The University of Toledo
The University of Toledo Digital Repository

Theses and Dissertations

2017

Fault in our feedback : students' experiences and preferences regarding corrective feedback

Matthew C. Hannum
University of Toledo

Follow this and additional works at: http://utdr.utoledo.edu/theses-dissertations

Recommended Citation

A Thesis

entitled

Fault in our Feedback: Students' Experiences and Preferences Regarding Corrective

Feedback

by

Matthew C. Hannum

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Master of Arts Degree in English

_____
Dr. Melinda Reichelt, Committee Chair

_____
Dr. Anthony Edgington, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Barbara Schneider, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Patricia R. Komuniecki, Dean
College of Graduate Studies

The University of Toledo

May 2016

An Abstract of

Fault in our Feedback: Students' Experiences and Preferences Regarding Corrective
Feedback

by

Matthew C. Hannum

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree in
English

The University of Toledo
May 2016

The effectiveness of corrective feedback is a topic that is often discussed in the field of

L2 writing. Many arguments for the continuation of the use of corrective feedback have

been argued; however, the most prominent is the desire to receive feedback from the

students. This reason has been cited in multiple studies and is still among the most

commonly argued reason against the abandonment of corrective feedback in the L2

writing classroom. However, many scholars argue that students' desire for corrective

feedback stem from their experience receiving it for the majority of their time in school.

This study examined the influences students' past experiences had on their beliefs and

preferences regarding corrective feedback. Ultimately, this study will show that students

are highly influenced by their experiences both in their home country as well as their time

attending the University of Toledo's ESL composition courses.

Table of Contents

<center>**Chapter One**</center>

<center>**Review of Literature**</center>

Overview of Literature

Corrective feedback has become *the* topic of discussion in the last few decades. Truscott's (1996) article called into question the usefulness of corrective feedback and even went so far as to deem it harmful. This sparked a series of studies examining the effectiveness of correction for L2 writers, and examining the validity of Truscott's assumptions. Scholars on both sides of the debate have examined the evidence in their own studies and come to their own conclusions, further increasing the rift. According to Ferris (1999), one of the most adamant reasons for the continuation of corrective feedback is the students' desire to receive feedback. Truscott (1996) vehemently argues the reason students desire feedback is because of their experiences with instructors providing feedback. Therefore, this study will examine students' preference and beliefs regarding corrective feedback as well as their past experiences with feedback in the classroom.

For this study, I conducted interviews with 10 ESL students (N=10) from the University of Toledo. These students varied in backgrounds and experiences and provided a general sample of the ESL population of the University of Toledo. The interview questions were used to elicit information from the students regarding background, beliefs, preference, and past experiences regarding corrective feedback. The students also answered questions involving their experiences both in their home country as well as at the University of Toledo. This information helped to answer the following research questions: What are ESL students' (attending the University of Toledo) beliefs

<center>1</center>

about feedback regarding their writing? Which forms of feedback do the students prefer and why? Specifically what are the students' beliefs about the use of error correction on their written assignments? What factors seem to influence students' beliefs about error correction and feedback? What might this mean for instructors in the future? These questions were examined to find if Truscott's (1996) assumptions regarding students' beliefs and experiences are reliable.

Feedback and its Issues

Corrective feedback in ESL writing is often discussed with an air of reluctance. Many instructors see it as a crucial part of their pedagogy, and many students view it as a necessary part of their academic writing careers. It has been discussed by Ferris (1999) that the focus on correction is important and an integral part of the ESL writing classroom. Several studies have been conducted supporting the use of error correction, claiming that it helps L2 students develop as writers of English (Ferris 1999, 2004; Bitchener 2005, 2008; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 1994, 1996; Fathman and Whalley 1990; and Chandeler 2003, 2004). These various studies have examined the correlation between feedback and writing accuracy, and found results that favored the use of feedback, specifically error correction. However, despite the mountain of evidence supporting error correction, there is still a heated debate among academics regarding the effects of error correction on both the students and the instructors. (Truscott 1999, 2007; Truscott and Hsu 2008; Junqueira and Payant 2015)

Some scholars argue for the abandonment of error correction altogether. Truscott (1996) argues extensively that correction has little or no effect on students' performance, and in the most severe cases, actually causes them harm. This can also be seen in Truscott

and Hsu (2008), which showed that students who received correction performed worse relative to those who did not receive corrections. Truscott's arguments have been criticized by Bruton (2009), Ferris (1999, 2004), and Chandler (2003, 2004); however, the discussion on the subject of correction has continued and been expanded by many other authors.

Although the discussion of error correction is still ongoing, both sides of the correction debate have brought attention to many problems that accompany the use of error correction in an ESL writing class. Both the students and the instructor face several issues when error correction is used in the classroom. Error correction can cause students to feel helpless and overwhelmed, and cause them to be unwilling to experiment with their writing. For instructors, error correction is tedious and time consuming, and may cause problems for everyone if the instructor is uncertain of the errors being corrected. These issues are present in almost every ESL writing classroom; however, they may change in severity depending on the experiences of the students or the instructors involved.

Problems for the Instructor

For many writing instructors, correction is one of the practices that comes with the position and is expected and accepted. However, few outsiders can truly grasp the daunting task of correcting a large amount of students' papers, and the amount of time it can take to do it in a way the student can understand. A recent study by Junqueira and Payant (2015) reveals that the task of written correction can be overwhelming for both NES and ESL writing instructors. Junqueira and Payant's study follows Kim, an MA student teaching an ESL writing course for her first time. As her semester begins, Kim

discussed her feedback beliefs as well as the practices she intended to use throughout the semester. Kim's belief in the importance of organization and content was consistent throughout the semester; however, her practices began to tell a different story. As her semester went on, her practice of correcting global issues slowly shifted to place more emphasis on local issues (p. 26). These changes continued throughout the semester, and Kim was interviewed about her gradual change.

Junqueira and Payant (2015) spent a great deal of time interviewing Kim and learning about the changes in her correcting practices. According to the study, throughout the semester Kim showed more signs of stress and exhaustion. Kim herself explained in her first interview that she was shocked with how much her students needed corrective feedback. Kim truly believed that her corrections would help her students to improve at writing. Whether her belief is justified is debatable, but what is true is that Kim spent a great deal of time and effort correcting her students' papers. Junqueira and Payant explain that Kim was an inexperienced instructor teaching her first ESL writing course as an MA student; however, Kim's frustration and exhaustion came from correcting the papers of only one class. Taking this into account, one can easily see how much time and effort can be exhausted correcting the writings of an average instructor's class load. Diab (2005b) interviewed a much more experienced instructor in her study on error correction and found a similar situation to Kim's with regards to the amount of time and effort needed to correct students' drafts. During her interview with the instructor, Diab noted the instructor would often remark on the time consuming nature of providing written feedback (Diab, 2005b, p. 36). The instructor commented that it often takes her a whole night to provide "proper" feedback (feedback consisting of mostly global issues and

minimal local error corrections) on 15 papers (p. 36), and considering an average class load of a typical writing instructor, it could take several days before completing feedback for a single draft of papers.

