Electronic Theses and Dissertations   Graduate School

1-1-2019

Dialogic feedback and its effects on English language learners' writing development: a case study

Shokhsanam Djalilova

DIALOGIC FEEDBACK AND ITS EFFECTS ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS'

WRITING DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation

presented in partial fulfillment of requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in English Education

in the Department of Teacher Education

The University of Mississippi

by

SHOKHSANAM DJALILOVA

August 2018

ABSTRACT

This exploratory case study aimed to investigate the meanings that second language (L2) learners derive from their writing purposes, revising processes, and their engagement with dialogic feedback. The goal was to grasp the meaning that revision experiences had for L2 learners (n=17) and to understand the context within which they were operating, and its influence on their revision behavior. In order to gain a better understanding of L2 learner engagement and investment in the revision processes which were bound to time and context, the case study was built upon an ecological-semiotic approach to learning. The case study aimed to construct a clearer reality within a bounded system – a culture of a classroom, feedback practices, learner and teacher histories – and bounded by time (4, 9, and 30 months) to understand why some L2 learners benefited from feedback and others did not. Drawing on dialogic interactions, interviews, writing samples and intensive revisions, qualitative interpretations were used to discover factors that explained L2 learner variation in receiving, processing, and applying dialogic feedback. The findings suggest that (1) dialogic feedback acted as a communicative, sign-making process that developed L2 learners' writing and revisions, and encompassed writing as a personal act that occurred in a classroom setting; (2) L2 learners encountered unique opportunities and constraints that afforded and limited their L2 writing learning experiences in a variety of ways in which individual differences played a significant role; (3) the way L2 learners responded to a writing task differed according to how they interpreted the goal of the task or the goal they set for themselves in relation to the task, and task conditions; (4) L2 learners may hold different, even contradictory, beliefs about L2 writing and revisions at different times, influenced

by diverse personal and contextual factors which shaped their approaches to revisions; and (5) L2 learners varied enormously with regard to revisions, as well as affective factors such as writing anxiety, attitude, and investment. The results of the study present a better understanding of L2 learners' perspectives and the value of feedback as a revising tool.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my loving parents, Tolmas and Zebo Djalilova for their endless

love, support, and encouragement. I would like to pay tribute to the memory of my father

Tolmas, who is never forgotten.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CF   Corrective Feedback

DF   Dialogic Feedback

DI   Dialogic Interactions

EFL   English as a Foreign Language

ESL   English as a Second Language

ETS   Educational Testing Service

FL   Foreign Language

IEP   Intensive English Program

IRB   Institutional Review Board

L1   First (native) Language

L2   Second Language

NNEST   Non-native English Speaking Teacher

NEST   Native English Speaking Teacher

NNES   Non-native English Speaker

SLA   Second Language Acquisition

SLW   Second Language Writing

TOEFL   Test of English as a Foreign Language

WCF   Written Corrective Feedback

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

After multiple pilot studies on written corrective feedback during seven years, students with whom I had a chance to work demonstrated multiplicity and complexity in their writing experiences. Although I only focused on feedback practices, particularly written corrective feedback, and believed my indirect comments would magically trigger student engagement and lead them to invest in revisions, I blamed my pedagogical skills when the feedback I composed did not translate into successful student revisions. I failed once, twice, and thrice, and still believed in the power of written corrective feedback because, as a second language learner myself, I knew feedback was imperative. However, during all these years, I not only embraced my fear to critique my research and teaching, but based on multiple case studies, I also learned that students need to invest if they want to develop their second language writing, particularly accuracy. Therefore, I implemented *dialogic feedback* which called for students' input to take a more active involvement in the revision processes, rather than passively receiving feedback. The case study presented here is based on my consistent and ongoing engagement – dialogue with students who have been learning to write and revise in a second language.

Dialogic feedback does not mean a one shot treatment, or a bandage on repeated student errors; it is feedback that initiates a dialogue which in its turn encourages students to become autonomous learners who can more effectively monitor their own learning and take control over their writing processes. Dialogic feedback is not limited to the teacher-feedback split (the signifier pointing to a signified) either, that is, the teachers' provision of the correct form, but it

gains a triadic nature of response – a student creating a renewed understanding based on the connection between feedback and his/her errors. In other words, a student negotiates the meaning of feedback based on the form provided and evaluates the context of usage in order to achieve self-regulation. Dialogic feedback (DF) does not mean feedback for correcting errors in writing, but rather feedback for learning that builds on student identity, as they work to make sense of the meaning in feedback through the dialogues. The act of writing is seen as "a dialogue that welcomes all voices"; a dialogue between its participants (Vandermeulen, 2011, p. xi), a never-ending dialogue in fact. More crucially, dialogic feedback has the power to create a safe platform to discuss both personal beliefs and attitudes, and the social experiences of the main actors in the process of dialoguing: a student and a teacher.

This exploratory case study aimed to investigate the meanings that second language (L2) learners derive from their writing purposes, revising processes, and their engagement with DF. Although studies on corrective feedback (CF) have been debated extensively over the past years, the recent research base provides limited insights on individual learners' characteristics as they receive, process, and apply CF; on the role of learners' agency; on their motivation to write, their goals in writing, and the gradual change in their perceptions toward second language writing (SLW). There is also limited research conducted in a classroom context. Therefore, the purpose of the case study was to explore learners' revisions in authentic classroom circumstances (Bruton, 2009; Lee, 2014a) in order to gain an in-depth and contextualized understanding of how and in what ways learners interpreted, negotiated, and responded to the demands associated with writing assignments in non-experimental conditions. The main purpose of the case study was to explore the role of DF and its effects on L2 learners' revisions. Dialogic feedback acted as communicative, sign-making process that developed learners' writing and revisions, and

encompassed writing as a personal act that occured in a classroom setting.

Second Language Writing scholarship represents few case studies (Bitchener, 2012; Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013; Han & Hyland, 2015; Kormos, 2012; Morton, Storch, & Thompson, 2015) that emerged from classroom research. Therefore, due to the ways in which L2 learners represent unique profiles and specific needs in terms of writing practice, this case study followed the qualitative method (Creswell, 2014) and explored individual learners and their engagement with revision processes. In previous SLW studies, neither the impact of the context nor the dynamics of a classroom has been given priority in explaining L2 learners' responses to feedback. Therefore, exploring revisions by looking at the interaction of learner characteristics and the context was vital.

Feedback is the mosaic of various strands of processes and practices tied together by the continuing interaction of the particulars – learner goals and needs, teacher planning and execution, the type of writing task, teacher feedback, learner response and engagement with feedback, and classroom culture – in a particular context. However, SLW research offers very little information about these strands and their influence on effective L2 learner revisions. The case study used qualitative interpretations to discover the factors that influenced learner response to DF.

Statement of the Problem

The debate about the effectiveness of feedback on L2 learner written accuracy has been controversial and resulted in two fundamentally opposing views. The findings of studies, conducted over the last 20 years, either point to the value and effectiveness of correction for improving student writing ability (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Evans, Hartshorn, & Strong-Krause, 2011; Ferris, 2006; Ferris et al.,

2013; Hyland, 2003; Sampson, 2012; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012) or present a "case against correction" (Truscott, 1996; Truscott, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008) and call for abandonment of this labor intensive activity (Krashen, 1985; Truscott, 2010a, 2010b). Although L2 learners who arrive in the United States have distinct characteristics and differing needs, they all need comprehensive guidelines for writing skills in order to comply with academic programs of a given institution. It is common that L2 learners may view the task of discovering their voice in an English dominant setting as a very difficult, if not impossible task. Many L2 learners tend to *float* through writing intensive courses and/or writing assignments, and attempt to just *get by* as best as they can without gaining from the course a confident sense of skill. A variety of factors such as differences in schemata knowledge and linguistic proficiency, as well as in most cases a lack of genre awareness, lexical variation, and rhetorical grammar, lead these L2 learners to struggle with responses to writing task requirements. They find difficulty engaging in SLW instruction and in recognizing the rhetorical patterns of academic discourses (these factors are discussed in Ferris, 2009 and Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Therefore, to focus on whether errors need to be targeted is counterproductive. Indeed, investigating the reasons why some L2 learners benefit from feedback, and others fail to do so is more beneficial.

      Recent research shows that accuracy or complexity in SLW does not develop substantially after one year (Knoch, Rouhshad, & Storch, 2014), or over three years (Knoch, Rouhshad, Oon, & Storch, 2015) in an English dominant setting (e.g., at the university level), if L2 learners do not receive feedback. Limiting instruction to giving explicit direction to focus on grammar while L2 learners engage in self-revisions (Ibarrola, 2013; Kim, 2014), and giving a summative evaluation to the end product, do not lead them to concentrate on formal aspects of

writing either. Some L2 learners have gaps in morphological, syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic knowledge that result in serious errors. Their errors cannot be resolved without expert help (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Not only do L2 learners face many challenges in trying to meet class-level writing expectations while simultaneously "grappling with language acquisition and writing proficiency development" (Ferris, 2009, p. 39), but they also need to adjust socially and culturally to a new environment. Some of them might have limited prior experiences with SLW. Considering these obstacles, this case study aimed to explore the ways "socially mediated and context-motivated factors could shed a light on why some learners benefit from feedback and others fail to do so" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012, p. 100; Hyland, 2003; Lee & Schallert, 2008; Liu & Tannacito, 2013).

The reason of implementing DF, and as a result dialogic interactions (DIs), was that it had a potential to promote a sensitive approach to L2 learners' writing needs, as well as to recognize L2 learners' diversity and their "literate histories that inevitably influence their readiness to develop writing skills" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014, p. 20).

Significance of the Case Study

The significance of this classroom-based research is that it aimed to explore interpretations about the language learning potential of instructional writing-based events. Gatekeeping mechanisms that measure knowledge based on language proficiency keep L2 learners stuck on the periphery. Therefore, real life accounts emerging from DIs of these learners might shed some light and provide SLW pedagogical models for better strategies to work with this populace. This study employed DF in a classroom setting. Existing studies fail to account for SLW classrooms and what is really happening behind the doors in L2 contexts. In order to gain a better understanding of learner engagement and investment in the revision processes which are

bound to time and context, and to reveal the value of DF, the case study was built upon an ecological-semiotic approach to learning.

An ecological-semiotic approach to learning, as proposed by Leo van Lier (2004, 2011) gives crucial attention to learner characteristics and context to address "criss-crossing complexities" of language, learning, and pedagogy to research the processes and the possibilities of second language teaching and learning (van Lier, 2011, p. 384). The ecological-semiotic approach evaluates relations, context, patterns and systems, emergence, quality, value, critical perspective, diversity, and agency principles. These principles guide and reinforce a naturalistic context of the research. Although van Lier (2004, 2011) does not refer directly to writing instruction in discussions of principles, they could be adopted to writing research, because they refer to ways of being in a classroom: how relations are built among students and the teacher; how the meaning of writing and feedback emerges and unfolds in and out of a classroom; how learning is constructed as use-based, rather than rule-based; and how instruction is geared toward emerging learner experiences that acknowledge their past and future. This approach regards writing development in terms of quality rather than quantity (the later reinforces error free discourse), when value is put into autonomous sustainable learning; when teaching is oriented towards recognizing and respecting learner diversity; when teaching is concerned with nurturing student critical thinking; and when teaching is set with promoting learner agency (enabling perceptual learning, initiative taking, engaging in feedback practices, and critical reflection). Not only do these principles inform how learners respond to L2 instruction, process feedback, recognize gaps in their knowledge, and the aspects of language they focus on (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013; Kormos, 2012; Schmidt, 1994), but also they emphasize the importance of the contextually situated nature of learning. In the words of Guenette (2007), there is a need for a

study "that will take the whole context into, in and out of the classroom" (p. 51), and the ecological-semiotic approach provides a framework to do so.

Ivanič (1998) states that each written word reflects one's "life-histories, encounters, hopes, fears and disappointments, values, beliefs, personality, anxiety, tensions and contradictions" (p. 6). The distinctive life experiences of L2 learners can present obstacles to comply with the rules of a particular educational context. Therefore, to understand the processes of SLW and the complexity of developing SLW skills requires recognizing the uniqueness of L2 learners, their written texts, and the setting in which they learn (Hedgcock, 2012). Therefore, this case study implemented the process writing approach because this approach can make feedback more meaningful, consequently outlining the success criteria in concrete terms and helping evaluate learner writing by indicating what they did well and less well with reference to the success criteria (Lee, 2014b), also giving them a better idea about how they can effectively improve their drafts. Insights gleaned from this case study may directly influence the pedagogy of teaching SLW.

Successful SLW goes beyond a learner's final product and a teacher's feedback. It includes writing purposes, writing tasks, learner needs and goals in a naturalistic classroom context (Bruton, 2009; Lee, 2014a, 2014b); learner attitudes to SLW (Kormos, 2012); learner affect and individual differences (Ferris et al., 2013; Kormos, 2012); and teacher attitudes, beliefs, and feedback practices (Evans, Hartshorn, & Tuioti, 2010; Ferris, Brown, Liu, & Stine, 2011; Furneaux, Paran, & Fairfax, 2007; Hyland, 2013; Hyland & Anan, 2006; Lee, 2009; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013). The success or failure of DF might depend on the classroom context, the type of errors learners make, their motivation, their proficiency level, the type of writing they are asked to do, the instruction, the relationship between the learner and

teacher, and the learner and the immediate cultural context. Therefore, I argue that improving the teaching practice of SLW requires moving beyond merely analyzing learners' final products and the styles of teacher feedback to assessment of the full writing ecology and observation of learner involvement in the process of writing and revision. Research, with an ecological orientation to the process-oriented writing classroom, can help broaden an understanding of the extent to which DF can mediate L2 learner writing development. The growth in the body of L2 learners, specifically international students, in English as a global language requires practitioners to be informed with the best strategies to help L2 learners become independent self-editors.

Purpose

The case study aimed to look closely at individual learner responses and engagement in DI to explore possible factors that might explain learner variation in receiving, processing, and applying feedback. The purpose of the case study was to understand why some learners benefited or did not benefit from provided DF. The case study sought to understand the how and why of phenomenon – learner revisions to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved from a holistic, participant-informed perspective (students and a teacher). The case study aimed to construct a clearer reality within a bounded system – a culture of a classroom, feedback practices, learner and teacher histories – and bounded by time (4, 9, and 30 months of data collection) to understand why some learners benefited from feedback and others failed to do so.

There are considerable obstacles to systematic classroom-based language learning research due to the complex nature of the classroom environment (Schachter & Gass, 1996). Learners often have varying native languages and cultures, proficiency levels, learning styles, motivations, and attitudes; teachers have their own distinctive belief systems, teaching styles,

and professional agendas. Furthermore, the work of these teachers and learners takes place in educational institutions that have their own sets of educational and social concerns. Therefore looking at the interaction of these circumstances, the changing identity of the participants (e.g., learners' writing identity; teachers' teaching beliefs), sense of power and agency within them, or their investment (learners' investment in composing and revising; teachers' investment in composing feedback, developing lesson plans and materials) revealed the unique complexity of the case – learners' engagement with feedback.

My interest was in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific factor, in discovery rather than confirmation. Given the limited evidence about the meaning that L2 learners (hereafter student-participants) derive from composing and revision processes, the following research questions guided the case study:

1. What realities do student-participants derive from their engagement with dialogic feedback?

    (a) What role does dialogic feedback play in facilitating student-participants' revision processes?

    (b) What factors may explain student-participants' engagement or disengagement with revisions?

In the next chapter, I present the conceptual framework that has guided the study, as well as provide a comprehensive review of previous research, arguments, and rebuttals.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter first presents the conceptual framework that has guided the case study. Next, this chapter discusses research studies of written corrective feedback (WCF) with the focus on (1) language learning potential of WCF; (2) the role of second language acquisition (SLA) theories in providing better understanding of WCF; (3) writing tasks; (4) teacher roles; (5) teacher perceptions; and (6) need for further research.

Conceptual Framework

The case study aimed to develop possible explanations why some student-participants benefited from provided feedback and others failed to do so. The goal was to grasp the meaning that revision experiences had for student-participants and to understand the context within which they were operating and its influence on their actions.

Compared with the amount of research on feedback types and teacher feedback practices, very few studies explore the impact of individual learner differences (Ferris et al., 2013). Affective factors may mediate learner engagement with feedback. Bitchener (2012) points out that if learners are unwilling to attend to and engage with the feedback they are given, it would seem self-evident that uptake will not occur and that learning will not occur. Even if uptake does result from engagement with the feedback received, individual factors may mediate whether or not they consolidate their knowledge for ongoing retrieval. Therefore, this case study aimed to understand an Intensive English Program (IEP) writing classroom, dialogic feedback (DF), and differences across individual student-participants when they engaged in revision processes.

No single theory might ever explain such complex phenomenon as second language writing (SLW), which necessarily involves the full range of psychological, cultural, linguistic, and educational factors in which learners engage (Hyland & Hyland, 2006b; Matsuda & Silva, 2005; Silva & Matsuda, 2010). Feedback is a key component of teaching SLW. This means that feedback does not represent a single theory or method, but a collection of ways by which feedback composers can assist feedback receivers toward a better understanding of their texts, their readers, their writing and revision processes, and their learning. Since no single theory or approach can account for *particulars* involved in composing feedback and revision processes in a classroom, a conceptual framework is used to inform the entire research process, including my ideological position and methodological choices. The following discussion outlines the *particulars* that helped me to conceptualize the framework for this case study.

The first particular derived from my own teaching experience and listening to and learning from students about their drafting and revision processing, which made me reconceptualize my feedback practices from one directional hierarchical teacher and text relationship into teacher and student and student text DI. When describing DI, I do not base my discussion on the sequence of utterance. I think my approach here is more aligned with Bakhtin's view of sequence, which relates to the unfinished quality of utterance, that is, there are no limits to the dialogic context. The Bakhtin view shows the utterance not just in terms of where it occurs in sequence, but how it connects to all other language, both in and out of the conversation in which it is found. The Bakhtin's concept of dialogism suggests that a word has no meaning until it has been infused with meaning by an individual or individuals: "Every utterance is the product of the interaction between speakers and the product of the broader context of the whole complex social situation in which the utterance occurs." (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 41) Within the context of

SLW, responding to a text in writing alone, without dialogism, increases the likelihood of a teacher misinterpreting the meaning of or intention behind the writing. Dialogic interactions, because of the two-way negotiation they entail, serve also to empower students who are better positioned to negotiate the outcome of their writing. For instance, their more active role in the process of revising their essays encourages students to clarify and defend their choices, which can help them to build greater ownership of their writing (Tardy, 2006). Dialogic interactions challenge the unequal distribution of power typical in student-teacher relationships (Hyland, 2000). This tipping of the scales, in turn, reduces the view of the teacher as an authoritarian figure (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). Equal relationship between a student and a teacher develops student revision agency.

I adopted Goldstein's model of conceptualization of the feedback and revision process (2010, p. 74) which shows the nonlinear relationship between *particulars* taking place within and being affected by particular contexts: teacher response particular is embedded with teacher characteristics, orientation, comment structure, and what to focus on; student particular represents a complex interaction between student characteristics, student text, teacher and teacher response; and context particular is in constant interaction with program and institution factors, teacher and teacher response, and student and student text:

> ...this process is one of communication flowing back and forth between teacher and student, that many texts (teacher's commentary and students' drafts) are created, that each teacher and each student brings his/her own sets of characteristics, knowledge and attitudes that influence and shape their texts and communications, that these texts get produced and these communications take place within particular contexts that also serve to shape teacher commentary and student revision, and that teachers and students

mutually influence each other in the process of commenting and drafting and revision.

(Goldstein, 2010, pp. 87-88)

All factors described in Goldstein's model are bounded by a context. In the case study, a classroom is, therefore, a frame that surrounds DF and provides resources for its appropriate interpretation, and application in DIs.

My second particular that I have followed and which helped to shape this case study is the notion of error feedback in SLA. The questions I have asked, the data collection techniques I have considered relevant, and data analysis strategies I have applied are informed by the work of SLW researchers and researchers on language and learning who characterize several important developments in the SLA field. Although these researchers and their perspectives stem from various paradigms (cognitive theories, sociocultural theories, critical theory, learning as changing participation in situated practices), I have found their work in related disciplines invaluable in helping me develop a conceptual framework for this study. The first group of researchers includes Schmidt (1990, 2001), Swain (1985, 1995, 2005), and Long (1996); the second includes Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), Lantolf (2000); the third includes Norton (2000, 2013); and the fourth includes Dörnyei (2005, 2009) and Dörnyei and Ryan (2015). While these researchers did not ask the same questions or follow similar research designs, I have found the ideas, concepts, theories and empirically tested hypotheses they share, which are outlined below, highly productive for research on feedback in SLW. The hypotheses and approaches are grouped based on three key dimensions of feedback – the wider sociocultural context, the ways that the feedback is delivered, and the interactions among participants – those who are involved.

(i) Cognitive theories that assess the contributions of CF for SLA include the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2001), the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005), and the

Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996). Although these theories primarily seek to account for how CF assists acquisition in interaction (e.g., oral CF), they also apply to WCF (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). The origins of the interaction approach are in work on oral interaction (Long, 1996). This approach emphasizes the role of input, output, and feedback, all of which occur during interaction in the L2. Most important, attention (noticing) is a major component in learning. When receiving input, the learner may pay attention to certain forms. When producing output, the learner has to pay attention to form (as explained by Swain 1985, 1995, 2005) to construct an utterance. As oral interaction occurs, the learner will receive implicit feedback in the form of negotiation and recasts, or, possibly explicit feedback in a classroom setting. This feedback serves as a way to draw the learner's attention to form. When L2 learners are given opportunities to incorporate corrections in multiple drafts, CF may trigger metalinguistic understanding of an error as they notice the gap by paying conscious attention to linguistic forms (in the input). Based on SLA theories, I adopted the process writing and applied an indirect type of feedback.

(ii) Sociocultural perspectives on language and learning view language use in real-world situations as fundamental, not ancillary, to learning. These researchers focus not on language as input, but as a resource for participation in everyday activities. Participation in these activities is both the product and the process of learning. A sociocultural approach to second language learning, as conceptualized by Lantolf (2000) and based on the work of Vygotsky, can to some extent explain why some learners fail to benefit from feedback. Vygotsky (1934) developed the theory of understanding child psychology and learning environment and roles of participants. His theory does not apply to writing development or second language learning, but discusses the overall learning process. Vygotsky (1978) believed that mental activity is mediated through symbolic tools, and that language is a symbolic tool available to solve problems. Each learner

has a zone of proximal development (ZPD) in which learning can take place with scaffolding. Through scaffolding by another person (usually an expert), the learner moves to regulate the activity alone until it becomes internalized. A teacher becomes an expert, while feedback is a scaffolding tool. Within this approach, explicit knowledge should be useable for certain learners. When a teacher is scaffolding, the moves can take many forms, including explicitly drawing the learner's attention to a form or providing a rule. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) claim that instead of providing direct error correction for the learners to look at, the teachers need to use a series of prompts designed to allow the learners to first self-correct the error. If the learners do not self-correct, the teacher gradually adds help, for example, by pointing to the location of the error and then noting the type of error.

(iii) Critical theorists tend to view marginalized members of a community as having their access to learning blocked because they may be prevented from participating meaningfully in target-language social practices (Canagarajah, 1999, 2000, 2005; Norton, 2000, 2013). Although issues of identity and learning have been treated in sociocultural approaches to learning, it is appropriate to mention that researchers often explore and critique the ways in which the patterning of power relationships can legitimize some identities and forms of participation but devalue others. As such, language learners have much more at stake than merely developing competence in an additional linguistic code. Norton (2000, 2013) argues for a greater focus on the learner's multiple, shifting subjectivities or social identities; their investment in language learning; their often restricted access to target-language speakers and communities (eg., needing adequate proficiency in English to participate in networks). Norton (2000) offers a critical L2 perspective, foregrounding issues of power, identity, (cultural) capital, and the complex social histories and desires of learners: "...learning of a second language is not simply a skill that is

acquired with hard work and dedication, but a complex social practice that engages the identities of language learners…" (Norton, 2000, p. 132)

Norton's (2000, 2013) work firmly connected the notions of imagination and imagined communities with the processes of L2 learning and use and with classroom practice. Norton (2000) shows that at times L2 learners are most uncomfortable speaking to people they see as members of – or gatekeepers to – imagined communities they are trying to enter. Thus, their behaviors and choices are linked to their investment in particular imagined communities. Norton (2000) argues that if learners' imagined communities are not acknowledged, their learning trajectories would be affected in negative ways. Therefore, Norton's dynamic view of identity is highly invaluable for SLW, because learners may be highly *motivated*, but may not be *invested* in feedback practices of a given classroom if the practices are racist, sexist, or homophobic. As identity is fluid, multiple, and a site of struggle, how leaners are able to invest in a target language is contingent on the dynamic negotiation of power (Norton, 2013).

(iv) While early L2 motivation research focused mainly on identifying individual differences in learners' motivational profiles to predict student effort and find explanations for ultimate achievement (Dörnyei, 2005), more recent approaches stress the dynamic and contextually sensitive nature of motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Drawing on the construct proposed by Dörnyei (2005, 2009) – The L2 Motivational Self System – the individual L2 learner differences and their language development are seen as a function of the moment-to-moment trajectory, which displays a non-linear growth. The individual-level analysis is a source of development, which depends on context and time (Dörnyei, 2009; Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006). The learner and the learning environment mutually influence and shape each other. Therefore, motivation is seen as a process that emerges from this interaction over time. Learner

16

characteristics are not stable but show salient temporal and situational variation (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Understanding learner variation is an essential part of SLW and feedback. The process of linking learner revisions to motivational factors is fruitful. The significant variance in learner engagement with SLW is not static, but a compound and relative phenomenon situated in a dynamic context.

The next sections discuss research studies of WCF with the focus on (1) language learning potential of WCF; (2) the role of SLA theories in providing better understanding of WCF; (3) writing tasks; (4) teacher roles; (5) teacher perceptions; and (6) need for further research.

Selected Empirical Studies on Feedback: Language Learning Potential of Written Corrective Feedback

The research on WCF is inconsistent. It can be classified into three sections: effectiveness of WCF, ineffectiveness of WCF (Bitchener, 2012; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Leki, Cumming, & Silva, 2008), and scholarly discussions and debates on how SLA theories are relevant to WCF (Ortega, 2012; Polio, 2012).

Error correction debate. Although most second language classrooms provide WCF as the most frequently used type of feedback form, scholars have debated its potential effectiveness since Truscott's (1996) study, in which he claimed that error correction causes harm and must be abandoned. Truscott repeatedly presents objections with respect to the use of WCF in SLW classes:

> Correction has been studied in a wide variety of contexts, different types of students, different types of instruction, different types of correction, and it has failed in all of them. This pattern of negative results is the central finding of correction research. It cannot be

explained away by the presence of random flaws in individual studies. A serious response

to the case against correction must show that the research contains systematic biases

against correction, accounting for the pattern of negative findings. I have yet to see

anyone suggest any such factors. (Truscott, 2010a, p. 334)

Although Bitchener (2008), Ferris (1999, 2002, 2004), and Ferris et al. (2013) made a stand for

the use of WCF and argued that Truscott's conclusions were inaccurate, they agreed that

evidence from well-designed studies was necessary before any firm conclusions could be drawn

about the ineffectiveness of error correction. These calls have resulted in an ever-expanding body

of studies exploring the effects of WCF on L2 learners' writing, and triggered Truscott's further

arguments:

My original thesis was specifically that grammar correction is ineffective, but more

recently I've talked mostly about error correction, a broader category, because the

experimental literature rarely distinguishes grammar errors from other types of errors and

so the empirical side of the case against correction has to be primarily about error

correction. In this context, what I want to say is that error correction in general is

ineffective but there are likely to be exceptions, and these exceptions are not likely to be

found in the area of grammar. (Truscott, 2010b, p. 632)

In his subsequent studies and reports, and from the preceding quote, it seems that Truscott

departed from his earlier beliefs that correction (or grammar) in SLW offers any benefit unless

there are sufficient studies demonstrating the contrary.

In his recent study, though, Truscott still calls to abandon grammar corrections in L2

classrooms (Truscott & Hsu, 2008). Participants (n=47) in Truscott and Hsu's (2008) study were

EFL graduate students enrolled at a university in Taiwan. The writing task was a narrative,

describing a picture in 30 minutes. After pre-test, the experimental group received teacher feedback, and the control group did not receive any. A week later, participants wrote a new narrative. The procedure was repeated in week 13. In week 14, participants wrote another narrative. Coding of errors included all grammatical errors. ANOVA was performed to ensure that students were at the same level before the study started. The difference between the error rate for the experimental group (.0799) and that for the control group (.0763) fell far short of significance (F =.1045, p=.7480). To examine the effect of error feedback on students' subsequent revisions, a comparison was made between the two groups of their reduction in error rates from Narrative 1 to Narrative 2. The two groups were identical on this measure (F=.0002, p=.988), indicating that the corrections did not have an effect on students' writing development. The researchers concluded that error feedback did not indicate a learning process, but helped only on immediate revisions. Although Truscott calls for distinguishing errors and having a clear research design, the study of Truscott and Hsu (2008) did not give information on the types of errors. Moreover, the study did not describe clearly which errors were corrected.

The studies conducted by Truscott must not be overlooked, although they present negative evidence of error correction. Error correction should be about a learning process, and not merely validation of positive or negative influence, and should also contribute to and improve the existing knowledge. Feedback in SLW instruction is unique as far as language input goes, which combines a specific L2 learning situation, type of instruction, and individual learning potential; it is "contextualized, individualized personalized, and embedded in productive meaningful learning generated by the learner/student, usually with time available for reviewing." (Bruton, 2010, p. 493) Differences in the learners' schemata knowledge and of linguistic proficiency can have an effect, but in most cases the lack of rhetorical grammar, genre

awareness, and lexical variation lead the learners to struggle with responses to texts and content, with engagement of SLW instruction, and with recognition of the rhetorical patterns of academic discourses (Ferris, 2009; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Therefore, to focus on whether errors need to be targeted does not offer a benefit.

Potentials of corrective feedback. Research on SLW reveals that WCF facilitates improved accuracy; certain types of WCF are more effective than others; and WCF improves accuracy for only certain linguistic forms and structures. Although focused WCF results in a more effective process than unfocused WCF, a single WCF treatment is useful.

Much of the research on the role of WCF in language learning has focused more on whether WCF helps students to revise their texts rather than on learning and language acquisition (Ashwell, 2000; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Ferris, 2004; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hyland, 2003; Sheen, 2007; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). Truscott and his colleagues have argued that the revision of a text does not necessarily provide evidence of learning (Truscott, 1996; Truscott & Hsu, 2008).

The study of Conrad and Goldstein (1999) explored the relationship between teacher written feedback and students' subsequent revisions. The participants, three students in their 20s (matriculated to academic classes) with different cultural backgrounds (Vietnamese, Iranian, and Filipino), wrote four expository essays during 16 weeks. The study used three types of data: drafts of student papers, written comments made by the teacher (focus on purpose, support, and the development of logical arguments, as well as paragraphing and lexical choices), and transcripts of conferences between teacher and student (which were used to better understand the students' motivations in revising). Data analysis was conducted in terms of frequencies that

students attempted to correct, or omitted/deleted errors. The analysis suggested that students revised more successfully in response to five characteristics of the feedback: (1) declaratives rather than questions; (2) within declaratives, those that identify the necessity of revision or make suggestions, rather than declaratives that characterize the student's text; (3) within questions, yes/no questions rather than special questions (what, how, why); (4) direct language rather than indirect language; and (5) inclusion of a specific revision strategy. All three students experienced problems developing their arguments. Other factors that seemed to play important roles in these students' revision processes include the misinterpretation of teacher comments, amount of content knowledge, effect of strongly held beliefs, influence of classroom instruction, level of self-motivation, and pressures of other commitments (a lack of time). Although the study sought to assess the process of error correction, it failed to mention the type of feedback and focus of WCF.

Similarly, Hyland (2003) investigated three aspects of feedback and revision in an academic course over the semester (14 weeks), particularly (1) the extent to which teachers focused on form when they gave feedback, and (2) the use that the students made of this form-focused feedback in their immediate revisions to drafts. The participants were 6 learners of English as a second language (ESL) enrolled in an English proficiency program at a university in New Zealand. Data was collected through student samples (a test done in class, an in-class writing task which was completed at home; the genre included: descriptive, argumentative, and research papers), student interviews (3 times), teacher interviews, and think aloud protocols (both students and teachers). The focus of the interviews was on revision strategies and student responses to feedback. Any comment made on the student text was counted as a feedback point, whether it was focused on grammar, content or genre related issues. The study found that

students were successful in revising in their immediate tasks.

Most of these studies did not look at new pieces of writing, and they provided little information about the long-term effectiveness on written accuracy. Therefore, this area needs further research. Most of the research over the last 10 years has focused on only one or two error categories (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2010; Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007) except Van Beuningen et al. (2012) who investigated comprehensive WCF on a wide range of errors.

Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) investigated how focused WCF influenced learners' accuracy development on three target structures. They found that WCF had a greater effect on the accuracy of past simple tense and articles than on the correct usage of prepositions. The study failed to explain to what extent WCF effectively targeted functional uses of definite and indefinite articles, which then prompted a number of other studies. Bitchener's (2008) study investigated the use of articles (a and the). The research questions examined (1) whether targeted WCF on ESL student writing could result in improved accuracy in new pieces of writing over a 2-month period and (2) whether there is a differential effect on accuracy for different WCF options. The study followed a pre-test and post-test design with a control group that did not receive any type of feedback. The classes were randomly assigned to one of four groups (n=17 in group one; n=18 in group two; n=20 in group three; and n=20 in group four). Participants wrote new texts on the same genre. The ANOVA test revealed a significant difference in accuracy scores across the three writing tests (F=60.028; d.f.=2; p=.000). Pairwise comparisons further revealed significant differences between the pre-test and the immediate post-test scores (p=.000), between the pre-test and delayed post-test scores (p=.000) but no difference between the immediate post-test and delayed post-test scores (p=.229). The results indicated that participants

significantly improved their accuracy immediately after the treatment.

Bitchener and Knoch (2008, 2010), Sheen (2007), and Sheen, Wright, and Moldawa (2009) observed significant results in both the immediate post-tests and delayed post-tests for the treatment groups, while no gains were found for the control groups. Although these studies fill the gap of design flaws of previous studies, only one function of articles was considered. The rules governing the use of articles can be complex for L2 learners to grasp, because the system calls for many rules, exceptions, and phrasal combinations. However, L2 learners can remember and understand the reference function of articles. Therefore, considering the very limited amount of research on linguistic error categories, it is imperative to investigate the potentials of WCF for learning other complex linguistic forms and structures.

Some researchers have employed the terms focused and unfocused CF (also comprehensive), instead of a single error category. Ellis et al. (2008) found accuracy gains for both their focused and unfocused CF groups, and thus concluded that both offer equally effective teaching strategies. Sheen et al. (2009), on the other hand, found the focused approach to be more beneficial than provision of unfocused feedback, when both were compared to the control group. However, the authors pointed out that the comprehensive CF group received rather unsystematic corrections; although some errors were corrected, others were ignored.

The two other studies, conducted by Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken (2008) and Van Beuningen et al. (2012) demonstrated the benefits of comprehensive error correction. Both consisted of tightly controlled classroom-based studies exploring the effects of two types of unfocused CF and two control treatments on learners' accuracy development. They found that comprehensive error correction not only led to improved accuracy in the revised version of a particular piece of writing, but that it also yielded a learning effect; learners who received

unfocused CF made significantly fewer errors in newly produced texts (i.e. written one and four weeks after CF provision) than students whose errors had not been corrected.

Improving the standards of teaching practice requires more evidence on the potentially differential value of focused versus unfocused CF, given that both might be valuable feedback methodologies in different ways.

All studies discussed so far have reported the extent to which learners have benefitted from a single WCF treatment. As Bitchener (2012) points out, it raises a question whether those who did not benefit from WCF would benefit if feedback were provided on further occasions and if a different type of feedback were provided. Different types of feedback have often been categorized as either direct or indirect types of correction, and various hypotheses concerning their relative effectiveness have been put forward.

Types of Written Corrective Feedback that Facilitate Language Learning

A reasonable number of studies opted to gain insights into the differential effects of direct and indirect CF on learners' written accuracy development; however they produced conflicting results (Chandler, 2003; Lalande, 1982; Sampson, 2012). Lalande (1982), for example, reported an advantage of indirect over direct CF. However, the observed between-group accuracy difference was not statistically significant. In contrast to Lalande, Chandler (2003) claimed more effectiveness from direct correction.

Chandler (2003) investigated how the manner of error correction might affect student revisions and their subsequent writing. The four various teacher responses were: 1) direct correction; 2) underlining with marginal description of type of error; 3) marginal description of type; and 4) simple underlining. Each student (n=36) received each kind of feedback but in a

different order. The outcome measures were: (a) number of errors per 100 words on both the revision and on the subsequent chapter before revision (accuracy), (b) holistic ratings of overall writing quality of the first draft of both the first and last chapters of each student's autobiography, (c) time students reported spending writing each chapter (fluency), (d) immediate student responses to each feedback type, including the time it took to make corrections, and to a questionnaire comparing the four types at the end of the semester, and (e) a rough comparison of time spent by the teacher in giving each method of feedback, both initially and over two drafts. Six raters who were college ESL teachers did holistic ratings. A *t*-test was performed to investigate overall effects on accuracy, fluency, and quality. Student writing improved significantly over the semester in terms of both accuracy and fluency. Furthermore, students made significantly fewer errors on their revisions if the teacher had written in corrections. The results showed significant differences between Correction and Underlining with Description, between Correction and Description, between Underlining and Underlining with Description, and between Underlining and Description, but not between Correction and Underlining or between Description and Underlining with Description. The researcher concluded that correcting errors had a positive effect on student writing accuracy. The experiment evaluated errors holistically, but the study report did not identify the error types on which students improved or retained their skills. Also the difference Chandler (2003) reported failed to reach significance. Additionally, narrative genre is a less demanding writing task compared to argumentation.

More recent studies reported that even though both direct and indirect feedback created positive short-term effects, direct error correction had more significant long-term effect than indirect CF (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). Shintani and Ellis's (2013) study examined whether feedback affects an adult ESL learners' L2 implicit

and explicit knowledge, and also compared the effect of one common type of feedback – direct corrective feedback (DCF) – with an alternative type of error feedback – the provision of metalinguistic explanation (ME). The study found that DCF had no effect on accurate use of the target feature. In contrast, ME led to gains in accuracy in the error correction test (ECT) and in a new piece of writing completed immediately after the treatment, but not in a second new text completed two weeks later.

Sampson (2012) examined the effects of coded and uncoded correction on Colombian EFL learners (n=10). The error frequencies were counted in percentages. The percentage figures for the receptive tests reveal that a) learners could, on average, correctly locate and identify 63% of their errors, and b) the experimental group were able to locate and correct their own errors slightly more successfully (with an average of score of 67%) than the control group (59%). This small difference could be interpreted as suggesting coded feedback was slightly more successful at developing receptive awareness of correct forms than uncoded correction. In terms of production, it appears that both coded and uncoded error feedback may contribute to a reduction in error frequencies in students' written work: almost all learners in the control and experimental groups produced fewer errors in the last task.

While the available research confirms the language learning potential of WCF for L2 learning and development, it does not clearly show how extensive its role might be.

Contributions of Second Language Acquisition Theories Toward Understanding How to Provide Effective Feedback

Individual differences in learning a language, learners' readiness to uptake the input (e.g., developmental stages) and the nature of language learning itself may explain why some students

benefit from feedback and others disengage from it. Although L2 research has frequently considered error correction and the process of error correction, few studies to date investigate WCF from various approaches of SLA theories, except research conducted on oral error correction (Erlam, Ellis, & Batstone, 2013; Qi & Lapkin, 2001). As many controversies grow about the efficacy of WCF, there is a shift in seeing the value of discussing WCF from SLA perspectives (Bitchener, 2012; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Ortega, 2012; Polio, 2012; Van Beuningen, 2010). It needs to be pointed out that not all theories can be applied to WCF.

A usage-based (or frequency-based) approach views language learning as occurring based on the input learners receive (Ellis, 2007). Ellis (2007) states that language learning is "an intuitive statistical learning problem, which involves associative learning of representations that reflect the probabilities of occurrence of form-function mappings" (p. 80). Although Ellis (2007) drew on oral input initially, in his later article he added that frequency and form-function mappings would play a role in written production also. Associative learning can be triggered by feedback and interaction, which can further affect learners' implicit learning by drawing their attention to the input. Ellis (2007) states that form-focused input, that is correction, offers a way to focus attention on features of language. No study evaluates written CF within a usage-based approach, but Evans et al. (2011) conducted a study in the framework of skill acquisition theory.

Skill acquisition theory builds on cognitive psychology. This theory proposes three developmental stages: declarative, procedural, and automatic. The first involves knowledge about a skill, the second rapid execution, and the third, faster execution, with less attention, and fewer errors. Practice plays an important role (more details in DeKeyser, 2007). Feedback can provide explicit knowledge, help the learner focus on problem areas, and ensure that the wrong information is not proceduralized.

The principle of practice of skill acquisition theory has been applied by Evans et al. (2011). This study built the evidence for applying dynamic WCF to improve student accuracy. As researchers emphasized, proceduralization requires extensive practice; thus dynamic CF was given 4 times a week for 10 minutes. The research questions were whether university-matriculated ESL learners exposed to one semester of dynamic WCF would produce greater linguistic accuracy than students exposed to a traditional process writing approach, and what effect, if any, this treatment would have on writing fluency or writing complexity. The control group wrote 20 page papers using a process approach. Feedback focused primarily on rhetorical aspects of writing, though feedback was also given on the linguistic accuracy of what the students produced. The experimental group practiced only short paragraphs (3-4 times a week) and rewrote based on feedback as many times as possible until the paragraphs were error free. The results suggested that dynamic WCF had a positive effect on improved writing accuracy for the treatment group. Even though it is the only study conducted in the skill acquisition theory framework, it leads to extremely helpful results. Although Polio (2012) points out the difficulties in implementing this method, the study showed benefits of error correction.

A sociocultural approach to second language learning, as conceptualized by Lantolf (2000) and based on the work of Vygotsky, can to some extent explain why some students fail to benefit from written feedback. Vygotsky (1934) developed the theory of understanding child psychology and learning environment and roles of participants. His theory does not apply to writing development or second language learning, but discusses the overall learning process. Vygotsky (1978) believed that mental activity is mediated through symbolic tools, and that language is a symbolic tool available to solve problems. In the case of writing, a teacher is an expert who provides support (scaffolds), while feedback is a scaffolding tool.

The most directly relevant study to the issue of error correction is Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994). In their study, three university ESL students met once a week with a tutor over the course of 8 weeks. Instead of providing direct error correction for the students, a series of prompts designed to allow the student to first self-correct the error were used. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) showed changes over time in the amount of independence gained by the learner in correcting an error.

Erlam et al. (2013) have also addressed the issue of error correction within a sociocultural approach and interactionist theory. The interactionist approach emphasizes the role of input, output, and feedback that occur during interaction between interlocutors (Gass & Mackey, 2007; Swain, 2005). Erlam et al. (2013) investigated the effectiveness of these two approaches (graduated feedback in accordance with sociocultural theory, and explicit feedback in accordance with cognitive-interactionist theory) to correct student errors in oral conferences. The participants were all adult students in a New Zealand language school. The study targeted two structures, the past tense verb forms and the use of the indefinite and definite article with count nouns. The same teacher conducted conferences with both groups. The instruments were two narratives. The data was coded according to the feedback episodes. Each episode started with the teacher drawing the student's attention to the location of a specific error. In the case of the Graduated Group it ended either with a resolution (i.e., either the learner self-corrected the error or uptook the teacher's correction) or with non-resolution (i.e., the learner failed to provide the correct form). In the case of the Explicit Group, an episode ended by the learner either uptaking or not uptaking the correction. The researchers found that students in the Graduated Group participated in more feedback episodes for both structures than those in the Explicit Group. The time spent on addressing errors in the two groups also differed. In total over both writing

conferences, students in the Graduated Group spent an average of 26 min 18 s. with the

researcher while students in the Explicit Group spent an average of 10 min 39 s. The researchers

concluded that Graduated Feedback was successful in enabling learners to self-correct. The study

describes only short-term uptake. It was not observed whether the structures discussed in

conferences were retained over time, at least during the period of investigation. If students were

able to self-correct, it still does not mean that they would be able to internalize the correct form

in later oral or written products. Despite the well-documented fact of the efficacy of oral

feedback, the usefulness of WCF within SLA theories remains uninvestigated. Currently,

however, inspired by oral CF studies, the investigations on WCF are ongoing, which are tightly

controlled in their methods and measure student outcome on pre- and post-test designs

(Bitchener, 2008, Bitchener & Knoch, 2010).

Another fundamental but often disregarded approach in L2 research is noticing, which is

also an important cognitive process in L2 composing. The Noticing Hypothesis, proposed by

Schmidt (1990, 2001), combines the two crucial cognitive linguistic notions of attention and

awareness. Those who notice the most learn more. Noticing is the intake of grammar as a result

of learners paying attention to the input. Swain (1985) argued that it was not just intake that

stemmed from an input source, but also produced in output. Both Schmidt and Swain define and

refer to noticing as noticing the gap – a mismatch or gap between what learners can produce and

what they need to produce, as well as between what they produce and what target language

speakers produce. Swain stated that the noticing function of output could trigger learners to

consciously recognize their linguistic problems.

Swain and Lapkin's (1995) study directly examined the noticing function of output in the

context of SLW, asking if learners' own output can lead them to a conscious awareness of

language problems they are experiencing, if cognitive processes are triggered in response to the problems they are aware of, and if learners engage in grammatical analysis in the processes. Eighteen Grade 8 French-immersion students (average age 13) participated in that study. The study asked participants to think aloud while composing in response to a writing task. The researchers developed a unit of analysis, language-related episodes (LREs), which they identified from the think-aloud protocol data, and then classified into descriptive categories, according to the cognitive processes they thought were reflected in the changes the participants made to their output. The study demonstrated that participants did indeed notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge while producing their L2 in the composing process. The researchers also found that when participants encountered difficulties in producing the target language, they engaged in certain thought processes that may play a role in L2 learning, including grammatical analysis that was considered essential to accurate production. The study also applied think-aloud protocols and investigated participants' oral output and negotiation of meaning while revising the errors. The Noticing Hypothesis makes it feasible to understand a beneficial role of error correction. If in oral output, a learner does not have enough time to think, and produces the output immediately, in written output the learner may not experience the same time constraint, and may therefore consciously apply grammar knowledge.

Although Truscott (1996) claims that feedback is harmful, feedback is not always as ineffective as it may seem. Despite differences among SLA theories, the usage-based approach, skill acquisition, sociocultural theory, interactionist approach, and noticing hypothesis have posited a positive role for feedback. What is necessary is that feedback needs to be at the right developmental level for the learner (Polio, 2012). From a sociocultural perspective, if given feedback is not in the learner's ZPD then, he/she will not be able to control the amount, and will

fail in uptake. Within the interactionist approach framework, if feedback is not at the learner's level (easy or difficult), he/she will not pay attention to form. Thus, feedback needs to be tailored to the learners' individual needs.

Significance of Writing Tasks

When L2 learners make errors in their written texts, they need appropriate feedback from the teacher to help them correct these errors (Qi & Lapkin, 2001). Van Beuningen (2010) argues that feedback needs to be provided within a realistic writing context to enable valid assessment of the role of CF in L2 learners' written accuracy development. Long (2007), for example, claimed that development could only be measured by examining language use during unmonitored production, when learners' focus is on content rather than on language as an object. The tasks used in earlier CF studies, however, have often (but not always) been artificial. Also, Bitchener (2012) questioned whether we could account for a learner's progress "when we see evidence in different genres, in different contexts, and in relation to fluency and complexity" (p. 349).

Ortega (2012) argues that writing tasks matter because the content, purposes, and demands of writing tasks greatly impact on the degrees of engagement with writing. That is, students connect with tasks they consider interesting and valuable. However, SLW studies with focus on feedback have given insignificant attention to the character of the specific task. Many studies used controlled tasks and tests: description of the picture (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Esfandiar, Yaqubi, & Marzban, 2014; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Truscott & Hsu, 2008), autobiographical writings (Chandler, 2003), and narratives about life experiences (Sampson, 2012). All these instruments fit under the category of a narrative genre, which represents a less

demanding task compared to analysis, argumentation, and critique.

Thurlings, Vermeulen, Bastiaens, and Stijnen (2013) in their discussion of understanding feedback from a learning theory perspective stated that feedback needs to be task or goal-related, but more related to task and dependent on task. For example, a study conducted by Riazantseva (2012) investigated the outcome measure of writing as a mediator of the effects of CF. The study examined the effect of writing tasks on the accuracy rate. Three tasks were analyzed: summaries, analysis, and a research paper written in class and at home. The samples were collected on the first and last week of classes. The three outcome measures consisted of in-class essays, in-class summaries, and at-home summaries. ANOVA results showed that the effect of outcome measure was significant at the .05 level. The pre-treatment accuracy rates of at-home summaries (M=21.57) were significantly lower than those of in-class essays (M=29.67) and in-class summaries (M=29.78). Similarly, the post-treatment accuracy rates of at-home summaries (M=17.04) were significantly lower than those of in-class essays (M=23.44) and in-class summaries (M=24.54). These results indicated that the type of writing task used as the outcome measure affected the accuracy rates observed in SLW. Further, the results of the paired t-tests for total errors showed significant differences between the pre-treatment and post-treatment error rates for all three outcomes measures, in-class essays (t(31)=3.706, p=.001), in-class summaries (t(31)=2.691, p=.011) and at-home summaries (t(31)=3.132, p=.004). The results of the paired t-tests for grammatical errors showed significant differences between the pre-treatment and post-treatment error rates for only two of the three outcome measures, in-class essays (t(31)=2.839, p=.008), and at-home summaries (t(31)=2.158, p=.039). No differences between pre- and post-treatment error rates were found for in-class summaries (t(31)=.990, p=.330). Although Riazantseva's (2012) study is one of the few studies that investigates the role of a writing task,

her research constitutes a significant call to address the type of measurement, which is an important variable to consider in observing accuracy rates in SLW development.

