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This descriptive research study deals with the beliefs about feedback of advanced English as a Second Language (ESL) composition students and their instructors at The Ohio State University. For the purpose of this research project, the definition of feedback has been expanded to also include strategies that ESL composition instructors may provide their students in order to help them to improve their writing skills.

Four sections of ESL composition students and their instructors participated in this study. Data were collected throughout the second half of Winter Quarter, 1997. The data were collected via three approaches: (a) questionnaires, (b) oral interviews, and (c) an in-class focus group. The following nine areas were investigated: (a) error-correction techniques, (b) peer review, (c) multiple-draft approach, (d) grading, (e) tutorials, (f) native language to English translation, (g) reading-writing connection, (h) reading aloud for self-editing, and (i) students and teachers discussing the topic of feedback.

The dissertation presents both the values that the subjects placed on these types of feedback (i.e., the statistical results of the questionnaire) and the reasons the subjects reported for rating the types of feedback as they did. This study also attempted to identify both similarities and incongruities in the beliefs of the subjects.
The results of this study showed that the student subjects shared similar beliefs about the nature and form of feedback they receive on college compositions. The types of feedback the student subjects reported to be the most beneficial were: (a) tutorials, (b) use of the multiple-draft system, and (c) peer review. The students also stated that they prefer to take an active role in the learning process. For example, the students preferred to have an opportunity to make their own corrections, and many students expressed the opinion that teachers and students need to discuss the topic of feedback.

For the most part, the instructors' views about composition feedback paralleled those of their students. The instructors also reported that composition teachers and their students need to keep open lines of communication concerning the topic of feedback.

The dissertation concludes with pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research. Although the study indicated that feedback on college compositions is important to both students and instructors, future applications of the findings of the present study suggest a need for systematic involvement of students in determining the feedback given by instructors. Further empirical study is also needed to establish the impact of selected approaches to providing feedback to composition students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Currently there is a need for more research that both examines the effects of different types of feedback on the writing skills of ESL composition students, and examines these students' beliefs about these types of feedback (e.g., see Cohen and Cavalcanti 1993; Mendonça 1994; Ferris 1995; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 1996). Evidence of this need can be seen when one reads the most current research on feedback in ESL composition courses. When one reads these studies, one finds that many of the previous studies referenced in the literature reviews did not deal with ESL students, but rather with students enrolled in foreign language courses such as German, or with students enrolled in composition courses for native speakers of English.

In addition to the previously documented shortage of studies investigating feedback in ESL composition courses, research by Silva (1993) and by Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995) suggested that if ESL students are instructed in English composition courses that implement the same pedagogy used for native speakers, the results could be
negative. A major reason for believing that methodologies (including feedback) implemented in ESL composition courses should differ from methodologies implemented in composition courses for native speakers is that due to cultural differences, methodologies also need to be different (see, for example, Holliday 1994). For example, in many cultures it is expected that the teacher be at the center of attention, and as such, activities such as peer review or practices such as having students be responsible for making their own corrections would not be considered appropriate. Also, in some cultures students are expected to do their best work the first time. Thus, a composition course that implemented the process approach would not be considered appropriate. Thus, a goal of this study was to determine whether or not the students who participated in this study approved of types of feedback that might not be considered appropriate in their home culture. The fact research exists that suggests feedback provided to ESL composition students might need to be different from feedback provided to native speakers, combined with a shortage of research on the topic of feedback in ESL composition courses, indicate a need for further research in all areas dealing with the topic of providing composition feedback to ESL students.

On the topic of ESL composition students' attitudes about feedback, Cohen and Cavalcanti (1993), after having conducted recent survey work, concluded that there is often a misfit between the types of feedback students felt would be most beneficial to them, and the types of feedback being provided to them by their teachers. The five major misfits reported in this study were the following: (a) Whereas the teachers tended to
focus most of their attention on the language (especially the grammar) of a composition, the students wanted more feedback concerning the content of their papers. (b) Whereas a majority of the teacher feedback was negative, the students wanted to receive more positive feedback concerning their work. (c) Although the teachers believed their feedback was helpful and clear, the students often did not understand the feedback that was provided to them by their teachers. (d) Whereas the teachers tended to base their grades on the language of a composition, the students believed the content should count equally or more for the grade. and (d) Whereas the teachers believed that students in a single-draft course processed and used the feedback provided on their compositions, students reported that they rarely did anything with the feedback provided on compositions in a single-draft course. These researchers' conclusions suggested a need for further research that explores ESL composition students' beliefs about feedback, as well as the beliefs of their teachers to see the extent of this misfit. Soter (1993) also reported on student-instructor communication gaps concerning feedback provided to minority student writers enrolled in freshman composition. Thus, one of the goals of this study was to provide additional research comparing the beliefs about ESL composition feedback of students and their instructors. This goal was met by collecting and comparing data concerning beliefs about feedback in ESL composition courses from ESL composition students and their instructors.
Furthermore, the literature (as documented in chapter two of this dissertation) has shown that ESL composition students in some studies reported a type of feedback to be beneficial, whereas subjects in other studies reported the same type of feedback not to be beneficial. Such findings suggest that additional research is needed to determine students' preferences and identify further research needs.

**Purpose**

The major goal of this study was to examine advanced college-level ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback. The topics examined in this study included the following: (a) Error Correction, (b) Content Feedback, (c) Peer Review, (d) The Process Approach (i.e., multiple drafts), (e) Tutorials, (f) Grading, (g) The Reading-Writing Connection, (h) Translation, and (i) Reading Aloud to Self-Edit. This study was designed to go beyond simply finding the value these students placed on different types of feedback by discovering and examining the reasons these students reported for rating the different types of feedback as they did. Although knowing students' preferences for feedback does have worth, the insight that is gained by learning why students have the preferences they do can make this knowledge more valuable. This knowledge can then be used by ESL composition instructors for decision-making purposes. As Hendrickson (1984) pointed out, when teachers are contemplating the types of feedback to use for second language writers, they need to consider their students'
attitudes about different forms of feedback. By providing students with the types of feedback they believe to be the most beneficial, students might be more motivated to process and use the feedback they are provided. Thus, favorable attitudes reported by the students in this study about types of feedback that the literature has shown to have positive effects on ESL students’ writing skills, should give added credence to the implementation of these types of feedback.

Finally, a major goal of this study was to derive pedagogical implications from the results of this research. Thus, based on the findings of this study, an implication section is provided that recommends suggestions for providing composition feedback to advanced college-level ESL students.

**Research Questions**

**Primary Research Questions:**

1. What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition students report to be the most beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills, and why?

2. What types of feedback do these students report to be the least beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills, and why?
3. To what degree are these students in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?

4. To what degree are these students willing to convey their beliefs about composition feedback?

**Secondary Research Questions:**

1. Do beliefs concerning feedback differ: (a) between graduate students and undergraduate students?, (b) between male and female students?, or (c) depending on the academic discipline of students?

2. What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition instructors report to be the most beneficial, and why?

3. What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition instructors report to be the least beneficial, and why?

4. To what extent are these instructors in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?

5. Do the student subjects and the instructor subjects report similar beliefs about composition feedback?
Basic Assumptions

For the purpose of this research project, the following basic assumptions have been made about the subjects who participated in it:

1. The participants in this study were honest concerning their beliefs about feedback.
2. Because of the student participants’ extensive background in English language instruction, they have been exposed to a variety of different types of feedback.
3. The student participants in this study know what they believe is best for improving their English academic writing skills.
4. The instructor participants in this study know what is best, pedagogically speaking, for improving their students’ English academic writing skills.

Limitations of the Study

This study made no attempt to investigate the effects of different types of feedback on the writing skills of ESL students, but rather focused on the subjects’ beliefs about various types of composition feedback. Thus, the suggestions for implementing various types of feedback found in the concluding chapter of this document were based on students’ opinions
about these types of feedback rather than the findings of a quantitative research study designed to determine the effects of these types of feedback.

Although the student subjects represented four different class sections and consisted of both undergraduate and graduate students, all the subjects were enrolled in writing courses in the same program at the same university. This factor would limit the generalizability of the findings to students enrolled in courses in that same program or a similar program at a different college or university. By the same token, a majority of the student subjects represented a small number of nationalities and first languages. This factor could also limit the generalizability of the findings of the study.

Conducting research in the subjects’ second language also posed possible constraints on both the quantity and the quality of the data obtained from the student subjects. Students might have hesitated to express certain opinions because they were not sure whether or not they could do so correctly in English. This might also be a factor responsible for the small number of students who agreed to participate in the oral interviews. That is, if the interviews had been conducted in the students’ first language, the students might have been less anxious about participating in an oral interview, and as a result more students might have agreed to participate.

Generalizations about the findings of the focus-group activity would also be limited because all members of the focus group came from the
same class section. Additional limitations could have been produced by the fact that only thirty minutes of one class period were devoted to the focus-group activity.

Finally, as with any descriptive study, attempting to quantify the personal beliefs of subjects is problematic. For example, what does it "really" mean when a subject strongly disagrees with an item on a questionnaire. Although a follow-up activity was designed to help clarify students' rationale for the ratings they had assigned items on the questionnaire, each student only commented on certain items on the questionnaire (approximately eight items per student). Thus, at times the only information obtained from a particular student about a particular type of feedback was the ratings that the student had assigned items on the questionnaire concerning that type of feedback. Whereas any study has its limitations, the present study produced valuable baseline data that both provided pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

Significance of the Study

As stated earlier in this chapter, to date there has only been a small amount of research conducted that investigated ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback. An interest in the effects of different types of feedback on foreign and second language students' writing skills began growing between the late 1970's and the mid 1980's. Furthermore, a few of the later studies designed to investigate the effects of a particular type
of feedback also obtained information from the subjects concerning their attitudes about the type of feedback under investigation. By the mid 1990’s, if not earlier, the stage had been set for the conducting of a comprehensive study designed to investigate ESL composition students’ beliefs about a range of different types of feedback. However, the writer of this dissertation was not able to find documentation showing that such a study had been conducted prior to the current study. Thus, this dissertation will help to fill that void in ESL writing research and perhaps to inspire further research on this topic.

Perhaps a reason why there is not currently much research available on ESL students’ beliefs about composition feedback is because it is not believed that students are good judges of what is best for them. Such an attitude would explain why a majority of studies that have dealt with the topic of composition feedback have been quantitative studies designed to investigate the effects of a particular type of feedback. This study shows that ESL students are able to determine which types of feedback help them the most to improve their English academic writing skills. Such findings stress the importance of teachers and students keeping open lines of communication concerning the topic of feedback.

The information obtained from this study should help ESL composition teachers to decide which types of feedback might best meet the needs of their students. Chapter 5 presents pedagogical implications based on the findings of this study. In addition to being of value to ESL composition teachers, the results of this research should be of interest to teachers in other areas who are dealing with the written
work of ESL students. Teachers in any academic unit might be concerned about how they should respond to ESL students' written assignments. This dissertation should provide those teachers with answers to questions they might have about how to respond to their students' written work.

Finally, the students in this study reported preferences for types of feedback that quantitative studies have shown to have positive effects on ESL students' writing skills. Such findings further validate the implementation of those types of feedback.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review of literature examines research that dealt with feedback in ESL composition courses; however, because of historical significance, related research (i.e., conducted with other languages or with English as a first language) is also investigated. Because research in the area of feedback in ESL composition courses is still in its infancy, it is understandable that the literature researchers are consulting in order to form their hypotheses and on which to base their research questions would include studies conducted with other languages or with English as a first language.

The majority of the studies presented in this review either examined the effects of different types of feedback on the writing skills of foreign and second language students, or the attitudes that these students have reported about different types of feedback. Some of the studies presented here examined both of these areas. The areas explored in this review are: (a) error correction, (b) content feedback, (c) peer review, (d) multiple drafts, (e) tutorials, (f) grading, (g) translation, (h) the reading-writing connection, (i) reading aloud for self-editing, and (j) ESL composition teachers' beliefs about feedback and current practices.
Because the topic of content feedback appears in several of the areas examined in this review, a separate section for this area is not provided.

Error Correction

When the topic of error correction for second language learners arises, so do several questions that historically have been in debate. The key questions are: (a) When should error correction take place?, (b) What errors should be corrected?, (c) How should these errors be corrected?, (d) Who should do the correcting?, and (e) Does error correction have any positive effect on the second language acquisition process? (see Hendrickson 1978).

One of the earlier experiments that examined the effects of the degree of overtness of error correction on the written work of second language learners was conducted by Lalande (1982). This study took place at Pennsylvania State University and involved 60 students enrolled in intermediate German courses. The subjects were pre- and post-tested to check their progress (the testing procedure consisted of having the students write an in-class essay). The students were divided into two control groups and two experimental groups. They received instruction for ten weeks. In both the control groups and the experimental groups the subjects received extensive review of grammar and were required to write essays. For the control groups the teachers made all of the corrections, and the students were required to rewrite the compositions
with the corrections. For the experimental groups the teachers indicated where the errors were located and used a coding system to help the students to understand what type of error had been committed. The students in the experimental groups were then required to make the corrections themselves and rewrite their essays. The results of the post-test showed significant improvement for the experimental groups in eleven of the twelve grammatical categories investigated in this study. The eleven categories in which the experimental groups showed significant improvement were the following: (a) auxiliary, (b) case, (c) gender, (d) mood, (e) number, (f) noun-adjective agreement, (g) verb forms, (h) spelling, (i) subject-verb agreement, (j) tense, and (k) word order. Furthermore, when the students were surveyed about the progress that they believed they had made during the term, whereas 86% of the students in the experimental groups believed that they had made progress, only 72% of the students in the control groups believed that they had made progress.

Whereas the previous study showed that the way in which teachers handle error correction has an effect on the progress of second language writers, Semke (1984) showed that students' progress was equal no matter which type of error-correction feedback was being provided by their teachers. Semke's study was conducted over a period of ten weeks and involved 141 third quarter German students. These subjects were divided into four sections. As with Lalande's study, the students in one group had all their errors corrected and the students in another group only had their errors indicated and coded and the students were required
to make the corrections themselves. For the other two groups, one received written comments and questions but no corrections, and the other group received both comments and corrections. This study reported that all groups made virtually the same amount of progress and suggested that the number one factor that improves the writing of second language writers is the amount of practice they have. This study is also of particular interest because at the end of the academic term the subjects were given a questionnaire to evaluate their attitudes about the feedback that they had received in their course. The students who only received comments on their papers indicated that they enjoyed the course, whereas the students who were required to make their own corrections based on the coding system had a negative attitude about the feedback that they had received. It was concluded that students' time would be better spent by having them do more writing than by having them correct language errors.

One of the earliest empirical studies designed to evaluate the results of different types of feedback on the writing of ESL students was conducted by Robb, Ross and Shortreed (1986). For this study 134 Japanese freshman ESL composition students were randomly assigned to four sections of ESL composition. A pre-test showed no significant difference in the writing abilities of the students in the four groups. The instructors for these four groups were rotated in order to avoid individual influences. Classroom activities for all groups were the same; students in all groups were required to write compositions at home and then to rewrite them based on feedback provided by their instructors. The four
types of feedback from the most salient to the least salient were the following: (a) the errors were corrected by the instructor, (b) the errors were indicated and a coding system was employed in order that the students would know what type of error had been made, (c) the errors were indicated but there was no coding system, and (d) only the number of errors per line was indicated in the margin. As did the previously discussed study by Semke, this study reported that over the course of the academic term all groups made the same amount of progress and suggested that practice in writing was the factor most responsible for the students' progress.

A study by Leki (1991) was conducted with 100 Freshman ESL composition students to determine: (a) what kinds of paper-marking techniques they believed helped them the most to improve their writing, (b) the importance they placed on grammar in their writing, and (c) what they believed were their instructors' attitudes about grammar. Data were collected via a questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire showed that 70% of the students believed that in order for writing to be good it must be error-free, and thus they wanted their instructors to mark all errors on their written work. It is also interesting to note that these students believed that their instructors were less concerned than they were in having students produce error-free work. As for the students' preferences for error-marking techniques, 67% wanted their instructors to indicate where an error was and give clues in order that the students may make the actual corrections themselves, 25% wanted their instructors to
do the actual correcting, 2% wanted their instructors to locate, but give no
cues, and 2% wanted their instructors to ignore errors and only respond
to ideas (i.e., content).

Given the results of the previously discussed study, if instructors are
trying to provide the type of feedback their students prefer, it is not
surprising research such as that conducted by Zamel (1985) revealed
that university-level ESL composition teachers see themselves as
language teachers as opposed to writing teachers. Zamel arrived at this
conclusion after having examined the written comments of 15 university-
level ESL composition teachers on 105 compositions.

Although Zamel’s research concluded that both ESL composition
teachers and ESL composition students are more concerned with
language (especially grammar) than they are with content, Cohen and
Cavalcanti (1993) reported that ESL composition students do want more
feedback on content than they are currently receiving. These
researchers surveyed ESL composition students in an English language
institute and in a university in Brazil. The results of both studies showed
that approximately 50% of the students surveyed wanted their teachers to
provide more feedback on content than they had been.

To complement the research that has been conducted concerning
the various error-marking techniques employed by foreign and second
language teachers, one should consider an article by Hendrickson
(1984). In this article Hendrickson discussed and gave examples of
various methods of error treatment (e.g., direct and indirect). The direct
method is when a teacher both indicates where an error has been
committed and provides clues as to what the problem is (e.g., cite the rule violated, provide a code). The indirect method is when the teacher only indicates where a problem exists, (e.g., circle, underline). Hendrickson basically discourages the practice of teachers providing the corrections themselves because this prevents students from acquiring the skills to discover solutions to their own problems. Hendrickson also encourages teachers to consider students' language level and attitudes about error feedback before selecting a method for error marking. For example, whereas students whose language skills are elementary would probably be best helped by having the teachers make the actual corrections for them, advanced learners would profit from the discovery learning that takes place when students are held responsible for making their own corrections. As for students' attitudes about error-correction feedback, when students are provided with a type of feedback that they view in a positive light, they might be more motivated to process and use that feedback than if it were a type of feedback that they did not believe to be beneficial.

Research has also been conducted that investigated the differences between native and nonnative speakers' evaluations and editing of ESL compositions. Kobayashi (1992) had 269 raters respond to compositions written by two ESL composition students at the University of Hawaii; both students were native speakers of Japanese. The raters (professors, graduate students and undergraduate students) were either native speakers of English or native speakers of Japanese. All raters were from language-related disciplines. Approximately one third of the American
professors were ESL instructors. The raters evaluated the grammaticality of the compositions and made editorial comments in the margins. This study reported that overall the native speakers were more critical of the grammaticality of the compositions than were the nonnative speakers; however, the higher the professional/educational level of the raters, the less severe they were in their evaluations. As for the editorial comments in the margins, the native speakers’ feedback about content was more often positive, whereas the nonnative speakers’ feedback about content was more often negative. These results suggested that whereas the nonnative-speaking raters were more concerned with content problems, the native-speaking raters were more concerned with grammatical problems.

The results of Kobayashi’s study concerning the severity of written ESL errors as judged by native and nonnative speakers are not congruent with the findings of some previous studies. James (1977) had 20 native-speaking and 20 nonnative-speaking ESL teachers respond to a questionnaire containing 50 sentences representing a variety of written errors produced by ESL students. The respondents used a likert scale to rate the severity of the grammatical error in each sentence. James reported that the nonnative-speaking ESL teachers were more severe in their ratings than were the native-speaking ESL teachers.

Santos (1988) reported findings similar to those of James. Santos surveyed 178 professors (96 from the Humanities/Social Sciences and 82 from the Physical Sciences) in order to solicit their reactions to the language and content in academic writing samples produced by ESL
students. The respondents completed a questionnaire using a likert scale to respond to questions about the language and the content of the writing samples. Santos found that the native-speaking professors were more lenient than were the non-native speaking professors. Santos also reported that the professors in the Humanities/Social Sciences were more lenient than were the professors in the Physical Sciences, and that overall the professors’ responses indicated there was more concern about the content of the writings than about language. Because this study examined the reactions of faculty members from a variety of academic disciplines, its findings could be of particular interest to ESL teachers who are preparing students to enroll in university-level courses outside of an ESL department.

Vann, Meyer and Lorenz (1984) also conducted a study that dealt with faculty opinions concerning the gravity of errors in the written work of ESL students. One hundred sixty-four faculty members at Iowa State University responded to a questionnaire that made use of a likert scale to rate the severity of a range of error types. The faculty members were divided into the following three categories according to academic specialty: (a) Physics, Math, Engineering, (b) Biological and Agricultural Sciences, and (c) Social Sciences, Education, Humanities. Overall, the faculty members in “Physics, Math, Engineering” were the most severe in their ratings, and faculty members in “Social Sciences, Education, Humanities” were the least severe in their ratings. This study also presented a hierarchy of seriousness of the different error types evaluated by the respondents. For example, spelling errors and
preposition problems were at the most tolerable end of the progression, subject-verb agreement problems were near the midpoint, and tense problems and word order problems were located at the least tolerable end of the hierarchy. Although department affiliation correlated considerably with the severity the respondents placed on errors in general, these researchers reported there was significant agreement as to the hierarchy of seriousness of the errors. It is also interesting to note that this study showed younger faculty members were less tolerant of errors than were the older faculty members.

To summarize, research on the effects of different types of error treatments on foreign language students’ writing have produced conflicting results. For example, whereas Semke (1984) and Robb et al. (1986) reported that choice of error treatment made no difference, Lalande (1982) reported that when teachers indicated the location of errors, provided information about error type, and required students to make their own corrections, students progressed more than when teachers made the corrections.

Studies that asked foreign language students for their opinions about the different types of error treatments being implemented on their written work have also reported conflicting findings. For example, whereas Semke (1984) reported that students disliked the method of teachers indicating errors and having the students make the actual corrections, Leki (1991) reported that students preferred this method. Such
discrepancies suggest a need for further research to determine whether or not the preferences of a larger sample of subjects tend to lean toward one direction or another.

The area that the literature has shown to have the least amount of conflicting findings is faculty opinions about error gravity. Although factors such as academic speciality or native language have been shown to play a role in how harshly errors are regarded in general, there is much agreement as to which error types are the most serious, and which error types are the least serious.

**Peer Review**

Among the various types of feedback currently available to ESL composition students, one of the most recent is peer review. With peer review, composition students are not only given the opportunity to obtain feedback from sources other than their instructor, but are also helped to develop a sense of audience.

Perhaps the earliest study that showed the positive effects of peer reviews was conducted by Chaudron (1983). This study involved 14 advanced ESL composition students at the University of California, Los Angeles. This study examined the effects of peer feedback and teacher feedback on two of each of the students' compositions. For one of the compositions half of the students received teacher feedback and the other half received peer feedback; for the second composition the students received the opposite type of feedback as they had the first time.
As for the peer feedback, students were instructed to mark what they believed to be linguistic errors, and to make written comments about both the strengths and the weaknesses of the composition that they were reviewing. After the students had revised their compositions based on the different types of feedback they had received, all the compositions (both the first and second drafts) were mixed and scored by ESL teachers. The evaluators did not know which type of feedback had been implemented nor if a particular composition was a first or a revised draft. The results of this study showed that the revised compositions using both types of feedback were significantly improved. Furthermore, the improvement was equal regardless of the type of feedback that had been given. Based on these findings, Chaudron suggested ESL composition teachers allow students to participate in peer reviews to save time for the teacher. Chaudron also suggested multiple peers be used to create a wider sense of audience.

Johns (1986) discussed the procedures and benefits of peer review in academic writing courses for ESL students. Johns suggested a top-down approach where students form small groups and respond to the content of another student’s first draft based on a list of questions provided by the teacher. After the students have written their second draft (based on the feedback obtained from their peer reviewers) the peer reviewers reexamine the paper from a structural standpoint. The composition is then rewritten and the third draft is the one that is turned in to the instructor. Johns hypothesized that if students apply the techniques acquired by participating in peer-review activities to their own
compositions they may become better self-editors. This hypothesis suggests a need for research to determine whether or not ESL composition students believe that participating in peer-review activities helps them to acquire self-editing skills.

A study at the University of Arizona conducted by Mangelsdorf (1992) to examine the attitudes of 40 freshman ESL composition students about peer-review activities yielded mixed results. Peer review is a common activity for all the students enrolled in the ESL composition courses at the University of Arizona. Students are required to exchange the first draft of their paper with another student who fills out a review sheet suggesting ways to improve the paper. Toward the end of the semester the subjects in this study spent approximately 20 minutes writing answers to questions concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the peer-review activities that they had been doing throughout the semester. Whereas the students generally reported that suggestions concerning content were helpful, they were uncertain about the degree to which they could trust the feedback of their peers. Comments from the instructors for these courses showed they believed peer review helps their students to develop a sense of audience; however, there was concern that students (based on peer suggestions) may incorporate inappropriate ideas into their papers.

A study by Mendonça (1994) yielded more positive results than did the previously examined study by Mangelsdorf. Mendonça's study described the negotiations that took place during a peer-review activity in
an ESL composition class and the effects that these negotiations had on the students' rewriting of their first drafts. This study also examined the students' beliefs about the value of this type of activity.

Mendonça audio taped the students (grouped in twos) giving feedback about each other's first draft of a composition to discover what types of negotiations were taking place. The peer reviewers were instructed to focus their attention on areas that were not clear and to ask the writer of the composition to clarify those areas. The tapes were then compared to the students' revised papers to determine the effects of this peer-review activity on the students' revisions.

Mendonça found that most of the negotiations involved students asking questions to gather more information, and little was said about grammar. The students' rewrites were found to be based to a large extent on the feedback they had received from their peers. Mendonça reported that the content of the revised versions of the students' papers was clearer. This study also reported that the students believed the activity was valuable because it helped them to realize that when they are writing for someone else, even though they know what they are talking about, the reader may need additional information. Thus, this study showed that peer reviews can help ESL writers to gain a sense of audience that in turn can have a positive effect on the content of their papers during the revision process.

It is interesting to note that the students in Mendonça's study were, whenever possible, paired with someone in the same academic field. This could be a reason why there was more trust in the peer feedback
than in the study by Mangelsdorf. That is, when students are writing a paper about an area in their own academic discipline, suggestions about content from others in the same field may be regarded as more valid, and thus considered more seriously than if the suggestions had come from someone outside their field. This is also more support for using peer review in advanced academic ESL writing courses, because the instructor may have little or no knowledge of many of the topics about which the students are writing (e.g., nuclear physics). Thus, in such situations, instructors could find it most helpful to turn to students in the class for help with content problems.

It is also interesting to note that more than half of the students in Mendonça's study came from non-western countries (e.g., Korea; Indonesia). Based on research conducted by Holliday (1994), one might predict that due to cultural differences peer-review activities would not have been well received by the students in Mendonça's study. In Holliday's work, he cites examples of students in non-western cultures who, because their system is teacher-centered, disapproved of group activities. In such cultures, if the teacher is not at the center of attention, then it is perceived that the teacher is not doing his or her job, and consequently, learning cannot be achieved. Holliday's research, however, was conducted with students in their home countries. Thus, the results of Mendonça's study suggest further research be conducted to determine whether or not once in the US, students from non-western cultures are more open to teaching methodologies that might not be viewed as appropriate in their native cultures.
In a related study, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) conducted research that compared the effects of teacher feedback to peer feedback in a multiple-draft college-level French composition course. The subjects in this study were 30 native speakers of English enrolled in an accelerated first year French course at Michigan State University. Half of the subjects received written comments on their papers from their instructor, and the other half participated in peer-review activities.

The students who participated in the peer-review activities read their papers aloud to the other members of their group and responded to questions about their papers. The students were provided with examples of questions to ask one another during the activity. The majority of these questions dealt with content and organization. The peer reviewers were also asked to point out what they believed to be language errors. Both groups were required to rewrite their compositions based on the feedback that they had received.

The students' final versions from both groups were blindly evaluated by four trained raters. The compositions were rated in the following four categories: (a) grammar, (b) content, (c) organization, and (d) vocabulary. Although the teacher-feedback group outscored the peer-feedback group in the category of grammar, the peer-feedback group outperformed the teacher-feedback group in all other categories. The categories in which the peer-feedback group excelled are the categories in which one might predict improvement if the activity were helping the students to acquire a better sense of audience. That is, these categories
more so than grammar are probably the areas that would most need to be improved in order to help one's reader to understand what he or she is trying to say.

As with the literature on error correction, research on peer review has also reported conflicting findings. Whereas Chaudron (1983) claimed that feedback from peers was as beneficial as feedback from teachers, findings in the study by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) and by Mendonça (1994) suggested that feedback from peers may be more beneficial than feedback from teachers, especially when dealing with content. The point on which all of the studies seem to agree is that peer review helps second language writers develop a better sense of audience.

As for student reactions to peer review, none of the studies reported that students disliked this type of feedback. The students in the study by Mangelsdorf (1992) expressed concern about the extent to which they could trust the feedback of their peers; however, on the whole the students' beliefs about peer review were positive. Furthermore, the study by Mendonça (1994) reported that students' reactions to peer review were positive.

**Multiple Drafts**

The use of multiple drafts in composition courses is based on the premise that students need to view writing as a process that consists of several stages. During the various stages of the process, the writer
focuses on different aspects of the composition (e.g., grammar, content, organization). By providing students with the opportunity to write multiple drafts, students are also encouraged to consider feedback they have received on an earlier version (be it from a teacher and/or a peer).

Bosher (1990) provided guidelines, suggestions, and rationale for implementing a process approach in ESL composition courses. Bosher advised that teacher feedback on a first draft mainly deal with content, and feedback concerning language be delayed until the next to the last draft. The rationale Bosher gave for delaying work on language issues is that if students are preoccupied with language on earlier drafts, then content will suffer. Bosher was also concerned that dealing with language errors on earlier drafts would discourage students from doing hypothesis testing. These concerns expressed by Bosher suggest a need for research to determine whether or not ESL composition students believe that focusing on language issues in the early stages of the writing process discourages hypothesis testing or has a negative effect on the content of a composition.

Research conducted by Zamel (1983) that examined the composing process of six advanced ESL students at the University of Massachusetts yielded findings that carry pedagogical implications for ESL composition courses that implement a process approach. The subjects in Zamel’s study, which represented five first languages, were observed writing several drafts of a composition. Zamel reported that during the writing of their first draft, five of the subjects mostly concentrated on content and dealt with language related issues (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, spelling) on
later drafts. The exception to this rule was a student that Zamel labeled ‘least skilled writer.’ This subject was preoccupied with producing error-free work from the onset of the composing process.

As Hendrickson (1984) recommended, when considering methods for supplying feedback to language students, it is important for teachers to consider students' attitudes about different types of feedback. Thus, the findings of Zamel's study suggest that ESL composition students in a course that implements a multiple-draft system should be more receptive to feedback from their teachers (or others) that deals with content on earlier drafts and with language on later drafts.

Raimes (1987) also investigated the composing process of college-level ESL composition students. For this study Raimes employed a think-aloud protocol to obtain data about the composing strategies of four remedial and four advanced students. Although this study only examined the subjects during the writing of a first draft, it contains implications for a process-oriented ESL composition course.

Raimes reported that the majority of editing and revising (57%) occurred during the writing of a sentence, as opposed to after having completed a sentence or a paragraph. As in the previously discussed study by Zamel, the subjects in Raimes' study revised more for content on this first draft than they did for language; however, contrary to Zamel's findings, the advanced writers in this study were much more preoccupied with language than were the remedial writers. Raimes hypothesized that the differences in concern about language between the two levels of students were because the advanced students had more of a sense of
personal responsibility about their writing, whereas the remedial writers expected their teachers to attend to the language problems in their compositions.

As Hendrickson (1984) recommended, when considering methods for supplying feedback to language students, it is important for teachers to consider the students’ language level. Thus, a possible pedagogical implication of the findings of Raimes’ study would be that ESL composition teachers who use a multiple-draft system with less skilled writers provide feedback about language errors by indicating where problems are located and giving clues about error type. This type of feedback could help students to acquire skills that will make them less dependent on their teachers for solving their problems. Furthermore, as previously seen in this review, Lalande (1982) demonstrated that this type of feedback helped improve foreign language writers’ language skills, and Leki (1991) reported that ESL composition writers preferred this type of feedback.