One of the most interesting parts of Junqueira and Payant's (2015) study was the gradual shift from global to local issues in Kim's corrections. According to the data collected, Kim provided 294 comments on global issues and 1533 comments on local issues (p. 26). This is an example of correction being a zero-sum game. As Kim's attention and effort is drawn toward local issues, her comments on global issues begins to decrease. As Kim discovered, with ESL students' writings, it's easy to be distracted by grammar and sentence structure errors; and for some, it can be hard to see beyond the local issues. However, as Kim demonstrated, these distractions can have consequences for the instructor. Kim was unable to provide feedback according to her beliefs that organization and content are the most important areas to focus on when correcting, and instead focused primarily on local issues. The time she spent on local issues greatly detracted from the time she could spend providing feedback on what she believed to be most important. When we examined how a more experienced instructor responds to L2 students' writings, such as in Diab (2005b) and Ferris (1997), we can see the vast differences experience makes when providing feedback. Both instructors examined in Diab (2005b) and Ferris (1997) provided much more feedback involving global issues, with much less emphasis on local errors. Even if providing feedback on mostly global issues, the act of responding to students' writings is a very time consuming process. This is time that is taken away from other aspects of writing instruction.

According to Truscott (1996), error correction is a zero-sum game and this is one of the most evident reasons why correction is harmful for students. In his discussion of the effects of grammar correction, Truscott examines what he calls the "time problem" involved in error correction, specifically for local issues (p. 355-356): "Students who take correction seriously will have to spend much time reading, thinking about, and correcting their mistakes, time that could be much better spent on other, more productive learning activities" (Truscott, 1996, p. 355). Truscott argues that this "time problem" is present for both instructors and students, "…the time problem causes the attention of teachers and learners to be diverted from other aspects of writing… time spent on grammar correction is time not spent on these more important matters," (p. 356). In her article responding to Truscott's argument, Ferris agrees that time constraints can be an issue for both students and instructors (Ferris, 1999, p. 7). Ferris acknowledges the importance of global issues, and recommends selective feedback for grammar and local errors. However, the issue remains that L2 students may spend a great deal of time simply correcting errors that may or may not prove effective. This great deal of correction can prove to be extremely overwhelming to L2 writers. During my interviews I ask several questions to the students asking what they believe helps and doesn't help them improve as writers. It is important for me to examine if students prefer to receive feedback on global or local issues. Understanding what the students prefer could help instructors create a more selective form of feedback with focus on what students desire and what they actually need to improve. This could at the very least help with the overwhelming nature of corrective feedback.

Problems for the Students

Truscott (1996, 1999), Lee (2005), and Leki (1991) all discuss the problem of overwhelming students with error correction. Leki in particular notes that some L2 students respond with hostility when receiving corrections (Leki, 1991, p. 204). This student aggression is obviously the extreme, but what of the students who may simply give-up? Truscott (1996) argues that the unpleasantness of correction may cause some students to lose motivation in writing; he states that "one should not neglect the importance of attitude in itself," (Truscott, 1996, p. 354). Indeed, the student's attitude and motivation is important; without motivation the act of writing becomes an act of tedium. Lee (2005) argues this vehemently, stating, "It is unlikely that teachers' error feedback proves motivating for weak students whose writing is often heavily marked" (p. 2). Much like Ferris (1999), Lee argues for a more selective style of correction by placing focus on error patterns rather than each individual error (p. 2). Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) support this idea, stating that focusing on the majority of grammar errors can deprive L2 writers and cause them to lose what Hedgcock and Lefkowitz call the "drive to improve their proficiency in general," (p. 290). If a student loses their "drive" or is overwhelmed by error correction, they may lose their willingness to experiment and try new things. This issue is seldom discussed, but it is an important problem for both the students and instructor. A students' motivation is what will ultimately decide whether they can improve as a writer. During this study I asked students what they hope to achieve as a writer and what determines whether a writer is good or not. I received a variety of answers because the participants are heterogeneous and come from different backgrounds. The participants also have different majors and goals when it comes to

writing. These questions helped to give some idea as to what each participant's motivation is when it comes to writing.

Many times during my time as a tutor at The University of Toledo writing center, I would work with students who would exhibit an air of defeat upon handing me their papers. I had a session with a first year student who was working on a paper for her sociology class. She had received feedback, made the necessary revisions, and brought in her second draft. As we began to examine her paper, I drew attention to the very simple and short sentences that lacked any variety or voice. She explained that her professor told her to use short sentences because of her grammar issues. I examined the marks on her first draft and to my surprise, her professor did indeed tell her to simplify her writing. Truscott (1996) discusses this problem in great detail, saying that because students simplify their writing to avoid correction, they do not learn nearly as well as students who receive no comments on local errors. This is, as Truscott says, "…because they have developed a less favorable attitude toward learning" (p. 355). The loss in motivation and unwillingness to experiment can lead some students to resent writing. The young woman who approached me at the writing center was certainly reaching her breaking point when it came to writing. This experience was one of the major reasons for conducting this study. It was important to examine students' past experiences both in their home countries as well as at the University of Toledo. Their experiences were examined, compared, and contrasted with their current beliefs regarding corrective feedback.

The problems discussed so far are only some of the many issues regarding error correction. There are many ways to improve one's use of correction to reduce the issues brought up by Truscott (1996, Lee (2005), and Leki (1991). Some have been discussed

by Ferris (1997, 1999, 2007), Lee (2005), and Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996); however, these issues are more than enough to question the use of error correction in the L2 writing classroom. The question still remains, does corrective feedback help students improve as writers? Bruton (2009) discusses the problems involved with research conducted about the effectiveness of corrective feedback, explaining that the time constraints and deadlines involved with most of the research. This limits the observed learning to a period that is unable to provide researchers with reliable enough evidence to effectively determine if error correction can truly improve writing performance. Despite Bruton's argument, I will examine the discussion involving the effectiveness of error correction because it is important to understand the current theories behind the effectiveness of corrective feedback.