Task complexity also affects learner performance. Plakans and Gebril (2013) investigated how the use of a source text impacts performances on an integrated writing task, and how this differs across score levels and task topics. The researchers argued that the source materials used in an integrated task clearly affect the way L2 learners approach the task and how they include these materials in their writing. Designing integrated writing tasks to achieve anticipated outcomes requires selecting, adapting, or developing source materials in a carefully planned way. The results of this study showed the inextricably complex nature of source use, which should be reflected in the scoring rubrics used with integrated writing tasks. Although the study did not investigate error correction, it determined other factors which may affect learners' readiness to receive and benefit from WCF.

Teacher Roles

Many studies of the error correction process have not only dismissed the task as an important factor, but also left unexamined the nature of the teacher as a factor. The inclusion of more central and richer roles for teachers would provide a noteworthy addition to efforts at understanding instructional benefits of WCF. Teachers are the main actors in the provision of error correction, and they make their choices in the social context of the classroom rather than in a social vacuum. Particularly when investigating the effectiveness of WCF, most studies neglected the social dynamics found among participants. In other words, past research on teacher feedback has mostly focused on quantifying and counting teacher corrections, providing records of teacher corrections in one way or another, without considering the socio-cultural context, and

socio-affective factors involved in error correction (Ortega, 2012).

Studies of SLW have given more attention to students' opinions or researchers' comments about teacher feedback, or these studies have analyzed the needs of student learning rather than teachers' insights about their actual practices. Far less attention has been paid to document the insights of day-to-day challenges that non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST) face in writing classrooms from their own perspectives reported in their voices. Although some studies have attempted to consult teachers as informants, the research scope has been limited to the "acts" of teacher feedback collected through surveys (Evans et al., 2010; Montgomery & Baker, 2007); or the research site has been mainstream classes where perceptions of college writing instructors were examined towards recognition of L2 writers' presence and needs, and whether adaptations were made to their feedback (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013); or conducted in EFL settings (Furneaux et al., 2007; Lee, 2011; Lee, 2013); or reported from a native English speaking teacher's (NEST) perspective, when a practitioner was engaged in self-study of quantifying corrective written feedback practices (Best, 2011). Specifically researching NNEST in L1 settings is more rare, with the exception of a few that involved in-service professional development (Reis, 2012). In these studies, NNEST were involved in learning to teach through course projects and their perspectives on their own development as EFL teachers of writing were investigated (Lee, 2010); and the effectiveness of teacher education on EFL teachers' identity development as they learn to teach writing was also addressed (Lee, 2013).

The research base offers insufficient analysis of the way in which NNEST reflect and evaluate their own practices in response to critical incidents which occur in the writing class. Only the studies of Lee and Schallert (2008) and Reis (2012) considered these issues. To explore

the relationship between a NNEST and students in an EFL college writing class, Lee and Schallert (2008) conducted a case study at a large university in Seoul, Korea. They reported that contrasting relationships with the teacher existed in the classroom: one of the students seemed to have trust in the teacher's ability to construct meaningful feedback, whereas another student questioned the teacher's English ability and resisted following her feedback, which consequently was detrimental to improving his drafts. Lee and Schallert (2008) found that the relationship between a teacher and student is "culturally embedded", and that trust between a writing teacher and students was built through the interplay of reactions and responses mediated by the words in the teacher's response written in the margins of student papers. Moreover, they also noted "the students reciprocal contributions played an even more critical role" (p. 179). Lee and Schallert's (2008) case study documents the complex social processes intertwined with personal ideologies in the feedback and revision process. For instance, a teacher's linguistic background influenced a resistant student's beliefs; he strongly believed that there is a difference in expertise between "teachers who have obtained a degree in an English-speaking country and those who have learned English only in Korea" (p. 175). On the other hand, a teacher felt frustrated with institutional hiring practices that left disadvantaged those "who had obtained their degree from a Korean university" (p. 170). Lee and Schallert (2008) built a foundation to discuss student resistance towards a NNEST, yet they did not give adequate attention to the teacher's perspectives and what practices the teacher applied in the classroom to resolve the issue.

Similarly, Reis (2012) investigated how a NNEST struggled to claim legitimacy as a university-level ESL writing instructor. Being involved in a dialogic journal with the participant, Reis (2012) argued for the need of in-service professional development that not only can support NNEST to question "unexamined and harmful assumptions about their skills", but also challenge

"the native speaker myth" and "come to a new understanding of their professional role and improve their instructional practices" (p. 35). Reis (2012) found that a NNEST, through collaborative inquiry, applied the discourse theory to rethink his experiences and reorganize his low self-esteem. The participant used "multicompetence" as a psychological tool to reorient both his actions and his thinking (p.47), and to diminish his NNES perceived skills (e.g., he taught the concept of multicompetence to his students, and created and used corpus tool in teaching). Although Reis (2012) provides an empowering case study to support NNEST development, little is known about the instructional tasks the participant assigned, their implementation and how students responded to and participated in them.

In contrast to Reis's (2012) study, Hyland and Anan (2006) investigated how non-native teachers, native teachers, and English-speaking non-teachers rated a student text. The participants comprised three groups of 16 members in each: a Japanese teacher group, a group of native English speaking non-teachers living in London, and a group of native English speaking teachers from the UK. Participants were asked to identify and correct the errors in a given sample (150 words) and were asked to evaluate the text holistically on a scale of 1–10, to identify and correct all the errors, to select and rank the three most serious errors (from 3 – most serious – to 1), and to give reasons for their choices. Results showed that although native teachers and native non-teachers found 80% of the target errors, non-native teachers identified slightly less (article omission). Additionally, non-native teachers were severe markers, while native teachers mostly focused on those errors that were affecting the meaning. In other words, non-native teachers marked all errors that they could detect; however they missed pointing out errors on articles, because their native language does not use articles. The researchers concluded that teacher feedback closely reflected the teachers' background and language learning

experiences.

Although researchers examined teacher feedback practices, non-native teachers were marginalized due to their linguistic competence. Although some studies attempt to legitimize NNEST in the teaching academe, categorizing individuals as NEST and NNEST has resulted in misrepresenting their true identities (Rajagopalan, 2005). Considering the dynamics of the English language teaching field nowadays, these teachers should instead be viewed from a sociocultural perspective that highlights the dialogic, multiple and situated nature of their identities, which transforms into their teaching ideologies and practices. More importantly, Hayes (2009) argues that "teachers' nativeness in this respect needs to be given its due prominence in understandings of teaching and learning English as a foreign language in context, rather than disproportionate attention paid to non-nativeness in terms of English language competence" (2009, p.9).

Similar insights, as observed in Hyland and Anan's (2006) study, resulted in Furneaux et al. (2007) study that outlined a teacher's nationality as a main factor in determining the focus of feedback. They investigated the feedback practices of 110 EFL teachers (convenience sample) from Cyprus, France, Korea, Spain, and Thailand, working in secondary school contexts (they ranged in age from 25 to over 56; all were experienced teachers). The researchers used a student sample as the measuring instrument; all participants commented on the same sample. They were asked to provide feedback the way they did in their own classes. The feedback guidelines were not outlined. Also, the researchers developed the coding scheme based on collected data (grounded approach), which was based on two categories: the teacher's role (initiator, supporter, advisor, suggester, provider, and mutator) and the feedback focus of each correction (lexical, grammatical, stylistic, semantic, discoursal, and mechanics). The ANOVA results indicated three

highly significant main effects – of role, of correction focus, and of nationality. The focus-nationality interaction was not significant. The instructor's role was more prevalent, that is, direct corrections were provided. Grammar-oriented feedback accounted for 45% of all annotations. Korean participants marked fewer errors compared to other groups and French participants exhibited the role of initiator. Since the instrument was generated for the study, this factor might have influenced participants' responses compared to an actual classroom. More importantly, the relationship between teachers' cultural background and feedback focus did not seem reliable.

Not only focusing on feedback types and feedback strategies teachers follow, but also uncovering what really happens in a writing classroom can help identify the factors that contribute to effective communication between a teacher and students (Goldstein, 2004), improve teachers' affective states (Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Reis, 2012), bring understanding to experiences of L2 writers (Park, 2012), affect revision processes (Ferris et al., 2011; Lee & Schallert, 2008; Matsuda et al., 2013), pinpoint weak and strong areas of teaching and response style (Muldoon, 2009), foster development of effective feedback (Best, 2011; Lee, 2009), test what works and what does not (Kumaravadivelu, 2003), and build a database of different pedagogical instruction (as L2 writer identities are varied). In spite of the usefulness of a practitioner's voice coming from the classroom in L2 research, especially in the realm of NNES writing teachers, no studies investigate NNES writing teachers' classroom practices.

Teacher Perceptions

The issue of investigating whether a teacher's feedback promotes student language skill development, and whether teachers correct what is needed, remains ongoing. Matsuda et al.

(2013) investigated writing teachers' perceptions (n=74) of the presence and needs of L2 writers. The data was collected from a perception survey. The results indicated that 19 teachers made efforts to address L2 needs. Seven mentioned that they needed more training to work with L2 students. Seven participants indicated they did not try to accommodate L2 needs. Eight tended to spend extra time with L2 learners compared to other students. Although some teachers made efforts to accommodate SLW needs, a significant number of teachers did not believe in adapting their teaching strategies to accommodate L2 students in their classes.

Unlike Matsuda's et al. (2013) study on teacher views about WCF (which relied on a survey), Ferris et al. (2011) investigated both mainstream and specialized teachers' philosophies and practices. The study recruited 129 participants (writing instructors) from eight postsecondary institutions in Northern California. Data were collected from an online survey (26 multiple choice questions that asked teachers about how their practices might vary with regard to L2 students in writing classrooms), and follow up interviews with volunteer participants who self-identified on the final question of the survey (53 volunteered but only 23 were interviewed), and student samples with teacher feedback (interviewees were asked to bring 3-5 student samples). Results indicated that a few of the instructors had no awareness of L2 writers in their classes or, if they were aware, felt strongly that students' language backgrounds did not constitute a sufficiently relevant factor to justify a specialized approach. Teachers focused primarily on L2 writers' errors; they were unsure of how best to help L2 writers. The self-reported teacher stances were also observed through examining their feedback patterns on sample student texts. The study by Ferris et al. (2011) brings a significant perspective into SLW research: teachers' beliefs translated into their practices. Not only do teachers' background and language learning experiences (Hyland & Anan, 2006), their affective states and agency (Lee & Schallert, 2008),

but also their beliefs and perceptions (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013) affect feedback and are closely connected to revision processes held in classrooms.

However, as Lee (2009) and Evans et al. (2010) studies show, teacher beliefs do not always translate directly into their practices. Lee (2009) has presented the salient findings in terms of ten mismatches between teacher beliefs and their impact on teachers' practices in written feedback. Participants were secondary EFL teachers in Hong Kong (convenience sampling; teaching experience ranging from 3 to 15 years). Data was collected from (1) feedback analysis based on 174 texts collected from 26 secondary teachers and follow-up interviews with seven of them; and (2) a survey comprising a questionnaire administered to 206 secondary teachers and follow-up interviews with 19 of them. A survey was conducted to know teachers' beliefs and their reported practice. Results yielded ten mismatches between teacher beliefs and practice inWCF: 1) teachers were caught in a conflict between their form-focused approach to feedback and their awareness that there was more to good writing than accuracy; 2) teachers marked errors comprehensively although selective marking was preferred; 3) teachers tended to correct and locate errors for students, but they believed that through teacher feedback students should learn to correct and locate their own errors; 4) teachers used error codes although they thought students had a limited ability to decipher the codes; 5) teachers graded student writing although they were almost certain that grades drew student attention away from teacher feedback; 6) teachers asked students to do one-shot writing although they thought process writing was beneficial; and finally, 7) teachers continued to mark student writing in the ways they did although they thought their effort did not pay off. Lee's (2009) study offers a significant contribution to identify teachers' beliefs versus their real practice in writing classrooms.

Evans et al. (2010) also investigated practitioners' perspectives on the extent to which

current SLW teachers provide WCF and what determines whether or not practitioners choose to provide WCF. The online survey, distributed globally, was completed by 1,053 NNEST specialized in writing from 69 different countries. Participants had master's degrees, and had 13-17 years of teaching experience. This study indicates that 92% of teachers did correct errors, while 8% of teachers chose not to provide error feedback because they believed: (1) content, organization, and rhetoric was more important than linguistic accuracy, (2) error correction was not effective, and (3) others (e.g., tutors, writing center) should help students. Participants believed they needed to comment on errors because it was the only element students struggled with; they did not regard error correction as a part of the learning process.

Need for Further Research

The majority of recent studies have focused intensively on whether (a) WCF and (b) type of feedback provided can be influential in facilitating student writing. Many studies have demonstrated the efficacy of WCF on the targeted structures (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Sheen, 2011), yet these studies have primarily directed attention to only a few linguistic categories and domains, such as the English article system (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Sheen et al. 2009; Shintani & Ellis, 2013), the past tense verb forms, the use of the indefinite and definite article with countable nouns (Erlam et al., 2013), and quantifiers (Esfandiar et al., 2014). These studies predominantly targeted rule-based grammar points, but the significance of attaining the correct usage of articles and quantifiers may not offer as much benefit for students compared to overcoming complex syntactic errors, which may impair the communicative function of their texts. Just a few studies have investigated the effects of unfocused (comprehensive) CF (e.g., punctuation, spelling, verb

tense, verb form, word order, run on sentences). However, the results have not been explicit, and have not led to clear determination of which error types learners resolved due to CF (Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris et al., 2013; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Riazantseva, 2012; Truscott & Hsu, 2008; Van Beuningen et al., 2008, 2012). When the errors have been measured holistically, it is hard to determine which error types improved. Thus, in terms of learner errors, there is a need to investigate WCF and its effect on more syntactically complex structures.

Studies that have investigated the relative merits of different types of feedback (direct/indirect (Chandler, 2003; Van Beuningen et al., 2012); focused/ indirect/explicit (Ferris et al., 2013); dynamic WCF (Evans et al., 2011); coded/uncoded (Sampson, 2012); written metalinguistic explanation, indirect circling of errors, written metalinguistic feedback and oral form-focused instruction (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010); direct and metalinguistic explanation (Shintani & Ellis, 2013); direct and written and oral metalinguistic explanation (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009a) have reported positive findings for direct feedback, and metalinguistic explanations. It should also be noted that except for Bitchener and Knoch's (2009a) study, most of these studies provided no information about the long-term effectiveness on written accuracy. Therefore, this area requires further research. If students gain the ability to self-correct due to the type of feedback, then of particular interest is whether or not students can sustain this improvement on subsequent writing over time (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Guenette, 2007). Therefore, there is a need to track student writing development over a period of time.

Instruments – writing tasks can have a major impact on research results. Previous research provides little information on the effect of different forms of writing tasks. Van Beuningen (2010) argues that feedback needs to be provided within a realistic writing context to enable valid assessment of the role of CF in L2 students' written accuracy development. Long

43

(2007), for example, claimed that development could only be measured by examining language use during unmonitored production, when learners focus on content rather than on the language as an object. The tasks used in earlier CF studies, however, have often (but not always) been artificial with a clear focus on linguistic accuracy. Ortega (2012) argues that writing tasks matter because the content, purposes, and demands of writing tasks greatly impact the degrees of student engagement with writing. However, SLW studies have given little attention to the character of the specific task and majority used tasks, which are not communicative in nature, as data instruments. Examples include asking participants to write a description of a given picture (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009a; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Esfandiar et al., 2014; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Truscott & Hsu, 2008), autobiographical writings (Chandler, 2003), and narratives about life experiences (Sampson, 2012). These instruments could be categorized under the narrative genre that is cognitively a less demanding task compared to analysis, argumentation, and reading-to-write assignments.

The treatments conducted in the studies lasted a short period of time: three weeks (Shintani & Ellis, 2013); four weeks (Sampson, 2012); six weeks (Van Beuningen et al., 2012); ten weeks (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010); two months (Bitchener, 2008; Esfandiar et al., 2014); a semester (Chandler, 2003; Hyland, 2003); except for Bitchener & Knoch's (2009a) study which was conducted over ten months. Although these studies applied pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test designs, three to ten weeks do not provide enough time to detect student linguistic accuracy. Further, they have relied on short-term measures, that is, revisions made by students in the texts on which they received CF. These measures may not suffice to show convincing evidence that development has occurred.

The majority of studies have provided one treatment procedure. This leaves unknown

whether students who fail to benefit as a result might not succeed with the benefit of further treatments. Additionally, in some cases teacher feedback and type of error were not identified (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Hyland, 2013; Lee & Schallert, 2008; Zhao, 2010). "Text-analytic descriptions of written teacher commentary have been fairly rare in the literature" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014, p. 239). Furthermore, few studies explicitly link teacher commentary to student revisions, as Bitchener and Ferris (2012) observe, "longitudinal research on student improvement as a result of teacher feedback has been virtually nonexistent" (p. 87).

The writing texts and the procedures of those studies do not fit under the process writing, or the genre theory, or the communicative task-based approach. This constitutes a serious limitation for application to current SLW pedagogy (Bruton, 2009). By revising teachers' feedback from a sociocultural perspective, Lee (2014b) particularly outlines the importance of the process approach complemented by task-specific feedback forms.

Many studies about error correction not only dismissed the task factor from discussion, but also left the teacher factor uninvestigated. More attention has been given to students' opinions or researchers' comments about teacher feedback, or has been used to analyze the needs of student learning rather than teachers' insights about their actual practices. Far less attention has been paid to documenting the insights of day-to-day challenges teachers face in writing classrooms from their own perspectives. However, there has been a recent shift in data collection. Some studies attempted to consult teachers as informants, but the research scope has been limited to the "acts" of teacher feedback collected through surveys (Evans et al., 2010; Montgomery & Baker, 2007); or the research site has been mainstream classes where perceptions of college writing instructors were examined towards recognition of L2 writers' presence and needs, and whether adaptations were made to their feedback (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al.,

2013); or conducted in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings (Furneaux et al., 2007; Lee, 2011; Lee, 2013); or has been reported from a NEST perspectives, when a practitioner was engaged in self-research of quantifying WCF practices (Best, 2011) without considering socio-cultural context, and socio-affective factors involved in error correction (Ortega, 2012).

Available empirical evidence demonstrates that focusing solely on feedback does not improve L2 learner writing development, and that consistent evidence has yet to be found on most of the questions that have been investigated; therefore, there is a clear need to conduct a case study for further investigations. The next section discusses the methodology of the case study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes key methodological components of the case study and procedures for conducting them. This chapter first provides a definition of the case study, devoting special attention to issues of credibility, followed by research objectives, research questions, setting, student-participants, data collection, and data analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion of semi-structured interviews, student-participant questionnaire, student-participant written texts, dialogic interactions, ensuring the quality and rigor of credibility, and my role.

Defining the Case Study

The role of qualitative case studies in second language writing (SLW) research is significant and valuable in understanding how learning takes place in the real world rather than in a controlled setting. Case study is a type of research design, which Duff (2008) characterizes as "attractive, ...having a high degree of completeness, depth of analysis, and readability" to "generate new hypotheses, models, and understanding about the nature of language learning" (p. 43). Other definitions of case study highlight the singular nature of the case, the importance of context (Schachter & Gass, 1996; Stake, 1995), the availability of multiple sources of information or perspectives on observations (Duff, 2008) collected with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible (Merriam, 1998), and the in-depth nature of analysis (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). Similarly, Creswell (2013) defines case study as an exploration of "a real-life" over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information "rich"

in context (p. 97).

The present case study sought to understand the how and why of phenomenon – student-participant revisions to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved from a holistic, participant-informed perspective (students and a teacher); it aimed to construct a clearer reality within a bounded system – a culture of a classroom, feedback practices, student-participant and teacher histories – and bounded by time (4, 9, and 30 months) to understand why some student-participants benefited from feedback and others failed to do so. Stake (1995) notes that a qualitative approach usually means finding good moments – episodes of nuance, the sequentiality of happenings in context: "Case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances." (Stake, 1995, p. xi) Therefore, observing closely the processes of how individual student-participants reacted to and used, or failed to use, feedback to develop their SLW was of a very special interest.

The case method, or in other words, *particularization* is an important aim because the uniqueness of individual cases (student-participants) and contexts (an intensive English program at a public university) are important to understanding the nature of L2 composing and revising practices. Therefore, the case design was employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those who were involved – student-participants.

The most commonly accepted disadvantage of conducting a case study is related to generalizability (and there are wide differences of opinion about this issue). Most researchers claim building generalization from a small convenience sample is unwise because the study is valid only for its participants. However, I want to employ Larsen-Freeman's "a grain of sand" perspective: "If you study grains of sand, you will find each is different. Even by handling one, it

becomes different. But through studying it and others like it, you begin to learn about a beach."

(Larsen-Freeman, 1996, p. 165) Feedback is similar to a beach metaphor. Although research

findings about efficacy of feedback are mixed and inconclusive (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012),

teacher feedback continues to play a significant role in SLW classrooms. Therefore a thick

description of student-participants and a context allows readers of a case study to determine

connections between the findings of research and the particulars of their lives (e.g., the

generalizability of findings to their particular situations or other situations). Furthermore, a

number of common features that occurred in this study might build cross-context connections

with other very distinctive settings (e.g., transferability).

When discussing the aspect of generalizability, the intent of conducting the case study is

also important to indicate. Stake (2005) differentiates between intrinsic and instrumental case

studies and their claims to generality:

> I call a study an *intrinsic case* study if it is undertaken because, first and last, one wants
>
> better understanding of this particular case. It is not undertaken primarily because the
>
> case represents other cases or because it illustrates a particular trait or problem, but
>
> because, in all its peculiarity and ordinariness, this case itself is of interest… I use the
>
> term *instrumental case* study if a particular case is examined mainly to provide insight
>
> into an issue or redraw a generalization. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a
>
> supporting role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else. The case is still
>
> looked at in depth, its contexts scrutinized, and its ordinary activities detailed, but all
>
> because this helps us pursue the external interest. The case may be seen as typical of
>
> other cases or not. (Stake, 2005, p. 445)

The notion of instrumental case study is related to the concept of analytic generalization, which is made not to populations but to theoretical models (Duff, 2008). Stake (2005) suggests that "even intrinsic case study can be seen as a small step toward grand generalization" (p. 448). The present case study was instrumental and it aimed to provide access to rich data about student-participants' experiences that can facilitate understandings of a reader's own as well as others' contexts and lives, through both similarities and differences across settings and cases. The present case study did not hold generalizability to populations as an achieving goal; however, it did not disqualify analytic generalizability which emerged from findings either. I focused more on generating *illustrative outcomes of DF, DIs* that drew strength from the rich *particularity of individual student-participant cases.*

Research Objectives

The case study was primarily explanatory in nature which aimed to explore the meaning that revision experiences had for student-participants to develop possible explanations of their engagement in revision processes, and to understand the context within which student-participants were operating and its influence on their revision behavior.

Research Questions

In order to understand what realities student-participants derive from their engagement with dialogic feedback (DF), the following research questions guided the study:

1. What role does dialogic feedback play in facilitating student-participants' revision processes?

50

2. What factors may explain student-participants' engagement or disengagement with revisions?

Setting

The case study took place in an intensive English program at a southern public university. The Intensive English Program (IEP) seeks to meet the needs of English learners who intend to study at U.S. institutions, or who require proficiency in English for professional and/or personal purposes. The curriculum provides intensive English instruction to learners who desire to gain a functional command of English, in preparation for a successful academic experience in the United States, and to meet the linguistic and cultural challenges of living in an English-speaking environment. The IEP administers an Institutional Paper Based Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) that measures learner ability to use and understand English in a classroom setting at the college or university level. The placement test identifies a learner's level of proficiency. The scoring is done by Educational Testing Service (ETS). Based on scores, student-participants placed in high intermediate and advanced level writing courses constituted the sample (n=17).

Two IEP writing sections investigated for the study were taught by me. The classes met three days a week – Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays – for 50 minutes each day. The main course goal was to help student-participants develop college-level writing skills. More specifically, the course aimed to enable student-participants to develop critical thinking (reading-to-write tasks) and learn about research skills, drafting skills, standard documentation styles, revision and editing. The early weeks involved building context by examining the features and goals of the target genre (reader response, compare/contrast, cause/effect, and book review); several classes were then spent on explicitly modeling and analyzing sample texts with a focus

on the genre structure and language conventions; following this, student-participants were familiarized with evaluative rubrics for the target genre and completed writing assignments through steps such as planning, drafting, revising, and editing their own texts.

Classroom activities involving the preparation of the assignment included readings from different sources and the textbook; class discussions; revision sessions fused with mini-grammar workshops; homework exercises from the different sources and the textbook; writing a first draft; one-on-one meetings (DIs) with the student-participants to discuss their revisions of the second draft; and at the end, submission of the final draft of the assignment.

Setting up the writing course as open to negotiations was an attempt to facilitate engagement with the classroom ecological resources and help student-participants adopt them as positive affordances (van Lier, 2011). Learning from course materials was also dialogical, with classroom discussions and group activities complemented with DF interactions on Google Docs and face-to-face.

Student-participants

A total of 17 students participated in the study. They were from two different sections of IEP writing courses: the advanced and the intermediate levels. All of the students in those writing courses were invited to volunteer for the study. The consent forms, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, and detailed description of the study were emailed. Those who consented to participate were invited to meet face-to-face to discuss the details, but more importantly to ensure that potential participants understood the process of the study.

The student-participants in this study came from six different countries. There were eight student-participants from Japan; four from South Korea; two from China; and one each from

Germany, Russia, and Vietnam. Their average age was 21 years old and they spoke six different L1s (Table 1). All student-participants were international visa students.

The student-participants had various academic goals and comprised four distinctive groups. The student-participants in the first group intended to study at the university and were preparing to matriculate to the university (n=2). A second group had already been accepted conditionally to the academic programs, but because of low scores on standardized tests were required to take English proficiency classes (n=3).

Table 1. Background information of student-participants.

Advanced Level n=8	High-Intermediate Level n=9
- Age: Mean 22 - Gender: Male n2 Female n6 - L1: Chinese n1 German n1 Korean n2 Japanese n4 - Length of Stay in the U.S. (months): Mean: 1	- Age: Mean 21 - Gender: Male n4 Female n5 - L1: Chinese n1 Korean n2 Japanese n4 Russian n1 Vietnamese n1 - Length of Stay in the U.S. (months): Mean: 2.28

The third group comprised student-participants already studying at the university who, because of demanding curriculum in their respective majors, had decided to improve their English writing skills, and thus enrolled in the IEP (n=8). The fourth group consisted of student-participants who were study-abroad exchanged students (n=4).

Data Collection

This study employed multiple methods to collect data (Table 2).

Table 2. Data collection timeline describes the steps in data collection which spanned over two and a half years.

Data Collection Timeline	
Phase 1: Weeks 1 - 16, August 2016 - December 2016	
August 2016	Student-participant Questionnaire/Survey
Week 1	Diagnostic test
Week 2	Writing task 1: Draft 1
Week 3	Writing task 1: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
Week 4	Writing task 2: Draft 1
Week 5-6	Writing task 2: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
Week 7	Writing task 3: Draft 1
Week 8-9	Writing task 3: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
Week 10	Writing task 4: Draft 1
Week 11-12	Writing task 4: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
Week 13	Writing task 5: Draft 1
Week 14	Writing task 5: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
Week 15-16	Writing task 6: Draft 1 Writing task 6: Draft 2 Dialogic Interaction Semi-structured interview
December 2016, Week 17	Post-test 1
Phase 2: December 2016 - May 2018	
March 2017	Post-test 1 Semi-structured Interview
May 2017	Post-test 2 Semi-structured Interview
October 2017	Post-test 3 Semi-structured Interview
February 2018	Post-test 4 Semi-structured Interview

First, demographic information for student-participants, including information about their backgrounds and English learning in the past was collected (Appendix A). Second, a brief survey addressing student-participants' attitudes toward writing was administered (Appendix B). Third, student-participants' texts, written feedback – Feedback 1, provided in the form of "what, how, why" comments (Appendix C) and Feedback 2, provided with error codes (Appendix D), and the student-participants' revisions based on Feedback 1 and 2 were collected. Fourth, DIs with the focus on student-participant individual writing issues were recorded. Fifth, semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore the way student-participants perceived the benefits of the process-oriented DF (Appendix E). Sixth, a total of nine student-participants (n=9) were followed after they completed the IEP writing course to explore how their intensive composing processes and continuous revisions translated into their academic lives. Post-tasks were administered and semi-structured interviews were conducted (Appendix F).

The data was collected during two phases following a multistage strategy:

Phase I

Observing student-participants (n=17) in a classroom over the course of one semester (16 weeks) during which student-participants were given explicit instruction, were provided with DF, and were engaged in DIs. The process was as follows (in a chronological order of events):

(a) The student-participants established Google Docs accounts. Using the electronic means provided a platform for student-participants to comment on DF when it was not clear to them; in that way, unclear DF and student-participant lack of resources or knowledge to revise were observed.

(b) The student-participants submitted their first draft for feedback 1. The first feedback holistically evaluated the overall structure and organization of the text

55

(Appendix C). I applied mitigation strategies when composing feedback: (a) interrogative form which expressed element of doubt or uncertainty in the comment; (b) paired comments which combined criticism with either praise or a suggestion, and a hyperlink to additional information/sources to solve the issue (e.g., online dictionary entries, and grammar websites); and (c) hedged comments which contained modal verbs. The use of mitigation strategies may not only build a positive relationship, but may also help to moderate the teacher's dominant role and tone (Hyland & Hyland, 2006b) and to give a friendly signal to the student-participant to engage in ongoing dialogue. These strategies were implemented to help to avoid *appropriating* student-participant writing (Tardy, 2006) and moving beyond the interaction between a teacher and a text; more importantly to involve student-participants' active engagement.

(c) The student-participants submitted the revised version of draft 1. They revised the draft based on feedback 1.

(d) Feedback 2 was provided on the revised draft 1 and included feedback primarily focused on grammar and mechanics of language. Indirect feedback which indicated the error by highlighting the text with an error code was provided. (Appendix D)

(e) Student-participants revised draft based on feedback 2, and participated in face-to-face DIs with me.

(f) After submitting the final draft, student-participants were interviewed after each writing task (six writing tasks, Appendix X) during 16 weeks (Appendix E).

Collecting data from multiple sources such as DF, DIs between the student-participant and me, interview transcripts, and student-participants' written documents, provided a comprehensive picture to truly understand revision processes.

Phase II

After completing 16 weeks (and an IEP writing course), all the student-participants were invited to participate in the second phase of the study. The data collection process was as follows:

    (a) Student-participants were asked to take post-tasks (Appendix F). The writing samples were collected for error analysis.

    (b) Semi-structured interviews were conducted (Appendix G).

Research phase II provided information on whether student-participants improved their written accuracy (fewer errors) over time (Appendix DD).

Data Analysis

Once the data collection was complete, various steps were taken to perform analysis. In order to do this, I closely followed the qualitative data analysis procedures (*within-case analysis* and *cross-case analysis*: Creswell, 2013; Duff, 2008; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). Interview transcripts, open-ended questions in the survey, and DI transcripts were reviewed multiple times and salient themes and categories were generated. Once the data were coded according to salient themes and categories, comprehensive profiles were developed about each individual student-participant.

I used the following steps to build a comprehensive profile for each student-participant engagement in writing and revisions. First, I analyzed interview transcripts, using open and axial

coding (Strauss & Corbin, 2008) and the questions for the semistructured interviews as a guide. I identified main themes for each student-participant and compared them across the student-participants. I also examined the transcripts of DIs and the student-participants' compositions to compare them with what the student-participants said in their interviews, following the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 2008). For this initial step, only data pertaining to student-participant reflections about prior writing history, their prior engagement with feedback practices and writing process were extracted from the DIs. Then, in a table, I summarized on several dimensions what I considered the key characteristics of each student-participant, including their past and current experiences with SLW, the kinds of problems they encountered in writing, their attitudes toward writing, and the role they expected SLW to play in their future lives (Appendix H). The compiled information gleaned from the data formed the basis for the student-participant writing profile.

The text analysis of student-participants' drafts and feedback posted online (Google Docs), student-participant responses to feedback posted, and the qualitative analysis of interviews and class documents constituted the second phase of data analysis. First, linguistic errors in the first drafts were identified and categorized according to Ferris's (2002) taxonomy with minor adaptations (Appendix I). The error frequency was counted based on the number of errors per three hundred words in each student-participant's first draft for all six tasks (Appendices J-S, Y, Z, AA, BB, EE, HH and JJ). Second, to explore how student-participants addressed their errors in the final draft after the reception of feedback, I crossed-linked original errors in the first draft treated with feedback to the revised part in the final draft. The revision operations in response to feedback were categorized based on the textual-level changes that

student-participants made to address the marked texts and the effectiveness of the changes (Appendix T).

In order to learn about individual student-participant's responses to feedback, their revision processes, and their strategies for utilizing feedback (Appendix U), the final stage of data analysis included coding DIs on Google Docs (Appendix V) and face-to-face (Appendix W). Preliminary codes emerged as I highlighted textual segments that provided insights to research questions, and these codes were constantly revised during recursive coding of each data file.

After completing three stages of data coding and analysis, a narrative of each student-participant's engagement with DF was generated. I then compared codes across data files to revise codes, and clustered codes sharing similarities or being closely related into categories and subcategories. These categories and subcategories helped me to refine and organize case study narratives for each student-participant. The clustered categories and subcategories of learner engagement with DF are shown in Appendices U, V, and W. More details on each data set are given further.

Semi-structured interviews. The interviews were exploratory and heuristic, seeking to develop explanations, and they followed a semi-structured, open-ended format. The sessions were conducted face-to-face, one-on-one by a peer researcher who was not involved directly with student-participants (Appendices E and G). The interviews were video recorded and written up as a summary immediately after the session, and when questions arose they were resolved with the assistance of student-participants. The interviews were conducted to gain insights or perspectives of student-participants, with less attention paid to actual linguistic features of the spoken discourse. At the beginning of data analysis, I read through the interview transcripts

several times. This gave me an overall idea about the emerging themes for answering the research questions. The transcripts were analyzed by utterances, beginning with obvious or recurring topics and looking for themes. To develop categories that reflected the major issues student-participants raised in their comments, two coding strategies were used: (1) frequency and (2) episodic unit. The frequency with which particular ideas occurred, the strength of their expression, and their distribution across student-participants were considered to identify the categories. Next, the episodic unit analysis was conducted. The episodic unit was based on the categories in a coding system and it lasted for as long as a student-participant continued to make the same kind of comment (Brice, 2005). This strategy allowed for parsing the data into units that retained enough context to be meaningful. Throughout the data analysis process, I used my classroom observation and reflective notes as well as class materials to supplement the emerging answers to the research questions.

Student-participant profiles. Student-participant profiles were built based on findings from a student-participant background questionnaire (Appendix A) and a survey addressing student-participant attitudes toward writing (Appendix B) in week 1. The questionnaire inquired about the student-participants' perceptions about their own writing, feedback preferences, and attitudes toward accuracy. The survey was designed to explore how student-participant attitudes toward the writing class, toward writing accuracy, and toward feedback itself changed over a period of time. Having all data ready for analysis, I created coding schemes such as (1) student-participants' prior writing experiences, (2) writing instruction, (3) grammar instruction, and (4) feedback practices. After coding student-participant responses, content analysis of open-ended questions was achieved through a stepwise process that involved two phases (Dörnyei, 2010): (1) Taking each student-participant's response in turn and marking any distinct content elements,

substantive statements, or key points. (2) Based on the ideas and concepts highlighted in the texts in phase 1, forming broader categories to describe the content of the response that allowed for comparisons with other responses.

Student-participant written texts. Six writing tasks were used to generate student-participant texts (Appendix X). The writing tasks were administered on six separate occasions within a period of 16 weeks (Phase I), and required persuasive writing and explicit citations from assigned readings. The writing tasks were not designed specifically for the research, but were required as a part of the curriculum, which adds a more natural validity to the investigation. The student-participant essays were analyzed for error counts (frequency). Three raters, R1 (NNEST), R2 (NEST), and R3 (NEST) scored the writing samples using error codes (Appendix I). Prior to rating the samples, the raters met on four occasions to discuss guidelines, define language units and errors, and engage in some practice scoring. Raters conducted all subsequent ratings independently of each other.

Dialogic interactions. The DIs explored how student-participants utilized feedback in revising their texts. Before each DI, the marked and revised draft of the student-participant's text was charted for discussion of ignored, deleted errors, and incorrect revisions (the ignored errors were identified based on type of error and frequency). The errors were coded by following two strategies. First, the errors were grouped into content (development, organisation, rhetoric) and grammar errors. Next, each group of errors was analyzed based on three categories: no change (no response to the correction is apparent), deleted problem (the error is deleted rather than attempting correction), and substitution (rewriting the error by bringing a new form).

Each DI included time to (1) discuss writing and revision issues and (2) have student-participants attempt to correct the errors which were ignored or deleted. The insights that were

gleaned from student-participants' attitude toward feedback and/or their reaction to those comments were analyzed based on content analysis. The actual talk was analyzed by episodes which focused on revisions.

Ensuring Quality and Rigor of the Case Study

One of the criticism leveled against the case study method is that it lacks objectivity. Stake (1995) notes that qualitative inquiry is subjective and personal: "Impersonal issues applied to carefully observed human beings become personal issues." (p. 46) I do not regard subjectivity as a failing element to be eliminated, but rather look at it as an essential factor of understanding. My role during data collection was primarily a participant-observer. Since no matter how objective I was, my beliefs, assumptions about teaching SLW and working with L2 learners, and feedback practices might have affected the process of data collection and analysis. Therefore to eliminate my bias, the following procedures were conducted. First, in addition to me, two experienced ESL professionals revised and constructed feedback on the same student-participants' texts. Because I am a non-native speaker of English, involving native speakers to do revisions was imperative. Research studies confirm that non-native teachers are severe markers, while native teachers mostly focus on those errors that are affecting the meaning (Hyland & Anan, 2006). Second, in order to decrease my and student-participants' biases, a peer researcher conducted semi-structured interviews. Third, the textual data of student-participants was provided to validate that the interpretations were in fact grounded in the lived experiences of the student-participants. Finally, consistency in composing feedback, coding feedback, sampling, interviewing, and data analysis procedures were ensured by having an audit trail about decision making throughout.

When analyzing the data, I followed the interpretive perspective which disputes "the assumption that there is a single reality and that studying it repeatedly will yield the same results" (Merriam, 1998, p. 205). Feedback practices are socially constructed and the focus of the research was on understanding this construction and the multiple venues it might imply.

The student-participants' culture and the larger social system of which they were part was respected and taken into consideration in the process of data collection. Some factual details about a student-participant were altered slightly to protect the identity of participants. The findings were described carefully with direct quotes from student-participants. Member checking was conducted to establish the credibility and confirmability of the case study (with 9 of the student-participants who participated in Phase II of data collection).

My Role

Teacher research encourages acknowledgement of the significant role instructor identities play in student writing and learning outcomes (Canagarajah, 2015). Understanding the place of my own values in student-participants' negotiations helped me manage my role appropriately. As a former EFL student, my identity is in many ways similar to student-participants' and other bi/multilingual students. My experience as a struggling multilingual L2 writer enabled me to provide feedback that encouraged agency, and it is possible that student-participants felt comfortable experimenting because of my identity. Though I admit that my course requirements, identity, and course activities might have influenced students to negotiate their writings in ways specific to my course, my position is that SLW pedagogy is not neutral. The unique conditions in each classroom, as in all contexts of SLW, have to be negotiated by its main actors – students.

I present my findings as a narrative, drawing from the methods and assumptions of

narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2004; Xu & Connelly, 2009). Teacher research has often been reported in narrative form, as it is suitable for representing the holistic, contextualized, and embodied nature of the findings: DIs as they evolve temporally in an IEP writing course. Teacher research can also permit the personal voice of the teacher/researcher in representing the engaged, affective, and insider orientation of the experience.

Although the analysis of data revealed intricate interactional patterns across 17 multiethnic student-participants, salient in the course of data collection and analysis were the student-participants' complex motives for engaging in revision processes. Student-participants' sense of self that they constructed with respect to SLW and revisions was the essential factor in their engagement. The next chapter discusses student-participant success and development of L2 writer revision agency.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The case study was guided by two research questions: (a) What role does dialogic feedback (DF) play in facilitating student-participants' revision processes? and (b) What factors explain student-participants' engagement or disengagement with revisions? This chapter discusses the main findings of the research. First, the role of DF on student-participants' revisions, and the themes that emerged from the dialogues on both platforms, Google Docs and face-to-face, are discussed. Second, several factors that explain student-participants' engagement or disengagement with revisions are presented.

What Role Does Dialogic Feedback Play in Facilitating Student-participants' Revision Processes?

Three major themes in conjunction with dialogic interactions (DIs) emerged: first, student-participants' heightened awareness of their writing issues; second, student-participants' increased awareness of academic writing (specifically reader expectations; genre; academic vocabulary); third, the positive role of dialogues in revision (perceived benefits of revisions). All student-participants engaged in two acts of meaning making: explaining their revisions (orally verbalizing thoughts) and defending their choices (avoiding appropriation). All these factors contributed to the development of participant L2 writer revision agency. I want to stress that L2 writer revision agency should not be considered as a quality of the student-participant, but as a contextually situated way of relating to second language writing (SLW) and revisions that is

shaped by student-participants' development history as well as their potential future related to SLW and its role in shaping their academic lives. Before presenting the findings, I describe the process of composing DF and DI.

The goal of the current study was not to examine whether or not focus on form led to more grammatically accurate written texts, but rather to explore how the focus on individual student-participant writing issues could affect the writing process and revisions. The broad purpose of the study was to investigate DIs around feedback, and consequently writing in an IEP classroom setting within a particular institution. A more specific focus which emerged from data to be subsequently discussed was on the actions taken by student-participants and by me as we negotiated around feedback (classroom interactions, online on Google Docs and face-to-face dialogues), and the implications of those dialogues. I approached data analysis with an interest in the ways student-participants interpreted and negotiated the demands associated with feedback, with writing itself (specifically writing tasks), and an IEP writing course within a social context into which student-participants were emerged (university life). I analyzed student-participant engagement in DIs by following Ushioda's argument, which stresses concentration on "person-in-context" rather than on context as the independent factor to capture the mutually constitutive relationship between persons and the context in which they act – a relationship that is dynamic, complex and non-linear (2009, pp. 216-218). My focus was to explore the complexity of personal meaning student-participants attached to revisions, specifically as a response to DF.

Dialogic feedback posted on student-participant drafts was addressed to help them to express their intended meanings through Google Docs and, thereafter, DIs. I posted "what, how, why" questions online to avoid appropriation of their writing (Appendix C), and during the DIs, although it was very hard not to blurt out the correction, I created the space and time in which

student-participants could feel comfortable to experiment with their revisions without the fear of correction. For their grammar issues, I applied indirect feedback (Appendix D).

During 16 weeks of intensive revisions, student-participants were reminded to approach SLW and their revisions as a learning process. I always stressed my collaborative role in those dialogues as well as asked them to consider me as an audience, a reader who was very interested in *understanding* their thoughts. I also emphasized that linguistic errors were developmental, and that it was almost impossible to have error free texts unless attention was paid to common errors. My main focus was to raise student-participant awareness of their common errors for which they could develop their own unique L2 writer revision agency.

For student-participants, our dialogues created a safe zone in which they could express their affective responses towards feedback. Student-participants discussed their misunderstanding of error codes (n=16), uncertainty of what feedback meant (n=7), and their attitude toward revisions (positive attitude (n=14) and negative attitude (n=3)). They were candid about the struggles they perceived they had (e.g., uncertainty of revisions (n=8)), and were open to *experiment* with the corrections (e.g., choosing a right revision strategy (n=9)). They also discussed their unique writing issues in *person* (e.g., specific grammar issues (n=17); the role of reading in writing (n=15); the issues of plagiarism (n=7); and individual errors (n=17)) .

The main part of DIs on Google Docs was associated with questions or comments that both student-participants and I posted online (Appendix V). Questions or comments that student-participants submitted as a response to feedback were regarding their lack of understanding, and subsequently how my responses to these questions or comments informed their revisions. When responding to the student-participants' questions online using Google Docs, I strove as much as possible to limit their dependence on my expertise (or at least role balance), and take ownership

of their own revisions (indirect feedback). When I posted questions on Google Docs, I tried to

develop student-participant L2 writer revision agency. I focused specifically on role reversal, in

which I depended on student-participant input to make sense of the content of their writing, and

in turn, to aid them in revising their drafts. When the sentence was confusing because of

linguistic errors, I still used "what, how, why" questions and asked student-participants to

elaborate on the discussed point in more detail.

The DIs were focused on student-participant questions to clarify feedback and the issues,

their concerns of day-to-day revision strategies, my questions to understand their writing and

revisions (avoid appropriation), and revisions of the errors collaboratively and/or independently

(Appendix W).

The next section discusses student-participants' SLW profiles and the ways in which DF

shaped their L2 writer revision agency.

Increased awareness of writing issues. The main finding that emerged is that the

absence of a fear of negative correction enabled student-participants to focus on the meanings

they wished to express (n=17). While in some cases, during revision episodes, student-

participant responses might not be considered correct because of grammatical or lexical errors

they produced, it nonetheless represented an important step in helping student-participants

develop their understanding of errors. Many student-participants did not know they had

rhetorical or linguistic errors (n=11) and perceived that DIs helped them to understand their

errors. Some shared that they felt very comfortable talking about their issues *in person*, or as they

reflected "face-to-face" (n=15):

> I am not silent and I ask questions, and express my opinion. I can talk about weakest
> points in person. I cannot talk about it in classroom. [Reika, the interview]

These meetings gave me an opportunity to write and think freely. It was a first time to write and revise like this, so it was meaningful for my writing development. [Kelly, the interview]

At the meeting, I can easily ask questions and share ideas with the teacher and get an effective feedback. I can discuss with the teacher on what I should improve on more. [Beth, the interview]

The majority of student-participants shared that they differed in writing skills and depth of knowledge; therefore, they needed "one-to-one feedback". Because student-participants could ask questions about their errors directly, without feeling that their questions were being ignored, reveals that WCF posted on their Google Docs might have been unidirectional, and might have attached a passive role to the recipient (lacking reciprocity – give and take). Many of them raised concerns on understanding what the feedback asked them to do (n=7). Therefore, for some other student-participants (n=5), DIs were a safe zone to clarify their misunderstandings:

I think the meetings helped me the most because I can understand the assignment more clearly. [Emiri, the interview]

Fragment, I couldn't understand this comment. However, I could get it and fix by talking to the teacher. [Caleb, the interview]

Although feedback posted online could have created confusion that needed to be discussed further *in person*, for some student-participants (n=13) it triggered engagement to take control of their writing and responsibility for their own revisions:

Sometimes it's hard because there are many ways to fix the errors, and I need to think which option is better, like think or pay attention. [Emiri, the interview]

I realized I am not good at supporting support, so next task, I need to focus on making my stance clear by supporting with examples, evidence. I need to develop paragraph more clearly and meaningful. [Lana, the interview]

I noticed there are many errors, I thought why did I make these mistakes? It was beneficial to think and remember them. [Sam, the interview]

My overall experience with working on fixing my errors based on feedback is that I need to check my essay conscientiously after writing. [David, the interview]

Increased awareness of academic writing. Another theme that arose from the DIs involved student-participants' increased awareness of audience (n=14), which stemmed from their realization that they needed to communicate their ideas more clearly (n=17). The word "clear" was a recurring term in all student-participants' reflections.

> After talking about my problems, I think about my content if I make clear communication between me and the audience, if I am using precise language and strong argument. [Beth, the interview]

The majority thought they were not providing specific examples because they received 'what, why, and how' question comments (n=9). Specifically, many recognized that communicating simpler ideas with more basic sentence structure would not discredit the complexity of writing they were trying to achieve (n=11). Since I tried to reverse my role, and minimized my authority as much as possible, many student-participants felt empowered during the dialogues, and argued that it helped them to rewrite their drafts to meet reader expectations:

> It is an excellent writing experience to work on fixing my errors, and it leads me to be good at writing. I felt comfortable commenting on my paper. It was interesting to feel myself in a role of teacher. It helped me to see my work from the other side. [David, the interview]

> I learned that if sentences become too long and loose, it is hard to read for others. Meeting with the teacher helped me to revise my essay in more clear way. The opportunity that be on the side of a valuer [reviewer] helps me to revise my paper more. [Kelly, the interview]

> When talking about my draft, I could understand that my writing is difficult to understand for other people. So I learned that it is important to write my opinion clearly. [Reika, the interview]

> I realized that I always imagine the readers who already know me and thus have same background with me when I write down an essay. That is why explanation for my readers was deficient in my essay. I learned that I should imagine the readers who have no information about me and I cannot skip background information. [Misa, the interview]

Themes of increased awareness of academic writing (specifically audience, or reader), the positive role of orally verbalizing thoughts in revision, and student-participants' ability to

70

explain their revisions and defending their choices (avoiding appropriation) are illustrated further through individual student-participant cases. First, the student-participant writing profiles are described, and then their L2 writer revision agency are discussed.

