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ABSTRACT

While topics exploring the efficacy of native and non-native language instructors are well-documented in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), a preliminary search of the literature on teaching other languages reveals very little research or writing on this topic, though the native language of language instructors is frequently a criteria for hiring in most language departments and programs. The works in TESOL focus primarily on attitudes: how instructors and program administrators feel about the differences and similarities they perceive between native and non-native instructors. There were many fewer data-driven studies that focus on learner outcomes and any differences in outcomes that could be attributed to the native language of the instructor. Student attitudes and beliefs were also scarcely addressed in the literature. I am interested in examining 1) if there are measurable differences in student outcomes that can be attributed to the native language of the instructor, and 2) if students and students who teach have preconceived notions about the relationship between measures or student success in language courses and the native language of their instructor and what those attitudes and beliefs are. In this preliminary study, I propose to examine the literature to determine if there are studies that address topics focused on native and non-native language instructors for languages other than TESOL, especially studies that describe student outcomes and student attitudes. Concurrently, I will conduct a survey of students in IU language courses about specific measures of their success and about their attitudes regarding the native language of their language instructors. The bibliographic searches will address works related to the teaching of any foreign languages. The surveys and any future research will be conducted in the narrower context of the Less Commonly Taught Languages, which is a fruitful field for research at IU.
1. PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION AND SPECIFIC RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this investigation is to conduct an in-depth search in the literature on language teaching for research and surveys that associate learner outcomes with the native language of the language instructor. Specifically, this literature review will be used to frame specific questions for future study about correlations between the native language of the instructor and specific measures of student engagement and success and to examine student perceptions and attitudes about the native language of their language instructor.

While topics exploring the efficacy of native and non-native language instructors are well-documented in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), a preliminary search of the literature on teaching other languages reveals less on this topic than the TESOL studies, though the native language of language instructors is frequently a criteria for hiring in most language departments and programs. The TESOL-related works found in the preliminary review focus primarily on attitudes: how instructors and program administrators feel about the differences and similarities they perceive between native and non-native instructors. There were many fewer data-driven studies that focus on learner outcomes and any differences in outcomes that could be attributed to the native language of the instructor. Student attitudes and beliefs were also narrowly addressed in the literature.

Perceived differences in the efficacy of native and non-native language teachers that are overtly or more subtly expressed by learners, language program administrators, and teachers are the impetus for this study, which aims to uncover if there is a literature outside the TESOL field that supports any biases towards native or non-native speaker language instructors. Accounts of data that measure student outcomes in language courses correlated to the native language of the instructor are of special interest. The primary objective of this study is a review of that literature and those data that may exist outside the field of TESOL.

A second objective is to gather information from language students at Indiana University about specific outcomes they can report, including 1) summative test scores (midterms and final exams), 2) proficiency test results, 3) students decisions to: a) continue in the language, b) major in the language, c) minor in the language, d) study abroad. The survey will also ask about attitudes towards instructors, including questions about whether students have preconceived ideas about their teachers based on their native language and if students have expectations that their instructors would be native or non-native speakers of the target language. This survey is intended to help better articulate questions for future research on student outcomes and attitudes and the IU Office of Research Compliance has determined that I will not need IRB approval for this pilot survey.

There are about 60 languages taught each year at IU. Some languages have very high enrollments and are mainly taught by graduate students (associate instructors or AIs), while others have lower enrollments and are taught by a combination of AIs and lecturers.
or only by lecturers. Some languages are never taught at the high school level, while others are commonly taught in K-12 programs and IU language students may have pursued those languages before coming to the university. In order to reduce the number of variables (e.g., variety of languages, types of instructors, and student exposure to the languages before taking a course at IU), the survey will focus on the Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs). IU has impressive depth and breadth of LCTL programs, so the potential for subsequent study that examines data about instruction and student outcomes in these languages is very rich.

The final objectives are to publish the literature review and to design a follow-up study based on the results of the literature review and the preliminary student survey, with a focus on both quantitative and qualitative student outcomes in IU LCTL courses.