As for the fact that the advanced writers in Raimes’ study were preoccupied with producing error-free work, this could be due to the students not being in a composition course that used a process approach. As such, they may have felt that they needed to do as close to perfect work as possible the first time because they would not have another opportunity. If this were the case, this fact could support the use of a multiple-draft system because students would be able to concentrate on different areas at different times, and thus may become stronger in all areas.
Ferris (1995) stated that research regarding ESL students' responses to their teachers' written comments on compositions has been limited to single-draft rather than multiple-draft contexts. In order to help fill this void in ESL composition research, Ferris surveyed 155 students enrolled in ESL composition classes at California State University, Sacramento. All courses in this program use a multiple-draft syllabus. Toward the end of the semester the students were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their attitudes about the type of feedback they had been receiving throughout the course. The following conclusions were drawn about the subjects in this study: (a) they take their course work very seriously, (b) they take their teachers' feedback very seriously, (c) they paid more attention to feedback on earlier drafts than on final drafts, (d) they reread more of their papers and paid more attention to teachers' feedback on final drafts than did students in single draft studies, (e) many of the subjects reported examples of positive feedback that they had received from their teachers, and (f) 93.5% of the subjects reported they believed teacher feedback had helped them to improve their writing skills.

The fact that the students in Ferris' study were more serious about their processing of teacher feedback on compositions than were subjects in single-draft studies suggests that implementing a multiple-draft system in ESL composition courses could yield positive results. Furthermore, the fact that these students overwhelmingly believed the feedback they had received was helpful gives added justification to implementing a process approach.
By contrast, Cohen (1987) conducted survey work with ESL students who were in composition courses that required the students to write only a single draft of their compositions. Cohen reported that many of the students in his study did little or nothing with the feedback that was provided for them on their papers by their instructors. Based on the findings of the previously discussed study by Ferris and that of Cohen, one could conclude that the process approach is superior to the single-draft approach because students who are given the opportunity to write multiple drafts of their compositions process and use the feedback that their instructors provide them.

The literature reviewed in this section suggests that the process approach can have positive effects on the writing skills of second language students. The main theme seemed to be that if students concentrate on different areas at different stages of the process, then the final product will be of a higher quality. The major consensus was that students need to focus on content first and then deal with language issues later. It was also seen that when students were given opportunities to revise their compositions, they processed and used the feedback that they had been provided.

Tutorials

Tutorials provide ESL composition students the opportunity to receive one-to-one feedback about their written assignments from their
teachers. This personal attention allows the teacher to focus on the specific needs of an individual student; needs that may not be met during a regular class session.

Although there has not been much research published about the effects of tutorials on ESL composition students’ writing skills, nor about ESL composition students’ beliefs concerning tutorials, the research that does exist supports the use of tutorials.

Perhaps the earliest study to investigate ESL composition students’ beliefs about tutorials was conducted by Berkovitch (1982). This study was conducted at The Ohio State University and involved 136 ESL composition students. Data were collected by having the students complete a questionnaire. Twenty-seven of the students also participated in oral interviews.

The subjects in Berkovitch’s study were asked questions concerning their beliefs about the following areas: (a) the purpose of the tutorials, (b) what happens at the tutorials, (c) what is learned at the tutorials, (d) what are the best aspects of the tutorials, (e) what are the worst aspects of the tutorials, and (f) what suggestions do the students have for improving the tutorials.

A majority of students in Berkovitch’s study provided positive comments about the tutorials. The most common points the students made were the following: (a) during a tutorial session students discussed and better understood what their problems were, (b) the tutorials helped to clarify written feedback that had been previously provided on the compositions by their instructors, (c) the students
received special attention concerning their individual needs, (d) the students felt more comfortable discussing their work in the tutorials than in class because of the privacy, and (e) the tutorials helped to strengthen the student-teacher relationship. The most common suggestions made by the students to improve the tutorials were to have them more often, and to make them longer.

Silva, Reichelt, and Lax-Farr (1994) conducted survey work with ESL composition students, which among other areas, solicited their opinions about tutorials. The subjects in this study were graduate-level ESL composition students at Purdue University. The ESL composition courses at Purdue University implement a multiple-draft approach. The students are required to write three drafts of a composition. After the first two drafts the students participate in a tutorial session with their instructors. The results of the survey, concerning the topic of tutorials, revealed that a majority of the students believed the tutorials were the most important aspect of their courses.

Concerning the effects of tutorials on the writing skills of university-level ESL composition students, Goldstein and Conrad (1990) examined students’ drafts before and after a tutorial session to determine the effects of the sessions on the students’ revisions. These researchers tape recorded the tutorial sessions of three students discussing a first draft of a composition with their teachers. After the tutorial the students were required to write a second draft of their compositions. This research reported that the areas discussed during the tutorial sessions were the areas most improved in the revised versions. These researchers
concluded that the two most plausible reasons for the improvement were: (a) the feedback was clearer because of the tutorials, and (b) because of the students' involvement in the tutorial session they remembered longer what needed to be done to make the revisions.

In a related study, Boswood and Dwyer (1995/1996) investigated the effects of teachers' audio-taped feedback on ESL students' compositions. This was a two-year study conducted with 200 students and four instructors at City University of Hong Kong. This study also investigated students' attitudes about this type of feedback by having them complete an open-ended questionnaire.

The rationale for providing composition students with audio-taped feedback was to provide them with a type of feedback that concentrated more on the content of their compositions than on the language. The students in this study were required to rewrite their compositions based on the audio-taped feedback.

The instructors in this study reported that much progress was seen in the students' revised versions, especially areas that had been dealt with on the recordings. Student reaction to this type of feedback was also positive. A majority of the student comments reported the following: (a) students who said they usually pay little or no attention to written feedback on their compositions, said that they took the audio-taped feedback seriously, (b) students believed the audio-taped feedback was more detailed and clearer than written feedback, and (c) students believed this type of feedback helped much with content problems. Although this study did not deal with tutorials, the fact that the feedback
provided to the students consisted of oral comments of the type students may receive during a tutorial session could allow hypotheses from this research to be formed concerning the effectiveness of tutorials on the writing skills of ESL composition students.

The research examined in this section has shown tutorials have positive effects on students' writing skills. Furthermore, the research has shown ESL composition students have positive attitudes about tutorials. Because of the reported effects of tutorials and students' attitudes about them, incorporating tutorials in ESL composition courses, especially those that implement a process approach (i.e., multiple drafts) might be well advised.

**Grading**

Although there is much research concerning the evaluation of ESL students' writing, the vast majority of this research deals with the evaluation of writing for placement purposes, and not student opinions about grading. As a matter of fact, the writer of this dissertation has been able to find only one study that, among other areas, investigated ESL composition students' beliefs about the evaluation of their written work. This study was conducted by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996).

The subjects in this study were 124 university-level freshmen ESL composition students. The subjects completed a 45-item questionnaire that implemented a likert scale. Several of the subjects also participated in oral interviews. The results of this study, concerning evaluation,
showed that the students were more concerned with the evaluation of the language in their compositions than the content. Furthermore, the subjects preferred that the teachers deal with language issues in earlier drafts and content in the final draft. Although this study did not ask students questions about assigning grades to their compositions, for the purpose of this dissertation, one may conclude that these subjects would agree that grades should be based more on the language of the composition than on the content.

Translation

Research exists that supports the hypothesis that writing skills are transferred from an ESL student's first language to English. That is, ESL students who are good writers in their first language will, after acquiring the code, be good writers in English, and subsequently, ESL students who are poor writers in their first language will be poor writers in English (e.g., Edelsky 1982; Mohan and Lo 1985; Jones and Tetroe 1987).

On the topic of the effects of ESL students’ composing in their first language and then translating into English, the writer of this dissertation has been able to find only two such studies, and these studies only dealt indirectly with the topic. These studies, however, are of importance because of the implications they have for ESL composition students to compose in their first language and then translate into English.

The first study was conducted by Lay (1982). Using a think-aloud protocol with four Chinese ESL composition students, Lay investigated
the following two questions: (a) How much of the subjects’ native language is used in the composing process? and (b) Is there a pattern in the use of the subjects’ native language? The subjects were free to write on any topic of their choice.

Lay reported that the more switches that were made between the two languages, the higher was the quality of the content and organization of the compositions. Lay also reported that the subjects did more language switching when writing about information acquired in their first language. These findings suggest that ESL composition students may find it to their advantage to turn to their first language for assistance when writing on a topic whose content was acquired in their native language. By the same token, it may prove to be detrimental for ESL composition students to rely heavily on their first language when writing on a topic whose content was acquired in English.

Influenced by the previously examined study by Lay, Friedlander (1993) conducted a study to test the hypothesis that ESL writers will be able to produce a higher quality of work that has better content if the initial work is done in the language in which the topic knowledge was acquired.

In his study, Friedlander had 28 Chinese ESL students at Carnegie Mellon University write essays dealing with subject knowledge acquired in English, and essays dealing with subject knowledge acquired in Chinese. For the Chinese topic, some subjects were instructed to do their initial planning in Chinese and then write the essay in English, whereas other subjects were instructed to do their initial planning in
English, and then write the essay in English. For the English topic, some of the subjects were instructed to do their initial planning in English and then write the essay in English, whereas other subjects were instructed to do their initial planning in Chinese and then write the essay in English.

The results of Friedlander’s study showed that writing was enhanced when the students did their initial planning in the language in which the topic knowledge had been acquired. It is suggested in this study that in addition to initial planning being done in the language in which the subject knowledge had been acquired, that the first draft also be written in that language and then translated into English before being turned into the instructor.

Information learned from studies such as the study by Lay and the study by Friedlander could prove valuable for ESL composition students who are pursuing advanced degrees in the United States because much of what they knew about their academic speciality before they came to the United States was most likely acquired in their first language. However, the information that they are continuing to learn is being acquired in English. Thus, for these students, it may be suggested they do their initial planning and first drafts in a combination of the two languages.

The Reading-Writing Connection

There is an enormous amount of research that has examined the effects of reading on the writing skills of native speakers of English. For
example, Stotsky (1983) reviewed dozens of studies conducted from the 1930's to the early 1980's and reported that many of these studies concluded the following: (a) better writers read more than poorer writers, (b) better readers tend to use more advanced grammatical structures in their writing than do poorer readers, (c) reading can improve grammar and usage more than formal grammar courses, (d) studying literature greatly improves one's ability to write compositions, and (e) additional reading improves writing skills more than additional practice in writing.

Although there is an abundance of research on the effects of reading on writing in English as a first language, this area in ESL is only just starting to receive attention. Thus far, the majority of research in this area has suggested that reading does have positive effects on the acquisition of English by ESL students, writing skills included.

Perhaps the earliest study that considered the effects of reading on the acquisition process of English as a Second Language was conducted by Elley and Mangubhai (1983). These researchers' subjects were fourth- and fifth-graders in the Fiji Islands. These children received thirty minutes of English instruction per day via one of the following three methods: (a) traditional audio-lingual, (b) free reading (done by the students), or (c) the students were read to. These researchers reported that the students who participated in free reading and the students who were read to performed better on tests of reading comprehension, grammar, and writing, than did the students who received instruction via the audio-lingual method.
Elley (1991) also demonstrated the positive effects of free reading in a study of 3000 children learning English in Singapore. The students in this study ranged in age from six to nine years old. This was a longitudinal study that tracked the progress of some of the students for up to three years. Elley reported that the children in this study who were in the English classes that had free reading tested better in the following areas than did students in English classes that used the audio-lingual method: (a) reading comprehension, (b) oral language, (c) listening comprehension, (d) grammar, and (e) writing.

One of the first studies to examine the effects of reading on the writing abilities of college-level ESL students was conducted by Janopoulo(s) (1986). The aim of this study was to discover if there were connections between the amount of pleasure reading done by ESL students, and their writing skills. The subjects in Janopoulo(s)’ study were 79 incoming graduate students at The Ohio State University. The subjects, because they were not native speakers of English, were required to take a one hour long essay test. The subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire to obtain information about how much pleasure reading they did per week. The results of the essay test were correlated with the respondents’ answers on the questionnaire. Janopoulo(s) reported that there was a positive correlation between reading and writing; students who reported doing more reading, scored higher on the essay test.

Polak and Krashen (1988) investigated the relationship between spelling and voluntary reading among community college ESL students. These researchers conducted three studies at Valley College in Los
Angeles. There were 123 subjects in these studies. The subjects were advanced enough in English to be enrolled in subject-matter courses with native-speaking students. The subjects, who had been asked to complete a questionnaire about their voluntary reading habits, were given a dictation. The students heard the passage used for the dictation two times, and were given time at the end to make revisions. The scoring was based on the number of words misspelled; however, if the same word had been misspelled more than once, it was only counted one time. In all three of these studies the subjects who had reported they did the most free reading produced the least number of spelling errors.

Another area research has shown reading benefits second language learners is vocabulary. Ferris, cited in Krashen (1993), reported that reading English had a positive effect on the acquisition of vocabulary by college-level ESL students.

Although the previously examined studies reported a positive correlation between reading and the acquisition of language skills by ESL students, there is at least one recent study that did not find a positive correlation. Falahive and Bailey (1993) conducted a correlational study to examine the generalization that adult ESL learners who read more are better writers. The subjects were 40 ESL composition students at either Colorado State University or Lehman College, CUNY. The subjects represented twelve first languages. Over half of the subjects had attained a minimum TOEFL score of 525. The subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire about their reading practices and to write an argumentative essay on a topic of their choice from a list of several
options. The essays were holistically evaluated by two experienced ESL teachers. The subjects were also administered the CELT to evaluate their grammar skills. These researchers reported that there was no significant positive correlation between the quantity of reading that the subjects had reported and their scores on the essays. There was also no positive correlation between quantity of reading and the subjects’ scores on CELT.

If empirical research continues to show that reading has a positive effect on the writing skills of second language learners, then ESL composition instructors could pass this information on to their students as a legitimate means for them to improve their writing skills. Furthermore, if research were to report that ESL students also believe reading improves writing skills, then ESL composition teachers would have more cause to consider incorporating writing activities into their curriculum that are based on readings (for suggestions see Pugh 1989; Hirvela 1990; Henning 1993; Kramsch 1993; Davis 1994).

Reading Aloud for Self-Editing

Although research has shown first language writers can benefit from this procedure (e.g., Butler 1980), Leki (1993) claimed that such a phenomenon does not exist for second language writers. Leki, however, did not give any references to support this claim. Lack of data on this
topic suggests a need to conduct research with ESL composition students both to determine the effects of this strategy on students’ writing and to determine students’ opinions about it.

ESL Composition Teachers’ Beliefs and Current Practices

Traditionally, many ESL composition teachers have had a tendency to regard themselves more as language teachers than as writing teachers. Consequently, the majority of teacher feedback provided to ESL composition students has addressed the language (especially the grammar) of their papers, and teachers have provided little feedback concerning the content of their students’ papers (Zamel, 1985; Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1993; Reid, 1993).

Traditionally, many ESL composition teachers have also had a tendency to make the corrections on the compositions for their students, especially in courses that implemented the single-draft approach. One reason why ESL composition teachers have had a tendency to make these corrections is that it is a common practice in the home cultures of many ESL students. This same type of error-correction feedback should continue to be provided, it is hypothesized, to these students once they are in the US (Silva, 1993; Atkinson and Ramanathan, 1995).

Currently, the process approach to composition writing is becoming more common place in ESL writing courses (Leki 1992). As a result, ESL composition teachers’ beliefs about content feedback and error-correction feedback may be changing. For example, because it is
believed that the discovery process involved in having students find
answers to their problems has a positive effect on students' language
and writing skills, teachers are having their students be responsible for
making their own corrections as they write various drafts of a composition
(Bates, Lane and Lange 1993). Because ESL students' writing is being
viewed more as a process than as a product, students are receiving
feedback concerning all aspects of their writing. Thus, ESL composition
teachers are being encouraged to provide their students feedback
concerning the content of their papers as well as the language and
grammar (Bates et al. 1993). ESL composition teachers are also being
advised to use the process approach because writing multiple drafts of a
composition both encourages students to do hypothesis testing (Bates et
al. 1993) and provides students opportunities to process and use
feedback (Kroll, 1993; Ferris, 1995).

The topic of peer review has received mixed reviews from ESL
composition teachers. Although empirical research has shown that peer-
review activities can have positive effects on ESL students' writing skills
(Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonça, 1994), some ESL composition teachers
are reluctant to have their students participate in peer-review activities. A
major reason why ESL composition teachers do not have their students
participate in such activities might be the fact that the activity is viewed as
inappropriate in many cultures (Carson and Nelson 1994).

One possible reason for the success of peer-review activities in ESL
composition classes is the social value of the activity. That is, the
students in the class have in a sense become a community, and the
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members of that community want to help each other to produce quality work and to acquire better writing skills (Zeki 1995). Although the use of peer review in ESL composition courses is still a controversial topic, the profession is encouraging ESL writing teachers to use peer-review activities in their classes (Reid 1993).

As previously mentioned, ESL composition teachers have traditionally regarded themselves more as language teachers than as writing teachers. This fact has undoubtedly influenced how ESL composition teachers have evaluated their students’ written work. The trend has been for ESL composition teachers to focus on the grammatical aspects of their students’ papers more so than areas such as content and organization (McKay, 1984; Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1993). Researchers, however, are suggesting that ESL composition teachers give more attention to the content of their students’ writing, especially in a multiple-draft context (Fathman and Whalley 1993). Teacher educators are also encouraging ESL composition teachers to place less emphasis on the grammatical aspects of a paper when assigning grades and to focus more on content and organization (Bates et al., 1993; Reid, 1993).

As previously shown, there exists research showing that reading in English has positive effects on the writing skills of native speakers (Stotsky 1983). Furthermore, it has also been shown that research conducted with college-level ESL students produced similar findings (Janopoulos, 1986; Polak and Krashen, 1988; Ferris, 1993). Because of the positive correlation between reading and the improvement of writing
skills, teacher educators are recommending that ESL composition teachers incorporate into their courses writing activities based on reading assignments (Raimes, 1984; Carson, 1993; Reid, 1993).

Finally, of all the types of feedback examined in this review, the one that seems to have the most support from students, teachers and teacher educators is the tutorial. Not only have studies of ESL composition students' beliefs about tutorials shown the students had a positive attitude about tutorials (Berkovitch 1982), but research by Silva et al. (1994) that examined ESL composition students’ general beliefs about feedback found that the students believed the tutorials were the most important aspect of their writing courses. Because of its positive effects on the writing skills of ESL students, it is not surprising that teacher educators recommend the implementation of tutorials in ESL writing courses (Thomas and Thomas, 1989; Reid, 1993).

Summary

This literature review has examined types of composition feedback ranging from error-marking techniques employed by teachers to strategies and suggestions that may help second language writers to improve their writing skills (e.g., planning initial drafts in one’s first language, doing more reading in the target language). This review has also examined feedback from teachers versus feedback from peers, and the role of feedback in the different stages of the process approach (i.e., multiple drafts).
It has been seen that in several areas research has reported mixed findings on both the effects of different types of feedback, and second language writers' attitudes towards these different types of feedback. Because more research is needed both to examine the effects of different types of feedback on second language writers, and to examine these persons' beliefs about these types of feedback, it might be suggested that future studies dealing with effects also survey their subjects to obtain their opinions about the type(s) of feedback being investigated.

If, for example, further research in areas such as error-marking techniques for ESL composition students continues to suggest that one technique is not more beneficial than other techniques (e.g., Robb et al. 1986), then ESL composition students' opinions may be the main factor to consider when selecting an error-marking technique. Further research may also suggest that ESL composition students' beliefs about feedback need to be seriously considered when making decisions about other types of feedback (e.g., peer review.)

Finally, this review of literature has examined ESL composition teachers' beliefs about feedback as well as the types of feedback that are being recommended by the profession. It has been seen that ESL composition teachers and teacher educators: (a) support the use of tutorials because of the personal attention students receive concerning their individual writing needs, (b) prefer the process approach to writing because it encourages hypothesis testing and gives students opportunities to process and use feedback, (c) support the use of peer review because the activity helps students to acquire a better sense of
audience, (d) prefer to require students to make some of their own corrections because of the discovery learning involved in that process, (e) encourage the incorporation of reading into the writing curriculum because of the positive correlation between reading and the improvement of one's language and writing skills, and (f) believe ESL writing students should receive more feedback concerning the content and organization of their compositions because these aspects are such important elements of successful writing.

Although some ESL composition teachers might be reluctant to use peer review or to require students to make their own corrections because such types of feedback are not considered to be appropriate in many of the cultures from which ESL students come, this review has shown that when such types of feedback are provided the results can often be positive. Furthermore, this review has also shown that ESL composition students in the US have reported such types of feedback to be beneficial.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This dissertation is both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative aspect includes a statistical analysis of the results of the subjects' responses to a questionnaire that implemented a Likert scale. The qualitative aspects of this dissertation include the following: (a) written comments by the subjects at the end of the questionnaire, (b) written comments on a follow-up to the questionnaire that asked students to provide reasons for the scores they had given particular items on the questionnaire, (c) oral interviews conducted with the subjects, and (d) a focus group conducted with one section of ESL composition. In both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study, analyses of the data are followed by discussions and implications.

In this chapter references are made to a pilot study conducted Summer Quarter, 1996 with one section of undergraduate ESL composition students (English 106) at The Ohio State University. Fourteen students participated in the pilot study. That study provided the basis for the procedures utilized in the present study. Information about the pilot study is included in this chapter to meet the following goals: (a) establish the reliability of the instruments developed for gathering data
for the dissertation (i.e., the questionnaire, the follow-up to the questionnaire, and the interview techniques), (b) make clear the procedures implemented to gather data for the dissertation, (c) familiarize the reader with the methods in which the data are reported in the dissertation, and (d) clarify the methods used to analyze the data for the dissertation.

It should be noted that there was not a focus-group activity conducted as part of the pilot study. Because the student subjects for the pilot study were willing to participate in the project and provided data pertinent to the study, it was decided to conduct a focus-group activity for the dissertation study to both acquire additional data concerning ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback and to examine the extent to which the subjects are willing to discuss their preferences for composition feedback.

**Subjects for Dissertation Study**

The subjects for the dissertation study were undergraduate and graduate international students enrolled in advanced ESL composition courses (English 107 and 108) at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, and their composition course instructors.

International students at The Ohio State University are either exempted or required to take course work in the ESL Composition Program based on their results on The Test of English as a Foreign Language, and on the results of a written placement examination.
administered and scored by members of the ESL Composition Program
staff. The undergraduate students in this program are typically preparing
to take Freshman English, whereas the graduate students are typically
enrolled in these courses to help them complete academic writing
assignments in their course work, and to help them prepare eventually to
write a thesis or a dissertation.

The ESL composition courses at The Ohio State University utilize a
process-oriented approach (i.e., multiple drafts) and provide students
with individual tutorials with their instructors. During a tutorial session, a
student and his or her instructor, for example, discuss changes a student
has made on a composition based on feedback provided on a previous
draft. During the tutorial sessions a student also receives feedback on
areas of his or her writing that still need work.

Data for the dissertation study were collected from students and
instructors in two sections each of undergraduate and graduate courses
specified above. All students in each section were surveyed. Forty-five
student respondents participated in the dissertation study (27
undergraduate and 18 graduate students). Among the graduate
subjects, eight were pursuing their Master’s degree and ten the doctoral
degree.

The following ten nationalities and numbers were in the dissertation
sample: (a) Korean - 13, (b) Indonesian - 12, (c) Taiwanese - 6, (d)
Turkish - 4, (e) Japanese - 4, (f) Chinese - 2, (g) Saudi Arabian - 1, (h)
Kuwaiti - 1, (i) Jordanian - 1, and (j) Malaysian - 1.

Twenty-eight male subjects (20 undergraduate students and 8 graduate students) and 17 female subjects (7 undergraduate students and 10 graduate students) participated in the dissertation study.

The undergraduate students ranged in age from 18 years to 27 years; the mean age was 21 years. The graduate students ranged in age from 24 years to 40 years; the mean age was 29 years.

The average length of time in the US for the undergraduate subjects at the time the data were collected was one year. The average length of time for the graduate subjects was one year and three months. However, some subjects at both levels had been in the US for less than two months, whereas other subjects had been in the US for more than four years. Thus, the spread of time in the US was from six weeks to four years and six months.
At the time data were collected, 47% of the subjects were enrolled in their first ESL composition course at The Ohio State University, 44% were enrolled in their second course, and 9% were enrolled in their third course.

Each of the four ESL composition classes that participated in the dissertation study was taught by a different instructor. Thus, four ESL composition instructors participated in the study.

All four of the ESL composition instructors were male. At the time the data were gathered for the dissertation study, two of the instructors held the Doctorate, whereas the other two were in the process of pursuing a doctoral degree at The Ohio State University. The instructors ranged in age from 37 years to 48 years. The instructors had taught from 2 to 22 courses in the ESL composition program. The instructors represented the following four nationalities: (a) American - 1, (b) Zairian - 1, (c) Chinese - 1, and (d) Surinamese - 1.

**Data Collection**

**Data from Composition Students**

Data from the student subjects who participated in the dissertation study were gathered via four procedures. The first required the subjects to provide ratings for 28 statements on a questionnaire concerning various types of feedback, see Appendix A. The second required the subjects to provide written comments giving their rationale for the scores
they had assigned to selected items on the questionnaire. The third was oral interviews conducted with four ESL composition students (one student from each class section). The fourth procedure was the participation of one ESL composition class in a focus group discussing the topic of ESL composition feedback.

The data for the dissertation were collected during Winter Quarter, 1997. The data collection was begun shortly after the students’ midterm examinations had been completed. It was decided not to begin the collection of data earlier in the quarter to allow the students more time to experience the various types of feedback being implemented in their courses. Thus, the data were collected over a period of five weeks.

The Questionnaire

The subjects based their responses on a four-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

In order to encourage the respondents to consider if the types of feedback examined on the questionnaire were or were not beneficial to them, no neutral response was provided. It was also decided not to provide the respondents with an option such as “no answer” or “not applicable,” for fear they would have chosen this response about a particular type of feedback because it was not being implemented in the course in which the students were enrolled at the time they completed the questionnaire. As mentioned in the basic assumptions, it was assumed that the subjects were already familiar with the types of
feedback on the questionnaire. Therefore, even if there had been types of feedback mentioned on the questionnaire that were not being implemented in the subjects’ course at that time, the subjects’ beliefs about these types of feedback were pertinent to this study, and thus every effort possible was made to obtain these data.

The items on the questionnaire dealt with the types of composition feedback examined in chapter two of this dissertation (i.e., error-marking techniques, peer review, the process approach, tutorials, grading, the reading-writing connection, composing in one’s first language and translating into English, and reading aloud for self-editing).

Research exists that reported ESL students wanted their native-speaking friends to correct their English (e.g., Chenoweth, Day, Chun, and Luppescu 1983). Thus, to determine whether or not the respondents in this study were receptive to feedback from persons other than their teachers or classmates, two items on this topic were included on the questionnaire.

Finally, a comment needs to be made about Item number 6: “My English teachers should correct all the spoken language errors I make in class.” and Item number 7: “Sometimes I want to participate in class, but I am afraid to speak because I do not want to make a mistake.” These two items appeared on the questionnaire developed for the pilot study. The respondents for the pilot study were undergraduate-level advanced ESL composition students enrolled in the same program as the subjects for the dissertation study. Surprisingly, even though the respondents were in a composition course, 54% agreed or strongly agreed with Item
number 6. Furthermore, several of the respondents who strongly agreed with Item number 6 also agreed or strongly agreed with Item number 7. In addition to the results of the pilot study, research by Cathcart and Olsen (1976) reported that ESL students wanted their teachers to correct all of the spoken language errors that they make in class. These findings suggested that additional data need to be collected to validate this trend.

In order to prepare for the second stage of the data collection process (i.e., the follow-up), each questionnaire bore a code number. Each subject was asked to make note of his or her code number. The coding system allowed the subjects to have anonymity and to have their questionnaires returned for the follow-up procedure.

In order to prepare for the third stage of the data collecting process (i.e., the oral interviews), on the questionnaire under the heading “personal data”, the subjects were asked whether or not they would be willing to participate in a short oral interview discussing their beliefs about composition feedback. The subjects who participated in the oral interviews were selected from those who had answered yes to this question.

In the pilot study, approximately 20 minutes of class time were required for the execution of the first phase of the data collection process (i.e., the questionnaire). The first eight minutes were devoted to giving the subjects information about the purpose of the study and instructions for completing the questionnaire. The remaining twelve minutes were used by the respondents to complete the questionnaire.
The subjects for the pilot study did not seem to have difficulty completing the questionnaires as few questions were posed, and those that did arise only required a brief repetition of the procedures for completing the questionnaires. The subjects, as indicated by their actions, comprehended the content of the items on the questionnaire. Their responses also suggested that the subjects were familiar with the various types of feedback discussed in the items of the questionnaire.

The results of the questionnaire for the pilot study suggested that the items were reliable and valid. For example, when students were asked more than one question about a particular type of feedback (e.g., Item #11: “All drafts should receive a letter grade.” and Item #12: “Only the final draft should receive a letter grade.”), students who rated one item high rated the other low. The fact that probably most supports the validity of the questionnaire is that the students’ comments to items for the follow-up procedure were appropriate. That is, their comments showed they understood the contents of the items in question, and their comments were congruent with the ratings they had given the items.

An exception to the appropriateness of comments was Item #28: “It is a good idea for a student to read his or her paper aloud when proofreading it.” Subjects who disagreed with this item reported on the follow-up that they did so because they would be uncomfortable reading their papers aloud in class. Thus, there was a misunderstanding about the meaning of this item. For the dissertation phase of the study, this item was modified to read as follows: “It is a good idea when proofreading a
draft of a paper to read it aloud to oneself at home." Student comments on the follow-up to the questionnaire for the data collected for the dissertation suggested that the modified version was understood.

The additional changes in the questionnaire since the pilot study was conducted included three new items. These items deal with students’ beliefs about the role of language versus content in the instructor’s assignment of grades to a composition.

Follow-Up to the Questionnaire

For the second stage of the data-collection process, the subjects had their questionnaires returned, and they were requested to provide written comments as to why they had rated certain items on the questionnaire as they did, see Appendix B. Items for the second stage of the data collection process were chosen in order to receive a written comment for each item from a subject from each class section who had strongly agreed with the item, and a written comment from a subject from each class section who had strongly disagreed with the item.

For the follow-up in the pilot study, between six and eight items were selected for comment on each student’s questionnaire. The item numbers were circled in red ink and a page was also attached to the questionnaire listing the numbers of the items for which a subject was requested to make comments. The follow-up activity for the pilot study took approximately fifteen minutes. Although these procedures seemed to work, some of the respondents’ comments were simply, “Because I like
it.” or “Because I think it helps a lot.” To avoid simplistic comments such as these for the data gathered for the dissertation, when the students were given the instructions for the follow-up to the questionnaire, they were asked to go into detail and tell why they feel the way they do about the items for which they were requested to comment. This extra effort to have students explain why they feel the way they do about various types of feedback, instead of their simply saying whether or not they like a particular type of feedback, seemed to “pay off” as the respondents for the dissertation study provided more detailed comments for the follow-up than did the respondents in the pilot study.

The rationale for the follow-up to the questionnaire was to give an explanation for the ratings the subjects assigned the types of feedback examined on the questionnaire. Knowing the reasons why students hold the beliefs they do about composition feedback provided more solid answers to the research questions investigated in this dissertation.

The follow-up to the questionnaire for the pilot study was useful. As previously mentioned, the students gave explanations for the ratings they assigned to items on the questionnaire. Furthermore, this follow-up showed the students to have specific beliefs about the types of feedback they prefer, thus indicating the importance of designing ways to obtain this information from them. This follow-up also proved useful because it gave students who were not willing to participate in oral interviews the opportunity to express their feelings in written form. In a sense, the
follow-up served as a sort of mini interview in written form. The success of the follow-up for the pilot study seemed to justify its inclusion in the data gathering process for the dissertation study.

