples, either the teacher did not give any time to allow the student to respond or the student continued without fixing their mistakes. As a result, the effectiveness of the corrective feedback in these two examples is not satisfactory.

B. Elicitation

Elicitation was also used by this teacher, and was mostly used for lexical errors. In the analysis, we found the teacher used elicitation to help students self-repair (Lyster, 2015), mainly by providing partial sentences and allowing the student to complete them (see Example 5 and 6):

Example 5 (Lesson 2):

T: What about new students?

S5: 新的。 (New.)

T: 新的——? (New…?)

S5: 新的生，新的学生。 (New stu…, new student.)

In Example 5, S5 did not complete the phrase 'new student' in Chinese, and the teacher repeated the Chinese word "new", pausing to allow the student to finish the word himself. The pause was explicit enough to attract the student's attention and prompt his self-repair. In this example, the Student tried twice and then produced the correct word.

Example 6 (Lesson 1):

S6: 我昨天不吃饭。 (I do not eat yesterday.)

T: 你昨天怎么了? (What did you do yesterday?)

S6: 不吃饭。 (Do not eat.)

T: 不对。 (Wrong.)

In Example 6, S6 produced the utterance with a grammatical error. The teacher used an elicitation to bring the student's attention to his error. However, the student repeated the error again, after which the teacher rejected the answer directly and asked another student the same question. In this example, although the student responded to the teacher's elicitation, the student failed to correct the error due to his limited knowledge of the language. In this case, even though the teacher did not correct the student's mistake, he intended to ask the same question to another student and prompt a peer recast.

C. Explicit Correction

Not many explicit corrections can be found in the recorded data; the teacher provided explicit corrections to lexical mistakes only twice. One example can be seen in Example 7:

Example 7 (Lesson 1):

T: 你吃早饭了吗? (Did you have breakfast?)

S7: 有。(Have.)

T: You cannot say "有", you need to use "吃 (eat)". "吃了 (eaten)" for yes.

S7: 吃了。(Eaten.)

In this example, the teacher used explicit correction after S7 produced an incorrect answer. The teacher pointed out the error in the student's utterance in an explicit manner , saying "you cannot say '有', you need to use '吃'". The student followed this correction by producing the correct utterance. Although the teacher did not favor explicit corrective feedback, students were successful in self-repairing errors after the teacher's explicit corrections each time, because the teacher clearly indicated that what the student had said was incorrect, which is consistent as what previous studies have shown (e.g., Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001).

D. Clarification Requests

Clarification requests is the corrective feedback type that this teacher used least. This might be related to the student's language proficiency level (e.g., Yang, 2016). All these students were beginners and the questions and answer pairs were very simple and straightforward. As a result, misunderstandings or confusion rarely occurred, which might be a reason clarification request were not used much. The only example found in the data is given Example 8:

Example 8 (Lesson 1):

T: 他的家有几口人? (How many people in his family?)

S8: 有五口人。 (Has 5 people.)

T: Full answer.

S8: 五…… (5…)

T: 不是，他的家——? (No, his family…?)

S8: 他的家有五口人。 (His family has 5 people.)

In this example, the teacher requested the student to provide the full sentence (3rd line), but the student was confused. So the teacher had to start the sentence himself and then adopted another feedback strategy (i.e., elicitation by pausing) to wait for the student to provide the full sentence, which turned out to be useful. Here, the teacher's request for clarification is neither about phonological, lexical nor grammatical mistakes, but more about his own intension to have the class practice the key sentence structure of the week (i.e., "有", there be). This error cannot be classified into categories of phonological, lexical nor grammatical mistakes, but is rather an error in contextual comprehension, so it was labelled as a "contextual mistake" in this study.

E. Teacher Repetition

Teacher repetition was used only once in the data. A typical repetition requires the teacher to repeat students' errors which may reinforce the mistakes for the student, which the teacher may wish to avoid. The only example from this study is shown below:

Example 9 (Lesson 1):

T: 你有妹妹吗? 你有妹妹吗? (Do you have younger sisters? Do you have younger sisters?)

S9: 没有妹妹。 (Do not have younger sisters.)

T: 没有妹妹? (Do not have younger sisters?) [Other students are laughing.]

S9: Wait, 有。(Wait, have.)

This is another example of a "contextual mistake" in which S9 provided an answer that was not consistent with the fact that he did have a younger sister. However, when the teacher asked him if he had a younger sister, he answered "no". This might be because he did not comprehend the teacher's question or the word "younger sister" in Chinese when he produced his first answer (line 2). The teacher who knew the student very well was surprised at the student's answer of "no younger sister", so he repeated what the student said. This repetition, together with other students' laughing, functioned as a trigger for S9 to realize his mistake and correct his answer. In this case, the teacher's repetition of the contextual mistake was sufficient for the student to repair his own comprehension mistake. However, as indicated by other researchers (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Suzuki, 2005), teacher's repetition of mistakes may not

always be as effective as this one. Repeating a student's mistake is not explicit enough to draw students' attention to their error and thus allow them to repair the mistakes. In some scenarios, a teacher's repetition of the mistake without any further corrective feedback may even enforce incorrect forms.