The Effects of Feedback

Corrective feedback has been the subject of debate for some time now. Many authors have called into question the effectiveness of corrective feedback, and attempted to discover if the use of corrective feedback (usually in the form of grammar correction) correlates with students' writing accuracy or fluency. Recent studies such as Truscott's (1996) caused great controversy with his call for the abandonment of grammar correction. Truscott's article, entitled *The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes* (1996), has sparked a debate among many authors in the field of L2 writing. This spark has caused many authors to research the effects of corrective feedback and to call into question the traditional use of corrective feedback in the L2 writing classroom.

Truscott (1996) breaks his argument for why error correction cannot be effective into several parts. First, he discusses the theoretical problems surrounding error correction. He argues that grammar correction relies on the idea that knowledge is transferable from teacher to student (p. 343). This implies the existence of the conduit metaphor. Reddy (1979) explains that the conduit metaphor involves "… the figurative assertion that language transfers human thoughts and feelings," (Reddy, 1979, p. 287). Truscott (1996) argues that this theory of teaching ignores the underlying processes involved in the development of a language system (p. 343). A direct transfer of knowledge would make teaching grammar incredibly easy; however, most L2 instructors would describe the process of teaching grammar as anything but easy.

According to Truscott (1996), many instructors often overlook the importance of the language acquisition process. "There is some reason to think that syntactic, morphological, and lexical knowledge are acquired in different manners," (p. 343). If this is true, then grammar correction might go against the order of acquisition and introduce student writers to concepts in which they are not yet ready. Ferris (1999) agrees with this criticism, stating that properly training students to self-edit is a possible solution to this issue. However, Ferris also argues that this may only prove useful if the students have "patterns of errors" (Ferris, 1999, p. 5-6). Many students don't exhibit patterns when making errors. Ferris explains her one of her studies on patterns of error resulted in nearly 50% of her students showed little to no patterns in their errors (p. 6). Correcting grammar outside of a student's current ability creates what Truscott (1996) calls "Pseudolearning" (Truscott, 1996, p. 346). Pseudolearning according to Truscott, is the knowledge about a language without ability to use said knowledge. It can be seen as the difference between

knowing a grammar rule, and using the grammar rule in one's writing. This issue is more of a problem due to the inconstancy with some of the grammar rules in the English language. Truscott argues that if correction causes pseudolearning, "…it has little or no value," (p. 347).

The theoretical problems show why some authors have questioned the use of grammar correction for L2 writers; however, Truscott explains some practical problems involved with error correction. The instructor faces several problems when it comes to correcting errors on students' papers. First, Truscott argues that an instructor needs to realize a mistake has been made. Many errors often go unnoticed in L2 writing due to the presence of other errors. If an instructor does recognize the error he or she may not have a proper understanding of how to correct it. This can present an even larger problem when the instructor has no idea how to explain the proper use to the student. According to Truscott, this is because grammar is not something physical but rather theoretical, and "even the best theories are extremely incomplete, are constantly changing, and are in many respects inconsistent with one another" (Truscott, 1996, p. 350). Ferris (1999) argues that the proper way to resolve this issue is to properly train instructors in linguistic and syntactic theory and to give them plenty of practice. Ferris reinforces her argument in her article "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…?)", stating that not only do instructors need to be prepared, they also need to focus on feedback that will help students and not discourage or distract them (Ferris, 2004, p. 59). Her advice, although useful, does not address the inconsistency and constantly changing theories of grammar.

Nor does Ferris (2004) address how an instructor determines what feedback is helpful and which is a distraction.

Ferris's (1999, 2004) argument that instructors need to prioritize helpful feedback has its limitations; however, the most critical issue Truscott addresses is the problem of student understanding. If an instructor can clearly identify an error, and properly explain it, the student may fail to understand the explanation or the error in general. If the student made a particular error, it may be unclear to the instructor why this occurred. This poses problems for the instructor when he or she tries to correct the error. This issue may lead to a misunderstanding when the instructor attempts to correct the student's errors, and the process may repeat. Truscott explains that this issue may cause students to forget the corrections rather quickly. Most L2 writers are bombarded with corrections when receiving their papers back. The lack of motivation and sense of being overwhelmed can result from receiving such a paper can take away much of the "learning experience" of correcting errors (Truscott, 1996, p. 351). The lack of motivation to learn how to correct errors can also be seen in Lee's (2005) study regarding students' attitudes toward correction. When asked how students preferred their errors to be corrected, 75.7% said they would rather have their instructors correct their errors for them (Lee, 2005, p. 7). This finding helps to show how many students view correcting errors as a chore, and shows they would rather have the instructor make the corrections for them. It may also show us that students lack confidence in their own abilities to make the corrections.

The discussion on the effectiveness of error correction continues to the present, and if what Bruton (2009) says is true and the current research on effectiveness is unreliable, it will be a long time before the debate concludes. However, one of the most

prominent arguments for the continuation of error correction has yet to be discussed; the preference of students. L2 student writers' preference toward error correction has been examined in very few studies. Ferris (1999, 2004) briefly discusses student preference, stating that "…the absence of any form of grammar feedback could frustrate students…" (Ferris, 1999, p. 8). This may indeed be the case; however, as Truscott (1996, 1999) explains, students' desire for correction does not necessarily mean instructors should provide it. He then goes on to explain that students desire feedback due to instructors' constant indication that feedback will help them develop as better writers. Lee (2005) argues for both sides, saying that "students' preferences should neither be ignored nor put on a pedestal (Lee, 2005, p. 4). Indeed, it seems that students' preferences should be taken into account, however, they should always be examined carefully and not used as a sole motivator for the continuation of correction. In this study I examine students' beliefs and preferences when it comes to corrective feedback. I ask each student questions regarding what they believe helps them improve as well as what they prefer when it comes to corrective feedback.

The Importance of Student Preference

L2 student preference regarding correction has been a significant topic in recent years. The importance of students' preferences has been discussed by Leki (1991), Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994), Ferris (1999, 2004), Diab (2005a, 2005b), Truscott (1996, 1999), and Lee (2005). There is no lack of literature discussing the importance of L2 students' preferences when it comes to corrective feedback; however, what is lacking is a consensus among scholars. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) were unsure of the importance of students' preferences after conducting their study on student receptivity of

feedback. Ferris (1999) states that students' desires for correction is one of the three most important reasons to continue to provide error correction. An instructor interviewed by Diab (2005b), regarded error correction as a security blanket, and stated that "it should nevertheless be provided because students expect it," (Diab, 2005b, p. 34). Truscott (1996) questions the importance placed on students' preferences by many researchers, instead claiming that preferences are often enforced by past experiences. Truscott states, "When students hold a demonstrable false belief about learning, the proper response is not to encourage that belief, but to show them that it is false…" (Truscott, 1996, p. 359). Leki (1991) comes to a very similar conclusion in her research, suggesting that instructors discuss the research on error correction to educate them in the controversy and allow them to come to their own conclusions regarding feedback (p. 210).