**Oral Interviews**

Oral interviews concerning student subjects' beliefs about composition feedback were conducted and tape recorded. One subject was selected from each of the four ESL composition sections surveyed for the dissertation study. The subjects who were selected came from those who had indicated on their questionnaire that they would be willing to participate in an oral interview, and who had supplied the most detailed comments on the follow-up to the questionnaire. Based on these criteria, two or three students from each class section were asked in person if they would be willing to participate in an oral interview. For various reasons, some of the students were not willing at that point to participate in an oral interview. However, one student from each class section agreed and participated in an oral interview. Thus, four students were interviewed for the dissertation study. The interviews took approximately 45 minutes. The student interviews were audio-tape recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis.

Because the interviews were conducted after the questionnaires had been collected, the interviews provided an explanation of subjects'}
responses to selected items of the questionnaire. All student subjects interviewed were asked at least the following eight questions:

(1) What are you studying at Ohio State?
(2) What is your background in English Composition?
(3) Why are you taking the English Composition Course in which you are currently enrolled?
(4) What types of feedback do you most prefer concerning your writing? Why?
(5) What types of feedback do you least prefer concerning your writing? Why?
(6) Are there any types of feedback that you are not currently receiving but would like to receive?
(7) Could you tell me about the tutorials with your instructor that you have for this class?
(8) Is there anything else you would like to add?

The oral interview conducted for the pilot study suggested the procedures were satisfactory as the subject appeared to be at ease and provided information concerning his beliefs about composition feedback. The student interviews conducted for the dissertation study were based on the one conducted for the pilot study.
Data from Subjects’ Instructors

The data for the dissertation study from the subjects’ instructors were collected by having the instructors complete a modified version of the student questionnaire, see Appendix C. The four instructors who participated in this study were asked to provide a short written comment about each item of the questionnaire.

Each instructor also participated in an oral interview which lasted approximately 45 minutes. These interviews were less structured than the interviews with the students, and as such, they were basically informal discussions about feedback in advanced ESL composition courses. The instructor interviews were audio-tape recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis.

The focus of the interviews was on the types of feedback the instructors typically provide their students and the reasons why they implement the types of feedback they do. In the course of each interview, some of the instructor’s responses to the questionnaire were also discussed.

The interview with the instructor for the pilot study, which was conducted in the same manner as those for the dissertation study, produced data that revealed the types of feedback he implements, and his rationale for doing so. One possible reason for the success of this interview could have been that, being informal, a relaxed atmosphere
was produced because the instructor did not feel as if he were being "put on the spot" as to his teaching practices. This seemed to also be the case with the instructor interviews for the dissertation study.

The Focus Group

The purpose of the focus group was to investigate advanced ESL composition students' beliefs about feedback. The focus-group activity was also designed to investigate to what degree students' opinions about composition feedback might change after having been given both an opportunity to reflect on the topic and to hear the opinions of others. The participants in the focus group were the students in one of the graduate-level courses, their instructor, and the writer of this dissertation.

The focus-group activity was conducted after the students in the course had completed the questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire. The focus group was conducted during the students' regular class session. Because the focus-group activity was also on the same day the students were scheduled to complete their course evaluations, only about 30 minutes remained for this activity. The focus-group activity was audio-tape recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis.

The following were the procedures for the conducting of the focus group: (a) The results of the questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire completed by the students who participated in the focus group were discussed, (b) The students were presented with research
that has been conducted on the topic of feedback in ESL composition courses (i.e., selected information about feedback contained in the review of the literature section of this document); a discussion of this research took place, (c) The students were asked at the end of the session if their opinions on the topic had changed due to the discussion, and (d) The students were asked to write a short reflection paper at home about their experience participating in the focus group; the papers were collected by the instructor for the course and given to the writer of this dissertation. The students were asked to keep in mind the following two questions while writing their reflection papers: (a) After having had time to reflect on the topic of feedback for composition students, heard other students' opinions about feedback, and been presented some research about feedback, have your opinions on the topic changed? and (b) Do you believe that it would be a good idea for composition teachers to discuss with their students why they use the types of feedback they do, and to obtain their students' opinions in ways similar to my study?

The purpose for the reflection paper was both to allow students time to process the information from the focus group before making more comments on the topic of feedback as well as to provide an opportunity for students who may not feel comfortable expressing their opinions orally to do so in writing.

It should be noted that at the beginning of the focus-group activity, the students were provided a handout that contained the following: (a) the
results of the questionnaire, (b) comments from the follow-up activity, (c) research on the topic of feedback for ESL composition students, and (d) the questions for the reflection paper, see Appendix D.

Data Reporting Procedures

Means were calculated for the data collected from the questionnaire to describe the value the subjects placed on the different types of feedback investigated. Means were reported for the following: (a) subjects in individual composition sections, (b) student subjects, (c) graduate subjects, (d) undergraduate subjects, (e) male subjects, (f) female subjects, (g) various academic disciplines, and (h) course instructors. Modes for the various groups were reported to describe the most common rating for each item. In addition to these modes, percentage charts were presented to show what percent of subjects from the various groups assigned a particular rating to each item of the questionnaire. Standard deviations were also reported on these data to determine to what degree the subjects differed in their responses.

Tables of these statistical findings were presented in the body of the text to support the discussion and facilitate the reader's access to these data. Abbreviated versions of the questionnaire items were included on these tables. Some of these data indirectly related to the main study research questions and will be the basis for further studies after the dissertation.
Comments from the end of the questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire were reported in the appendix. The comments for each item from the follow-up to the questionnaire were arranged according to the ratings that the subjects gave the item; these were presented from the highest rating to the lowest rating. Not all comments for this activity were reported in the appendix, but rather a sample has been provided that reflects the most frequent comments reported for each item. The following illustrative example, with unedited comments, is taken from the pilot study. These data were reported in the same manner for the dissertation study.

**Item 13.** We should be graded on a satisfactory / unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade of “A” through “E”.

(a): (Rating = 4) For second language student it is hard to get “A” if not native speaker, especially for me. It lower my grade.

(b): (Rating = 3) If ESL program want to improve the student’s ability, they don’t need to grade “A” to “E” because satisfactory / unsatisfactory system is enough to grade the students.

(c): (Rating = 2) Satisfactory / unsatisfactory doesn’t really put or grade the student in a certain standard.

(d): (Rating = 2) The system A-E is easier to find out what my English graded.

(e): (Rating = 1) Because the S / U system can make the students lazy. They just think that they must get satisfactory.
Transcripts of the student interviews and the teacher interviews were included in the appendix. Because the focus of these interviews is what the subjects said, and not how they said it, false starts, slips, extraneous information, and so forth, have not been included in the transcripts. This editing of the transcripts is also intended to facilitate the reading of those who examine them.

Data Analysis

The analysis began with an examination of the data obtained from the undergraduate-level students. Because readers of this dissertation might consider academic level to be a major variable in this research, it was decided to examine and report the results for the undergraduate students and the results for the graduate students separately. Furthermore, the separate examination and reporting of the results of the students from the two academic levels allowed for a more systematic comparison of the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs of the two groups.

The basis of the examination of the data obtained from the undergraduate students was the statistical results of the questionnaire and the written comments these students provided for the follow-up activity. This examination focused on the types of feedback these subjects reported they believed were the most beneficial and the least beneficial for improving their English academic writing skills. Separate statistical tables of the results of the questionnaires completed by the
subjects in the two undergraduate-level class sections were also presented to show the similarities in the ratings assigned to items on the questionnaire by students in those two class sections.

The analysis continued with the examination of the data obtained from the graduate students. The basis of the examination of the data obtained from the graduate students was the statistical results of the questionnaire and the written comments these students provided for the follow-up activity. This examination focused on the types of feedback these subjects reported they believed were the most beneficial and the least beneficial for improving their English academic writing skills. Separate statistical tables of the results of the questionnaires completed by the subjects in the two graduate-level class sections were also presented to show the similarities in the ratings assigned to items on the questionnaire by students in those two class sections.

Following the analysis of the graduate-student data is an examination that compared the undergraduate-student findings with the graduate-student findings. The focus of this comparison was on the subjects' reported beliefs concerning the following seven topics investigated by this study: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation. This analysis answered the research question: “Do beliefs concerning feedback differ between graduate students and undergraduate students?”

In order to answer the following research question: “Do beliefs concerning feedback differ between male and female students?” data
from all male students were combined and data from all female students were combined and analyzed to define any trends in the beliefs of these two groups, and whether or not the trends showed similarities and differences.

In order to answer the research question: “Do beliefs about feedback differ depending on the academic discipline of students?” data from the different academic disciplines represented by the students who participated in this study were grouped together and analyzed to see whether or not there were trends in the beliefs about feedback among these different groups, and whether or not these trends showed similarities and differences. The students were grouped according to the following four broader academic branches: (a) Accounting and Business, (b) Education and Humanities, (c) Engineering, and (d) Mathematics and Sciences.

The focus of the analysis of the data obtained from the students who participated in oral interviews was on the types of feedback the interviewees reported to be the most beneficial for helping them to improve their English academic writing skills. The findings of the four student interviews were also compared to show the similarities and differences in the beliefs about composition feedback of those four subjects. The examination of the student interviewees’ data concluded with a comparison of the findings of those subjects with the findings for Composite Students.

The examination of the student interviewees’ data is followed by the results of the focus group. This examination included both the results of
the focus-group activity and the results of the reflection papers written by the students who participated in that activity. The data from the focus group were examined to give added information about the participants’ preferences for composition feedback. The data were also compared to the results of the questionnaire and the follow-up that were completed by the students who participated in this activity. This comparison was to determine whether or not the students, after participating in this activity, had changed their opinions concerning different types of feedback. Finally, the analysis of the data from the focus group was also used to help determine the degree to which student subjects in this study were willing to discuss their beliefs about composition feedback.

The analyses of the data obtained from the students’ responses to the questionnaire, the students’ comments for the follow-up to the questionnaire, the student interviews, and the focus group answered the following research questions: (a) “What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition students report to be the most beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills?”, (b) “What types of feedback do these students report to be the least beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills?”, (c) “What reasons do these students report for having the beliefs they do concerning feedback?”, (d) “To what degree are these students in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?”, and (e) “To what degree are these students willing to convey their beliefs about composition feedback?”
The examination of the student-subject data is followed by an examination of the instructor-subject data. Because readers of this dissertation might want to focus on the instructor results, it was decided to examine and report the instructor results separately. Furthermore, the separate examination and reporting of the instructor results and the student results allowed for a more systematic comparison of the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs of the two groups.

The analysis of the instructor-subject data included the following: (a) the statistical results of the instructor questionnaire, (b) written comments provided by the instructors at the end of the questionnaire, and (c) information obtained from the instructors during their oral interviews. The focus of the analysis of the data obtained from the instructors was on the types of feedback they provide their students and the reasons they reported for using those types of feedback. The items on the questionnaires the instructors gave the highest ratings and the items they gave the lowest ratings were discussed and supported by comments they had written on the questionnaires and from comments they had made during the oral interviews. The data from the instructors were also examined to discover similarities and differences in their reported beliefs about the types of composition feedback investigated by this study. The analysis of the data obtained from the instructors answered the following three research questions: (a) “What types of feedback do advanced-college level ESL composition instructors believe to be the most beneficial, and why?”, (b) “What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition instructors believe to be the least beneficial, and
why?”, and (c) “To what extent are these instructors in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?”

Following the examination of the instructor-subject data, the analysis turned to a comparison of the findings of the student-subject data with the findings of the instructor-subject data. The focus of this comparison was on the similarities and differences reported by the two groups of subjects concerning their beliefs about the following seven topics: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation. This analysis answered the research question: “To what extent are these students’ reported beliefs concerning the value of different types of feedback congruent with those of their instructors?”

The next chapter includes an analysis and the findings, with the final chapter emphasizing pedagogical implications based on the information obtained from this study. Suggestions for future research were also described.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Forty-five ESL composition students (27 undergraduates and 18 graduates) and four ESL composition instructors from The Ohio State University participated in this study. The students represented four different composition class sections. Two of the class sections were for undergraduate students and two of the class sections were for graduate students. The four instructor subjects each taught one of the class sections that participated in the study.

This chapter reports the major findings of the data obtained from both the ESL composition students and the ESL composition instructors. The findings presented were obtained by having the subjects: (a) respond to items on a questionnaire and (b) participate in oral interviews. The student questionnaire is found in Appendix A and the instructor questionnaire is found in Appendix C. All subjects were asked to rate items on the questionnaire dealing with various types of composition feedback. The student subjects also participated in a follow-up activity concerning their responses to the questionnaires. For the follow-up activity, the students had their questionnaires returned with various item numbers circled in red. The students were asked to provide written responses to explain the rationale for the ratings that they had assigned to the items in question. Examples of written comments provided by the students for
the follow-up activity are presented in Appendix F. Transcripts of the student interviews and the instructor interviews are also found in the appendixes, see Appendixes G-N.

In addition to the previously mentioned data gathering procedures, one of the graduate-level ESL composition classes also participated in a focus-group activity. The participants of the focus-group activity discussed the topic of feedback and the results of the questionnaires completed by the students from that class section. The focus-group participants were also asked to write a short reflection paper about the experience. In addition to gathering data concerning ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback, the focus-group activity was included in this study both to examine the degree to which ESL composition students are willing to discuss their beliefs about composition feedback and to conduct a sort of mini-pilot study about the activity for further research possibilities. Further research incorporating focus groups is explored in the concluding chapter.

The focus of the data presented in this chapter is on the types of feedback the subjects reported they believed were the most beneficial and the least beneficial for improving the writing skills of advanced college-level ESL students. The subjects' beliefs about the following seven topics were examined: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation.

This chapter reports the following descriptive statistics obtained from the results of the questionnaires completed by the subjects who participated in the
study: (a) means, (b) modes, and (c) standard deviations. In addition to tables containing these statistical findings, tables are also presented to show the percent of subjects who gave the same ratings to items.

The chapter begins with an examination of the data obtained from the undergraduate-level students. This examination focuses on the statistical results of the questionnaire and the written comments the students provided for the follow-up activity. Because readers of this dissertation might consider academic level to be a major variable in this research, it was decided to report the results for the undergraduate students and the results for the graduate students separately. Furthermore, the separate reporting of the results of the students from these two academic levels allows for a more systematic comparison of the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs of the two groups. Separate statistical tables of the results of the questionnaires completed by the subjects in the two undergraduate-level class sections are also presented in this chapter to show the similarities in the ratings assigned to items on the questionnaire by students in those two class sections.

Following the examination of the data obtained from the undergraduate students, the results of the data obtained from the graduate students are presented. These data are presented in the same manner as the undergraduate student data. These results are followed by a comparison of the data from the students from the two academic levels.

In order to allow broader generalizations of the data obtained from the student subjects, tables containing composite-student statistics are presented. Because a goal of this study was to determine whether or not variables such as gender or academic discipline were factors affecting ESL students’ beliefs
about composition feedback, statistical tables are presented that represent these variables. As for academic discipline, the student data were analyzed according to the following four broader categories: (a) Accounting and Business, (b) Education and Humanities, (c) Engineering, and (d) Mathematics and Sciences.

Following the examination of the results of the student questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire, the results of the four student interviews are presented. The focus of the examination of the student interviews was on the types of feedback the interviewees reported to be the most beneficial for helping them to improve their English academic writing skills. The results of the four student interviews were also compared to show the similarities and differences in the beliefs about composition feedback of those four subjects. The examination of the student interviewees’ data concluded with a comparison of the findings of those subjects with the findings for Composite Students.

The examination of the student interviewees’ data is followed by the results of the focus group. This examination included both the results of the focus-group activity and the results of the reflection papers written by the students who participated in that activity.

The examination of the student-subject data is followed by an examination of the instructor-subject data. Because readers of this dissertation might want to focus on the instructor results, it was decided to report the instructor results separately. Furthermore, the separate reporting of the instructor results and the student results allows for a more systematic comparison of the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs of the two groups. The instructors’ beliefs
concerning the following seven topics were examined: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation.

The instructor-subject data included the following: (a) The statistical results of the instructor questionnaire, (b) Written comments provided by the instructors at the end of the questionnaire, and (c) Information obtained from the instructors during the interviews.

Following the examination of the instructor-subject data, a comparison of the results of the student-subject data and the results of the instructor-subject data is presented. The focus of this comparison was on the similarities and differences reported by the two groups of subjects concerning their beliefs about composition feedback. The chapter concludes with a summary of the major findings and a discussion.

Before preceding to the results of this study, the writer of this dissertation would like to make some suggestions to the reader as to how she or he might best interpret the statistical results of the student questionnaire. One should be cautioned to not simply compare the mean score for a particular item for one group of student subjects (e.g., Accounting and Business Students) to the mean score of that item for another group of student subjects (e.g., Education and Humanity Students). First, whereas some groups tended to be lower raters overall, other groups tended to give higher ratings in general. For example, the ratings tended to be higher overall for the Education and Humanities Students than for the Accounting and Business Students. Thus, even though the mean score for item #25: "The tutorials are a very important part of this course." was 3.92 for the Education and Humanities Students, and only 3.40 for the
Accounting and Business Students, this item received the highest ratings of all the items from the Education and Humanities Students and the second highest ratings from the Accounting and Business Students.

In addition to some student groups being lower raters, and others consistently giving higher ratings to items on the questionnaire, the (N) for some student groups was fairly small (e.g., only eight subjects for Graduate Section Two; only nine subjects for Mathematics and Science Students). Thus, only one or two subjects from such a group assigning a higher or lower rating to an item than the other students in that group had a significant effect on the mean score for that particular item. Because of this fact, in order to make generalizations about an individual group's beliefs about feedback, one needs to also take into consideration the mode for a particular item and the percent of students who assigned that score to the item. Furthermore, the reader also needs to consider the statistical results of all items on the questionnaire that dealt with the same type of feedback (e.g., the process approach; error-correction techniques). For example, whereas the mean score for Item #8: “The best number of drafts for a paper written for an advanced ESL composition course is three.” was 3.18 for the female students, the mean score for this item was only 2.85 for the male students. However, upon examining the mean scores for all three of the items that dealt with the process approach to composition writing, one sees that this item (i.e., Item #8) received the highest mean score of all the items dealing with draft number from both the female and the male students. Furthermore, the mode for this item for both groups of students was “3” (agree) and a majority of the students from both groups
assigned this rating to this item. Thus, when one considers the results from
different aspects, one will be able to see that both the female and the male
students reported a preference to write three drafts of a composition.

Finally, the reader of this dissertation might wonder why these data were not
presented in tables that reflected a hierarchy. There were three major reasons
why it was decided not to report the statistical results in such a manner. First, to
do so would place emphasis on the mean score for an item, which, as
discussed above, is not recommended. Second, such reporting would not have
allowed the items on the questionnaire to remain grouped according to topic.
By keeping the items in the same order as they were on the original
questionnaire, the reader is better able to compare the results of related items.
Third, such a reporting method would have, for example, placed tutorials at the
top of the list, and all items dealing with the process approach would have
ranked lower. Thus, one might be inclined to believe that having students
participate in tutorial sessions with their teachers is more important than
implementing the process approach to composition writing. It was not intended
that data be perceived in such a way.
Composite Undergraduate Student Results

This section reports the results of the questionnaire and the results of the follow-up to the questionnaire of the undergraduate-level ESL composition students who participated in this study. This section both presents the statistical results of the questionnaire and the reasons reported by these subjects for rating certain items on the questionnaire as they did. The focus of the results presented in this section is on the types of feedback the students reported to be the most beneficial and the least beneficial for helping them to improve their English academic writing skills. Table 1 contains the means, modes and standard deviations for the undergraduate subjects. For the chart containing the percent of undergraduate subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 2.

Subjects

Twenty-seven undergraduate students (twenty males and seven females) comprised this group. The subjects represented seven different nationalities. The number in parenthesis indicates the number of subjects. Indonesian (12), Korean (8), Japanese (3), Chinese (1), Jordanian (1), Malaysian (1), and Taiwanese (1). The subjects ranged in age from 18 years to 27 years, and the mean age was 21 years. The subjects had been in the US from two months to four and a half years; the average length of time was one year and two months.
This was the first ESL composition course at The Ohio State University for ten of the subjects, the second course for thirteen of the subjects, and the third course for four of the subjects.

**Major Findings for Composite Undergraduate Students**

The type of feedback that received the highest ratings from the undergraduate respondents was the tutorials. A majority of these respondents strongly agreed that the tutorials were a very important part of their composition course. The two major reasons reported by undergraduate respondents for their support of the tutorials were the following: (a) The tutorials provided personal attention that was geared to the individual needs of a particular student, and (b) During a tutorial session an instructor had an opportunity to clarify feedback that had been provided prior to the tutorial session.

Concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, a majority of the undergraduate respondents strongly agreed that their teachers should make the actual corrections on students' compositions. The two major reasons reported for preferring teachers to make the corrections were the following: (a) It was the teachers' job to make corrections, and (b) If teachers did not make the corrections, students would not know what the correct answers were.

Although a majority of the undergraduate respondents strongly agreed their teachers should make the corrections for them, there was also support from these students for the technique of teachers indicating and coding errors and requiring students to make their own corrections. The major reason reported by undergraduate respondents for wanting an opportunity to make their own
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2, 3 (44%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2 (41%)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2 (44%)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3 (63%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2 (59%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2 (37%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2 (30%)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2 (81%)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3 (41%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2 (48%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4 (52%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3 (48%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (48%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4 (59%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3 (52%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=27

Table 1: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Composite Undergraduate Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=27

Table 2: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Composite Undergraduate Students
corrections was that they believed this procedure helped them to acquire 
the self-editing skills they would need in the future when they no longer had the 
assistance of a teacher. Although many of the undergraduate respondents 
reported that they wanted an opportunity to make their own corrections, several 
of these same students also reported that they wanted their teacher to make the 
actual corrections for them on the final draft of a composition. It was also 
reported that teachers should make the actual corrections for students when the 
problem was a question of most appropriate word choice.

Although many of the undergraduate subjects supported the technique of 
teachers indicating and coding errors, the technique of teachers only indicating 
errors received low ratings. Comments from undergraduate subjects who did 
not support the practice of teachers only indicating errors suggested that 
although they believed it was beneficial for them to make their own corrections, 
they still needed guidance from their teacher about the type of problems that 
existed and suggestions from their teachers about how these problems might 
be solved.

Last, on the topic of error-correction feedback, a majority of the 
undergraduate respondents strongly agreed that no matter which type or types 
of error-correction techniques were used, their teachers should mark every 
error. Undergraduate students who agreed their teachers should mark all 
errors reported that this practice would prevent them from making the same 
mistakes in the future. There was, however, concern expressed that marking all 
errors could make students feel anxious and discouraged.

The results of the questionnaire and the follow-up showed that the 
undergraduate students were strong supporters of the process approach to
composition writing and that a majority of these students agreed it was best for them to write three drafts of a composition. Comments from undergraduate respondents stated that they believed that by having an opportunity to write multiple drafts of a composition, they were encouraged to do risk taking and hypothesis testing, which these respondents reported they would not do if they were in a composition course that implemented a single-draft approach. It was also reported that because these students were required to rewrite their compositions, they seriously considered and processed the feedback they received between drafts.

The composite undergraduate results also showed that a large percent of these students agreed that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content of the paper and that the focus of the feedback provided for a second draft should be on the language. The two major reasons reported for preferring the focus of the feedback for a first draft be on the content were the following: (a) The content of the paper was more important than the language, and (b) Content problems were more difficult to solve than language problems, and as such, students needed more time to work on that area.

A majority of the undergraduate respondents agreed that the content and the language of a composition should count equally for the grade. However, the item stating the content of a composition should count more for the grade received higher ratings than the item stating the language should count more for the grade. The major reason reported for preferring the content and the language count equally for the grade was that weaknesses in either of these
two areas would have a negative impact on the overall quality of a paper. The major reason reported for preferring that the content count more was that what is said is more important than how it is said.

The undergraduate respondents’ opinions were divided concerning whether or not all drafts of a composition or only the final draft should be graded. Although the ratings for the items dealing with this topic were scattered, there was more support for the item stating that only the final draft should be graded. The major reason reported for preferring that only the final draft receive a grade was that the final draft reflected the progress that a student had made and it was this progress that should be graded. There was also concern expressed that if all drafts were graded, students would be afraid to do hypothesis testing because they would not want to make any mistakes on their first draft, and as a result, their writing skills would remain at an elementary level. The major reason reported for preferring that all drafts be graded was that this would allow students to know how much progress they were making during the revision process.

Last, on the topic of grading, the undergraduate respondents’ opinions concerning whether or not their course should be graded satisfactory / unsatisfactory were also divided. The item dealing with this topic received the highest standard deviation of all the items on the student questionnaire. Undergraduate respondents who preferred to receive a letter grade reported that they had this preference because a letter grade was a more specific indicator of the quality of their work and of the progress they were making.
Undergraduate respondents who preferred a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system reported that the main concern should be with whether or not students were making progress, and not with the actual quality of their work.

A majority of the undergraduate respondents agreed that participating in peer-review activities improved their English and writing skills. However, these respondents reported that receiving peer review was more beneficial than giving peer review. The major reason reported for believing peer review was beneficial was that this activity helped to improve the contents of a student's paper because a peer-reviewer could point out areas that were not clear and suggest ways to make these areas clearer. For example, a peer-reviewer may suggest that more detail be added. There was, however, concern reported that because the students were all basically at the same level of proficiency in English, they may not be qualified to help each other with language issues.

A majority of the undergraduate students strongly agreed that reading improved their writing skills. The three major reasons reported by undergraduate respondents for believing that reading improved their writing skills were the following: (a) Reading helped build vocabulary, (b) Reading provided examples of grammatical structures, and (c) Reading provided examples of academic writing.

A majority of the undergraduate respondents disagreed that translating into English from their first language was helpful. Students who disagreed that translating was helpful reported that they were concerned that this strategy would cause problems due to negative transfer. However, there were respondents who reported that doing their initial planning and outlining in their
first language helped to improve the content of their papers because this strategy helped them to better remember what it was they wanted to say concerning their topic.

To conclude the examination of the undergraduate student data obtained by the questionnaire and by the follow-up to the questionnaire, it should be pointed out that for the most part the data obtained from the two individual undergraduate class sections were similar. The types of feedback that received the highest ratings on the student questionnaire from Undergraduate Class Section One were the same types of feedback that received the highest ratings from Undergraduate Class Section Two. Consequently, the types of feedback that received the lowest ratings from the two undergraduate class sections were the same. Furthermore, the most frequent reasons reported by respondents from the two undergraduate class sections for rating items on the questionnaire as they did were the same. There was, however, one exception that should be noted. Whereas a majority of the students in Undergraduate Section One reported that they were afraid to speak in class because they might make mistakes, a majority of the students in Undergraduate Class Section Two reported the opposite to be the case.

Table 3 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the respondents from undergraduate section one. For the chart for undergraduate section one containing the percent of these respondents who gave the same rating for an item, see Table 4. Table 5 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the respondents from undergraduate section two. For the chart for undergraduate section two containing the percent of these respondents who gave the same rating for an item, see Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Afraid to speak in class – May make errors</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1 (42%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2,4 (33%)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3 (83%)</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2 (83%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4 (58%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3 (42%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4 (58%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4 (58%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1 (42%)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=12

Table 3: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire
Undergraduate Students Section One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=12
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3 (53%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3 (87%)</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3 (53%)</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2 (53%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2 (53%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2,3 (40%)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (73%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2,3 (47%)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>123 (27%)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2 (47%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (53%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2 (80%)</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4 (53%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2 (47%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4 (47%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3,4 (40%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4 (53%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4 (53%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (73%)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (53%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>American friends correct spoken</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher correct all spoken</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid speak in class - make errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate helpful</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Composite Graduate Student Results

This section reports the results of the questionnaire and the results of the follow-up to the questionnaire of the graduate-level ESL composition students who participated in this study. This section both presents the statistical results of the questionnaire and the reasons reported by these subjects for rating certain items on the questionnaire as they did. The focus of the results presented in this section is on the types of feedback the students reported to be the most beneficial and the least beneficial for helping them to improve their English academic writing skills. Table 7 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the graduate subjects. For the chart containing the percent of graduate subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 8.

Subjects

Eighteen graduate students (ten females and eight males) comprised this group. The subjects represented seven different nationalities. The number in parenthesis indicates the number of subjects. Korean (5), Taiwanese (5), Turkish (4), Chinese (1), Japanese (1), Kuwaiti (1), and Saudi Arabian (1). The subjects ranged in age from 24 years to 40 years, and the mean age was 29 years. The subjects had been in the US from two months to four years; the average length of time was one year and three months. This was the first ESL composition course at The Ohio State University for eleven of the subjects and the second course for seven of the subjects.
Major Findings for Composite Graduate Subjects

A large majority of the graduate respondents strongly agreed that the tutorials were a very important part of their composition courses. The major reason reported by these subjects for supporting the use of tutorials was that during a tutorial session students were provided specific and detailed feedback about their compositions.

The composite graduate results showed that these respondents were strong supporters of the process approach to composition writing and that a majority of these students agreed that the best number of drafts to write for a composition was three. The three major reasons reported by these students for preferring to write multiple drafts of a composition were that by doing so they could: (a) do hypothesis testing, (b) concentrate on different aspects of a composition at different times, and (c) process feedback provided between drafts. The major reason reported for believing that writing multiple drafts of a composition allowed these students to do hypothesis testing was that by having opportunities to make revisions in their compositions, they did not feel pressured to produce a perfect first draft, and as such, they felt free to do some risk taking.

As for processing feedback between drafts and concentrating on different aspects of a composition at different times, a majority of the graduate respondents preferred: (a) to concentrate on and receive feedback about the content of a composition for a first draft, and (b) to concentrate on and receive feedback about the language of a composition for a second draft. The major
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2 (44%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2, 3 (44%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3 (61%)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3 (61%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2 (61%)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2 (61%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (78%)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2 (44%)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2 (83%)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3 (61%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3 (61%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2 (72%)</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3 (61%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2, 3 (39%)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4 (61%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2 (44%)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18

Table 7: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Composite Graduate Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class – May make errors</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18

Table 8: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Composite Graduate Students
reason reported by graduate respondents for preferring the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft be on the content was that correcting content problems required more time, and as such, feedback needed to be provided about content as soon as possible. It was also reported that as revisions were made in the content of a paper, more language problems were apt to arise, and as such, one needed to first be satisfied with the content of a composition before concentrating on language issues.

Concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, a majority of the graduate respondents both agreed that their instructors should make the actual corrections on their students’ papers and that teachers should indicate and code errors in order to give their students an opportunity to make their own corrections. Although it may seem a contradiction that both of these types of feedback would have received an almost equal amount of support, an examination of the comments written by these students for the follow-up activity revealed that they believed the choice of error-correction feedback should depend on draft number and the type of error committed. For the most part, graduate subjects who commented on these two types of error-correction feedback reported that they preferred their teachers make the actual corrections for them when the problem was a question of word choice, or when the error was on the final draft of a composition. As for the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors and requiring their students to make their own corrections, graduate respondents who supported this type of corrective feedback reported that having an opportunity to make their own corrections, especially when dealing with minor grammatical problems, allowed them to learn from their errors and helped them to acquire self-editing skills.
A majority of the graduate respondents disagreed with the practice of teachers only indicating errors. The major reason reported for not preferring this type of corrective feedback was that these students, even if they wanted to try to make their own corrections, needed guidance from their teachers as to the nature of their problems. It was reported, however, that it was acceptable for teachers to only indicate errors when dealing with careless mistakes made by a student when he or she should have known better (e.g., subject-verb agreement).

Last, on the topic of error-correction feedback, a majority of the graduate students agreed that no matter which type or types of marking techniques were used, their instructors should mark all errors. The major reason reported by these students for wanting all errors marked was so they would not be misled into believing something that was incorrect was correct, otherwise they might continue to make the same error in the future.

A majority of the graduate respondents agreed that having their written work peer-reviewed improved the content of their papers. The major reason reported for believing the content of papers was improved by participating in peer-review activities was that peer reviewers pointed out areas that were unclear and provided advice on how to make these areas clearer. There was, however, concern reported that peers might not be qualified to help with language problems. A majority of the graduate respondents also reported that receiving peer review was more helpful than giving peer review.