F. L1 Linguistic Clues

This teacher also used L1 linguistic clues to assist the students in producing correct utterances by themselves. Interestingly, English clues were only used with lexical mistakes in the data.

Example 10 (Lesson 2):

T: Can you translate the next sentence?

S10: 起床 (get up) is going to?

T: 起 is arise, 床 is bed。

S10: I get up at 7 in the morning.

Example 11 (Lesson 2):

T: New computer 怎么说？ (How do you say new computer?)

S11: (pause)

T: New electric brain.

S11: 新……(New…)

T: 新电脑。 (New computer.)

The CF that the teacher provided in both examples was labelled L1 linguistic clues because they are quite similar to metalinguistic clues in that the teacher tries to provide some extra information, helping students to understand the vocabulary better. However, metalinguistic clues relate to general grammatical rules in a language, which may be too difficult for beginners as these students have not been introduced to enough of the target language. This might be the main reason that the metalinguistic clues found in Lyster and Ranta's study (1997) were not adopted by the teacher in this study. While L1 linguistic clues are very specific, and only relate to the vocabulary under discussion, they are direct, and provided students a scaffold to reconsider the question using their existing semantic knowledge.

In these two examples, we can see that there were no mistakes in the students' responses, but rather a gap – neither student knew how to respond to the teacher's question. The teacher provided the student feedback to help the fill the gap by using L1 linguistic clues. In Example 10, the student produced the correct answer after the teacher gave an L1 linguistic clue. Instead of providing the sentence's English translation directly, the teacher told the student the meaning of each character. With these linguistic clues, the student was able to figure out the meaning of the whole phrase, and produced the correct translation. This kind of linguistic clue was particularly effective when the clues were in the context of translation of Chinese to English as the students know English while their vocabulary in Chinese was limited. In contrast, Example 11 is one case in the data where students could not produce the correct answers despite the teacher's L1 linguistic clues. In this example, S11 forgot how to say "new computer" in Chinese, and the teacher provided a literal translation (line 3) as a clue. However, the Student 11 was only able to say "new" in Chinese.

These two examples show that linguistic clues are explicit enough to elicit students' responses, however, the effectiveness of such clues is dependent on students' language proficiency.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we obtained the following results: 1) the Chinese beginners made pronunciation and vocabulary mistakes most often; 2) the teacher provided CF to the students' mistakes in vocabulary, grammar and contextual understanding while ignoring half of the phonological mistakes; 3) Measured by the student's self-repair, explicit correction turned out to most effective CF type, while recasts, elicitations and linguistic clues were the least effective of the six strategies the teacher used. Teacher repetition seems very effective, while clarification requests were least effective. However, given their infrequent use (i.e., only once), we could not draw conclusions about their effectiveness in this study. 4) Following the teacher's CF, students could self-repair their mistakes more effectively when they related to contextual comprehension, which was not the case with grammar and vocabulary errors.

Although great care was taken in designing this study, there are some limitations which should be overcome in future studies in this vein. First, this study only analyzed data from 2 lessons and the analysis might be affected by the teaching focus for that week. Second, only one Chinese teacher from one school was observed, thus making the results ungeneralizable. Finally, although gender differences among students was not considered in this study, classroom interactions in co-educational schools and girl's schools may not be the same as in the boy's school studied.

These results have clear pedagogical implications for Chinese teaching and Chinese teacher training. The explicitness of CF plays an important role in the effectiveness of self-repair. In the study, explicit corrections were found to be the most effective CF among the identified categories. Recasts were not effective in all contexts, especially when it was implemented for a whole sentence, which did not highlight the mistake sufficiently. Prompts, however, were not found to be helpful for the beginners' self-repair because the beginners may not have adequate knowledge of Chinese to repair their error. For example, in the grammar section, we can see the teacher did not explain the student's mistake, but rather simply recast the response or prompted the student to give a new answer. This reveals that the role of teacher's explicit

scaffolding in effective self-repair. Ellis (2010)'s suggestion of a prompt-then-provide approach might be a good solution. This means that teacher training on what CF types are available and when to them is also necessary.