Whatever the instructor decides to do in his or her class, student preference should not be ignored. Leki (1991) explains that students who arrive in this country have certain expectations when it comes to language learning, and to ignore them completely could work against students' motivation (p. 210). Lee (2005) came to the conclusion that student preference needs to be examined; however, it should never be overemphasized when deciding how to provide feedback to students' writing. Diab (2005a) recommends a collaborative approach, involving instructors exploring "…their student expectations on writing, feedback, and error correction and try to bridge any gap between their own and their students' expectations…" (Diab, 2005a, p. 44). Diab, however, much like Truscott (1996), suggests that students' beliefs and preferences are linked with their previous experiences. However, an understanding of students' past experiences may be required

before examining their preferences or what Diab refers to as "limited knowledge or experience" (Diab, 2005a, p. 44).

There is a serious gap in research when it comes to students' past experiences with writing instruction and this lack of information may be a key factor as to how their beliefs are formed regarding correction. Truscott (1996) argues that past experience is the only reason for students to desire corrective feedback. Diab (2005) and Leki (1991) both hint that this may be a possibility, but they never attempt to research it in their studies. Leki (1991) explains that ESL students come to the US to "perfect" their English abilities, and that each student comes with expectations "…based on past language learning experience, of how to accomplish that goal…" (Leki, 1991, p. 204). Leki even goes as far as to suggest that these expectations "may impede their ability, or even willingness" (p. 204) to accept their instructors' methods of correction. However, Leki (1991) comes to the conclusion that ESL students want to receive corrective feedback, without determining if their beliefs correlate with their perceived past experience. In their study, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) found that current teachers' practices exert strong influences on students' beliefs regarding rhetorical conventions and writing accuracy (p. 157). Their study, however, never examined how students compared their past experiences with their views on corrective feedback.

Students' perceived past experiences is an area that is often discussed, but seldom explored. However, when Truscott (1996) argued that students' past experience was the sole reason for their current desire for correction, Ferris (1999) responded by listing students' desires as one of the main reasons to continue correction. In their on-going discussion, neither one has explored this issue further. Indeed, most researchers

acknowledge past experience as a possible motivator for students; however, rarely has any of their research explored this topic. This has created one of the most noticeable gaps in the current research on written feedback. This study will attempt to fill this gap and examine students' past experiences with corrective feedback. Their experiences will then be examined in relation to their beliefs and preferences regarding corrective feedback to find any relationships. The relationship between their experiences and beliefs will tell us whether students past experiences are actually influencing their current beliefs of corrective feedback.

Gaps in Research

There are several gaps in the current research on corrective feedback. Many authors have discussed and even heatedly debated the effectiveness of error correction with regards to helping students become better writers. However, there exists a much smaller library regarding L2 students' preferences and beliefs on corrective feedback. The small library that does exist rarely includes data received from face-to-face interviews, and instead typically uses questionnaires and surveys. Diab (2005b) conducted one of the very few studies that used interviews to obtain very detailed information regarding students' beliefs and desires regarding feedback. Interviewing students is one of best ways to obtain very detailed information on their beliefs. Surveys and questionnaires can result in much more data gathered, however, they can lack the face-to-face interactions provided by interviews. There may be much more to a student's preference than we currently know, and conducting interviews may give students the opportunity to voice their beliefs and opinions on the subject of corrective feedback. Finally, as mentioned above, there exists little if any research regarding students

perceived past experience. This is a huge area that has rarely been explored. Many researchers like to cite students' desires as a reason to continue to provide error correction; however, they rarely ask why students have this desire in the first place. This unexplored area of research may have important implications when it comes to the use of corrective feedback, and it needs to be examined.

The students' past experiences remain vastly unexplored; therefore, my study examined the relationship between students' past experiences and their beliefs about corrective feedback. To do this I interviewed ESL students at the University of Toledo. I elicited information regarding their past experiences writing in their own country as well as in their current country, and their beliefs and opinions on the subject of corrective feedback. This information helped to shed some light on the students' motivations as well as their preferences regarding feedback used in the writing classroom. Chapter Two will give information regarding the participants and methodology used in this study, and Chapter Three will show the results of the study and discuss the possible implications.

Chapter Two

Study and Methodology

Purpose of the Study

Chapter One overviews the discussion of the effectiveness of corrective feedback, as well as the discussions on the students' preferences and beliefs. Many researchers (Truscott 1996, 1999; Leki, 1991) have found that correction is ineffective. However, Ferris (1999) argues extensively that students' desires for corrective feedback are one of the most important reasons for the continuation of the practice. Her argument has been criticized by Truscott (1999) as being a form of circular reasoning. According to Truscott, students' desires or beliefs about corrective feedback stem from their past experiences with writing instructors. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine ESL students' perceived experiences with English writing instruction, as well as the practices they were exposed to both in their home countries and at the University of Toledo where they were enrolled at the time of the study. The students' perceptions and beliefs about corrective feedback will also be examined to find if there is any relationship between their experiences and beliefs. The study will attempt to answer the following research questions.

1. What are ESL students' (attending the University of Toledo) beliefs about feedback regarding their writing?

2. Which forms of feedback do the students prefer and why?

3. Specifically, what are the students' beliefs about the use of error correction on their written assignments?

4. What factors seem to influence students' beliefs about error correction?

5. What might this mean for instructors in the future?

Context

The study took place at the University of Toledo (UT). The University of Toledo offers a variety of writing classes and two separate ESL composition classes (English 1020, and English 1110). Students are required to pass a TOEFL or Accuplacer test to be admitted to the University of Toledo; they are required to achieve a score of 450 on the TOEFL or pass all three parts of the Accuplacer test (with passing scores including Listening-86, Language Use-93, and Reading-92) to gain admittance. The students are placed into one of the writing classes based on their performance on an in-house placement writing test. English 1020 provides ESL students with chances to develop their writing linguistically as well as improve on their overall structure. In English 1110, students are instructed on how to conduct research and the processes involved with writing an academic research paper. English 1110 is required for all students at UT, however, English 1020 is only required for ESL students who were unable to place into 1110. Both English 1020 and 1110 are the only classes where ESL and NES are separated.