A majority of the graduate students either agreed or strongly agreed that only the final draft of a composition should be graded. The two major reasons reported for preferring that only a final draft be graded were: (a) The final draft
was a result of the progress that had been made on the composition, and as such, the grade should be a reflection of that progress, and (b) if all drafts of a composition were graded, students would be preoccupied with trying to produce error-free drafts as far as language was concerned, and consequently, they would be discouraged from doing hypothesis testing or including what might be important information because they were not sure whether or not they were expressing themselves correctly.

A majority of the graduate respondents agreed with the item stating that the language and the content of a composition should both count equally for the grade. However, the item stating that the content should count more received higher ratings than the item stating that the language should count more. The major reason reported for preferring that the content and the language count equally for the grade was that in academic writing weaknesses in either of this two areas would have a negative effect on the overall quality of a paper. The major reason reported for preferring the content count more was that what was said in a composition was more important than how it was said. It was also reported that because the students were still in the process of acquiring the language, they were bound to have many language problems in their compositions, and as such, to count the language as much or more than the content would not be fair.

Last, concerning the topic of grading, a majority of the graduate respondents preferred the letter grading system to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system. The major reason reported for preferring the letter grading
system was that this system was a more accurate and specific indicator of the quality of a student's work. It was reported, however, that implementing a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system could lower students' anxiety levels.

As for the reading-writing connection, a majority of the graduate respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that reading improved their English and writing skills. The major reason reported by these respondents for believing that reading improved their writing skills was that reading provided concrete examples of academic writing. It was also reported that reading helped students build vocabulary and improve grammar.

Finally, a majority of the graduate respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that it was beneficial for them to compose in their first language and translate into English. The major reason reported for believing that translation was not helpful was that this strategy produced errors due to negative transfer. It was reported, however, that outlining and doing initial planning in one's first language improved the content of a paper by helping the writer to remember what it was he or she wanted to say, especially if the information in question was acquired in the writer's first language.

To conclude the examination of the graduate student data obtained by the questionnaire and by the follow-up to the questionnaire, it should be pointed out that for the most part the data obtained from the two individual graduate class sections were similar. The types of feedback that received the highest ratings on the student questionnaire from Graduate Class Section One were the same types of feedback that received the highest ratings from Graduate Class Section Two. Consequently, the types of feedback that received the lowest ratings from
the two graduate class sections were the same. Furthermore, the most frequent reasons reported by respondents from the two graduate class sections for rating items on the questionnaire were the same.

The only area where the two graduate class sections were not in agreement was concerning whether or not students should be graded with a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade. Whereas a majority of students in graduate section one preferred the letter grading system, a majority of students in graduate section two reported that they would prefer to be graded with a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system.

Table 9 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the respondents from graduate section one. For the chart for graduate section one containing the percent of these respondents who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 10. Table 11 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the respondents from graduate section two. For the chart for graduate section two containing the percent of these respondents who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (80%)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3, 4 (40%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class – May make errors</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2 (80%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (80%)</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2, 3 (40%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (80%)</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4 (90%)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1 (40%)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=10

Table 9: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Graduate Students Section One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends to correct spoken errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Graduate Students Section One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3, 4 (37%)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2 (62%)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2 (62%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3, 4 (37%)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3 (87%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (62%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2 (37%)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2, 4 (37%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2, 4 (37%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3 (87%)</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2 (59%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3, 4 (50%)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3, 4 (50%)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2 (37%)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8

Table 11: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Graduate Students Section Two
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8

Table 12: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Graduate Students Section Two
Undergraduate Students' Results Compared with Graduate Students' Results

The purpose of this section is to present the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs about composition feedback of the undergraduate-level ESL students and the graduate-level ESL students who participated in this study. In order to achieve this goal, this section presents a comparison of the major findings for the undergraduate students and the graduate students.

The following seven topics are examined in this section: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation. This section compares both how highly these two groups of subjects rated items on the questionnaires concerning these seven topics and the major reasons reported by both groups for rating these items as they did.

Peer Review

Both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students agreed that participating in peer-review activities had positive effects on their English and writing skills. Although a majority of the students from both academic levels supported the use of peer review, the undergraduate-level students' ratings for this type of feedback were higher. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for supporting the use of peer review was that when students participated in peer-review activities they helped one another with content issues. Several students from both academic levels reported that having their papers peer-reviewed improved
the content of their papers because peer-reviewers were able to point out areas that were unclear and suggest ways to make those areas clearer. For example, a peer-reviewer may suggest that more detail is needed for the reader to better understand what the writer was trying to say. There was, however, concern reported by students from both academic levels that peer-reviewers may not be qualified to provide feedback about language.

Error Correction

The preferred type of error-correction feedback for both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students was for teachers to make the actual corrections on the compositions. Students from both academic levels reported, however, that the use of this type of error-correction feedback depended on error type and draft number. The consensus of the students from both academic levels was that teachers should make the actual corrections when dealing with usage problems (especially word choice) and when providing feedback for a final draft.

Although a majority of the students from both academic levels preferred their teachers make the actual corrections on the compositions, both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students also agreed that the technique of teachers indicating and coding errors to give students an opportunity to correct their own problems was beneficial. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for believing this type of error-correction feedback was beneficial was that it helped students to acquire the self-editing skills they would need when they no longer had a
teacher to help them. Students from both academic levels also reported that teachers should avoid making corrections based on guessing what they believed a student was trying to say, because to do so could result in the teacher guessing incorrectly and changing the intended content of a student's paper.

As for the practice of teachers only indicating that an error exists, both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students disagreed that this type of error-correction feedback was beneficial. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for not believing it was helpful for teachers to only indicate errors was that students, especially if they were to make their own corrections, needed guidance as to the nature of their problems and suggestions as to how these problems might best be solved. However, it was reported by students from both academic levels that it was acceptable for a teacher to only indicate an error when it was a question of a student having made a careless mistake (e.g., subject-verb agreement).

As for whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students' compositions, a majority of the undergraduate-level students strongly agreed and a majority of the graduate-level students agreed that their teachers should mark all errors. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for believing their teachers should mark all errors was that if teachers did not mark an error, students might be misled to believe something that was incorrect was correct, and as such, they would continue to make the same mistake in the future.
Last, on the topic of error-correction feedback, approximately half the students from both academic levels either agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers should correct spoken errors made by students in class. As for the students who believed their teachers should correct their spoken errors, the major reason reported by students from both academic levels for having this belief was that if their teachers did not correct their spoken errors, they might continue to make the same errors in the future. As for students who disagreed that their teachers should correct students’ spoken errors, the major reason reported by students from both academic levels for having this belief was that if their teachers corrected their spoken errors, they would not be willing to participate in class for fear of making mistakes. Students from both academic levels also reported that correcting spoken errors in class was a waste of time.

Multiple Drafts

Both the undergraduate-level students and the graduate-level students supported the process approach to composition writing, and a majority of students from both academic levels agreed that the best number of drafts to write of a composition was three. The three major reasons reported by students from both academic levels for preferring the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach were the following: (a) Because students had opportunities to revise their papers, they were not preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft, and as such, they felt free to do hypothesis testing, (b) Because students were not preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft as far as the language was concerned, they concentrated
more on the content of the first draft, and (c) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students were provided an opportunity to process and use the feedback they had received on earlier drafts.

Both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students also agreed that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content of the composition as opposed to the language. The two major reasons reported by students from both academic levels for preferring the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft be on the content were the following: (a) The content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, feedback concerning content issues needed to be provided as soon as possible, and (b) More time was required to correct content problems than to correct language problems, and as such, feedback concerning content problems needed to be provided as soon as possible. It was also reported by students from both academic levels that because more language problems were apt to arise as changes were made to the content of a composition, it was best to wait until the contents of a paper were satisfactory before devoting much time to language concerns.

**Tutorials**

Both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students strongly agreed that the tutorials were a very important part of their composition courses. The two most common reasons reported by students from both academic levels for believing the tutorials were beneficial were the following: (a) During a tutorial session a teacher focused on the
specific needs of an individual student, and (b) During a tutorial session
teachers could verify whether or not a student had understood feedback written
on a paper prior to the tutorial session.

Grading

As for the students' beliefs concerning whether all drafts of a composition or
only the final draft should be graded, both a majority of the undergraduate-level
students and a majority of the graduate-level students agreed that only the final
draft should receive a grade. The major reason reported by students from both
academic levels for preferring that only the final draft be graded was that they
were being graded according to the progress they had made. Concern was
also reported by students from both academic levels that if all drafts of a
composition were graded, students would be too preoccupied with trying to
produce an error-free first draft, and thus, they would be reluctant to do
hypothesis testing.

As for the students' beliefs concerning the role of content and language in
the assigning of a grade to a composition, although the opinions of both the
undergraduate-level students and those of the graduate-level students were
divided concerning this topic, the overall preference of the students from both
academic levels was for the content to count more. The major reason reported
by students from both academic levels for believing the content should count
more was that the content of the paper was more important than the language,
and as such, should be weighed more heavily when assigning an overall grade
to a composition.
As for the students’ beliefs concerning whether they should be graded using a letter grading system or a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system, although the opinions on this topic were mixed for both groups of students, the overall preference of both the undergraduate-level students and the graduate-level students was for being graded with a letter grading system. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for preferring the letter grading system was that the letter grading system was a more accurate and specific measurement of the quality of their work and of the progress they were making.

The Reading-Writing Connection

Both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students either agreed or strongly agreed that they improved their general English and their writing skills by reading materials written in English. The three major reasons reported by students from both academic levels for believing reading improved their writing skills were the following: (a) Vocabulary was increased by seeing new words in a meaningful context, (b) Grammar was improved by seeing new or problematic grammatical structures in a meaningful context, and (c) Reading provided good examples of different styles of academic writing.

Translation

Both a majority of the undergraduate-level students and a majority of the graduate-level students disagreed that it was helpful to write compositions in
their first language and then translate them into English. The major reason reported by students from both academic levels for not believing it was helpful to write compositions in their first language and translate them into English was that doing so would result in producing errors due to negative transfer. However, it was reported by students from both academic levels that using their first language when doing the initial planning and outlining of a paper improved the content of a composition because this strategy helped them better remember what it was they wanted to say. It was also reported by students from both academic levels that this strategy was especially helpful when the information to be included in a composition was acquired in the writer's first language.

This comparison of the data obtained from the undergraduate-level ESL composition students and the graduate-level ESL composition students has shown that the types of feedback reported by the two groups to be the most beneficial and the least beneficial for helping them to improve their English academic writing skills were similar. Furthermore, the major reasons reported by students from both academic levels for believing whether or not various types of feedback are beneficial were also similar.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, in order to allow broader generalizations to be made with the data obtained from the student subjects, tables containing composite-student statistics were presented. Table 13 contains the means, modes and standard deviations for Composite Students. For the chart containing the percent of the student subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3 (64%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3 (47%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2 (51%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2, 3 (36%)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3 (47%)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2, 4 (31%)</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3 (64%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (51%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2 (82%)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4 (47%)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3 (49%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3, 4 (47%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3 (51%)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3 (62%)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2 (53%)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4 (60%)</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4 (51%)</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2 (49%)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3 (53%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=45

Table 13: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Composite Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=45

Table 14: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Composite Students
Results According to Gender

An examination of the data obtained from the ESL composition students showed that for the most part the statistical results of the questionnaire for the male subjects and the statistical results of the questionnaire for the female subjects were similar. That is, the types of feedback that received the highest ratings on the student questionnaire from the male students were the same types of feedback that received the highest ratings from the female students. Consequently, the gender of the raters did not turn out to be a factor.

Furthermore, the reasons reported by members of the two groups on the follow-up to the questionnaire for rating items as they did were the same. Thus, it may be concluded that the beliefs about composition feedback reported in the section that compared the undergraduate results to the graduate results would apply to student subjects in this study regardless of gender. It should be noted, however, that there was one area where the beliefs of the male students and the female students differed. Whereas a majority of the male students reported a preference for a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system, a majority of the female students reported a preference for a letter grading system.

Table 15 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the student questionnaires completed by the male student subjects. For the chart containing the percent of the male subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 16. Table 17 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the student questionnaires completed by the female student subjects. For the chart containing the percent of the female subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3 (59%)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2 (41%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (48%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3 (48%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2 (41%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2 (37%)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3 (48%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2 (52%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2 (48%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2 (37%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3 (59%)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2 (48%)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2 (78%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4 (52%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4 (48%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4 (52%)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=27

Table 15: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Male Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=27

Table 16: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Male Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3 (59%)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (76%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3 (47%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2 (53%)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2, 3 (41%)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3 (41%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3 (47%)</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3 (53%)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2 (71%)</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2 (76%)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2 (71%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4 (47%)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (71%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3 (71%)</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2 (47%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2 (82%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2 (59%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3 (59%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2 (47%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3 (47%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3 (76%)</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3 (65%)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2 (41%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3 (41%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4 (65%)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4 (47%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1 (47%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3 (59%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18

Table 17: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Female Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18

Table 18: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Female Students
Results According to Academic Discipline

The student data obtained by the questionnaire and by the follow-up to the questionnaire were grouped according to the following four academic branches: (a) Accounting and Business, (b) Education and Humanities, (c) Engineering, and (d) Mathematics and Sciences. An examination of these data showed that students' beliefs concerning composition feedback were similar for all four groups. The statistical results of the questionnaire completed by the students representing these four academic branches were similar. That is, the types of feedback that received the highest ratings from a majority of the students from each of the four groups were the same. Consequently, the types of feedback that received the lowest ratings from a majority of the students from each of the four academic branches were also the same. Furthermore, the most frequent reasons reported for believing a particular type of feedback was beneficial or not were the same for all four academic branches. Thus, it may be concluded that the beliefs about composition feedback reported in the section that compared the undergraduate results to the graduate results would apply to student subjects in this study regardless of academic discipline.

Table 19 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the questionnaires completed by the Accounting and Business students. For the chart containing the percent of the Accounting and Business students who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 20. Table 21 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the questionnaires completed by the Education and Humanity students. For the chart containing the percent of the Education and Humanity students who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 22. Table
23 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the questionnaires completed by the Engineering students. For the chart containing the percent of the Engineering students who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 24. Table 25 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the questionnaires completed by the Mathematics and Science students. For the chart containing the percent of the Mathematics and Science students who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 26.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (80%)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2 (70%)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2, 3 (30%)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2, 3 (40%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2 (80%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4 (60%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3 (90%)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=10

Table 19: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Accounting and Business Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 20: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire
Accounting and Business Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (83%)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3,4 (42%)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (42%)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2,4 (42%)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (83%)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (83%)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2 (58%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3 (58%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3 (42%)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4 (92%)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 21: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Education and Humanities Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N=12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 22: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Humanities Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 23: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Engineering Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Engineering Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2, 3 (44%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2, 4 (33%)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3 (67%)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher indicates and coded errors</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>123 (33%)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3, 4 (44%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2 (56%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Reading improves writing</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4 (56%)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (56%)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=9

Table 25: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations for Student Questionnaire Mathematics and Science Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receiving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving peer review is helpful</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-teacher native feedback is helpful</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask American friends correct spoken errors</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher should correct all spoken errors</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Afraid to speak in class - May make errors</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Want more than three drafts</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Want less than three drafts</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Want more feedback on language</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want more feedback on content</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=9**

**Table 27: Item Rating Percentages for Student Questionnaire Mathematics and Science Students**
Student Interviews

This section reports the major findings of the oral interviews in which ESL composition students participated. Interviews were conducted with one student from each of the four class sections that participated in this study. The students who participated in the oral interviews were students who had indicated on their questionnaires that they would be willing to participate in an oral interview. Although several students had said on the questionnaire that they would be willing to participate in an oral interview, only one student from each class section agreed to do so when asked in person.

The interviews were conducted after the students had completed the questionnaires and the follow-up to the questionnaire. The focus of the examination of these interviews was on the types of feedback the subjects most preferred and the reasons they had reported for having those preferences. The presentation of data from the student interviews includes a discussion of the similarities and differences in the reported beliefs of the four subjects about composition feedback. The extent to which the opinions of the four student interviewees paralleled those of a majority of the students who participated in this study was also examined. This examination was done by comparing the results of the interviews with: (a) the composite-student statistical results of the questionnaire, and (b) all of the written comments obtained by the follow-up to the questionnaire activity. The results of this comparison are presented.
Student Interview Undergraduate Section One

The subject of the student interview for undergraduate section one was a 21 year old Japanese male majoring in accounting. The subject's career goal was to become a Certified Public Account. At the time of the interview, he had been in the United States for approximately six months. This was the subject's second ESL composition course at The Ohio State University. Prior to coming to the United States, the subject had studied English for six years. Four of those years were during his education in Junior High and High School, and the other two years were at a Japanese university.

The student interviewee from undergraduate section one preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach and reported that he seriously considered feedback provided for all drafts. He reported that the process approach both encourages hypothesis testing and allows him to use the feedback he is provided. Of particular interest is the fact that the subject reported that English courses in Japan use the single-draft approach, but that he would recommend implementing what he referred to as “the US way” (i.e., the process approach).

On the topic of differences reported by this student between the English courses he took in Japan and the English courses he has been taking in the US, it should also be noted that the subject stated that the focus of the English courses he took in Japan was on reading and translation and that writing courses were not readily available.

As for error-correction feedback, the subject preferred to have an opportunity to correct his own errors. The reason reported for this belief was
that when students correct their own mistakes, they are given an opportunity to learn from their mistakes. The subject reported that in Japan it is considered a teacher’s job to make the corrections, and as such, students are not given opportunities to make their own corrections. Once again this student reported that he preferred a type of feedback used in his courses in the US to a type of feedback that he experienced when he was studying English in his own country. Although he preferred to have an opportunity to make his own corrections, the subject reported that the teacher should make the actual corrections on the final draft of a composition.

The subject disagreed that receiving peer review was helpful; however, he did report that giving peer review improved his writing skills. The subject’s comments suggested that he would be more supportive of receiving peer review if the activity were approached differently. For example, he reported that if more time were allotted for this activity, it could be more beneficial.

The subject reported that he preferred to receive letter grades on all drafts of a composition. As for the course grade, he preferred a letter grading system to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system. The reason the subject preferred letter grades was that such a grading system is a more specific measurement of the quality of his work and of his progress.

Finally, the subject reported that reading materials written in English improved his English and writing skills. The area reported to be most helped by reading was vocabulary because reading allowed the subject to see new words being used in a meaningful context.
Student Interview Undergraduate Section Two

The subject of the student interview for undergraduate section two was a 19 year old Taiwanese female who planned to major in accounting. At the time of the interview, she had been in the US for approximately six weeks. This was the subject’s first ESL composition course at The Ohio State University. The subject reported that she was taking this composition class because it was a requirement. Prior to coming to the United States, the subject had studied English for seven years. The subject reported that she had studied composition in her English classes when she was in High School in Taiwan.

The student interviewed from undergraduate section two reported that participating in peer-review activities had positive effects on her writing. The area reported to be the most positively affected by this activity was the content of her compositions. The subject also reported that what she had learned from participating in peer-review activities would have long term positive effects on her writing.

The subject supported the process approach to composition writing and reported that it was generally best to write three drafts of a paper. The subject preferred the focus of the feedback for a first draft be on the content and the focus of the feedback for the second draft be on the language. The subject reported that by writing multiple drafts of a composition, she had an opportunity to do hypothesis testing. The subject also reported that because she had to rewrite her compositions, she seriously considered the feedback she received for the different drafts, which she said she would not have done if her course had implemented the single-draft approach.
Regarding the process approach to composition writing, the subject also made some interesting comments that dealt with cultural differences, and how those differences affect decisions concerning the type of methodologies that teachers may implement in courses in her country. For example, the subject reported that if she were an ESL teacher in Taiwan, she would like to have her students write multiple drafts of a composition. However, according to the subject, in her culture students are expected to produce high quality work the first time, and as such, it would not be appropriate to give students opportunities to revise their compositions.

The subject strongly agreed that the tutorials were a very important part of her composition course. The major reason reported by the subject for supporting the use of tutorials in her composition course was that the personal attention she received from her instructor had a positive effect on her writing skills.

The subject preferred to receive a grade on each draft of a composition. The reason reported for this belief was that by having all drafts graded, she has a better understanding of the quality of her work at all stages of the writing process.

The subject reported that reading materials written in English had a positive effect on her English and writing skills. The subject reported that the area that was most improved by reading was her vocabulary.

Finally, the subject reported that translating a composition into English from her first language was not helpful. The reason reported by the subject for not believing this strategy was helpful was that it produced grammatical problems due to negative transfer.
The subject of the student interview for graduate section one was a 27 year old Turkish female pursuing a doctoral degree in Early and Middle Childhood Education. At the time of the interview, she had been in the US for approximately five months. This was the subject's first ESL composition course at The Ohio State University. The subject's career goal was to be a teacher trainer in Turkey. Prior to coming to the US, the subject had taught English in a Junior High School and a High School in Turkey.

The student interviewed from graduate section one reported that the tutorials in which she participated with her instructor was one of the most important aspects of her composition course. The subject's major reason for having this belief was that during a tutorial session her instructor provided her with detailed and specific feedback concerning her writing.

The subject reported that she preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach and that she preferred to write three or four drafts of a composition. The subject reported that she preferred to write multiple drafts of a composition because this allowed her both to concentrate on different aspects of her paper at different times and to process feedback provided between drafts.

Both the practice of teachers making corrections on students' compositions and the system of teachers indicating and coding errors to give students an opportunity to make their own corrections received support from this subject. She reported that the type of error-correction feedback a teacher used should depend on the type of error that a student has committed. For example, whereas the subject reported that correcting her own grammatical errors helped
she to learn from her mistakes, she preferred for her teacher to supply the corrections for her when problems were due to inappropriate word choice. The subject, however, did not support the method of teachers only indicating errors because she needed to know the exact nature of her problems, especially if she were required to make her own corrections.

The subject reported that peer-review activities could improve the content of a composition. The subject, however, cautioned that a peer-reviewer might not be qualified to help with language issues.

As for the reading-writing connection, it was reported that reading materials written in English helped the subject to improve her writing skills. For example, the subject reported that reading journal articles provided her with a good source of examples of academic writing.

Concerning the topic of grading, the subject reported that the content of a composition should count more for the grade than the language. This belief was based on the opinion that what was said is more important than how it was said. The subject also preferred the letter grading system because it is a more specific indicator of the quality of her work, and of the progress she is making.

The subject cautioned that students should not be afraid to participate in class for fear of making spoken errors and that teachers should not correct all of their students’ spoken errors because this would be too disruptive. The interview was concluded by the subject stating that it was important for ESL composition teachers to discuss the topic of feedback with their students.
Student Interview Graduate Section Two

The subject of the interview for graduate section two was a 30 year old Kuwaiti female pursuing a Master’s degree in English Education at The Ohio State University. The subject’s educational background included studying English for eight years before coming to the US. The subject reported that the focus of several of the English courses she had taken in Kuwait was on writing. The subject reported that prior to coming to the US she had taught undergraduate-level English courses for two years in Kuwait. The subject also reported that prior to attending The Ohio State University she had completed two English composition courses at The University of Illinois. At the time the interview was conducted, the subject had been in the US for two years and was enrolled in her second ESL composition course at The Ohio State University. The subject reported that her two major career goals after completing her Master’s degree were to pursue a doctoral degree at The Ohio State University, and then to become a teacher educator in Kuwait.

The student interviewed from graduate section two reported that participating in peer-review activities had a positive effect on the content of her papers because the activity helped her to acquire a better sense of audience. Of particular interest was the fact that the subject reported that because of cultural differences, peer review would not be an acceptable type of activity to do in classes in her county. This, according to the subject, was because the educational system in her county is very teacher-centered, and as such, if the teacher is not always at the center of attention, the students do not believe that the teacher is doing his or her job. The subject pointed out, however, that when
international students from educational systems such as hers come to the US, they usually do not know what to expect, and as such, are often more willing to participate in activities that would not be considered appropriate in their own countries.

The subject preferred the process approach to composition writing and reported that three drafts of a paper was the best number to write. It was reported that the process approach allowed her both to do hypothesis testing and to process feedback received between drafts. The subject also reported that she did little or nothing with the feedback she had received when she took single-draft composition courses in Kuwait.

The subject reported that the tutorials were an important part of her composition class because during a tutorial session she received personal attention addressing her specific needs. The subject also pointed out that tutorials helped students and teachers develop a closer relationship that had a positive effect on the learning process.

As for the subject's beliefs about error-correction feedback, she reported that for the most part she preferred the teacher to indicate and code errors in order to be given an opportunity to make her own corrections. The subject reported that by making her own corrections, she was able both to learn from her mistakes and to acquire self-editing skills. It was reported, however, that instructors should provide the corrections on a final draft of a paper.

As for the topic of grading, the subject preferred receiving letter grades because the letter grading system is a more specific measurement of the quality
of her work. The subject also preferred to have all drafts of a composition graded because this gave her a better idea of how much more work she needs to do when making revisions on an earlier draft.

Concerning the reading-writing connection, the subject reported that reading improved her English and writing skills by building vocabulary and by providing concrete examples of complex grammatical structures. The subject also reported that reading provided her with examples of academic writing.

Finally, the subject reported that writing her compositions in her first language and then translating them into English was not helpful because doing so would make her compositions sound awkward due to negative transfer. The subject reported, however, that using her first language when preparing an outline for a composition had positive effects on the content.

Summary of Major Findings from Student Interviews and Comparison of Student Interview Findings to Composite Student Findings

For the most part, the four ESL composition students who participated in the oral interviews reported similar beliefs about composition feedback. Furthermore, their beliefs about composition feedback paralleled those of a majority of the students who participated in this study.

The area where the beliefs of the student interviewees were the most similar concerned the process approach to composition writing. All four subjects preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach. All four subjects also reported that one of the major advantages of the process approach was that it gave students an opportunity to process the feedback they
were provided. As a matter of fact, three of the four subjects reported that they had previously been in writing courses that used the single-draft approach and that they did not process the feedback they were provided in those courses. Furthermore, those same three subjects also reported that if the courses in which they were enrolled at the time of the interviews had been using the single-draft approach, they would not have processed the feedback they were receiving. The major reason reported by these subjects for not processing feedback in a single-draft course was that they would not receive further feedback concerning their processing of that feedback.

Three of the four student interviewees also reported that a major advantage of writing multiple drafts of a composition was that by doing so they were encouraged to do hypothesis testing. The major reason reported by all three of those subjects for believing that the multiple-draft approach encouraged hypothesis testing was that knowing they would have opportunities to make revisions in their papers, they would not be afraid to write something without being sure if it were correct linguistically.

The opinions of the four student interviewees about the process approach paralleled those of a majority of the students who participated in this study. All four subjects, as did a majority of the student participants, preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single draft-approach. Furthermore, these four subjects, as did a majority of the subjects who commented on the process approach, reported that the two major advantages of the process approach were: (a) it gave students an opportunity to do hypothesis testing and (b) it gave students an opportunity to process the feedback they were provided.
Three of the four student interviewees reported that the tutorials were one of the most important aspects of their composition course. The major reason reported by all three of those subjects for supporting the use of tutorials was that during a tutorial session their instructor provided them with detailed and specific feedback concerning their individual needs. A large majority of the students who participated in this study also reported that the tutorials were one of the most important aspects of their composition course. Furthermore, the most common reason reported by student subjects for supporting the use of tutorials was that during a tutorial session a student received personal attention addressing his or her specific needs.

Three of the four student interviewees reported that having their compositions peer-reviewed had a positive effect on their writing skills. All three of those subjects reported that the area of their papers that was the most positively affected by peer review was the content. The major reason reported by the interviewees for believing that peer review improved the content of a composition was that a peer-reviewer was able to point out areas that were unclear and to suggest ways to make those areas clearer. Two of the interviewees also made comments to the effect that participating in peer-review activities had helped them to develop a better sense of audience, and that this sense of audience would help them with their future writing needs when they no longer had anyone to review their writing.

Although one of the student interviewees disagreed that having his compositions peer-reviewed improved his writing skills, he did report that giving peer review to a fellow classmate helped him to acquire editing skills that he
was able to apply to his own writing. Furthermore, this same student reported that peer-review activities could be more successful if more time were devoted to the activity.

A majority of the student subjects in this study also reported that participating in peer-review activities had a positive effect on their writing skills. Furthermore, a majority of the student subjects who commented on this topic also reported that the area of their compositions that was most improved by participating in peer-review activities was the content.

Three of the four student interviewees reported that reading materials written in English had a positive effect on their writing skills. The major reason reported by those three subjects for believing reading improved their writing skills was that reading helped them to increase their vocabulary by seeing new words in context. Two of the student interviewees also reported that reading journal articles concerning their major improved the style of their writing by providing examples of academic writing.

A large majority of the student subjects also reported that reading improved their general English and their writing skills. One of the major reasons reported by student subjects for believing reading improved their English and writing skills was that reading helped to build vocabulary by presenting new words in a meaningful context. Several student subjects who commented on this topic, as did two of the student interviewees, also reported that reading provided concrete examples of academic writing styles.

During the interviews, three of the four subjects discussed their preferences for receiving error-correction feedback. All three of those subjects reported that they both preferred to be given an opportunity to make their own corrections.
and to have their teachers make the corrections for them. The major reason reported for wanting an opportunity to make their own corrections was that doing so helped them to become independent writers. As for teachers making the actual corrections on students' papers, two of the student interviewees reported that they preferred that the teacher make the corrections on the final draft of a composition.

A majority of the student subjects in this study also supported both the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors and the practice of teachers making the actual corrections on students’ compositions. Furthermore, a majority of the student subjects who commented on this topic reported that being given an opportunity to make their own corrections helped them to acquire the self-editing skills they would need in the future when they no longer had a teacher to turn to for help. In addition, several student subjects who preferred to have an opportunity to make their own corrections reported that their teachers should make the actual corrections on a final draft.

During the student interviews three of the four subjects discussed their preferences for receiving grades. All three of those subjects reported that they preferred the letter grading system to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system. Two of the student interviewees also reported that they preferred to have all drafts of a composition graded. The major reason reported by student interviewees for preferring the letter grading system was that the letter grading system is a more accurate and specific indicator of the quality of a student's work and of the progress a student is making. The major reason reported by the student interviewees for preferring that all drafts of a composition be graded
was that by receiving a grade on all drafts of a composition, students receive feedback concerning how much progress they are making as they revise their papers.

A majority of the student subjects in this study also preferred the letter grading system to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system. Furthermore, a majority of the student subjects who commented on this topic also preferred the letter grading system because they believed it is a more specific measurement of the quality of their work and of the progress they are making.

During the student interviews, two of the four subjects discussed their beliefs concerning writing compositions in their first language and then translating the compositions into English. Both of these subjects reported that this strategy was not beneficial because they believed direct translation produced problems due to negative transfer.

A majority of the student subjects also reported that translation was not beneficial. The major reason reported by student subjects for believing that translating was not beneficial was also because they believed translating produced errors due to negative transfer.

This section has shown that the four ESL composition students who participated in the oral interviews reported similar beliefs about composition feedback. For the most part, the types of feedback the student interviewees reported to be the most beneficial were the same and the reasons they reported for having those preferences were similar. Furthermore, their beliefs about composition feedback closely paralleled those of a majority of the students who participated in this study.
The Focus Group

The purpose of the focus-group activity was to investigate advanced ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback. The focus-group activity was also designed to: (a) help determine the degree to which ESL composition students are willing to share their beliefs about composition feedback, (b) investigate whether or not the participants' opinions about composition feedback changed after they had been given both an opportunity to reflect on the topic and to hear the opinions of others, and (c) provide data about the results of this type of activity for its possible inclusion in further research designs.

The focus-group participants were the students from Graduate Section One, their instructor, and the writer of this dissertation. All ten of the students from Graduate Section One participated in the activity.

The focus-group activity was conducted after the students had completed the student questionnaires and the follow-up to the questionnaire. The focus group was conducted during the students' regular class session and lasted approximately 30 minutes.