2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH RESULTS WHEN APPLICABLE

As noted, I have uncovered a rich literature about non-native English speakers in the TESOL literature, including over 50 articles that address questions of native and non-native English speakers teaching TESOL both domestically and overseas. The first was published in 1974 and the most recent in 2014. Only 2% of the articles described the teaching of languages other than English. Here is a sample of the scope of topics and languages covered in this pilot search: teacher preparation for non-native English speakers in the TESOL classroom and many other articles about teacher education and teacher identity based on the native language of the instructor; investigations of native vs. non-native teachers’ judgments and assessments of student proficiency; perceptions of non-native language teachers by multiple audiences; use of target and non-target language by native and non-native speakers; personal reflection pieces by non-native instructors.

3. SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT THE STUDY MAY HAVE UPON UNDERGRADUATE OR GRADUATE TEACHING AND LEARNING

The proposed literature review and results of the anonymous student survey are not intended to affect immediately teaching and learning on campus. The review will provide a background and suggest need for further research, and the survey results will be entirely anecdotal and are only intended to help in articulating further research objectives and design. Ultimately, the results of further study at IU on this topic might most impact instructor training and professional development. If there are quantifiable differences in any of the measures of student success (including course outcomes, continued interest in the language, motivation to study abroad) and/or in student attitudes towards instructors (including relationships students form with instructors, comfort approaching teachers during office hours, raising or lowering of the affective filter), then teacher training or other interventions would be the first place to focus on minimizing those differences. If there are not differences, then further publication of results and disseminating these results more broadly to the field, and to program administrators, might impact hiring and promotion of instructors.
The immediate study and its outcomes should not contribute to the assessment of student learning at Indiana University.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The proposed literature review will be based on these research questions: 1) is there a body of literature that addresses a correlation between student outcomes in language courses and the native language of the instructor; 2) what are the data in the literature that are used to support those correlations, how are those data collected, and what data are sought to support assertions of student success; 3) is there literature that addresses students attitudes towards their instructors based on the instructor’s native language, and is that considered a factor in overall outcomes or measures of student success? Based on these questions, I will formulate a list of initial search terms and seek guidance on refining those from reference librarians in the Well Library. Both these search terms and others that yield relevant references will be recorded and included in the final published review.

The search for sources will begin with the databases recommended by the IU Linguistic Area Studies Librarian (http://libraries.iub.edu/linguistics-resources) beginning with the ERIC ProQuest Database (http://libraries.iub.edu/resources/eric-proquest). Again, the databases used for finding resources will be recorded and included in the final review.

Bibliographic references will be managed (captured and categorized) using EndNote X7. Sources will be evaluated according to a rubric that gauges authority, currency, reliability, relevance, biases, and readability (see Appendix 1). This is a rubric for literature reviews that I developed together with the IU Slavic and East European Area Studies Librarian through our collaboration on an information literacy grant-funded course. The scope of the review will include journal articles, books, conference papers, and other scholarly writing. Sources that support all viewpoints will be recorded and considered.

Once the search is complete and the rubric is applied to all sources, I will write the review as a piece of discursive prose. Like the bibliography in EndNote, it will be organized into sections that support different viewpoints and data. The review itself will synthesize and evaluate the material according to the rubric listed above. It will also address areas of controversy in the literature. Finally, based on the results of the search and the analysis of the literature, the review will conclude by noting if the literature indicates 1) if the original research questions are appropriate, and 2) if it will be necessary to formulate new questions and avenues for future investigation. Any new questions will be noted in the conclusion.

The bulk of the funding for this grant will pay for a graduate assistant to help with the search in the literature and any initial analysis of the sources based on the rubric for evaluation listed above.
At the beginning of the funding period, I will apply for survey approval from the University Survey Committee (http://ovpue.indiana.edu/assessment/procedures/procedure.html). If approved, this committee will help coordinate and promote the survey. The survey will be administered by free survey software, e.g., Survey Monkey or Qualtrics. I will solicit participation through list servers of the area studies centers on campus, assistant directors in the Language Flagships, and with the assistance of language coordinators in language departments. All three of these groups regularly work with me and I am confident they will support this effort by sharing my request for participation with students. For guidance in framing the questions and evaluating the results, I will compare the survey questions and the data to similar analytical data available from the Bloomington Office of Assessment and Research. This will happen at the beginning of the project as I am formulating the questions, and again at the end of the project, as I am evaluating the results.