Participants

The researcher is a graduate student in the ESL program at the University of Toledo. He has taught English 1110 for ESL students for three semesters, and tutored in both the UT Writing Center and the neighboring IEP the American Language Institute. During the time of the study the researcher was in his final semester in his program. The participants in this study were 10 ESL students attending the University of Toledo. 5 women and 5 men were interviewed ranging in age from 18 to 25 in age. The students

were either taking English 1110 at the time of the study, or had previously completed the course. The students volunteered for the study, and were very diverse when it came to their country of origin. Their home countries include Spain (1), Japan (3), Saudi Arabia (2), Russia (1), South Korea (1), and China (2). For the purpose of this study, aliases will be used when referring to individual students.

Data Collection and Instrument

ESL Students were recruited from two English 1110 classes at the University of Toledo, and participants consist of volunteers from both classes. The interviews took place at the University of Toledo, and participants were interviewed for 10 to 20 minutes. Each participant was asked a total of 29 questions. Questions 1-9 attempted to elicit background information for each participant. Early questions were designed to acquire information regarding each participant's previous experiences with corrective feedback. Next the students were asked about their preferences when it comes to corrective feedback. Finally, students were asked about their preferences regarding error correction specifically. The interview questions were designed to avoid yes or no answers to obtain as much information about the students' beliefs and experiences as possible. The interview questions can be found in Appendix A. Participants were overall engaged in the topic offering very detailed information about their beliefs as well as their experiences in both their home countries as well as the US. After debriefing the students, they seemed to understand the significance of the topic as well as why their beliefs on feedback are important.

Data Analysis

   The interviews were transcribed and coded according to certain categories developed for the purpose of this study. The four categories include (1) the students' beliefs about corrective feedback, (2) students' preferences on corrective feedback, (3) students' perceived experiences with corrective feedback in both their own country and in the US, and (4) students' beliefs on error correction. The students' answers were transcribed and placed in one of the four categories mentioned. The four categories provided a way to compare each student's answers with the other students', as well as with their own. After the answers were categorized, each interview was then examined to find information that didn't fit in one of the four categories. Chapter 3 discusses the findings, as well as the implications.

Chapter Three

Results and Discussion

Students' beliefs and preferences for feedback is a topic that is often discussed in research regarding feedback effectiveness. However, the influences that result in these beliefs and preferences are rarely discussed. This study examine whether students' past experiences may influence their beliefs and preferences. The study included interviewing 10 students from the University of Toledo to discover what their beliefs and preferences currently are as well as what experiences they have had receiving feedback. A list of research questions was created to help examine the findings; these include:

1. What are ESL students' (attending the University of Toledo) beliefs about feedback regarding their writing?

2. Which forms of feedback do the students prefer and why?

3. Specifically what are the students' beliefs about the use of error correction on their written assignments?

4. What factors seem to influence students' beliefs about error correction?

5. What might this mean for instructors in the future?

Results

The results were coded and categorized into four major categories: (1) the students' beliefs about corrective feedback, (2) students' preferences on corrective feedback, (3) students' perceived experiences with corrective feedback in both their own country and in the US, and (4) students' beliefs on error correction. From the results of

the study we can see that students' beliefs and preferences for feedback and error correction are influenced by their experiences both in their home countries and in the US.

Students' Beliefs about Writing. The participants of the study expressed two main themes when discussing their beliefs about writing in English: that proficiency in writing will benefit them in their future careers and that the ability to write clearly is what determines a proficient writer of English. Most of the participants were very clear in their answer when asked to discuss their goals in learning to write in English. Six out of the ten students discussed their future careers as the primary motivator to improving their English writing abilities. One participant from Japan explained that she would need to be proficient in writing to have a successful career in business. Another participant from China explained that his writing might someday represent his employer and company, and stressed that writing will be extremely important to him in the future. Another commonly discussed goal was the ability to perform well at the academic level. Four out of the ten students interviewed described school as a primary motivator for improving their writing abilities. A student from Japan confirmed that writing research papers for her classes was her main reason for improving her ability to write in English. All of the participants interviewed had goals that related to improving their future in some way. Whether it be through a career or school, they all believe that improving their writing will have some positive impact on their future.

When asked what qualities make a good writer in English, nine out of ten of the students agreed that a good writer is easily understood and can express their ideas clearly to the reader. Two participants further explained that the writer needs to be understood by everyone, including ESL students. One of these participants stated that good writing is:

"Easy to read, like, not grammatically correct but not stiff English not very grammar strict English but written so it's easy for everyone even for people who have English as a second language." All but one of the students interviewed described clarity as the quality of a good writer, and six students directly stated clarity for a *reader* as being most important.

All but one student described writing in English as being significantly different than writing in their L1s. When asked why, the students gave a variety of different reasons, the most prevalent being organization. One student from Saudi Arabia explained that writing in his L1 typically revolves around his ideas, and generally builds up to his thesis near the end of his essays. Three students explained that although research writing was often assigned in their home countries, they typically did not have to reference or cite their sources. Grammar came up several times as well during the interviews; however, none of the students listed grammar as being the major difference between writing in English and their L1.

Students' Beliefs about Feedback. The students have a variety of different beliefs when it comes to feedback; however, the majority of students describe feedback focusing on global issues as being most beneficial when it comes to improving their abilities to write. When asked what was the most helpful thing a teacher can do to help students become better writers, the participants gave several examples of feedback involving global issues. Three students listed the development of ideas as the most helpful. One student from China added that receiving help with ideas early in the writing process is extremely beneficial for him. Organization and structure were also common answers during the interviews, with a few students describing instances of instructors

24

providing models or examples of the writing assignment to better demonstrate the organization of ideas. Two students provided information about what they found to be unhelpful, and when questioned both described instances of having their written ideas changed by the instructor.

When discussing what kinds of feedback the participants find most helpful, the students gave many examples of instances when they received assistance with writing. Four students listed the peer review exercises in their English composition classes as examples of helpful feedback, and two students cited experiences they had in the University of Toledo Writing Center as examples of good feedback. However, all of the experiences cited by these students contained examples of feedback on global issues such as issues on organization and idea development. Most of the students were unable to explain why they found the feedback most helpful, but one student clarified his belief that feedback on organization was most helpful by explaining that good organization "makes it easier [for the reader] to understand."

Students' Beliefs about Feedback during Multi-Draft Essays. The participants had very similar beliefs when discussing feedback on multi-draft assignments; all of the students stated that they spend more time reading feedback on their first drafts and that they find feedback on the first draft to be more helpful. A participant from South Korea initially stated she typically spends the same amount of time reading both comments on her first and final drafts; however, when asked to explain she determined that she spends more time on the first draft because, "I still have to write my final draft so I read the comments more." This type of reasoning came up quite frequently as most of the students explained that the feedback on the first draft was crucial for them to write the final draft.