The activity began by presenting the participants with the results of the questionnaires they had completed and a few of the comments they had written for the follow-up activity. The participants were also given a brief presentation on research concerning the topic of composition feedback. Following the presentation of these materials, the participants discussed their beliefs about composition feedback.
At the end of the session the students were asked to write a short reflection paper at home about their experience participating in the focus-group activity. The participants were asked both to report if any of their beliefs about composition feedback had changed because of having participated in this activity, and whether or not they believed ESL composition teachers and their students should have similar in-class discussions on the topic of feedback.

**Researcher's Observations of The Focus-Group Activity**

The word which first came to this researcher's mind when reflecting upon the focus-group activity was “enthusiasm.” The focus-group participants seemed to take the activity seriously and were eager to make their opinions known. The participants also seemed to be interested in the opinions of their fellow classmates and made it known when they agreed or disagreed with the comments of the other participants (both verbally and by either nodding or shaking their heads).

The first type of feedback discussed was peer review. Although the results of the student questionnaire showed a majority of the students from this class section agreed that participating in peer-review activities had positive effects on their writing, 20% of these students disagreed that peer-review activities were beneficial.

The main theme of the dialog concerning peer review was that for this activity to be successful, there had to be a relationship of trust among the participants. As one might expect, it was mentioned that trust meant that peer-reviewers must have knowledge of the topic of a paper to be able to provide
feedback concerning the paper's content. As the discussion progressed, however, opinions were voiced that showed "trust" might not only be a question of subject knowledge, but also a question of a psychological compatibility among the members of a peer-review group. For example, one of the focus-group participants commented, "The personality of the person is very important. And how he or she reacts." On this same note, another participant expressed the opinion that if there were a good rapport between the members of a peer-review activity, the activity could be successful even if the members were not majoring in the same field. For example, that participant stated, "I do peer review with a friend of mine, and even though we don't have the same major, she is someone I can trust. So we ask each other questions about parts in our papers that are not clear and this helps a lot."

The next topic discussed was error-correction feedback. The results of the student questionnaire showed that the participants of the focus group equally supported the practice of teachers making the actual corrections for students and the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors to give students an opportunity to make their own corrections. As with the comments on the follow-up to the questionnaire completed by these students, the main reason expressed at the focus group for believing students should have an opportunity to make their own corrections was because this practice helped students to develop self-editing skills.

As for the practice of teachers making the actual corrections on students' papers, several students from this class section reported on the follow-up that they preferred their teachers make the actual correction when the problem was
a question of most appropriate word choice. One of the focus-group participants also stated that teachers should supply the correct answer for students when it was a question of most appropriate word choice.

Perhaps the most interesting view expressed during the focus-group activity concerning error-correction feedback was that of a participant who was more interested in receiving feedback about content than receiving feedback about language. This participant stated, "At this stage the teacher's comments about the content are more important for me than the comments about the language."

At this point the discussion turned to the process approach to composition writing. The results of the questionnaire showed that a large majority of the focus-group participants preferred to write multiple drafts of a composition. A majority of the comments expressed at the focus group also were supportive of the process approach. As previously mentioned, one of the reasons for conducting the focus-group activity was to investigate whether or not students' opinions about composition feedback changed after the students had been given an opportunity to hear the opinions of others. During the discussion of the process approach to composition writing, an example of the opinions of one student affecting the opinions of another student was observed. After having heard positive comments about the process approach, one of the participants stated,"...but it is not like reality. In reality you only have one product, so for me this is not like what we really do." Upon hearing these comments another participant stated, "Yes, but by having the multiple-draft system, even if I don't have a teacher to help me in the future, I can set up the same system. I can write a first draft for myself, then I can make revisions on it from what I learned from the class." The student who had made the negative comments about the
process approach seemed to listen carefully to these comments supporting the process approach, and although he made no verbal reply, he nodded his head in agreement.

The focus-group activity concluded with a brief discussion on the topic of grading. One of the participants raised an interesting point concerning the topic of whether all drafts or only the final draft should be graded. This participant reported that all drafts should be graded to show progress, but only the grade for the final draft should be counted for the course grade. For example, this participant stated, "I like having a grade on each draft. This will give us an idea how much progress we are making. The grade for the last draft is the one that should count for the final grade." It should be noted that the comments on the follow-up to the questionnaire from the students in this class section who reported that all drafts should be graded showed that those students also reported that grading all drafts showed how much progress had been made between drafts. As for the students from this class section who reported that only the final draft should be graded, they reported that by only grading the final draft, teachers were rewarding the progress students had made. The aforementioned comments expressed by the member of the focus group, however, combined both the viewpoint of the students from this class section who preferred that all drafts receive a grade and the viewpoint of the students from this class section who preferred that only the final draft be graded.
Results of Reflection Papers

Forty percent of the focus-group participants wrote a reflection paper concerning their impressions about the activity. Although none of the participants who wrote a reflection paper reported that the activity had caused them to change their opinions about composition feedback, all of the students who wrote a reflection paper gave positive comments about the experience and agreed that it was important for ESL composition teachers and their students to discuss the topic of feedback. The major reason reported by the focus-group participants for believing it was important for ESL composition teachers and their students to discuss feedback was that by having open lines of communication concerning feedback, students had a better understanding of their teachers' expectations, and as a result, students were better equipped to process their teachers' feedback and meet their teachers' expectations.

The following five comments concerning the importance of ESL composition teachers and their students discussing feedback were taken from the reflection papers written by participants of the focus group: (a) "it would be a good idea for composition teachers to discuss in class with their students why they use the types of feedback they do, and get their students' opinions in ways similar to your study.", (b) "...when students are well aware of what they are doing, it will be more likely for them to make progress according to their teachers' expectations.", (c) "...teachers should explain why they use their feedback. What teachers want from students should be clear.", (d) "Teachers need to
explain the feedback they use. If we can’t understand the feedback, we can’t use the feedback.”, and (e) “If I don’t want to have peer-editing then I can say my reasons. Therefore it is good to be discussed in class.”

To summarize, the results of the focus-group activity showed that the participants were both willing and interested in discussing the topic of composition feedback. Furthermore, the reflection papers written by the participants showed that these students believed that it was important for ESL composition teachers and their students to discuss the topic of feedback. Finally, the results of the focus group showed that ESL composition students were able to have an influence on one another concerning their beliefs about composition feedback.
Composite Instructors

The purpose of this section is the following: (a) To provide a general profile of the beliefs about composition feedback of the ESL composition instructors who participated in this study, and (b) To determine the degree to which these instructors were in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback. It should be noted that directly following this section is a section comparing the instructor findings with the student findings.

The following seven topics were examined in this section: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation.

The instructor data examined in this section included the following: (a) The statistical results of the questionnaires completed by the instructors, (b) Written comments provided by the instructors at the end of the questionnaires, and (c) information obtained from the instructors during the oral interviews in which they participated.

Table 27 contains the means, modes, and standard deviations for the items on the questionnaires completed by the instructor subjects. For the chart containing the percent of these subjects who gave the same rating to an item, see Table 28.
Subjects

Four instructors from the ESL composition program at The Ohio State University participated in this study. Each of these four instructors taught one of the four advanced-level ESL composition classes that participated in this study. Two of these class sections were for undergraduate-level students and the other two class sections were for graduate-level students. The data obtained from these instructors dealt with the feedback they were providing the students in the class sections that participated in this study. All four of the instructors were male. At the time the data were gathered, two of the instructors held the Doctorate, whereas the other two instructors were pursuing a doctoral degree at The Ohio State University. The instructors ranged in age from 37 years to 48 years. The instructors had taught from 2 to 22 courses in the ESL composition program at The Ohio State University. The instructors represented the following four nationalities and numbers: American (1), Chinese (1), Surinamese (1), and Zairian (1).

Peer Review

The results of the instructor questionnaire showed that all four instructors reported that having ESL composition students participate in peer-review activities had positive effects on the students’ writing skills. Three of the instructors agreed on the questionnaire and one of the instructors strongly agreed that peer-review activities improved ESL students’ writing skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Peer review is helpful</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher corrects all spoken errors</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1, 2 (50%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students afraid speak - May make errors</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More than three drafts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Less than three drafts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Grade all drafts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grade only final draft</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1, 2 (50%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3, 4 (50%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reading improves writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Translate from first language is helpful</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2 (75%)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3, 4 (50%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=4

Table 27: Means, Modes, and Standard Deviations Instructor Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peer review is helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students only trust teacher feedback</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher corrects all spoken errors</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students afraid speak - May make errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Three drafts is best number</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than three drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Less than three drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grade all drafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grade only final draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grade Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Language and content equal for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Content counts more for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Language counts more for grade</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher makes corrections</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teacher indicates and codes errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher only indicates errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher marks all errors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Focus on language first draft</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Focus on content first draft</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tutorials are helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reading improves writing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Translate from first language helpful</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Read aloud to self-edit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=4

Table 28: Item Rating Percentages for Instructor Questionnaire
Although the statistical results of the instructor questionnaire suggested that all four instructors had a positive attitude about peer review, the comments written on the questionnaires and made during the oral interviews were less than positive for three of the four instructors. The three instructors who did not express positive opinions about peer review were the three instructors who assigned a rating of three (agree) to Item #1: “Having my students participate in peer-review activities improves their writing skills.” All three of these instructors reported that they were not using peer review in their class section that participated in this study. One of these three instructors reported that the main reason why he was not using peer review for his class section that participated in this study was because being a graduate-level course, the students wrote papers dealing with a variety of different topics depending on their major, and as such, often there were not enough students majoring in the same subject to be able to help one another with content issues. This same instructor did report, however, that he has had success with peer review when it was used with undergraduate students who were writing papers about the same topic.

The other two instructors whose comments regarding peer review were not favorable and who reported that they were not using peer review in their class sections that participated in this study, reported that they had tried having students in previous courses participate in peer-review activities, but did not believe their students were receptive to the activity. One of those two instructors reported, however, that he was having the students in his class do in-class collaborative writing assignments and reported that this activity was producing positive effects. The writer of this dissertation observed one of those activities the day he was in that class to have the students do the follow-up to the
questionnaire and mentioned to the instructor during the interview that it seemed as if the students were commenting on what one another had contributed to the paper, and as such, it appeared that the students were doing a peer-review activity. The instructor agreed with that observation.

As for the instructor who strongly agreed on the questionnaire that having his students participate in peer-review activities improved their writing skills, his comments about this topic were positive. This instructor reported that he was using peer review with his students and that he was achieving positive effects with this activity. It should be noted that the class section in question was an undergraduate-level course. This instructor reported that for peer review to be successful, one must follow a certain procedure. According to this instructor, the first step of the procedure should be to have a class discussion on the topic of peer review. This class discussion is then followed by having all the students participate in an in-class peer review of a paper that was written by an ESL composition student in a different class section. The instructor reported that this initial preparation helped to familiarize students with the activity, and thus helped to account for its success. The instructor also reported that students should be grouped according to academic field to better help one another with the content of a paper. This instructor pointed out that an advantage of having students peer review papers written by a classmate in the same field was that whereas a teacher might not have the subject knowledge to help a particular student with the content of his or her paper, another student in the class may have the necessary subject knowledge.
Error Correction

Items on the instructor questionnaire concerning error-correction feedback dealt with the following three techniques: (a) The teacher makes the actual corrections on students' papers, (b) The teacher indicates and codes errors and requires students to make their own corrections, and (c) The teacher only indicates errors and requires students to make their own corrections.

Of the three items that dealt with error-correction feedback, the item that received the highest ratings from the instructors was Item #15: "I indicate where a problem is and tell what type it is (e.g., tense problem) but I do not make the actual changes." The mean score for this item was 3.25. Two of the instructors strongly agreed with this item, one instructor agreed, and one instructor disagreed. The most common reason reported by the instructors for believing it was beneficial to have students try to make their own corrections was that this technique helped students to acquire the self-editing skills they would need in the future when they no longer had a teacher to help them. Two of the instructors also expressed concern that when teachers make corrections for their students, they might be guessing what a student was trying to say, and as such, might guess incorrectly and change the intended content of the student's composition. The instructors also reported that it was important for students to know what type of error had been committed, and that at the beginning of a new term they provided their students a handout explaining their coding system.

Both Item #14: ("I make the corrections on my students' papers for them.") and Item #16: ("I only indicate where a problem is (i.e., circle it underline it, etc.), but not correct it, nor tell what type it is.") received low ratings from the
instructors. The mean score for both of these items was 2.25, with three of the instructors disagreeing with both of these items and one instructor agreeing. Although the ratings for Item #15 were high, and the ratings for Item #14 and Item #16 were low, an examination of the comments provided by the instructors on the questionnaire and an examination of the oral interviews conducted with the instructors revealed that all four of the instructors used a combination of these three types of error-correction feedback. As a matter of fact, one of the instructors reported that he had rated each of the three error-correction techniques “2” (disagree) because he used them all. The instructors reported that the two main factors that determined the type of error-correction feedback they provided their students were the following: (a) Error type, and (b) Draft number. As for error type, the instructors reported that they tended to make the actual corrections for their students if the problem was with word choice because their students might not be able to solve the problem themselves. The instructors also reported that they tended to make the actual correction when dealing with a complex grammatical problem because to do so was easier. It was also reported that when a student had made the same error in the same composition several times, the instructors would correct the problem the first time or two to serve as a model and then would indicate the same problem throughout the rest of the paper to give the student an opportunity to practice making the correction. One of the instructors also reported that during the first tutorial session he had with a student, he asked the student what types of feedback he or she preferred and took that input into consideration when marking that particular student’s compositions. As for draft number, the
instructors reported that if after having given their students opportunities to make their own corrections on earlier drafts there were still problems remaining on the final draft, they would then make the corrections.

At this point it would be appropriate to examine the results for Item #17: “No matter which system is used, (Items 14, 15 or 16), I mark all my students’ errors.” All four instructors rated this item “2” (disagree). The major reason reported for not marking all errors on students’ compositions was that to do so, especially if there were a large number of errors, could make students feel discouraged and raise their anxiety levels.

Last, concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, two of the instructors strongly disagreed on the questionnaire and two of the instructors disagreed with Item #3: “I correct all the spoken language errors my students make in class.” The instructors reported that they rarely corrected their students’ spoken language errors because they did not want to make their students anxious about participating in class and asking questions. It was also reported that because these courses were writing classes, it would not be appropriate to be preoccupied with spoken language errors. It should be noted that all four of the instructors also reported that they believed their students were sometimes afraid to speak in class because they might make language mistakes. Three of the instructors strongly agreed on the questionnaire, and one of the instructors agreed with Item #4: “I think my students are sometimes afraid to speak in class because they may make language mistakes.”
Multiple Drafts

The data obtained from the instructors showed that all four instructors supported the process approach to composition writing and that they tended to require their students to write three drafts of a composition. All four instructors disagreed on the questionnaire that their students should write less than three drafts of a composition and all four instructors disagreed on the questionnaire that their students should write more than three drafts. However, two of the instructors reported that if a student’s second draft was of a high quality, they would not require a third draft. These same two instructors also reported that if a student’s third draft still contained many problems, they would require the student to write more than three drafts.

The following five reasons were reported by the instructors for believing the multiple-draft approach was superior to the single-draft approach: (a) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students have an opportunity to make their own corrections, and thus learn from their errors, (b) Because students have opportunities to correct their errors, they will not be anxious about having errors in an earlier draft, and thus will be willing to do the hypothesis testing needed to achieve a higher level of proficiency in English, (c) When using the single-draft approach, content suffers because students are too preoccupied with trying to produce an error free paper as far as the language is concerned, (d) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students concentrate on different aspects of the composition at different times, and (e) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students are given an opportunity to process feedback.
All four instructors also reported that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content of a composition and not the language. The two major reasons reported for believing that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content were the following: (a) If the focus of the feedback for a first draft were on the language, then students would be too preoccupied with language concerns, and as such, the content of the paper would suffer, and (b) Because the main purpose of these courses was to teach students to write academic papers, the content was more important than the language, and as such, feedback about content issues needed to be provided as soon in the writing process as possible.

Tutorials

The data obtained from the instructors showed that they all supported the use of tutorials in their composition courses. As for the statistical results of the questionnaire, 100% of the instructors strongly agreed with Item #20: “The tutorials are a very important part of this course.” The following five reasons were reported by the instructors for believing that the tutorials were beneficial: (a) During a tutorial session a teacher focused on the specific needs of an individual student, (b) Tutorials provided an opportunity to verify whether or not feedback given for a previous draft had been understood, (c) Students were more focused and receptive to feedback during a tutorial session, and as a result, the students often suggested acceptable changes in their compositions during the sessions, (d) During a tutorial session a teacher and student could discuss changes that a student had made based on feedback provided by the
teacher on an earlier draft, thus allowing the teacher to see how the student had processed that feedback, and (e) During a tutorial session a teacher and student could discuss preferences for feedback.

**Grading**

The instructors provided data about the following three areas concerning the topic of grading: (a) Whether or not all drafts or only the final draft of a composition should be graded, (b) The role of language and content in the assigning of a grade to a composition, and (c) Whether or not the students in their courses should be graded using a letter grading system or a satisfactory / unsatisfactory grading system. It should be noted that at the time the data were gathered the ESL composition courses at The Ohio State University used a letter grading system of “A” through “E”.

The results of the questionnaire showed that all four instructors preferred to grade only the final draft of a composition. All four instructors agreed with Item #9: “Only the final draft should receive a letter grade.” Furthermore, all four instructors disagreed with Item #8: “All drafts should receive a letter grade.” The major reason reported for believing that only the final draft of a composition should be graded was because they believed the grade for a composition should be based on how well the students processed the feedback they had received on earlier drafts and the progress that had been made because of the students’ processing of this feedback. Although all four instructors agreed it was best to only grade the final draft, one of the instructors reported that it could be helpful to grade all drafts of a composition to show students how much more
progress needed to be made for the final draft. However, this same instructor also reported that if all drafts were graded, the grade for the last draft should be weighed more heavily to reward students for the progress they had made during the revision process.

As for the role of language and content in the assigning of a grade to a composition, the statistical results of the questionnaire showed that all four instructors reported that the content of a composition should count more for the grade than the language. The mean score was 3.50 for Item #12: "The content of the composition should count more than the language for the grade." Two of the instructors agreed and the other two strongly agreed that the content of a composition should count more than the language for the grade. Furthermore, the mean score was only 1.75 for Item #13: "The language of the composition should count more than the content for the grade." Three of the instructors disagreed, and one of the instructors strongly disagreed that the language of a composition should count more than the content for the grade.

The two major reasons reported by instructors for counting the content of a composition more than the language for the grade were the following: (a) Because the purpose of the ESL composition courses was to teach students to write academic papers, the content was more important than the language, and as such, the content should count more for the grade than the language, and (b) if the language of the composition counted as much or more for the grade than did the content, then students would be preoccupied with language concerns, and as such, the content of the composition would suffer.

As for the instructors' beliefs concerning the type of grading system that should be used, the statistical results of the questionnaire showed no support
for using a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system, but instead supported the letter grading system. Two of the instructors strongly disagreed and two of the instructors disagreed with Item #10: “My students should be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade of “A” through “E”.” The major reason reported by the instructors for preferring the letter grading system was because they believed this system was a more specific measurement of the quality of their students’ work and of the progress their students were making. It was also reported that a letter grading system provided incentive for students to strive to produce higher quality work.

The Reading-Writing Connection

All four instructors reported that their students’ English and writing skills were improved by reading materials written in English. All four instructors strongly agreed with Item #21: “Reading improves writing skills.” The major reason reported by the instructors for believing reading improved the writing skills of ESL composition students was that reading provided concrete examples of vocabulary and grammar in a meaningful context. It was also reported that reading provided students with examples of appropriate academic writing styles.

Translation

All four instructors reported that it was not beneficial for ESL composition students to compose in their first language and then translate into English. One
of the instructors strongly disagreed and three of the instructors disagreed with Item #22: "It is a good idea to tell my students to write a composition in their native language and then translate it into English." The most common reason reported for believing translation was not beneficial was that translating could result in language problems due to negative transfer. One of the instructors, however, reported that the use of one's first language when preparing an outline for a composition could have positive effects on the content by helping the writer to keep clear in his or her mind what he or she would like to say.

The data obtained from the instructors showed that they shared similar beliefs about the types of feedback that should be provided to college-level ESL composition students. The statistical results of the instructor questionnaire showed the instructors were in agreement about the value of the different types of feedback examined on the questionnaire. The standard deviation for 74% of the items was at or below .50. Furthermore, 30% of the items on the instructor questionnaire received a standard deviation of 0.00. The comments written on the questionnaires by the instructors and the results of their oral interviews also showed that the instructors were in agreement as to the reasons they reported for believing certain types of feedback were beneficial or not.
Instructor Subjects’ Results Compared with Student Subjects’ Results

This section presents a comparison of the beliefs about composition feedback of the ESL instructors and the ESL students who participated in this study. The focus of this comparison is on the following seven topics: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation. This section compares both how highly the two groups of subjects rated items on the questionnaires concerning these seven topics and the major reasons reported by the two groups for having the beliefs they did concerning these seven topics.

Peer Review

The results of the questionnaires showed that a majority of the students and all the instructors held the opinion that peer-review activities had positive effects on the writing skills of ESL composition students. The major reason reported both by students and by instructors for supporting the use of peer review was that when students participated in peer-review activities they helped one another with content issues. The students and the instructors shared the belief that peer-review activities improved the content of students’ papers because peer-reviewers were able to point out areas that were unclear and offer suggestions to make those areas clearer.
Error Correction

Whereas the preferred type of error-correction feedback for a majority of the students was for teachers to make the actual corrections on the compositions, the instructors’ preferred type of error-correction feedback was to indicate and code errors and require students to make the corrections. Although a majority of the students reported that they preferred their teachers make the corrections, the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors also received support from the students. Furthermore, the instructors also reported that they preferred to make the actual corrections under certain circumstances.

As for the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors and requiring students to make their own corrections, the major reason reported both by students and by instructors for believing this type of error-correction feedback to be beneficial was that it helped students to acquire the self-editing skills they would need when they no longer had a teacher to help them. Several students, as did two of the instructors, also reported that teachers should avoid making corrections based on guessing what they believed a student was trying to say, because to do so could result in the teacher guessing incorrectly and changing the intended content of a student’s paper. It was reported both by students and by teachers that in such cases it was best for teachers to indicate that they did not understand what a student was trying to say.

One of the major reasons reported by students for wanting teachers to make the corrections was because they believed this was a teacher’s job. Although the instructors disagreed that their job was to make the corrections for their students, the instructors, as did several students, reported that teachers should
make the actual corrections under the following three conditions: (a) When a problem was due to inappropriate word choice, (b) When dealing with a complex grammatical structure, or (c) When providing feedback for a final draft.

A majority of the students, as did all the instructors, reported that the practice of teachers only indicating errors was not helpful. The major reason reported both by students and by instructors for not believing it was helpful to only indicate errors was that students, especially if required to make their own corrections, needed guidance as to the exact nature of their problems. It was reported, however, both by students and by instructors that it was acceptable for a teacher to only indicate an error when it was a question of a student having made a careless mistake (e.g., subject-verb agreement).

The opinions of the students and those of the instructors differed considerably concerning whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students’ papers. Whereas 100% of the instructors reported that they did not mark all of their students’ errors, the results of the student questionnaire showed that 47% of the students agreed, and 47% of the students strongly agreed that their teachers should mark all errors. The major reason reported by the instructors for not marking all errors was that if all errors were marked, especially on a composition containing numerous errors, this could make students feel discouraged and raise their anxiety levels. The major reason reported by students for preferring that teachers mark all errors was that if teachers did not mark an error, students might be misled to believe something that was incorrect was correct, and as such, they would continue to make the same error in the future.
The opinions of the students and those of the instructors also differed concerning whether or not teachers should correct spoken errors made in class by their students. Although the opinions of the students were divided on this topic, more than half of the students reported that teachers should correct students' spoken errors. The instructors, however, reported that they very rarely corrected their students' spoken errors because to do so could discourage students from asking questions and participating in class. As for the students who reported that teachers should correct students' spoken errors, the major reason reported by these students for having this belief was that if teachers did not correct students' spoken errors, then students would continue to make the same errors in the future. The students who reported that teachers should not correct students' spoken errors shared the instructors' belief that if teachers corrected students' spoken errors, students would not be willing to participate in class for fear of making mistakes.

Multiple Drafts

The instructors and the students both supported the process approach to composition writing. The instructors, as did a majority of the students, also reported that generally students should write three drafts of a composition. The three major reasons reported both by instructors and by students for believing the multiple-draft approach was superior to the single-draft approach were the following: (a) Because students had opportunities to revise their papers, they were not preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft as far as the language was concerned, and as such, they felt free to do hypothesis testing,
(b) Because students were not preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft as far as the language was concerned, they concentrated more on the content of the first draft, and (c) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students were provided opportunities to process and use feedback.

The instructors, as did a majority of the students, reported that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content of the composition as opposed to the language. The major reason reported both by instructors and by students for believing the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content was because they believed the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, feedback concerning content issues should be given as soon as possible. Both students and instructors also reported that because revisions in the content of a paper are likely to cause additional language problems, content problems should be dealt with prior to language problems.

Tutorials

All four instructors, as did a majority of the students, strongly agreed on their questionnaires that the tutorials were a very important part of the ESL composition courses. The two most common reasons reported both by instructors and by students for believing the tutorials were beneficial were the following: (a) During a tutorial session a teacher focused on the specific needs of an individual student, and (b) During a tutorial session teachers could verify whether or not a student had understood feedback written on the paper prior to the session.
Grading

Although the students' opinions were divided concerning whether all drafts of a composition or only the final draft should be graded, a majority of the students, as did all the instructors, reported that only the final draft should be graded. The two major reasons reported both by students and by instructors for believing that only the final draft should be graded were the following: (a) By grading only the final draft of a composition, students were being graded according to the progress they had made, and (b) if all drafts of a composition were graded, students would be too preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft, and thus would be reluctant to do hypothesis testing.

Although the students' opinions were also divided concerning the role of content and language in the assigning of a grade to a composition, the overall preference of the students was that the content should count more. As for the instructors, they all reported that the content should count more. The major reason reported both by instructors and by students for believing the content should count more was because they believed the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, the content should be weighed more heavily when assigning a grade to a composition.

The students' opinions were also divided concerning whether ESL composition students should be graded using a letter grading system or a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system; however, the overall preference of the students was that they be graded with a letter grading system. As for the instructors, they all reported that their students should be graded with a letter grading system. The major reason reported both by instructors and by students
for preferring a letter grading system was that a letter grading system is a more accurate and specific measurement of the quality of students' work and of the progress students were making.

The Reading-Writing Connection

All of the instructors, as did a majority of the students, strongly agreed on their questionnaires that ESL composition students could improve their English and writing skills by reading materials written in English. The three major reasons reported both by instructors and by students for having this belief were the following: (a) Vocabulary was increased by seeing new words in a meaningful context, (b) Grammar was improved by seeing new and/or complex grammatical structures in a meaningful context, and (c) Reading provided good examples of different styles of academic writing.

Translation

All the instructors, as did a majority of the students, reported that it was not helpful for ESL composition students to write compositions in their first language and then translate them into English. The major reason reported both by instructors and by students for not believing translation was helpful was that translating produced errors due to negative transfer.

To summarize, this comparison of the data obtained from the ESL composition instructors and the ESL composition students who participated in this study has shown that for the most part these two groups of subjects held
similar beliefs concerning the various types of feedback investigated by this study. The five topics for which the beliefs of the instructors and those of the students were the most similar were the following: (a) Peer Review, (b) Multiple Drafts, (c) Tutorials, (d) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (e) Translation.

There was less agreement between the instructors and the students concerning the topic of error-correction feedback and the topic of grading. As for the topic of grading, the major factor that contributed to the differences in the beliefs between the two groups was the fact that the opinions of the students concerning grading were divided. However, the beliefs of the majority of the students concerning the topic of grading did parallel those of the instructors.

As for the differences in the beliefs between the instructors and the students concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, whereas the students’ preference was for instructors to make the corrections on the compositions for them, the instructors’ preference was to indicate and code errors and require the students to make their own corrections. There was, however, support from the students for the indicating and coding technique. Furthermore, the reasons reported by the students who supported the indicating and coding technique were similar to those reported by the instructors for using this technique. As for teachers making the actual corrections for the students, the instructors reported that under certain circumstances they also preferred to make the corrections for their students. Furthermore, these circumstances were similar to the ones reported by students for wanting teachers to make the corrections.

The two areas under the rubric of error-correction feedback where the beliefs of the instructors and those of the students differed the most were whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students’ papers and whether
or not teachers should correct spoken errors made in class by their students. Whereas 100% of the instructors reported that they did not mark all of their students' errors, 94% of the students reported that teachers should mark all errors. As for whether or not teachers should correct spoken errors made in class by their students, whereas 100% of the instructors reported that they very rarely corrected students' spoken errors, 56% of the students reported that teachers should correct students' spoken errors.
Summary and Discussion

This chapter has presented an examination of advanced college-level ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback. This examination focused on the types of feedback these students most preferred, the types of feedback these students least preferred, and the major reasons reported by these students for having those preferences.

The student-subject data examined and presented in this chapter were obtained by questionnaires, interviews, and a focus-group activity. The student-subject data in this chapter were examined and presented based on academic level, class section, academic branch, and gender. The results reported in this chapter have shown that no matter which of these variables were being taken into consideration, the findings were often similar.

This chapter has also presented an examination of advanced college-level ESL instructors' beliefs about composition feedback. This examination focused on the types of feedback these instructors were providing their students who participated in this study and the major reasons reported by these instructors for using those types of feedback.

The instructor-subject data examined and presented in this chapter were obtained by having the instructors complete questionnaires and participate in oral interviews. The results reported in this chapter have shown that the instructors held similar beliefs about composition feedback. Furthermore, the results presented in this chapter have shown that generally the instructors' beliefs concerning composition feedback paralleled those of their students.
The focus of the examination of the data obtained from the participants in this study was on their beliefs about the following topics: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation.

This chapter reported the following descriptive statistics obtained from the results of the questionnaires completed by the subjects: (a) means, (b) modes, and (c) standard deviations. In addition to tables containing these statistical results, tables were also provided to show the percent of subjects who gave the same ratings to items. This chapter also presented an examination of the most common reasons reported by the subjects for rating items on the questionnaire as they did.

The student-subject findings presented in this chapter have shown that a majority of the student participants reported the following beliefs concerning the topics investigated by this study: (a) Participating in peer-review activities has a positive effect on the content of their compositions and helps them to acquire a better sense of audience, (b) Having an opportunity to correct their own errors helps them to learn from their mistakes and to acquire self-editing skills, (c) Teachers should make the corrections for them when problems are due to inappropriate word choice or when providing feedback for a final draft of a composition, (d) Teachers should mark all errors, otherwise students might believe something that is incorrect is correct and will continue to make the same error in the future, (e) Except in the case of a careless mistake, teachers should not only indicate that an error exists because students need specific details about the nature of their problems and suggestions about how they might solve them, (f) Teachers should correct students' spoken errors, otherwise they might
continue to make the same errors in the future, (g) The multiple-draft approach is superior to the single-draft approach because it encourages hypothesis testing and provides opportunities for students to process and use feedback, (h) The focus of the feedback provided for a first draft of a paper should be on the content as opposed to the language because the content of the paper is more important and content problems require more time to remedy, (i) Tutorials are beneficial because during a tutorial session a teacher and student focus on the specific needs of that particular student, (j) Only the final draft of the composition should be graded to reward a student's progress, (k) A letter grading system is preferred to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system because it is a more accurate and specific measurement of the quality of a student's work and of the progress he or she is making, (l) Reading materials written in English helps to build vocabulary and provides examples of academic writing styles, and (m) Composing in one's first language and then translating into English can cause problems due to negative transfer.

The instructor-subject findings presented in this chapter have shown that the instructors' beliefs concerning feedback were similar to those reported by a majority of the student subjects. The only two areas where the beliefs of these two groups differed considerably were: (a) Whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students' compositions, and (b) Whether or not teachers should correct their students' spoken errors. Whereas the instructors reported that they did not mark all errors because to do so might be discouraging for the student, a majority of the students reported that teachers should mark all errors, otherwise students will continue to repeat the same errors. As for teachers correcting their students' spoken errors, whereas the instructors reported that
they rarely corrected their students’ spoken errors because to do so might
discourage their students from participating in class, a vast majority of the
students reported that teachers should correct students’ spoken errors,
otherwise students will continue to make the same errors.