5. MEANS THAT WILL MEASURES THE PROJECT’S SUCCESS

The bulk of the project’s success can be measured quantitatively. The bibliography should include all articles found using the search terms formulated for this study and should represent the past decade of publications in the field of language pedagogy or specific language teaching fields in the US (e.g., the Slavic and East European Journal, The International Journal of Middle East Studies, the Journal of the Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages). For the survey, I would also like to see at least 25 participants representing at least four of the LCTLs taught on campus. All survey responses must be recorded by the end of period funded by this grant and prepared for sharing with others. Finally, the literature review must by completed and ready for sharing at conferences, as a presentation in the SOTL event series, or condensed into poster format as part of a SOTL poster session.

The most successful outcomes will be: 1) a refined research idea and well-articulated plan for pursuing that research, and that both of those will be approved for continued SOTL funding; and 2) a publishable version of the literature review and its acceptance for publication.

6. MANNER IN WHICH RESULTS WILL BE DISSEMINATED

I will gladly share my results in a presentation in the SOTL event series or as part of a SOTL poster session, and will definitely present them in my department as part of our monthly Slavic Symposium. I will submit my literature review for publication to the Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. If unsuccessful with them, I will submit it to the Journal of the Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages. I will also apply to present my findings at the November 2016 FALCON conference (https://facet.indiana.edu/events-programs/FALCON/index.shtml) and at the January 2017 annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.
BUDGET NARRATIVE

Phase I funding of $2000 is requested for the period July 2015 to November 2016. Funds will be used to support a graduate assistant (GA) to work on the bibliographic search and evaluation of sources that will inform the literature review. The GA will be paid $12/hour for almost 130 hours. Funds will also support travel to the FALCON conference in November 2016 (thus the proposed end of the funding period).

Graduate assistant @ $12/hour for 127 hours $1524
Travel to FALCON (based on actual FALCON expenses in 2014)
  Transportation $60
  Lodging $355
  Per diem for meals not provided $61
Total $2000
RESEARCH PLAN AND TIMELINE

Please see §4 “Research Methodology” in the Project Description for methodological details related to this plan. It breaks down to:

1) Establish search terms for bibliographic search for sources in library databases;
2) Identify initial list of databases to consult;
3) Prepare a method for recording search terms and databases consulted and share that with GA;
4) Organize EndNote with parameters for managing sources found;
5) Promulgate survey through on-campus list serves that reach language learners.
6) Write up survey results;
7) Write discursive literature review, using rubric for evaluating authority, currency, and relevance of sources;
8) Share outcomes in CITL, Slavic Department, at FALCON conference and through publication.

In addition to the plan and timeline outlined below, I will attend all CITL SOTL meetings and events during the funding period.

**Timeline:**


August 2015: Start bibliographic search and draft survey. Compare the survey questions to similar surveys available from the Bloomington Office of Assessment and Research when designing survey.

September 2015: Continue bibliographic search and check GA’s work. Finalize survey and promulgate on area studies, Flagship, and Summer Language Workshop listservs to students. Ask language coordinators to send email to students about the survey.

October 2015: Continue bibliographic search and GA supervision. Begin reviewing sources found using rubric. Survey open.


December 2015: Finalize bibliographic search and continue source review. Survey open. Prepare midterm report on progress to CITL and seek consultation there if needed.
January 2015: Continue reviewing sources and begin writing review of literature. Close survey. Put survey results in Excel for easy organization. Compare the survey results to similar analytical data available from the Bloomington Office of Assessment and Research.

February 2015: Continue literature review. Write up survey results. Start formulating questions and methods for next level of investigation. Apply for Phase II funding.