Four of the students directly related the act of revising the first draft with the desire to obtain a better grade as their reason for spending more time reading it. When asked what draft the students find feedback to be more helpful, all of the participants expressed that feedback on the first draft as being more helpful.

Students' Preferences for Receiving Feedback. When examining students' preferences regarding corrective feedback, many of their preferences correlate with the beliefs they expressed. All of the students stated that they prefer to receive feedback on their first draft when writing a multi-draft essay. Five of the students expressed the desire for a good grade, while two of the students stated that they typically don't pay attention to feedback on a final draft. Two other students explained that they wished their final draft to be perfect and not require feedback. One student remarked that feedback on the first draft is "much more useful" than feedback on the final draft. When asked to clarify he stated that he prefers feedback on the first draft because he has a "strong desire to succeed."

Students' Preferences and Beliefs about Error Correction. When the students were asked about their preferences regarding error correction, a majority of students expressed the desire to have their errors corrected on their writing assignments. Four students stressed that they prefer to receive error corrections because they wished to improve their general writing abilities. One student went so far as to explain that she doesn't enjoy having errors and that error correction would help her ensure that she doesn't make the same errors again. Two students answered indifferently to having their errors corrected, stating that they "don't really care that much." There were no participants who preferred to not have their errors corrected. Seven of the ten students

said they believed error correction would help them improve their abilities to write in English, and two students stated that they really appreciate instructors for correcting their errors.

Students' Experiences Receiving Feedback in their Home Country. The ESL students interviewed came from a variety of different backgrounds, and as such have very different experiences with feedback in their home countries; however, most of the students indicated that they had received feedback from instructors in their home countries. Six out of the ten students interviewed stated that they definitely had received feedback from their writing instructors, and two of these six said they received feedback on both their English writing and on writing in their L1. Two out of the remaining four students specified that they would receive feedback, but only for special occasions; for example, a student from South Korea explained that she received feedback, but only while studying for the TOEFL. She further explained by saying "…but he [TOEFL instructor] was from America so he gave me American kinds of feedback, but in Korea no one give much feedback." The remaining two students said that they never received feedback on their writing from their instructors.

The students' past experiences also differ with the type of feedback that they received; however, for specifically English writing most students agreed that their feedback consisted mostly of grammar and spelling corrections. Many students seemed unsure of the answer to the interview question "If so (if they received feedback in their home country) what did the feedback consist of?", and some began to change their answer half way through speaking. A few students mentioned that their experiences changed from grade level to grade level, and one student remarked that although she

received very basic grammar correction in her home country of Japan, she was still in high school so the writing assignments were very short and limited. Even students from the same country described very different types of feedback received. One student from China explained that the feedback he received mainly consisted of grammar and sentence structure; however, the other participant from China received feedback focusing on developing his ideas and providing more details.

Although the students experienced feedback very differently in their home countries, eight out of ten agreed they would always receive feedback after they turned in their final drafts. In addition, most students stated that they would receive their grades at the same time as their feedback. One student from Russia explained that he received feedback after he turned in his paper, but that he could ask the instructor to provide feedback before he turned in the paper. Two students clarified that they would receive feedback after they turned in their final paper; however, when they had an American instructor they would receive feedback on an earlier draft. When students were asked to describe the type of feedback they received, many of them were hesitant and unsure; however, when asked about when they received the feedback, almost all of them were immediately sure of their answer.

Students' Experiences Receiving Feedback in the US. The students' experiences with feedback in their home countries varied greatly; however, as all of the students attended the University of Toledo's composition course, their experiences with feedback at an American university were very similar. The similarity of their experiences at the University of Toledo is due to almost all of the composition courses being taught by instructors working as TAs with the same mentor; these instructors all use the same

syllabus and assignments in their composition classes. All of the participants stated that they have received feedback in their writing classes in the US. Most of the students described organization as the main focus of their feedback, and some explained that they received feedback the most in their composition classes. When asked to elaborate on this, the students explained that unless the class was an English writing class they would rarely receive feedback on writing assignments. Four of the students directly related their experience receiving feedback to an assignment in their English composition class. Most notable was a student's example of receiving feedback at the writing center regarding his organization of ideas. Another student gave the example of a peer review session he had where he began to notice elements in his own writings that could be improved from noticing what he called "mistakes" on a fellow classmate's paper. All students generally had positive feelings toward corrective feedback, and no student described it as unhelpful. All of the students interviewed stated that they received their feedback before turning in their final papers, and two students specified that they received this feedback in their composition classes.

      Differences and Similarities in Feedback. When asked to describe the similarities and differences between the types of feedback they received in both their home countries and the US, most of the students chose to focus on what was different. Only one student from Russia described the styles of feedback as being mostly similar. Nine out of the students described the types of feedback as being vastly different. Two students from Japan described similar differences, stating that feedback in Japan consisted mostly of grammar correction, whereas the feedback they experienced in the US focused much more on "structure and flow." Two students from China also had

similar answers to one another. They both described the feedback they experienced in China as a way to mold students into writers with very similar ways of writing; however, they contrasted this with the feedback they received in the US which focuses on developing their own styles. The two students from Saudi Arabia said the feedback was different, but had trouble explaining why or how.

Experience with Error Correction. When asked about their experience with error correction, many students were unsure of the difference between error correction and feedback, but when I explained what constitutes error correction all of the students said they have received error correction in the past. When asked to explain, the students described a variety of local issues; however, the most prominent was spelling. Eight out of ten students listed spelling as one of the most common errors corrected on their writing assignments, and five of the same students also listed grammar as a common issue. One student gave the example of his prepositions being the main focus of his corrected errors.

Discussion

Discussion on Feedback Beliefs. When examining the results of the interviews involving students' beliefs about feedback, three common themes are present: first, that most students believe English writing will be important in their future careers; second, that feedback on global issues is both more beneficial and more helpful than feedback on local issues; and third, that feedback received early in the drafting process is both more beneficial and helpful than feedback received on the final draft. The students' beliefs that comments on global issues is more beneficial contradicts Ferris's (1999) findings that students place more importance on grammar correction than anything else. The results of the interviews are very similar to Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) results that students

place higher value on idea development; however, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz also noted that students in an EFL context appeared to place more value on grammar correction than did students in an ESL context. This appears to be the case as only one student listed a focus on grammar as the most beneficial and helpful form of corrective feedback. This result may be influenced by the feedback they received in their composition classes at the University of Toledo. Instructors teaching the ESL composition classes tend to focus heavily on global issues when providing feedback, and only providing feedback on local issues when there are no global concerns. Because English composition is often students' first writing class at the university, they may feel that the feedback provided is the standard of US writing classes. If this is the case, then students could already have developed a propensity for receiving feedback on global issues.