The reader of this dissertation, especially if he or she has had experience
teaching writing to ESL students, might have been somewhat surprised by
some of the findings reported in this chapter and might have posed the
following three questions: (a) Why was there so much agreement among the
students who participated in this study?, (b) Why was there so much agreement
between the beliefs reported by the students and the instructors?, and (c) Why
was there so much support from the students for methodologies that research
has shown are not considered to be appropriate in the cultures of a majority of
the students who participated in this study?

These are legitimate questions and deserve to be answered. In order to
answer these questions further research needs to be conducted. Suggestions
for research designed to answer these types of questions are discussed in the
following chapter. An attempt, however, will be made here to answer these
questions. Data obtained from this study will be used to answer these
questions.

One possible answer for all three of these questions is simply the fact that
the ESL composition instructors who participated in this study were doing a
good job. That is, these instructors were providing their students with the types
of feedback that has the most positive effects on their students’ writing skills.
The review of literature in this document presented research that supports the types of feedback the instructors in this study reported that they were providing their students.

Given the fact that the instructors in this study were providing their students with the types of feedback research has shown to have the most positive effects on ESL students’ writing skills, it should not be surprising that their students would have a positive attitude about those types of feedback. One needs to keep in mind the reasons for which the students in this study were enrolled in the ESL composition courses. Approximately half of the students were undergraduates who were taking the courses as a required prerequisite before being able to enroll in Freshman English. The rest of the students were graduate students taking the courses in order to help them acquire the writing skills they will need to write a Master’s thesis or a doctoral dissertation. Thus, there should be little question that the students who participated in this study would have a vested interest in the types of feedback that were being provided in their courses, and as such, would have a positive attitude about types of feedback that were helping them to acquire the writing skills needed to achieve their future goals.

In response to the question: “Why was there so much support from the students for methodologies that research has shown are not considered to be appropriate in the cultures of a majority of the students who participated in this study?” the previously stated argument could also answer this question. That is, once students experience the positive effects of types of feedback that might not be considered appropriate in their home culture, their attitudes about these types of feedback will be positive. Data obtained from the student interviews
support this hypothesis. One of the student interviewees stated that ESL students who come to the US are not sure what to expect and thus are willing to try something new even if it goes against what would be appropriate in their native culture. Although this may indeed be true, the reason why students are receptive to new approaches may go farther than that. A more important factor could be the fact that the students, once they have seen the positive effects of a particular type of feedback, will develop a positive attitude about that type of feedback. Two other student interviewees also reported that the methodologies being implemented in their classes would not be acceptable in their countries; however, these two students also made it clear that because those types of methodologies were helping them to improve their writing skills, they supported them and believed that they should be implemented in the English courses in their native countries. Of course, the answer might very well contain elements of the information obtained from all three of those students. That is, because ESL students who come to the US are willing to try something new, their willingness to take the new methodologies seriously allows the new methodologies to work well. Then, once the students have both given the new methodologies a chance to work and have seen their positive effects, the students develop a positive attitude about the new methodologies and want to continue to receive feedback based on those methodologies. Furthermore, one should also consider the possibility that the students in this study view their composition class as a culture. Thus, the types of feedback that are being implemented in "the new culture" are regarded as being appropriate, and as such, the students have a positive attitude about them.
This chapter should not conclude without pointing out that the ESL students who participated in this study deserve to be given credit about what they believe about composition feedback. Perhaps a reason why there is currently not much research available that has dealt with ESL students' beliefs about composition feedback is because it is not believed that students are a good judge of what is best for them. The results of this study have shown quite the opposite to be true. The students in this study not only supported the types of feedback that research has shown to have the most positive effects on the writing skills of ESL students, but also reported reasons for believing those types of feedback were beneficial that paralleled researchers' hypotheses for the success of those types of feedback. Although some of the students were graduate students majoring in various areas of education (including Foreign Language Education) many undergraduate students and graduate students representing various majors provided written comments for the follow-up activity that sounded as if they had been written by an ESL composition teacher. Such findings suggest that further research dealing with ESL students' beliefs about feedback would provide additional data with pedagogical implications for ESL writing students. These findings also suggest that by establishing and keeping open lines of communication with their students, ESL teachers could learn important information from their students that would help them to better meet their students' needs.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

This chapter begins with a brief presentation of the major findings of the study. The presentation includes the following seven topics investigated by this study: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation. Following this presentation, the research questions are answered. The answers to the primary questions provided the basis for both general and pedagogical implications. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research and study.

Major Findings

The student-subject findings presented in Chapter Four showed that a majority of the ESL participants in this study held similar beliefs concerning their preferences about composition feedback. The ratings assigned to items on the questionnaire were similar and the reasons reported by the students both on the original questionnaire and on the follow-up to the questionnaire were similar. Furthermore, the data obtained from the students who were interviewed and the data obtained from the students who participated in the focus-group activity were also
similar. These data were also consistent with the data obtained in both
the questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire. The results
presented in Chapter Four also showed that for the most part the
following four variables did not play a significant role in the students’
beliefs concerning composition feedback: (a) Class Section, (b)
Academic Level, (c) Gender, or (d) Major. The few times when these
variables did seem to play a role in the students’ beliefs about
composition feedback are noted later in this chapter as part of the
response to Secondary Research Question #1.

The instructor-subject findings presented in Chapter Four showed
that the ESL instructors who participated in this study held similar beliefs
concerning composition feedback. The ratings the instructors gave items
on the questionnaire were similar and the reasons reported by the
instructors both in questionnaires and during oral interviews for rating
items as they did were similar. Last, the results presented in Chapter
Four showed that the beliefs about composition feedback of the instructor
subjects were similar to those of the student subjects.

The analysis of the data obtained from this study focused on the
following seven topics: (a) Peer Review, (b) Error Correction, (c) Multiple
Drafts, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and
(g) Translation. Following is a summary of the major findings for these
seven topics.
Peer Review

Both a majority of the students and a majority of the instructors reported that peer-review activities were believed to have positive effects on the writing skills of ESL composition students at the college level. The major reason reported for supporting the use of peer review was that peer-review activities provided help with content. Several students reported that having their papers subjected to peer review improved the content of their papers because peer-reviewers were able to point out areas that were unclear and offer suggestions that made the content clearer. Several students also pointed out that whereas an instructor may not be able to help with content because a student was writing on a topic about which the instructor was not familiar, another student majoring in the same field could provide needed content feedback as well as format feedback.

Error Correction

Practices of teachers for noting and coding errors to help students make their own corrections as well as the practice of teachers making corrections on students’ compositions received support from all subjects in this study. Students and instructors reported that noting and coding errors is beneficial because this technique helps students to acquire self-editing skills. It was also reported that teachers should avoid making corrections based on guesses about what teachers believe a student is
trying to express. Guessing may result in the teacher’s incorrectly guessing and thereby changing the intended meaning of a student’s paper.

As far as teachers making the corrections on students’ compositions, students and instructors both recommended that teachers make the corrections under the following three conditions: (a) When a problem was due to inappropriate word choice, (b) When dealing with a complex grammatical structure that may not be fully mastered by the student-writer, or (c) When providing feedback for a final draft of a paper or manuscript.

Both students and instructors reported that the practice of teachers only indicating errors was not believed to be helpful. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that if students are to make their own corrections, they need guidance as to the nature of and reasons for their writing problems. It was reported, however, that it was acceptable for a teacher to only indicate an error when it seemed to be a question of a student having made a careless mistake (e.g., subject-verb agreement).

Students and instructors differed considerably concerning whether or not teachers should mark all the errors in students’ papers. Whereas the instructors reported that they did not mark all of their students’ errors, a majority of the students reported that they preferred their teachers to mark all errors. The most frequent reason reported by instructors for not marking all errors was that if all errors were marked, especially on a composition containing numerous errors, this could discourage students and raise students’ anxiety levels. The most frequent reason reported by
students for preferring that teachers mark all errors was that if teachers
did not mark an error, students might be misled to believe something that
was incorrect was correct, and thus would continue to make the same
error.

Students and instructors also differed concerning whether or not
teachers should correct spoken errors made by students. Whereas the
instructors reported that they did not correct spoken errors so as not to
discourage students from participating in class, approximately half the
students reported that they prefer for teachers to correct students’
spoken errors, or else students would continue to make the same errors.

**Multiple Drafts**

Both students and instructors supported the process approach to
composition writing, and generally reported that the best number of drafts
to write was three. Three reasons were reported for believing the
multiple-draft approach was superior to the single-draft approach: (a)
Students felt free to do hypothesis testing because they knew they would
have opportunities to revise their papers, (b) Because students were not
preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft as far as the
language was concerned, they concentrated more on the content of the
first draft, and (c) By writing multiple drafts of a composition, students
were provided opportunities to process and use the feedback they
received between drafts.
A majority of the students and all the instructors reported that the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content of the composition as opposed to the language. The most frequent reason reported for believing the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft should be on the content was that the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, feedback concerning content issues should be given as soon as possible. It was also reported that because changes in content would produce additional language errors, feedback concerning language should generally be postponed until the content of a composition is satisfactory.

Tutorials

Both students and instructors supported the use of tutorials in ESL composition courses. The two most frequent reasons reported for believing the tutorials were beneficial were the following: (a) During a tutorial session a teacher focused on the specific needs of an individual student, and (b) During a tutorial session teachers could verify whether or not a student had understood feedback written on the paper prior to the session. It was also reported that during a tutorial session students and teachers are seen as building a relationship that encourages students to play an active role in the learning process.
Grading

A majority of the students and all the instructors recommended that only the final draft of a composition be graded. The two most frequent reasons reported for believing that only the final draft should be graded were the following: (a) By only grading the final draft of a composition, students were being graded according to the progress they had made, and (b) if all drafts of a composition were graded, students would be too preoccupied with trying to produce an error-free first draft, and thus, they would be reluctant to do hypothesis testing. It was reported, however, that if teachers graded all drafts of a composition, students would be able to see how much progress they were making, and how much more work needed to be done for the final draft. A student who participated in the focus-group activity made a suggestion that might allow students to see a formal evaluation of the progress they are making between drafts without discouraging them from doing hypothesis testing. This suggestion was that all drafts of a composition be given a letter grade; however, the grade for the final draft would be weighed more heavily than the grades for the previous drafts of the same composition.

A majority of the students and all the instructors reported that the content of a composition should count more for the grade than the language. The most frequent reason reported for believing the content should count more was that the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, should be weighed more heavily when assigning a grade to a composition.
As for whether ESL composition students should be graded using a letter grade or a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grade, a majority of the students and all the instructors recommended that students be graded based on a letter grade. The most frequent reason reported for believing ESL composition students should be graded with a letter grade was that a letter grade was believed to be a more specific measurement of the quality of students’ work and of the progress students were making. It was also suggested that a letter grading system provided an incentive for students to try to produce higher quality work.

The Reading-Writing Connection

A majority of the students and all the instructors reported that ESL composition students improved their English and writing skills by reading materials written in English. Three major reasons were reported for having this belief: (a) Vocabulary was increased by seeing new words in a meaningful context, (b) Grammar was improved by seeing new and/or complex grammatical structures in a meaningful context, and (c) Reading provided good examples of different styles of academic writing.

Translation

A majority of the students and all the instructors reported that it was not helpful for ESL composition students to write compositions in their first language and translate them into English. The major objection to
translation was the view that translating produces errors due to negative transfer. However, several students and one instructor reported that students could improve the content of a composition by using their first language when doing the initial planning and outlining for their papers because this strategy helped students better remember what it was they wanted to say.
Answers to Research Questions

Primary Research Questions

1. What types of feedback do advanced college-level ESL composition students report to be the most beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills, and why?

The type of feedback reported by students to be the most beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills was the tutorials. The most frequent reason reported by students for this belief was that tutorial sessions focused on the specific needs of an individual student.

The student subjects also reported that they preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach because the multiple-draft approach allowed them to do hypothesis testing, and provided them opportunities to process and use feedback. A majority of the students reported that they preferred to write three drafts of a composition. The students also stated that they preferred to concentrate on and receive feedback about the content of the first draft of a composition, and concentrate on and receive feedback about the language of the second draft. Students reported that the focus of the feedback provided for the first draft should be on the content because the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, one should first be satisfied with the content of the composition before dealing with
language issues. It was also reported that content problems were more difficult to solve than language problems, and as such, more time should be devoted to that aspect of a paper.

The students both supported the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors in order for students to have an opportunity to make their own corrections, and the practice of teachers making the actual corrections on students' compositions; however, teachers making the actual corrections received more support than the indicating and coding technique. The students reported that the type of error-correction feedback that should be used depended on the type of error that had been made and the number of the draft in question. Students reported that they preferred their teachers make the corrections for them when the problem was due to inappropriate word usage, and when providing feedback for a final draft. The main reason students supported the indicating and coding technique was that they were acquiring the self-editing skills they felt they would need in the future when they no longer would have a teacher to help them. Students also reported that they preferred teachers to mark all errors, otherwise they would not know an error had been made and might continue to make the same error.

Slightly more than half the students reported that their teachers should correct spoken errors made in class by students. Students who held this belief reported that if teachers did not correct spoken errors, students might continue to make the same errors in the future.

A majority of the students reported that participating in peer-review activities had positive effects on their writing skills. The students
reported, however, that receiving peer review was more beneficial than giving it. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that a peer-reviewer could help with the content of a composition by pointing out areas that were unclear and offering suggestions to make those areas clearer. It was also reported that participating in peer-review activities helped students to acquire a sense of audience.

A majority of the students reported they preferred: (a) that only the final draft of a composition be graded, (b) that the content of a composition count more than the language for the grade, and (c) that they be graded with a letter grading system. The two most frequent reasons reported by students for believing that only the final draft should be graded were that the grade should be based on the progress students have made, and that grading all drafts would discourage hypothesis testing on earlier drafts because students would be too concerned about making errors. The most frequent reason reported by students for believing the content of a composition should count more than the language for the grade was that the content was more important than the language. The most frequent reason reported by students for believing they should be graded with a letter grading system was that a letter grading system was a more accurate and specific measurement of the quality of their work and of the progress they were making.

Finally, a majority of the students reported that their English and writing skills were improved by reading materials written in English. Students reported that seeing language in a meaningful context helped them to increase their vocabulary and to improve their grammar. It was
also reported that reading provided concrete examples of academic writing. For example, students can follow the format of a journal article when writing their own academic papers. It was also reported that reading journal articles helped students to distinguish between formal and informal language usage.

2. What types of feedback do these students report to be the least beneficial for helping them to develop their academic writing skills, and why?

A majority of the students reported that the practice of teachers only indicating errors was not helpful. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that students, especially if they were required to make their own corrections, needed more detailed feedback concerning the nature of their problems. It was reported, however, that it was acceptable for a teacher to only indicate an error when a student had made a careless mistake.

The students also reported that the single-draft approach to composition writing was not beneficial. The most frequent reasons reported by students for this belief were: (a) The single-draft approach discouraged hypothesis testing, and (b) The single-draft approach did not provide opportunities for students to process and use feedback.

As for the topic of peer review, although students reported that participating in peer-review activities had positive effects on the content of a composition, several students reported concern that peers might not
be qualified to help with language issues. It was reported that a peer-
reviewer might make suggestions that would cause a student to change
language that was correct to language that was incorrect.

A majority of the students reported that it was not beneficial for
teachers to grade all drafts of a composition because to do so would
discourage students from doing hypothesis testing. The most frequent
reason reported for believing grading all drafts would discourage
hypothesis testing was that students would be too concerned with
producing an error-free draft from the very start of the writing process. It
was reported, however, that grading all drafts showed students how
much progress they were making and how much more work needed to
be done for a final draft.

A majority of the students also reported that it was not beneficial for
them to be graded with a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system. The
most frequent reason reported by students for this belief was that such a
system was not an accurate nor specific measurement of the quality of
their work and of the progress they were making.

Finally, a majority of the students reported that it was not helpful for
them to write compositions in their first language and then translate them
into English because translating produced errors due to negative
transfer. It was reported, however, that students could improve the
content of a composition by using their first language when doing the
initial planning and outlining for their papers because this strategy
helped students better remember what it was they wanted to say.
3. To what degree are these students' in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?

The student subjects who participated in this study reported similar beliefs about composition feedback. A majority of the items on the student questionnaire received low standard deviations and the written comments provided by the students to explain their rationale for assigning the ratings they did to various items on the questionnaire were also similar.

The seven topics investigated by this study where the students' beliefs were the most similar were: (a) Tutorials, (b) Peer Review, (c) Error-Marking Techniques, (d) The Multiple-Draft Approach, (e) The Role of Content and Language in the Assigning of a Grade to a Composition, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (g) Translation.

A vast majority of students (98%) supported the use of tutorials. The most frequent reason reported for supporting the use of tutorials was that the students found the individual attention they received during the sessions helped them to improve their English and academic writing skills.

Eighty-three percent of the students reported that receiving peer review is beneficial. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that classmates can help each other to improve the content of a composition by pointing out areas that are unclear and offering suggestions that might help to make those areas clearer.
Concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, a majority of the students both preferred their teachers to make the corrections for them and supported the practice of teachers indicating and coding errors. Although 91% of the students preferred that their teachers make the corrections for them, 71% of these students also supported the practice of teachers coding errors and giving students an opportunity to make their own corrections. As for teachers making the corrections for students, several students reported that they preferred their teachers to make the corrections for them when dealing with usage problems and when providing feedback for a final draft of a paper. As for students making their own corrections, several students reported that having an opportunity to make their own corrections both helps them to learn from their mistakes and to become better self-editors. A large majority of students (94%) also preferred their teachers to mark all errors on their papers. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that if errors are not marked, students will not know that there are problems, and as such, they will continue to make the same errors in the future.

Last, a majority of the students (85%) reported that it was not helpful for teachers to only indicate that an error exits. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that students need specific information about the nature of their problems, especially if they are required to make their own corrections.

The students who participated in this study showed strong support for the process approach to composition writing, and 82% of the students reported that they prefer to write three drafts of a composition. The two
most frequent reasons reported for preferring the process approach were that by writing multiple drafts of a composition students feel encouraged to do hypothesis testing and are provided opportunities to process and use feedback.

Although 80% of the students either agreed or strongly agreed on the questionnaire that the content and the language of a composition should count equally for the grade, an examination of the results of all of the items that dealt with that topic suggested that the overall preference of the students did lean toward believing that the content should count more. The most frequent reason reported for believing that the content should count more was that the content is the most important aspect of a composition.

A majority of the students (89%) reported that reading materials written in English has positive effects on their English academic writing skills. The most frequent reasons reported for this belief were that vocabulary is increased by seeing new words in context and that grammar is improved by seeing new and/or problematic grammatical structures in context. It was also reported by several students, especially graduate students, that reading provides examples of appropriate styles of academic writing.

A majority of the students in this study showed little support for the strategy of writing compositions in one’s first language and then translating the compositions into English. Forty-nine percent of the students disagreed and 27% strongly disagreed on the questionnaire.
that translation was beneficial. The most common reason reported for this belief was that translation causes language problems due to negative transfer.

Although the students' opinions were divided concerning whether they should be graded with a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system or with a letter grade, a majority of the students (60%) preferred to receive letter grades. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that a letter grade is a more specific measurement of the quality of students' work.

The students' opinions were also divided concerning whether all drafts of a composition or only the final draft should be graded; however, a majority of the students (60%) preferred that only the final draft of a paper be graded. The most frequent reason reported for this belief was that grading only the final draft of a composition rewards students for the progress they have made during the writing process.

4. To what degree are these students willing to convey their beliefs about composition feedback?

The students who participated in this study seemed to be willing to convey their beliefs about composition feedback. Every student in each of the four class sections that participated in this study completed a questionnaire and provided written comments for the follow-up to the questionnaire. Thus, all 45 ESL students who were asked to participate in this study agreed to participate and contributed data concerning their beliefs about composition feedback. Furthermore, comments written by
students on the follow-up to the questionnaire were detailed, and thus suggested that the students both had set beliefs about composition feedback and were willing to make those beliefs known. Students who participated in oral interviews also provided data concerning their beliefs about composition feedback and reported that it is important for teachers and students to discuss the topic of feedback. Last, six of the ten students who participated in the focus-group activity seemed eager to express their views about feedback, and all of the students from the focus group who wrote a reflection paper (40%) reported that teachers and students should discuss the topic of feedback. These students also reported in their reflection papers that it could be beneficial for teachers to obtain information concerning their students' beliefs about composition feedback in ways similar to how the data were collected for this dissertation (i.e., questionnaires and in-class discussions). It was also recommended that teachers and students discuss the topic of feedback during tutorial sessions.
Secondary Research Questions

1. Do beliefs concerning feedback differ: (a) between graduate students and undergraduate students?, (b) between male and female students?, (c) depending on class section, or (d) depending on the academic discipline of students?

Except in a few cases, the aforementioned variables did not play a significant role in the students' beliefs concerning composition feedback. For the most part, regardless of the variable taken into consideration, the statistical results of the student questionnaires were similar and the written comments provided by the students were similar. That is, for the most part, the same types of feedback were reported to be the most beneficial by a majority of members of each of the aforementioned groups and the same types of feedback were reported to be the least beneficial by a majority of members of each of the aforementioned groups. The times when the opinions of various student groups differed the most were the following: (a) Whereas a majority of the students from Undergraduate Class Section One reported that they were afraid to speak in class because they might make mistakes, a majority of the students from Undergraduate Class Section Two reported the opposite to be the case; (b) Whereas a majority of the male students reported a preference for a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system, a majority of the female students reported a preference for a letter grading system; (c) Whereas a majority of the students in Graduate Class Section One
reported a preference for the letter grading system, a majority of the
students in Graduate Class Section Two reported a preference for a
satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system; and (d) Although both a
majority of the undergraduate students and a majority of the graduate
students supported the use of peer review, the results of the student
questionnaire suggested that the undergraduate students believed that
peer-review activities are more beneficial than did the graduate students.

Except for the few cases noted above, a majority of the students from
all groups investigated by this study reported the following beliefs: (a)
Tutorials are beneficial because of the individual attention students
receive during the sessions, (b) The process approach is superior to the
single-draft approach because by writing multiple drafts of a composition
students feel encouraged to do hypothesis testing and are provided
opportunities to process and use feedback, (c) Teachers should make
the corrections for students when dealing with usage problems and when
providing feedback for a final draft of a paper, (d) Having an opportunity
to make their own corrections both helps students to learn from their
mistakes and to become better self-editors, (e) Teachers only indicating
ersors is not helpful because students need more specific information
about the nature of their problems, (f) Teachers should mark all errors on
students' papers, otherwise the students might continue to make the
same errors in the future, (g) Participating in peer-review activities helps
students to improve the content of their papers, (h) Only the final draft of a
paper should be graded in order to evaluate and reward the progress
students have made, (i) The content of a paper should count more for the
grade than the language because the content is the most important aspect of a composition, (j) A letter grading system is preferred because it is a more specific measurement of the quality of students' work and of the progress they are making, (k) Reading materials written in English has positive effects on students' English academic writing skills, and (l) Composing in one's first language and then translating into English produces errors due to negative transfer.

2. What types of feedback do advanced-college level ESL composition instructors report to be the most beneficial, and why?

All the instructors reported that having students participate in tutorial sessions had a positive effect on students' writing skills. The two most common reasons reported for believing the tutorials were beneficial were: (a) During a tutorial session a teacher focused on the specific needs of an individual student, and (b) During a tutorial session a teacher could verify whether or not a student had understood feedback written on the paper prior to the session. It was also reported that during a tutorial session students and teachers could discuss preferences for feedback.

The instructors reported that they both made the actual corrections on students' composition, and that they indicated and coded errors in order to give students an opportunity to make their own corrections. The instructors reported that the type of error-correction feedback they used depended on the type of error that had been made and the number of the
draft in question. Instructors reported that they preferred to make the corrections for students when the problem was due to inappropriate word usage, and when providing feedback for a final draft. It was also reported that when a student had made the same error several times in the same composition, it was best for an instructor to make the actual correction for the student the first time or two to serve as a model, and then indicate and code the problem to allow the student to practice making the actual correction. As for the indicating and coding technique, the major reason reported by instructors for believing this type of error-correction feedback was beneficial was that by giving students an opportunity to make their own corrections, students acquired the self-editing skills they would need in the future when they no longer had a teacher to help them.

All instructors reported that having students write multiple drafts of a composition had positive effects on the writing skills of their students and that they tended to have their students write three drafts of a composition. The instructors reported that they preferred the multiple-draft approach to the single-draft approach because the multiple-draft approach allowed students to do hypothesis testing and provided students opportunities to process and use feedback. The instructors also reported that the focus of their feedback for a first draft was on the content of a composition, and that the focus of their feedback for a second draft was on the language. Instructors reported that the focus of the feedback provided for the first draft should be on the content because the content of the paper was more important than the language, and as such, one should first be satisfied with the content of the composition before dealing with
language issues. It was also reported that if the focus of the feedback provided for a first draft were on the language, then the content of the paper would suffer because students would be too preoccupied with producing an error-free paper as far as the language is concerned, and as such, students might not include pertinent information if they were not certain how to say it correctly in English.

The instructors reported that they preferred to only grade the final draft of a composition. The major reason reported for only grading the final draft was that by doing so they were rewarding students for the progress they had made by processing the feedback they had been provided. It was reported, however, that grading all drafts of a composition could be beneficial because doing so would show students how much progress they were making, and how much more work needed to be done for the final draft. It was also reported that if all drafts of a composition were graded, the grade for the final draft should count more in order to reward students for their progress. As for the role of language and content in the assigning of a grade to a composition, the instructors reported that the content of the composition should count more than the language, otherwise students would be too preoccupied with language concerns, and as such, the content of the composition would suffer. Last, the instructors reported that it was best to grade their students with a letter grading system as opposed to a satisfactory /unsatisfactory grading system, because the letter grading system is a more accurate and specific indicator of the quality of students' work and
of the progress students are making. It was also reported that the letter grading system provided an incentive for students to strive to produce higher quality work.

Concerning the reading-writing relationship, the instructors reported that their students' English and writing skills were improved by having them read materials written in English. The instructors reported that seeing language in a meaningful context helped students increase their vocabulary and improve their grammar. It was also reported that reading journal articles provided students with concrete examples of academic writing.

As for the topic of peer review, the statistical results of the instructor questionnaire suggested that all four of the instructors had a positive attitude toward peer review. Although the instructors reported that peer-review activities could have positive effects on the writing skills of ESL composition students, it was reported that this activity seemed to work best with undergraduate-level students who were writing papers dealing with the same topic. As for graduate-level students, it was reported that because these students often write papers dealing with their major area of study, there might not be students in the course who have the subject knowledge necessary to provide feedback concerning content.
3. What types of feedback do advanced-college level ESL composition instructors report to be the least beneficial, and why?

Concerning the topic of error-correction feedback, the instructors reported their view that it was not beneficial to only indicate on students’ compositions that an error exists because students, especially if they are to make their own corrections, need more detail about the types of errors they have made. The instructors reported that marking all errors on students’ compositions was not beneficial because this practice could discourage students and raise their anxiety levels. The instructors also reported that they rarely corrected spoken errors made by students in class because to do so could discourage their students from participating in class.

On the topic of grading, the instructors reported that it was not beneficial to grade all drafts of a composition because they would not be rewarding students for the progress they had made by processing the feedback they had been provided. The instructors reported that having the language count as much or more than the content for the grade could cause students to be too preoccupied with language concerns, and as such, the content of the composition could suffer. The instructors also reported that a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system was not beneficial because such a system is not an accurate and specific indicator of the quality of their students' work nor of the progress their
students are making. It was also reported that a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system would not provide incentive for students to strive to produce higher quality work.

Finally, the instructors reported that it was not helpful for students to write compositions in their first language and then translate them into English because translating produces errors due to negative transfer. It was reported, however, that students could improve the content of a composition by using their first language when doing the initial planning and outlining for their papers because this strategy could help students better remember what it was they wanted to say.

4. To what extent are these instructors in agreement with one another concerning their reported beliefs about composition feedback?

The instructors reported beliefs similar to one another concerning the types of feedback they provide their composition students. A majority of the items on the instructor questionnaire received the same rating from all four instructors and the reasons reported on the questionnaires by the instructors for rating items as they did were similar. Furthermore, during the oral interviews in which the instructors participated all four instructors basically reported that they provided their students with the same types of feedback and for the same reasons. The six topics for which the opinions
of the instructors were the most similar were: (a) The Process Approach, (b) Error-Marking Techniques, (c) Tutorials, (d) Grading, (e) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (f) Translation.

All four instructors reported that the process approach to composition writing was superior to the single-draft approach because by writing multiple drafts of a composition students are provided opportunities to process and use feedback. All four instructors reported that they used a combination of error-marking techniques and that their choice depended on error type and draft number. The instructors were in agreement that it is best to make the corrections for students when the problem is due to inappropriate word usage and when providing feedback for a final draft. As for the indicating and coding technique, the instructors were in agreement that this type of error-correction feedback was beneficial because by giving students an opportunity to make their own corrections, students acquire self-editing skills. All four instructors were in agreement that it was not beneficial to only indicate errors on students’ compositions because students, especially if they are to make their own corrections, need more detail about the types of errors they have made. All four instructors also reported that they did not mark all errors on students’ compositions because this practice could discourage students and raise their anxiety levels. All four instructors reported that having their students participate in tutorial sessions had a positive effect on their students’ writing skills because the tutorial sessions focused on the specific needs of an individual student. All four instructors reported that it is best to only grade the final draft of a composition, that the content of the composition
should count more for the grade than the language, and that their students should be graded with a letter grading system. All four instructors were in agreement that by only grading the final draft of a paper they were rewarding students for the progress they had made, that the content of the composition should count more for the grade than the language because the content is a more important aspect of the paper, and that the letter grading system is a more accurate and specific indicator of the quality of students' work and of the progress students are making. All four instructors were in agreement that having their students read materials written in English could help their students increase their vocabulary and to improve their grammar. Finally, all four instructors reported that it was not helpful for students to write compositions in their first language and then translate them into English because translating produces errors due to negative transfer.

5. Do the student subjects and the instructor subjects report similar beliefs about composition feedback?

The beliefs of the students concerning composition feedback were similar to those of the instructors. The two groups of subjects were most in agreement concerning their beliefs about the following six topics: (a) Peer Review, (b) Multiple Drafts, (c) Tutorials, (d) Grading, (e) The Reading-Writing Connection, and (f) Translation. The two areas where the students' beliefs and the instructors' beliefs differed the most were whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students' compositions,
and whether or not teachers should correct spoken errors made in class by students. As for whether or not teachers should mark all errors on students’ compositions, whereas all four of the instructors reported that they did not mark all of their students’ errors, a large majority of the students (94%) reported that teachers should mark all errors. As for whether or not teachers should correct spoken errors made by students in class, whereas all four of the instructors reported that they rarely corrected students’ spoken errors, a majority of the students (56%) reported that teachers should correct students’ spoken errors.
Pedagogical Implications

The purpose of this section is to recommend types of feedback that might be used in advanced college-level ESL composition courses. The students would be enrolled in these courses for the same major reasons as the students who participated in this study. That is, the undergraduate-level students would be preparing to take Freshman Composition with native speakers of English and the graduate-level students would be acquiring the writing skills necessary to allow them to begin work on writing a Master's thesis or a doctoral dissertation.

The types of feedback recommended in this section are based largely on the results of the data provided by the students who participated in this study. As stated in the Basic Assumptions listed in Chapter One: It is assumed that non-native English speaking college and graduate students know what they believe is best for improving their academic writing skills. Furthermore, it was seen in the review of literature that research exists that has shown the types of feedback the students in this study reported they believe to be the most beneficial are also the same types of feedback that have had the most positive effects on the writing skills of ESL composition students. This fact provides additional justification for the implementation of the types of feedback suggested in this section.