March 2015: Share survey results and first draft of literature review with CITL SOTL office. Seek feedback on draft.

April 2016: Second draft of literature review. Present anecdotal survey results and salient aspects of literature review at Slavic Symposium. Seek feedback on second draft from departmental colleagues. Submit proposal to FACET for presenting results and plans for further study at FALCON conference.

May 2016: Finalize literature review. Prepare for submitting for publication to the *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.

June 2016: Prepare a final report on project for CITL.

November 2016: Attend FALCON conference.
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**Indiana University grants**

• REEI Mellon Grant, 2014-15 for revising textbook *Reading Modern Russian* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica)
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• Department of State, Office of Outreach, Title VIII grants to Indiana University in 2009-2010 (Co-PI); 2010-2012; 2011-2012; 2012-2013
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• American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators

• Association for Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies

• Association of Women in Slavic Studies
Appendix 1: Source evaluation rubric

### Evaluating sources: Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Author’s name &amp; credentials are provided, can be verified, and suggest expertise on the topic; and publisher is reputable.</td>
<td>Author(s) are named and relevant credentials are verifiable, or publisher is a credible source on this topic.</td>
<td>Author(s) are named, but credentials cannot be verified or credentials are unrelated to the topic.</td>
<td>Author(s) and/or publisher are not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currency</strong></td>
<td>Source is less than 5 years old, or it is a primary source.</td>
<td>Source is 5 to 10 years old or has some historical value.</td>
<td>Source is more than 10 years old and has no historical value.</td>
<td>There is no publication date or copyright date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Formally cited and from a peer-reviewed, academic source or it is a primary source.</td>
<td>Formally cited (bibliography, references or footnotes) or source is industry-approved (such as a trade or professional journal).</td>
<td>Source(s) of information are mentioned, but not formally cited. No bibliography or references included.</td>
<td>Content seems “off-the-wall” or source contains poor grammar or numerous spelling errors or no sources mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>The information is related to the topic and very useful for the questions to be answered.</td>
<td>The source is related to the topic, but the information is not useful.</td>
<td>The information is somewhat useful, possibly as overview or background.</td>
<td>The information is unrelated to the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biases</strong></td>
<td>The source examines both sides of the issue fairly, and/or is primarily fact-based.</td>
<td>The source is argumentative, but is poorly cited and inadequately supports arguments.</td>
<td>The argument is tendentious and not well supported.</td>
<td>The source is entirely opinion-based and unfair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readability</strong></td>
<td>Expressions of ideas are clear, the flow from sentence to sentence is smooth, and errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling do not distract the reader.</td>
<td>The text is easy to read and follow, but the reader occasionally has to reread some passages.</td>
<td>Problems with grammar, spelling, or punctuation recur, and the reader consistently has to reread passages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this nomination letter in connection with the application of Ariann Stern-Gottschalk for a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Grant. Dr. Stern-Gottschalk’s proposal to conduct an initial investigation of available literature on the effects of perceptions of native versus non-native foreign language instructors on the language learning process is both timely and well-conceived. The apparent paucity of such studies outside of TESOL contexts makes it difficult if not impossible to determine whether such factors as student engagement, motivation, and proficiency attainment correlate with the employment of native (or non-native) language instructors. Dr. Stern-Gottschalk correctly notes in her application that assumptions about some correlation are often implicit in foreign language hiring practices. Her investigation will help us to see where the holes are in the research to date.

Her second objective of gathering data specific to IU is no less crucial. As foreign language instruction figures importantly in Indiana’s regional, national, and international profile, and is constantly cited as one of its historic strengths, we absolutely need to have good data on our students’ assumptions and preconceptions about foreign language study and, most importantly, the general profiles of their teachers.

I can imagine multiple possible follow-up studies, but we need to have a better sense of what is out there first, and Professor Stern-Gottschalk’s investigation is an essential first step.

Please give her application your most careful consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Russell Scott Valentino
Professor and Chair
Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures
Indiana University
503 Ballantine Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 855-3272

President, The American Literary Translators Association