REFERENCES

[1] Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 5.2, 156-171.
[2] Chen, S., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Chinese language teaching in Australia. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & A. Hancock (Eds.), *Learning Chinese in diasporic communities: Many pathways to being Chinese* (Vol. 12). John Benjamins Publishing Company, 181-201.
[3] Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2006). Teaching and learning Chinese: Heritage language classroom discourse in Montreal. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 19.2, 189-207.
[4] Ellis, R. & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28.4, 575–600.
[5] Ellis, R. (1984). Classroom second language development: A study of classroom interaction and language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.
[6] Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focussed instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19.1, 18–41.
[7] Ellis, R. (2010). Cognitive, social, and psychological dimensions of corrective feedback. In R. Batstone (ed.), *Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 151-165.
[8] Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51.2, 281–318.
[9] Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, VI-1, 159-181.
[10] Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 593-611.
[11] Gass, S. M. (2013). Input, interaction, and the second language learner. New York, NY: Routledge.
[12] Huang, H. (2011). Localisation and internationalisation of Chinese language curriculum. In L. Hong, H. Huang & B. Gao (eds.) *Teaching Chinese in a global context: Theory and practice*. Shanghai: Academia Press, 37-52.
[13] Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10.3, 206-219.
[14] Kern, R. G. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and characteristics of language production. *The Modern language journal*, 79.4, 457-476.
[15] Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. Alatis (ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
[16] Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
[17] Krashen, S. (1985). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.
[18] Lee, A. H. & Lyster, R. (2016). The effects of corrective feedback on instructed L2 speech perception. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38.1, 35-64.
[19] Lee, J. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms at the primary level in Korea. *English Teaching*, 62.4, 311–334.
[20] Llinares, A. & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42.2, 181-194.
[21] Lu, X. & Gao, L. (2015). Impact of Corrective Feedback on Language Acquisition in Chinese L2 Classroom Interaction. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 29.1, 95-110.
[22] Lyster, R. & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28.2, 269–300.
[23] Lyster, R. & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32.2, 265-302.
[24] Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language learning*, 48.2, 183-218.
[25] Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26.3, 399-432.
[26] Lyster, R. (2015). The relative effectiveness of corrective feedback in classroom interaction. In N. Markee (ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 213-228.
[27] Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19.1, 37-66.
[28] Lyster, R., Saito, K. & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*.1, 1-40.
[29] Mackey, A. (1995). Stepping up the pace: Input, interaction and interlanguage development: An empirical study of questions in ESL. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sydney.
[30] Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21.4, 557-587.
[31] Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 27.3, 405-430.
[32] Mackey, A. (2012). Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 classrooms. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
[33] Mackey, A., Abbuhl, R. & Gass, S. M. (2012). Interactionist approaches. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge, 7-23.
[34] Nassaji, H. (2016). The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

[35] Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51.4, 719-758.
[36] Orton, J. (2008). Chinese Language Education in Australian Schools: October 2008. University of Melbourne.
[37] Panova, I. & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36.4, 573-595.
[38] Ranta, L. & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness - Practice - Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-160.
[39] Sato, M. (2011). Constitution of form-orientation: Contributions of context and explicit knowledge to learning from recasts. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14.1, 1-28.
[40] Scrimgeour, A. (2014). Responding to the diversity of Chinese language learners in Australian schools. *Babel*, 49.3, 26-37.
[41] Scrimgeour, A., Foster, M. & Mao, W. (2013). Dealing with distinctiveness: Development of Chinese in the Australian curriculum: Languages. *Babel*, 48.2/3, 20-29.
[42] Seedhouse, P. & Jenks, C. J. (2015). International perspectives on ELT classroom interaction: An introduction. In P. Seedhouse & C. J. Jenks (Eds.), *International Perspectives on ELT Classroom Interaction*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-9.
[43] Seliger, H. W. (1983). Learner interaction in the classroom and its effect on language acquisition. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 246-267.
[44] Sheen, Y. & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge, 593-610.
[45] Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8.3, 263-300.
[46] Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 8.4, 361-392.
[47] Simard, D. & Jean, G. (2011). An exploration of L2 teachers' use of pedagogical interventions devised to draw L2 learners' attention to form. *Language Learning*, 61.3, 759-785.
[48] Spada, N. & Lightbown, P. M. (2009). Interaction research in second/foreign language classrooms. In A. Mackey & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honour of Susan M. Gass*. London: Routledge, 157-174.
[49] Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 4.2. Retrieved from http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/view/58.
[50] Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.) *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125-144.
[51] Tsang, W. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 35.2, 187–209.
[52] Vicente-Rasoamalala, L. (2009). Teachers' reactions to foreign language learner output. Ph.D. dissertation, Universitat de Barcelona.
[53] Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System*, 61, 75-86.
[54] Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective-feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17.1, 78-93.

Xinxin Li is currently a second-year PhD candidate in the School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics at Monash University. Her research interests include second language acquisition, teaching Chinese as a L2, and processing strategies of reading.

Hui Huang is a senior lecturer in the School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics at Monash University and holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics. Her research interests and publications cover the areas of second language acquisition and sociolinguistics, particularly the teaching of Chinese as a second /heritage language, ICT in language teaching, cross-cultural communication and immigrant identity. Her studies include collaboration with researchers from Linguistics, Education and Medicine in cross-disciplinary projects in Australia and overseas.