An ESL composition teacher might consider using certain types of feedback based on the fact that research has shown that those types of feedback have had the most positive effects on the writing skills of ESL
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composition students. ESL composition teachers, however, should not
limit their choice of feedback based solely on research that has
examined the effects of different types of feedback, but should also
consider their students' beliefs when deciding which types of feedback to
use. It might be recommended to consider the following question: Why
do certain types of feedback have a more positive effect than others on
the writing skills of ESL students? This study has made an attempt to
answer that question by asking students to give reasons why they prefer
certain types of feedback to others. Research reported in the review of
literature in this document has also attempted to answer this question.
For example, research has shown that giving students an opportunity to
correct their own errors helps them to become better self-editors.
Students in this study also reported that they believed that having an
opportunity to correct their own errors helps them to become better self-
editors.

Although many hypotheses can be made concerning why certain
types of feedback are more effective than others, one should not dismiss
the possibility that an important factor in the success or failure of a certain
type of feedback is linked to students' perceptions of that type of
feedback. In other words, if students believe a certain type of feedback is
beneficial, then that type of feedback may produce positive effects. Or at
least, the effects of a particular type of feedback might be more positive
than they would otherwise be if students did not believe that the type of
feedback in question was beneficial. We must not dismiss the role of
attitude and motivation in the learning process. If students have a
positive attitude about a certain type of feedback, this positive attitude provides the motivation that might in part be the reason for the positive effects that are being achieved by using that particular type of feedback.

This section includes recommendations for providing advanced college-level ESL composition students feedback concerning the following eight topics investigated by this study: (a) Multiple Drafts, (b) Peer Review, (c) Error Correction, (d) Tutorials, (e) Grading, (f) The Reading-Writing Connection, (g) Translation, and (h) Teachers and Students Discussing Feedback. As previously mentioned, these recommendations are based largely on the results of the data obtained from the ESL composition students who participated in this study. Thus, the following types of feedback are recommended because they are the ones reported by a majority of the students in this study to have the most positive effects on their English academic writing skills. Furthermore, most of the feedback recommendations suggested in this section are also supported by previous studies designed to investigate the effects of these types of feedback on the writing skills of ESL students.

As previously seen, the opinions of the students in this study were divided concerning certain types of feedback (e.g., grading). In such cases, the recommendations in this section reflect a combination of the beliefs of the students about a particular type of feedback. These recommendations are intended to serve as guidelines regarding the feedback objectives of a hypothetical advanced ESL composition course for college-level students.
Multiple Drafts

In order to encourage the students to regard their writing as a process rather than a product, the course should implement the process approach to composition writing. Because the students will know that they have opportunities to revise their papers, they will be encouraged to do hypothesis testing. The multiple-draft approach will also give the students opportunities to process and use the feedback they are provided. It is recommended that students write three drafts of a composition to be submitted to the instructor.

To prevent the students from being so preoccupied with the language of their papers that the content suffers, the students should be instructed to focus on the content of the composition for the first draft and the focus of the feedback provided by the instructor for the first draft should also be on the content of the composition. The majority of teacher feedback concerning language issues should be reserved for the second draft of the composition. However, when language problems are directly interfering with the teacher’s being able to understand the message a student is trying to convey, feedback concerning language should be provided for a first draft. Feedback provided by the instructor for the second draft should also address to what extent a student has processed and used the feedback provided for the first draft. Thus, feedback provided for the second draft will deal with the content of the composition as well as the language.
In addition to the fact that the students in the current study reported that the process approach is superior to the single-draft approach, research exists that also suggests that writing multiple drafts of a composition can have positive effects on ESL students’ writing skills (Zamel, 1983; Raimes, 1987; Ferris, 1995.)

Peer Review

Because peer review can both help ESL writing students to improve the content of their papers and help them to acquire a better sense of audience, the students should be required to participate in peer-review activities. Before having the students participate in their first peer-review activity, it is recommended that there be a class discussion on the topic. This class discussion will serve to familiarize the students with the procedures for conducting peer-review activities. In order to further familiarize the students with the activity, the class discussion should be followed by an in-class peer review of a paper written by a student from a different class section.

For the peer-review activities, it is recommended that students be grouped by twos or threes and that the following three factors be taken into consideration when forming the peer-review groups: (a) first language, (b) major, and (c) students’ preferences. Whenever possible, students in a peer-review group should not have the same first language, otherwise a content problem, for example, might be clarified in the student’s first language, but this clarification might never find its way into
the student's composition. That is, if a problem is solved in English, it stands to reason that there is a greater chance that the changes will be incorporated into the student's next draft of the paper. In order to better help each other with the content of a composition, whenever possible, students in a peer-review group should be majoring in the same or a closely related field. As seen in the current study, when students feel comfortable with the other members of a peer-review group, the students are more receptive to the activity, and as such, the activity can produce more positive effects. Thus, the students should also be asked to contribute input about whom they believe they would be most comfortable working with in a peer-review activity.

It is recommended that students receive feedback from their peers concerning the first draft of a paper. The students should be instructed to take their peers' feedback into consideration when writing the first draft of a paper to be submitted to the instructor. Because ESL students both tend to doubt their own ability to help their peers with language problems and to not trust language feedback provided by their peers, the students should be instructed to focus on the content of the composition for which they are providing feedback. However, the students should also be instructed to comment on the language of a composition, especially when it is believed that meaning is being impeded due to language problems.

In addition to the fact that the students in the current study reported that participating in peer-review activities has positive effects on their
writing skills, research exists that also suggests that peer review has positive effects on ESL students' writing skills (Chaudron, 1983; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonça, 1994).

**Error Correction**

It is recommended that the following three types of error-correction feedback be provided by the instructor on a student's composition: (a) The instructor makes the actual corrections for the student, (b) The instructor indicates and codes errors and requires the student to make the corrections, and (c) The instructor only indicates errors. The type of error-correction feedback provided by the instructor should depend both on the type of error that has been made and the number of the draft in question.

It is recommended that the instructor indicate and code a majority of the errors on the second draft of a composition and require the students to make their own corrections. It is not recommended that the instructor focus on the language in the first draft of a composition because this will both discourage students from doing hypothesis testing and lead students to believe that aspects of writing such as content and organization are less important than the student's use of mechanics. Furthermore, because the students are advanced in the language usage and are learning to do academic writing, they will probably need more time to work on improving the content of their papers than the language. Thus, the teacher should focus his or her attention on the content of the
student's first draft of a paper. Also, as changes are made in the content of the paper, more language problems are apt to arise. Thus, it is best to wait until the content of the composition has been improved before focusing on the language of the paper.

The practice of indicating and coding errors and requiring the students to make their own corrections will help the students to acquire the self-editing skills they will need when they no longer have a teacher to help them. Furthermore, a majority of the students in the current study who commented on this type of error-correction feedback reported that when required to find answers to their own problems they learned more than when the answers were supplied to them by their teachers. However, the instructor should correct any errors that are still remaining on the final draft. The instructor should also supply the correction on earlier drafts when the error is due to a usage problem that the teacher feels the student would not be able to solve. If a student has made the same error several times in the same paper (and the paper is not the final draft) it is recommended that the instructor correct the error the first time or two to serve as a model, and then indicate and code the error in order that the student may make the subsequent corrections. When it appears that a student has made a careless mistake, (e.g., subject-verb agreement) the instructor may choose to only indicate that a problem exists.

Because a large majority (94%) of the students who participated in this study recommended that teachers mark all errors on students' compositions, this type of error-correction feedback should be provided
for the students in the hypothetical courses for which these implications are intended. Although the writer of this dissertation is well aware of the fact that most experienced ESL composition teachers would disagree that marking all errors is beneficial, because it was decided to largely base the recommendations in this section on the results of the data obtained from the students who participated in this study, this type of error-correction feedback should be provided. Furthermore, because the students in this study were enrolled in advanced-level courses that implemented the process approach, it should not be surprising that they would want all of their errors marked. First, because these students were enrolled in the most advanced ESL courses offered at their university, they might believe that any writing problems they still have, especially concerning their English language usage, should be addressed at this point. Second, because the students are writing multiple drafts of a paper, the teacher does not have to mark all errors on the first draft, which, of course, might be discouraging if there are many errors. Besides, the students in this study reported that all language errors should not be marked on the first draft. However, especially considering the level of the students, the students might believe, and with good cause, that before moving on to a new writing assignment, all language errors should eventually be addressed in one way or another.

It is possible, however, that once students have been exposed to this type of feedback, students who supported this practice might change their opinions and request that their teacher no longer provide this type of feedback. As one of the student subjects reported during an oral
interview, sometimes students may believe a type of feedback is beneficial until they have actually had an opportunity to experience it. Later in this section the importance of teachers and students keeping open lines of communication on the topic of feedback is discussed. If, for example, students in these hypothetical courses reported that they did not want to have their teachers mark all of their written errors, then this practice should no longer be done.

Tutorials

Because one-to-one tutorial sessions with an instructor provides an ESL composition student an opportunity to receive personal attention that addresses the student’s individual needs, each student should be required to participate in a minimum of one tutorial session with the instructor for each composition written for the course. The tutorial sessions will also provide the teacher an opportunity to verify whether or not previously provided feedback had been understood by a student. It is recommended that a tutorial session take place after a student has been returned the first draft of his or her composition in order to give the student time to process the feedback that has been provided on the composition by the instructor. Although a student should not be required to rewrite the paper before the tutorial session, the student should be required to come to the session with possible solutions to some of the problems marked on the paper by the instructor. In order to encourage students not to focus on language issues, and because at this level
content problems might require more time to remedy than language problems, the focus of the tutorial for a first draft should be on the content of the paper. It is also recommended that the instructor use the tutorial sessions as an opportunity to discuss the topic of feedback with his or her students.

In addition to the fact that the students in the current study reported that the tutorial sessions in which they participated with their instructors had positive effects on their writing skills, research also exists that supports the use of tutorials (Berkovitch, 1982; Goldstein and Conrad, 1990).

Grading

In order to allow the students to see the progress that they are making, it is recommended that all drafts of a composition be graded; however, the grade for the last draft should be weighed twice as heavily for the final grade of the composition. By counting the grade for the final draft more, the students will be rewarded for the progress they are making. Furthermore, placing less weight on earlier drafts should encourage the students to do more hypothesis testing because they will be less anxious about making errors. The language of the composition should count for one third of the grade and the content should count for the other two thirds. By counting the content more than the language, the students should be encouraged to concentrate on the content and the organization of their papers, which, because the course is a writing
course, should be their main concern. Because letter grades are a more specific measurement of the quality of students' work and of the progress they are making, it is also recommended that the students be graded with a letter grading system.

The Reading-Writing Connection

Because reading can have positive effects on writing skill development, the students should both be encouraged to do outside reading and be required to do written assignments based on readings. If the students are undergraduate-level students, it is recommended that they participate in collaborative writing activities based on materials being read by all members of the class (e.g., a short story). If the students are graduate-level students, they should be required to write papers based on journal articles concerning their major area of study.

In addition to the fact that the students in the current study reported that reading materials written in English improves their writing skills, research also exists that suggests that reading can have positive effects on the writing skills of ESL composition students (Janopouloès, 1986; Polak and Krashen, 1988; Ferris, 1993). Some writers have recommended students do written assignments based on readings (Pugh, 1989; Hirvela, 1990; Kramsch, 1993).
Translation

Students should be informed that composing in their first language and then translating into English is not recommended because of the problems that can arise due to negative transfer. It is recommended, however, that students be told that using their first language when doing their initial planning and outlining of a paper can have positive effects on the content of their papers, especially when they are writing about a topic whose subject knowledge was acquired in their first language.

Discussing Feedback with Students

The instructor and the students should have in-class discussions on the topic of feedback similar to the focus-group activity conducted for this study. It is recommended that the instructor present the class with research on the topic, (e.g., from the review of literature in Chapter 2 of this document) and explain why he or she has the preferences he or she does concerning feedback. The instructor should allow students to voice their own opinions on the topic of feedback. The instructor should consider his or her students' preferences for feedback and make modifications to the previous recommendations accordingly (e.g., the discontinuation of the marking of all errors on students' compositions).

In addition to the types of feedback recommended in this section, the instructor is encouraged to provide his or her students types of feedback that were not examined in the current study (e.g., portfolio assessment).
The results of this study indicate that the students are not only receptive to a variety of different types of feedback, but that they prefer to receive a range of different types of feedback. Thus, the instructor should not limit his or her choices of feedback.

To conclude this section, the writer of this dissertation believes it would be appropriate to add a few personal comments about his experience writing this dissertation. These comments deal with what has been learned both by having conducted this study and by having received feedback from the committee members concerning the writing of this document.

In a sense, I have lived my dissertation. That is, I have written an academic paper while having received many of the types of feedback concerning writing that were investigated by this study. I have experienced the process approach to writing because of the various drafts I wrote initially for my adviser, and then modified based on feedback provided by my other two committee members. Feedback that I received concerning language issues included all three of the methods examined by this study. Feedback that I received about the content of my dissertation could be viewed as peer-review. As for the many office appointments spent with committee members discussing the progress that had been made on my dissertation, those meetings could be put under the rubric of tutorials.

Although both as a French teacher and as an ESL teacher I have provided my students with all the various types of feedback investigated by this study, prior to having written this dissertation I had not as a
student personally experienced most of these types of feedback. Over the years as a student I have written compositions for advanced-level French courses with several different professors at three different colleges. The instructors for all of those courses basically provided their students with the same types of feedback. The courses implemented the single-draft approach, the students did not participate in peer-review activities, and no tutorials were formally provided. Error-correction feedback either consisted of the teacher having made the actual correction or the teacher simply indicated, without providing specific detail, that a problem existed (e.g., underlined or circled the error). The focus of the instructors’ feedback for those courses was on the language of the composition (especially grammar) and not the contents of the paper. The language of the composition also seemed to play a greater role than the content concerning the grades that the instructors assigned to the compositions.

I believe that the writing of this dissertation and the feedback that I received from my committee members have had positive and lasting effects on my academic writing skills. The types of feedback the student participants in this study reported to be the most beneficial were also the types of feedback I found to be the most beneficial. Furthermore, the major reasons these students reported for their preferences for feedback were the same reasons I found the feedback I received to be helpful.

A majority of the students who participated in this study preferred the process approach to the single-draft approach. The most frequent reasons they reported for having this preference were that by writing
multiple drafts of a composition, students are encouraged to do hypothesis testing, are provided opportunities to process and use feedback, and learn to concentrate on different aspects of writing at different times. I also found this to be true. Although I am a native speaker of English, I too sometimes have difficulties concerning the most appropriate English to be used for an academic document such as a dissertation. Furthermore, knowing what information should be included in this document and how best to present that information posed many problems. However, knowing that I would have opportunities to make revisions I did not hesitate to include information that at first was not presented in a very clear way or else turned out later to be information that was not necessary to report. My advisor, who patiently read the 400 page first draft of Chapter 4, can attest to this fact.

The process approach has also taught me the importance of concentrating on different aspects of writing at different times, and that this applied not only when I was writing a section of this document, but also from the initial outlining to the final proofreading. I found that by concentrating on different aspects at different times I did not feel as overwhelmed and was able to produce better quality work. For example, I would first work on the actual content of my ideas, then work on the organization of those ideas. I dealt with language concerns last. Even when proofreading for typographical errors, I found that when I only looked for one type of problem at a time, I was more apt to find that problem.
One of the students who participated in the focus-group activity pointed out that in the future when he no longer had anyone to provide feedback concerning his writing, he would apply what he had learned about the process approach and write multiple drafts for himself. I would imagine that he is not going to wait that long, but rather was doing that for the papers he was writing for the class in which he was enrolled at the time the focus-group activity was conducted. That is, I would imagine that the first draft he turned in to his instructor was not the first draft that he had written of his paper. I too found myself going through all the steps of the process approach for what was officially a first draft of something I gave my advisor.

As for written feedback provided by my committee members, as did the students in this study, I found that I needed the feedback to be clear, specific, and detailed. For the most part their feedback met these criteria. Of course there were times when I was not sure what a committee member was saying a problem was and I guessed. I, however, almost always guessed incorrectly. In such cases, it would have saved precious time and energy both for myself and for the committee member in question if I had asked that committee member to clarify the feedback before I tried to process it.

On the topic of the clarification of feedback, this was one of the major reasons reported by students in this study for believing that the tutorials were a valuable part of their writing courses. I found that the office appointments I had with committee members provided a valuable opportunity for the clarification of their feedback. I also learned the
importance of a teacher using a tutorial session to verify that previously provided feedback, especially in written form, had been understood by a student. There were times when I was not sure how to interpret the feedback that I had been provided, and I hesitated to ask questions about the feedback in question. If a doctoral candidate is hesitant to ask a dissertation committee member to clarify feedback, it would not be surprising that a Freshman ESL student would hesitate to ask for feedback clarification at a tutorial session. ESL composition teachers need to be aware of this fact, and not assume that feedback is understood simply because a student does not ask for clarification.

Finally, a majority of the students who participated in this study reported that having their writing peer-reviewed had positive effects on their writing skills. Several students pointed out that by having participated in peer-review activities they had acquired a better sense of audience. The feedback that I received from my committee members also helped me to acquire a better sense of audience. I learned that even though I may know about what I am writing, my reader may need more details and clarification. My advisor also pointed out several times that it is important to anticipate possible questions a reader may have and to answer those questions as soon as possible. When I was working on the section for further research, for example, I kept that point in mind. As I suggested a possible research design, I could hear my advisor asking questions about the point of that research. Thus, I added a line or two about what might be done with the information acquired for each of those suggestions.
When all is said and done, I would have to say that my personal experience writing this dissertation has shown me that the types of feedback the students in my study reported to be the most beneficial for them were the same types of feedback I also found to be the most beneficial. Because of this experience, I will provide future students with the types of feedback suggested in this section, and I will feel assured that I am providing them with the types of feedback that will have the most positive effects on their writing skills.
Further Research

The purpose of this section is to propose further research based on the findings of the present study. In addition to recommending procedures in the methodology that should remain the same, changes to the present study are also recommended. These changes include modifications to the methodology and the expansion of the population to be studied.

As with the present study, it is recommended to have the subjects complete a questionnaire concerning their beliefs about composition feedback. After completing the questionnaires, the subjects, as in the present study, should be asked to participate in a follow-up to the questionnaire activity (i.e., the subjects are asked to provide written comments explaining why they had rated selected items on the questionnaire as they did).

It is recommended to have subjects complete questionnaires because this procedure allows researchers to easily and quickly gather data from a large number of subjects. As for the follow-up to the questionnaire, this activity allows subjects who are not willing or able to participate in oral interviews to have an opportunity to provide detailed information concerning their beliefs about composition feedback.

As with the present study, subjects should be asked to participate in oral interviews in order to obtain additional data concerning their beliefs about composition feedback. Because the questionnaire and the follow-up to the questionnaire used for the present study seemed to facilitate the
interview process by familiarizing the subjects with the topic at hand, it is recommended that oral interviews be conducted after the subjects have completed the questionnaires and the follow-up to the questionnaire activity (i.e., the written responses).

As for expanding the population to be studied, in addition to replicating this study with other ESL students enrolled in writing courses at the college level, this study should also be replicated with ESL students in High Schools, and perhaps even with ESL students in Junior High. Data gathered from ESL students at these various academic levels would be compared to see the degree to which students at these various academic levels are in agreement concerning their beliefs about composition feedback. Findings from such studies would either reinforce the pedagogical implications presented in this study or suggest other types of feedback might better serve the needs of those students.

One might also consider expanding the population sample to include non-native English speaking college students who are not enrolled in writing courses. For example, oral interviews and focus-group activities could be conducted with students in a School of Nursing, a Business School, etc. Data gathered from these students would be used to develop writing courses designed to meet the specific needs of these students.

Research should also be conducted to determine whether or not the types of feedback students report to be the most beneficial are indeed the types of feedback that have the most positive effects on the writing skills of those same students. After participating in a study similar to the
present study, students would be placed into writing classes based on the results of the data they provided. For example, the data should be used to make sure that both students who believe peer review is beneficial as well as students who do not believe peer review is beneficial are placed in a course that uses this type of feedback and in a course that does not use this type of feedback. The performance and progress of the students in both classes should be monitored and those results should be compared to the reported feedback preference of the students in the two classes to determine whether or not the preferred type of feedback was actually the one that had produced the most positive results. If, for example, the findings of such research were to show that students’ writing skills were improved more when they had been provided the type of feedback they reported to be the most beneficial, then these findings would provide further support for the importance of teachers knowing their students’ preferences for feedback.

At The Ohio State University undergraduate students who are not native speakers of English are not formally admitted into some schools (e.g., College of Business) until they have completed Freshman English (i.e., English 110). Furthermore, before being able to enroll in Freshman English, some students are required to complete course work in the ESL Composition Program. Thus, it is suggested that longitudinal studies be conducted with such students at The Ohio State University and at other colleges and universities.

The students should be tracked as they proceed through their course work in the ESL Composition Program, Freshman English, and into
programs in their major areas of study. The students could participate in oral interviews concerning the types of feedback they receive in their ESL composition courses as well as Freshman English. Of particular interest would be whether or not the students believe the feedback they received in the ESL composition courses had prepared them to take Freshman English, and whether or not the students believe that the feedback they received in their ESL writing courses and in Freshman English had prepared them to write academic papers for courses in their major fields of study. The findings of such studies could be used by ESL writing instructors, Freshman English instructors, and administrators to better prepare these students for their future writing needs. By the same token, graduate students could also be tracked to determine the degree to which their ESL composition courses had helped prepare them to write major documents such as a Master’s thesis or a doctoral dissertation.

In order to probe additional beliefs of ESL students about composition feedback, it is further recommended that the use of case study methodology be explored. The case study subjects could participate in systematic interviews while they are enrolled in ESL composition courses at a university. In addition to discussing the students' preferences for feedback, the students and the researcher could discuss various drafts of papers written by case study subjects to explore how the students process the feedback they are provided and to determine the extent to which the feedback had helped the students
improve their writing skills. The researcher could also investigate the progress the students are making. Interviews with their composition instructors would also provide additional data.

Findings from these case studies could be used to study how students process composition feedback. This information could then be used by ESL composition teachers to help them provide feedback that will have the most positive effects on their students’ writing skills.

In order to further expand the population to be studied, research similar to that conducted for this study should be conducted with college students enrolled in advanced composition courses in foreign languages (e.g., French or German). Because the courses would be in American colleges, the questionnaire would remain written in English, and “ESL” would be replaced by the name of the language in question. If for a particular group of subjects certain types of feedback appearing on the questionnaire were not being provided in the course in question (e.g., peer review or the multiple-draft approach), those items should still remain in order to learn whether or not the students would be interested in receiving those types of feedback. As was done with the students in the current study, students in future studies should be asked not to limit their opinions to types of feedback they are receiving, but also to give their opinions about types of feedback they are not receiving. Data from future studies (both from ESL students and from foreign language students) should be compared to both further examine the extent to which advanced college-level ESL composition students share opinions concerning composition feedback, and to examine the extent to which
the beliefs about composition feedback of advanced college-level
composition students in various foreign languages are similar. Findings
from such studies would either show that the pedagogical implications
presented in this study might also apply to students enrolled in advanced
foreign-language composition courses, or else suggest that other types
of feedback would probably better meet these learners' needs.

Concerning changes to the methodology in the present study, two
items on the student questionnaire should be modified. The two items to
be modified are Item #21: "I would like to receive more feedback about
language on my compositions than I currently am," and Item #22: "I
would like to receive more feedback about content on my compositions
than I currently am." The purpose of these two items was to investigate
the value the students placed on the language and on the content of the
composition; however, as these items read, they seem to evaluate
whether or not the students are receiving the amount of feedback they
would like concerning these two areas, and not whether or not the
students believe one aspect of the composition is more important than
the other. The new version proposed for these two items are: (a) Item
#21: "I would like to receive more feedback about the language of my
compositions than about the content," and (b) Item #22: "I would like to
receive more feedback about the content of my compositions than about
the language."

Because students who participated in both the oral interviews and in
the focus-group activity recommended that composition teachers discuss
feedback with their students, an item should be added to the student
questionnaire addressing this issue; it would read as follows: "ESL composition teachers and their students should discuss the topic of feedback." An item dealing with this topic should also be added to the instructor questionnaire; it would read as follows: "ESL composition teachers should discuss the topic of feedback with their students."

The procedures for the conducting of the focus-group activity also need to be modified. Because the students who participated in the focus-group activity wrote positive comments about the experience in their reflection papers, and because the activity produced data pertinent to this study, the amount of time devoted to this activity should be increased. By increasing the amount of time, topics that were not discussed during the focus-group activity reported in this document could be discussed, and more data could be obtained concerning the topics that were discussed. Thus, instead of the focus-group activity being conducted during one class session, the activity should require at least two class sessions. Furthermore, if more time were devoted to the focus-group activity, the students could be asked to write their reflection papers in class toward the end of the last class session. By having the students write the reflection papers in class, data concerning the questions posed for the reflection paper would be obtained from all the participants of the focus-group activity.

Finally, the results of this study showed that types of feedback that might not be considered appropriate in the cultures of many of the students who participated in this study received support for those very students. Furthermore, three of the four students who participated in oral
interviews provided information suggesting that even though certain types of feedback may not be considered appropriate in their cultures (e.g., peer review), they believe it is appropriate to use those types of feedback in courses in the US and preferred their teachers to use them.

These findings suggest that more data need to be gathered to determine if this belief is common among ESL composition students in the US. If one were to replicate the present study, it is recommended to have all the student subjects respond to a question on this topic when providing their written comments for the follow-up to the questionnaire activity. The following question is suggested: Are you currently receiving types of feedback that were not provided in your home country, and if so, how do you feel about that? This same question should also be posed during student interviews and focus-group activities. If research were to continue to show that students do respond positively to types of feedback that are not considered appropriate in their home countries, then ESL composition teachers in the US who are hesitant to use these types of feedback because of cultural differences might want to rethink their concerns on this topic.
Concluding Remarks

This dissertation has presented and examined advanced college-level ESL students’ beliefs about composition feedback. This dissertation has presented and examined the types of feedback these students most preferred, the types of feedback these students least preferred, and the major reasons reported by these students for having the preferences they do concerning composition feedback.

The student-subject data presented and examined in this dissertation were obtained by questionnaires, interviews, and a focus-group activity. The student-subject data in this dissertation were examined and presented based on academic level, class section, academic branch, and gender. The results reported in this dissertation have shown that no matter which of these variables had been taken into consideration the findings were similar.

This dissertation has also presented and examined advanced college-level ESL instructors’ beliefs about composition feedback. This dissertation has presented and examined the types of feedback these instructors most preferred, the types of feedback these instructors least preferred, and the major reasons reported by these instructors for having the preferences they do concerning composition feedback.

The instructor-subject data presented and examined in this dissertation were obtained by having the instructors complete questionnaires and participate in oral interviews. The results reported in this dissertation have shown that the instructors’ beliefs concerning
composition feedback were similar. Furthermore, the results presented in this dissertation have shown that for the most part the instructors' beliefs concerning composition feedback paralleled those of their students.

Finally, this dissertation has presented pedagogical implications suggesting types of feedback that ESL composition teachers might want to consider implementing in advanced college-level ESL composition courses. These suggestions were based on the most frequent preferences reported by the students who participated in this study. This study has shown that ESL students have firm and valid beliefs concerning which types of feedback help them the most to improve their English and academic writing skills. Such findings both validate the pedagogical implications presented in this dissertation and stress the importance of teachers and students keeping open lines of communication concerning the topic of feedback.


APPENDIX A

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Code Number

FEEDBACK FOR ADVANCED ESL COMPOSITION STUDENTS

Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire concerning your personal feelings about feedback as it pertains to your continuing acquisition of English and development of academic writing skills. Thank you for your participation.

A. Personal Data:

1. Age: 

2. Gender: 

3. First Language: 

4. Nationality: 

5. Major: 

6. Degree Sought: 

7. Amount of Time in the US: 

8. Counting this course, how many ESL composition courses have you taken at OSU? 

9. Main Career Goal(s): 

10. I would be willing to participate in a short oral interview on the topic of my beliefs about composition feedback. Yes No.
B. Please respond to the following statements by assigning each one a number between 1 and 4. 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; and 4 = strongly agree. We are interested in your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Having my writing peer-edited improves my English and writing skills. ________

2. Peer-editing another classmate’s work helps me to improve my English and become a better writer. ________

3. Receiving feedback about my English from a native speaker who is not a language teacher is an excellent form of feedback. ________

4. The only feedback I trust is from a teacher. ________

5. When I speak English with American friends, I usually ask them to correct my English as much as possible. ________

6. My English teachers should correct all the spoken language errors I make in class. ________

7. Sometimes I want to participate in class, but I am afraid to speak because I do not want to make a mistake. ________

8. The best number of drafts for a paper written for an advanced ESL composition course is three. ________

9. We should have more than three drafts. ________

10. We should have less than three drafts. ________

11. All drafts should receive a letter grade. ________

12. Only the final draft should receive a letter grade. ________

13. We should be graded on a satisfactory / unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade of “A” through “E”. ________
14. Both the content and the language of a composition should count equally for the grade. ______

15. The content of the composition should count more than the language for the grade. ______

16. The language of the composition should count more than the content for the grade. ______

17. The teacher should make the corrections on my paper for me. _____

18. The teacher should indicate where a problem is and tell what type it is (e.g., tense problem) but not make the actual change. ______

19. The teacher should only indicate where a problem is (i.e., circle it underline it, etc.), but not correct it, nor tell what type it is. ______

20. No matter which system is used, (Items 17, 18 or 19), the teacher should mark all errors. ______

21. I would like to receive more feedback about language on my compositions than I currently am. ______

22. I would like to receive more feedback about content on my compositions than I currently am. ______

23. During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on language not content. ______

24. During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on content not language. ______

25. The tutorials are a very important part of this course. ______

26. Reading improves writing skills. ______

27. It is best to write a composition in one's native language and then translate it into English. ______
28. It is a good idea when proofreading a draft of a paper to read it aloud to oneself at home.

Comments:
Please add a few brief comments about your views concerning your preferred ways of receiving feedback on your written assignments.

Thank You for Your Participation in this Research Project.
APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP DIRECTIONS
Code Number

Some of the items on your questionnaire have been circled in red. Please provide written comments telling why you gave these items the ratings that you did. That is, tell why you believe these types of feedback are useful or not. Thank you for your help. If you need more room, you may write on the back of this page.

Item #’s to comment on are: ______________________
APPENDIX C
INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE
FEEDBACK FOR ADVANCED ESL COMPOSITION STUDENTS
"INSTRUCTORS' VERSION"

Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire concerning your personal feelings about providing feedback to the students in your course who are participating in this research project. Please note that for the purpose of this project the definition of feedback has been expanded to include suggestions or strategies that you may provide your students. Thank you for your participation.