One of the most interesting findings was the students' motivations for improving their English writing abilities, as well as what makes a good writer. All of the students listed either their future academic careers or their future professional careers as their primary motivations. This shows us that no matter what career these students plan to have, they believe it will most certainly involve writing in English. The student who explained that his writing will represent his employer and company made it clear that he needed to be proficient in writing and that his proficiency would affect both his job and those around him. When the students were asked to clarify what it means to be a good writer, almost all stated the ability to be understood by everyone as the most important factor. Some students went so far as to say that a good writer's composition should be understood by NNES as well as NES. These findings indicate that the students place heavy emphasis on the importance of audiences understanding of their writings. This is

not surprising as all of the students are in an ESL context and are constantly writing for several different instructors as well as their peers. The large number of peer review sessions in the students' English composition classes alone enforces the importance of writing to an audience that may not understand the topic. The nature of the composition program's curriculum reinforces the importance of writing for an audience. The curriculum includes writing a research paper on a controversial topic in the student's field. Because the students are in many different programs, their papers need to be understood by all of their fellow students as well as their instructors. The notion of writing for a general audience is constantly stressed by the instructor as many students (or instructors) may not have the background needed to understand very specialized ideas or concepts.

The participants' beliefs on corrective feedback were varied; however, most of the students described feedback focusing on global issues as being the most beneficial and helpful. The most common answer among students was a focus on idea development, with organization being a close second in terms of importance. One common occurrence was students giving examples of times they received feedback that they feel benefited them. The fact that students chose to use examples from their experiences at the University of Toledo, shows that they already associate their beliefs about feedback with their experiences in the US. We can interpret from this information that students are pulling from their more recent experiences to provide examples of their beliefs, and that their experiences in the US have already begun to influence their beliefs on corrective feedback.

All of the students agreed that feedback on early drafts was both more beneficial and more helpful. When asked which draft they spent more time reading, all of the students said they spent more time reading the first draft. Although five of the students agreed that spending more time on the first draft would help them improve their paper, none of the students said that this would improve their ability to write future papers. This shows that the participants don't believe that feedback on their first drafts will help them improve as a writer, instead most of the students are focused on improving their writings to obtain a better grade in the class overall. Although this finding is not very surprising, it does help shed some light on how students view the act of revision. For many of the students, multiple draft assignments are just used to help them improve their papers and receive a better grade. This could be the result of a lack of understanding on the students' part, or more likely a lack of explanation from the instructor. This finding might be the result of the fact that many writing classes are focused on using a product-oriented approach to writing, stressing the importance of writing as a finished product rather than a process. Placing a great deal of emphasis on writing as a product could influence students to view revision as just a means to an end.

As mentioned in the results, two students began to discuss error correction when general feedback was the topic of discussion. These students were understandably surprised when the interviewer began asking questions specific to grammar correction, and stated that they thought they had already answered the questions. Although there was an explanation of what feedback is in the interview question, these students still associated the idea of feedback with error correction. This may imply that the students

were so used to receiving error corrections (perhaps in their own country or in the US), that they simply began to associate it with any feedback their instructor provided.

Discussion on Feedback and Error Correction Preferences. Correlating with their beliefs that feedback on the first draft is more beneficial and helpful, all of the students said they prefer to receive feedback on the first draft. The students seemed to regard feedback on the first draft as being more useful than feedback on the final, and when asked to clarify many explained their desires to receive good grades as their reasoning. This shows that the participants don't seem to find feedback helpful on activities beyond the assignment. Only one student stated that he had a strong desire to succeed when questioned about his reasons for preferring feedback on the first draft. These results can show that students regard feedback as an activity that provides no real benefit in everyday activities. In direct contrast to this, when students were questioned about their preferences regarding error correction, many of them stressed that correcting their errors would help them improve their English writing abilities. The difference in these results tell us that students believe that correcting errors extends outside of the classroom, whereas reading corrective feedback does not. One student explained that although she does not like having errors, the act of correcting them will help her avoid the same errors in the future. Both Truscott (1996, 1999) and Ferris (1999) state that students do desire error correction; however, as discussed in Chapter 1, they believe this is because of very different reasons. To examine why students might feel this way, we will have to examine their past experiences with both feedback and error correction.

Discussion on Experiences. The participants came from a variety of background and likewise they reported that they experienced a variety of different types of feedback

in their home countries. Most of them agreed that they had received feedback of some kind, and all of them stated that it was always on the final drafts of their papers. This, as many of them said, was very different than the feedback they receive in their composition classes. Most of the students tended to use the feedback received in their English composition classes as a model of feedback typically used in the US. The consensus among the participants was that feedback in their home countries typically involved correcting grammar and spelling, whereas feedback in the US focuses on higher-level concerns such as organization and structure. The differences in types of feedback between their home countries and the US were greater for some; however, most of the students agreed that the feedback was different.

Influencing Factors. The experiences students had during their English composition classes correlate with their beliefs and preferences regarding corrective feedback. Students stated that they prefer to receive feedback early in the drafting process and believe that feedback on global issues are more beneficial and helpful. The students' preference and beliefs are in line with the feedback provided in the English composition course at the University of Toledo. This finding supports the claim that students are influenced by their experiences; however, it also implies that students draw more influence from their time in the US when it comes to feedback. There may be several reasons for this: First, students draw more from more recent experiences; second, students believe the feedback in the composition course is the standard in US writing classes and thus is more beneficial; and third, students are new to corrective feedback and their beliefs and preferences on feedback are also relatively new.

The results support the idea that students' past experiences impact their beliefs and preferences on error correction. Examining the students' preferences and beliefs on error correction proved to be a bit more challenging. For starters not all of them discussed how their errors are handled in their current writing classes, nor did they mention if it was different from their home country. However, when examining the results we can see that the majority of students who preferred to receive error correction have also had experience with it in the past.

One important thing to note is that many of the students stressed that feedback was used in their composition classes in the US. If they are stressing this because feedback is not always given by their content course instructors then this might pose a serious problem. One serious problem that may occur is a lack of importance on self-revision and editing. Students may notice (either consciously or unconsciously) that they are only receiving feedback in their English writing courses, and may undervalue the feedback they are given. If this is the case, then it might help explain why students would state that feedback helps them improve their writing assignments instead of saying that it helps them improve as a writer. If feedback is only provided in one of their several classes, then they might conclude that feedback is only helpful in that class' assignments.