Increased awareness of genre: Mary's case. Mary stated: "Understanding errors is one step, but acting upon them is a bigger, more crucial step." Mary's revision profile is described in Appendix Y.

Mary, 20 years old from South Korea, was the most stable student-participant in terms of continuous engagement, even prioritizing IEP writing over courses for her major, Nutrition and Hospitality Management. She was very serious about writing assignments, carefully following task guidelines and taking notes during classes. Although she was upset with her linguistic errors in the first interview, stating "I felt embarrassed because I didn't know that I had lots of grammar problems, especially with preposition, tense, and article. At least, I realized that I have quite many of them in my writing". She highly valued feedback and believed that feedback was indispensable for improving her writing skills:

> In Korea, when I wrote my essay and submit it to my professors, they just graded but they did not do any feedback. So I did not know so far what is wrong or what is correct in my essay. And I remember that the professors focused more on general problems, not on content, and not on letting me know my specific problems. [August 2016, the interview]

After week 1 (and the first interview), Mary did not talk about her struggles, and did not have any emotional response toward her writing skills. She focused on understanding her problems and resolving them. Mary outlined a set of goals for each of her writing tasks, and followed those goals. There was no disconnection between her planned and actual practice. She revised content and grammar feedback equally because she believed both could hinder meaning and misguide readers. Mary was invested in her revisions, and was reflective of her practices.

71

Revision would perfect writing and it is helpful, but if I do not have any feedback, and I just hear 'you should revise your essay', it will not be helpful. When feedback is there I can revise my problems and I felt my essay improved more each time I revised. [November 2016, the interview]

Compared to other student-participants, Mary was not a passive recipient of information. She would always question the reading material, class activities and discussion, as well as the drafting process and its purpose. She was not afraid to contest my feedback and would challenge me during the DIs. She was also not hesitant to point out her misunderstanding about how to respond to feedback:

Sometimes I can notice the problem and change it, but sometimes I cannot understand the comments, like what is the problem? For example, noun ending, plural, tense I know what it means, but there was sometimes abstract feedback about my grammar. The instructor commented using like 'adjective plus noun', and I am not sure what is that. Is it what I wrote or what should I do with this? Should I change to this? [October 2016, the interview]

Mary also differed from other student-participants in her use of a wider range of meta-cognitive and cognitive operations while revising (Appendix Y). She was one of the few student-participants who planned steps to deal with feedback. Mary was a participant who invested in learning at her fullest potential: "I feel a kind of responsibility to do my best in this class, and I learned more, something new in this class than the other major classes. I tried my best for everything and want to, so just personally motivated." [December 2016, the interview] As well as being extensively engaged with feedback, Mary was also relatively successful in making revisions. None of the errors receiving feedback was left unmodified.

Mary's L2 writer revision agency. In the DIs, Mary was concerned about her misunderstandings and wanted to resolve her questions during the discussion. She usually initiated questions and followed up with other questions while I was sharing my opinion. Mary's

role could be described as being an active agent who made an effort not only to understand the problem, but also to solve it.

Mary's cognitive engagement with revisions was extensive, particularly manifested in her understanding and awareness of academic writing. This desire to write "academically" could be observed on several occasions. In one instance, while discussing a word choice and deciding on whether to use subordination or coordination, Mary questioned the value of using "so" in academic papers, since she observed her other professors' were not often using this conjunction: "I have a question, so using 'so' is not academic writing?" In the following revision episode, she used parallel construction, because she believed it was one of the demands of academic writing, and did not notice the repetition.

> Task 1
> Draft 1: Parents who are not familiar with digital communication can't communicate well with their children who are familiar with digital communication
> Draft 2: Also, parents who are not familiar with digital communication cannot communicate well with their children who are familiar with.
> Final: Also, parents who are not familiar with digital communication cannot communicate well with their children who are familiar with digital communication.
>
> S: Yes, you tried to correct, but see, you have repetitions right?
> M: A: (.3)
> S: What else could you use instead of "digital communication"?
> M: Hm (.3) social networking services
> S: Because "digital" means "online", right (.3)
> M: I think because it is in one sentence, and I needed to parallel this part [points to "digital communication"] "without not"; is it better to paraphrase?
> S: Yes, it is better, also yes parallelism is important, and you are still doing it "who are not familiar and who are familiar"
> M: Ah: okay

The DIs thus served to increase Mary's understanding of genre and that some elements could be used differently depending on their function within a particular task. During the last meeting, discussing Task 6, Mary initiated the question about the usage of quotes. She was confused when I asked her to cite some direct quotes to support her opinion about the main character: "I think in

the previous tasks paraphrasing was very important, and better than using direct quotes, but this time for the story task, you recommended to use more direct quotes in my essay, so it was confusing. I thought I was supposed to use only one direct quote when I write." Mary recognized the discrepancy in her learned information about quotes and their purpose in different types of writing tasks. This gap in her knowledge helped to develop her genre awareness.

As Mary worked through her drafts, she became more aware of her content, grammatical structures, and word choices. In the following episode, Mary took control of the discussion and defended her choice by vocalizing the correction:

> Task 2
> Draft 1: If people meet face to face, it is very hard <u>to say sorry or request.</u> It is also hard to complain or refuse because people are in the same physical place looking at each other. Sometimes it makes them uncomfortable and embarrassed.
> Final: If people meet face to face, <u>it is very hard to admit their fault or ask a favor.</u> It is also hard to complain a problem or refuse because people are in the same physical place looking at each other.
>
> S: Let's see what you did [reads] "it is hard to say sorry" and you replaced it with [reads] "to admit their fault"?
> M: Yes, I think "say sorry" is the expression, and it's not formal
> S: So what you say, is "apologize"?
> M: Right
> S: But what I mean is, "to say sorry" and, "to admit their fault" are two different expressions [and
> M: [Yes, I think, "we say sorry" because we know that we made a fault, so maybe it will be the same meaning
> S: I see, okay, actually I agree with you, you are right [reads the correction one more time]

Not only did Mary defend her correction, but also noticed the difference between a formal and informal register. In another episode, Mary ignored feedback on using "as and as" comparative construction because she believed the correction might have changed her intended meaning: "I think you asked me which option I want to use, and I wrote 'as' as conjunction. Actually I think

about using 'as well as', but I am worried if I put 'as well as' maybe the meaning can be changed, so I did not try to follow this comment."

In all these exchanges, Mary's oral verbalization regarding the error helped her to clarify her thoughts, and subsequently her revisions. In this regard, Mary's explanations, in which she clarified her intended meaning to me, were also explanations to herself. She first reflected on the discrepancy between the meaning of the words on the page and the true meaning that she wanted to convey. Mary then realized that her writing needed to achieve the same degree of clarity and simplicity that her vocalization had.

Mary's use of vocalization to revise her papers helped her not only to identify discrepancies but also to reconcile them. Mary alluded to this in the interviews, as she talked about some of the major changes she made during her revision process, including the deletion of large chunks of her paper: "I think my writing is progressing. When I wrote the first draft of this assignment [Task 4] there was no definite cause and effect relationships. I thought there was something wrong. I revised it and deleted and changed a lot of things, like most of the body part was gone."

It is crucial to note that Mary's understanding of her errors benefited considerably from dialogues we had about her revisions. Mary reflected that written feedback on Google Docs had limitations to discuss her writing concerns, but dialogues helped her to ask more specific questions and get more information about the problem in person:

> Commenting just revise, depending on the comments does not make me to remember my problem, but we always talk about revisions and our ideas. There were always questions like "what did you mean?, what did you learn?, what was your strongest and weakest part?" When I do those reflections, and think about my errors, it reminds me and I say "oh, these are my repeated problems" and I could feel satisfied with my revision. [November 2016, the interview]

Throughout the study, as previously noted, Mary displayed many instances of increased academic genre awareness and was able to orally verbalize her thoughts to revise her writing. This was possible, in large part, because of Mary's advanced-level English language skills. These skills also played a significant role when she discussed and defended her revisions, and in turn, to develop her L2 writer revision agency.

Increased awareness of readership: Sara's case. Sara stated: "Writing does not develop by magic, if the learner does not want to invest and learn about the errors". Sara's revision profile is outlined in Appendix Z.

Sara, like other student-participants, was an international student from Japan. At the time of the study, Sara was 20 and had already spent one year in London attending a language program, which included a writing course. Since arriving at the university, she had lived with Korean speakers, but hoped to move into a house with English speakers to improve her speaking skills. She enrolled in a range of intercultural communication subjects – History, Politics, Management, and Social Studies, as well as two elective courses – IEP Writing and Speaking outside of her major that she felt would improve her writing and speaking:

> My writing is so poor, and I know writing is the most important skill in the business. Therefore, I have to improve my writing skill more. I want to get a job, and if I do not speak English, I cannot take great occupation [job]. I want to tell others what I'm saying exactly. [August 2016, the interview]

Sara showed an interest in developing and strengthening her writing and speaking skills at the start of the course, but her revision processes and participation in the DIs (during 16 weeks), as well as on Google Docs, showed her intentional and partial disengagement. I want to be cautious when I use the word *disengagement* to describe Sara's case because she was doing all the work that was required; however, she did not invest in learning about all her problems and did not engage in understanding those problems. She picked particular problems that were relevant to

her *present reality* (at that time). Although, after 16 weeks, Sara held the same belief about developing writing skills, she intentionally did not invest at her fullest potential in the IEP writing course. One of the reasons was that Sara experienced much difficulty in her discipline subjects and their writing tasks: "I have a lot of assignments in this class [an IEP writing course], so then I also have academic classes. I cannot keep up, and keep balances. Sometimes it's little bit stressful, but also little bit hard for me." [October 2016, the interview]

When discussing Sara's case, it is important to draw on Dweck's notion of fixed versus growth mindsets, which largely determine what role one's perceived language aptitude will play in the process of L2 learning. Dweck (2006) claims that "mindsets frame the running account that's taking place in people's heads. They guide the whole interpretation process" (p. 209). This connection between beliefs and the "whole interpretation process" is especially important in that it suggests a framework for connecting beliefs to the wider language learner psychology in order to understand how they interact to shape approaches to learning. Thus, mindsets are concerned with the adaptive nature of beliefs; how learners are able to process a range of beliefs about themselves and the nature of learning; and how they are able to adjust those beliefs in response to ongoing learning situations. Sara's predetermined beliefs also played some role in her engagement, since she did not think she would be able to improve her writing.

There was a disconnect between Sara's behavior and her imagined future (Dörnyei's the Ideal L2 Self, 2009). Sara was caught up in her day-to-day learning experience in academic courses, rather than building writing confidence. Sara was submitting all the assigned work, but she shared that she revised the first two tasks without thinking of their importance for her writing development. When Sara could find the connection between her academic course assignments and the IEP writing course, she invested in her revisions. She engaged fully in the IEP writing

course beginning with Task 3, when the topic was interesting to her (women's role in today's job market) and when she had a similar writing task in one of her academic courses (Gender Studies):

> I have assignment in that class, that one is like 7 to 12 pages I have to write. I have to write one part, which is 5 pages, so I can find this writing [refers to the IEP Writing course, Task 3] is basis of my feminism class assignment [refers to Gender Studies], so I concentrated on this Task 3. I also, but this female one male one [refers to Task 3] I liked this one really, because my major is communication and I am really interested in this topic. [October 2016, the interview]

Although Sara was not engaged from the beginning of the study (first 7 weeks), DIs served as the vehicle through which both Sara and I engaged in acts of revisions. Sara, at the final interview, shared that those interactions were the "key to revise the paper and make it better": "If the instructor teaches me answer, just answer it without waiting for my opinion, it is very easy for me to revise, but not helpful for improving my skills." [March 2017, the interview]

Sara's L2 writer revision agency. Our DIs increased Sara's audience awareness involving her consideration of the reader as a collaborator. She revised both as a writer and a reader. As a writer, she included the content she felt was pertinent to her paper; as a reader, she became more cognizant of the need to ensure that this content was communicated clearly for her readership. For instance in the following discussion, Sara explained the reason why she included the translation of a Japanese article to support her point:

> Draft 2: If we tell the channels which we watch to our friends, we can talk about them in the school tomorrow. Then, our chatting will be more sensational. We should accept it and acknowledge to own limitations of using technology. Also, the author mentioned "We're down on the interaction time." (Chandra Johnson, 2014)
> Final: We can talk about channels we watch in the school, the next day when we meet friends. Then, our chatting will be more meaningful. <u>In Japan, 67.8% people who use social media try to follow others' status and recent activity (JMIC, 2011). We live in the society when we can have access to others' lives easily.</u> We should accept and acknowledge the limitations of using technology.

> S: Why did you add this part?

Sara: First I wrote draft 1, and now I see Johnson's article is not related to my topic, but this Japanese article is about how people use, social media today, then, (.3) this Johnson said like "because of technology, we cannot, we cannot establish good relationship and good communication with others," but this Japanese article says "we can establish good one in social media", and also a lot of people use this social media, so I can, I think I can use this one out of one evidence

S: Supporting details?

Sara: Yeah, supporting evidence

In the dialogue above, Sara assumed her role as a writer and negotiated my question of whether it was needed to use secondary sources, which Sara ultimately chose not to utilize as she revised. However, while verbalizing her thoughts, she also realized that her sentences lacked coherence and she needed to reorganize the whole paragraph.

In our dialogues, Sara was more concerned how her sentences would be accepted by the reader: "I am really confused when I write down my opinion, so if I can write them simply and clearly, I can explain more, can explain my opinion more easily to readers." [October 2016, DI] Sara's awareness increased as she engaged in talking about her concerns and struggles on how to make her writing clear so that it would be accepted by the reader. Awareness of audience manifested in her revisions of sentence structure (simple vs. complex sentences; type of coordination), use of transitions, and academic vocabulary (she would bring at least 4-5 words to discuss). At the end of the study, Sara shared that she gained confidence over her writing: "I can write and I can show my opinion more correctly by using good, appropriate vocabulary. I could not tell my opinion before." [March 2017, the interview] Throughout the study, Sara strove to achieve clarity and simplicity in her writing. She also developed genre awareness and realized that each writing type had a "cause and effect relationship" and that she "should understand it more to write a good essay."

Sara not only assumed L2 writer agency by taking control of her writing (awareness of audience), but also candidly critiqued my focus on grammatical accuracy during our dialogues.

79

Sara communicated her experience by pointing out that it was not easy to revise grammar errors when she lacked linguistic support. Sara was critical of her repeated errors, and would always start our dialogues by sharing her self-revision challenges. Sara was one of many student-participants who approached the DIs as a safe zone where she could express her feelings directly without the fear of being judged. Throughout the study, as previously noted, Sara displayed many instances of increased awareness of audience and was able to orally verbalize her thoughts to revise her writing. These skills also played a significant role to avoid acts of appropriation, and in turn, to develop her L2 writer revision agency.

Increased awareness of academic register: Yuna's case. Yuna stated: "Revisions require understanding of core errors". Yuna's revision profile is outlined in Appendix AA.

Yuna's case could be discussed from the point of those student-participants who try to understand their errors and learn about them, that is, to understand why they are making those errors. Yuna was 22 years old at the time of the study, and it was the first the time for her to live apart from her family in Japan. Although Mary took it to another level, and focused on how to correct and avoid errors, Yuna was more concerned about the reasons for her mistakes. She was not invested in finding ways to solve those errors.

During the DIs, Yuna corrected and provided responses to those errors that she missed, ignored, or corrected wrong. Yuna was quite confident of her English skills and was responsive to the instruction. Despite having writing courses and receiving direct feedback on her papers, which was limited to grammar, Yuna stressed that she did not know how to correct her errors. Yuna's attitude toward feedback was positive and she was happy to receive comments; her beliefs did not change till the end of the study. Although she wanted to study abroad and be able to communicate with native speakers, SLW would play a marginal role in her future life as an

engineer in a Japanese company, and her motivation to learn English was thus highly

instrumental. However, after receiving feedback and being engaged in revision processes (both

on Google Docs and DIs), Yuna's interest to develop and improve writing was triggered:

> I had never revised my draft many times like this with instructor's feedback or comments about grammatical mistakes and content. I felt that I could ask questions any time through online tool [Google Docs], so it was very convenient for me. Sometimes it took over two weeks to get the feedback about my paper in Japan. Therefore, I have kept working on my draft and didn't forget what I wrote in my work. Moreover, in meetings [dialogic interactions], I think that I could get the skill to express my opinion like disagreement. There were guides such as the feedback, so I think it is good experience for me to know efficient way of revisions. [October 2016, the interview]

Similar to Sara, Yuna prioritized academic course writing assignments at first. When reflecting

about those courses, Yuna focused on the difficulty of keeping up with those assignments. If

Sara had struggles with the concepts and meeting other professors' expectations overall, Yuna

had difficulties with reading demands and the pace of the courses. Yuna's immediate difficulties

experienced in academic classes affected her focus of revisions in the IEP writing class. When

revising, she focused more on reading strategies and writing a summary, and skipped linguistic

errors. Among Mary, Sara and Yuna, Yuna was also the first student-participant to mention

reading as a significant part of writing.

Similar to Mary, Yuna was not aware of her linguistic errors, and pointed out that

revision processes helped her to remember repeated errors: "I realized that I often overlook basic

point, such as the article. It reminds me of the importance of grammar and review." [November

2016, the interview] Although Yuna acknowledged her weaknesses in making lexical choices,

she had minimal interest in enhancing her written accuracy until she noticed she had "a lot of

grammatical mistakes."

Feedback positively influenced Yuna's attitude towards her errors and, as a result, her

engagement with revisions. Dialogues that gave her freedom to think became her main

motivating factor to be invested in the IEP writing course. During the DIs, Yuna revised the majority of her errors correctly. Most of the time, Yuna was leading the dialogues. For example, she verbalized her corrections and expected me to provide my version of revisions as well. Yuna was the first student-participant who took a leading role (without my initiation) in her revisions among Mary and Sara. When reflecting about DIs, she said: "We have opportunity to talk about papers and the contents we talked actually helped me to write, and rewrite essays. I don't know why but I could concentrate on the task, and I tried to revise as best as I can." [December 2016, the interview] Yuna stressed the notion of having *in person* feedback throughout the study where she could resolve her issues:

> I made many kinds of mistakes, such as grammatical and content mistakes and sometimes the feedback were not what I imagined or expected it was. I misunderstood feedback. That's why it was not easy to revise my papers. However, at the same time, I noticed I have to study English more and more. First, I noticed that my English writing skill is not enough for readers to read my essay, and second, I learned difficulty of writing academic essays, which motivated me to work on academic vocabulary. And talking about my problems in person helped the most. Meeting with the instructor is my favorite feedback. [November 2016, the interview]

Yuna's L2 writer revision agency. Yuna was one of the student-participants who spent more time in understanding feedback and locating her errors. The common revision strategy she applied while working on her errors was to delete and rewrite. In most cases (Tasks 1, 3, 4, and 6), the main body of the essays had been rewritten as a response to feedback. It might be assumed that Yuna was appropriating her texts as a response to the feedback, but in reality, based on feedback, Yuna felt an urgency to reconsider her choices, whether it was a rhetorical issue or a linguistic error.

Some research considers appropriation within DIs a two-way street, in which both teachers and L2 writers appropriate one another's words (Tardy, 2006). Specifically, while

teachers may still recommend changes that a writer finds wrong or inappropriate, the writer is likewise able to communicate such sentiments to the teacher. In our dialogues, appropriation was not monologic (or a one-way flow), but served instead to emphasize Yuna's writing agency. Dialogic feedback increased Yuna's awareness of academic writing style, and she invested in developing her academic vocabulary: "I thought my writing or word selection were academic when I was writing the draft; however, I realized that they were not enough through the feedback." [November 2016, the interview] Although Yuna was an advanced learner and taking academic courses, it was surprising that she did not know about a common academic lists of words. She often reflected that academic words were difficult to learn to write, since she never paid attention to them when writing before taking the IEP writing course.

Focus on vocabulary also helped her to reconsider her writing. In the following example, I focused on the "relative pronoun", but Yuna interpreted my input as a lack of certainty in her text:

Draft 2: Then, women can exert their abilities <u>what </u>they may have basically.
Final: <u>At that time, </u>women <u>could</u> exert their abilities, <u>such as a communication skill</u>.

S: I recommended to check the functions of "what", but you deleted and rewrote [your
Y: [Ah: I'd like to make this point more specific, so
S: Hm: [listening]
Y: I think that one is not specific, so I write this point [reads] "communication skill"
S: Why do you think I commented on "what" though? (.3) [reads] "check the functions of what"
Y: Ah: I (.3) I understood but wanted to rewrite
S: Okay, you understood, but maybe you didn't know how to correct?
Y: No: [very loud]
S: No? oka:y
Y: I wanted to change to "that" but I'd like to be more specific
S: Okay, great

When instances of appropriation did occur, they typically involved Yuna's defending her textual choices, or better educating me about the feedback and how that influenced her textual choices.

Yuna's emotional responses towards her writing also provided a secure platform for her to verbalize and experiment with corrections. In many instances, Yuna reflected on the excerpt and then reworded it verbally. During this process, Yuna seemed to internalize the problematic excerpts, which in turn heightened her awareness of the linguistic and textual choices: "I think paraphrasing my revision and explaining what I wanted to tell by using my own words helped me to understand my errors itself." [December 2016, the interview] Yuna had taken writing classes and had received direct feedback, although only on grammar, before registering for the IEP writing course, but because of DF and our meetings *in person* (Yuna was the first student-participant who stressed "in person"), she developed awareness of her common errors and felt she was successful in resolving those problems.

Increased awareness of the benefits of revisions: Kevin's case. Kevin stated: "I did not think I needed to spend time on revisions, but later I realised my writing did improve". Kevin's revision profile is outlined in Appendix BB.

Unlike Mary and Yuna, Kevin, 21 years old from South Korea, was less motivated to revise his drafts and to engage in composing, regarding the IEP writing course as just a regular course to complete. Kevin had taken a writing course before and was accustomed to receiving direct feedback: "Feedback was not specific, and it was at the end, general. It was not like posted next to the sentence." [September 2016, the interview] Kevin did not believe in improving writing and did not think acquiring this skill would benefit him in the future. Compared to other student-participants, Kevin was confident of his writing skills:

> I think my writing skill now is not bad, because I learned how to write an academic writing in my university for over one year, so basic things, such as format, structure and grammar. However, I am still poor about grammar, especially article and tense. I can't use vocabularies in a correct way, as well. Vocabulary is the biggest problem for me. It takes plenty of time looking up it in a dictionary. [August 2016, the interview]

Although Mary doubted she would write again in L2, and Sara could not be engaged at her fullest potential, they both showed a desire to develop their writing skills and resolve their common errors. In contrast, Kevin believed that it depended on the student as to whether he had an interest in developing writing skills, and how much effort to allocate to learning about his errors. In alignment with this belief, he suggested that it was the instructor's task to motivate students to work. Only Kevin, of all student-participants (n=17), stressed that direct feedback would be beneficial to save time: "Direct comment are not difficult for me. It saves time." [October 2016, the interview] At the same time, although he spent time while revising, he did not disqualify indirect feedback and felt that it helped him to improve his writing: "It is very helpful to give me hints about mistakes which I hardly notice while writing. It helps me to review what I learned." [December 2016, the interview]

Throughout the study, Kevin did not point out any specific errors in terms of severity, and did not think he had any that impeded his writing. It was only in the last interview when Kevin initiated talk about his errors and pointed out "prepositions" and "articles" as his most recurring problems. Not only did Kevin have issues with the course structure, but he also could not connect to the writing assignments: "I do not know how important this is for me, but I believe I have improved myself by experiencing a type of compare and contrast form, reader response, and book review which I had not experienced before." [November 2016, the interview]

Kevin was disinterested in revisions; however, as time passed and by participating in the DIs, his attitude changed towards revisions. Kevin was able to see the benefits and actually was reflective about his experience. Although he revised as quickly as possible, such as deleting and ignoring, he realized his writing problems: "I found even though I believe I wrote well enough

while drafting, there are a lot of lacks of explanations, comparing and contrasting on it when people see it objectively." [October 2016, the interview]

As he engaged in revisions, even when at times he did not want to do so, his dissatisfaction increased: "I did not like, incoherence things. When I was writing essays I am correct I think, I thought, but [chuckles] after finishing I reread the essay, and that was awful." After finishing Task 4 (November), Kevin shared that he felt his writing was improving: "I realize that contents of my writing assignment gradually get mature, in point of vocabulary, comprehension of structure and an order to write. I think my essay has gotten closer to an academic one." His positive attitude was also manifested in his revisions sessions as well as his renewed belief about writing:

> I consider that writing skill is very significant for my academic achievement, because I can at least write a good writing to announce others my achievement. Even though the achievement is great, people will not accept it because of the awful writing. Therefore, academic writing skill is essential for me to inform others of my achievements. [November 2016, the interview]

Although Kevin found it important to develop SLW, his realization did not translate into practice. Kevin kept his content revisions short. For example, in Task 2 (choosing the best candidate), although it was suggested to add supporting details for each candidate, Kevin managed to give a general sentence and did not elaborate on any candidate. Kevin knew that he provided minimum revisions on candidates' information, and at the interview he reflected that it was his weakest point.

When Kevin did not know the problem (locating the error) and when he did not know how to revise that particular error, he ignored feedback. When asked why he did not post his concerns about feedback on Google Docs, he said that he was not used to asking questions: "I do not know it is cultural, but my private school teacher taught that I must search by myself. And I

86

am not good at asking, questions. I have not asked questions very often in Korea." [September 2016, the interview] When some comments required him to look up terms in the dictionary, or apply some extra strategies, he rewrote the errors without targeting feedback. For example, during the DIs, Kevin was surprised to find out that the word "communication" had many synonyms.

Kevin was open about his revisions, and confessed that he would revise "easy" errors first, such as "prepositions, articles, subject and verb agreement", because they did not require much effort from his side, and would leave the difficult ones behind. Kevin's definition of difficulty equated to time: "Remarks on the sentence, and for example, what does it mean? wordy, word order, and it takes sometimes more time to revise, tremendous time, a lot of time." [October 2016, the interview] Kevin shared that because of revisions, he could not spend time with the target group, and he would rather prioritize socializing, since it was the ultimate goal of studying abroad. As a coping mechanism, Kevin rewrote his errors without following feedback because it saved time for his social events.

Kevin did not have specific goals set for the writing tasks. Similar to other student-participants, Kevin had assignments in other academic courses. Once, during DIs, Kevin shared that all the assignments "were gonna kill" him. Kevin regarded DIs as a safe zone to talk about his frustration.

Kevin's L2 writer revision agency. What makes Kevin's case unique is that he always defended his choice, and avoided appropriation. Although Kevin did not increase audience awareness, he had a strong desire to debate feedback; consequently, the dialogues encouraged Kevin to orally verbalize the errors. This oral verbalization acted as a form of revision. In the

following excerpt, Kevin resisted making any changes to his initial draft and did not rewrite the

paragraph:

> Draft 2: In addition, they look after their husband who are probably tired (1) <u>after their jobs.</u> Women are also patient because they experience childbirth which takes a lot of pains. Therefore women's tolerance and patience works efficiently in an office where is (2) <u>sensitive to stress</u>.
> Feedback:
> (1) And? How does it explain your purpose?
> (2) How are these ideas connected to the main purpose of your essay?
> Final: In addition, they look after their husbands who are probably tired after their jobs, <u>which might be a burden on his wife.</u> Women are also patient because they experience childbirth which gives them a lot of pains, while men cannot endure it. Therefore women's tolerance and patience let them be calm and make an appropriate decision in an office where it is sensitive to stress.
>
> S: You did not work on this comment. What is the reason. What do you think?
> K: (.3)
> S: [reads] "How does it explain your purpose" so you need to: also explain how? Is it connected to your main point that you are saying?
> K: Hm: I: (.3) was satisfied with adding: (.3) [reads] "which might be a burden on his wife"
> S: Hm, okay
> K: I believe it will work
> S: How would you explain this part then?
> K: (.3)
> S: So you are giving all these examples, but they are not connected to your main purpose [.3]
> K: [.3] Hm: women tend to be patient and [.3] office gives staff: stress and they can be calm [.3] but [.3] as I mentioned women are [.3] patient and tolerant, I think they can [.3] be calmer [.3] so they [.3] make a decision [.3] appropriately or correctly [.3] than men
> S: Okay

It cannot be concluded that Kevin completely ignored the revisions, but he exerted minimum

effort. Although the end paragraph comment was ignored, Kevin shared that he did not want to

change his examples; otherwise, he would need to rewrite the whole paragraph. Kevin expressed

the desire to keep his initial ideas in the final draft, because he found his examples to be

interesting.

In other occasions, while discussing coherence, Kevin clarified his ideas through oral verbalization (Appendix CC). Oral verbalization helped Kevin to rewrite. In the interview, Kevin pointed out that "coherence" problems would be very difficult to revise without DIs: "I do not like incoherence things and comments about them." However, based on the interaction we had, it is clear that Kevin took control of his writing and tried his best to revise and to make it clear for me to understand his points. Our role reversals are especially significant to point out here, where Kevin repeated his revisions and checked with me by using the signal "right?" (Appendix CC). Kevin was in charge of the dialogue, which could have increased his agency if we had had some more time to work together. Kevin showed interest and became an active negotiator at the end of the study. In the final interview, Kevin shared that the whole process of drafting and revising became very serious for him because he could see progress in his writing skills:

> I found revisions to be very efficient because I can write more, longer sentences. I come up with ideas faster. I mean can organize my thoughts faster, I read faster. I pay more attention to my grammar. I always thought about my essay, vocabulary. I use more synonyms than before. I think I used to revisions now. I learned something new from comments and meeting with instructor, and as a result this way of thinking helps me to improve my writing skills. [December 2016, the interview]

Summary. Findings suggest that student-participants' L2 writer revision agency is not static, as well as their portrayal of selves, which evolved during the course of the writing assignments and DIs. Their engagement led them to use various writing strategies; perceive different writing activities to be difficult or easy; and adopt various lived experiences in revising. Their identity, on the other hand, helped student-participants align with the writing tasks; influenced their task perceptions; and mediated writing choices that were rewarding. The next section discusses how student-participants encountered unique opportunities and constraints that afforded and limited their second language writing learning experiences in a variety of ways.

What Factors May Explain Student-participants' Engagement or Disengagement with

Revisions?

Following student-participants over a period of time (9 months) showed that there were

several factors that could explain student-participants' engagement or disengagement with

revisions. The following themes emerged: task complexity, student-participants' perceptions of

the task difficulty, and of the importance of writing for their future studies, the lack of

opportunity to produce extended writing and to receive feedback on writing during the second

course of study (Spring 2017), self-perception of their improvement or lack thereof, and the lack

of opportunity to engage with the target language community. These findings could be

categorized into three strands: task factors, learner factors, and contextual factors. The following

analysis is based on 10 student-participants who continued to the second phase of the study from

August 2016 to Spring 2017.

Task complexity. Writing tasks caused variation in student-participant revisions and

performance. With regard to accuracy the student-participants made fewer mistakes in the less

complex task (when reading was not involved) than in complex tasks (when reading was

involved) (Appendix F and X): I found significant differences for the total number of errors

(Appendix DD). Because of the cognitive complexity of the writing tasks, and individual

differences such as attitude, motivation, and anxiety, student-participants could not devote

attention to every aspect of the task at the same time. With regard to revisions, task condition

such as content feedback, which was specifically based on reading material, also affected

student-participant engagement. Four common revision behaviors were observed: ignoring the

feedback and leaving problems untouched, deleting the sentences and/or paragraphs on which

content feedback was posted, revising without targeting the actual content feedback, and providing one word and/clause revisions which in some cases might not be considered efficient.

Two of the best known models which try to explain the relationship between task complexity, task conditions and learner factors on the one hand and linguistic performance on the other hand are Limited Attentional Capacity Model (Skehan, 1998; Skehan & Foster, 2001) and Triadic Componential Framework or Cognition Hypothesis (Robinson 2001, 2011). Although these models were conceptualized for oral tasks (but researched in L2/FL writing, e.g., Byrnes & Manchón, 2014), I assume that they can provide a useful framework not only for explaining the linguistic performance of student-participants, but also their revision processes.

Skehan and Foster's Limited Attentional Capacity Model proposes that task variables can be grouped into two general categories: task features (how information is structured, what elements can be manipulated) and task implementation (including planning time, and task repetition). Both interact in complex ways and affect learner production in terms of fluency, accuracy, syntactic complexity, and lexical complexity. Specifically, Skehan (1998) argues that learners possess a limited capacity, that only one of these aspects may be in focus at a given time during a given task, and manipulation of task variables affects the fluency, accuracy, and complexity of production.

Adopting a different cognitive approach to language learning, Robinson (2001) argues that the human brain has a multiple-resource attentional system, and has the capacity to attend to various aspects of language and language processing simultaneously. It is assumed that complex tasks, triggering more noticing, will lead to better performance (higher syntactic complexity, lexical variation, and accuracy). Triadic Componential Framework distinguished three

dimensions of task complexity which may influence linguistic performance: cognitive factors, interactive factors, and learner factors (p. 294).

Fluency vs. accuracy. Based on student-participant total number of errors (Appendix DD), interviews and DIs, the first underlying assumption is that meaning takes priority for some student-participants, and that the form of language had secondary importance (n=14). These findings may be viewed in light of Skehan and Foster's Limited Attentional Capacity Model. As task complexity increased when reading material was involved, participants (n=14) focused their attention on content (communication of a core message) over language form, a consequence of their limited attentional resources. From the standpoint of performance this likely translated into their attending to only one aspect of performance – fluency – at the expense of accuracy.

> When I read article, I pay attention to content the most, and I cannot concentrate on function, or grammar when I write. [Sara, the interview]

> When reading is involved in writing, I work on article [reading], and I focus on my opinion. Because it's difficult to come up with my opinion. [Yuna, DI]

As a result, student-participants' attention was on fluency, in which their priority was meaning. If some could not focus on grammar because they had to understand the reading material and compose a response (n=8), other student-participants did not think linguistic accuracy was more important than fluency. They often bypassed a pivotal role for form, since meaning could be extracted even if the sentences were ungrammatical (n=3). Student-participants believed they only needed to create sentences adequate for the communicative purpose.

> I think some incorrect grammar are not important. People can understand by reading sentences with mistakes. [Caleb, the interview]

> I acknowledge it [the error] is important when I write report or paper, but it does not affect the context or quality of my essay. [Kelly, the interview]

Writing tasks required student-participants to consider their own current linguistic knowledge

and their own knowledge of the writing genre (a reader response) (n=17).

> It was my first time to do the reader response so I didn't know how to build my essay. And it was difficult to understand what is reader response. [Lana, the interview]

> I think reading was really difficult. I don't know what the writer wants to say, he likes that or do not like that. [Peter, DI]

> It was difficult to summarize the article and it was little bit hard to get author's purpose or opinion. I understand the article, but it is just difficult. [Sam, DI]

> I have to use references from our articles in this task, though previous one was not [refers to the task which did not require reading]. Thus, it is difficult to blend articles and my ideas. Using the reference takes time to write. [Sara, the interview]

Tasks based on familiar information with clear discourse structure had low task demands

(high intermediate level, Tasks 3 and 4; advanced level, Task 2), while a task requiring

imagination and abstraction, and a complex outcome (a reader response), such as agreeing or

disagreeing (argumentation) on the topic of discussion, made much higher demands (high

intermediate level, Tasks 1, 2 and 6; advanced level, Tasks 1, 3, 5 and 6) (Appendix DD). It

could be argued that student-participants' familiarity with the subject matter, as well as with

genre and task type, plays a crucial role in how they allocate their attentional resources while

composing.

> I felt frustrated because I did not really understand the assignment. [Beth, DI]

> I could not decide easily which information from articles I would use because there were really much information this time. Not only that, it is hard to decide what I would ask in interview. When it comes to essay, I experienced difficulties in connecting several information using transition. [Kelly, DI]

> It was a long reading. That is why it was important not to lose any details to create a good thesis statement. [David, the interview]

Learners are independent agents in the language-learning process. In a sense, learning is

information-driven but it is the learner who chooses what to prioritize in that information.

Therefore, the problem-solving and decision-making nature of writing tasks translated into student-participants themselves – how they conceptualized and responded to the demands of those tasks. Task complexity also influenced student-participant perceptions of the difficulty of tasks.

> I'm really bad at article [reading]. Supporting the reasons like why I thought he [the author] was right. [Misa, DI]

> I had difficulties because I don't know how to make comments. It is difficult for me because I don't know how to form a critique. [Caleb, DI]

When student-participants were familiar with the task and topic, they made fewer errors (n=14). At the same time, those tasks were not cognitively demanding and required a simple description of events based on factual evidence.

Regarding comprehension, the resources to extract meaning from reading material that student-participants applied in their writing increased in effectiveness with practice. At the beginning, there was limited understanding of reading and its role in writing, and how to respond to reading material; however, at the end of week 16, many student-participants became familiar with reading-to-write tasks (n=12).

> In the beginning, I thought reading skill is not important when I write summary because I thought it's all about writing. But it isn't and interpreting the information accurately is more important. [Mayu, DI]

Many student-participants shared that they did not revise their drafts for grammar (n=7), and/or when some of them read before finalizing the draft for submission, they could not locate and self-revise their common errors (n=11). Getting their ideas on paper was their main purpose (n=17).

> I hardly notice whether I make a mistake while writing [Kevin, DI]

> I always have mistake about noun ending, about article, and preposition, but it is not easy to improve. When I write essay, I try but cannot recognize the error myself. [Sam, DI]

Schmidt (1990) argues that task demands may have processing implications, in terms of overloading the limited capacity system in such a way that noticing is less likely. Because of task complexity, participants could not self-revise their common errors, and found the process to be discouraging and stressful (n=9).

I feel sad because my revision skill is bad. [Misa, DI]

Self-revision is difficult. Because I don't get my errors. [Emiri, the interview]

To be honest, it wasn't easy to find the errors in an essay. I read again and again three times, but I just fixed some errors. I thought about the errors I usually have based on feedback like noun ending, article, or s+v. I thought I found and fixed them, but in reality I did not, and it is bad. [Beth, DI]

I had a lot of comments about article/grammar mistakes again. It means I couldn't focus on those mistakes, again. [Lana, DI]

I was sad because of my summary skills problems. Revising my summary is difficult for me because I have never written summary. [Caleb, the interview]

Learner factors such as motivation (or discouragement) and anxiety (or stress) are subject to temporal change, and as a result these factors may temporarily expand or reduce the learners' available ability resources, affecting L2 task performance and learning. Robinson (2001) claims that the greater the cognitive demand of a task, the more they engage cognitive resources (attention and memory), and therefore are likely to focus attention on input and output, which will have performance effects. For three student-participants (Mary, Kelly, and David) task complexity triggered more noticing of relevant forms in the input (feedback), and the problematic forms in the output (errors) leading to more incorporation (of forms in the input) and modification (of errors in writing).

Based on data analysis, it could be speculated that as the more complex task (high intermediate level, Tasks 1, 2 and 6; advanced level, Tasks 1, 3, 5 and 6) involved a more formal, less familiar topic (social issues) within a genre (reader response) that demanded higher

reasoning skills, it prompted learners to use a more formal, academic register characterized by longer and more varied sentence structure with more subordination over coordination. The student-participants' awareness of these characteristics and their efforts to meet the expectations of such a register may have loaded their working memory capacity, preventing them from simultaneously attending to linguistic accuracy demands. By the same token, cognitively less demanding tasks (high intermediate level, Tasks 3 and 4; advanced level, Tasks 2 and 4), which were assumed to deal with a subject matter more familiar and more personal (food, hometown, language teacher) within a genre that is less demanding in information organization (opinion), led student-participants to produce essays of lower syntactic complexity (less formal academic register) but of relatively higher level of accuracy (fewer errors).

Task goals. Based on student-participant DIs and interviews conducted over 16 weeks, the second underlying assumption is that the way student-participants responded to a task differed according to how they interpreted the goal of the task or according to the goal they set for themselves in relation to the task. Student-participant attitude toward writing itself played a significant role in this regard. When the student-participants were asked to define what successful writing was (how they understood writing), some mentioned *meaning* as a main factor (n=8),

> Interesting with clear ideas. [Sam, the interview]

others allocated some importance to grammar, but content was mentioned first (n=6),

> An essay is defined as good writing when the writers state their main idea clearly and use examples to support their thesis to deliver the right message to their audience. A good writing is also free of grammar and spelling errors. [Beth, the interview]

and only three student-participants found linguistic grammar to be an important factor to show the quality of writing (n=3).

First of all no mistakes, or less mistakes and grammar of course. [Peter, the interview]

I feel when grammar is wrong maybe it doesn't make sense. Reader cannot understand what the author want to say. I think it's important. [Lana, the interview]

The argument so far has been that meaning is primary, and that a range of factors such as task difficulty, student-participants' perceptions towards tasks and task goals, genre and topic familiarity, and complexity of reading material takes attention away from linguistic form when they composed.

Task complexity, revisions, and learner factors. With regard to student-participant revisions, task condition such as content feedback, which was specifically based on (1) how well reading material was incorporated into writing and (2) rhetorical purposes, also affected student-participant engagement. Student-participant content revisions were affected by learner factors (goal setting, perception of task demands, anxiety and attitude toward feedback, and vision of SLW) and context factors (pressure of other academic courses, time constraints, and reading topic) which influenced how reading material and feedback (input) was processed. These factors constrained what student-participants could attend to effectively. Common revision behaviors of ignoring feedback, deleting the material in question, revising without addressing feedback, and brief revisions were observed.

Byrnes and Manchón (2014) argue that provision and processing of feedback have an effect on task processes and task performance. Content feedback was provided first online, and then reinforced during DIs. I provided an indirect type of feedback by using "what, how, which, why" questions (e.g., what do you mean here?, how is it described in the reading?), imperatives (e.g., elaborate please, provide more details), and direct feedback (e.g., bridge, transition) on Google Docs. During the DIs, I provided explanation on how to revise content feedback. Content feedback fostered analysis, synthesis, and problem solution skills (Appendix C, V, and W).

In revising content feedback, all student-participants adopted some level of revision behavior in order to achieve the goal of task completion. The analysis shows that some student-participants adopted a more effective level of revision behavior than others, which affected their revision success and consequently learning outcome. The nature of problems and the problem-solving routes being adopted looked quite different in different student-participants, even those at roughly the same level of proficiency. The next section details different revision behaviors student-participants applied to revise content feedback, and the reasons why some student-participants were or were not effective in their revisions.

Yuna's case: Student-participant's goal setting as a response to task demands. Yuna's revision profile is outlined in Appendix AA. Although Yuna was invested in revisions and was one of the student-participants who clearly understood and realized the benefits of revisions and who critically evaluated her progress throughout the study (and who also volunteered to participate in the study even when she was not residing in the U.S.), she ignored content feedback which specifically asked her to critique the link between her writing (thesis and supporting details) and reading (the author's purpose of writing and how that particular reading explained or supported her main points):

> Draft 2: First reason is the characteristics of women. Typically, men have worked outside for themselves and their family to spend the life and women do housework because it is often said that men have power to work for a long time and women tend to be good at taking care of children. However, it has been changing gradually, and women take part in working outside more and more. According to America's government officials (cited in Galagan, 2013), about 50% of women have worked in the US (p.114). Thus, women have the chances to work outside and to be treated as men in a company or an organization. (1)

>> (1) Feedback on Google Docs: (a) It is a good paragraph, but how do these ideas describe the main objective of the essay? (b) Why are women better leaders? (c) You are saying women have equal rights and can find jobs these days easily compared to the past; however, how does this statement support your thesis? (d) What is the role of the quotation?

Final: The first reason is women's characteristic, <u>communication skill. The communication skill is one of the important ones as a leader to cheer up the atmosphere and accomplish the task with people in a workplace.</u> Typically, men work outside and women do housework because it is often said that men have power to work for a long time and women tend to be good at taking care of children; however, it has been changing gradually, and women take part in working outside more and more. According to America's government officials (cited in Galagan, 2013), about 50% of women work in the US (p.114).

As is seen from the example above, Yuna responded to the questions (a) and (b) which are about the main point "women's leadership", and she added "communication skills". However, she not only missed supporting her point of why she thought "communication skills" might be a factor to explain "women leadership", but also she did not respond to the other questions related to the reading and the quote.

When content feedback was targeted on factual revisions, that is, when Yuna could check the original article and write about it (textual revisions) without involving her analytical skills, she revised those comments; however, when feedback asked her to engage in problem-solution (abstract and critical thinking), she deleted and/or ignored the feedback.

The DIs and interview data reveal that Yuna was more concerned about reading the articles and understanding the meaning of them. During 16 weeks, her revision behavior did not change. She spent more time and energy on learning techniques to summarize the reading material, specifically choosing linguistic choices (reporting speech and verbs), and never reflected on engaging with the reading and critiquing the author's stance. In the DIs, Yuna shared that that she needed to pay attention to the reading material and reread it several times. More time was spent on understanding the reading and its purpose than on actual writing practice. Most of the questions she initiated were about whether she summarized the reading accurately. Although Yuna mentioned that she realized that without understanding the reading she could not write a good response, in practice, she was not engaged critically with the reading

material. She was an advanced learner and completed reading-to-write assignments in her academic courses. However, her attitude toward focusing on factual information did not change. In spite of the discussions, Yuna did not challenge the writers' authority (reading materials) and did not try to create her own either. What Yuna did notice, however, was an improvement in her comprehension of academic texts, and her ability to select relevant material to incorporate into her writing more quickly, two components of academic literacy that could be certainly considered critical to the development of writing:

> Getting information from an article is not easy as it seems. The reason is that I misunderstood the author's main points at first. That's why I learned that I have to read the article for a couple times to make sure I understand what they [the author] want to say in the article. Also, I sometimes wrote the points which are not necessary or related to my purpose. [November 2016, DI]

Lana's case: Student-participant's perception of task demands. Lana's revision profile is outlined in Appendix EE. If Yuna was familiar with writing assignments and had some strategies on how to incorporate reading in writing (although limited to a summary), Lana had difficulties in the cognitive demands of a writing task that involved a reading component. In order to revise content feedback, as an active learner who was concerned about her English progress, she deleted her sentences and/or paragraphs on which feedback was posted and either added new sentences and/or paragraphs, or, in some cases, did not provide any substitution.

Reading added some extra anxiety to Lana. In the example below, instead of re-reading the articles and solving the problem, Lana decided to rewrite her point. Although in her initial draft she had a stronger point to discuss (humor), she changed her idea into a generic statement (different experience), which affected the quality of her final draft.

> Draft 2: To think about characteristics, I think (1) <u>men are better to communicate with others</u> than women because of their sense of humor. It is important (2) <u>to keep the employee's motivation</u> up for leaders.
>   Feedback:

(1) How do we know? Is there any evidence in three articles that you could bring to support your idea?

(2) Why is it important?

Final: Next, to think about characteristics, men are better to communicate with others than women because of their different kinds of experiences. It is important to keep the employee's motivation up for leaders. If the employees don't work, it means the company doesn't work at all.

In the interview, Lana reflected that she changed the structure of her paragraph because she could not find examples in the readings to support her main point although one of the articles specifically discussed "humor" as a communicative strategy to improve the working environment. The extract below shows the interaction between Lana and me which also reveals another reason why Lana rewrote her paragraph:

S: Do you have this sentence?
L: Deleted
S: Why?
L: I have no idea how to support this
S: Okay, let's look at some examples, so...

[the discussion of the problem and examples of how to respond to the error was omitted]
...
S: You were talking about "humor", but I guess you deleted? [.3] right?
L: Yes
S: Did you add anything about "communicative skills"?
L: [looks at her draft](.3)
S: What do you think about this comment?
L: Hm [nodding] (.3) actually when I see this comment, it means my paragraph is not well developed, so (.3) this is (.3) another reason why I changed structure [main points] of this paragraph (.3)

As is seen from the interaction above, Lana rewrote because she perceived there was "something" wrong with her paragraph. She did not engage in solving the problem, and did not initiate a question or nor did she ask me about how to respond to and/or avoid these types of problems in the future. I conducted mini activities to instruct student-participants how to incorporate source text materials appropriately by using paraphrasing strategies for each reading

material discussed in class. When reflecting about the class activities, Lana shared that she was not able to participate at her fullest potential during those activities: "It was a little difficult for me. In class, when we read and analyze the article, it was very fast for me. It makes it difficult to follow others." [September 2016, the interview] In addition to classroom activities, the DIs were also allocated to discuss individual student-participant struggles. In the dialogue above, Lana, despite the support provided, was not participating and did not bring any examples to support her opinion. It might be concluded that Lana misunderstood or had difficulty responding to the feedback; however, in the interview, Lana confessed that she not only felt embarrassed to make a mistake, but also to ask a question. As we met more often, Lana reached the zone of comfort where she felt she "can ask much more about the comment". [October 2016, DI]

Because of the cognitive load of the task complexity Lana adopted her own formula to revise content feedback, which was rewriting and not targeting the actual problem. Lana was self-critical of her revision strategy and mentioned her concern during the DIs. Closer to the end of the study, specifically Tasks 5 and 6, Lana revised all the comments and was able to detect her problems. Not only was Lana aware that she did not respond to the article/prompt, but she also felt progress: "At first I feel a lot of work to do, but now I feel it develop my skills for writing and also it developed my confidence more." [December 2016, the interview]

Kevin's case: Anxiety toward feedback. Kevin's revision profile is described in Appendix BB. Content feedback provoked anxiety among student-participants, and Kevin's case can serve as a good example showing the relationship between writing anxiety and personality characteristics and provide justification for regarding content revisions (because reading is involved) as a distinct form of anxiety. Kevin's writing anxiety referred to a situation-specific individual difference that reflected his inclination to approach or avoid content feedback that

required major revisions (generating new sentences and paragraphs), along with his perceptions of the feedback:

> Revision was difficult and tough because, for example, the instructor give me comments from this [points to the first line of the paragraph] to the end of the paragraph. Several sentences. So I had to rewrite the whole sentence and sentence. And I had to reread the articles and reorganize the content and rewrite and then revise. I really took pains. [December 2016, the interview]

Kevin made a point about the feedback; he was also the only student-participant who resisted following feedback. It is possible that feedback could make him feel demotivated or anxious about his writing (Krashen, 1984; Truscott, 1996; Zamel, 1985). This point is illustrated by the following example.