What does this mean for Instructors in the Future? As we can see from the results, students' beliefs on feedback tend to correlate with their experiences in the US, namely their experiences in their composition classes. ESL composition instructors at the University of Toledo typically provide feedback on global issues, provide feedback on early drafts, and stress the importance of writing to a general audience. Based on these results, we can determine that whatever type of feedback the instructor decides to use will

impact the students' beliefs and preferences on feedback in the future. However, as noted in the discussions, when feedback is not provided (as some students implied was the case in their content focused courses) students may begin to devalue the act of self-correction and instead see it only as a tool for receiving a better grade. Feedback from content-course instructors was not researched in this study; however, until students' experiences with feedback in their other courses is examined, instructors should provide some kind of feedback and stress its importance in helping students improve as writers. If nothing else, doing this may influence students to practice self-editing to improve their writings in both composition and content courses.

Limitations of Research

There are several limitations present in the study. The most obvious limitation is the small pool of participants. Due to the time constraints present with the study only 10 students volunteered to be interviewed. Another limitation is that the students were all from their first and second years at the university; including a broader range and students from higher level classes might have showed some contrasting results from student to student. Finally, one of the biggest limitation is the reliability of self-reporting. Participants can say whatever they want and change their answers freely and the researcher wouldn't know. Although there is no reason to suspect students of lying, the presence of questions they don't understand may lead to answers that aren't reliable. This also includes situations arising from the observer's paradox in which students may feel intimidated by a researcher who is also an instructor, as well as change their answers to give the researcher what they are looking for.

Suggestions for Future Research

The research conducted provided great and useful information; however, there are several ways the research could be improved in future studies. To improve similar research the first suggestion would be to increase the number of participants in the study. Although the researcher interviewed a wide variety of students from varying backgrounds, a larger pool could provide more examples and information regarding their beliefs and preferences. A larger pool of participants could also help reinforce the current findings. It would also be prudent to include students who have only taken content courses in the US, to examine whether they are receiving feedback in their classes. This could help discover if students undervalue feedback because of their current experiences in the majority of their classes.

Another suggestion would be to provide more questions regarding students' preferences on corrective feedback and grammar correction. As the research stands there are only a few questions that were asked that fall under this category. A general question would be helpful asking students what kinds of feedback they prefer, or even what feedback methods they prefer to see in their writing classes. A few students said they like using peer review, but it could be improved by asking every students what they prefer. This would also make it easier to relate their beliefs with their preferences, and would strengthen any conclusion made by the researcher.

A final suggestion would be to examine either students from both a freshmen class and a senior class, or the same students through a period of time. This would give the researcher much more data to work with, as well as provide information on whether the students' opinions and beliefs changed over a period of time. Doing this would take a

much longer period of time, but it would provide a much stronger argument as to whether students are influenced by their time writing in the United States. All of these features could be added in one future study and could provide very different results than what were found in this study.

Conclusion

The students participating in this study had different beliefs about feedback; however, the general consensus is that feedback focusing on global issues is more helpful and beneficial. Students also stated that they prefer to receive feedback early in the drafting process. Finally students explained that the most important thing is to be understood by their audience. The beliefs and preferences of these participants are very much in line with their experiences attending the University of Toledo composition courses. In addition to this the students' beliefs and preferences about error correction correlate with their experiences receiving correction in their home countries. All of these results point to the conclusion that the participants' beliefs and preferences are directly influenced by their experiences in both their home countries and the US.

References

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 102-118.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 191-205.

Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effects of grammar correction in L2 writing: Not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*, 136-140.

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.

Chandler, J. (2004). A Response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*, 345-348.

Diab, R. L. (2005). EFL university students' preferences for error correction and teacher feedback on writing. *TESL Reporter*, *38*(1), 27-51.

Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: a case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, *23*(1), 28-43.

Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.* 178-190. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(2), 315-339.

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to

    Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. R. (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.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on Feedback: assessing learner

    receptivity to teacher response in L2 composition. *Journal of Second Language*

    Writing, *3*(2), 141-163.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student

    response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, *80*(3),

    287-308.

Junqueira, L., Payant, Caroline. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A

    novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second*

    Language Writing. 27. 19-36.

Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: what do students

    think? *TESL Canada Journal*, *22*(2), 1-16.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students of error correction in college-level

    writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, *24*(3), 203-218.

Reddy, M. J. (1979). The conduit metaphor-A case of frame conflict in our language

    about language. *The Conduit Metaphor*, 285-324.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language*

    Learning, *46*(2).

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 111-122.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*, 255-272.

Truscott, J., & Yi-ping Hsu, A. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 292-305.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Background Questions

1. What is your major?

2. What country are you from?

3. What is your L1?

4. How many languages do you speak?

5. How many languages have you had writing instruction in?

6. How many years have you studied English?

7. In your home country, have you taken any English courses that included writing? If so how many?

8. What writing course are you currently taking?

9. In the US, besides your current course, have you taken any English courses with writing?

Feedback Questions

10. What are your goals in learning to write in English?

11. What do you think it means to be a good writer?

12. Is writing in English different than writing in your native language? Why?

13. What is the most helpful thing your teacher can do to help you become a better writer in English? Least helpful? Why?

14. Sometimes teachers write comments on student papers, telling them what they liked or disliked, or telling them what they should do to improve the paper. All of

this is called feedback. Have you ever received feedback on your English-language writing in your home country?

15. If so what did the feedback consist of?

16. Did you receive this feedback after you turned in your final paper for a grade, or before?

17. Have you received feedback on your writing in the US? Tell me about the feedback you received.

18. How was the feedback similar or different to feedback you received in your home country?

19. If so, did you receive this feedback after you turned in your final paper, or before?

20. What kind of feedback have you found most helpful for you to improve your ability to write?

21. Why do you feel this is the most helpful?

22. When do you prefer to receive feedback: after you turn in your final paper, or before? Why?

23. Many writing classes at the University of Toledo require students to write a multi-draft essay. This typically involves the students writing a first *draft* of the paper, receiving feedback from either their instructors or their peers, and then *improving* the paper by making changes their instructors have suggested. The paper the students would turn in after *revising* is their *final draft*. In your home country, have you ever written a paper where you turned in a draft, and your instructor provides feedback, and allows you to make changes and turn in a final draft? Tell me about the paper.

24. In the US, have you ever written a paper where you turned in a draft, and your instructor provides feedback, and allows you to make changes and turn in a final draft? Can you give me some examples?

25. Do you spend more time reading your instructors' comments on your first draft or on your final draft? Why?

26. On which draft do you find feedback more helpful? Why?

27. Have you ever had an instructor correct errors on your paper?

28. What kinds of errors do they usually correct?

29. What do you like or dislike about having your errors corrected? Why?