Kevin followed two common revision strategies: deleting or ignoring the problems when he did not understand the feedback and rewriting those problems which required minimum corrections (one or two words). Nothing changed in 16 weeks; Kevin had been following the same strategies (Appendix FF). It could be assumed that Kevin had difficulty acting on the feedback, and this could have been due to language proficiency (reading) as well as motivation. It is important to note, however, that research has found motivation to be a main factor in second or foreign language achievement (Dörnyei, 2009). With low motivation, students might not take teacher feedback seriously (Guenette, 2007). For example, Hyland (1998) reported that two ESL writers became less positive about their writing during a course in which they received feedback. His findings suggest that there needs to be a more open teacher/student dialogue on feedback, because it can lead to miscommunication and decrease student motivation. Since Kevin was an advanced learner and met the university admission requirements, language proficiency could be disputed. Analysis of Kevin's engagement during DIs reveals that Kevin was not interested in developing writing skills and he never liked reading either.

> First I do not like reading books and articles, so it was little but difficult, took long time, and finely I think it is beneficial for me, read and understand and summarize and write. [September 2016, DIs]

> I do not need to write, I do not have specific imagination of future. [October 2016, DIs]

The recurring theme in Kevin's interviews was the notion of time:

> When I received comments about content, with why and how questions, and thought if I analyze [them], I have to revise whole thing. Almost whole thing. So I skip comments which require to focus and spend some time, but I fix the easy ones. [December 2016, the interview]

Kevin did not point out his serious errors, and thought he did not have errors that needed special attention. He did not have specific goals set for the writing tasks either. Although Kevin provided minimum revisions on his content and organization overall, and also he did not invest in reading for information; he was aware of his progress. Kevin did not believe he needed to improve his writing, and as a result did not invest in revisions (to learn), but he shared that the process of working on revisions was beneficial.

The last four weeks in the semester (starting week 11, and Tasks 5-6), Kevin completely ignored content feedback and argued that the feedback was incomprehensive, and he did not know how to revise because he did not understand "what" and "how" questions given in the feedback:

> Draft 1: I interviewed five students for four questions which are whether technology (1) can help students in higher education, if technology (2) has actually aided students, (3) what type of technology supports students, and what beneficial and unbeneficial aspects are.
>   Feedback:
>   (1) How? And in what? Be specific
>   (2) In what? Be specific
>   (3) What?

> Final: I asked five students about four questions which were, how technology could help students in higher education, how technology actually aided students, what type of technologies assisted students, and what a beneficial and a unbeneficial aspects were.

The interesting point to mention is that the whole course and DIs were geared toward student-participant specific issues, but Kevin never initiated any questions about content feedback and did not show interest in developing writing or revision agency.

Beth's case: Student-participant's vision of SLW and its role. Kevin did not invest in developing SLW and consciously disengaged himself; in Beth's case (Appendix K), she never envisioned SLW and its role in her academics. Although she wanted to have a bachelor's degree and *seemingly* was working toward this plan, SLW was not her main skill to improve. Beth did not actively use Google dialogues. While revising grammar errors, when she could correct the problem without any extra effort, that is based on background knowledge without checking dictionaries, she revised; when the problem was beyond her comfort zone, she either rewrote, deleted or ignored corrections. Her main strategy of working on content feedback was providing minimum revisions:

> Task 6
> Draft 1: The story take place in the New Year Eve when a Chinese family invites (1) the is guest to the party. After enjoying the Chinese food, the guests compliment the hard work that (2) Mary has done. However, her parents disagree and believe that she should have done a better job.
>   Feedback:
>   (1) Who are the guests? Add/describe them.
>   (2) Who is Mary? Have you introduced her?
>
> Final: The story takes place in the New Year Eve when a Chinese family invites their friends or their neighbors to the party. After enjoying the Chinese food, the guests compliment the hard work that Mary, a Chinese daughter, has done and says "you and the girls must have spent hours doing all that fine dicing and slicing" (Namioka, p86). However, her parents disagree and believe that she should have done a better job.

During the DIs and interviews, Beth shared that she never reflected about the role of writing in her learning, and she never payed attention to revisions. Beth revised because it was part of the course requirement.

Task complexity, revisions, and contextual factors. Some student-participants stressed the importance of developing SLW at the beginning of the study. However, their engagement with revisions showed that their beliefs were not practiced in reality; those beliefs during the semester were influenced by diverse contextual factors. Those beliefs had the greatest impact on how they approached writing tasks and revisions. The following three cases illustrate this finding in more details.

Sara's case: Pressure of academic courses defines student-participant's engagement. Sara's revision profile is described in Appendix Z. If Lana had some linguistic issues and was not familiar with how to respond to the reading material, or Yuna was more concerned with developing reading skills, Sara was one of the student-participants who did not report significant issues with task complexity and task conditions. Indeed, Sara was very confident of her reading and writing skills, and was more concerned about content than grammar feedback throughout the study. In contrast to Kevin and Beth, and despite her interest in developing writing and specifically "coherence", Sara invested in content revisions when the writing topic met her interests and writing goals (Tasks 3 and 6). She became engaged in revisions in the middle of the study (end of October 2016, Task 3). There were two reasons why Sara decided to invest in the IEP writing course. During the interviews, she reflected that she was interested in the topic of gender issues, and the topic itself motivated her to revise Task 3.

Sara was also interested in learning how to write reports, and thus she found Task 6 fulfilled her writing goal. Other topics did not interest her and as a result she had struggles when composing, because she could not formulate any ideas to write. The second main factor, however, which affected her revisions and full participation in the IEP writing course, was her anxiety experienced in academic classes: "I did not concentrate on writing task as other academic

106

classes were really busy, so I just read the comment then believe I understand it. But the first time until October maybe, it was really nervous for me in that class [300 level academic course]." [November 2016, the interview] When Sara, in her own words, "acclimated" herself to the culture and demands of academic courses, and had enough time to revise, she focused on IEP writing tasks (but specifically Tasks 3 and 6). It must be stressed that when Sara found the link between IEP and academic writing tasks, she realized the importance of revisions.

Sara not only demonstrated a high level of awareness of her actions and was self-critical of her performance, but she also felt "sorry" for providing minimum revisions (one word and/or clause revisions) for the first seven weeks. During the DIs, Sara confessed that she did not think about her errors and did not reflect upon her revisions.

> I did not concentrate on writing task as other academic classes were really busy, so I just read comment then I believe I understand this one. [September 2016, DI]

> I revise it as quick as possible not to spend time. [October 2016, DI]

> I revised, because the instructor point out my mistake, I just revise my mistake, but I did not think about why I have used this one, or why I have this mistake. [December 2016, the interview]

When Sara was not interested in content revisions, she ignored the problem and rewrote by adding new sentences. For instance, in the extract below, the content feedback was composed of three questions, and Sara paid attention to the first part of the question "how" and did not consider the second "how is it reported in the article" question:

> Task 1
> Draft 1: Also, (1) <u>using the technology too much will be unhealthy for our brain.</u> It will hurt our brain and it makes us difficult to express our feeling and even tell others with our languages. Therefore, we should know our limits of using the technology not to hurt our lives.
> Feedback:
> (1) How? How is it reported in the article? What does the author think about this point?

Final: Also, using the technology too much will be obstacles to forget how to use our verbal skills and emotions. Technology made worse our communication skills for the others directly. We should consider the amount of using this high quality system, technology in our lives and know we depend on it too much.

During the DIs, Sara reflected that she understood the questions, but did not have time to reread the article and work on other questions. Based on her revisions, it could be concluded that she might not respond directly to the feedback, but she knew her problems, and she corrected them with minimum effort. For Tasks 3 and 6, Sara not only revised all her problems, but she was also engaged during DIs when those tasks were discussed. Moreover, Sara rewrote Task 6 several times (the same errors were revised twice based on content feedback), because she was not satisfied with her revisions (Appendix GG).

Sara stands in sharp contrast to other student-participants because she was aware of her progress and knew she was not responding appropriately to feedback:

I always until October, the instructor comment something about content, and I just revise it. I just follow her comment and revise it, but now I can add my opinion and respond to feedback. Content is one feedback that we, students should consider about, as I said before in addition to the instructor comment, I should mix my idea and create new idea. [December 2016, the interview]

Veronica's case: Time constraints define revision behavior. Veronica, similar to Sara, prioritized writing tasks in her academic classes. Veronica did not have linguistic constraints and was used to reading-to-write tasks (Appendix R); however, in her reflections she pointed out that she first revised grammar and the easy errors (based on background knowledge), and then revised the complex problems. Veronica classified content revisions as a complex process which required her to think and write more, and because of time constraints she prioritized academic courses. Although Veronica was one of the student-participants who not only "loved", but also "enjoyed" writing, she had to focus on particular aspects of the course that had immediate connection to her academic classes:

I like writing, and I think it's for me good exercise to be here [the IEP writing course], not only speaking but also writing, because most of my courses, I have exams. And another one I have always essays, summaries of articles or texts we read, and I also have a term paper and the presentation. I have to say what helped me a lot is that my term paper was really bad, not reliable, he [refers to the professor in academic course] did not help me at all. If I had not have this course [the IEP writing course], I would not know how to use APA style. I mean I think I made some mistakes probably, but I felt more safe. [November 2016, the interview]

The interesting factor to point out is that Veronica put all her effort in understanding and learning how to use APA style (because it was new information) and how to correct "wordy" sentences (because other professors pointed out that issue as well). All the comments that targeted those writing issues were revised.

Ruowen's case: Reading topics demotivate and disengage. Ruowen's revision profile is described in Appendix HH. Ruowen was one of the student-participants who did not find the reading materials interesting. Her common revising strategy was to provide only one or two word substitutions. During the DIs, "coherence" issues were discussed in detail; however, Ruowen never changed her strategy. She thought "bridge" problems were "transition words and adverbs", and substituting "however" with "because" was a significant change. Although "bridge" examples were discussed and many activities were conducted in class, Ruowen never targeted learning about "bridge" problems.

Ruowen actually understood the importance of working on coherence. She shared that connecting the sentences and providing the connection between what she thought and the original article was necessary. However, she did not practice it in reality. Instead, Ruowen provided corrections by adding a word or two words which were synonymous to the original version:

Task 3
Draft 2: As it is known to us all, men have being leaders for a long time since ancient age. (1) <u>In China, almost every emperor and chairman is male.</u> (2) <u>Actually,</u> compared with women, man are more decisive than women.
    Feedback
    (1) Would you elaborate on this point?
    (2) Bridge
Final: As it is known to us all, men have been leaders for a long time since an ancient age. In China, almost every emperor and chairman is male <u>such as Zedong Mao, Xiaoping Deng and the present chairman Jinping Xi.</u> <u>In addition</u>, compared with women, men are more decisive compared with women.

The content feedback that required major work or addition of new sentences was ignored because of other courses: "I think if I'm free it's okay to revise, but I have classes and I should prepare for them. So revisions will maybe take a little time." [December 2016, the interview] What Ruowen meant by "little time" was spending less time on revisions.

Ruowen, compared to Veronica, was not interested in developing writing, and compared to Sara, did not think she would need SLW for her future academic studies. Ruowen considered writing practice as one of the ways to learn the language in general, and, similar to Sara and Veronica, prioritised her academic courses (engineering courses).

Sara's, Ruowen's, and Veronica's cases could be discussed from perspectives of learner beliefs. Kalaja and Barcelos' assumption that learners are not necessarily consistent in their beliefs across domains and situations can be seen as dynamic perspective on beliefs (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011; Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003). In other words, beliefs are not always consistent with each other, and actions are not always consistent with those beliefs. For Sara and Veronica, SLW was connected to their future employability. Ruowen believed in developing SLW, but she strongly believed her math skills would compensate for her gaps in English when she was in the job market or even if she decided to continue to graduate school. In Sara's and Veronica's cases,

developing SLW was instrumental and personally significant; however their immediate social context (academic courses) challenged their beliefs.

Sara felt anxiety towards her academic classes. During the interviews, she shared that she audiotaped all her lectures, and asked other international students in class to assist with course requirements. Sara framed her learning experience as one who does not understand and because she is an L2 learner, it must be considered "hard" and other "professors must understand her struggles". Barcelos and Kalaja (2011) state that beliefs are intrinsically related to other affective constructs such as emotions and self-concept, and that beliefs are mediated by their affective dimensions in leading to action (pp. 285-286). Similarly, Sara's emotions and self-concept led her to prioritize academic courses.

For Ruowen, even though she had some struggles in her academic courses, she did not believe they were detrimental to her overall learning. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) made a point that belief has long had an emotional dimension, and thus, those beliefs that are deeply entrenched, to which learners feel some form of emotional attachment, and which they consider central to their self-concept, are less susceptible to change. Ruowen was positive about her math skills, and she never feared being judged based on her English skills. At the interviews, she always stressed that her academic skills and math would work as a bandage to "cover" her linguistic faults, if the time came when she would be evaluated by her SLW skills. It could be assumed that student-participants' beliefs are personal convictions about various facets of L2 learning, a view which fits easily into the narrative accounts that they create about themselves to organize and understand their L2 learning experiences. Nothing changed in Ruowen's beliefs about SLW over nine months. It is important to note that professors in her academic courses evaluated her progress based on concepts and not on how she framed her ideas, and not based on linguistic

accuracy. Barcelos and Kalaja (2011) state that beliefs are other-oriented, and the construction of beliefs, both the incorporation of new beliefs and the consolidation of older ones, is influenced by interaction with other people (pp. 285-286). Ruowen's immediate social context also affected her beliefs about SLW, which might have been influenced by interaction with other people with whom she was in contact. In the words of Ruowen, her professors "exercised tolerance" toward her SLW and errors because solving a math problem was more significant.

Sara's, Ruowen's, and Veronica's revision behaviors could be attributed to their beliefs about themselves and how they were able to adjust those beliefs in response to ongoing learning situations. These student-participants did not ignore the IEP writing course or revisions, but they differed in level of engagement, which affected their SLW development in the longer term.

Summary. It must be admitted that a few student-participants did not invest in the IEP writing course, and were either engaged in searching for ways to secure their legal status in the country (e.g., looking for a job), or were more interested in being engaged in social life. For example, Rikuto was not interested in revisions. His common strategies were either deleting or ignoring errors. He was also the only student-participant who did not post questions on Google Docs, and was always hesitant to attend DIs, which he often rescheduled. When content feedback required major revisions, Rikuto skipped those problems. When he attended the DIs, he was a passive recipient to my endeavors to engage him in the dialogue of his common errors. At the end of our interactions, Rikuto would initiate questions on how to find a job, or would share his experiences of job interviews, and would hope I would share some useful tips. Another student-participant, Mayu, who valued content feedback and always asked to post content feedback because it was more beneficial than grammar feedback, invested in learning more about the target culture and community than working on her writing issues. To the questions why she

ignored or deleted content revisions, she would always respond "I did not have time because I spent time with friends." Mayu and some other student-participants found that developing speaking skills was easier and faster than writing skills at the end of the study (16 weeks). For example, Reika and Emiri shared that they always looked for opportunities to be involved in campus activities where they could have chances to meet native speakers of English. The cases of Rikuto, Mayu, Reika, and Emiri show that the relationship between beliefs and actions is not simple and casual but dynamic, mediated by interpretations of one's own actions, emotions, and self-concept (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011, pp. 285-286).

Some student-participants kept balance and revised both content and grammar feedback equally and seriously. Although they had challenges (task complexity and understanding feedback), they were focused on learning (Yuna, David, Mary, Kelly, and Caleb), and finding strategies to resolve their errors (Mary and Peter), despite the fact that they also expressed some affective emotions toward writing task demands. Dörnyei, Henry, and Muir (2016) argue that learners need to perceive that their skills match the demands of the task. The important factor is not simply having sufficient capabilities, but rather achieving a challenge-skill balance. Finding this balance is not the degree of the actual task demands or an objective level of abilities, but rather what the learner believes these to be. These student-participants did not focus on the task difficulty, but rather focused on resolving their errors (both content and grammar).

Although all the student-participants experienced a number of challenges during the semester (16 weeks), there had been a great deal of discussion about how to enhance reading comprehension (Yuna, Mary, and Lana), how to respond to reading (Mary and Kelly), and how to incorporate source text materials appropriately (Yuna, Mary, Caleb, Veronica, and Sara). Reading-to-write tasks also led to inappropriate, misleading, or irrelevant textual borrowing

when some student-participants were not aware of the cultural norms governing textual appropriation (Beth, Peter, David, Reika, Emiri, and Rikuto) or lacked the language skills necessary to paraphrase source texts within the time limits (Reika, Emiri, and Mayu). At the same time, topic familiarity, reading comprehension skills (Kevin and Sam), L2 proficiency, and the complexity of the source texts (Lana and Misa) also contributed to the difficulty of responding to content feedback. Finally, another challenge worth noting was student-participants' understanding of the writing tasks and its requirements (n=7).

All these factors affected student-participant engagement to successfully accomplish content revisions:

(1) The way student-participants responded to a task differed according to how they interpreted the goal of the task or according to the goal they set for themselves in relation to the task (fluency vs. accuracy). Individual differences played a significant role in this regard.

(2) Writing tasks contained a set of components that needed to be addressed by the student-participants during the processes involved in drafting and revising. The relationship between the components of the task, the processes involved in writing, and the goals of the task were mediated by the revision behavior that the student-participants adopted during the act of revising (e.g., deleting, ignoring, and rewriting).

(3) Task performance depends on the cognitive complexity of the task, the conditions under which the task has to be performed (feedback), and learner factors, such as attitude, motivation, and anxiety (Ellis, 2003; Robinson, 1995, 2007; Schmidt, 1990; Skehan, 1998), as well as contextual factors such as academic courses, university life, and time constraints.

(4) Participants may hold different, even contradictory, beliefs about writing and revisions at different times, influenced by diverse personal and contextual factors. The

relationship between beliefs and actions is not simple and casual but dynamic, mediated by interpretations of the student-participants' own actions, emotions, and self-concept (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011; Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003).

(5) Student-participant beliefs shape approaches to revisions.

The case of nine months: Why do student-participants make the same number of errors? The motivation for studying in an English medium university is presumably not only to gain a degree but also to improve English language proficiency (n=17). Studying in an English-medium university provided student-participants with a rich immersion environment (n=17). They were all (n=17) excited to develop their writing skills (August 2016). However, when looking at their Post-task 2 (April 2017), it is obvious that the majority made a similar number of errors compared to Task 1 (n=3), some had made more errors (n=4), and few had improvements (n=3). In Post-task 1 (December 2016), conducted in a short period of time (16 weeks), after intensive revisions, many student-participants had made significantly fewer errors compared to their Task 1 (n=13), others made fewer errors (n=2), and a few did not have any changes (n=2). The analysis of written texts shows that student-participants' writing improved after nine months of study but only in terms of fluency (both idea generation and word count), and changes in accuracy (number of linguistic errors) fell short (Appendix DD).

Analysis of interviews and DIs show that student-participants' perceptions of the task difficulty and of the importance of SLW for their future studies were predictors of writing gain. The lack of opportunity to produce extended writing and to receive feedback on writing during the second phase of study (Spring 2017) is another reason for lack of improvement in SLW, despite immersion in the L2 university environment (except Peter, who had extended writing and

worked with tutors at the writing center to improve his drafts). Also, the lack of opportunity to engage with the L2 language community accounted for a lack of improvement. All 10 student-participants were living with those who shared L1. The following discussion is based on 10 student-participants who continued to the second phase of the study (August 2016 to Spring 2017).

   Student-participant perceptions of post-task difficulty. Most of the student-participants (n=7) shared that time was the first factor that influenced their writing accuracy. Some spent time on reading the article and finding key points (n=6), others focused on choosing points and ways of connecting the reading and writing (n=4), a few were indecisive in choosing the genre of response (n=2), and finally, the majority debated about specific supporting details (n=8). Only two student-participants had time to self-revise for grammar. Others prioritized content and ignored grammar revisions (n=8). For example, Ruowen stated:

> I think difficult part is about read the article and find the key points. Because I spend a lot of time and I should to decide what I will write. So I should, like arrange it, like to find what I should use in this paragraph and what should I write in next paragraph. Another is that when I'm writing I should change some words to academic words. [April 2017, the interview]

   Student-participant perceptions of the importance of SLW for future studies. At the beginning of the study (Fall 2016), the student-participants expressed the feeling that writing was important for their future (n=10); however, when pressed they were not able to expand on this viewpoint further and referred instead to the general importance of improving this skill (n=6). As time passed (Spring 2017), they also talked little about any concrete future plans to continue to progress as L2 writers (n=7). Peter, Yuna, Sara, and Ruowen were the only student-participants who had visions for developing SLW although they had unique learning trajectories.

Length of assignments and feedback. Most of the student-participants (n=7) reported that they did little or a small amount of writing in Spring 2017. Appendix II summarizes the results and student-participant reports about the length of their assignments. Among all of them, Sara and Yuna had no writing. They shared that writing was involved only in open-ended questions which did not require them to write more than 100 words. Both reported a lack of writing tasks compared to their intensive course load and writing assignments in Fall 2016, when they had to write 7-10 pages for one assignment in one course.

Taken together, the results of the interviews show that throughout Spring 2017 most student-participants (n=7) did not write much for their academic classes. A closer examination of the data also revealed that the majority of student-participants who had little writing wrote reflection and summary types of assignments and the word count did not exceed 200 words for one task. Some student-participants reflected that they did not have a "serious task" to write that semester (n=6). The serious task was articulated as being "argumentation", "problem and solution", and "reader response".

Student-participants were also asked whether professors commented on their written assignments. All student-participants who had little writing (n=7) stated they did not receive comments on the quality of their writing. For example, Emiri commented that:

> I don't think teacher cares about my writing. Because teacher just say like three pages or like two pages, or one page to write and then give like A, or B+ on the corner of the paper. So it's just like that, it's done. It's called writing assignment. [April 2017, the interview]

Some student-participants had a positive attitude toward not receiving feedback, while others felt discouraged. For example, Mayu believed that no feedback was better than having one:

> This semester teachers do not give feedback, and they just want to know my opinion. [March 2017, the interview]

Whereas Rikuto did not question a lack of it:

Feedback is good, but it is also useful for more serious tasks. This semester I do not write serious tasks, it's only reflections. [April 2017, the interview]

However, another student-participant, Reika was upset that she was not receiving feedback:

Feedback needs to be pointed, highlighted. If it is highlighted it raises motivation to work. When I have questions, teachers must reply to those questions, because it helps me understand and work. But I feel less motivated when I do not receive answers this semester. [May 2016, the interview]

Misa, on the other hand, was indifferent:

The last semester when I wrote something and teacher gave feedback, I have to like search or think by myself. But now, the teacher just corrects the paper. So after I get feedback, I don't really pay attention. And also in the last writing class, I did drafting for two or three times. But now, writing is just one draft, so teacher feedback is the end. I do not need to revise. [April 2017, the interview]

Self-perception of improvement or lack thereof. Most student-participants (n=9) mentioned that before commencing their degree they presumed that studying at an L2- medium university would improve their SLW. This assumption led them to be passive recipients in their own learning. Many of them did not self-regulate their own learning strategies. Only one of the student-participants, Peter, worked towards learning about SLW and improving this skill. Others (n=7) did not think of SLW as a separate skill to learn and considered it as a part of English comprehension overall. Although the majority understood the role of SLW (n=6), they were not involved in the process. For example, for Beth, developing L2 academic writing was essential for her academic success, since she planned to reside in the country, but because of her personal issues, she could not invest in developing this skill:

I think about how to get job and what I would need to get that job. [March 2017, the interview]

Based on Beth's interviews, she did not need to write for the job she had at that time (April 2017) in a nail studio; also she was taking care of her younger cousin (6 years old) while her aunt

was working. In her interviews, Beth connected SLW to developing academic vocabulary, but never mentioned strategies for improving her academic vocabulary. In Beth's case, her wish to develop did not turn into action, because she was caught up in the immediate context of her family. When asked about SLW and her progress, she said:

> Writing is making yourself relaxed and do not focus too much. [April 2017, the interview]

All the student-participants (n=10) believed that their writing skills had improved over 9 months of their study, with academic writing style (paragraph structure and organization) (n=10) and reading strategies (n=6) being the most frequently cited areas. However, only some student-participants (n=5) were of the opinion that their grammatical accuracy improved during their study.

The student-participants who believed they had progressed attributed their improvement to the IEP writing course (n=10), the instructor's feedback, specifically DIs (n=8), revision processes (n=10), reading articles (n=4), intensive writing practice (n=7), and self-revisions (n=4). For example, Reika explained her improvement in terms of "taking time to work on writing, doing review, writing a lot" as being important and helpful. It helped her to get used to writing in English. [May 2017, the interview]. Another participant, Beth reflected that she "could self-revise" when she wrote because she "was more attentive and concentrated on verb and adjective problems", her "common errors" she learned she had [September 2017, the interview].

Another reason mentioned by a number of student-participants (n=8) for perceived improvement in writing was the requirement to produce reading-to-write assignments. Many commented on increased fluency and less amount of time spent on responding to the writing task (n=7) compared to Fall 2016. All attributed this change to the intensive practice in the IEP writing course taken in Fall 2016. Their fluency increased significantly in Fall 2016, suggesting

that the student-participants were able to produce more words within the same allotted time. The increase in fluency could also be attributed to the fact that they knew how to approach their writing tasks, and had writing opportunities inside and outside the academic context (e.g., using social media) and thus had not only a greater word knowledge to draw on when writing, but also increased efficiency in retrieving this vocabulary.

The student-participants who believed that their writing accuracy did not improve (n=4) attributed this mainly to the number of errors, lack of practice in writing (Spring 2017) or the dearth of feedback on their language use. Mayu claimed that her grammar did not improve but she learned to self-revise before submitting any task. Emiri and Sara shared that they revised their assignments for spelling and not for grammar as they were of the opinion that professors would not focus on grammar.

Lack of opportunity to engage with the L2 community. Research shows that positive attitudes toward the L2 language community may encourage learners to interact with native speakers and thus provide more opportunities for receiving comprehensible input and producing output (Serrano, Tragant, & Llanes, 2012). In addition, L2 learners who are living with English-speaking people show more improvement in lexical richness than those who are living with one or more shared L1 speakers. Student-participants (n=10) had little opportunity for actual contact with speakers of the target language, and all resided with international students who shared their L1. All the student-participants had a positive image of the target community; however, daily academic struggles, course requirements (task complexity and reading) and personal issues played an important role in student-participants' engagement with a target group.

Some student-participants had group projects (n=3) in which they were paired with target language speakers and occasional "get togethers", but they were limited in number (e.g., once in

3-4 weeks). For example, Peter did a peer review, but felt he was not helping his peer to improve his draft. That peer review was the first and the last in which Peter was paired with a target language speaker; in other occasions, he worked with other L2 speakers. In Ruowen's case, when she worked on a lab report, the group members did not need to meet, and everybody did his/her own part, and communicated via emails. A few volunteered at a Japanese language school (n=2) in the hope of meeting more people, but because of the demanding schedule, were more absorbed in writing the lesson plans. Some student-participants did not look for ways to interact (n=3) because of their perceived limited speaking proficiency although they were proficient speakers.

Beth stands in sharp contrast to the others, because she not only had to comply with course requirements, but also had family duties after school. Beth had to take care of her cousin, and would "run" to pick her up after school. When she was asked what she did to improve her English after the classes, she responded that she talked to her cousin (6 years old; Spring 2017), who knew English as a native speaker. In two and half years, nothing changed in Beth's schedule, except she had started helping her other Vietnamese friends, also university students, with transportation and would take her aunt's shift on weekends at the nail studio. She gladly performed her duties because she believed she had more chances to interact with target language speakers than in her classes. Those who did not have family responsibilities had academic anxiety. Many of them would reach out to other international students and engage in study groups (n=4).

The majority stayed in their own created communities with people sharing their culture and language (L1), or with other L2 speakers with whom they did not share L1 culture or language. When asked to count in percentages how much time they allocated to speaking in L1,

121

many responded between 50-80% a day. English constituted 20-50% a day, and reading in L2 was cited the most (n=8) among English skills. Only one of the participants, Peter, invested in finding ways to engage with the target community.

Based on student-participants' responses, it could be argued that they all were motivated to learn from and engage with the target population since it was the driving force to come to study where they could speak English; however, when access to the target community was not easily granted, some of them did not invest in opportunities to engage with the target community. Norton Peirce (1995) proposed the construct of "investment" to complement constructs of motivation in the field of language learning as better capturing the complex relationship between a learner's motivation and his/her willingness to use the L2. Norton uses the term to signal the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners with the target language, and their often "ambivalent desire to learn and practice it" (2013, p. 6). A sense of self is closely tied to the investment and the envisioned future and one's role in it. Given limited time and specific priorities at a particular point in their lives, student-participants invested their time and energy in learning the target language in relation to the particular aspects that were important in their envisioned futures. This finding is discussed in detail in the next section by portraying two cases.

Why is it important to develop L2 writer revision agency? This section describes two student-participants – Ruowen's and Peter's engagement and their revision agency. I followed Peter for two and half years, whereas Ruowen decided to leave the university after a year. Their stories show two different investments. Peter invested in finding ways to engage with SLW. In contrast, Ruowen did not find it important. While the day-to-day realities of student-participants' learning experiences were the function of multiple factors related to diverse aspects of the learning environment and student-participants' personal lives, Peter had a vision of becoming a

122

member of the target community. On the contrary, Ruowen did not get access to the target community. Peter's overall persistence and his imagination of becoming a successful L2 writer – the Ideal Self (Dörnyei, 2009) – acted as a strong driving force that stimulated him during his L2 learning process, resulting in ultimate language attainment. However, Ruowen failed in developing her agency because she did not find it important to invest in developing her writing skills.

The reason for discussing these two cases is (1) to show that SLW is dynamic and bound to contextual factors; (2) to describe that student-participants varied enormously with regard to revision strategies, as well as affective factors such as writing anxiety, attitude, and investment; (3) to explain that the vision of the L2 writer an individual wants to be seem to be one of the most reliable predictors of long-term commitment and effort; and finally (4) to claim that a social situation changes over time, and this change affects the student-participant characteristics operating within that context, and these characteristics are further affected by their continuous interaction with other student-participant personal factors.

Effective revisions but limited investment – momentum engagement: Ruowen's case.
Ruowen's revision profile is decribed in Appendix HH. Ruowen was a 22 year old female from China, majoring in Electrical Engineering. At the time of the study, she had been in the U.S. for only one month. She showed great enthusiasm for participating in the study. She expressed excitement by saying,"I want to improve my writing skill and write some wonderful articles. It's important for my future plans because I want to go to Hong Kong as a graduate student". [August 2016, the interview] She reported 12 years of instruction in English with a major emphasis on grammar and translation of written texts (2-3 sentences). In comparing her English classes in China and those in the U.S., Ruowen shared that her middle and high school classes

included grammar instruction and that her teachers emphasized grammar and mechanics the most. She felt that increasing her vocabulary and complexity of sentence structure would make her become a better writer in English. Ruowen was also self-conscious about her writing skills and shared that her "writing was very poor". [September 2016, the interview]

Ruowen's revision style could be categorized as mechanical. Her revisions did not translate into her understanding and feeling that it was better for her English proficiency. The attempts to understand the error were not found compared to Mary, who always tried to understand and avoid making the same errors. Ruowen's participation during DIs, in online dialogues while drafting, and with revision processes confirm her mechanical engagement (Appendix HH).

Revision requires effort and continuous engagement. Moreover engagement is tightly connected to goals which give direction and purpose to a particular action. Accordingly, as is seen in Appendix HH.2., Ruowen had a very clear sense of direction at the beginning of the course and wanted to learn about her strengths and weaknesses in writing. As weeks passed, Ruowen did not structure her SLW experience by channeling attention to work on her challenges she perceived she had; rather, her writing goals constituted the end in themselves. Ruowen was engaged in revising her problems, but she was not interested in having a plan to overcome them. There was a disconnect among her planned goals and the aspects she worked on while revising, and the errors she perceived she had after finishing the writing tasks. What is more dramatic was that Ruowen pointed out repeatedly "verb tense, verb choice, and bridge problems" as her serious problems in all 4 tasks (Tasks 1-4), even for the tasks in which she did not have those errors (Task 3). Setting a goal for each writing task is merely half of the battle; for students to fully engage with the goal and take real ownership of drafting and revising, it needs to concern

issues that are meaningful and of value to them and their personal learning. Ruowen was a present-oriented learner and never reflected about her academic goals for the future, and could not situate SLW as her main purpose either at the beginning or at the end of the academic year (9 months).

Students who are able to link their current behavior with its future implications are more willing and resolute when engaging in non-interesting yet essential activities than their present-oriented peers (Time Perspective theoretical approach, Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). When she was asked directly, Ruowen could not formulate specific answers about her writing goals. Instead, in her interviews, Ruowen described how she devoted large proportions of her time and energy to learning her major after her arrival at the university. Although she knew from the start that her goal was to become knowledgeable in her field and learn how American universities teach engineering courses, she was surprised at how this goal seemed to completely dominate her activities and thoughts. Throughout the first semester (16 weeks), she was more concerned that she was spending a significant amount of her time on revisions when she could have concentrated on her academic classes:

> I think correction is such a thing I should spend lots of time on it. [September 2016, the interview]

> I was in class, but recently when I am in class, these days, I have other tests, so I do not have time to review it, so I am sorry. [October 2016, DI]

> Fixing [errors] I think it's positive, but I cannot pay more time in correcting. So I feel the time is so tight because I have other classes...I think if I'm free it's okay [revising] but like I have classes and I should prepare for them. So it [revising] will take a little time. [December 2016, the interview]

Time was the only factor that Ruowen mentioned when she was reflecting about writing and revisions. Ruowen did not connect revisions to her success to learning and developing a

language, particularly writing skills. If Peter predicted his success through developing

proficiency in L2 academic writing, Ruowen did not invest in strengthening her English skills:

> I'm not sure. I think the writing in this class will help me to correct my reports from mistake. Maybe someday I will have to write a paper in English or I can use some skills learned in this class to finish my paper. I'm not sure. [December 2016, the interview]

Although Ruowen was uncertain about the significance of the writing class for her future plans,

she was also doubtful about the usefulness of revisions because of her past experience with

feedback in China. Ruowen reflected that she had been making the same errors:

> I think every time I correct my article [meaning essay], I will find new problem, so it is every time. [November 2016, the interview]

After 9 months, at the final interview, Ruowen confessed that she truly did not pay attention to

feedback, and she revised as fast as possible without thinking about her errors and did not reflect

about the reasons why she committed those errors. Because the IEP writing course was heavily

built on reading and critical thinking, Ruowen felt disengaged from day-to-day class activities

and could not find the importance of reading in the writing class. Although I planned to raise

genre awareness and mentioned in every meeting that they were using different type of genres to

learn about writing strategies and rhetorical and lexico-grammar techniques that the writers use

to engage readers, Ruowen was uncertain about the value of those reading texts. The activities on

language structures (word choices, verb choices, sentence types and types of organization)

conducted in class did not help Ruowen to see the value of reading for writing either:

> I don't pay attention to the reading [laughing]. Because I think it's just the reading. My feeling is there are too many materials [reading]. I'm confused. Which should I use or should not. After this class and the next class there are also many materials to read. [December 2016, the interview]

The vision of the L2 user an individual wants to be, as Dörnyei, Henry, and Muir (2016) claim, seems to be one of the most reliable predictors of long-term commitment and effort. Although Ruowen put some effort into her revisions, she did not develop the vision of an ideal L2 writer.

After completing the program at the university, Ruowen had planned to take an English proficiency test in China (she was reluctant to share details about the test). She devoted her second semester to learning new vocabulary. The test had a writing portion, but Ruowen was not concerned about the writing and practice, and believed she could learn by heart the common scripts and reproduce them during the exam: "I mean writing that test is like you can use some good examples and I think I will recite them in August or September." [April 2017, the interview]

During her stay at the university, Ruowen did not try to get access to the community. The only time she spoke English was when she had questions and needed to approach the professors or when she worked on group projects, but again there was little interaction. Most of her free time she spent with Chinese speaking students on campus. Norton (2000) argues that language learners need access to the social networks of target language speakers in order to practice and improve the target language; on the other hand, they have difficulty gaining access to these networks because common language is an a priori condition of entry into them. In Ruowen's case, she lacked confidence in her speaking skills and thus did not look for ways to meet the target group. When I first met Ruowen, I was surprised that she was interested in developing her speaking skills in the writing class. In the survey questions regarding how writing was taught in a home country, Ruowen wrote that little time was devoted in developing speaking and listening skills in China. In the final interview (May 2017, 9th month), when we talked about her living experience at the university and progress in learning English, Ruowen felt that she had made

significant progress in learning vocabulary and speaking. To explain her progress, Ruowen drew

a distinction between being "happy" and being able to "communicate" with the target group:

> I think in speaking, I have a little improvement. I'm happy [laughing]. Because I can communicate with other people better. Because I learned some words that I didn't know before I came here [the university] and I can use it [them] in my speaking. [May 2017, the interview]

Nevertheless, she was well aware that opportunities to practice English were not readily

accessible out of class and group projects: "I speak in English but not too much. I just meet

American friends in some party, but I don't have time spent with American friends." [May 2017,

the interview]

Despite the fact that she understood the importance of practicing her English in order to

become more fluent, she did not have much opportunity to meet native speakers outside her

school situation, and the low self-concept about her speaking skills also created a major obstacle.

Ruowen did not look into possibilities of meeting and building connections, in contrast to Peter.

Whenever she had some time, she spent it with her Chinese friends speaking Chinese. The same

pattern of disengagement was also observed in her reflections about the IEP writing course.

Ruowen could not specify what she remembered from the class.

Dörnyei proposes L2 Motivational Self System theory which is centered on a key

premise rooted in understanding that the way in which language learners imagine themselves in

the future plays an important role in energizing their learning behavior in the present (2005,

2009). Ruowen did not envision or sense her future by investing in writing and revisions.

Ruowen stands in sharp contrast to Peter and Mary, because her L2 learning experience was

rooted in her present rather than her imagined future experience, covering a range of situated,

executive motives related to the immediate learning environment, such as the impact of the

feedback, the course materials and organization, peer work, and her past experience with teacher

feedback and SLW in China. Ruowen did not want to fail the course; therefore, she performed

mechanical revisions without learning and understanding her errors and gaps in SLW. Ruowen's

L2 revision experience was *momentum* which explains why she could not self-revise her errors in

the Post-tasks (Appendices DD and HH) .

 Ruowen's engagement with revisions: Errors. Ruowen has progressed from Task 1 to

Post-task 1, and in Post-task 2 she kept a similar number of errors, but in Post-task 3 she had

more mistakes compared to Post-task 1 and Post-task 2, but relatively fewer than Task 1. The

reason she had more errors in her Post-task 3 could be attributed to the fact that she did not

practice writing in her second semester (Spring 2017), and did not have writing tasks in her

academic courses (Engineering). Although Ruowen was given extra time to self-revise Post-task

3, she was not able to locate her errors. Another explanation of Ruowen's errors could be

attributed to her revision practices she had followed during the 16-week intensive writing and

revision cycle (Fall 2016) which are described further in more detail.

 While working on lexical errors, Ruowen was hesitant to work on feedback about verb

choice, and in many cases ignored revisions:

> Task 1 (September 2016)
> Draft 1: In another word, just as <u>Talyor says,</u> it preventing kids from developing even
> basic communication.
> Draft 2: In another word, just as <u>Taylor says,</u> it preventing kids from developing even
> basic communication.
> Final: In another word, just as <u>Taylor said,</u> it prevents kids from developing even basic
> communication.

When asked about the reasons of not attempting to revise the error, Ruowen reflected that she

did not pay attention because "it's a small error". Ruowen did not consider "verb choice" as an

error. During DI, Ruowen said that "say" was not a reporting verb, and admitted that she did not

need to revise that error, because it was not a serious error. Ruowen ignored all "verb choice"

errors in Task 1, as well as in Task 2 (September 2016):

> Draft 2: "Face time vs.screen time" written by Chandra Johnson starts the article by
> <u>talking </u>about Marc Brackett, a director of Yale University's Center for Emotional
> Intelligence.
> Final: "Face Time vs.Screen Time" <u>talks</u> about Marc Brackett, a director of Yale
> University's Center for Emotional Intelligence.

Although "verb choice" was discussed repeatedly in classes and many activities were conducted

on how other writers used "verb choices" (close reading of articles for "verb choices"), and the

files, graphs, and tables on "verb choice" examples and grammar structures were posted in the

Google folder and also were printed out and distributed to all student-participants, Ruowen did

not find it important to invest in revising "verb choices".

Ruowen obviously had problems with all comments that started with "verb form, verb

choice, verb tense" throughout the semester (16 weeks, Fall 2016). In the example below,

Ruowen revised the "verb choice" as a "verb form". The same pattern is observed in all her

tasks:

> Task 3 (October 2016)
> Draft 2: On the contrary, though Diego is ambitious and sees himself as a future leader in
> the ESL world, there is no denying that he <u>is lack of</u> work experience.
> Final: On the contrary, though Diego is ambitious and sees himself as a future leader in
> the ESL world, there is no denying that he <u>was lack of</u> work experience.

In the interviews, Ruowen reflected that she focused on the first part of the term "verb" and did

not pay attention to the rest of the comment ("form/choice" part). Also, it was hard for her to

remember all the codes and new terminology. Ruowen learned English grammar in Chinese, by

using Chinese terminology.

In week 13, Ruowen realized that "verb choice" was important to consider in academic

papers. In Task 5 (November 2016), Ruowen did not have many errors, and corrected all of them

except the "verb choice". Ruowen reflected that she did not know how to correct and thus

ignored. Only by the end of week 16, in Task 6 (December 2016), Ruowen corrected "verb

choice and verb form" problems, and she did not mix them when she revised compared to her

previous tasks (1-5). In all the interviews and DIs, Ruowen clearly outlined that her serious error

was "verb choice" and she wanted to work on it; however, in practice, she did not invest in

learning and solving that error. It is important to note that I used online collocation dictionaries,

and when Ruowen was provided with a link about that specific error to a web page on how to

correct the "verb choice", Ruowen revised them.

When revising grammatical errors, with "run on and fragment" problems, Ruowen

applied *minimum revision* technique. She split the sentences, and as a result had simple

sentences. Her revisions were correct grammatically, but the complexity was lost, because she

never attempted to use punctuation or any other subordinators. More importantly, Ruowen

missed the opportunity to learn how to revise and compose complex sentences. In DIs, Ruowen

reflected that she did not know how to correct "run on" sentences, and it was also easier to revise

by writing simple sentences:

> Task 1 (September 2016)
> Draft 2: <u>Because you can teach your parent how to use it and it </u>will be easier if they
> grasp the skills about online communication.
> Final: <u>You can teach your parents how to communicate online. It's easy to acknowledge
> online communication skills.</u> All the people no matter old or young are willing to learn
> new things.

It is clear that Ruowen did not want to take a risk, and did not want to make a mistake:

> Task 2 (September 2016)
> Draft 2: From my point of view, the disadvantages Johnson pointed <u>out, it is known to us
> all that every coin has two sides, and technology communication is no exception.</u>
> Final: In my view, the disadvantage Johnson point out is known to us all. "Every coin has
> two sides", and technological communication is no exception.

Grammar exercises were conducted in class to teach strategies on how to work on "run on and fragment" errors. If considering the fact that Ruowen might not be engaged with the instruction and had some distraction, the "run on and fragment" problems were discussed repeatedly in all DIs. In Task 3, Ruowen changed her strategy and started either ignoring or rewriting the "run on" problems:

> Task 3 (October 2016)
> Draft 2: Women can better understanding employees' feeling and thinking through deeply talking, the team can be better and the work can be done effectively… In conclusion, both male and female leaders have their own advantages and disadvantages, what they should do is to play their specific advantages to build a perfect team.
> Final: Women can better understand employees' feelings and think through deeply talking, the team can be better at doing work efficiently… In conclusion, both male and female leaders have their own advantages and disadvantages, it is difficult to decide who are good at being great leaders.

In the final draft of Task 3, Ruowen deleted the problem and added a new clause, but made a new error. The same pattern could be observed in her other tasks throughout the semester (Fall 2016).

In the final interview, Ruowen stated that feedback she received in class was more about grammar, and she wanted to know about her rhetorical problems as well (December 2016, the interview). The problem here is that Ruowen received those comments; however, she either did not revise them, or provided *minimum revisions*. In the IEP writing course, the class activities were planned based on student-participant errors, and the DIs were also implemented to discuss individual student-participant problems. "Bridge" issues and how to revise them were repeatedly reinforced throughout the semester, and it was pointed out clearly that student-participants needed to avoid "one word" corrections when they received "what, why, and how" questions and comments. In Ruowen's case, "what/how/suport/provide details" questions were corrected but with 2-4 word additions only. In most cases, those revisions did not add anything, but rather

repeated the same information. Ruowen's common revising feature when it came to "bridge" problems was *one word substitution* and in most cases the synonym of the old version:

> Draft 1: <u>There is</u> a saying like this: "Fighting like a man" which shows man is more powerful, fearless and full of authority. <u>The most</u> important is that male leaders have less scruple to keep balance work and balance. <u>However</u>, though the age is changing, lots of people still insist that its women's duty to take care of the family.
> Final: <u>For instance, t</u>here is a saying: "Fighting like a man" which shows man is more powerful, fearless and full of authority, even some male leaders are regarded as "men in women". <u>Furthermore,</u> the most important thing is that male leaders have less scruple to keep balance between work and life <u>because that though the time</u> is changing, lots of people still insist that men's duty is working and it's women's duty to take care of the family.

In her reflections during the semester, Ruowen shared that she understood the importance of working on the content questions and "bridge" issues, because connecting the sentences and providing the connection between what she thought and the reading material was necessary. However, when explaining the factors that influenced her revisions, Ruowen stated that she did not have time to do all the work required in the IEP writing course. Also, at the end of the final interview (9th month), Ruowen confessed that her major classes were her priority and scoring well on the tests was more important than revising "content and bridge" issues. Her minimal revisions could be attributed to *time*.

Summary of Ruowen's common revision behavior:

- Ruowen followed easy and safe ways to correct (run ons, fragments, and articles).

- Ruowen misunderstood some instructor comments (word choices, verb choices, articles, noun endings, run ons, and content feedback).

- Ruowen ignored some of her revisions (content feedback, verb choices, word choices, verb tense, articles, noun endings, possessive pronouns, sentence structure, run ons, fragments, and relative clauses).

- Ruowen deleted some of her errors (content feedback, word choices, and word forms).

- Ruowen rewrote the errors (object of the prepositional phrase, articles, noun endings, and run ons).

Revision strategies. Throughout the drafting process, Ruowen used a couple of revision strategies which were repeated in all the tasks; she did not read over the previous sentences and paragraphs and focused mostly on rephrasing existing expressions and adding words. Although some grammatical aspects, such as "tense markers, agreement and numbers, run ons, fragments, and articles" were problems she attempted to correct, most of these changes seemed to be guesswork, rather than a knowledgeable decision. The strategy that she used the most was correcting based on her knowledge that she learned in China. It seemed that she did not have systemic grammar knowledge to help self-monitor her writing. In all the tasks, the repeated errors (articles, prepositions, and noun endings) were not self-corrected. Although I pointed out to self-revise the repeated errors both in class and in her drafts repeatedly, Ruowen did not self-correct when the repeated error was not highlighted in her text. In the following example, the comment asked her to clarify to whom she was referring by "author":

> Task 6 (December 2016)
> Draft 2: The third example is that after <u>the author</u> perform perfect in the concert, her mother's eyes were shining and said "She is good", however, after said that she covered her mouth and looked embarrassed.(Namioka,P.93) Apparently, Chinese people such as Mary's father and mother will regard praising their couples or children as a boasting.
> Final: The third example is that after <u>the Mary</u> performed perfectly in the concert, Mary's mother's eyes were shining and said "She is good", however, she immediately covered her mouth and looked embarrassed.(Namioka,P.93) Apparently, Chinese people such as Mary's father and mother will regard praising their couples or children as boasting.

It is clear that when she added the name, she did not think about deleting the article. During the DI, she admitted it was a mistake, and knew the rule for not using "articles" with proper names. Ruowen shared that she focused on the comment and did not read the whole sentence.

Appendix HH.6. shows Ruowen's different revising strategies she applied in all her tasks throughout the semester (Fall 2016). She used eight strategies in her first task and three in her final. It is important to note that Ruowen started using fewer strategies in the middle of the semester, and corrected all her errors by giving possible corrections without checking any other sources. I stressed the importance of working on errors and using secondary sources (dictionary and grammar websites); however, Ruowen ignored this suggestion. Another interesting pattern that emerged is that Ruowen's rewriting behaviors were apparently influenced by what her previous teachers taught.

As is seen in Appendix HH.6., Ruowen rarely used meta-cognitive and cognitive operations while revising. She looked up words and phrases in an online dictionary often without questioning the information that it provided. Her DIs showed that Ruowen occasionally used one cognitive operation-activating previous knowledge, in an attempt to explain her errors (Appendix HH.5). However, there was no evidence in the data of her monitoring the cause of her errors, or questioning her previous knowledge about feedback and target structures.

Given her ineffective use of meta-cognitive and cognitive operations, it is not surprising that Ruowen had errors in her Post-tasks. When she felt confused by feedback, Ruowen often considered deleting or substituting the problematic forms, or even ignoring. This revision behavior prevented her from learning about her errors. She sometimes also consciously resisted feedback with a strong belief in the accuracy of her original text. For example, although ''ESL program'' was underlined, she chose to use it without an article in the final draft, firmly believing that her version is accurate, because the phrase was used without the article in some websites (she could not clarify the websites):

Task 2 (September 2016)
Draft 2: In conclusion, she is the most suitable candidate for ESL program.
Final: In conclusion, she is the most suitable candidate for ESL program.

Although she disagreed with feedback, Ruowen never initiated conversation to discuss her concerns during the DIs. Ruowen could be categorized as a learner who performed behavioral engagement (revision operations such as correcting, deleting, substitution, ignoring and revision strategies such as using dictionaries and websites).

Teacher feedback problems. Ruowen had problems in understanding teacher comments, and consequently interpreted them in her own way. The comment asked her to consider word choice and the structure of 'to be +adjective' while selecting the word choice. Ruowen interpreted that she needed to add "to be" and did not revise word choice:

Task 1 (September 2016)
Draft 2: Besides, another problem is that people online are not intimacy filleed, but actions like voice inflection, body language, facial expressions and the chemials released during face-to-face interactions are fundemental to establishing closer relationships.
Final: Besides, another problem is that people online are not to be intimacy filled, but actions like voice inflection, body language, facial expressions and the chemicals released during face-to-face interactions are fundamental to establishing closer relationships.

In another example, Ruowen thought the answer was given and she needed to use "somebody" instead of "them" when I posted "somebody>> them?" comment. I assumed Ruowen, being an advanced learner, would pick up the problem – agreement:

Task 2 (September 2016)
Drat 2: For somebody who is addicted to online communicating, we should help them to set a schedule to supervise them do not touch electronic equipments.
Final: For somebody who is addicted to online communicating, we should help somebody to set a schedule and supervise them not to touch electronic equipment.

Ruowen had major problems with the error terms until the end of the semester (Fall 2016). Ruowen reflected that she never felt comfortable using them (articles, noun endings, verb choices, verb forms, verb tense, and run ons). Not only remembering these terminologies, but

also understanding them took her a while. In every DI meeting, I explained the terms, their meaning, and presented strategies on how to revise them, but Ruowen did not show an interest in learning and understanding those problems. Specifically, Ruowen struggled with "noun ending" problems, and finally asked me to use "single or plural" words when posting feedback on her drafts. "Number" was one of the issues that Ruowen could not self-revise. This factor could be also attributed to L1 transfer. Ruowen followed an irregular pattern when revising "article and noun ending" problems. For example, in Task 4, she rewrote "article and noun ending" problems, and provided her own version of revisions without following the comment:

> Draf 2: However, since different people can adapt to <u>different environment,</u> there are many choices of <u>study space</u>.
> Final: However, since different people can adapt to d<u>ifferent environmental space</u>, there are many choices of <u>study space</u>.

Based on the interviews, Ruowen had problems in understanding "noun endings", and she thought when she received the comment it meant adding a noun. In Task 5, she rewrote "article" problems as "noun endings", although the "noun ending" was not mentioned in the comment:

> Draft 2: The atmosphere is <u>important element </u>of study space.
> Final: The atmosphere is <u>important element of study spaces,</u> so does the atmosphere of Starbucks.

In the interview, Ruowen reflected that it did not matter whether it was a singular or plural form.

Ruowen's engagement on Google Docs. Ruowen's revision strategies are connected to her beliefs about writing. Cohen and Dörnyei (2002) state that strategy is logically linked to learner beliefs, since learners will obviously select the most appropriate strategies for themselves on the basis of what they believe is the most appropriate approach toward mastering an L2. As it is seen in Appendix HH.3., Ruowen did not use Google Docs, and in cases when she did, it was either to explain her revisions, because I asked her to clarify, or when she was not sure about the error code. When asked why she did not use Google Docs, Ruowen responded that she thought

137

she could solve the problem, or at least she guessed how to solve, and therefore she did not think of asking for more explanation on Google Docs.

Ruowen's attitude toward revisions. At the beginning of the study, Ruowen classified errors into "small and big" and when asked what she meant by "small and big", she never explained. Nothing changed throughout the study. She still felt that grammar must be categorized to major and minor problems. However, during the semester (Fall 2016), starting weeks 12-13, Ruowen realized that she needed to think about those revisions seriously: "Taking every comment seriously and just asking the instructor if you don't know what the comments mean is important." [November 2016, the interview]

After finishing her work on Task 6 (December 2016), Ruowen reflected that she learned how to solve problems, and how she became more comfortable with revisions and realized the benefit of revisions. It was the first task in 16 weeks for which Ruowen followed the comments and tried to solve the errors based on feedback. She also mentioned that because of other tests in major classes, she could not write it well and thus had many mistakes. It was also the first time that Ruowen reflected about her own progress and evaluated her draft. Ruowen for the first time shared that she felt satisfied with her revisions (week 16).

Locating L2 writer agency. In this section, I present six extracts from DIs conducted over a 16-week period to examine some of the problems and possibilities involved in understanding Ruowen's engagement. It is apparent that locating her agency is by no means an easy matter. I placed these extracts in a chronological order, from beginning to the end of the semester (Fall 2016). Ruowen and I met a total of 12 times from September until late December 2016 for the DIs (Appendix HH.4).

Extract (1) clearly fails to engage the agency of Ruowen. I attempt to get discussion going about having "complex sentences and using active subjects", but in spite of repeated questions and multiple pauses to elicit Ruowen's response, only manage to extract contribution from Ruowen in the single-word "ahem and yeah":

Extract (1) Task 1 (September 2016) Discussing Sentence Structure
Draft 2: From my point of view, the disadvantages Johnson pointed out, it is known to us all that every coin has two sides, and technology communication is no exception. What I want to express next is the advantages of technology communication and deeply discuss the methods to keep a balance between technological one and interactional one.
Final: In my view, the disadvantage Johnson point out is known to us all."Every coin has two sides", and technological communication is no exception. What I want to express next is the advantages of technology communication and deep discuss the methods to keep a balance between face communication and screen communication.

S: The comment was [reads] "make Johnson the subject and combine two sentences by using conjunction" so what I meant is (.3) [looking at her draft] well, you are repeating the same information in all these sentences [meaning the rest of the paragraph]. That's why I advised you to rewrite your sentences, that is: Johnson: in the place of a subject
R: Ahem [meaning continue] (.3)
S: For example, (.3) [reads the correction] "Johnson points out the disadvantages:," (.3)
R: Ahem (.3)
S: Now, you are saying that all these disadvantages we know here, and then you are saying what I want to express next is advantage of technological communication, how would you do it? (.3) [reads] "although, Johnson, points out, the disadvantages" (.3)
R: Yeah (.3)
S: "That, disadvantages of technological communication, the advantages of technological communication (.3) are more important to discuss:" see:? (.3) just one complex sentence
R: Yeah

Extract (2) takes place when I make a comment on using academic verbs. Here I am giving simple instruction that is responded by Ruowen. One may say that agency is more evident here than in extract (1), since Ruowen signals her understanding of my comment, whereas in extract (1) Ruowen was simply not responding with the small exception of producing "yeah":

Extract (2): Task 2 (September 2016) Discussing Verb Choice
Draft 2: Certainly, online communication make our lives more convenient, we can share our feelings even we are far from each other.
Final: Certainly, online communication makes our lives more convenient. We can share our feelings even we are far from each other.

S: [reading] "Certainly online communication, ma:kes:," very good (.3) now, next time, avoid using "make," because "make, do, have, to be,"
R: It is not academic word [statement]
S: They are not, plus, they do not carry a strong meaning (.3)
R: Ah:, okay

Extract (3) is a straightforward example of an exchange, where Ruowen gives a response

to my question. This can be seen in extract (3) as another step up in agency, since Ruowen now

has to formulate and articulate a thought. It is reasonable to argue Ruowen may also be

formulating thoughts, even when she did not express them verbally in extract (1). However, in

this instance Ruowen has to employ some additional level of initiative and provide self-initiated

correction (in all 3 extracts):

Extract (3): Task 3 (October 2016) Discussing Content Feedback
S: Did you rewrite any parts?, because I do not see that you added or changed anything (.3)
R: Because I think in this paragraph I just talk both, man and female
S: Hm: [meaning continue]
R: Have these abilities, but then I just talk about their special ability, but then ability in the 10 qualities
S: Okay (.3) these examples are not on the topic, because your topic is who makes a better leader, the question is not whether women need to work, the question is who makes the better leader, (.3), what do you think?
R: Ahem [listening]
S: And you are going somewhere else, here
R: Ahem [listening]

Extract (4) takes another step up the agentive ladder, in that here Ruowen not only

articulates her thought in response my question, but also asks a self-initiated question, followed

by my explanation. However, as in all extracts (1-4), Ruowen does not show initiative to self-

correct the error, although I provided ample time for her to do so. Ruowen chooses not to

engage, but she employs a significant amount of self-initiated agency in asking questions:

Extract (4): Task 4 (October 2016) Discussing Run On Sentence
Draft 2: Women can better understanding employees' feeling and thinking through deeply talking, the team can be better and the work can be done effectively.

Final: Women can better understand employees' feelings and think through deeply talking,the team can be better at doing work efficiently.

S: You did not correct this one? What is the reason?
R: (.3)
S: You did not understand this? (.3) You did not know what to do here? (.3)
R: Ah:, (.3) I changed a little, bu:t, (.3) you mean "run on" makes the sentence easy to understand?
S: Let's [look
R: [no?
S: Let's look here, [reads] "women can better understand employees" feelings and think through deeply talking,] think about what? (.3) now, okay, let's imagine these two are one idea, and then you are saying "the team can be better at doing work". Comma is not enough to connect these sentences
R: Hm:
S: They are not connected, this part is not connect to this part [draws on her draft; two clauses], you are saying here [reads] "women can better understand employees"
R: Hm [listening]
S: And then you are saying, or you could say "women can better understand employees" feelings and when they talk to them, or when they communicate, the team: (.3) can: (.3) do: (.3) work, or something else (.3) efficiently
R: Hm [confirming]

Finally, extracts (5) and (6) show a higher sense of agency. Here Ruowen is directly debating with me, and she is contributing to the discussion because she feels she has something to say and she has a strong opinion about it. However as in all extracts, Ruowen does not volunteer to provide the correction and does not engage in dialogue to co-construct her problematic sentences:

Extract 5: Task 5 (November 2016) Discussing Article and Noun ending
Draft 2: The atmosphere is important element of study space.
Final: The atmosphere is an important element of study spaces, so does the atmosphere of Starbucks.

S: "Study space"
R: I did "study spaces" [laughing]
S: Ah, the comment was "article", but you corrected as "noun ending"
R: Hm (.3)
S: Actually it works (.3) why didn't you follow the comment? tell me please
R: Because I think it is the same change, single or plural

Extract 6: Task 5 (November 2016) Discussing Parallel Structure and Word Forms
Draft 2: A told me that she will study here three or four times a week, and the reason she studies here is that the environment in Starbucks is comfortable and relax.
Final: Jane told me that she studies here three or four times a week, and the reason she studies here is that the environment in Starbucks is relaxed.

S: Now here, "comfortable and relaxing", where do you have it?
R: Relaxing
S: Why? Where did it go? "Comfortable", why did you delete?
R: Hm, because parallel means two adjectives the same meaning, synonym
S: Parallel means, it is about word forms, for example, adjective plus adjective, and you have "comfortable" as an adjective, and "relax" as a "verb", you just needed to work on word forms [reads] "it is comfortable and:" (.3) what is the adjective of "relax"? (.3) "re:la:xi:ng"
R: Yeah, I know but I did it and I know part of speech and that is the verb [meaning "relax"; points with her finger on the draft] and I change it and I think these two are similar meaning, so I just delete "comfortable"
S: Oh, you think they are the same
R: Hm [nodding]
S: Let's discuss it in more details, and use other examples…
[Ruowen is a passive recipient of information]

In Extract (6), Ruowen does not ask about the difference between "relaxed" and

"relaxing", which also marks her as being unresponsive to create a collaborative agency event.

Summing up, the six extracts could be categorized in terms of agency in the following manner:

   (1) Ruowen is unresponsive or minimally responsive.

   (2) Ruowen carries out instructions given by the instructor.

   (3) Ruowen volunteers answers to the instructor's questions.

   What is missing in Ruowen's engagement is autonomous and committed learning

behavior. van Lier (2008) states that agency is situated in a particular context and it is something

that learners do, rather than something that learners possess. By looking at Ruowen's interaction

during the DIs, it should not be concluded that the most active student is not by any means

always the most agentive (successful) one. Conversely, resistance and passive engagement forms

should not be considered as expressing lack of agency. Ruowen could revise her errors either by

following my comments or by revising on her own way based on her senses, or by completely ignoring or deleting the problem. The main factor to understand is why she could not self-revise and committed the same errors after being involved in intensive revisions and having been living in an English speaking environment for a year. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) claim that agency also includes the ability to assign relevance and significance to things and events. Ruowen was not involved in understanding her problems, but more importantly learning strategies to avoid those problems. It would be wrong to conclude that she did not invest in revisions. Indeed, she revised her drafts but spent as little effort as possible in understanding the errors that were detrimental to her writing development. This element could not be detected solely by analyzing the DIs and counting how many times Ruowen initiated the question and voluntarily responded to the problem.

Ruowen's evaluation of her progress. At the beginning of the semester, Ruowen was surprised to receive feedback on her draft and to learn about her errors, since her former teachers did not provide detailed comments. Although at the end of the study, Ruowen did not feel improvement in grammar and in writing generally, she strongly believed she learned to revise her drafts:

> I think I learned a lot. First, there are like four types, like reader response, book task, cause and effect, and compare and contrast. All of the structure I didn't learn before, and some mistakes, like instructor comments are very careful. Because in my first writing class my teacher just gave me a grade and do not like correct things like one by one. So I learned a lot here [refers to the IEP writing course]. [December 2016, the interview]

Ruowen did not want to spend time on revisions throughout the semester but acknowledged that the practice helped her to correct them. During the DIs, Ruowen asked me if she could provide direct corrections. However, she realized the importance of working on errors without the instructor's input. If Ruowen was not clear about her progress in week 16, and did not give any specific examples about her beliefs, as time passed she recognized the value of drafting:

143

I know if I should write an article [an essay], I should write an essay part, like the introduction, body paragraph, and conclusion. But in the past I didn't know it, I just like write what I want. Before the class [the writing course], I'm not sure if the teacher gave the feedback, I'm not sure what the problem was. And after the twenty times feedback I know some mistake and I know how to correct it. Though I still make mistakes on some of them but I know how to correct them. [April 2017, the interview]

Ruowen did not invest in understanding her errors and performed mechanical revisions. However, when she was defining the role of feedback in improving her writing skills, she could articulate her thoughts: "To correct, help me to correct a mistake and have a better understanding of it. Make sure that I know what is a mistake and I can correct it." [May 2017, the interview]

At times, feedback posted online was confusing, but Ruowen did not initiate any questions on Google Docs to clarify her concerns, nor did she participate during the DIs when I was explaining those problems. Ruowen could evaluate her passive engagement throughout the semester, and once admitted being "sorry" for not completing revisions:

I think the most importantly is that I should listen carefully in class and use Google Docs, that resources and articles for the course like as much as possible. I think it will help my writing. When fixing, just take every comment seriously and just ask the instructor if I don't know what the comments mean. [April 2017, the interview]

If Ruowen did not value reading and even was confused why I implemented reading various genres, she was able to see the connection at the end of the study. Ruowen in our final encounter admitted that good writing involves knowing conventions. Although she did not think focusing on grammar was important in delivering the message to her audience in the beginning, she changed her beliefs after nine months:

When you're writing you should like to think about how can make your writing more academic and sometimes you should follow the structures and you should focus on your grammar. And that's it, that's success and good writing. [May 2017, the interview]

144

It took quite a long time for Ruowen to realize what good writing involved. Compared to Ruowen, Peter understood from the start that investing in writing and revisions was the only strategy for him to become an ideal L2 user.

Summary. The following are the major findings of Ruowen's case I have reviewed in this section, which explain why she did not have significant changes in accuracy (9 months).

- Ruowen revised the drafts without attempting to learn about her errors. The common patterns of revisions were deleting, rewriting, and ignoring. While revising, Ruowen relied on her background knowledge and corrected based on guess in 80% of instances. Ruowen deleted comments when she did not know how to revise.

- Ruowen was neither an active participant in asking questions on Google Docs, nor attempted to self-revise during the DIs. Ruowen expected the instructor to provide direct corrections.

- Ruowen did not self-regulate her learning and did not manage her own achievement though specific writing goals and revisions. At the final interview, she could not remember her major errors and did not specify any tasks and revisions that were influential to develop her writing.

- Ruowen's beliefs were fluctuating. She held different, even contradictory, beliefs about the revision and feedback, influenced by personal and contextual factors. For example, she pointed out that rhetorical strategies were important for her to focus on, but in practice ignored content feedback.

- Ruowen had some major difficulties in the IEP writing course. Ruowen did not find grammar to be important in writing and always was concerned about the time she spent on revisions. Ruowen did not find instruction interesting for her because there were many

readings to complete and many materials to work with. She became comfortable with the pace of class only in the middle of the semester.

- Ruowen had difficulties in remembering error codes, and till the final task had to double check the definitions. However she found error codes beneficial to learn to correct errors.

- Reading and finding key points to write about was difficult, but because of the practice in class, she could plan effectively. Ruowen focused on academic words (word choice) while drafting.

- Ruowen understood the benefits of revising, but they were not enough to involve her in practice.

- The free time that she had during nine months, she spent with Chinese friends speaking Chinese and did not look into possibilities to interact with the target group and culture although she was interested in developing her speaking skills.

Ruowen failed to develop L2 writer revision agency because she was never invested in this skill and never connected her future academic success to writing in general.

Strategic planner: Peter's investment in writing and revision to achieve a bigger goal.
Peter's revision profile is described in Appendix JJ. Peter was a 22 year-old male Chinese student, in his second year in Computer Science. At the time of the study, he had been in the United States for three months. He had started learning English when he was in kindergarten and he had never learned how to write essays in English until he enrolled in an English program in his country when he was 14. He reported that his previous English classes in China had been centered mainly around grammar exercises and pattern drills, and there was more emphasis on reading skills. His previous ESL teachers in China did not emphasize writing, and limited time

was allocated to teaching writing. The first time he ever learned writing was when he took ESL courses at high school and a university in China. He shared that writing tasks were usually to compose a story about a picture in high school, to explain the graphs and data in a university, and continuous drilling of good examples to use at exams: "I think classes were good, but not enough. Because what we need to do is getting a high score in test, not in lives." [August 2016, the interview]

Peter considered writing to be very difficult, and never liked to write: "I do bad in grammar and vocabulary and style. I think I can express what I want to express but not in a polite way or correct way… I do not like writing." [August 2016, the interview] Compared to other student-participants, Peter had a particular vision about what he needed to improve in writing class before entering the classroom. Not only was he brave to admit his weaknesses in writing, but he also could clearly formulate why writing was an important skill for him to develop:

> These days, I tried to write emails to my math teacher, but I feel really difficult to write them. I don't know the rules to be polite, and I feel hard to explain myself clearly. The most important thing for me is how to write clearly. But I just don't know how. And a good writing can make me feel free to write to the teachers, and help me make my voice clear. If I can't write clear, people may not understand what I am talking about. [September 2016, the interview]

From the beginning of the classes, Peter was open and positive about the revisions, and found the whole process of drafting and revising instrumental to his development of writing skills, which indicates his early desire to develop independence as a writer. Not only was Peter critical of his repeated errors, but he was also aware of the challenges. Although Peter regarded written accuracy as less important than content, he highly valued feedback and believed that feedback was indispensable for improving his writing and his L2 proficiency. When receiving feedback, Peter first experienced negative emotions, but he quickly converted the disappointment

into motivation by playing down the risk of failure and taking a future-oriented perspective. This positive attitude toward feedback resonated with Peter's belief in the effects of feedback.

It is crucial to note that Peter's understanding of his errors benefited considerably from the DIs. Our collaborative re-construction of his errors, in which Peter took an initiative firstly helped Peter to recognize the corrective force of feedback. Peter was relatively successful in making revisions. Although he put significant effort into understanding his errors, he would incorrectly revise (3 out of 27 errors in task 1; 9 out of 41 in task 2; 4 out of 30 in task 3; 2 out of 26 in task 4; 1 out of 30 in task 5; 5 out of 35 in task 6). Peter was actively and extensively engaged with feedback. He regulated negative emotions caused by feedback and solicited effective help from me, which further contributed to his understanding of errors and implementation of revision operations.

Goals as motivating force. What makes Peter unique compared to other student-participants is that he never stopped evaluating his progress. Moreover, Peter was a highly motivated language learner with clearly-defined goals, studying English and writing as part of the process toward establishing himself in a target culture. Goals seemed to completely dominate his activities and thoughts. During two and half years, there were three periods in particular when his motivation to learn SLW and improve his accuracy in English seemed to take over his life. His first experience of such a powerful surge of motivational energy came when he found out that he received a scholarship and that it would enable him to transfer from China to an American university, and that he could graduate in the U.S. From that moment, he knew his life was going to revolve entirely around SLW: "I want to graduate from this school. I know I have to take writing class and I need to write papers, and I cannot graduate if I don't have that. So writing is very important for me." [September 2016, the interview] In particular, he was engaged

148

in revisions and was never satisfied with his final draft, and always asked me if he could rewrite the final draft one more time.

Peter's vision of future possibilities could materialize if he put enough effort into developing his accuracy in writing. The IEP writing course and feedback challenged Peter to invest effort in setting and monitoring his learning goals. Feedback that focused on the difference between the current and desired levels of performance thus emphasized what was yet to be achieved. The role of DF featured prominently in fueling his motivation:

> I feel really moved because the instructor gives us a lot of comments. I didn't thought about it in August. I felt I was moved because I think the instructor must take a lot of time to comment that. (.3) After that, I changed my view about writing and I paid more effort. If I don't have a comment, I do not think I will pay a lot of effort. And I think feedback is the most important thing to, for me to revise it, and improve. It's just let me know my mistakes and let me know, like "don't make it again, but try to like have idea of what's wrong". And next time, when I need to write it, I can have idea that it might be wrong and just pay attention to it. [December 2016, the interview]

On top of this, the occasion when such feedback was articulated verbally (DI) transpired as particularly instrumental in furthering his investment:

> I think that meeting with the teacher is most interesting and important, and I like our meetings the most. I feel like it's the best, because I can ask whatever I want to ask and the instructor comments help the most. Because when I revise if I don't understand some comments I do not hesitate to ask. [December 2016, the interview]

Dörnyei et al. (2016) argue that a person can be caught up in a motivational current only if he/she feels complete ownership of the process and its outcome. This sense of ownership existed in Peter, who believed that he had sufficient capabilities to perform required actions and thus to engage in revisions: "I mean the goal is that the students have the idea that we make mistakes and what the mistakes are. So I have that idea about if I'm writing, I might make some mistakes, but I know how to fix." [January 2017, the interview]

However, after six months his energy and enthusiasm rapidly trailed off. Other courses followed, his mainstream writing instructor was not providing feedback (compared to his IEP writing course) and he was receiving a low score. Peter questioned a lot the instructor's feedback in all our meetings in Spring 2017:

> P: I'm not sure whether she really read or not.
> S: But how can you, I mean why do you say that?
> P: Sometimes it sounds too general. I mean (.3)
> S: How did you know?
> P: The teacher has the same sentence. I mean you shouldn't always have the same sentence. I don't know what she really means.
> S: You mean, she posts similar comments for each assignment? Is that what you mean?
> P: Not completely the same. She always tries encourage us but not talk about what's really bad. She always writes "you're completely on the right track". And (.3) it's not true.

He also realized he still had a long way to go to improve his writing to reach his main goal. Peter was very upset with his repeated errors. Peter shared that he expected to have errors in his first assignment because he did not know the instructor's expectations. More importantly, Peter realized he was no longer in the IEP writing course, and he knew he needed to compete with other mainstream students, which made him feel stressed in the beginning (he changed his opinion about competition later on, after a year):

> S: How are you?
> P: Little bit tired (.3)
> S: Do you have problems in class?
> P: ah:(.3)
> S: Do you want to talk about them? ah: [maybe you are:
> P: [not about class, I feel (.3) like I have a lot, (.3) maybe I have a logical problem in writing, [smiles] yeah, I think I try to make it clear [meaning his writing]
> S: It's okay, (.3) we: cover some examples today, and I [guess
> P: [yeah I know what my problem is, and I do not mind that others know, I do not mind
> S: Was your draft discussed in class? (.3) It probably helped you to see [your
> P: [I know my problems and I can fix myself (.3)

A negative experience has turned out to be disappointment at first, but triggered Peter's motivational surge to keep him going for months. Then, seven months later, Peter suddenly

150

found himself in a second current of goal-oriented energy. Peter did not give up on his writing, and since he was not receiving feedback in his mainstream composition class, he started attending the writing center where he worked with seven tutors to continue improving his SLW and accuracy. Working with different tutors was very important for him:

> Every time, I change the teacher. I don't like to work with the same person. Because I feel like different teachers have different ideas. Every time, as soon as I change a teacher I see this teacher will focus on something that the previous teacher doesn't focus. That's really important in writing. To get different perspectives. [March 2017, the interview]

Goals affect overall performance in terms of focused direction, effort, and persistence; they also increase an individual's affective reactions, as experienced with the successful completion of targeted outcomes. Progress checks, as Dörnyei et al. (2016) emphasize, depict clearly the level of investment which has already been made and the momentum already achieved, which in turn strengthens ongoing commitment. In Peter's case, investment led to increased commitment.

When Peter was done with two semesters, his next progress check of his skills was triggered when he could not get a summer job. He felt he failed the interview and could not respond properly because his speech was not clear. Peter decided to withdraw from summer classes and take a break. He could not keep up with assignments and was not motivated to do anything. Before leaving for China, in our last meeting of June 2017, Peter was deliberating whether he needed to continue his studies in China.

Experiences of fatigue – in Peter's case, the affective signal of the increasing difficulty of goal maintenance – do not suddenly arise from nowhere, but are experienced as an increasing sense of tiredness and strain associated with goal-pursuit activities. Peter shared that he did not like writing in general, but he had to develop this skill in order to secure his academic success (which he projected via SLW). Further, Peter's expectations were not met in the mainstream composition course, and in order to self-regulate his learning he immersed himself into working

151

with seven tutors at the writing center. Peter also shared that he benefited tremendously from

tutoring sessions, but he did not have any free time for himself and for other activities (because

he was also taking other academic classes). By the end of the academic year (2016-2017), Peter

did not have achievement satisfaction.

However, it did not take long for Peter to regain his positive emotional tenor. Three

months later, his third current of energy was triggered when he saw his friend's resume, who was

in strong standing academically, but was also active in campus activities and organizations. It

was the time when Peter learned that by focusing solely on SLW, he would not achieve success.

However this time, Peter not only strongly desired to be a member of the target community, but

he also wanted to establish himself professionally. Peter's motivational current to improve his

writing and later on speaking skills pushed him to accomplish something truly remarkable,

achieving a level of competence which exceeded even his most optimistic expectations.

Peter strongly desired access to the target community. The university – the courses – was

the only place where Peter had regular exposure to English and practice in English. The first 16

weeks (Fall 2016), Peter did not perceive that he was not getting enough contact with the target

population. However, in his second semester (Spring 2017), Peter realized he was speaking

Chinese 80% of his time, and was always around people from his own culture. This realization

pushed Peter to look for a job in order to get access to the community where he could meet

people. Finally, after multiple interviews, Peter was able to get a part time job as a community

assistant at one of the student residential dorms on campus:

> I think that's a good way to improve to be a CA because you have to manage everything
> if they have any conflict, that's my job. If they have, like they want something, for
> example, their fridge is broken, they will tell me 'Hey, my fridge is broken'. I have to say
> 'I'm sorry' and think about how can I make him comfortable? and tell him about what to
> do, how we can fix it. To be friendly and at the same time talking English and give him
> the solution. And also sometimes their glasses fell down and they can't find it. They want

me to find it. Although this is not my job, I have to help them and they'll be really appreciative for that. Mostly, like for me, I want to make them comfortable and provide safe living here. [October 2017, the interview]

Peter did not stop with getting a community assistant job because he wanted to meet more people and strongly desired to be accepted by his skills. He started volunteering at various student organizations such as Chinese Association and International Student Association:

I want to at least have ability that to prove to the others that I'm like one of those successful people. Those who are admitted by America. That I have the ability. [December 2017, the interview]

Peter never wanted to elaborate why he thought it was important to be accepted by the skills he had. Although we met every second week for two and half years (not counting Summer 2017 when he was in China), I did not pressure him to elaborate on what he really meant by "skills".

At our final interview, Peter shared that he needed to change if he wanted to achieve success:

I came to America and it makes me feel like I have to change myself. I can't just be a normal Chinese, staying in the dorm. And most Chinese, they don't change their skills. They just stay normal. They did really bad on it [improving]. So that's why I want to involve myself. Meet with the people. Talk with the people. Share my experience. [May 2018, the interview]

Norton (2000) explains that learning a L2 involves not only mastering the language code and behavior but also constructing social identities in the host country as learners negotiate their "sense of self within and across different sites at different points in time" and "gain access to—or [are] denied access to—powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak " (p. 5). Peter was learning through a formal course of instruction, but his participation was voluntary, and in the interest of some personal goals. Peter's investment in the target language was also an investment in his own identity, which is constantly changing across time and space:

If I don't have job, I don't even have access to talk to people here. And I know the job makes me to change and not only attitude but also my characteristic. I was always shy and that's not what I want. [April 2018, the interview]

Peter stands in sharp contrast with other student-participants because he had a vision of

what he wanted to become. Dörnyei et al. (2016) state that the vision learners have of the L2 speaker/user they would like to become seems, in the long run, to be one of the most reliable predictors of long-term commitment and effort. Peter's vision about himself was the Ideal L2 Self; the self which he would possibly become if he was able to identify and take the right opportunities when they arose. Peter saw a discrepancy between an ideal self and his state, and it acted as an impetus for motivation in three specific occasions in two and half years, to further develop his proficiency. The next section describes how Peter's L2 writer revision agency developed during two and a half years.

Situating Peter's L2 writer agency. Peter's L2 writer revision agency did not develop in an empty vacuum. Indeed, writer agency was not simply his individual character trait, but a contextually enacted way of being that was shaped by his cultural and societal trajectories. Peter initially did not perceive SLW as an act of learning, but part of what he perceived was influenced by his first language and first culture experiences:

> Like normal way, we don't consider writing the most important thing. Because writing's I think 30 points, from a hundred and fifty points. In college, we used like several classes, not the whole class for the writing, but several minutes for writing. In college, we recite a lot. Writing others' articles [essays] and try to imitate, try do the same, not do the same. I mean, imitate others' writing. (September 2016, the interview)

In an ecological perspective, an important facet of agency is the active process of perceptual learning, which is multisensory and takes place in the context of real work in the real world (van Lier, 2004). When being introduced to the environment of the university and its policies, writing course and its culture, Peter took an increasingly active role in developing his own constitutive, yet emergent, role in it. By engaging in composing and multiple intensive revisions, and collaborating with peers, Peter was involved in meaningful and relevant activity in pursuit of a worthwhile goal, which was achieving a high score to maintain his academic status (first 16 weeks). Peter projected this achievement through being successful in writing.

Learning SLW and becoming engaged in a new culture involved adjusting a sense of self and creating new identities, that is, co-perceive oneself. Shaping new identities therefore requires ongoing struggles and it can reflect resistance as well as accommodation. In Peter's case, at first, it was accommodation because he knew if he did not challenge his concepts of L1 writing, he would not succeed in the new environment:

> In my idea, I never imitate others, other articles in China. I know sometimes it's good, but here [the U.S.], I think I know more, learn more about it. I need to have a difference in different articles [essays] and I have a lot of rules I cannot break. No one told that to me before. (November 2016, the interview)

Agency involves initiative or self-regulation by the learner (van Lier, 2008). In a few weeks, becoming an independent writer was significant for Peter : "I just want to write my own [paper]." [November 2016, the interview] Although Peter felt responsibility to change his common concepts about imitation and patchwork writing, he still viewed writing as one of the tunnels to pass through to get to his target. Awareness of writing as a need to communicate did not develop right a way; it was gradual process. Peter felt responsibility to re-learn how to write and it was mediated by the DIs: "I think if I have the same topic, and same research paper and use it in different classes, it's like plagiarism. And I can't." [November 2016, the interview]

Not all the student-participants had easily identifiable L2 self-guides. However Peter was the one who challenged his concepts. Not only immediate context influenced his learning behavior, but also the precise nature of the identity to which Peter was aspiring might explain the choices he made in his investment in SLW. Throughout the first 16 weeks, Peter had many struggles while composing, while responding to the reading materials, and while engaging in revisions:

> I think it's every types of article [essay]. I think writing, that's hard. But I don't know how to change that. I don't know how to start writing. I sit there a half hour, I want to

start it, but but I don't know how to start it. I just have too much fear [laughing]. And reading was really difficult, a very long one. I read three times, I still don't know what he's [the author] writing about. [December 2016, the interview]

Although Peter was open about his struggles in writing, he had the ability to manage the frustration and self-regulate his learning. For example, Peter believed that he needed to pay attention and take time while revising: "I thought if I want to really learn something, and if I pay attention, pay attention, and take the time, I know I will learn." [December 2016, the interview]

As was demonstrated through Peter's reflections, his actions were always centered on an explicit, pre-defined desired outcome. High commitment to goals was attained when Peter was convinced that the goal was important and attainable or that, at least, sufficient progress could be made toward it. Peter's investment in SLW must be understood with reference to his reasons for coming to the U.S., his plans for the future, and his changing identity (L2 learner identity).

Engagement with revisions: Errors. Peter made an incredibly marked improvement from Task 1 to Post-task 1, and from Task 1 to Post-task 4. Post-tasks 1 and 2 are quite similar; some of the same errors exist, but not many of them inhibit understanding (Apendices DD and JJ). In week 1, Peter made 23 errors, and after two years, he was able to reduce his errors to 5 (per 300 words). Peter's motivation to work on his revisions to improve his writing consumed him completely throughout the time I followed him (two and half years). There was no time or day that he did not write and was not involved in reading. In the summer of 2017, Peter travelled home, to China, and yet he continued to write reflections because he *feared* he would forget SLW conventions.

Peter had struggles with error codes (terminology); he could not remember them and always had to translate them into Chinese. In Task 1, he ignored some errors because he did not know how to respond to feedback. During the DIs, I explained what the "fragment, subject and

156

verb agreement, and noun ending" problems were and how to correct them. Although Peter was

responsive and was asking questions to clarify his understanding, it took 3-4 meetings before

Peter finally understood problems such as "verbals, noun endings, run ons, fragments, and point

of view/shift in pronouns". The main reason was that it was new grammatical information for

Peter, but also he would focus on other parts of the problem, and miss the actual error. In the

example below, Peter ignored the comment because he thought feedback "verb form/verbals"

was about "do+have":

> Task 2
> Draft 2: However, I <u>do have something disagree</u> with the author.
> Final: However, I <u>do have something disagree </u>with the author.

During the DI, Peter insisted on keeping "do" for emphasis; it was what he meant:

> S: I commented "v+v", so [reads] in "I do have something disagree", "I have" is one verb, and "disagree" is the second verb, so:
> P: Ah: (.3)
> S: Okay, let's imagine that you do not have "do" here
> P: Yeah
> S: Let's say "I have something" and then you are using another verb, what should it be?
> P: Disagreement? Maybe
> S: You have a direct object here, so you have "something" thus if you did not have then, you could say "I have a disagreement"
> P: Yeah
> S: But because you have "something", you have used second verb, so "I have something (.3) to: disagree"
> P: Ah:
> S: Did you understand this comment "v+v"?
> P: I thought it was about "do and have", so I did not change [means revised]

When I was scaffolding, Peter was more concerned with which preposition to use with

"disagreement", and was not interested in revising by using "verbals" and covering more

examples on "verbals".

Peter ignored the following problem because the comment "shifts in the point of you" did

not yield any results on his Chinese dictionary and search websites:

157

Task 1
Draft 2: Because the teacher who are nonnative have experience the process now you are expiring.
Final: Because the teachers who are nonnative must have experienced the process you are experiencing now.

Although many exercises were conducted in class, and each DI would focus on "the point of view", Peter had troubles in understanding this problem. Only by the end of week 10, Peter said "I am finally clear about pronoun shift, and I am sorry it took many times". [November 2016, DI] By saying "many times" he meant the problem was discussed five times in three months.

In the interviews, Peter commented many times that he would forget "run ons" and there was no occasion when he did not search on how to correct "run on" problems. Peter always questioned himself during the DIs. His main concern was that he did not know how to revise "run on sentences": when it was better to work on "subordinators", and when it was better to split the sentence into simple sentences to avoid "run ons".

"Noun ending" was another problem for which Peter had difficulties in remembering the error code. Although this problem was discussed in all DIs, Peter, on some occasions, kept ignoring this error till the end of the IEP writing course (16 weeks).

Task 3
Draft 2: If there is no food transportation, the immigrant can't have food they prefered.
Final: If there is no food transportation, the immigrant can't have food they prefer.

Another interesting pattern that emerged from DIs is that Peter ignored some comments because he did not want to change his opinion expressed in his writing. In the example of "noun ending" above, Peter intentionally kept the singular of "immigrant" because he did not want to classify immigrants into a group, and meant to show that they were individuals. Peter thought the reader would connect with his opinion if he expressed it by using a singular form, although he realized grammatically it was incorrect. Peter actually showed signs of going beyond the grammatical

158

errors and engaged in writing itself. He questioned the format of reader responses and the use of personal pronouns during the DIs.

Peter ignored some comments when he did not find it necessary to follow because it would change his intended meaning, or in Peter's words "effect". The comment was "fragment":

Task 2
Draft 2: <u>What else?</u> Facebook has not that power to destroy the word friend.
Final: <u>What else? F</u>acebook doesn't have such power to destroy the word friend.

Peter strongly believed that "what else" was conversational and everybody he knew was using it in daily conversation. Therefore, the phase was needed to catch the reader's attention and make his draft reader friendly. During the DI, although he did not agree it was an actual error, he admitted that he had "to write the whole sentence" with a subject and a verb.

Another example when Peter tried to connect to his audience was seen in the sentences when he referred to his audience directly, by using the second person, although the whole paper was written in the third person. I was discussing this issue every time we met for the DI, but Peter persisted in his style, and never attempted to change:

Task 2 (September 2016)
Draft 2: If there is something <u>don't need to see, just ignore it.</u>
Final: If there is something <u>you don't want to see, just ignore it.</u>

Task 6 (November 2016)
Draft 2: <u>Do whatever you want to do! Make friend whoever you want to know!</u>
Final: Do whatever you want to do! Make friend whoever you want to know!

Peter ignored revisions when he believed his style was true. It was not about misunderstanding or not knowing the problem, it was about his choices – taking ownership of his writing.

Peter had problems with "verb forms" and he believed he would always make them, because it was hard for him to self-revise. In his Post-tasks, Peter performed "verb form" errors. At the interview, Peter reflected that "article and verb form" problems were "small" errors, and

the most important was to work on delivering the message. Similar classification of errors into "small and big" groups were observed in other student-participants.

Peter did not self-revise the repeated errors when they were not commented. Although self-revision was reinforced in class and in all DIs, Peter felt he failed in self-revisions. "I know it's wrong, but I did not notice that. And I did not see the rest [errors]. I just want to say that I pay attention, and I am sorry, I feel sorry that I cannot revise". [November 2016, the interview]

Peter attempted to follow content feedback. There was only one occasion when he deleted and ignored feedback, for the last Task 6. Although at the DIs and interviews, Peter showed interest in understanding how to present ideas effectively, and even mentioned that he was not sure about his organization and ideas, and would like to receive more detailed feedback, he found it very difficult to revise Task 6:

> Draft 1: In paragraph 87 first paragraph, Kim asked : "how can your mother and your father so nasty to each other?" Yingmei's family want to show their modest however result in making kims' family thought they are rude. From my own angle, as a Chinese, I don't really understand why Chinese don't like to talk the real opinion? When one think he did a good job, he has to say sorry, I did really bad! What do people really gain from this kind of modest? I consider it as a dishonest behavior and I also suffered a lot from people say things obside to what he really think. People have to consider other's real idea, which some-times end up with a bad ending. (1) <u>Like a famous story in Germany, there is a couple love each other really much, the man think the woman will like the button of the bread because he likes the button of the bread, and the woman think the man will like the top of the bread better because she likes the top better, so they keep eating the portion they don't like for 20 years then discover it. How pitty are they!</u> From this easy story people should learn always (2) <u>telling the truth.</u> If Yingmei's father really like the food made by Yingmei's mother and tell her how much he love it, Yingmei's whole family will definitely have a easier process to get into America. The stupid joke wouldn't happen ofcouse.
> > Feedback
> > > (1) Very interesting, but you need to discuss only the story and its examples.
> > > (2) It seems this is your main point/thesis. Provide more examples from the story to support your main idea.
>
> Final: In paragraph 87 first paragraph, Kim, one of the guest, asked : "how can your mother and your father be so nasty to each other?" Yingmei's family wanted to show their modesty, however resulted in making Kims' family thought they are rude. From my

own angle, as a Chinese, I don't really understand why Chinese don't like to talk about the real opinion? When one thinks he did a good job, he has to say sorry, I did really bad! What do people really gain from this kind of modesty? I consider it as a dishonest behavior and I also suffered a lot from people who say things opposite to what they really think. People have to consider other's real ideas, which sometimes end up with a bad result. From this easy story, people should learn always telling the truth. If Yingmei's father really likes the food made by Yingmei's mother and tell her how much he love it, Yingmei's whole family would definitely have a easier process to have integrate into America. The misunderstand wouldn't happen of course.

As is seen in the final draft, Peter deleted sentences and did not add any examples from the story. Peter recognized he did not do well on revisions and reflected that his content had some problems because he revised it only once. Peter found this task the most difficult because he did not like the topic, and he did not know "what to quote". [December 2016, the interview]

Summary of Peter's common revision behavior:

- Peter followed feedback most of the time.

- Peter ignored when he believed his version had a strong rhetorical purpose (morphological errors and syntactical errors).

- Peter deleted the problem because of cognitive load (content feedback and reading related).

- Peter misunderstood some comments because of error terminology (verb forms, noun endings, run ons, fragments, and word forms) and as a result, rewrote the error without following feedback.

Revision strategies. There was considerable change in Peter's revisions (Appendix JJ.6.). If in Task 1, he relied on his background knowledge 28 times out of 31 to revise his errors, in Task 6, this strategy was considerably reduced. Peter mostly applied solving and evaluating strategies when working on his errors.

161

Teacher feedback problems. There were two cases when Peter inaccurately revised his

drafts: his metalinguistic awareness and incomprehensive feedback. The feedback was not

comprehensive, and thus Peter could not correct the error. I posted "verb> may or may not?",

and Peter thought he needed to focus on whether the sentence was affirmative or negative.

However, I meant two problems: "verb form and meaning":

> Task 1
> Draft 2: The people who have ability with great grammar may also can't buy food in a
> restaurant because they may not clear about the name of the food.
> Final: The people who have ability with great grammars may also can not buy food in a
> restaurant because they may not be clear about the name of the food.

At the DI, Peter pointed out this problem and commented that he did not know how to use modal

verbs. In the following example, instead of commenting on "sentence structure and verb aspect",

I posted "who needs to study?" Peter corrected based on feedback, but the actual problem was

not targeted. Feedback was not comprehensive so that Peter could act on it:

> Task 6
> Drat 2: When people travel around world or leave in a different country, there are a lot of
> traditions, habits and behaviors need to study or even change.
> Final: When people travel around world or live in a different country, there are a lot of
> traditions, habits and behaviors for immigrants need to study or even change.

In the next example, Peter could not correct because I did not target the problem. Instead of

coding the error for fragment (verb is missing) or noun ending (possessive) and verb form, I

posted "what do you mean?":

> Draft 2: Modesty is a good personality, but modest in a not proper way could lead a bad
> result. The best way to deal with the relationship should be honest and always say what
> one real idea.
> Final:Modesty is a good personality trait, but modesty in a not appropriate way could
> lead to a bad result. The best way to deal with the relationship should be honest and
> always say what one's real idea.

During the DI, Peter self-corrected the problem.

Peter's engagement on Google Docs. Peter was active on Google Docs compared to other student-participants. He usually asked when he did not understand the comment, did not know the error code, and when he wanted to check his corrections (Appendix JJ.3.). This active behavior could be attributed to Peter's successful revisions and success overall. Peter hesitated at first to contact me when he was unsure about the comment itself – what it meant, and when he did not know how to revise:

> I was afraid of the instructor in the beginning. I did not want to send email even. But now I feel free to ask questions and post online. Even like I ask, I forgot the time, whether it's 9 or 11 pm. I'm pretty sure it's 11 pm, but I'll still ask, I feel free. And I am not too nervous now around the instructor, so I can ask questions now. [September 2016, the interview]

Peter reflected that he changed his opinion about the instructor and felt comfortable of asking questions online after his first DI and the DF:

> In my school I did not use computer to write [in China], and Chinese teacher always gave us comment after the article [essay; end comment]. That's why I am shocked that the instructor have comment next to it, to the problem. I know she read every sentence, and which sentence is wrong. We won't get those reviews in China...I have not used this before [Google Docs]. The first time I asked the instructor, she can get it [his questions]. I mean it's very convenient, like, I can, and she can use it at the same time [being online]. [September 2016, the interview]

Peter was not passive in his learning and initiated dialogue on Google Docs more than other student-participants. His behavior did not change and he always initiated the questions online for each single task. Asians students usually are hesitant to ask or even talk about their challenges. There are many reasons to explain this behavior. However, based on data analysis, the most recurring reasons are: they do not want to take the instructor's time; in many cases they do not want to reveal their weakness (because they feel embarrassed); and they are taught to resolve their problems independently. Although Peter was not comfortable asking, he tried to overcome his cultural disposition, and he was an active agent in his own learning: "When I see [comments]

I will reply as soon as possible, and I do not mean to be rude, but I want to learn. I am sorry to

disturb the instructor." [December 2016, the interview]

Feedback and my presence on Google Docs also boosted Peter's motivation to engage in

revisions:

> Because of all the comments, I know my problem and first I fixed it by myself and if I
> have some question, I comment back [using the reply option online] and I see the
> instructor is replying, and some of them I still have questions and I reply again and she
> give me another [response online], and I fix all of them [errors]. [November 2016, the
> interview]

Peter was engaged in dialogues online to clarify his point, to understand feedback, to learn about

his errors, to confirm that he followed the correct revision, and to evaluate his progress. All these

strategies were successfully employed, which played a major role in Peter's revisions.

Peter's attitude toward revisions. Peter was positive toward revisions and felt that

feedback not only helped him understand, but also revise. He strongly believed that no errors

needed to be ignored. Although he was unhappy that he could not self-revise some errors (verb

forms and s+v), and that the process of revisions was hard, learning how to revise made him

happy at the end of week 16:

> I like all of my revisions and I did good job. At least I focus on the comments and did
> everything. At least I tried to do everything, every time I see I have several I missed. But
> more and more, I know how to rewrite. And that make me feel good. And I stay there one
> hour and I fix all the problems by myself. I fixed it. [December 2016, the interview]

Peter projected his learning of English by investing in revision. Revision strategies which Peter

employed projected his learning routes. As time passed, Peter's attitude towards revision was not

stable but showed salient temporal and situational variation. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) explain

that the parameters of a social situation change over time, and this change affects the learner

characteristics operating within that context, and these characteristics are further affected by their

continuous interaction with other learner variables. Since the IEP writing course was heavily

focused on multiple drafting and revisions, Peter perceived the culture of that course, and tried to

follow the same strategy of learning in his mainstream writing courses. When we met in January

2017, Peter was concerned that he did not have multiple drafting in his mainstream writing class

and he was not satisfied with his revisions because he received comments only on his final

product. As a result, Peter's motive about revision changed: "I never tried to write a revision that

I can satisfy myself." [March 2017, the interview]

By the end of the semester, because of his mainstream writing class culture, Peter

realized that it is a student's sole responsibility to learn about his errors and revision strategies:

> You should focus the grammar for yourself. You shouldn't have the idea of the grammar
> faults from your teacher. She doesn't have the time to tell you the grammar is wrong
> because you're here to learn English. You're learning writing but it's not being passive
> and lazy. [April 2017, the interview]

Peter was taking other academic classes and was writing term papers on different subjects

(biology lab reports, synthesis papers, and research papers). Since, in those courses, he did not

receive feedback on his language errors, his attitude towards revision changed based on his

immediate context:

> It's better to have good grammar, but if there is something wrong with it, it's okay… I
> feel if I go to Writing Center, that makes me feel better. At least, I tell myself I already
> paid the effort. [November 2017, the interview]

Peter's attitude toward revision is seen as ongoing, and an evolving construct rather than a stable

trait. However, Peter never lost the importance of working on his errors:

> I think feedback's the most important thing, actually. That's how we learn. Like if I don't
> know what I did wrong, how can I improve? It's like maybe I did really bad in my
> analysis paper. And I won't know. [February 2018, the interview]

> *Peter's self-perception of his improvement: Awareness.* At the start of this study, Peter's

description of what writing meant to him focused on his lack of confidence: "I have no idea at

the first time essay, I think I don't know what I need to write. And how to write." [September

2016, the interview] Over the duration of his first semester, Peter's understanding shifted to one

who saw writing as a simple assignment with overall predicted structure:

> Organization, also have, but most of grammar, and I think [laughs] it's the biggest one, and I know, I have a general idea about how to write. I need to quote something, like which example and write about it, what is about, how is it about, and write my opinion [November 2016, DI]

By the end of the year, his focus was on organization, the choice of sources and their effect on

potential readers:

> Should I just obey the format all the time? Actually I agree that the format is clear and easy to understand, but if everyone writes like this it is not interesting. And I don't know if one can have his own format? [May 2017, the interview]

As time passed, Peter's understanding shifted to one who saw writing as more complex and as

much about process as product. It is clearly manifested in his learning about the importance of

reading and engaging in analyzing reading text:

> The reading is a bit difficult because I am not quite sure the author's opinions about technology. Why he says he doesn't use it but his wife use it and she is a good teacher? And I also didn't see the real opinion of him in a direct way. [November 2016, DI]

> I also found reading and writing connection. I think I have a different feeling when I look at reading articles now. Like before, I would just have everything messed up and talk whatever, and write whatever. But I feel much clearer now. I think it's still because ESL writing asked us to focus on analyzing and we had a lot of reading. I know I have to analyze the topic and make a point of the topic for the paper. And I should think about why it's very important that I can write, and what else I can discuss that it's interesting. [December 2017, the interview]

Peter was clearly aware of his progress in writing, and he could articulate them well with specific

examples. When asked about his development in writing over two years, Peter spoke in terms of

becoming gradually more proactive in responding to writing assignments:

> In September, I would just write whatever I want to write. I see the prompt now and I know what I need to write. And know, is it a thesis statement? And I need three points in each part. At least I have general ideas. Also now I have at least to think about and make a draft. Make a layout. [April 2017, the interview]

I feel I am still improving. And I see my improvement and I think my ideas are more clear now. I know this, but I didn't really notice. I mean, it's so important that I should have supporting points and I can go from here. Just not afraid of it now [writing]. [December 2017, the interview]

When Peter was asked to self-assess his writing at interviews over two and half years, he was the only one who reported he "got better every time" he wrote; he reported gradual development. However his anxiety towards writing was also remarkably similar at the start and end of the study:

I don't know how to start writing. I sit there a half an hour. I want to start it, but but I don't know how to start it. I just too much fear [laughing]. [December 2016, the conference]

I want to finish writing as soon as possible because it's still hard. I'm not a native speaker so it's hard. And I'm just not sure. [October 2017, the interview]

I don't like writing, but I feel I'm doing progress in writing. [March 2018, the interview]

Anxiety is one of the most important affective factors responsible for individual differences in the success or failure of L2 learning. Anxiety is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994), but the current consensus is that language anxiety should be viewed as a situation-specific construct that recurs consistently over time within the given context of language learning situations (Horwitz, 2001; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). Although Peter was invested in writing and revisions, his anxiety about writing did not change. However, Peter's self-efficacy beliefs kept him motivated and invested in writing.

Self-efficacy is a core construct in the field of educational research because of the strong empirical relationship between self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and behavior (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Self-efficacy beliefs play an important role in how learners feel and think, and how they motivate themselves and behave (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Prior empirical research suggests that high self-efficacy is positively associated with L2-related task performance and achievement

167

(Hsieh & Kang, 2010), and with specific language skills such as writing and reading (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006; Woodrow, 2011).

Because these tasks-specific self-beliefs exert control over individuals' thoughts, feelings, and actions, they function as a vital force in future performance and success (Mills, 2014). Studies have also consistently demonstrated that writing self-efficacy is positively linked with learner's interest and expanded effort, capacity for self-regulation, writing self-concept, goal achievement, and successful writing performance (Pajares, 2003; Piniel & Csizér, 2015). In Peter's case, although he had writing anxiety, his tasks-specific beliefs promoted stronger writing agency, higher perceived value of writing, and better self-regulation.

Locating L2 writer revision agency: Engagement in dialogic interactions. Peter and I met a total of 12 times from September until late December 2016 for the DI (Appendix JJ.4.). Peter initiated the questions in all DIs. He particularly drew attention to potential problems in his writing and revisions (Appendix JJ.5.).

In those cases, Peter not only initiated the interaction but also determined the immediate content of that interaction, and led the dialogues to focus on a specific issue. In other cases, Peter's attempts to explain reasons for using a particular revision strategy and metalinguistic explanations were also common. When I was explaining the problem, Peter never remained silent, and engaged in active dialogue by offering possible ways to improve his writing. In all episodes, Peter either tried to understand or understood the information provided by me and successfully elaborated on it, that is, active integration was observed. Although Peter validated the significance of feedback and followed my comments, in some occasions by justifying his revision choices, he took on a relatively powerful role within the feedback discussion. Peter responded to the feedback with some level of disagreement. In those particular DIs, by

associating himself with his own work and claiming knowledge of his own work, Peter assumed

L2 writer revision agency.

Some extracts (5) below will be presented to examine Peter's revision agency and his

dynamic interaction at DIs. The extracts are placed in an ascending order (time and tasks), in a

largely intuitive way.

Extract (1) is a straightforward example of an exchange in which Peter gives a response

to my questions and this responsive is positively evaluated. This can be seen as a primary level in

his agency, since he has to formulate and articulate a thought. As the result Peter successfully

self-revises the problem. The comment was "word choice", and Peter did not follow feedback,

and corrected by making the word "motivation" plural:

> Task 1 (September 2016)
> Draft 2: It is smart for people to choose different way to study a foreign language for
> <u>different motivation.</u>
> Final: It is smart for people to choose different ways to study a foreign language for
> <u>different motivations.</u>
>
> S: How did you correct?
> P: It means [reads] "language for different motivations", right?
> S: The comment is "word choice", [and
> P: [Hm: [uncertain]
> S: You said "motivation", yes, it's good, but:, it would be better to use another word
> P: Addition, or (.3)
> S: Or, yes, great, any other synonyms
> P: Okay, because I have used this word, ah: (.3)
> S: Yes?
> P: Okay: (.3)
> S: You are saying, "choosing ways:, to study, to achieve, what?
> P: Hm: (.3) to achieve: (.3)
> S: Just think about it, what is motivation for you?
> P: Hm:, motivation is (.3)
> S: Let's say, [draws on his draft] here is the person, on the left, right?
> P: Yeah
> S: Here is the: (.3) target, on the right, so it means learning a foreign language, right?
> P: Oka:y:
> S: You are saying "choosing different ways"
> P: Yeah

S: It means choosing ways to achieve this point, target?
P: Yeah
S: Now, where is the motivation here? In this diagram?
P: Motivation, is something that can motivate, and give him power
S: Perfect, so it means, it's here, right? [draws on his paper]
P: Yeah
S: You see, you start with motivation to achieve: what?
P: Ah: to achieve the goal or ambition, not motivation
S: Perfect
P: Yeah
S: I know what you mean [referring to his original version]
P: I have to:, maybe it's better to write "choose different ways to (.3) and motivation to achieve the goal"
S: Yeah, see, you have self-corrected
P: Okay thank you, I got the point [smiles]

Extract (2) takes another step up in agency, since Peter asks a self-initiated question,

followed by my explanation, followed by another question from Peter. Peter employs a

significant amount of self-initiated agency in asking these open-ended content-oriented

questions:

Task 2 (September 2016)
S: Let's look at your task
P: I have a question about the format?
S: Give me any example please
P: Like my (.3) I want to know, do you like my idea?, the form of my writing?
S: The way you present your ideas? organization?
P: The way (.3) I mean I use a lot of time on thinking how to write this essay and what should I write about the article, I think I make a lot of ideas on page, but I use, I only summarize little, you said it should one third of the paper, one paragraph, but I have a little (.3)
S: When I said one third, it meant the information that you are taking should be one third, for example, the whole paper you are writing has three parts, and one part needs to be a summary and two parts your opinion, it does not mean it needs to come here, you give information in the introduction and in your body, You may have some references to the original article, you need to remind your readers what you are talking about
P: Okay, no more than one third, but it could be shorter?
S: Right

In extracts (3) and (4), Peter's higher sense of agency consists of the fact that he

volunteers to explain his revision choices. This is the initiative that requires a strong sense of

autonomy. What is more significant here is that Peter exhibits a strong level of joint

(collaborative) agency, because not only does he offer his revision, but also requests to be

corrected (instructed). In this sense the event manifests a quality that transcends Peter and that

characterizes the joint activity of collaborative learning/teaching. Thus, Peter's revision agency

could be seen as not only an expression of his individual volition, but also as a feature that can

characterize a collaborative, co-constructed dialogue:

> Extract (3) Task 2 (September 2016)
> Draft 2: That's why he gives the reader his action about facebook is delete all the people who are no matter to him. Because the fake friends is no matter to him. Finally he encourages us to make friends in person rather than make friends on facebook.
> Final: That's why he gives the reader his way to deal with the Facebook is to delete all the people who are no matter to him. Finally he encourages us to make friends in person rather than make friends on facebook.
>
> S: [reads] "Because the fake one no matter to him" (.3) you deleted this sentence, which is fragment? Why?
> P: Because I think I have already written this
> S: Okay
> P: So this is repeated, so I think I should not write this idea again
> S: I see
> P: And I put the second sentence into the first paragraph, so I do not want to repeat too much to make the summary too long
> S: Good
>
> Extract (4) Task 4 (October 2016)
> Draft 2: I like the environment of the library which is very close to my dorm that it only takes me 7 minutes to walk to the library.
> Final: I like the environment of the library which is very close to my dorm. It only takes me 7 minutes to walk to the library.
>
> S: I said conjunction, [but
> P: Yeah, I changed it because it's better
> S: It's better if you separate sentences and have two simple sentences?
> P: Ah: yeah
> S: What is conjunction?
> P: Conjunction is using another word like "because, since" like that to connect two sentences
> S: You could also use coordinating conjunction, "and" [reads] "it only takes me 7 minutes [to walk

P: [Okay hm: "and" cannot be, (.3) it could be yeah, I chose to use two sentences and I think it's also okay, right?
S: Ah: okay
P: Like I know I can use "and", so but I want to use two sentences or, now I know I can use "and" so conjunction
S: It's your paper, and if you want to have two simple sentences, it's fine
P: When it's short, it's clear
S: Good point

Extract (5) shows high levels of agency in Peter during discussion about the "point of view and pronoun shift". Here Peter is directly debating with me, because he has a strong opinion about it. As in extracts (3) and (4), agency could be contributed to Peter individually as well as to the entire speech event. Indeed, Peter's revision agency could be described as individual and collaborative, where the second could be argued to be of a higher level on terms of DI quality. Especially in extract (5), it can be argued that the entire interaction is energized by the spirited discussion about giving suggestions to readers in the conclusion part of the paper:

Extract (5) Task 5 (November 2016)
Draft 2: One can common on whatever they want to common. If there is something don't need to see, just ignore it. Do whatever you want to do! Make friend whoever you want to know!
Final: One can comment on whatever they want to comment. If there is something one doesn't want to see, just ignore it. Do whatever one want to do! Make friend whoever one want to know!

S: You did not do anything with this, [reads] "Do whatever one want to do! Make friend whoever one want to know!" You ignored?
P: I think I changed
S: Hm?
P: I changed to "one"
S: You are still using "do", it means "you do", "whatever you want to do"
P: Yeah
S: "You make friends"
P: I can use the word
S: You are giving commands, and when we write for this task, we do not give commands, for example, for other types of essays, the process essay we give commands on how to accomplish something
P: Oh:

S: We give commands when we describe something, for example, how to clean the engine of the car. Then you would say "open the trunk, get your instruments", because you are giving instructions on what to do, but here, it's not the process, you are not commanding somebody to do anything, you are just sharing your opinion

P: Yeah, so how should I change this?

S: How did you do it here?

P: I just changed "one", but you mean I cannot recommend something?

S: Ah:

P: I want people to do just as he [the author] wants to, and (.3)

S: Or you could say, the "recommendation" is doing whatever is possible, or you could rewrite as "making friends", "doing everything" so "the recommendations are making friends, being free"

P: Also can I write, "do whatever I want to do?"

S: Okay, recommendation is to do whatever one wants to do and make friends, you're rewriting by using infinitive

P: Why I should write like this?

S: Your whole essay is written in 3rd person singular, because you are writing "the author proposes, the author gives", this is 3rd person singular and then, you are using second person, when you write you should keep one point of view, so you are using 3rd person [and also

P: [Can I use "I" ?

S: Yes, you can, when you want to say what you really believe, for a stronger statement, you use "I", it's okay

P: [nodding] But if I change into "the recommendation" (.3)

S: Ye:s [meaning continue]

P: I can write, (.3) if the recommendation is and then I can use the second condition [person]

S: Okay, let me write it down [writes on his draft] "the recommendation is to do" you are changing the whole sentence

P: Oh, this is the subject?

S: Yes

P: Okay

S: See the point, and "to do" becomes the object

P: And this one is also should be changed? ah: (.3) I could write like, "I think one can comment on whatever", so this sentence to change to "I think"...

Summing up, the extracts can be categorized in terms of revision agency in the following

manner:

(1) Peter volunteered answers to the instructor's questions.

(2) Peter voluntarily asked questions.

(3) Peter volunteered to create a collaborative agency event.

(4) Peter voluntarily entered into a debate with the instructor and created a collaborative

agency event.

Peter exhibited participatory, inquisitive, autonomous, and committed learner attributes. In Peter's case, his revision agency can be related to issues such as intentionality, initiative, intrinsic motivation and autonomy. Peter was an active learner who shaped his own learning path. His initiative to emerge himself in discussing revision strategies and his engagement in understanding his core errors, and meaningfully discussing his opinion with me could be connected to his self-regulation and self-determination. van Lier (2008) suggests three core features of agency: (1) agency involves initiative or self-regulation by the learner, (2) agency is interdependent, that is, it mediates and is mediated by the sociocultural context, and (3) agency includes an awareness of the responsibility for one's own actions vis-a-vis the environment, including affected others (p.172). As it is seen through Peter's interactions, he was not passive and he exhibited high levels of writer agency because he was initiative, his knowledge was mediated by the context, but more importantly he was responsible for his own revisions.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Revision Agency as a Path to Meaningful Second Language Writing Experience

My main goal was to investigate feedback as a holistic phenomenon. I paid attention to individual revision differences among student-participants, to their SLW history and prior feedback practices, their immediate context and future orientations (SLW and its role in their future), their response to dialogic feedback (DF) and, consequently, their engagement in dialogic interactions (DI), and finally their learning outcomes. Having attended to all these factors, I found that DF brought positive changes in student-participants' writing processes and facilitated meaningful revisions. The output-prompting nature such as elicitations and clarification requests of DF appeared to have a meaningful effect on student-participants and launched development of their L2 writer revision agency. What appeared to be essential was that student-participants identified their progress by attending to this type of feedback, and coined themselves the phrase "personal approach to [our] problems" (n=17) when reflecting about DF. Not only did DF help student-participants to both revise their drafts and to demonstrate greater accuracy and fluency in subsequent assignments, but also it facilitated the development of L2 writer revision agency.

Given the nature of the DIs in this case study, several themes emerged. First, student-participants recognized through DIs that a heightened awareness of audience (specifically in the words of student-participants "reader expectations") helped them in producing more reader-friendly essays (or as student-participants pointed out "giving a clear message to the reader"). For all of them (n=17), the audience awareness was connected to "understanding" their errors

175

and investing in revisions of those errors. Second, my interest in understanding student-participants' ideas/sentences and giving them unlimited opportunity to self-revise encouraged them to discuss essay excerpts/errors. The dialogues acted as a form of revision, which empowered student-participants and gave a feeling that they had control over their writing (n=15). Many student-participants shared that the nature of the dialogues was "reflective", and in fact "talking about revisions" made them notice their common errors (n=12), and prompted the realization of investing in SLW and revisions. Third, because I acted as a peer, and minimized my authority during the dialogues (by using an indirect type of feedback and "what, why, how" questions), student-participants took ownership of their revisions (n=13), and invested in negotiating their corrections.

Student-participants' increased understanding of and participation in DIs affected their writing and revision strategies. Based on the results of this study (n=17), I argue that L2 writer agency cannot be considered without L2 writer revision agency. The concept of L2 writer revision agency emerged within data as an attempt to conceptualize a higher-order factor which can help explain sustained motivation in attending to revisions (Mary's and Peter's cases), or demotivation resulting in partial engagement (Sara's and Veronica's cases). Revision agency as a concept, I believe, might prove to be one of the most reliable constructs of long-term commitment and effort of the student-participants. Findings suggest that student-participants' revision agency is not static, as well as their portrayal of selves, which evolved during the course of the writing assignments and DIs. Student-participants approached and understood revisions in the context of writing as a tool for learning.

Emotion. Another finding that emerged during dialogic DIs is student-participant positive emotions toward SLW and revisions. For example, Kevin was disengaged from the

course and revisions, but our continuous dialogues sparkled his engagement (although at the end of the study). In Misa's case, the engagement was not promoted during 16 weeks, but after 9 months, she reflected that those dialogues helped her navigate resources in academic classes and that she realized the importance of L2 revisions right before leaving the IEP writing course. This finding also has pedagogical relevance in shedding light on emotions in SLW academic contexts. It seems that emotions are not negligible when it comes to *learning* about L2 revisions (indeed, it was a learning for student-participants on how to revise). Being aware of those emotional states may maximize SLW learning experiences. By promoting enjoyment, especially with writing activities and topics students like and feel positive about in the classroom, L2 revision experiences in the instructional setting could also be enhanced. A pedagogical implication that can be drawn from this finding is that L2 learners align themselves with a classroom task not only according to the teacher's pedagogical intention, but, more importantly, according to the way in which engagement in the task is most meaningful for them (i.e., meeting their goals, similar to Sara's and Yuna's cases). In this respect, this case study points to the need to pay greater attention both to individual students' trajectories and also to their hopes and aspirations for the future with respect to the use of the target language. Awareness of the role played by the target language in the past, the present, and the projected future of individual students, in turn, could valuably be used in creating SLW curriculum (Ruowen's case).

Another finding of this study is that student-participant individual characteristics are not stable but show salient temporal and situational variation (e.g., Ruowen's, Peter's, Sara's, and Veronica's cases). The parameters of a social situation change over time (university life and courses), and this change affects the learner characteristics operating within that context (success vs. failure). Understanding learner variation is an essential part of any study in L2 feedback and

writing. The significant variance in student-participant engagement and with the IEP writing course explain that a SLW classroom is not a static setting, but a compound phenomenon situated in a dynamic classroom context. Because some student-participants found the revision processes to be difficult (n=5), it is very important to nurture positive motivational thinking about SLW and revisions. Weiner (2010), the main proponent of Attribution Theory, argues that the subjective reasons to which we attribute our past successes and failures considerably shape our motivational disposition underlying future action. If, for example, students ascribe past failure in a particular task to low ability on their part (e.g., Lana's case), the chances are that they will not try the activity ever again (e.g., Rikuto's and Misa's cases), whereas if they believe that the problem lay in their insufficient effort (e.g., Mary's, Yuna's, Sara's, Veronica's, Ruowen's, Kevin's, and Peter's cases) or the unsuitable learning strategies that they had employed (e.g., Beth's case), they are more likely to give it another try (e.g., Peter's and Mary's cases). Students must be encouraged to negotiate their past experiences and build the link with their future achievement efforts (Ruowen's and Sara's cases). One of the findings suggest that *effort* plays a crucial role in overcoming negative SLW revisions or lack of success (Lana's, Mary's, Peter's, and Yuna's cases). Therefore, creating a learning atmosphere which can attribute student positive outcomes to personal ability, internal factors (e.g., effort), and external factors (e.g., investment, goals) is very crucial in SLW courses.

Grammar. The interviews with the student-participants indicated that focus on grammar is still necessary for helping these students to improve their writing. How then can grammar awareness be provided effectively? Grammatical errors in student-participants' writing can be addressed by using students' real writing samples as much as possible. When I used textbook essay samples, the student-participants asked me to use their writing when working on particular

grammatical features (specifically for syntactic problems). Since many L2 writers may have both negative and positive attitude towards grammar drills, because in reality the majority possess grammatical knowledge, it is very crucial not to *instruct/teach* but to provide *stress free* mini-workshops (10 minutes only!) on how to apply that grammar knowledge in practice. Therefore, the focus of grammar revisions must be on the process rather than product.

Another factor to consider is that providing grammar mini-workshops right before the revision and allowing students to focus on one specific aspect of grammar at a time is detrimental. Although it might require some planning, tailoring the workshops to the specific needs of *each* individual student in that classroom may promote investment from the student's part, and as a result develop his/her writer revision agency. For example, Veronica was more engaged in solving her punctuation problems, or Mary was more concerned about her "run on" sentences, and on the other hand, Lana was upset with her misuses of "transition words". By targeting these student-participants' self-perceived errors (responding to *their goals* for revisions), I organized the workshop on providing four strategies (not many because of cognitive overload) on correcting sentence structure issues which targeted "punctuation, transition words", as well as "run on" sentences. This kind of specific, guided practice will promote student revision agency (that is, investing in solving the problems) and prevent them from doing guesswork as they work on grammar revisions in their writing. Raising grammar awareness is imperative in any SLW course.

Feedback. As discussed in Chapter 2, corrective feedback research has produced mixed results with regard to the effectiveness of teachers' error correction. The findings of this case study found individual differences – such as attitudes towards SLW, feedback, and writing tasks as well as investment in the process of revisions – which influenced student-participants'

receptivity to error correction and thus the effectiveness of the feedback. More importantly, student-participants wanted to have their errors corrected, and the majority expressed their preferences regarding indirect types of feedback (n=16) because, in the words of student-participants "they make [them] think".

This case study can provide valuable implications for teacher provision of feedback. All discussed cases have shown the uniques ways student-participants engaged with feedback, even when feedback provided was similar in terms of scope, type, and frequency, and all student-participants were offered the opportunity to be engaged in Google Docs dialogues and to self-revise during face-to-face DIs. Only by working closely and intensively, I could *understand* unique student-participant revision trajectories. For example, some focused on reading (n=4) more than on writing, and some ignored reading and focused on writing (n=7). Many invested in learning strategies to avoid their common errors (n=8), while others invested in the revision processes when the writing topic was interesting (n=2). A few provided *mechanical revisions* without reflecting on the value of their work because SLW was not connected to their future plans (n=5). In contrast, some became involved during the process when they felt the progress and sense of accomplishment (n=3). A few others, although they realized the benefits of revisions, could not engage to their fullest potential because of external factors: family burdens (n=2), and academic loads in other university courses (n=3).

A pedagogical implication that can be drawn from these findings is that DF (or feedback in general) requires commitment from both the teacher and students. While written feedback and follow-up oral feedback should be fine-tuned and targeted to the students' developmental level, such efforts on the teacher's part may be futile if the students themselves do not view feedback as a language learning opportunity with the potential to not only polish their texts, but also to

improve their L2 competence (n=3). Therefore, having a realistic understanding of students'

ability levels and being aware that students do not necessarily understand and act on feedback is

imperative (n=5). For example, when commenting on "articles and plural forms of noun

phrases", I was not sure exactly what a student-participant particularly meant. Was it an article

issue or plural form of the noun? Consequently, I advised two options for corrections: article and

noun ending. What I found was that when student-participants were given two choices to revise,

they would follow *the easy way out*, and focus on adding plurality even though initially they

meant to use an article. If asked to rewrite the phrase or to delete it, student-participants would

delete without attempting to solve it. In the case of working on run on problems, many would

split the sentence and, as a result, would have two simple sentences.

Therefore, as much as possible, taking into account students' levels of anxiety (e.g.,

avoiding to take a risk with the usage of articles or to experiment with subordination could be

attributed to student anxiety) and developmental level is suggested (e.g., if a student cannot

differentiate between count and non-count nouns, commenting on the use of articles without

explaining types of nouns is demotivating for students). A better strategy would be to

communicate with students about the acquisitional value.

In addition to having open discussions with students to better understand their beliefs,

goals, previous experience with feedback, and their developmental levels, teachers can explicitly

inform students about their feedback approaches and strategies, conduct checks on students'

understanding of feedback, and build in supportive systems such as workshops to facilitate

students with processing and using feedback. Instructions about how to use external L2 learning

resources could also be helpful to better engage students with feedback. For example, with "word

choice" problems, student-participants revised better when they were directed to particular

websites to learn about their error. Word choice is the most difficult problem to revise, because it requires pragmatic knowledge (which even students at the advanced level might lack). If these students are not given support and are not directed to the *right* resources, they would use L1 resources when working on this type of error (n=9). The best strategy is to provide links to collocation dictionaries (e.g., many student-participants pointed that specific links to examples and online dictionaries made their revisions interesting, n=14).

Another advantage of DIs was that it provided a platform to talk about linguistic errors in more details. Written feedback does not assist learners to correct complex structures such as "relative clauses, conditional patterns, run ons, and fragments". Although DIs facilitated understanding and awareness of those problems and student-participants were encouraged to experiment with revisions, errors in Post-tasks show that syntactic problems could not be resolved. Based on my intensive work with student-participants and our interactions, I think these types of errors need multiple treatments over an extended period of time. Another important issue to consider is that coding these syntax issues in a way that student-participants could understand the problem constitutes another challenge. If the same error is repeated, then the student may notice the common error; however, for example, "run on" issues is the type that varies each time for each occurrence and every writing task. While composing feedback, I particularly could not decide how to code sentence structure problems, because the sentence could have been revised in multiple ways. Even if the feedback is comprehensible, the students may not have or might be developing linguistic knowledge, which may dramatically affect their understanding of the comment, and consequently lead to deletion of the problem and not investing in learning about it. Thus, one of the common strategies could be to ask a student to

rephrase his/her sentences by asking the question "what do you mean?" Posting this question may not prevent new errors, but would trigger student responsibility to revise.

Revisions. The connections between revision strategy use and student-participant engagement was observed. Strategy use was linked to student-participant beliefs, since they selected the most appropriate strategies for themselves on the basis of what they believe is the most appropriate approach toward revising the drafts. The results show that no individual strategy is good or bad. Moreover, it is not necessarily a matter of the more strategies used the better the learning or the better, in the case of a writing task, the end-product. While revising, student-participants combine linguistic knowledge with revision strategies; it is the combination of both that would lead to variability in writing task outcomes. Therefore, when designing a writing task, students' linguistic knowledge need to be considered as task requirements activate student revision strategies at a level that challenges and does not demotivate them.

Another result that emerged is that student-participants' goals for SLW and writing tasks affected their revisions. Student-participant goals were their interest, as well as their core values and beliefs about SLW, tasks, activities, and revision sessions. When they had self-concordant goals, they were pursued with greater commitment and, although they offered little intrinsic value, student-participants engaged in revisions which were demanding (e.g., Sara), stressful (e.g., Kevin), repetitive (e.g., Sam) or even outright boring (e.g., Rikuto). Nevertheless, student-participants willingly entered into these activities and generated positive feelings of successful revisions. For example, Mary, having 4.0 GPA and possessing a strong learning agency, described spending countless hours on revisions. Improving SLW and learning to revise her errors were not instrumentally-driven (there was no concrete value); rather her ultimate goals concerned self-improvement and effecting a change in who she was and how she saw herself

(learning agency). Her goals were thus highly self-concordant. Because her self-concordant goals emanated directly from self-choices which were central to both her current and future identities, the motivational power of such goals tended to be enduring.

Goals are crucial for any motivated behavior because they provide direction and purpose. The following steps could be taken to increase students' goal-orientedness in the classroom: by formulating explicit class goals accepted by them (e.g., Ruowen and Sara); by having the students negotiate their individual goals and outline a common purpose (e.g., Mary, Yuna, Lana, and Kevin), and display the final outcome in public; by drawing attention from time to time to the class goals and how particular activities help to attain them (e.g., Sara and Ruowen); by keeping the class goals achievable by re-negotiating if necessary (e.g., Kevin, Lana, and Yuna); by encouraging students to select specific, short-term goals for themselves (e.g., Beth and Veronica); and by emphasizing goal completion deadlines and offer ongoing feedback (e.g., Peter). Encouraging students to take ownership of their L2 learning goals and processes and giving them control of as many decisions as possible regarding revisions in the given context is crucial for developing L2 writer revision agency.

Many student-participants believed that DIs were their progress checks and that the structure of the dialogue provided them the feeling of achievement (n=15). Progress checks may depict clearly the level of investment which has already been made and the momentum already achieved, which in turn strengthens ongoing commitment. Therefore, providing detailed affirmative/positive feedback on students' progress, setting aside a short period of time at the start of every week (two weeks, or even three weeks) to allow students to think of and record personal targets, having set up explicit progress checkpoints, and whenever applicable,

celebrating their successful revisions are imperative in any SLW course with the focus on revisions.

Writing Tasks. The student-participants' engagement in a number of crucial processes during their problem-solving activity resulted in interaction between writing task factors and their learner factors. Importantly, cognitive accounts of writing emphasizes the relevance of looking into the nature of learner agency in the problem-solving activity that characterizes writing, especially regarding students' own perceptions of task demands, their resulting goal setting activity and, on the basis of it, their processing activity during task execution - writing and revising. Some student-participants prioritize fluency over accuracy. In classrooms, if a balance between fluency and accuracy is important, then SLW instruction needs to ensure that learners do not consistently prioritize one of these at the expense of other. Students who might prefer to emphasize fluency would then need to be treated slightly differently from students who prioritize form. Students, when they enter SLW courses, may prefer to do what comes naturally to them, even though this may have unfortunate consequences for longer-term development of SLW skills. In those cases, it may be a teacher's expertise to assess what is appropriate for individual student so as to avoid unbalanced development of writing skills.

Teacher and dialogic approach to teaching SLW. Many student-participants reflected that I was *enthusiastic* about their success and *believed* in them (n=14). Three student-participants shared that they engaged in revisions because "it was important for [me]". For SLW courses teacher motivation is crucial. In the introduction to their book *Motivating Learners, Motivating Teachers*, Dörnyei and Kubanyiova (2014) explain the inclusion of the topic of teacher motivation as follows: "A transformation of classroom practice has to begin with the teachers … teachers can become transformational leaders, and the engine of this transformational

drive is the teacher's vision for change and improvement" (p.3). Therefore, they conclude that teacher and student motivation are inextricably linked "because the former is needed for the latter to blossom" (p.3). An increase in teacher motivation leads to improved motivational practice on their behalf, which in turn promotes student investment, which eventually results in enhanced student performance. The only strategy that I could recommend based on my fifteen years of teaching experience is that L2 writers are better graded for progress rather than the final product.

Student-participant revisions and their own reflections about the process suggest important pedagogical implications. Though it's hard to pinpoint which resource enables continuous student engagement with revisions (time and context), and developing L2 writer revision agency (identity and ideology), teachers can provide balanced affordances. This is important because students' backgrounds are not fully understood nor their desires fully predictable by the teacher. Students can make numerous repeated errors, yet teachers should think of themselves as facilitators of the types of negotiations students should undertake for their development of L2 writer revision agency, not models or authorities. Teachers should also devise dialogic pedagogies that will make students more engaged in their voice construction, turning their errors into positive affordances. The dialogical approach can help students negotiate their own L2 revisions in relation to their interlocutors (peers, teachers, and themselves) and other ecological resources (time, context, and future). For example, choosing course materials that provide positive models of multilinguals with critical voices, but also those which introduce the dominant norms to acquaint students with the established discourses is detrimental (Sara's and Veronica's cases). Similarly, while providing students a safe and friendly environment for

experimentation, teachers should help students confront the institutional and discoursal structures that impose dominant norms.

Further research. As student-participants were advanced students from the same class taught by one instructor, the current findings cannot be hastily generalized to students of other performance levels or in other pedagogical contexts. Further studies thus need to be conducted with more student-participants of differing proficiency levels, and in different pedagogical and social contexts. The population of the current study constituted mostly students from Asian backgrounds; thus broadening the research scope to other L2 learners would be beneficial.

The findings of this study should be interpreted with caution, not only because of the relatively small size of the study (n=17) but also because of the nature of the writing tasks used. Had I used more discipline-specific topics in the Post-tasks (2, 3, and 4), some improvements in accuracy could have been observed. Not only topics, but also had I controlled for task complexity and did not use a reading component, student-participants could have worked on accuracy and would not feel anxious about fluency (e.g., understanding the reading and getting their ideas on paper). This is also the point made by Norris and Manchón (2012) in their review of studies on SLW development. The authors note that research on writing development needs to take into consideration the extent to which the tasks used enable learners to display their knowledge and in turn what it is that researchers can observe about writing development. Although reading was involved and student-participants engaged with textual analysis, other aspects of academic writing (e.g., incorporating sources, development of an authorial voice) were not examined in the current study. Further research could investigate the link between revision agency and the development of an authorial voice.

Another shortcoming of this study relates to the frequency of error counts employed (only accuracy). Future studies thus need to consider using a broader range of measures that capture features that are characteristic of academic writing, including more appropriate measures of syntactic and lexical complexity, and also explore the causal link between DIs and its effect on student lexical and syntactic complexity.

Final thoughts. I conclude this work with reflections on case study methodology. I approached this study (and all other pilot studies) with an interest in the experiences of bi/multilingual learner revisions. Although I did not have an opportunity to continue working with each student-participant form my first initial sample (August-December 2016; n=17), I was happy that some of them volunteered to continue their path with me (January 2017; n=9). Other students (n=7) left the country, but they were willing to continue working, and we worked and communicated online. Because they (n=7) stood in sharp contrast to 9 student-participants who continued taking academic classes and stayed in an English speaking environment, I did not include them in my discussions.

During two and a half years, only three student-participants continued working with me (August 2016-May 2018); others changed universities (n=3), and a few returned home (n=4). Although two of them asked not to be included in my analysis, yet I found that longitudinal case studies, as is seen in the case of Peter, were able to capture some of the complexity and diversity of L2 learners' trajectories as academic writers. In particular, I found that in-depth interviews over the duration of the study (in all cases, such as August 2016, January 2017, and my journey with Peter from August 2016 till May 2018) fostered learner-researcher relationships that opened up space for insights into the unpredictable and unexpected practices contributing to the leaners' progress as academic writers (Casanave, 2002). All student-participants told me they enjoyed the

opportunities to talk at length about their issues and especially to reflect upon their learning experiences — opportunities they said were not available to them elsewhere in the university context. The in-depth interviews, in my experience, encouraged self-reflection and contributed to "the learning that happens as people listen to themselves put feelings and experiences into words" (Casanave, 2002, p. 33). The kind of reflexivity about writing that was built up in these interviews could thus be linked to student-participants' success in SLW.

Case studies orient toward participants as individual learners because SLW is an act of learning for the majority of L2 writers. I hope this focus on L2 leaner revision agency in this case study helps to redress the more common orientation of L2 feedback toward *learner texts only* movement.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal, 78,* 465–483.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9,* 227–258.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1994). In P. Morris (Ed.), *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov.* New York, NY: Edward Arnold.

Barcelos, A.M.F., & Kalaja, P. (2011). Introduction to beliefs about SLA revisited. *System, 39*(3), 282–289.

Best, K. (2011). Transformation through research-based reflection: A self-study of written feedback practice. *TESOL Journal, 2*(4), 492–509.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 102–118.

Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 348–363.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research, 12*, 409–431.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009a). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*, 193–214.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009b). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal, 63*, 204–211.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers

    with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*, 207–217.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effective of different types of corrective

    feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14,* 191–205.

Brice, C. (2005). Coding data in qualitative research on L2 writing: Issues and implications. In P.

    K. Matsuda and T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the*

    process of knowledge construction (pp. 159–175). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effect of error correction in L2 writing: Not so

    straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 136–140.

Bruton, A. (2010). Another reply to Truscott on error correction: Improved situated designs over

    statistics. *System, 38,* 491–498.

Byrnes, H., & Manchón, R.M. (Eds.). (2014). *Task-based language learning – insights from and*

    for L2 writing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford,

    England: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2000). Negotiating ideologies through English: Strategies from the

    periphery. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on*

    English (pp. 121–131). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). Critical pedagogy in L2 learning and teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.),

    Handbook of research in second language teaching and research (pp. 931–949).

    Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2015). ''Blessed in my own way'': Pedagogical affordances for dialogical

    voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,*

27, 122–139.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267–296.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2004). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* Boston: Jossey Bass.

Cohen, A. D., & Dornyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles, and strategies. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170-190). London: Edward Arnold.

Conrad, S., & Goldstein, L. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 147–179.

Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

DeKeyser, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Practicing in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Dweck, C.S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Random House.

Ellis, N. (2007). The associative–cognitive CREED. In B. Van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 77–96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ellis, N., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics. Introduction to the special issue. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(4), 558–589.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36*, 353–371.

Erlam, R., Ellis, R., & Batstone, R. (2013). Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing: Two approaches compared. *System, 41,* 257–268.

Esfandiar, F., Yaqubi, B., & Marzban, A. (2014). Learning corrected target forms: Students'

    corrective feedback through teacher's written corrective feedback in Iranian EFL

    Context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(3), 504–512.

Evans, N., Hartshorn, K., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic written

    corrective feedback for university-matriculated ESL learners. *System, 39,* 229–239.

Evans, N., Hartshorn, K., & Tuioti, E. (2010). Written corrective feedback: Practitioners'

    perspectives. *IJES, 10*(2), 47–77.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott

    (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 1–11.

Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: The

    University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do

    we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime?) *Journal of Second Language*

    Writing, 13, 49–62.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and

    long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback*

    in second language writing: Contexts and issues (pp. 81–104). Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press.

Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. Ann Arbor: The

    University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D., Brown, J., Liu, H., & Stine, M. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing

    classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(2), 207–234.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*.

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ferris, D., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 307–329.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161–184.

Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *IRAL, 45,* 69–94.

Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. Van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 180–206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goldstein, M. L. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 63–80.

Goldstein, M. L. (2010). Finding "theory" in the particular: An "autobiography" of what I learned and how about teacher feedback. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.). *Practicing theory in second language writing* (pp. 72–89). Indiana: Parlor Press.

Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 40–53.

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30,* 31–44.

Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*, 84–109.

Hayes, D. (2009). Non-native English-speaking teachers, context and English language teaching. *System 37*, 1–11.

Hedgcock, J. (2012). Second language writing processes among adolescent and adult learners. In E. Grigorenko, E. Mambrino, & D. Preiss (Eds.), *Writing: A mosaic of new perspectives* (pp. 221–239). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21,* 112–126.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 125–132.

Hsieh, P. H., & Kang, H. S. (2010). Attribution and self-efficacy and their interrelationship in the Korean EFL context. *Language Learning, 60*, 606–627.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4(1),* 33–54.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, *31,* 217–230.

Hyland, K. (2013). Student perceptions of hidden messages in teacher written feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *39,* 180–187.

Hyland, K., & Anan, E. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of first language and experience. *System, 34,* 509–519.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006a). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An

introduction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1–20). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006b). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 206–224). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ibarrola, A. (2013). Reformulation and self-correction: Insights into correction strategies for EFL writing in a school context. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10,* 29–49.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kalaja, P., & Barcelos, A.M.F. (2003). Researching belief about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A.M.F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 7–33). New York, NY: Springer.

Kim, J. (2014). How does focus on form affect the revising processes of ESL writers?: Two case studies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*(1), 1-11.

Knoch, U., Rouhshad, A., & Storch, N. (2014). Does the writing of undergraduate ESL students develop after one year of study in an English-medium university? *Assessing Writing, 21,* 1–17.

Knoch, U., Rouhshad, A., Oon, S., & Storch, N. (2015). What happens to ESL students' writing after three years of study at an English medium university? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 28,* 39–52.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 4–33.

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 390–403.

Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and applications.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Institute of English.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal, 66*, 140–149.

Lantolf, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J.P., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1996). The changing nature of second language classroom research. In J. Schachter & S. Gass (Eds.), *Second language classroom research: Issues and opportunities* (pp. 157–173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lee, G., & Schallert, D. (2008). Meeting in the margins: Effects of the teacher–student relationship on revision processes of EFL college students taking a composition course. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17,* 165–182.

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal, 63*(1), 13–22.

Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 143–157.

Lee, I. (2011). Working smarter, not working harder: Revisiting teacher feedback in the L2

    writing classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 67*(3), 377–399.

Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using ''identity'' as an analytic lens to understand

    EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 330–345.

Lee, I. (2014a). Feedback in writing: Issues and challenges. *Assessing Writing, 19,* 1–5.

Lee, I. (2014b). Revisiting teacher feedback in EFL writing from sociocultural perspectives.

    TESOL Quarterly, 48(1), 201–213.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in*

    English. New York, NY: Routledge.

Liu, P-H. E., & Tannacito, D. J. (2013). Resistance by L2 writers: The role of racial and

    language ideology in imagined community and identity investment. *Journal of Second*

    Language Writing, 22, 355–373.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.

    Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San

    Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M. (2007). *Problems in SLA.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and

    language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning, 41*(1), 85–117.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive

    processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*(2), 283–305.

Matsuda, P. & Silva, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the*

    process of knowledge construction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matsuda, P., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence

and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 68–86.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mills, N. (2014). Self-efficacy in second language acquisition. In S. Mercer, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 6–22). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety, self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 276–295.

Montgomery, J., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 82–99.

Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2015). What our students tell us: Perceptions of three multilingual students on their academic writing in first year. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30,* 1–13.

Muldoon, A. (2009). A case for critical revision: Debunking the myth of the enlightened teacher versus the resistant student writer. *College Teaching, 57*(2), 67–71.

Norris, J. M., & Manchón, R. (2012). Investigating L2 writing development from multiple perspectives: Issues in theory and research. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 221–244). Boston, MA: deGruyter.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 9–31.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change.* Essex: Pearson.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ortega, L. (2012). Epilogue: Exploring L2 writing–SLA interfaces. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 404–415.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19*, 139–158.

Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(1), 127–151.

Piniel, K., & Csizér, K. (2015). Changes in motivation, anxiety and self-efficacy during the course of an academic seminar. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 164–189). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Plakans, L., & Gebril A. (2013). Using multiple texts in an integrated writing assessment: Source text use as a predictor of score. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 217–230.

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 375–389.

Qi, D.S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 277–303.

Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Nonnative speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers:*

Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession (Vol. 5), (pp. 283–303). Springer Science & Business Media.

Reis, S.D. (2012). "Being underdog": Supporting nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in claiming and asserting professional legitimacy. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*(3), 33–58.

Riazantseva, A. (2012). Outcome measure of L2 writing as a mediator of the effects of corrective feedback on students' ability to write accurately. *System, 40*, 421–430.

Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory and the noticing hypothesis. *Language Learning, 45*, 283–331.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: A triadic framework for investigating task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 287–318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2007). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 45*, 193–214.

Robinson, P. (Ed.). (2011). *Second language task complexity: Researching the cognition hypothesis of language learning and performance.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sampson, A. (2012). Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Colombian EFL learners' writing. *System, 40,* 494–504.

Schachter, J. & Gass, S. (1996). *Second language classroom research: Issues and opportunities.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11,* 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11,* 11–26.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serrano, R., Tragant, E., & Llanes, A. (2012). A longitudinal analysis of the effects of one year abroad. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 68,* 138–163.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 255–283.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-610). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System, 37*, 556–569.

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 286–306.

Silva, T. & Matsuda, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Practicing theory in second language writing.* Indiana: Parlor Press.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second*

language instruction (pp. 183–205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443–466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. London: Sage.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language: Studies in honour of H. G Widdowson.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(3), 371–391.

Tardy, C. (2006). Appropriation, ownership, and agency: Negotiating teacher feedback in academic settings. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (60–78). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Thurlings, M., Vermeulen, M., Bastiaens, T., & Stijnen, S. (2013). Understanding feedback: A learning theory perspective. *Educational Research Review, 9,* 1–15.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language*

Learning, 46, 327–369.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 255–272.

Truscott, J. (2010a). Some thoughts on Anthony Bruton's critique of the correction debate. *System, 38*, 329–335.

Truscott, J. (2010b). Further thoughts on Anthony Bruton's critique of the correction debate. *System, 38,* 626–633.

Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 292–305.

Usher, E., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research, 78*, 751–796.

Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 1–27.

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 156,* 279–296.

Van Beuningen, C., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in Dutch multilingual classroom. *Language Learning, 62,* 1–41.

Vandermeulen, C. (2011). *Negotiating the personal in creative writing.* Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective.* Boston, MA: Springer.

van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. In J. P. Lantolf and M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 163–186). London: Equinox.

van Lier, L. (2011). Language learning: An ecological-semiotic approach. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 383–394). New York, NY: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. (1934). *Myshlenie i rech': Psikhologicheskie issledovaniya [Thinking and Speech: Psychological investigations].* Moscow & Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Sotsial'no-Ekonomicheskio Izdatel'stvo.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weiner, B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory motivation: A history of ideas. *Educational Psychologist, 45*(1), 28–36.

Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. System, 39, 510–522.

Xu, S., & Connelly, F.M. (2009). Narrative inquiry for teacher education and development: Focus on English as a foreign language in China. *Teaching and Teacher Education 25*, 219–227.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1)*,* 79–102.

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15,* 3–17.

Zimbardo, P.G., & Boyd, J.N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(6), 1271–1288.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Student-participant Background Questionnaire

Please reflect on (answer) the following questions in <u>detail</u>, avoid general information (such as "yes or no" responses). Your answers will help to build lessons that would meet your academic needs.

1. When were you first exposed to studying English?

2. If you started studying English in your home country, how was it taught?

3. If you started studying English in your home country, which skills were predominantly taught? (e.g., is it predominantly grammar oriented? Or reading? Or listening? Or writing?)

4. Did you take any writing courses? If you did, please describe what you learned in those courses.

5. What do you think about your writing now? Do you consider writing as an important skill for your academic achievement?

6. How do you feel about your English language use (grammar, vocabulary) in writing?

7. What is your goal of taking an IEP writing course? Is it important for your future plans, studies, or career? How?

8. How do you define "good writing"?

9. What do you want (or anticipate) to learn in an IEP writing course?

10. In your opinion, what is the best way for the instructor to help you with your writing?

11. Please describe any expectations that you have for this course.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY ADDRESSING STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ATTITUDES TOWARD

WRITING

Survey Addressing Student-participant Attitudes Toward Writing

Please respond to the following statements by rating your agreement on the scale:

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = agree

4 = strongly agree

1. Writing is a very important skill to learn. 1 2 3 4

2. I like to write because I can write freely to express myself/my ideas. 1 2 3 4

3. Writing makes me carefully revise the way I present my ideas/arguments. 1 2 3 4

4. I check my writing carefully <u>for content</u> before submitting. 1 2 3 4

5. I check my writing carefully <u>for accuracy</u> (grammar, punctuation) before submitting. 1 2

   3 4

6. I check my writing carefully <u>for content and accuracy</u> before submitting. 1 2 3 4

7. I care about whether or not the content of my writing is interesting to readers (audience).

   1 2 3 4

8. I care about whether or not the content of my writing is informative. 1 2 3 4

9. Overall, I am satisfied with my writing. 1 2 3 4

10. I prefer written feedback on my writing. 1 2 3 4

11. I prefer oral feedback on my writing. 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX C: FEEDBACK 1

Feedback 1

    (a) "Wh" questions

What is your thesis statement?

What do you mean here?

How do these ideas support your main point (thesis statement)?

               Some Examples of Feedback 1 Posted on Student-participants' Draft:

Yuna

- What is the original text about? How are these statements discussed in the text?

- What did she do in a private school?

- How do we know? Why?

- If women get the same benefits, are there gender issues?

- Bridge! How is this sentence connected to the previous sentences?

Peter

- It is a good paragraph, but how do these ideas describe the main objective of the essay? Why are women better leaders? You are saying women can keep a balance; however, how does this statement support your thesis?

- Before presenting the results, you could give some info about who you interviewed? How many? Where?

Veronica

- How does this quote support your topic sentence here?

- How do we know? Is there any evidence in these three articles that you could bring to support your idea?

Sara

- How did they adapt? Does the example show the process?

Emiri

- Did he have a managing position before? What was his success?

(b) Statements

Mary

- Everything is great here, except the source. Think about the common theme that could tie them together. For example, you are presenting opposing views on the use of technology, thus you could use transitions/hedging/nouns. Check the file titled "coherence" in Google Folder, and we will talk about it when we meet.

Lana

- Johnson reports that texting diminishes our verbal skills and emotional intelligence. It seems you disagree with this statement <which is good!>; however, by citing some statements from the original article, you need to make it clear that you are responding to the ideas described in the original text.

Caleb

- Bridge! You start with statements about having phones and mobile games, and suddenly introduce a new idea about problems of communication.

Kelly

- Good, but support with examples. Explain why is it not possible?

APPENDIX D: FEEDBACK 2

Feedback 2

Error Codes Posted on Google Docs

Error Type Code	Brief Description
VT	Verb tense
VF	Verb form
VC	Verb choice
WF	Word form
Art	Article
N	Plural marker (nouns; pronouns)
Ant	Antecedent
Pron	Pronoun (all types)
S+V	Subject and verb agreement
Prep	Preposition
WO	Word order
WC	Word choice
SP	Spelling
RO	Run on
FRAG	Fragment
Punc	Punctuation
SS	Sentence structure
Tran	Transition words
Con	Connectors (coordination)
CL	Clauses (relative, nominative)
PH	Noun phrase, prepositional phrase (all types)

Some Examples of Feedback 1 Posted on Student-participants' Drafts

Verb form

Draft: The people who have ability with great grammar may also can't buy food in a restaurant because they may not clear about the name of the food.

Coordinating Conjunction

Finding the right way on teacher, method, motivation can be the best way to success!

Subject and verb agreement & article

He also give readers the definition of what real friend is.

Preposition

Therefore, they try to <u>adapt new culture</u> because they do not live in China.

Verb choice

When women get pregnant, they need to take some time at least one year<u> to get birth and glow</u>

<u>their child up</u>.

Run on

To conclude this essay, the structure creates an atmosphere which student can concentrate <u>their</u>

<u>studying, as a result, study room</u> is a comfortable place to study.

Fragment

The balance between technology and people who use it.

Word choice

I was really astonished and felt disappointed regardless of a park where people physically play

<u>something.</u>

Word form

If they use it properly, there also must be<u> profitable.</u>

Sentence Structure

The cause of relaxing environment make them productivity is that soft lighting, comfortable

seats and beautiful music.

Relative Clause

I am a social creature that have to keep the run of many people.

APPENDIX E: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDES

Semi-structured Interview Guides, Phase 1, August 2016 - December 2016

Semi-structured Interview Guide #1

(a) Common questions

1. Explain your prior education in English in a writing class, or any other class where you wrote and received feedback.

2. Is it the first time you have received this type of feedback (dialogic feedback) (DF)?

3. Did you find DF useful or not?

4. How did you feel when you saw error codes posted on Google Docs?

5. How did you revise the task? What was the process?

6. How important was this task (Task 1) for your writing development?

7. What do you think about the drafting and revising stages?

8. Let's look at your Task 1. Which comments were difficult to revise?

9. Let's look at your Task 1. Which comments were not clear? That is, you did not know what you need to do.

10. Which comments were inaccurate in your opinion?

11. What is your opinion about the most effective ways to help you revise your task?

12. What is your overall experience with working on your errors based on DF?

(b) Student-participant specific questions based on errors analysis

13. Let's look at this part…

Semi-structured Interview Guide #2, #3, and #4

(a) Common questions

1. Did you find DF useful or not?

2. How familiar/comfortable are you with error coding in this stage? Does the coding help you to revise Task 2 (3, 4)?

3. When you see error codes, does that make you think of a rule to apply?

4. Are you becoming more aware of common types of errors you make?

5. How did you revise Task 2 (3,4)? What was the process?

6. How important was Task 2 (3, 4) for your writing development?

7. Do you think/feel you have progressed in writing since your Task 2 (3, 4)?

8. To what extent, do you think, could *these* (student-participant) factors have influenced your engagement with revision?

(b) Student-participant specific questions based on error analysis

9. Let's look at your Task 2 (3, 4). Which comments were difficult to revise?

10. Let's look at your Task 2 (3, 4). Which comments were not clear? That is, you did not know what you need to do.

11. Let's look at this part…

Semi-structured Interview Guide #5 and #6

(a) Common questions

1. Did you find DF useful or not?

2. How did you revise the Task 5 (6)? What was the process?

3. How important was Task 5 (6) for your writing development?

4. Do you think/feel you have progressed in writing since your Task 1?

5. To what extent, do you think, could *these* (student-participant) factors have influenced

    your engagement with revision?

(b) Student-participant specific questions based on errors analysis

6. Let's look at this part…

Semi-structured Interview Guide #7

Phase 1: Final Interview, December 2016

1. How do you define "good writing"?

2. How important do you think writing is in your (courses you take now; courses you will take the next semester; academic life in general; future professional life)?

3. If you reflect back on fall semester, what have you learned about writing? Has your opinion about feedback and writing changed over this time?

4. What is your opinion of feedback now?

5. What do you think the function/goal of feedback should be?

6. What is your overall experience with working on your errors based on DF?

7. What do you think about your writing now after taking an IEP writing course? Has it improved?

8. In your opinion, what is the best way for a teacher to help students with their writing? What is your opinion about the most effective ways for a teacher to give feedback about (1) organization-content and (2) language errors-grammar?

9. What advice would you give to students about how to succeed at writing? What advice would you give for revising, or correcting errors?

10. What are the major challenges and/or difficulties you have encountered in this course (IEP writing)?

11. What are the major challenges you have encountered while revising?

12. What difficulties did you have while working on all writing tasks?

13. Has your approach to completing assignments/tasks changed after taking this course?

14. You have done a number of different types of assignments in this course. Could you talk a bit about one or two that were most successful for you?

15. What do you think about dialogic interactions? What aspects of your writing does DI improve?

16. Are you becoming more aware of the types of errors you make?

17. To what extent, do you think, could these (based on student-participant) factors have influenced your engagement with revisions?

18. What role does Google Docs have on your writing? On your revisions? What are the benefits of using Google Docs to write and revise?

APPENDIX F: POST-TASKS

Post-task #1

Prompt: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "Social Networking Leads to Isolation." Use specific reasons to explain your point of view. Be sure to fully develop your view by including relevant examples and specific details.

Task Description:

1. Write an argumentative response with a clear purpose/thesis statement, body paragraphs, and conclusion. Use the articles as supporting material/evidence (for or against the topic/thesis statement).

2. Use two (2) sources/readings to help to develop/explain the thesis statement, bring examples/facts to support the thesis statement/main points, and bring statistics to justify your opinion. Readings: (1) "Social Networking Leads to Isolation…" p. 202; (2) "Social Networks: A Learning Tool for Teams" pp. 216-21.

Essay Organization Pattern:

It depends on (1) your topic/questions and (2) what you want to say about the topic (that is the thesis statement). The following types of paragraph construction could be used:

- compare/contrast

- cause and effect

- argumentation

- problem and solution

  Must-haves:

1. Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

2. Citations - APA style; summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes (no more than 2 quotes).

3. Reasoning: effective evidence.

Post-task #2

Task Description:

1. Read the article "Diversity Leads to Economic Growth" by Richard Florida. What do you think about his arguments? Is diversity a factor of economic growth? Explain why? Bring examples! No abstract explanations! What are some ideas that Richard Florida argues? How would you evaluate those ideas? Do you agree? Disagree? Explain!

2. Write a reader response with a clear thesis statement. Use the reading "Diversity Leads to Economic Growth" by Richard Florida as supporting material/evidence (for or against your thesis statement/main opinion).

3. Use the article "Diversity Leads to Economic Growth" to help to develop/explain the thesis statement, bring examples/facts to support the thesis statement/main points, bring statistics to justify your opinion, or argue against the main points, etc.

Essay Organization Pattern:

It depends on (1) your main idea/questions and (2) what you want to say about the reading "Diversity Leads to Economic Growth." The following types of paragraph construction could be used:

- compare/contrast
- cause and effect
- argumentation
- problem and solution

Must-haves:

1. Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning),

and conclusion.

2. Citations - APA style; summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes (no more than 2 quotes).

3. Reasoning: effective evidence.

Post-task #3

Task Description:

1. Read the article "The Trouble with Talent: Are We Born Smart or Do We Get Smart?" by Kathy Seal. What do you think about her arguments? What does it mean to be 'smart'? Can people 'get smart' or are they 'born smart'? What are some ideas that Kathy Seal discusses? How would you evaluate those ideas? Do you agree? Disagree?

2. Write an essay/response with a clear purpose/thesis statement. Use the article "The Trouble with Talent: Are We Born Smart or Do We Get Smart?" by Kathy Seal as supporting material/evidence (for or against your thesis statement/main opinion).

Essay Organization Pattern:

It depends on (1) your main idea/questions and (2) what you want to say about the reading "Diversity Leads to Economic Growth." The following types of paragraph construction could be used:

- compare/contrast

- cause and effect

- argumentation

- problem and solution

Must-haves:

1. Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

2. Citations - APA style; summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes.

3. Reasoning: effective evidence.

Post-task #4

Task Description:

1. Read the article "Overcoming Information Overload" by Margarita Tartakovsky. What do you think about her claims? What are some ideas that Margarita Tartakovsky argues? How would you evaluate those ideas?

2. Write a reader response (essay) with a clear thesis statement. Use the article "Overcoming Information Overload" as supporting material/evidence (for or against your thesis statement/main opinion).

Essay Organization Pattern:

It depends on (1) your main idea/questions and (2) what you want to say about the reading "Overcoming Information Overload." The following types of paragraph construction could be used:

- compare/contrast
- cause and effect
- argumentation
- problem and solution

Must-haves:

1. Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

2. Citations - APA style; summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes of the reading "Overcoming Information Overload".

APPENDIX G: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

Phase 2: December 2016 – May 2018

1. How do you feel about your writing now?

2. How would you assess your English language proficiency now (grammar, vocabulary use, etc.)?

3. What do you do to improve your English skills, specifically writing skills?

4. How important do you think writing is in your academic courses this semester? What types of writing assignments do you have this semester? What type of feedback do you receive?

5. How do you respond to those writing tasks? Describe the process.

6. What is the role of revisions when you write those tasks?

7. What is your view of feedback from professors in your academic studies now (so far)?

8. What do you think the function of feedback should be?

9. What is your opinion about the most effective ways for professors to give feedback?

10. What do you remember from the IEP writing course taken Fall Semester, 2016?

11. If you reflect back on the entire process: what have you learned about writing now (so far)? Have your beliefs changed?

12. What advice would you give to second language students about how to succeed at writing?

13. Student-participant specific questions...

APPENDIX H: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF WRITING

Student-participant Perceptions of the Role of Writing

Fall 2016 1-16 Weeks	Writing Focused Courses & Hours	Writing History before Arriving in the U.S.	Writing Needs at Week 1	Writing Needs at Week 6-14	Writing in the Near Future (in 1-4 years)
Group 1 Immediate necessity to write	IEP (up to 6 credit hours) Academic courses (up to 15 credit hours) Writing focused courses (up to 9)	English classes at the middle & high schools; a semester at a university; Feedback: direct correction in L1 & end comments	Sentence structure Vocabulary Coherence	Focus on academic classes Focus more on speaking skills	Needed & important
Group 2 Immediate necessity to write	IEP (up to 6 h.) Academic courses (up to 15) Writing focused courses (up to 9 hours)	English classes at the middle & high schools; a semester at a university; No feedback, but end comments	Sentence structure Vocabulary	Focus on both IEP & academic courses	Not needed
Group 3 No writing needed in academic courses	IEP (up to 6 h.) Academic courses (up to 15) Writing focused (up to 6 hours)	English classes at the middle & high schools; a semester at a university; No feedback	Sentence structure Vocabulary	Focus on both IEP & academic classes	Not necessary, if only for graduate school
Group 4 Writing needed in IEP	IEP (21 h.)	English classes at the middle & high schools; No feedback	Sentence structure Vocabulary	IEP & extra curricular	Not necessary
Group 5 Immediate necessity to write in academic courses	IEP (up to 6 h.) Academic courses (up to 15 h.) Writing focused (up to 9 h.)	English classes at the middle & high schools; a semester at a university No feedback, but end comments	Sentence structure Vocabulary	Focus on IEP only	Not necessary
Group 6 Immediate necessity to write in acad. c.	IEP (up to 6 h.) Academic courses (up to 15) Writing focused (up to 9 hours)	English classes at the middle & high schools; a semester at a university Only end comments	Sentence structure Vocabulary	Focus on IEP & Academic courses	Needed

APPENDIX I: ERROR CATEGORIES ADAPTED FROM FERRIS (2002)

Error Categories Adapted from Ferris (2002)

Error Types	
Lexical Errors (LE)	Word choice (adj choice) Verb choice
Morphological Errors (MorE)	Subject-verb agreement Verb form Verb tense Antecedent Pronoun + noun agreement; noun + pronoun agreement Adjective + noun agreement Agreement (quantifier + noun) Word form (parallelism) Verbals Noun ending (plurals, non-count nouns, possessive) Reflexive pronoun Noun phrase-agreement (adv + noun?) Compound nouns One of the + noun expressions Noun + object agreement Pronoun + verb agreement Possessive pronoun
Syntactical Errors (SynE)	Word order (order of adjectives) Subject is missing Verb is missing Incomplete phrase (noun head is missing, object of the prepositional phrase is missing; verb phrase) Object missing Fragment Run on and comma splices Relative clause Connectors (missing, extra, or wrong use of coordinating, correlative, and subordinating conjunctions) Sentence structure Punctuation Pronouns
Articles (Art)	Missing, extra, or wrong articles
Prepositions (Prep)	Missing, extra, or wrong prepositions

APPENDIX J: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Emiri

300 words	Task #1 418 w/418	Task #2 491w/300	Task #3 511w/300	Task #4 355w/300	Task #5 306w/300	Task #6 420w/300	Post #1 520w/418	Post #2 454w/418	Post #3 426w/418	Post #4 465w/418
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	4 3 9 4	3 4 8 4 2	3 3 1	7 4 4	1 5 3 5 3	1 5 1 2	2 3 5 6 1	2 7 4 3	4 11 7 1 4	2 2 6 6 1
Total:	20	21	7	15	17	9	17	16	27	18
Frequent error type	Art (4) Word choice (4) Run on (3)	Art (4) Word choice (3)	Sentence structure (3)	Art (4)	Art (5) Prep (3)	Verb tense (5)	Art (6) Fragment (3)	Noun ending (5) Art (3)	Run on (4) Verb form (3) Prep (4)	Art (6)

APPENDIX K: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Beth

Per 300 words	Task #1 307	Task #2 495	Task #3 564	Task #4 301	Task #5 414	Task #6 698	Post #1 565	Post #2 379	Post #3 467
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	2 9 4 7	3 1 1	1 2 1 3	2 9 4 9 2	2 7 2 3	7 4 2 1	8 6	1 14 3 8 1	6 1 2 3
Total:	22	5	7	26	14	14	14	27	12
Frequent error type	Art (7)	Verb tense (2)	Art (3) Noun ending (3)	Art (9) Noun ending (3)	Noun ending (3) Prep (3)	Word choice (7)	Art (6) Verb form (3)	Art (8) Noun ending (5) Word form (3)	Noun ending (3) Prep (3)

APPENDIX L: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Mayu

Per 300 words	Task #1 525w	Task #2 539w	Task #3 592w	Task #4 498w	Task #5 269w	Task #6 269w	Post #1 490w	Post #2 398w	Post #3 371w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	1 4 5 7 2	 6 3 2	 7 3 6 1	 7 3 2 2	1 3 3 4 1	2 8 1 3 3	1 7 4 2	2 13 1 4 3	1 6 2 5
Total:	19	11	17	14	12	17	14	23	14
Frequent error type	Art (7)	Verb forms (4)	Art (6) Noun ending (3)	Noun ending (3)	Art (4)	Agreement-number (3) Prep (3) Art (3)	Art (4) Noun ending (3)	Agreement-number (6) Art (3)	Prep (5) S+V (3)

APPENDIX M: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Reika

Per 300 words	Task #1 349w	Task #2 384w	Task #3 358w	Task #4 307w	Task #5 309w	Task #6 586w	Post #1 645w	Post #2 485w	Post #3 560w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	4 3 3 2 2	2 5 5 2 1	3 4 4 4 1	1 6 9 1 3	3 17 7 6 6	3 15 4 1 1	1 5 1 3 3	 6 3 4 	2 3 2 3 1
Total:	14	15	16	20	39	24	13	13	11
Frequent error type	Word choice (4) SS (3)	SS(3)	Art (4) S+V (2) Noun ending (2)	Run on (4) SS (4)	Agreement-number (4) Noun ending (6)	Verb tense (5) Noun ending (3) Verb forms (3)	Word form (2) Art (3) Prep (3)	Art (4) Word forms (3)	Art (3) Noun ending (2)

APPENDIX N: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Rikuto

Per 300 words	Task #1 475w	Task #2 722w	Task #3 467w	Task #4 277w	Task #5 444w	Task #6 477w	Post #1 525w	Post #2 226w	Post #3 474w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	 1 9 3 1	2 3 3 3 	1 9 8 2 1	5 13 2 6 4	2 4 3 3 4	6 3 5 8 	 4 3 10 1	2 10 3 1 1	2 6 4 2 1
Total:	14	11	21	30	16	22	18	17	15
Frequent error type	Relative clauses (4) Art (3) Frag (2)	Art (3)	Agreement (3) Frag (3)	Noun ending (6) Agreement (5) Word choice (3) Art (6)	Prep (4)	Art (8) Word choice (4) Run on (3)	Art (10) Agreement (2) SS (2)	Noun ending (5)	Noun ending (3) SS (3)

APPENDIX O: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

David

Per 300 words	Task #1 517w	Task #2 645w	Task #3 613w	Task #4 412w	Task #5 320w	Task #6 653w	Post #1 524w	Post #2 477w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	3 3 11 3 1	5 3 4 3 1	2 4 7 2	2 3 8 4	4 2 1 2	3 3 4 1 2	1 7 5 1 1	3 5 3 3
Total:	21	16	15	17	9	13	15	14
Frequent error type	Punc (4) Word choice (3) Art (3) Word order (2)	Word choice (4) Run on (3) Articles (3)	Articles (7)	Relative clause (2) SS (5) Art (3)	Word choice (2) Art (2)	Antecedent (2) Word choice (2)	Word form (2) Agreement-number (3)	Noun+pronoun agreement (3) Art (3) SS (3)

APPENDIX P: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Kelly

Per 300 words	Task #1 564w	Task #2 518w	Task #3 497w	Task #4 527w	Task #5 642w	Task #6 830w	Post #1 714w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	7 4 4 2	 4 1 3 2	 3 2 3 1	3 3 3 1 1	4 3 1 1 1	3 3	2 3 4 2
Total:	17	10	9	11	10	6	11
Frequent error type	Word choice (5) Articles (4)	Articles (3)	Articles (3)	Word choice (3) Number agreement (3)	Word choice (4)	Verb choice (3)	Articles (4)

APPENDIX Q: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Caleb

Per 300 words	Task #1 365w	Task #2 475w	Task #3 545w	Task #4 442w	Task #5 336w	Task #6 624w	Post #1 598w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	3 6 5 2 3	2 9 4 5 3	2 4 3 2 1	4 6 2 3 2	5 5 5 7 5	1 5 3 3 4	1 4 3 2 1
Total:	19	23	12	17	27	16	11
Frequent error type	Verb forms (3) Word choice (3) Prep (3)	Articles (5) Noun ending (4)	Articles (2) Noun ending (2) Word choice (2)	Noun ending (5)	Articles (7) Prep (5)	Prep (4) Articles (3) Agreement (3)	Articles (2) Number agreement (2)

APPENDIX R: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Veronica

Per 300 words	Task #1 867w	Task #2 419w	Task #3 930w	Task #4 920w	Task #5 829w	Task #6 1514w	Post #1 1007w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	2 7 8 2	2 2 6 1	1 5 6 4	3 3 1 2 1	4 7 2 1 1	 5 2	2 1 2
Total:	19	11	16	10	15	7	5
Frequent error type	Relative clause (6) Verb form (4) Punctuation (2)	Word order (3) Punctuation (3)	Noun ending (3) Articles (4) Frag (3)	Word choice (2) Articles (2) Verb forms (2)	Word choice (2) S+V (3) Pronoun+ noun agreement (2)	Noun ending (2)	Prepositions (2)

APPENDIX S: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT ERROR FREQUENCY

Sam

Per 300 words	Task #1 416w	Task #2 214w	Task #3 526w	Task #4 370w	Task #5 532w	Task #6 517w	Post #1 626w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	5 9 3 2	2 1 6 4 2	11 6 4	4 3 3 1 4	3 4 3 7 2	1 2 1 5 2	2 3 2 2
Total:	19	15	21	15	19	11	9
Frequent error type	Word choice (3) Verb tense (2) Word form (2)	Articles (4) Fragment (2) Incomplete phrase (3)	Noun ending (6) Word form (5) Articles (4)	Prepositions (4) Word choice (4)	Articles (7) Verb form (3)	Articles (5)	Sentence structure (2) Articles (2) Word choice (2)

APPENDIX T: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT REVISION OPERATIONS EMERGED FROM

DATA

Revision Operations	Description
Correct revision	The marked error was corrected as it was intended.
Incorrect revision	The marked error was addressed incorrectly.
Deletion	The marked error/clause/sentence was deleted completely without addressing the error.
Substitution	The marked error was substituted by a correction which did not target feedback and the actual error.
No revision	The marked error was ignored.

APPENDIX U: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT STRATEGIES FOR UTILIZING DIALOGIC

FEEDBACK

Category	Revision Strategy
Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess Do not want to search for solution thus guess Do not have time to search for solution thus guess
Give possible correction: a student participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources.	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class Based on knowledge learned in writing class
Work on the error and apply notes: a student-participant sees the error code (feedback), understands the problem/error, and tries to solve/correct it by using notes and other sources.	Grammar folder on Google Drive Classroom discussion Handouts given in class Internet search (websites) Self-found files (not given in class) Dictionary Ask the instructor by using Google Docs
Evaluate notes: a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes and other sources.	Asking the instructor by using Google Docs Asking a friend (native or non-native) Google Docs/grammar folder Classroom discussion Handouts given in class Internet search (websites) Self-found docs (not given in class) Dictionary
Notice or remember features of the error based on error code: a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention.	Recall/remember Pay attention and apply grammatical rule
Delete/rewrite the error	Do not know how to correct thus delete (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay) Rewrite the error (by using a new form) Ignore the error (do not make any corrections and leave it as it is)

APPENDIX V: DIALOGIC INTERACTIONS ON GOOGLE DOCS

Categories	Subcategories
Error code problems	Terminology Revision uncertainty
Request to clarify	Student-participant request to clarify feedback Student-participant response to clarify an instructor's question
Confirmation/verification	Student-participant checks his/her understanding of feedback Student-participant explains his/her choice of revisions Student-participant asks to approve his/her revisions
Evaluation	Student-participant challenges feedback Student-participant appraisals of feedback

Some Student-participant DI Examples from Google Docs

Error code problems

Sara's draft: (1) <u>We should understand women</u> have great potential powers to be headman.

Feedback: (1) relative clause>relative pronoun

Sara: I do not understand

Request to clarify

Yuna's draft: A lighting is the first element. The lighting is suitable for studying <u>(1) to make</u>

<u>things light up compared with a lighting in other places,</u> such as in my room or in a library.

Feedback: (1) It is not clear why it is better?

Yuna: I think that the following sentence can be the reason, thus I connected two

sentences using "because".

Confirmation/verification

Mary's draft: Five experts quoted by Chandra in "Face time vs. screen time" suggest that it is necessary to make good balance between technology communication and (1) <u>interpersonal communication</u>.

    Feedback: (1) Has this fact been discussed in detail?

    Mary: I used this word to paraphrase "face-to-face communication". I think it couldn't be fully replaced. Do I understand your comment right?

Lana's draft: Children can communicate with strangers online. SNS like LINE, Twitter, Facebook can use casually. In real society, to get know well each other, I need to tell others what my hobby is. However, it is hard for me to share personal information with strangers... [omitted] ...By means of SNS chatting, I could communicate without nervousness even if it was a first time (1) <u>to meet</u>.

    Feedback: (1) What does the reading article state about communicating online?

    Lana: I realized that my reader response is not responded to original text because I just gave my opinion. I need to agree or disagree to the original article with explaining the author's opinion. Then give the examples to support why I agree or disagree.

Evaluation

Kevin's draft: (1) <u>At first,</u> social networking service, texts and Internet sites connect people who are very far to each other, even unknown people.

    Feedback: (1) transition

    Kevin: Is there difference in the meanings of "at first" and "first"? I learned that I can use "at first" when I want to list things.

APPENDIX W: DIALOGIC INTERACTIONS FACE-TO-FACE

Category	Subcategory
No engagement: A student-participant responds minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant is unresponsive (passive recipient). The student-participant does not follow up. The only utterance is 'ahem' and nodding.
	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant shows signals of comprehension by providing minimum responses, but does not self-revise.
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiates the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant is not sure how to correct.
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant does not have any clue on how to revise the error.
	The student-participant tries to understand the problems and generates a couple of questions/statements to confirm his/her understanding and revision, and finally self-corrects.
	The student-participant asks a question to clarify feedback, but also provides 2 strategies to revise the error, and wants the instructor to confirm which option would be successful.
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revision, and the student-participant asks a question to confirm his/her understanding of the error
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).

Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The student-participant explains his/her revision without the instructor's input or question.
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Ownership	The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realizes the error and self-corrects.
	The student-participant initiates the question and the instructor explains, and the student-participant self-corrects and/or realizes the error.
	The student-participant initiates the question because he/she does not know how to correct.
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.
	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffold (noticing).
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain/clarify what she/he means.
	Self-regulation
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.
	The student-participant's affective responses towards feedback and errors.
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.

APPENDIX X: WRITING TASKS

X.1. Writing Task 1: Reader Response

Task Description

Read the article "Face Time vs. Screen Time: The Technological Impact On Communication" by Chandra Johnson and compose a response. The reader response paper should include a short summary of the article, followed by your evaluation of it. You may want to consider the following descriptive and evaluative issues.

1. *Issues of description*: Summarize the content of the article. Possible questions to consider include: What is the central theme of the article? What are its most important points? Does the article raise or address worthwhile issues? Does it pose interesting questions? How clear are the ideas? How readable is the text? Who is/are the relevant audience(s) for this article?

2. *Issues of evaluation:* React to the article. You might consider the following questions: What do you like and dislike about the article; its content, its style, etc.? Is the content coherent? What are the strengths of the article? What are its weaknesses? How well are ideas presented? Are the major points explained adequately; are the arguments appropriate? Is the central message clear? What kinds of evidence are employed? Are they appropriate?

3. *Issues of response:* Respond to the article as a reader (neutral). Potential questions are: What meaningful points does the author make? How do the ideas in this article relate to other readings you have done on this topic? What is the practical relevance of the article and the ideas it presents? Who should read this article? Do you find the substance of the article compelling and insightful, or an unproductive use of one's reading time (or something in-between)?

Reader Response Rubric

Criteria	Points (Comments)
Summary (30 points) ● Emphasizes major/minor points from the text ● Is reported correctly (summary; paraphrase) (1) effective inclusion of topic sentences, (2) accurate interpretation of the source, (3) linking of details to main idea, and (4) use of the student writer's' own words.	
Critique (40 points) ● Has a thesis statement/goal ● Demonstrates why issue is important ● Is supported with major and minor details ● Is informative/interesting (1) effective inclusion of topic sentences, (2) accurate interpretation of the source, (3) linking of details to main idea, and (4) use of the student writer's' own words.	
Organization and Transitions (10 points) ● Details and transition words and phrases are placed in a logical order ● Logical progression from one idea to the next	
Punctuation and Grammar (15 points)	
References/citation (5 points)	
Total 100 points	

X.2. Writing Task 2: Compare/Contrast 1

Task Description

Imagine you are on a hiring committee for Apple; you are looking for a new business manager in the executive office. Below are four candidates. Which would you choose and why? Use information from the "Top Ten Qualities" article and your own opinion to help you decide.

1. Selena (48) has a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree and solid background in working with computers. She has never been a manager but has excelled in sales throughout the years at a small family-owned computer store. She is driven to succeed, highly motivated, well-organized, and a little intimidating.

2. Diego (27) makes up for his lack of experience with his confidence and positive attitude. He has been in business only a few years, but he is already making a name for himself in the business world as a conference speaker. He is very active on social media and knows many people worldwide; he is ambitious and sees himself as a future leader in the business world.

3. Marianne (55) has spent her entire career being a computer salesman. She has worked at Best Buy for the last 29 years, and she's ready for a change. She's very creative; she has developed new computer software in the past few years and also writes poems and advertisements. She is an excellent writer; she is always calm and polite to others, but she can be shy in a group of people.

4. Chris (36) has spent the last twelve years traveling and working in Apple stores around the world. He has worked in China, Japan, Russia, and South Korea, but he has never been a manager. His degree is in Sociology, and he has audited a few business classes. He is cheerful, optimistic, and outgoing, and he has a great sense of humor.

Task Organization Pattern:

The following structure must be used:

- compare/contrast

 Must-haves:

(1) Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

(2) Citations - APA style; summary and paraphrase; no direct quotes.

(3) Reasoning: effective evidence (the article "Ten Top…").

Self-checking Guidelines

Before submitting Draft 1, self-revise the draft based on the following *statements:*

1. I have provided a complete summary of the issue/problem (background information about the issue).

2. I have provided a clearly stated original statement- thesis (the choice of a candidate).

3. I have explained the particular choice by comparing and/or contrasting to other candidates (the analysis of 4 candidates).

4. I have provided reasons for choosing a particular candidate (based on the job description, a candidate's qualifications, and qualities described in the reading "Top Ten…") .

5. I have used 10-20 academic words (from Academic Word List).

6. I have used compare/contrast language (e.g., transitions, adverbs, adjectives, nouns, verbs, phrases etc.)

Task 2 Rubric

Criteria	Points/Comments
Used Compare/Contrast Language (30)	
Used Effective Reasoning to Compare and Contrast Four Candidates (30)	
Revisions (25)	
Punctuation and Grammar (10)	
Citations (5)	
Total:	

X.3. Writing Task 3: Compare/contrast 2

Task Description

Who do you think, women or men, will make great leaders in a company or organization? What is the difference between female and male leaders? What special characteristics can women or men bring to leadership roles in companies and other organizations?

Use sources/readings to help to develop/explain the thesis statement, bring examples/facts to support the thesis statement/main points, and bring statistics to justify your opinion.

Readings: (1) "Why We Need Quiet, Introverted Leaders" pp. 110-112; (2) "MIA: Women in the Executive Suite" pp. 114-117; (3) "Top Ten Qualities that Make a Great Leader" pp. 104-107

Task Organization Pattern:

The following structure must be used:

● compare/contrast

Must-haves:

(1) Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

(2) Citations - APA style; summary and paraphrase; no more than 3 direct quotes.

(3) Reasoning: effective evidence (the article "Ten Top…").

Rubric

Category	5	4	3	2
Purpose & Supporting Details	The paper compares and contrasts items clearly. The paper points to specific examples to illustrate the comparison. The paper includes only the information relevant to the comparison.	The paper compares and contrasts items clearly, but the supporting information is general. The paper includes only the information relevant to the comparison.	The paper compares and contrasts items clearly, but the supporting information is incomplete. The paper may include information that is not relevant to the comparison.	The paper compares or contrasts, but does not include both. There is no supporting information or support is incomplete.
Organization & Structure	The paper breaks the information into block, similarities - to-differences, or point-by-point structure. It follows a consistent order when discussing the comparison.	The paper breaks the information into block, similarities - to-differences, or point-by-point structure but does not follow a consistent order when discussing the comparison.	The paper breaks the information into block, similarities - to-differences, or point-by-point structure, but some information is in the wrong section. Some details are not in a logical or expected order, and this distracts the reader.	Many details are not in a logical or expected order. There is little sense that the writing is organized.
Transitions/ Compare/ Contrast Language	The paper moves smoothly from one idea to the next. The paper uses comparison and contrast transition words to show relationships between ideas. The paper uses a variety of sentence structures and transitions.	The paper moves from one idea to the next, but there is little variety. The paper uses comparison and contrast transition words to show relationships between ideas.	Some transitions work well; but connections between other ideas are fuzzy.	The transitions between ideas are unclear or nonexistent.
Grammar & Spelling	Writer makes no errors in grammar or	Writer makes few errors in grammar	Writer makes some errors in grammar	Writer makes many errors in

	spelling that distract the reader from the content.	or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.
Quotes/ Citations	Incorporates at least 3 quotes (1 from each source). Follows the quote sandwich steps (Intro quote, quote, analyze quote). Correct APA format for works cited and in-text citations. Summarizing/paraphrasing strategies are used.	Incorporates at least 2 quotes (1 from each source). Somewhat follows the quote sandwich steps (Intro quote, quote, analyze quote). Correct APA format for works cited and in-text citations is attempted. Summarizing/paraphrasing strategies are used.	Incorporates at least 2 quotes (1 from each source). Does not follow the quote sandwich steps (Intro quote, quote, analyze quote). Correct APA format for works cited and in-text citations is attempted. Summarizing/paraphrasing strategies are not used.	No quotes/or at least 1 quote. Does not follow the quote sandwich steps (Intro quote, quote, analyze quote). Incorrect APA format. Summarizing/paraphrasing strategies are not used.
Academic Word List	Uses 15-20 words	Uses 10-15 words	Uses 6-9 words	Uses 1-5 words
Total				

X.4. Writing Task 4

Cause/effect 1

Prompt: What are the causes of productivity at school?

Task Description

Step 1

(a) Choose a space where you often work or study. This could be an office, a dorm room, a

classroom, a lecture theatre, a library or any space (your choice).

(b) Visit the space and note your observations on the following:

- The colour
- The lighting
- The air quality
- The comfort of the furniture
- The amount of ambient noise
- The proximity to washrooms, sources of food and drink
- Your choice

(c) After taking notes, interview two to three people/students who also use the space regularly.

Ask them about their experiences in the space and how productive they feel when they are trying

to work there.

Step 2

Based on your personal experience as well as conducted interviews, write a short response to the

following prompt: What are the causes of productivity at school?

Task Organization

Introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion: A simple structure to follow (you may use

another type of structure as well). Please notice, it is only an example:

- Describe the place where you study, why you study there, and how productive you are.

- Explain how elements described in Step 1 (b) affect your productivity.

- Present your findings/results of your interviews.

- Compare/contrast each respondent.

- Present/explain the causes. Conclusion/restate the results.

Rubric	4	3	2	1
Audience and Purpose	Consistently targets an audience through word choice and details; clearly identifies purpose in introduction	Targets an audience through most word choices and details; identifies purpose in introduction	Misses a target audience by including a wide range of word choice and details; presents no clear purpose	Addresses no specific audience or purpose
Organization	Presents a clear, consistent organizational strategy to show cause and effect	Presents a clear organizational strategy with occasional inconsistencies to show cause and effect	Presents an inconsistent organizational strategy; creates illogical presentation of causes and effects	Demonstrates a lack of organizational strategy; creates a confusing presentation
Elaboration	Successfully links causes with effects; fully elaborates connections among ideas	Links causes with effects; elaborates connections among most ideas	Links some causes with some effects; elaborates connections among some ideas	Develops and elaborates no links between causes and effects
Use of Language	Chooses clear transitions to convey ideas; presents very few mechanical errors	Chooses transitions to convey ideas; presents few mechanical errors	Misses some opportunities for transitions to convey ideas; presents many mechanical errors	Demonstrates poor use of language; presents many mechanical errors
Academic Words	20	15	10	5
Total:				

X.5. Writing Task 5

Cause/Effect 2

Prompt: What are the effects of using technology in education?

Task Description

1. Use sources/readings to help to develop/explain the thesis statement, bring examples/facts to support the thesis statement/main points, and bring statistics to justify the opinion.

    Readings: (1) "Swimming against the Tide of Power Point" pp. 129-131; (2) "Students Want More Mobile Devices in Classroom" pp. 134-135

2. Use observation: interviews

    Conduct interviews with students (4-6) on campus. Compose your interview questions based on thesis/major points you are going to discuss.

Must-haves:

● Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

● Reasoning: effective evidence (the interviews and readings).

Rubric

Introduction (15):

Opening catches reader's interest _____of 5

Thesis uses language that shows whether the focus is cause or effect _____of 5

Thesis sentence indicates what relationship the paper will be trying to establish between cause and effect and why. _____of 5

Organization (50):

At least three cause-and-effect relationships were clearly described in detail. _____of 10

The main points are supported with specific reasons. _____of 10

The evidence is properly introduced, explained, and cited _____of 10

Ideas progress logically from one paragraph to another. _____of 10

Each of the body paragraphs is smoothly connected to the thesis. _____of 10

Conclusion (15):

The conclusion restates the thesis first. _____of 5

The conclusion ties back to introduction. _____of 5

Ending sentence helps the reader feel closure. _____of 5

Grammar and Mechanics (10):

The paper is free of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and grammar/usage errors. _____of 5

The word choices (the academic list 20 words) convey the intended message in a precise and interesting way. _____of 5

Documentation (10):

In-text citation used appropriately _____of 5

Works Cited included and entries written correctly _____of 5

Total: _____of 100

X.6. Writing Task 6

Reader Response: A Story

Prompt: Present an analysis of the short story "They Don't Mean It".

Task Description:

(1) Choose your topic/questions of discussion/essay. The following topic/questions may be used

(in combination):

- Identify the author's purpose. Ask yourself, what theme or main idea did the author want the reader to understand after he or she had finished reading? What is the title of the work and why did the author choose that title? Why might the author have written this work?
- How could the author be characterized? As a harsh critic or a compassionate mentor? Did you find this author to be condemning or inspiring?
- Why do you think the author wrote this story? If you were the author, would you have ended the story in a different way? Why? How so? How does the author provide information or details to make the story seem realistic? How does the author help you feel that you are really there? Do you have any unanswered questions about the story?
- Think of the characters, tone, setting, plot, stylistic devices that help ensure that the reader "gets" the meaning that the writer intended him or her to learn. Ask yourself, why did the author choose to use *these* devices, in *these* particular ways? How does this kind of character, plot event, or type of imagery help the reader understand the theme?
- Who is "telling" the story? Why did the author select this character to tell the story? How would the story be different if told from someone else's point of view?
- Why does the narrator choose certain language, report the details that he/she does, reveal the characters in the manner that he/she does, offer or not offer interpretive comments, and/or tell the story in a certain order?
- Copy an interesting/confusing/important/enjoyable passage and explain why you chose it.
- Explain a character's problem and then offer your character advice on how to solve his/her problem.
- Explain how a character is acting and why you think the character is acting that way. Pick a scene in which you disagreed with how a character handled a situation/person and rewrite it in the way you think it should have happened.
- What quality of which character strikes you as a good characteristic to develop within yourself over the years? Why? How does the character demonstrate this quality?
- Do you have any unanswered questions about the story?

(2) Write an essay/response with a clear purpose/thesis statement, body paragraphs, and

conclusion. Use the short story "They Don't Mean It" as supporting material/evidence (for or

against the topic/thesis statement).

(3) Use the short story "They Don't Mean It" to help to develop/explain the thesis statement, bring examples/facts to support the thesis statement/main points, bring statistics to justify the opinion, or argue against the main points, etc.

Essay Organization Pattern:

It depends on (1) your topic/questions and (2) what you want to say about the topic (that is the thesis statement). The following structures could be used:

- compare/contrast,

- cause and effect,

- argumentation, problem and solution, and

- critique (reader response).

Must-haves:

(1) Introduction (thesis), body paragraphs (well-developed paragraphs with clear reasoning), and conclusion.

(2) Citations - the story: summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes (examples directly taken from the story).

(3) Reasoning: a sandwich approach.

Checklist before submitting Draft 1

- Thesis presents a strong assertion or claim, and is tightly focused.

- All quotations or examples clearly demonstrate and support the claim of the paper.

- Paper displays insightful understanding and analysis of the story.

- Paper is solidly developed

- Quotations or examples are contextualized, explained, or woven smoothly into the discussion.

Rubric

Intro/Conclusion (10)	Introduction grabs attention and provides meaningful context to a persuasive argument. Conclusion effectively restates the argument, but fresh language and meaningful insight leaves reader wanting more.
Thesis Topic Sentences and Transitions (20)	Argument is clearly articulated and persuasive, contains an original opinion. Topic sentences contribute to the highly persuasive nature of the argument.
Evidence (20)	Evidence is highly persuasive and effective in supporting the argument.
Commentary (20)	Creative/original ideas and insights; extensive commentary, refreshing; goes beyond obvious and basic commentary.
Literary Analysis (10)	Appropriate balance of quotes & analysis.
Style, Vocabulary, Sentence Structure (10)	Academic vocabulary; sentence variety; quotations are smoothly blended.
Language Use (10)	Perfect! (or minor errors)
Total:	

APPENDIX Y: MARY'S CASE

Y.1. Mary's Error Frequency

Mary/300 words	Task #1 583w	Task #2 305w	Task #3 860w	Task #4 567w	Task #5 700w	Task #6 954w	Post #1 640w
Lexical Errors	4	5	2	4		1	
Morphological Errors	5		1	3	1	5	3
Syntactical Errors	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Articles	4	1	4	1	2		1
Prepositions	3						1
Total: Errors	18	8	9	10	4	7	6
The most frequent error type	Verb form (4) Word choice (3) Art (4)	Word choice (3) Fragment (2)	Art (4)	Word choice (3) Noun ending (2)	Articles (2)	Verb form (3)	Verb form (1) Word form (1) Noun ending (1) Art (1)

Y.2. Mary's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	Learn how to write a reader response	Learned how to write effective summary and paraphrase Learned how to use quotes	Realized she had many grammatical errors such as "articles and prepositions" Learned about rhetorical strategies (verb choices)
Task 2	Learn how to organize compare/contrast response	Worked on compare/contrast type of organization Focused on the purpose of compare/contrast responses Learned about point of view Learned to pay attention to the common errors	Articles Word choice
Task 3	Use reading sources as	Learned a sandwich approach	Articles

	supporting details	Focused on paragraph construction Learned APA style	Coherence
Task 4	Learn how to organize cause/effect type of response	Worked on paragraph construction of cause/effect	Non-count nouns
Task 5	Revise the draft based on common errors such as articles, prepositions, and word choice	Learned it was hard to self-revise common errors	Articles
Task 6	Learn how to write a book report	Learned to be objective when presenting information Focused on vocabulary – word choices (being specific)	Verb tense

Y.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6

Error code problems
    Terminology
 	
    Revision: uncertainty
	Noun ending
	
	Point of view					

Request to clarify
    Student request to clarify feedback
    Student response to clarify an instructor's question
	Transition word		*Content
			**Content
						**Point of view
						**APA style
						*Content

Confirmation/verification
    Student checks his/her understanding of feedback
    Student explains his/her choice of
	*Content
	
	*Sentence Structure					

revisions Student asks to approve his/her revisions			**Content			**Content

Evaluation
    Student challenges feedback
    Student appraisals of feedback
	*Content
	
	*Transition word					

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).

**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

Y.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks/Episodes	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 15 Episodes	00:22:03	Draft
	00:43:11	Revisions
Task 2 6 Episodes	00:14:02	Draft
	1:14:17	Revisions
Task 3 17 Episodes	00:18:54	Draft
	00:45:49	Revisions
Task 4 7 Episodes	00:13:17	Draft
	00:17:45	Revisions
Task 5 2 Episodes	00:27:04	Draft
	00:15:32	Revisions
Task 6	00:38:04	Draft

| 4 Episodes | 00:29:17 | Revisions |

Y.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Mary's Engagement

Category	Subcategory	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responses minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant shows signals of comprehension by providing minimum responses, but does not self-revise.	Article; bridge;
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Point of view; passive voice; sentence structure;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiate the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.	Articles; word choice;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.	Verb tense;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant does not have any clue on how to revise the error.	Sentence structure; word choice;
	The student-participant tries to understand the problems and generate couple of questions/statements to confirm his/her understanding and revision, and finally self-corrects.	Rhetorical purpose; word choices; point of view; verb choice; point of view; sentence structure; non-count nouns; run on; articles;
	The student-participant asks a question to clarify feedback, but also provides 2 strategies to revise the error, and wants the instructor to confirm which option would	Rhetorical purpose; point of view;

	be successful.	
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revision, and the student-participant asks a question to confirm his/her understanding of the error.	Rhetorical purpose;
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness

Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations | The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise). | Transition choice; word choice; rhetorical purpose; |
| | The student-participant explains his/her revision without the instructor's input or question. | Relative clause; point of view; non-count nouns; |
| Cognitive Engagement: Agency

Ownership | The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realizes the error and self-corrects. | Word choice; preposition; sentence structure; |
	The student-participant initiates the question and the instructor explains, and the student-participant self-corrects and/or realizes the error.	Parallelism; articles; rhetorical purpose;
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.	Verb choice; rhetorical purpose; coordinating conjunction; rhetorical purpose; using quotes;
	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffold (noticing).	Preposition; word choice;
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain/clarify what she/he means.	Verb forms; word choice;
	Self-regulation	
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Error codes help to think and revise. Drafting process is helpful. Writing tasks motivate to write.

	The student-participant affective responses towards feedback and errors.	Lack of understanding of common errors. Difficult to differentiate between singular and plural forms of nouns.
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Revisions create positive feelings about the progress. Revisions lead to progress. Self-correction shows progress.

Y.6. Mary's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Categories	Subcategories	Errors
Task 1 6 times	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Word choice, verb choice, noun ending, pronoun choice, preposition;
6 times	Work on the error and Apply Notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Parallelism, verb form, comparative degree;
1 time		Handouts given in class Dictionary	Wordy;
7 times			Verb form, preposition, word choice, noun phrase;
		Recall/remember	
13 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)		Word choice, bridge, content feedback, word order, verb choice, article, fragment;
14 times		Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, verb tense, noun phrase, pronoun+noun agreement, verb choice, part of speech, point of view;
3 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Sentence structure,

		Ignore the error	content feedback; Comparison degree;
1 time			
Task 2 2 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Dictionary	Word choice, fragment;
4 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Articles, verb choice, word choice;
3 times		Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, noun phrase, fragment;
Task 3 6 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Verb choice, word choice, collective noun;
22 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Articles, word order, bridge, preposition, verb choice, word choice, verb tense, pronoun+noun agreement, content feedback;
3 times		Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Articles, noun ending; Point of view;
1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form) Ignore the error	
Task 4 9 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Word choice, relative clause, word order, verb choice, noun ending, fragment, comparison degree;
4 times		Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Articles, verb tense, noun ending;
Task 5 6 times	Notice (recognize/remember	Recall/remember	Fragment, transition

7 times	features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	words, word choice, articles, word order; Articles, part of speech, gerund, noun ending;
Task 6 11 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (that is a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Content feedback, s+v, verb choice, verb tense, articles, run on, word order, fragment, verb choice;

APPENDIX Z: SARA'S CASE

Z.1. Sara's Error Frequency

Per 300 words	Task #1 544w	Task #2 414w	Task #3 660w	Task #4 499w	Task #5 704w	Task #6 1001w	Post #1 644w	Post #2 426w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	4 3 4 1 4	4 3 1 2 1	6 1 5 4	5 5 1 1 2	2 1 1 1	4 7 2 3 3	1 5 1	 7 2 4 1
Total:	16	11	16	14	5	19	7	14
Frequent error type	Frag (3) Prep (4)	Word choice (2) Verb choice (2) Articles (2)	Relative clause (5) Verb choice (3) Articles (4)	Word choice (4) Verb tense (2)	Word choice (2)	Verb choice (3) Verb form (3) Pronoun +noun agreement (2)	Agreement (2) Verb form (2)	Articles (4) Verb form (4) Noun ending (2)

Z.2. Sara's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre-Drafting: Planned Goal	In Practice: While Writing	Post-Completion: Serious Error
Task 1	Use specific examples	Worked on grammar mistakes	Focus on organization of ideas
Task 2	Use comparing language and sentence structure	Learned that it was difficult to apply grammar rules while writing	Coherence (ideas must flow)
Task 3	Coherence (ideas) Clarity	Learned to use dictionary more often, and to focus on word choice problems	Transition between paragraphs Urgency to improve coherence
Task 4	Clarity (word choices)	Learned that every essay has a cause/effect relationship	Difficult to differentiate cause from effect
Task 5	State opinion clearly	Learned introduction is important	State opinion clearly Focus on grammar errors

Task 6	State opinion clearly Support with specific examples	Realized the thesis statement is not interesting	Organization Clarity (ideas)

Z.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Tas k 5	Task 6
Error code problems Terminology Revision: uncertainty			*Relative clause **Sandwich approach **Subjective tone **Wordy			**Pronoun+noun agreement (x2) **Noun ending
Request to clarify Student request to clarify WCF Student response to clarify a teacher's question						**Word choice **Content (specific details) *Sentence structure

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).
**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

Z.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks/Episodes	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 24 Episodes	00:42:09	Draft
	00:46:55	Revisions
Task 2 11 Episodes	00:24:12	Draft
	00:58:29	Revisions

Task 3 17 Episodes	00:38:16	Draft
	00:43:28	Revisions
Task 4 10 Episodes	00:28:46	Draft
	00:31:27	Revisions
Task 5 3 Episodes	00:10:19	Draft
	00:13:32	Revisions
Task 6 10 Episodes	00:26:41	Draft
	00:50:32	Revisions

Z.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Sara's Engagement

Category	Subcategories	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responds minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant is unresponsive (passive recipient). The student-participant does not follow up. The only utterance is 'ahem' and nodding.	Preposition; fragment; content feedback (using quotations x2; topic sentences; clarification); verb form (x3); point of view (x3); word choice (x2); word order; compare/contrast signals; word order; APA style; parallelism; verb tense;
	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant shows signals of comprehension by providing minimum responses, but does not self-revise.	Word choice;
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Transitive and intransitive verbs; relative clause; preposition; wordy; sentence structure (cause/effect relationship);

295

Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiate the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.	Noun phrase as a subject of the sentence;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant does not have any clue on how to revise the error.	Noun phrase; content feedback (using quotations), article;
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).	Word form (x3); coherence; preposition; content feedback (supporting details x2); sentence structure (subordination); verb tense; word choice; s+v;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Ownership	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain/clarify what he/she means.	Content (supporting detail);
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.	Content feedback (reading); article;
	The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realizes the error and self-corrects.	Content (clarification and supporting details); sentence structure (simple vs. compound);
	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffold	Nominative case; s+v; pronoun+noun agreement;

	(noticing).	
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Revising on Google Docs is a productive way of working.
	The student-participant affective responses towards feedback and errors.	Understanding error codes is time consuming. Feedback is confusing and it's easy to misunderstand what is required to do (error codes and content feedback).
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Summarizing skill is improved. Noticing common grammatical errors (articles) is increased. Coherence is developed. Fluency is improved (ideas and word count). It is difficult to respond to the task requirements (reading, interviewing, and analyzing). Vocabulary is limited.

Z.6. Sara's Strategies Applied during Revising the Errors

Tasks	Categories	Subcategories	Errors
Task 1 10 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	'Wh' questions; sentence structure; verb choice; verb form; s+v; word choice; subordinate conjunction;
1 time		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Content feedback;
11 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	'Wh' questions; word choice; transitive verbs; prepositions; articles; possessive pronoun; word form; Fragments; using
2 times		Classroom discussion	sources;

297

			Word form;
1 time	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	
5 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	'Wh' questions; word choice;
3 times		Ignore the error	"Wh" questions; verb choice; fragment;
2 times		Delete the error (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay)	Word choice; 'Wh' questions;
Task 2 15 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Point of view; articles; verb choice; sentence structure; 'wh' questions; word form; word choice; object of the preposition; s+v; Nominative case; word choice; preposition; noun ending; punctuation;
7 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	
Task 3 11 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Articles; sentence structure; verb choice; noun ending; word choice; 'wh' questions; s+v; Relative clause; punctuation; non-count nouns; word choice; verb form; preposition; noun phrase; parallelism; Relative clause; wordy; APA style; 'Wh' question;
6 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	
2 times		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	
2 times	Evaluate notes (a student knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Handouts given in class	

3 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Ignore the error	'Wh' questions; wordy;
Task 4 25 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Articles; word choice; verb tense; prepositions; s+v; noun ending; verb choice; 'wh' questions; antecedent;
1 time		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	'Wh' questions;
5 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Verb choice; wordy; word form; articles;
2 times 2 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Ignore the error Delete the error (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay)	Prepositions; Word choices;
Task 5 16 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	'Wh' questions; verb choice; verb form; verb tense; preposition; articles; word order;
3 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Ignore the error	'Wh' questions; parallel structure;
4 times		Delete the error (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay)	Verb choice; 'wh' questions;
Task 6 32 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	'Wh' questions; word form; verb tense; verb choice; articles; s+v; noun ending; sentence structure; preposition; verb form;
1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Subordination;
4 times		Ignore the error	Preposition; articles; s+v; noun ending;
4 times		Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	'Wh' questions; word form;

1 time		Delete the error (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay)	'Wh' questions;

APPENDIX AA: YUNA'S CASE

Per 300 words	Task #1 510w	Task #2 321w	Task #3 659w	Task #4 445w	Task #5 679w	Task #6 874w	Post #1 766w	Post #2 351w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	2 8 3 2 1	2 1 4 6	1 2 7 2 1	2 4 1 2 1	1 5 4 6 1	5 8 3 2	4 1 2 1	1 7 1 3 2
Total: Errors	16	13	13	10	17	18	8	14
Frequent error type	Verb form (6)	Art (6) Word order (2) Incomplete phrase (3)	SS (3) Comparative form (2)	S+V (2) Word choice (2) Article (2)	Art (6) SS (4)	Run on (3) Verb choice (3) Verb form (3)	S+V (2) Art (2)	Noun ending (3) Word form (3) Art (3)

AA.2. Yuna's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	Distinguish between the author's opinion and fact Write critique and find the author's weakest points	Learned to focus on academic vocabulary Learned how to write effective summary and paraphrase	Realized she wrote unnecessary info that did not support the thesis Misunderstood the reading text Articles
Task 2	Summarize the main points Compare three candidates by using compare/contrast language	Focused on paragraph construction Learned that overlooked info in the reading	Articles Academic Vocabulary Word choice
Task 3	Analyze the reading Write clearly/more specific with clear supporting details	Self-revised the draft 3 times before submitting Realized she made many article errors	Articles Noun phrases
Task 4	Avoid common errors in	Learned to support thesis	Articles

	both grammar and rhetoric	with specific supporting details	Word order Word choice
Task 5	Write using academic vocabulary	Focused on using specific word choices that clearly describe her intention	Evaluate the reading and do not rely on the summary
Task 6	Use quotations effectively to support the thesis	Learned to use quotations effectively Focused on vocabulary - word choices (transition words)	Word choice

AA.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6

Request to clarify
    Student request to clarify feedback
    Student response to clarify an instructor's question
	*Content		**APA style
			
			*Content (x2)
				*Word choice		*sentence structure
						*content

Confirmation/verification
    Student checks his/her understanding of feedback
    Student explains his/her choice of revisions
    Student asks to approve his/her revisions
	*Content
	
	**s+v
			**Sentence structure
			
			*Content (x2)			

Evaluation Student challenges feedback				*Content		

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).
**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

AA.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 13 Episodes	00:11:45	Draft
	00:36:47	Revisions
Task 2 10 Episodes	00:07:23	Draft
	00:58:48	Revisions
Task 3 14 Episodes	00:25:38	Draft
	00:19:37	Revisions
Task 4 10 Episodes	00:13:17	Draft
	00:28:47	Revisions
Task 5 7 Episodes	00:14:05	Draft
	00:27:18	Revisions
Task 6 17 Episodes	00:10:23	Draft
	00:34:30	Revisions

AA.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Yuna's Engagement

Category	Subcategory	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responses minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant shows signals of comprehension by providing minimum responses, but does not self-revise.	Point of view, verb choice, punctuation, run on

Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Article, sentence structure, comparison degree
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.	Prepositional phrase
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant is not sure how to correct.	Point of view
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant tries to understand the problems and generate couple of questions/statements to confirm his/her understanding and revision, and finally self-corrects.	Non-count noun, word choice
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).	Word choice, article, content feedback (supporting details),
	The student-participant explains his/her revision without the instructor's input or question.	Content feedback (supporting details)
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Ownership	The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realises the error and self-corrects.	Part of speech, run on, content feedback (supporting details), relative clause, article, paragraph organization, verb form
	The student-participant initiates the question because does not know how to correct.	Part of speech, content feedback (examples), word choice
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.	Transition word

	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffold (noticing).	Article
	The instructor asks a student-participant to explain/clarify what she/he means.	rhetorical purpose, sentence structure, content feedback (elaboration), run on
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	It is hard to revise content feedback. During the discussion she notices her mistakes.
	The student-participant affective responses towards feedback and errors.	Indirect feedback helps her think about her errors.
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Drafting and revisions are helpful because she can practice writing new words. It is easier to write summaries and do the paraphrase.

AA.6. Yuna's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Category	Subcategory	Errors
Task 1 4 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Content feedback, wordy, verb choice, verb tense;
7 times		Classroom discussion	Content feedback;
2 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	s+v; Preposition, verb form, noun phrase, part of speech;
7 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Do not know how to correct thus delete (deleting the whole sentence/phrase from the essay)	Content feedback, bridge, prepositional phrase, part of speech;
14 times		Rewrite the error (by	Content feedback,

		using a new form)	preposition, verb tense, article, noun phrase, object is missing, run on, word choice; agreement, article, content feedback;
3 times		Ignore the error (do not make any corrections and leave it as it is)	
Task 2 6 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Article, word order;
2 times		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	article;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Content feedback;
1 time		Dictionary	Word choice;
2 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	s+v;
7 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback, noun phrase, object is missing;
Task 3 11 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Noun ending, article, word choice, comparison degree, preposition, word order, fragment;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Preposition;
6 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on	Recall/remember	article, content feedback, s+v;

	error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)		
14 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback, word choice, run on, article, transition word;
Task 4 8 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Word choice, article, s+v, verb form, verb tense;
1 time	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Preposition;
2 times 1 time	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, word choice; Part of speech;
6 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Word choice, article, run on, word order, content feedback;
Task 5 8 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Transition word, noun ending, article, preposition, word form;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Article, word form;
6 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, s+v, word order, verb tense;

	knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)		
24 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback, word choice, run on, sentence structure, noun ending, s+v, verb choice, word form;
Task 6 11 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Verb choice, article, verb tense, point of view;
6 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Word form, preposition, word choice;
8 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Run on, preposition, verb form, if sentences, s+v, verb choice;
15 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Sentence structure, point of view, content feedback, article, word choice, run on, wordy;

APPENDIX BB: KEVIN'S CASE

BB.1. Kevin's Error Frequency

Per 300 words	Task #1 523w	Task #2 305w	Task #3 674w	Task #4 482w	Task #5 610w	Task #6 882w	Post #1 612w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	5 6 5 2 1	2 3 1 2 2	6 7 3 2	1 2 2 2	2 2 7 2 2	1 1 2 2 4	 4 1 1 2
Total:	19	10	18	7	15	10	8
Frequent error type	Sentence structure (3) Word choice (4)	Art (2) Prep (2)	Word choice (4) Verb form (3)	Articles (2)	Sentence structure (3)	Prep (4)	Prep (2)

BB.2. Kevin's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	No goal	Nothing	Nothing
Task 2	Write a better essay	Learned how to organize main points Learned main points needed to be supported with more examples	Grammar: Nothing special Compare/contrast language
Task 3	Understand compare/contrast essays	Learned differences between facts and opinions Learned that he could not self-revise the errors	Grammar: Nothing special Lack of supporting details
Task 4	No goal	Learned cause and effect type of organization Learned strategies on how include research as supporting evidence	Articles
Task 5	No goal	Learned the role of academic words	Prepositions Articles APA style
Task 6	Write 600 words	Learned that he was still making grammatical errors	Prepositions Articles Coherence

BB.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	5	Task 6
Error code problems Revision: uncertainty	*Coherence *Word choice					**Subjun-ve

Request to clarify
  Student request to clarify DF
  Student response to clarify a teacher's question
	**Wordy
	**Word choice
	*Content
				**Cause & effect language		**Content

Confirmation/verification Student explains his/her choice of revisions		**Content	*Bridge			
Evaluation Student challenges DF			**Transition			

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).
**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

BB.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks and Episodes	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 15 Episodes	00:14:03	Draft
	00:45:02	Revisions

Task 2 8 Episodes	00:15:34	Draft
	00:28:41	Revisions
Task 3 10 Episodes	00:22:26	Draft
	00:35:17	Revisions
Task 4 6 Episodes	00:18:05	Draft
	00:16:24	Revisions
Task 5 3 Episodes	00:06:45	Draft
	00:23:37	Revisions
Task 6 9 Episodes	00:17:13	Draft
	00:43:55	Revisions

BB.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Kevin's Engagement

Category	Subcategory	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responds minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant is unresponsive (passive recipient). The student-participant does not follow up. The only utterance is 'ahem' and nodding.	Wordy; word form (x4); relative clause; antecedent; fragment; word choice; verb form+preposition; Content (x4); preposition; subjunctive
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Bridge; relative pronoun;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiates the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.	Cause and effect language;

linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.	Content;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency

Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback | The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revision, and the student-participant asks a question to confirm his/her understanding of the error. | Word choice; |
| Cognitive Engagement: Awareness

Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations | The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise). | Word choice (x3); content feedback (x4); antecedent; preposition (x2); coherence; |
| Cognitive Engagement:

Ownership | The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realises the error and self-corrects. | Content (x2); word choice; |
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.	Verb form;
	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffold (noticing).	Parallel structure (word form);
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Asking questions is hard because it has never been encouraged back home. Revisions take time. Tasks are new and not easy to compose.
	The student-participant affective responses towards feedback and errors.	It is hard to remember error terminology.

	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Read-to-write tasks are beneficial to improve skills. Fluency has improved.

BB.6. Kevin's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Category	Subcategory	Errors
Task 1 13 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Content feedback, relative clause, word choice (x2), verb form (x3), articles (x2), preposition, s+v, noun ending, comparison degree;
3 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Handouts given in class	Content questions (x2), fragment;
1 time		Internet search (websites)	Content question;
1 time	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Self-found docs (not given in class)	Correlative conjunction;
3 times		Dictionary	Verb choice, verb form, part of speech;
3 times		Asking the instructor by using Google Docs.	Wordy, sentence structure, content questions;
1 time		Internet search (websites)	Antecedent;
1 time		Self-found docs (not given in class)	Content question;
1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Do not know how to correct thus delete	Word choice;
3 times		Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content questions (x2), pronoun+noun agreement;
6 times		Ignore the error	Content feedback, word choice;
Task 2 20 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Verb form, word choice, word form, preposition, sentence structure, antecedent, content questions, s+v;

Task 3			
2 times	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Word choice;
2 times		Do not want to search for solution thus guess	Content feedback;
4 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	S+V, content feedback, word order, word choice;
1 time	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Word choice;
3 times		Self-found docs (not given in class)	Verb form, pronoun+noun agreement;
13 times		Dictionary	Verb choice, s+v, noun ending, part of speech, preposition, noun ending, article;
2 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Handouts given in class	APA style;
1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Do not know how to correct thus delete	Word choice;
5 times		Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Sentence structure, bridge, content feedback;
5 times		Ignore the error	Word choice, content feedback;
Task 4			
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Word choice;
1 time	Evaluate notes (that is a student knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Handouts given in class	Content feedback;
1 time		Dictionary	Word order;
9 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when	Recall/remember	Noun ending, article, s+v, verb form;

	he/she pays attention)		
3 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Word choice, transition word;
Task 5 1 time	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Punctuation;
2 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Word order, article;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Word choice, article;
3 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Internet search (websites)	Preposition, verb choice, sentence structure;
7 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Punctuation, word choice, preposition, s+v, run on, noun ending;
8 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Sentence structure, content feedback, verb form;
3 times		Ignore the error (do not make any corrections and leave it as it is)	Content feedback;
Task 6 11 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Article, relative pronoun, verb form, word order, verb tense, s+v;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Point of view, bridge;
3 times		Self-found docs (not	Verb form, subject of

		given in class)	the clause, word choice;
10 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Dictionary	Preposition, article, verb tense;
6 times		Handouts given in class	Content feedback, bridge, coherence;
1time	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Content feedback;
3 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Wordy, content feedback, word choice;
3 times		Ignore the error	Content feedback;

APPENDIX CC: KEVIN'S DIALOGIC INTERACTION

Kevin's Dialogic Interaction

Our role reversals are especially significant to point out here, where Kevin repeats his

revisions and checks with me by using the signal "right?" Kevin was in charge of the dialogue,

which could have increased his agency and self-efficacy.

S: Here, we need have a connection between sentences [draws on the draft] [reads]
"however Diego can learn his work to do, can learn his work while:, doing it,
K: Hm [confirming]
S: And: [reads] "the needs are always changing with time" What does it mean?
K: (.3) Hm, yes (.3) the style is always changing according to the period of time
S: Okay, but how is it connected to Diego?
K: So he: (.3) he is younger and (.3) he does not have enough experience, so he (.3) he
can: adopt the easier than the others
S: Very good, why didn't you write about it?
K: [chuckles]
S: You gave me such a perfect sentence
K: So I write "Diego can learn his work while doing it, period, the needs are always
changing with time" right?
S: [looking at the draft] Yes,
K: "Therefore Diego may fit because he has a potential to change" that's all?
S: Great. Now, here, (.3) Marianna, here again disconnection
K: Hm?
S: [reads] "Marianna who is one of the candidates might have fixed ideas because of her:
[writes on his draft] experience: (.3) here, I do not know about Marianna, you needed to
compare to other candidates, but what do you think about Marianna?
K: (.3) I think Marianna is the oldest candidate and (.3) hm: she has: enough experience:
however (.3) it might disturb her
S: Very good
K: She might have fixed idea, because of her experience
S: Again, you have brought a good sentence
K: I would say, "although Marianna, one of the candidates, has: teaching experience, her
ideas might have been fixed" (.3) right?
S: Right [looks at his draft]

320

APPENDIX DD: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT TOTAL NUMBER OF ERRORS

Student-participants	2016 September	2016 September	2016 October	2016 October	2016 November	2016 November	2016 December	2017 April
Intermediate Group	Task 1 Reading +	Task 2 Reading +	Task 3 Reading –	Task 4 Reading –	Task 5 Reading – Interview**	Task 6 Reading +	Post 1 Reading *	Post 2 Reading *
Peter	23	26	17	21	17	25	15	34
Emiri	20	21	7	15	17	9	17	16
Beth	22	5	7	26	14	14	14	27
Kelly	17	10	9	11	10	6	11	
Kim	19	23	12	17	27	16	11	
Mayu	19	11	17	14	12	17	14	23
Reika	14	15	16	20	39	24	13	13
Rikuto	14	11	21	30	16	22	18	17
David	21	16	15	17	9	13	15	14
Advanced Group	Task 1 Reading +	Task 2 Reading –	Task 3 Reading +	Task 4 Reading – Interview **	Task 5 Reading +	Task 6 Reading +	Post 1 Reading + –	Post 2 Reading + –
Veronica	19	11	16	10	15	7	5	
Sam	19	15	21	15	19	11	9	
Go	19	10	18	7	15	10	8	
Lana	22	29	32	28	15	19	6	
Mary	18	8	9	10	4	7	6	
Ruowen	21	10	13	18	5	10	10	8
Yuna	16	13	13	10	17	18	8	14

| Sara | 16 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 7 | 14 |

Reading + is included.

Reading – is not included.

Reading * is included, but it is short (500-600 words).

Interview** results must have been reported and no reading is involved.

APPENDIX EE: LANA'S CASE

EE.1. Lana's Error Frequency

Per 300 words	Task #1 615w	Task #2 366w	Task #3 660w	Task #4 453w	Task #5 616w	Task #6 754w	Post #1 836w
LE MorE SynE Art Prep	5 10 7	3 11 6 8 1	5 11 7 3 6	4 14 3 6 1	2 9 3 1	1 11 2 2 3	1 3 2
Total: Errors	22	29	32	28	15	19	6
The most frequent error type	Word choice (3) Verb tense (3) Sentence structure (3)	Noun ending (5) Articles (8)	Verb choice (4) Prepositions (6) Verb forms (8)	Word choice (4) Articles (6) S+V (6)	Noun ending (3) Verb form (3) Articles (3)	Verb forms (6)	Verb form (3)

EE.2. Lana's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	Learn how to write a reader response Get accustomed to Google Docs	Learned the importance of both grammar and content in writing Learned it was hard to self-revise Realized the need to revise grammar	Academic vocabulary Grammar Paragraph development
Task 2	Write a clear paragraph with strong supporting details	Learned the importance of providing clear examples	Grammar Articles
Task 3	Use reading material as evidence	Focused on supporting details Learned APA style	Articles Subject and verb agreement
Task 4	No Goal	Realised that understanding task description was the first step before drafting	Weak support

Task 5	No Goal	Learned to self-revise and revision strategies	Subject and verb agreement
Task 6	Avoid article errors Write clear paragraphs with effective examples	Realized that having main points was important before drafting Realized she could not self-revise s+v, prepositions, and articles	Prepositions S+V Academic vocabulary

EE.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	T 5	Task 6
Error code problems Terminology Revision: uncertainty		**word choice **word form	**object of the preposition **verb form			**run on
Request to clarify Student request to clarify feedback Student response to clarify an instructor's question	**Verb choice *Content *Sentence structure	**noun phrase **Content		**content *content		*word choice *content
Confirmation/verification Student checks his/her understanding of feedback Student explains his/her choice of revisions	**Content *Content *word choice *sentence structure	**sentence structure	*content	*article		

326

	*antecedent *agreement	**preposition **article **verb form *verbals	**adverb **sentence structure **preposition **word order			
Student asks to approve his/her revisions						
Evaluation Student challenges feedback Student appraisals of feedback						*content

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).
**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

EE.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks and Episodes	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 19 Episodes	00:21:07	Draft
	00:58:45	Revisions
Task 2 9 Episodes	00:10:35	Draft
	1:05:05	Revisions
Task 3 14 Episodes	00:19:24	Draft
	00:24:51	Revisions
Task 4 13 Episodes	00:33:10	Draft
	00:37:10	Revisions

Task 5 9 Episodes	00:15:46	Draft
	00:18:13	Revisions
Task 6 8 Episodes	00:31:04	Draft
	00:28:50	Revisions

EE.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Lana's Engagement

Category	Subcategories	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responses minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant shows signals of comprehension by providing minimum responses, but does not self-revise.	Possessive, thesis, antecedent, s+v, run on
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	verb tense, s+v, preposition, verb form
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiate the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.	run on
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.	correlative conjunction
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant is unsure how to revise the error.	word choice, sentence structure, content feedback, transition word
	The student-participant tries to understand the problems and generate couple of questions/statements to confirm his/her understanding and revision, and finally self-corrects.	sentence structure, content feedback, article

	The student-participant asks a question to clarify feedback, but also provides 2 strategies to revise the error, and wants the instructor to confirm which option would be successful.	uses of semicolon
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revision, and the student-participant asks a question to confirm his/her understanding of the error.	content feedback
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).	verb form, verb tense
	The student-participant explains his/her revision without the instructor's input or question.	pronoun + noun agreement, verb tense, s+v
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Ownership	The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realises the error and self-corrects.	word choice, relative clause, article, verb form, noun phrase, content feedback, verb choice
	The student-participant initiates the question and the instructor explains, and the student-participant self-corrects and/or realizes the error.	verbal
	The student-participant initiates the question because does not know how to correct.	correlative conjunction
	The student-participant initiates the question to confirm his/her revision.	word choice
	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain/clarify what she/he means.	word choice
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Revisions raise awareness of common errors. Drafting helps to think

		about the problems. Dialogic interactions make her feel comfortable and she can ask questions.
	The student-participant affective responses toward feedback and errors.	Some errors are repetitive and she does not have control over them. Error codes are new terminology and it takes time for her to remember them.
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Paragraph construction is improved. She can develop clear introduction and effective supporting details.

EE.6. Lana's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Category	Subcategories	Errors
Task 1 10 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Verb tense, word form, comparison degree, word choice, transitive verb, compound subject, word order, relative clause, verb choice;
3 times 7 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites) Dictionary	Noun ending, verb choice; Verb choice, word choice, antecedent, pronoun+noun agreement, word order, verb form;
3 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Non-count nouns, word order, preposition;

9 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	S+v, verb tense, word order, article, verb form, parallelism, preposition, word form;
2 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form) Ignore the error	Fragment, content feedback;
Task 2 1 time	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Word form;
5 times		Dictionary	Word form, preposition, verb form;
1 time		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Word choice;
6 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Noun phrase, preposition, article, verbals;
2 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on	Recall/remember	Content feedback;
8 times	error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, noun ending, s+v, comparison degree;
Task 3 6 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Word choice, noun ending, verb form, s+v, relative clause, preposition;
7 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Word choice, preposition, object of the preposition, verb choice;
2 times		Dictionary	Word choice;
3 times		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Preposition, content feedback;
3 times	Evaluate notes (a student-	Google docs/grammar	Word order, APA

		folder	style;
	participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes and other sources)		
19 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Comparison degree, s+v, word choice, article, verb form, antecedent, noun ending, content feedback, preposition, parallelism;
5 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback;
Task 4 7 times	Give possible correction (a student-participant is not sure, but based on rules he/she has learned before or recently, and his/her evaluation that it is correct, and he/she does not check any other sources)	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	S+v, agreement, noun ending, article;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Relative clause, wordy;
3 times		Dictionary	S+v, verb choice, verbals;
2 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Recall/remember	Article;
4 times		Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Article, verb tense, noun ending;
11 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback, conjunction, run on, word choice, verb choice;
Task 5 3 times	Work on the error and apply notes: a student-participant sees the error code (feedback), understands the problem/error, and tries to solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Verb tense, verbals;
2 times		Internet search (websites)	Word choice, reflexive pronoun;
1 time	Notice (recognize/remember	Recall/remember	Preposition;
9 times	features of the error based on	Pay attention and apply	Article, noun ending,

	error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	grammatical rule	s+v, word order;
7 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Verb form, content feedback, noun ending, possessive pronoun, word choice, s+v;
Task 6 1 times	Work on the error and apply notes: a student-participant sees the error code (feedback),	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Possessives;
2 times	understands the problem/error, and tries to solve/correct it by	Internet search (websites)	Preposition, antecedent;
9 times	using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	Preposition, word choice, s+v, verb choice, fragment, word form;
11 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code (a student-participant knows the correct answer when he/she pays attention)	Pay attention and apply grammatical rule	Noun phrase, s+v, article, word form, verb tense, possessive, fragment;
7 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Verbals, wordy, content feedback, verb form, preposition, s+v;

APPENDIX FF: KEVIN'S EXAMPLE

In the example below, first five questions were posted, and when Kevin expressed confusion on how to revise, three more questions were posted (total of eight questions). Although Kevin was asked to make specific changes and was provided with clear guidance, some of the questions were not reviewed, specifically the "bridge" comments.

Task 1
Draft 1: (1) <u>These days, I am often surprised that I have seen only a junior high school student have their own smartphone. I also see even an elementary school student with their own cell phone. It is impossible in my youth. Even if they had, it was their parent's, and only for calling their parent to pick them up to their home.</u> (6) <u>Additionally, one day, I saw a TV commercials of mobile games which some children play mobile games together in a park, not play with a ball or running.</u> (2) <u>I was really astonished and felt disappointed.</u> Although problems relating communication of children has seen as a one of the biggest concern, a very famous company advertises such a silly thing. Although problems relating communication of children has seen as a one of the biggest concern, a very famous company advertises such a silly thing. (7) <u>I sometimes hear</u> people say that they have some problem in communicate. In my opinion, they tend not to have less experienced communicate with many people and be good at something relating technology. It is really necessary to communicate with people face to face because of (3)<u>skills on technology</u>, I guess. (8)<u>On the other hand, interestingly,</u> people who play or played for long time have less difficulty in communicating with others comparing people who do not. (4) <u>In this case, people on the same team cannot help communicating with their team mate toward the victory. Also, in the game, facial expression and body language is much more effective way because they have to do it in an instant. Therefore people who experience a sport is better at communication comparing people</u> who do not. <u>…(5)</u>

Feedback 1
(1) Where are you leading? How is it related to the original article? Present the topic sentence.
(2) Why? What is the connection here between your idea and the original article?
(3) How is it related to face-to-face interactions?
(4) How are these ideas related to the article?
(5) Think of rearranging the sentences in this paragraph. Consider coherence.

Dialogue on Google Docs.
    Kevin Sep 18, 2016
        About this, I don't know what should I add or fix.
    Shokhsanam Sep 18, 2016
        Ideas/sentences do not flow in this paragraph. Consider using conjunctions/adverbs and changing the order of sentences (moving some sentences up and down in this para).
    Kevin Sep 18, 2016
        I cannot come up with any ideas at all.
    Shokhsanam Sep 18, 2016

I will add new comments and title "bridge" to explain the points in this paragraph. The questions will guide you.

Feedback 2

(6) Bridge>>you start with kids having phone and suddenly jump to discuss games.

(7) Bridge>>you start with statements about having phones and mobile games and suddenly introduce new idea about problems of communication.

(8) Bridge > here you start discussing about how sports are beneficial, but what is the connection between kids having phones and mobile games? I mean the ideas are good; you just need to connect them coherently and show the cause and effect process>>

1. Kids are playing on phones because many companies launch mobile friendly games>>

2. Because kids play mobile games, they are not doing any sports.

3. Disadvantages of not doing sports>>

4. How these disadvantages affect interpersonal communication

Final: I also think technology can be harmful for children to develop their communication skills because they need to do some physical and oral communication in order to acquire such skills, as the author wrote in the original article. One day, I saw a TV commercials of mobile games in which some children not play with a ball or running but play mobile games together in a park. I was really astonished and felt disappointed regardless of a park where people physically play something. Although problems relating to communication of children have been seen as one of the biggest concerns, a very famous company Nitendo advertises such an ironic commercial. I sometimes hear people say that children have some problems in communication. In my opinion, they tend to have less experienced communication with many people and be good at something relating to technology. Communication with people face to face is really necessary because of technology. On the other hand, interestingly, people who play or played sports for a long time have less difficulty in communicating with others compared to people who do not. In this case, people on the same team cannot help communicating with their teammate toward the victory. Also in the game, facial expression, eye contact and body language is much more effective because they have to communicate with each other instantly for the triumph. People who have experienced a sport are better at communication than those who have not. Therefore I think physically doing something like I stated above is a material point that plays a great role as a "bridge" from being uncommunicative to be communicative.

APPENDIX GG: SARA'S EXAMPLE

Sara rewrote Task 6 several times (two times based on content feedback, the same problems), because she was not satisfied with her revisions.

Tssk 6
Draft 1: The author described how to make Chinese dishes for their friends in specific way because it is easy to describe that the family have Chinese identity. On the other hand, they also respect <u>American culture. (1)</u> "These days, she bought dead fish. […] When we first came to America, [mother] used to keep live fish in the bathtub because that way she knew the fish would be fresh when it came time to cook it. (Namioka p. 82)." The mother learned that using living fish for cooking is unique in the world, though it is common in their home country. Thus, she adapts new culture and respects it now.

Feedback
   (1) Provide some background/context info before presenting the example (a summary).

Draft 2: The author described how to make Chinese dishes for their friends in specific way because it is easy to describe that the family have Chinese identity. <u>They want to maintain their identities.</u> On the other hand, they also respect American culture <u>because they are in USA.</u> "These days, she bought dead fish. […] When we first came to America, [mother] used to keep live fish in the bathtub because that way she knew the fish would be fresh when it came time to cook it. (Namioka p. 82)." The mother learned that using living fish for cooking is unique in the world, though it is common in their home country.

Draft 3: The author describes how to make Chinese dishes for their friends in a specific way because it is easy to describe that the family has Chinese identity. <u>They want to maintain their identities. On the other hand, they also respect American culture because they are in the U.S. They are eager to respect their Chinese habit, but it is impossible for American to understand easily and accept completely their habits. The example of "living fish" describes this point:</u> "These days, she bought dead fish. […] When we first came to America, [mother] used to keep live fish in the bathtub because that way she knew the fish would be fresh when it came time to cook it." (Namioka, p. 82) The mother learns that using living fish for cooking is unique in the world, though it is common in their home country.

APPENDIX HH: RUOWEN'S CASE

HH.1. Ruowen's Error Frequency

Per 300 words	Task #1 819w	Task #2 332w	Task #3 451w	Task #4 429w	Task #5 607w	Task #6 795w	Post #1 518w	Post #2 381w	Post #3 362w
LE	5	3	3	1		2	2	2	2
MorE	7	3	3	7	3	5	4	3	3
SynE	6	2	4	3	1	3	1	2	5
Art		1	2	5	1		2	1	1
Prep	3	1	1	2			1		1
Total:	21	10	13	18	5	10	10	8	12
Frequent error type	Relative clause (3) Run on (3) Verb form (5)	Verb choice (2) Verb form (2)	Frag (2) Noun ending (3)	Art (5) Verb form (4) Word form (3)	Word form (2)	Verb form (3) SS (2)	Verb form (3)	Verb form (3)	Run on (3)

HH.2. Ruowen's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	Know strengths and weaknesses in writing	Learned how to write summary and critique Learned to use her own words when paraphrasing the reading Summarized grammar mistakes Took revisions seriously when the error was 'small'	Tense Verb choice Bridge/transitions
Task 2	Use compare/contrast organization	Learned compare and contrast structure of organization Summarized effectively Provided her opinion clearly Learned citations Worked on verb choice and prepositions	Tense Verb choice Bridge/transitions Provide strong evidence
Task 3	Know strengths and weaknesses in	Took every error seriously Paraphrased by using her own words	Tense Verb choice

	writing Prevent errors	Worked on coherence	Bridge/transitions
Task 4	No goal	Learned cause and effect type of organization	Grammar Word choice
Task 5	Describe interviews	Presented supporting evidence Combined reading material and interview results	Cause and Effect type of organization Describe effects Citations
Task 6	Know strengths and weaknesses in writing	Learned analysis and thesis Solved problems (revisions)	Tense Verb choice Bridge/transitions Find the author's purpose

HH.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6

Error code problems
    Terminology
 	
    Revision:
    uncertainty
		*Article
		
		*Word choice
			*Noun ending (x2)	*Noun ending		

Request to clarify
    Student request to clarify WCF
    Student response to clarify a teacher's question
		*Wh questions
		*Wh questions
						**Voice

Confirmation/verification Student explains his/her choice of revisions			*Wh questions (x3) *Verb choice *Run on			*Wh questions *S+V

341

Evaluation
     Student
     challenges WC
	*Relative
	clause					

*Student expressed his opinion/concern in a statement form (affirmative sentence).
**Student expressed his opinion/concern in a question form (interrogative sentence).

HH.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks and Episodes	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 28 Episodes	00:15:45	Draft
	1:24:09	Revisions
Task 2 16 Episodes	00:14:05	Draft
	00:59:17	Revisions
Task 3 17 Episodes	00:27:08	Draft
	00:22:03	Revisions
Task 4 9 Episodes	00:17:56	Draft
	00:29:31	Revisions
Task 5 5 Episodes	00:5:07	Draft
	00:15:54	Revisions
Task 6 14 Episodes	00:41:09	Draft
	00:33:42	Revisions

HH.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Ruowen's Engagement

Category	Subcategory	Errors
No engagement: A student-participant responds minimally ('yeah') or does not respond and gives nonverbal signal (nodding)	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant is unresponsive (passive recipient). The student-participant does not follow up. The only utterance is 'ahem' and nodding.	Word choice, sentence structure, citation/references (3 times), the quotes, voice/shift, 'wh' questions, run on (2 times), verb tense, verb choice (2 times) relative clause;
	The instructor explains the problem and the student-participant tries to understand, but does not self-revise.	Noun ending, object of the preposition, 'wh' question, agreement-number;
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Verb choice, word choice (2), word form 'wh' question, verb form, spelling, article;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiate the question to confirm his/her revision.	Verb tense;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant is not sure how to correct.	Bridge, word choice, preposition;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant does not have any clue on how to revise the error.	'Wh' question
	The student-participant asks a question to clarify feedback, but also provides 2 strategies to revise the error, and wants the instructor to confirm which option would be successful.	Agreement-number, article;

	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revision, and the student-participant asks a question to confirm his/her understanding of the error.	Verb choice, fragment, run on;
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).	Run on (3 times), wordy, verb choice (2 times), verb tense, noun phrase, preposition, sentence structure (3 times), agreement-person (2 times), fragment, article (2 times), noun ending, transition, 'wh' question, verb form;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency	The student-participant defends his/her correction.	Article (3 times), noun phrase, word form;
Ownership	The student-participant initiates the question.	Citation/references
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflections about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Feedback helps to revise and improves writing. She is happy when she can solve the error. Drafting on Google saves time. She improved her vocabulary (using academic words); she can effectively organize her essays; she knows how to respond to the reading material. She learned how to solve bridge problems, how to write about other writers' opinion. Reading material is not interesting. There is always error in her writing. She has limited time to revise because of other commitments (major classes).

	The student-participant affective response towards feedback	She is positive about feedback. She always makes many mistakes.

HH.6. Ruowen's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Category	Subcategory	Errors
Task 1 5 times	No strategy		Wordy, word choice, run on, noun ending, word order;
6 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error by using a new form	Word choice, prepos, 'wh' comments, relative pronoun, wordy, article;
6 times		Ignore the error	Verb choice and tense, word choice, citation;
28 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	
2 times		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Preposition;
8 times	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Run on, verb form, wordy, article, tense and verb choice; fragment;
1 time	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Google grammar folder	Verb agreement; subordinate or relative pronouns, 'wh' questions; preposition;
3 times		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	
1time		Internet search (websites)	
Task 2 8 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Verb form, content questions, noun ending, compare & contrast structure;

1 time	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Grammar folder on Google Drive	Article;
2 times		Internet search (websites)	Preposition, verb form;
2 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Verb choice;
Task 3 2 times	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Punctuation, noun ending;
23 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Lexical, morphological, syntactic errors, content questions;
4 times		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Bridge, point of view, verb form;
1 time	Work on the error and Apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Google grammar folder	Citation;
1 time		Classroom discussion	Citation;
2 times		Internet search (websites)	Verb forms;
1 time		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Possessive;
2 times	Notice (recognize/remember features of the error based on error code, pay attention)	Recall/remember	Object is missing;
1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Run on;
Task 4 12 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Lexical, morphological, syntactic errors;
1 time		Based on knowledge learned in writing class	Word form;
2 times	Work on the error and Apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Prepositions;
1 time		Google grammar folder	Citation;

2 times 1 time	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error by using a new form Ignore the error	'Wh' questions; Noun ending;
Task 5 9 times 2 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources Delete/rewrite the error	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class Ignore the error	All errors; Word choice; verb form;
Task 6 25 times 2 times 2 times 4 times 1 time 1 time	Give possible correction without checking any other sources Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources) Delete/rewrite the error	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class Based on knowledge learned in writing class Internet search (websites) Rewrite the error by using a new form Ignore the error Do not know how to correct thus delete	All errors; Verb choice, bridge; Preposition, word form; Article, preposition, 'wh' questions; S+v; Run on;

APPENDIX II: STUDENT-PARTICIPANT REPORTS ON THE AMOUNT OF WRITING

PRODUCED IN SPRING 2017

	No Writing (up to 200 words per task and total of 700 words in a semester)	Small Amount (up to 300 words per task and total of 1200 words in a semester)	Large Amount (up to 3000 words per task and total of 15000 words in a semester)
Spring 2017	Sara Yuna	Ruowen David Rikuto Reika Mayu Emiri Beth	Peter

APPENDIX JJ: PETER'S CASE

JJ.1. Peter's Error Frequency

Per 300 words	Task #1 300w	Task #2 537w	Task #3 443w	Task #4 300w	Task #5 451w	Task #6 440w	Post #1 643w	Post #2 472w	Post #3 601w	Post #4 1159w
LE	3	4	3	5	2	8	1	2	1	2
MorE	10	11	8	8	4	8	7	28	4	2
SynE	7	7	3	4	8	6	4	2	5	1
Article	3	3	1	1	3				1	
Prep		1	2	5		3	3	2		
Total:	23	26	17	21	17	25	15	34	11	5
The most frequent error type	Verb form Frag Art	Verb form Word order	Word form Word choice	Prep Verb form Verb choice	Run on Art	Word choice	Verb tense Art Prep	Word form Verb form Art	Run on S+V	Verb form

JJ.2. Peter's Goals for each Task

Tasks	Pre: Planned Goal	Reality: While Writing	Post: Serious Error
Task 1	Peter did not think about goals; that is, he did not realize he needed to have anything.	Worked on grammar and format mistakes	Grammar Organization
Task 2	Make less errors (obvious s+v) Make the essay interesting and easy to understand	Learned that he was still having mistakes, but less compared to task 1 Learned how to revise his errors	Avoid using 'you'/voice Organization
Task 3	Practice how to write compare and contrast essays	Learned to write effective thesis statement Wrote compare and contrast essay	Thesis statement Transition between paragraphs
Task 4	Organization	Wrote a better compare and contrast essay compared to task 3	Organization

Task 5	Write more words Coherence	Felt less pressure and wrote more compared to other tasks	Transition between paragraphs and main points (causes)
Task 6	Work on repeated errors Write interesting topic sentences	Wrote a better essay compared to task 5 Focused on having effective topic sentences in each paragraph	Be aware of repeated errors Notice repeated errors while revising
Task 7	Support each paragraph with effective details	Learned to critique other writers' statements Learned to present some background information before presenting other writers' examples	Organization (how to present the information) Coherence

JJ.3. Dialogic Interactions Online, Google Docs

Categories & Subcategories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	T 4	Task 5	Task 6
Error code problems 　　Terminology 　　Revision: uncertainty	*Article *Agreement *S+V *S+V	*Parallel structure **Relat. clause	*Run on *Part of speech *Prep phrase *Noun ending (x2) *Word choice			*Noun ending
Request to clarify 　　Student request to clarify feedback 　　Student response to clarify a teacher's question	**Word choice *Verb form	 *Shifts in point of view	**Verb tense *Relative pronoun *SS		*SS	*SS
Confirmation/verifica						

tion
    Student checks his understanding of WCF
    Student explains his/her choice of revisions
    Student asks to approve his/her revisions
	**Word choice
	**Verb form
	
	*Verbals
	*Word choice
	
	**Fragment
	**Verbals
	**Relative pronoun
		
		*Word order
		
		**Relative pronoun
		**Verb form (x3)
			**Coherence & intr
			
			** S+V
					
					**SS
					**Prepositional phrase
					**Agreement
						**Noun ending
						**Word choice
						
						**Verb choice (x2)

Evaluation
    Student challenges WCF
    Student appraisals of WCF
		**Point of view
		
		*APA style
		*Word choice
		*Word order
			*Coherence		**Run on	

JJ.4. Dialogic Interactions: Meeting Schedule

Tasks	Length of Time (in hour, min, sec)	Discussion
Task 1 14 Episodes	00:24:07	Draft
	00:43:08	Revisions
Task 2 20 Episodes	00:19:57	Draft
	1:12:12	Revisions
Task 3 16 Episodes	00:21:37	Draft
	00:33:12	Revisions

Task 4 7 Episodes	00:21:34	Draft
	1:01:18	Revisions
Task 5 15 Episodes	00:25:13	Draft
	00:18:51	Revisions
Task 6 11 Episodes	00:34:01	Draft
	00:39:16	Revisions

JJ.5. Dialogic Interactions Face-to-Face: Peter's Engagement

Category	Subcategory	Errors
Cognitive Engagement: Noticing Description: The extent to which a student-participant detects feedback, recognizes the instructor's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects the error.	Word choice, sentence structure, word choice;
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant self-corrects, but also initiates the question/statement to confirm his/her revision.	S+v, parallelism, verb form, sentence structure, word form (non-count nouns);
	The instructor scaffolds and the student-participant shows his/her understanding by summarizing the information.	Pronoun shift (voice), noun ending, verbals, word order, verb form;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Description: Cognitive strategies and skills that a student-participant uses to process and respond to feedback	The student-participant asks a question to understand feedback. The student-participant does not have any clue on how to revise the error.	Fragment, run on, sentence structure;
	The student-participant tries to understand the problems and generate a couple of questions/statements to confirm his/her understanding and revision, and finally self-corrects.	Word order;

	The student-participant asks a question to clarify feedback, but also provides 2 strategies to revise the error, and wants the instructor to confirm which option would be successful, and/or provides 2 revisions to confirm his/her understanding of the problem.	Verb form, fragment, point of view (voice);
Cognitive Engagement: Awareness Description: The extent to which a student-participant successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations	The instructor asks the student-participant to explain his/her revisions (why that particular strategy is used to revise).	Content feedback, article, fragment, citation, s+v, incomplete phrase, word choice, run on, possessive pronoun, noun ending, verb choice;
	The student-participant defends his/her correction, and/or realises the error and self-corrects.	Fragment, verbals, relative clause, transition, run on;
Cognitive Engagement: Agency Ownership	The student-participant initiates the question and the instructor explains, and the student-participant self-corrects and/or realizes the error.	Verbals, content (task purpose, organization), verb form, outline;
	The student-participant self-corrects without any scaffolding (noticing).	Verb form, s+v, verbals;
	Self-regulation: coping with errors Asking questions Translating into Chinese	Word choice, run on, verbals;
Affective Engagement: Emotions	The student-participant reflects about revisions, feedback, and course structure.	Feedback is very helpful to revise. Reading was hard.
	The student-participant affective responses toward feedback and errors.	It's hard to notice errors and self-revise. There are always many errors. It's hard to remember error codes.
	The student-participant self-evaluates his/her progress.	Revising takes patience. Learning how to revise requires attention. Remembering repeated

			errors is very important. If there is no revision, there is no improvement.

JJ.6. Peter's Strategies Applied During Revising the Errors

Tasks	Category	Subcategory	Errors
Task 1 23 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Content feedback-questions; articles; noun ending; s+v; verb forms; incomplete phrases; verb tense; word choice, verb choice; fragment, relative clause; transitions, subordinators; point of view;
8 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Ignore the error	Article, noun ending, verb form, s+v, verb tense; point of view;
Task 2 1 time	Guess possible correction (predict)	Do not know how to correct thus guess	Verb form;
3 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Verb form, word choice, word form;
2 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search (websites)	Preposition, incomplete phrase;
1 time		Self-found docs (not given in class)	relative clause;
13 times		Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Article, fragment, pronoun choice, word choice, wordy, subordinators, s+v, parallelism;
4 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right	Asking the instructor by using Google Docs.	Parallelism, word form, s+v, verb form;

3 times	correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Internet search (websites)	Word order, verb form;
17 times	Delete/rewrite the error	Rewrite the error (by using a new form)	Content feedback; s+v, article, fragment, word choice, word form, word order, verb form, pronoun shift;
2 times		Ignore the error (do not make any corrections and leave it as it is)	Fragment, pronoun shift;
Task 3 9 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Content feedback; word choice, noun ending, run on, article, preposition;
10 times	Apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Word form, s+v, word choice, sentence structure, verb form;
15 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Verb tense, content feedback, word form, word choice, prepositional phrase, fragment, verb choice;
Task 4 8 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	S+v, preposition, word choice, verb choice, run on, relative clause;
17 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Ask the instructor via Google Docs	S+v, article, fragment, preposition, verb choice, noun ending, word choice, content feedback, punctuation, verb form;

Task 5 6 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Dictionary	S+v, article, run on;
21 times	Evaluate notes (a student-participant knows the right correction, but still wants to get it 100% right and thus double-checks it by reviewing notes)	Ask the instructor via Google Docs	Article, fragment, run on, pronoun+noun agreement, verb choice, preposition, verb form;
Task 6 10 times	Give possible correction without checking any other sources	Based on knowledge learned prior to writing class	Content feedback; word choice, word form, verb choice, s+v;
7 times	Work on the error and apply notes (solve/correct it by using notes and other sources)	Internet search	Word choice, fragment;
8 times		Dictionary	Verb choice, preposition;

VITA

Shokhsanam Djalilova

EDUCATION

08/2009-07/2011   MA, Teaching English as a Second Language
Department of Modern Languages
The University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi

08/2004 – 07/2006   MA, English Linguistics
Thesis: Lingua Poetic Analysis of Tropes in Virginia Woolf's Short Stories
Department of English Philology
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

08/2000 – 06/2004   BA, Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Thesis: Structural Analysis of Compound Abstract Nouns of Modern English Language
Department of English Philology
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

01/2013-08/2018   Graduate Instructor
Intensive English Program
The University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi
Designed and taught the following ESL courses:
    Academic Writing for International Students
    Advanced Plus Writing
    Advanced Writing and Grammar
    Literature Written in English
    Intermediate Grammar
    Intermediate Writing and Grammar
    Advanced Grammar

Advanced World Cultures
Advanced Reading
Extensive Reading
Integrated Skills (reading, writing, & grammar)

08/2011-5/2013	Teaching Assistant

Department of Modern Languages
The University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi
Graduate Courses (M.A. in TESL and Applied Linguistics
Programs):
    Ling 501 Descriptive Grammar
    Ling 545 Indigenous Languages and Pedagogies
    TESL 689 Teaching Second Language Writing

08/2010-05/2011	Russian Language Graduate Teaching Assistant

Department of Modern Languages
The University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi
Designed and taught the following courses (undergraduate programs):
    Russian 299
    Russian 399
    Special topics in Russian 402

08/2009-05/2010	FULBRIGHT Foreign Language Teaching Assistant Department

of Modern Languages
The University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi
Designed and taught the following course (undergraduate programs):
    Ling 350 Uzbek Structure/Morphology

8/2006 – 7/2009	Lecturer

Department of English Philology
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan
Designed and taught the following courses (Pre-service teacher's
program):
    Analytical reading of English short stories written in the 19th
        century (second-year pre-service teachers)
    Theory of English Structure (first-year pre-service teachers)
    Descriptive Grammar (first-year pre-service teachers)
    Extensive Reading (second-year pre-service teachers)
    Intensive Reading (second-year pre-service teachers)

8/2004 – 7/2009   Instructor

Samarkand State College of Economy, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Designed and taught the following courses:

English for Academic Purposes (EFL context)

English for Specific Purposes (EFL context)