A. Personal Data:

1. Age: _______

2. Gender: _______

3. First Language: __________

4. Nationality: __________

5. Major (if applicable): __________

6. Degree Sought or in Hand: __________

7. Amount of Time in the US: __________

8. Counting this course, how many ESL composition courses have you taught at OSU? __________
Code Number

B. Please respond to the following statements by assigning each one a number between 1 and 4. 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; and 4 = strongly agree. We are interested in your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Having my students participate in peer-review activities improves their writing skills. ________

2. The only feedback my students trust is from a teacher. ________

3. I correct all the spoken language errors my students make in class. ________

4. I think my students are sometimes afraid to speak in class because they may make language mistakes. ________

5. The best number of drafts for a paper written for an advanced ESL composition course is three. ________

6. My students should write more than three drafts. ________

7. My students should write less than three drafts. ________

8. All drafts should receive a letter grade. ________

9. Only the final draft should receive a letter grade. ________

10. My students should be graded on a satisfactory / unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade of “A” through “E”. ________

11. Both the content and the language of a composition should count equally for the grade. ________

12. The content of the composition should count more than the language for the grade. ________

13. The language of the composition should count more than the content for the grade. ________
Code Number:________

14. I make the corrections on my students' papers for them. ______

15. I indicate where a problem is and tell what type it is (e.g., tense problem) but I do not make the actual changes. ______

16. I only indicate where a problem is (i.e., circle it underline it, etc.), but not correct it, nor tell what type it is. ______

17. No matter which system is used, (Items 14, 15 or 16), I mark all my students' errors. ______

18. During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on language not content. ______

19. During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on content and not language. ______

20. The tutorials are a very important part of this course. ______

21. Reading improves writing skills. ______

22. It is a good idea to tell my students to write a composition in their native language and then translate it into English. ______

23. It is a good idea for my students to proofread a draft of a paper by reading it aloud at home. ______
APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP HANDOUT
### Focus Group Questionnaire Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Raw Data</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode(s)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3,3,3,3,3,3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3,3,4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,3,3,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>1,1,2,2,3,3,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>3,3,3,3,3,4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>1,1,2,2,2,2,2,2,3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>2,2,2,3,3,4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3,3,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>2,2,2,2,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>2,3,3,3,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>2,3,3,3,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>3,3,3,3,3,3,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>1,2,3,3,3,3,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3,3,3,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>1,1,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>1,2,2,2,2,3,3,3,4,4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>3,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>2,3,3,3,3,4,4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>1,1,1,1,2,2,2,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>2,2,2,2,2,3,3,3,3,4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH FINDINGS IN THE LITERATURE AND STUDENT

COMMENTS FROM THIS STUDY

Peer Review

Research in peer review in ESL composition courses has shown that this activity has a very positive effect on students' writing. The area that most benefits is content. This is because the students develop a sense of audience. That is, they realize that although they know what they are trying to say, their reader may need more and clearer information. These skills continue to help students when they no longer are having their written work reviewed by others because they keep in mind what they did during these activities, and thus put themselves in the role of their reader as opposed to just the writer. Research has also shown that many students believe peer review to be very helpful.

Students who rated peer review highly in this study reported that they did so for the same reasons previously mentioned in the literature. Some also reported that a peer reviewer can help to point out a language mistake when the writer should have known better.

Students in this study who did not rate peer review highly did so for the following reasons: (a) The peer reviewer may not have knowledge about the topic so can not help with content, (b) If the students participating speak the same first language, they may use it to clear up problems, but the changes may not be made in English, and (c) They do not trust other students to be strong enough to correct language errors.

Error Correction

This study has investigated students' beliefs about the following three error marking techniques: (a) The teacher makes the correction for the student., (b) The teacher indicates the error and gives clues to the problem and the student has to make the correction., and (c) The teacher only indicates where there is a problem and the student has to make the correction.

Research has shown that students make the most progress when the teachers indicate and code and then require that the students make the actual corrections. It is suggested that this method is beneficial for the following two reasons: (a) the students remember longer when they
make the corrections themselves, and (b) this technique helps the students to become better self-editors when they no longer have the advantage of having someone to edit their writing.

Research dealing with ESL students' beliefs about error-correction techniques has shown that the majority of the students believe that the best system is for the teacher to indicate and code, and then allow the students to make the actual corrections. Research has also shown that the students' least preferred method is when the teacher only indicates where the problem is.

Many of the students in this study have indicated they prefer that the teacher make the changes for them; however, for this class both the technique of having the teacher make the correction and having the teacher indicate and code received strong support. For all four of the sections who participated in this study, the technique of only indicating received low ratings.

Some of the students who prefer that the teacher make the changes stated that the teachers should make the changes because that is their job. Students who preferred that the teacher indicate and code, reported beliefs similar to those previously mentioned that are in the literature.

As for having the teacher only indicate the errors, a student in this study who prefers this system stated that because there can be more than one way to fix a problem, it is best to let the student try to come up with a possible solution. When asked what the student thought about those who had said that it is the teacher's job to make the corrections, the student stated, "The teacher's job is to teach us to learn, not to give us the answers."

**Single-Draft System Versus Multiple-Draft System**

Research suggests that students' writing skills are more positively affected when they are in a multiple-draft course as opposed to a single-draft course. According to research, one of the major reasons why the multiple-draft system is superior is because of how students process the feedback that they receive on the different drafts. Whereas students in single-draft courses have reported that they do little or nothing with the feedback that they receive on their compositions, students in multiple-draft courses have reported that they greatly consider this feedback during the revision process. Furthermore, students in multiple-draft courses have reported that they also seriously consider the feedback on the final draft. The area that seems to improve the most is content.
Teachers who use the multiple-draft approach usually deal with content problems first and language problems later. It is believed that if students are too preoccupied with producing a first draft paper that has no language problems then the content will suffer.

In all, research on ESL students' beliefs about multiple-draft composition courses has been very positive.

The students in this study overwhelmingly prefer writing several drafts of a paper, and most believe that three is the best number. In addition to the reasons reported in the literature, students in this study have reported that they are not afraid to take a chance and write something that may be incorrect because they will have a chance to fix it later.

Reflection Paper

I would greatly appreciate everyone who participated in this activity today to write a very short paper for me. This paper may be hand written and as long or short as you wish. What I would like you to write are some comments to answer the following two questions:

(a) After having had time to reflect on feedback for composition students, heard other students' opinions about feedback, and have been presented some research on feedback, have your opinions on the topic changed? For example, would you change some of your ratings on the questionnaire? And if so, why?

(b) Do you believe that it would be a good idea for composition teachers to discuss in class with their students why they use the types of feedback they do, and get their students' opinions in ways similar to my study? If you think this is a good idea, briefly explain why.

After you have finished writing your comments about these two questions, please put them in your instructors' box in The Stadium. You may wait until after you have finished your finals. Please have your code number on the paper. Thank you very much for your help.
(1) I think the teacher should give a grade to each draft of the paper. This course is helping me to make much improvement.

(2) This course should be pass / fail.

(3) I like to do peer review.

(4) I like doing the group writing projects.

(5) We should have two tutorials for each paper. Talk about the contents for the first one and the grammar for the second one.

(6) I would like to receive feedback from my peers. I want the teacher to point out all my problems and make it crystal clear.

(7) Sometimes I think this ESL course is a waist of time because the teacher does not have enough time for each student. The classes should be smaller. Not more than 10 students.

(8) I would like to have peer review in this class.

(9) They should give an example of the assignments so that the student can more understand about the assignment.

(10) I mostly prefer feedback about content, rather than having each grammar error corrected.

(11) I think the tutorials are very helpful.

(12) In the beginning I concentrate more on the content of my paper and then work on the language later.

(13) Feedback about both content and language are important; however, feedback about content is more important.

(14) Feedback about content in most important for the first draft, then deal with language later. I like peer review, but this should be done with someone in the same major subject, and the focus should be on content.
(15) I prefer the teacher to indicate where the problem is and tell what
types the problems are.
(16) The tutorials should be given to the students more frequently.
(17) I like to plan my topic first in Turkish and try to remember what I
remember about it in Turkish. Later I write it in English.
(18) Many times I don't know how to write something in English, so I do it
first in my language.
(19) I want more than one teacher to correct my compositions. I want to
have more feedback about content.
(20) I think we need to have more written assignments.
(21) I need more help with language.
(22) I want to know all of my mistakes. The teacher should write as many
marks / comments as possible on my paper.
(23) We need more tutorials. In tutorial I can get the chance to talk in
detail about my topic and my grammar. We need more work on
grammar.
(24) I need problems on my paper pointed out very clearly. “A” - “E”
system is very bad.
(25) I think both content and language are equally important.
(27) The teacher should make all the corrections for me.
(28) We need to do more reading in this class.
APPENDIX F

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP COMMENTS
**Item 1.** Having my writing peer-edited improves my English and writing skills.

(a): (Rating = 2) What they say is grammatically questionable and untrustable.

(b): (Rating = 2) My peers still do not have excellent writing skills, so it might mislead my writing skills.

(c): (Rating = 3) They help me to find errors so I can use correct English.

(d): (Rating = 3) I get a lot of help from my peers about the contents. They give me good ideas.

(e): (Rating = 4) They help most with my content. Let me know my weak areas.

(f): (Rating = 4) They can give me their opinions about the content and let me know if they understand what I am saying, or if I need to make it clearer. My peers can also help me to find grammar mistakes.

**Item 2.** Peer-editing another classmate’s work helps me to improve my English and become a better writer.

(a): (Rating = 2) Because the other students are at my level, they don’t have the knowledge to help me.

(b): (Rating = 2) Because of my poor English I do not trust that I can help my peers. It is best for the teacher to do this.

(c): (Rating = 3) Their examples can improve my skills.
(d): (Rating = 3) I like to get other peoples’ opinions, then I can brainstorm these ideas.

(e): (Rating = 3) I do not really expect my peers to be able to help much with language problems, but they can help with content and organization.

(f): (Rating = 4) I can learn how to write an essay, and new words.

Item 3. Receiving feedback about my English from a native speaker who is not a language teacher is an excellent form of feedback.

(a): (Rating = 2) I don’t think that native speakers always use their own language correctly.

(b): (Rating = 3) Because English is their mother tongue, they can help to find mistakes.

(c): (Rating = 4) I also need professors in my field to help me with content in my particular field.

Item 4. The only feedback I trust is from a teacher.

(a): (Rating = 1) Sometimes another student may make a suggestion that will help my paper more than the advice that the teacher would have given me.

(b): (Rating = 3) Teachers have been trained how to teach students.

(c): (Rating = 3) As far as I know, English teachers in American universities have a good ability to to make students improve English skills and correct their mistakes.
Item 5. When I speak English with American friends, I usually ask them to correct my English as much as possible.

(a): (Rating = 1) My American friends do not care if I make mistakes. This takes too much time.

(b): (Rating = 4) This helps me to make better conversations.

(c): (Rating = 4) I hope that my American friends will correct my English, not everything, because this is a good way to practice and it will help me to improve my English.

Item 6. My English teachers should correct all the spoken language errors I make in class.

(a): (Rating = 1) This would be an irritative situation and I would get mad. I don’t want to be disturbed when I am trying to share my ideas.

(b): (Rating = 1) This would make me nervous and increase anxiety. This would keep me from speaking and keep me from making progress.

(c): (Rating = 2) It would take too much time to correct all of the mistakes.

(d): (Rating = 3) When I talk in class I may keep making the same mistakes and not notice it.

(e): (Rating = 4) Teachers are the ones who should correct our mistakes. If teachers don’t tell us, we usually do the same mistakes.
Item 7. Sometimes I want to participate in class, but I am afraid to speak because I do not want to make a mistake.

(a): (Rating = 1) If you are afraid to speak then you can not learn. You need to ask questions. Besides, this is a writing class, not a spoken English class.
(b): (Rating = 3) It is embarrassing to make speaking mistake, and your question nobody understand.
(c): (Rating = 4) The classes are so short that I am afraid that if I can't express myself clearly, it will take up too much time.
(d): (Rating = 4) If I make mistakes, sometimes I feel foolish.

Item 8. The best number of drafts for a paper written for an advanced ESL composition course is three.

(a): (Rating = 3) For the first draft the teacher corrects the content, for the second draft the teacher corrects the grammar, and the third draft is the result of the first two drafts.
(b): (Rating = 3) I don't have to try to get everything right the first time. I can experiment. If I make a mistake I can fix it later, and I also learn something new.
(c): (Rating = 3) This gives me the chance to use the feedback that the teacher gave me on the first two. But if the paper is good enough after the second draft a third one is not necessary.
(d): (Rating = 4) Writing is step by step. First draft = check idea, organization, Second = check language mistakes, Third = final draft.
(e): (Rating = 4) This gives me time to keep improving the final product. It doesn’t have to be perfect the first time, so if I try to say something and it is wrong, I will learn how to make it right. I can think about the teacher’s corrections for the first two drafts for the rewriting of third.

**Item 9.** We should have more than three drafts.

(a): (Rating = 2) I have too much to do for my other courses. I try to do my best so I will not have to rewrite papers.
(b): (Rating = 4) It gives me more times to make corrections and learn new things.

**Item 10.** We should have less than three drafts.

(a): (Rating = 1) I prefer to have three drafts so I can have chance to improve contents on second and language and contents on final (third) draft.
(b): (Rating = 2) I want to rewrite my papers using the feedbacks I get on first two drafts. If I don’t have chance to rewrite paper, I don’t know if I can fix paper correctly and improve writing skills.
(c): (Rating = 4) Because three is too many. It takes too much time for us to do all do these rewritings.
**Item 11.** All drafts should receive a letter grade.

(a): (Rating = 1) The first and the second draft is just kind of process which are still incomplete.
(b): (Rating = 1) Because for the first two drafts we are still working out our problems. It is not fair to grade these.
(c): (Rating = 3) Because this way the learner can know if he/she is making progress, and how much.
(d): (Rating = 3) Seeing the improvement can build confidence in the writer.

**Item 12.** Only the final draft should receive a letter grade.

(a): (Rating = 1) I think it is best to grade all of the drafts so we can see our progress.
(b): (Rating = 2) Because I want to know how well I did on the first drafts. I will know how much more work I need to do. The final grade will not be unexpected.
(c): (Rating = 3) The point is to make progress, so grading the last one is grading the progress.
(d): (Rating = 3) Because the first drafts will get a low grade because they will have a lot of problems. This will put down the student’s spirit, and the student will feel disappointed.
(e): (Rating = 4) I will be too worried about the grade, so I will not try to make mistakes on the first draft. Then my paper will sound like beginner’s.

(f): (Rating = 4) The previous drafts show the development, the final draft is the result.

**Item 13.** We should be graded on a satisfactory / unsatisfactory system instead of receiving a letter grade of “A” through “E”.

(a): (Rating = 1) Students need a more exact measure of their level.

(b): (Rating = 1) S/U system is less helpful because it is not specific enough.

(c): (Rating = 2) With letter grades I have a chance to get a high grade, and I can be proud of my grade.

(d): (Rating = 2) “A” through “E” system can show me more exactly my English level.

(e): (Rating = 4) Because this way students would not be under so much pressure.

(f): (Rating = 4) ESL is for developing students’ language skills, not measure the skills like solving problems in math.
Item 14. Both the content and the language of a composition should count equally for the grade.

(a): (Rating = 2) The content is more important, because the paper may not have any language mistakes, but if the content is not good the paper will make no sense.

(b): (Rating = 3) They are both important because both need to be good so that the reader can understand what you are saying. Also, if the language is not good, it will be hard to read and not interesting.

(c): (Rating = 4) Both are very important to have a good paper.

(d): (Rating = 4) Both are important factors to make a good composition.

Item 15. The content of the composition should count more than the language for the grade.

(a): (Rating = 3) It takes many years to learn a language. So for now, content should count more.

(b): (Rating = 4) Composition means contents in the story.

(c): (Rating = 4) It is hard to have perfect language for a foreign language, so the ideas should count the most.

(d): (Rating = 4) Idea more affects the value of a paper to this field.

(e): (Rating = 4) I need most to learn how to write academic papers for my degree.
**Item 16.** The language of the composition should count more than the content for the grade.

(a): (Rating = 2) My language is totally opposite of English, so it is more difficult for me. This could hurt my GPA.

(b): (Rating = 2) I am good in language, but my paper is nothing without good contents.

(c): (Rating = 3) I am here to improve my English, so for me language is more important.

**Item 17.** The teacher should make the corrections on my paper for me.

(a): (Rating = 2) If the mistakes are ones when the students should know the answers or be able to find it oneself, the teacher should not make the correction.

(b): (Rating = 2) In order for me to learn, I need to participate in the correction process.

(c): (Rating = 2) It is important for us to make our own corrections so we will not forget and make the same mistakes again.

(d): (Rating = 3) It needs to be clear to the students what the answers are.

(e): (Rating = 3) That depends on the type of problem. If it is a word that we would not know is best choice the teacher should change it. If it is a grammar problem we can fix, we should fix it. Also, it depends on draft. If it is the last draft and I still am wrong, then I want the teacher to fix it.
(f): (Rating = 4) That's the teachers job.

Item 18. The teacher should indicate where a problem is and tell what type it is (e.g., tense problem) but not make the actual change.

(a): (Rating = 1) That is the teachers job. If they don't do the corrections, I will not know what the correct answer is.
(b): (Rating = 2) If it is a word choice that native speaker only know best, then teacher need to change it.
(c): (Rating = 3) It is good for us to practice making our own corrections. But it helps sometimes to know what type of problem we have.
(d): (Rating = 3) I like to try to fix problems, but I need the help of knowing what type they are.
(e): (Rating = 4) If we always depend on the teacher to make the corrections, who will do it when we no longer have a teacher?
(f): (Rating = 4) Students should learn some things by themselves rather than passively accept teachers' corrections.

Item 19. The teacher should only indicate where a problem is (i.e., circle it underline it, etc.), but not correct it, nor tell what type it is.

(a): (Rating = 1) Students need to learn how to correct their mistakes for the future, but when in ESL class, they need advice how to do it. Best is indicate and tell what type problem.
(b): (Rating = 1) The teacher must correct for me, or else I will not what is wrong and my writing will not improve.

(c): (Rating = 1) It is good for us to correct the mistakes ourselves, but we should be told first what kind of a mistake we made.

(d): (Rating = 2) It is important that we correct them ourselves, but we need to have explanations and suggestions.

(e): (Rating = 3) If it is a dumb mistake and I should know better, this is all that is necessary.

**Item 20.** No matter which system is used, (Items 17, 18 or 19), the teacher should mark all errors.

(a): (Rating = 2) If our ideas are expresses clearly, the teacher does not need to mark every mistake. Marking all the errors will discourage students to study English.

(b): (Rating = 4) We need to know are mistakes so we will not make them again in the future.

**Item 21.** I would like to receive more feedback about language on my compositions than I currently am.

(a): (Rating = 3) So I can learn to express my ideas more clearly.

(b): (Rating = 3) I am not good in language.

(c): (Rating = 4) Especially because the structure of my language is so different than English, I continue to make very many mistakes.
**Item 22.** I would like to receive more feedback about content on my compositions than I currently am.

(a): (Rating = 3) I want to make my ideas clearer.
(b): (Rating = 3) Simply because I am bad at it.
(c): (Rating = 3) Content is a weak point for me.
(d): (Rating = 4) This is where I need most improvement.

**Item 23.** During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on language not content.

(a): (Rating = 1) This is when we need to decide if the ideas for the paper are good.
(b): (Rating = 1) The tutorial should be focused on contents because this is the only chance to totally change the contents.
(c): (Rating = 1) Content is harder to improve, it takes more time.
(d): (Rating = 3) For international students the biggest problem is language, not content.
(e): (Rating = 4) So I can fix the language problems as soon as possible.

**Item 24.** During a tutorial for a first draft the emphasis should be on content and not language.

(a): (Rating = 3) We need to first make sure that our ideas are clear.
(b): (Rating = 3) Expressing our ideas is most important.
(c): (Rating = 4) Content is more important that language, so we should have more time to work on it.

Item 25. The tutorials are a very important part of this course.

(a): (Rating = 3) The teacher can concentrate on my mistakes.
(b): (Rating = 4) It gives students the chance to talk more about their individual problems.
(c): (Rating = 4) Students can get more specific information about their paper.
(d): (Rating = 4) We get a chance to talk about our individual situations.
(e): (Rating = 4) Because we can work closely with the instructor about our problems.

Item 26. Reading improves writing skills.

(a): (Rating = 2) For me reading only helps comprehension skills, not writing skills.
(b): (Rating = 3) I learn a lot of new English from reading books.
(c): (Rating = 4) I can learn new ideas for writing.
(d): (Rating = 4) All language skills come from imitating. By reading I learn examples of how to write.
(e): (Rating = 4) Because I get to see examples of different styles of writing.
(f): (Rating = 4) I get new vocabulary, grammar, and structures from reading. Therefore, I can write better.

**Item 27.** It is best to write a composition in one's native language and then translate it into English.

(a): (Rating = 1) My language is totally opposite of English. If I try this no one will be able to understand my papers.

(b): (Rating = 1) I need to think in English to write in English. Because of language and cultural differences, translating will make the paper strange.

(c): (Rating = 2) To translate directly often gives the wrong meaning. Also, sometimes I can't find the same word or expression in the other language.

(d): (Rating = 3) Because I can think better in my native language, so I don't get stuck on my ideas.

(e): (Rating = 3) Whenever I am writing about opinions that I already have, I do some of the beginning writing in my language so I don't lose the ideas. So I write down my ideas in Indonesian, then I do the essay in English.

**Item 28.** It is a good idea when proofreading a draft of a paper to read it aloud to oneself at home.

(a): (Rating = 3) It helps to hear if something is inappropriate.
(b): (Rating = 3) You can concentrate more on the paper.

(c): (Rating = 3) If it sounds good, maybe it is good.

(d): (Rating = 4) I can hear the grammatical mistakes when I do this.
APPENDIX G

STUDENT INTERVIEW

UNDERGRADUATE SECTION ONE
I:  = Interviewer
S:  = Student

I:  First of all I would like to thank you for agreeing to do this interview.
S:  No problem.
I:  Ok. To begin I have a few basic questions that I am asking all the
students who are participating in this research project. Next I want to go
to the questionnaire and talk about some of your responses. So, first of
all, can you tell me what you are studying at Ohio State?
S:  Accounting.
I:  So, you say here that you have been in the United States for six
months.
S:  Yes. This is my second quarter.
I:  I was wondering about your background in English and in English
composition. Can you tell me when you started studying English? What
types of composition classes you have had, and the differences between
the Japanese system, and what you are doing here?
S:  I started English class in Japan in middle school and then in high
school. So I had six years. Then for two college years. I never did same
thing as composition class in the United States.
I:  Ok. So you never really had a writing class before you came here.
S:  Yes, that’s right. But before I came to Ohio State, I was in
Tennessee to take a composition class, a sort of ESL class during
summer break last year.
I: So in Japan there is not much of an emphasis on writing in the English classes.

S: No. Reading and vocabulary. The Japanese system is more focused on reading and translating from English to Japanese.

I: So what do you think of the two systems?

S: In Japan we never wrote a long paper in English so it is a kind of weak point for me. So I wanted to study writing at that time, but it's the Japanese system. It's a bad point.

I: Ok. Good. Before we look at specific items on the questionnaire, just off the top of your head, what types of feedback do you think are the most valuable for you? What helps you the most with your writing?

S: Writing papers. The homework assignments. To me that only way to improve writing skills in English is to write, write, write. So it's not the teacher, not friends that help writing skills. It's the practice that makes the most improvement.

I: Ok. So, is there any type of feedback that you are not receiving in this class but you would like to?

S: There is too much basic grammar. I need more vocabulary. But actually vocabulary comes from my own studies. So I can't ask the teacher to help with this.

I: That makes me think about the item about reading. You agreed that reading improves your writing skills. What area of writing do you think reading helps the most?

S: I think vocabulary.

I: Yes, that's why I asked about that.
S: I don’t use dictionary often. I can guess the word. It works.

I: Ok. Good. Now, let’s talk about one of the items with which you disagreed. For example, you don’t think that having your papers peer-reviewed helps you to improve your writing. So, do you do peer-review activities in this class?

S: Yes we do.

I: Can you tell me the procedure for this and why you feel the way you do about it?

S: We don’t have enough time to peer review satisfactory, and that’s the biggest problem. We don’t have enough time to read the paper, it takes too much time.

I: Ok. But you did agree that peer reviewing another student’s paper can help you to improve your writing. Why do you feel this way?

S: Because when I read another’s paper I am more worried with their problems than I am with my own paper. But when I see their mistakes, they may be same kind I make, so it helps me when I look for mistakes on my paper when I proofread it.

I: Ok. So according to your response about the multiple-draft system, you think it is a good idea to write three drafts of the same paper.

S: Yes, I think is helps a lot.

I: Why?

S: (No Response)
I: Ok. So, for example, let's say that you are going to write a paper for a single-draft course and for a course like this one where you write three drafts of it. Would you do anything differently depending on which system is being used?

S: I would be more worried about making mistakes in one draft. With three I get chance to fix mistakes. I can learn from the mistakes. Also, if I only have one draft I try write things I know are right.

I: Have you had English classes where you only write one draft of the paper?

S: Yes. That's the system in Japan. That's a bad point. I think they should do it the US way.

I: So what did you do with the feedback on the papers that you wrote in the single-draft course?

S: Nothing. (Student gestures throwing paper away)

I: Ok. How about the grading system. According to your questionnaire you want all the drafts to receive a letter grade, and you would not prefer a satisfactory/ unsatisfactory system. So you seem to like grades, why?

S: By seeing the letter I can see how well I am doing. The progress I am making. When I get good grades it makes me feel good. I do well in my composition classes and it helps my GPA.

I: I'm also interested in your beliefs about the three types of error-marking techniques on the questionnaire. That is, the teacher makes the corrections, the teacher indicates the problem and gives a code, or
the teacher only indicates where a problem is. You strongly agreed on
your questionnaire that you want the teacher to indicate and code errors.
Do you like to have a chance to correct your own errors?

S: Yes. I can learn better from my errors. I want to correct. In Japan
the teacher is required to make the correction. That is a bad point. So on
erly draft teacher can indicate and I fix. But on last draft the teacher
should make the correction because I don’t have more chances.

I: Ok. Great. Is there anything else you would like to add about
anything?

S: No.

I: Ok. Thanks a lot for your help.

S: No problem.
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I: First I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview with me.

S: That's ok. You're welcome.

I: First I would like to ask you some questions that I am asking all the students in this research project. After that I want to talk about some of the responses you put on the questionnaire; the ratings you gave some of the items. Ok, but first I would like a little background information. So, can you tell me about what you are studying here, your major?

S: I'm in the university college.

I: Now, what does that mean exactly? I saw on your questionnaire that for major you put UVC.

S: Well. I will major in business. But before that I must enroll in some courses, then I can enter in business major.

I: Are these courses something to do with business?

S: No, everyone enter Ohio State enter UVC first.

I: Ok. So, in a sense it is like your major still isn't decided officially even though you know what you want to do.

S: Yes, that's right.

I: Ok. So, can you tell me about your background in English and in English composition?

S: You mean in Taiwan?
I: Yes. Start at the very beginning and tell me about your past courses in English and then what you have done since you have been at Ohio State.

S: I started to study English from twelve years old, and never stop up to now.

I: Ok. So you are 19, so that makes seven years. See, I can figure these things out. So, anyway, did you have writing classes before you came here?

S: Yes, in High School. We must before we enter university. We must enter an examination test for English composition.

I: Do you have to write an essay?

S: Yes. About two hundred words. We have about one half an hour.

I: So, did you have a choice of topics?

S: Yes. Show your own opinion in that essay.

I: Ok. So, how about the English course you are taking now. Why are you in the class you are in now?

S: Why?

I: Yes. Why? Is is a requirement, or you just felt you would benefit from it?

S: it is a requirement.

I: Ok. Well, how about overall, without my picking a specific item from the questionnaire, off the top of your head could you pick a couple of types of composition feedback you like and tell me why? That is, what types of feedback do you think are most helpful and why?

S: I like peer review.
I: Ok. Let's look at that item on your questionnaire. You gave it a "3". So, you agree that peer review can help you to improve your writing.

S: Yes, it helps a lot.

I: Ok. So, is this your first composition course at Ohio State?

S: Yes.

I: And have you done any peer-review activities in this class?

S: Yes.

I: So, could you tell me a little bit about them? What you do, and why you like these activities.

S: I think it is very helpful to see other students' writing, and we can discuss if we have done it well.

I: Ok. So, what are the steps involved in this activity?

S: We exchange our papers first, and then the next day we will discuss each others' papers.

I: Ok. So you read the other student's paper at home?

S: Yes. And then the next day we ask questions about things we don't understand.

I: So when someone asks you questions about your composition, usually what types of questions do they ask? Do you talk about grammar, content, things like that? Is there some area that seems to be helped the most by peer review?

S: I think content. If the other student doesn't understand my writing it means I need to make it more clear. Maybe I need to add more
examples, more detail so he or she will know what I'm saying. I know what my article about, but I need to add more so other can understand my article.

I: Do you think that the peer-review activities will have a long term effect on your writing? That is, do you think it will help you after you are no longer taking courses in composition?

S: Yes.

I: Ok. So how do you think it will help you in the future?

S: When I no longer have except me when I am doing writing, I can ask myself the question that my peer asked, and see if my writing is good.

I: Great. That is very interesting. Ok. So you gave this item a “3” so you agree it helps, and you gave some very interesting reasons why; however, you didn’t give it a “4” (strongly agree). So, is there anything negative you think about peer review?

S: Yes. Sometimes when we are doing peer review with someone, we may do it with someone who speaks same language then we don’t use English. But we should only use English.

I: Ok. So, when you write compositions for this course, what types of things do you write about?

S: I like to write about reading. How reading can help improve writing.

I: Ok. So let’s look at some of the items for which you disagreed. For example, on item #12 “Only the final draft should receive a letter grade” you strongly disagreed with that.

S: Yes.
I: Can you tell me why you feel this way?

S: Yes, because I want to know if I did very well on the first draft. If I don't receive a grade I don't know if it was good.

I: Ok, good. Now back to some of my preliminary questions. Is there anything in this course that you are not doing but would like to do or are there any types of feedback that you would like to receive in this course but you are not?

S: I don't think so.

I: Ok. So back to your feelings about reading improving writing. Do you have reading assignments in this class?

S: Yes.

I: What types of things do you have to read?

S: We have a book with short stories we read.

I: Ok. So tell me why you think reading helps you to improve your writing skills.

S: Because we have words in the story that I don't know before, and I learn these words.

I: Do you mean by seeing them in context helps you to understand the new words?

S: Yes. I can see how the word is used. It helps more than a dictionary. I see how it is really used.

I: Ok. Good. How about item “27”? You strongly disagreed that it helps to write a composition in your first language and then translate it into English. Why do you think this is a bad idea?
S: It is because in Chinese the structure is too different. It is impossible.

I: Ok. But, before you write a composition do you make an outline about what you are going to write about?

S: Yes I do that.

I: Do you use Chinese when you do this?

S: Yes, some. Then I look in dictionary to see how say it in English.

I: You agreed with the item that the tutorials are helpful. Can you tell me what you do at these tutorials, and why you like them?

S: We can discuss our papers personally. The instructor can tell me about my problems with my papers and I can ask him questions about my paper.

I: So, what do you work on first, language, content, etc.? 

S: Well, I always make language mistakes, use the wrong word. But I think content should be worked on first, and then language later.

I: What do you think about the idea of having several drafts of the same composition?

S: I think it is very good system. In China we only write one draft. I prefer US system.

I: Ok. So, if you were in a course where you only had one draft of a paper, or a course such as the one you are in now where you write three drafts of a paper, would you do anything differently depending on which type of course you are in?
S: When I get back a paper I only write one time I don't care about the problems on it because I don't need to do it again. If I need to write a second or third draft I need to correct the mistakes. So what teacher write on the first is important so I can correct it.

I: Very good. Now that tells me how you process the feedback that you receive in the two types of courses. Now I would like to know if you are more worried about making mistakes in one class or the other.

S: Yes, in single draft I don't get a second chance to make it right so I try to do better. When I only have one chance I don't like to write something unless I'm sure it is right. But with more one draft I can make mistake and learn from mistake.

I: Because you have such a strong interest in English, and your comments on the questionnaire, the follow-up, and today's interview sound like the types of answers I would expect from an ESL teacher, imagine, if you will, that after you return to China you were given a job teaching an English composition class. What types of things would you do in that class?

S: I would like to teach same way as in United States. But that is impossible in Taiwan because everyone only care about grades on test, but don't care about writing ability in English. That's why I like to study here because the courses in US are more practical reason. We learn for purpose.

I: What about the multiple-draft system? Would you have your students write more than one draft of a paper?
S: Yes. I would like to, but that is not the Chinese way. We have to do it the Chinese way. So we have to do our best job the first time....no chance to revisions.

I: Great. It looks like we have talked for almost 30 minutes. Is there anything else you would like to add?

S: No.

I: Ok. I thank you very much for your time. This interview will be very helpful to me.

S: You are welcome.
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I: First I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview with me.
S: You’re welcome. It’s a pleasure.
I: First I would like to ask you a few basic questions, then I would like to discuss some of the items on the questionnaire.
S: Ok.
I: Could you tell me what type or types of feedback help you the most with your writing and why? It could be something on the questionnaire, or something else.
S: Yes. For me the tutorials are a very important part of this class. We talk about the content, and the organization, and the language. He points out where I need to add more information or where it is not clear, and he points out alternatives to me.
I: Ok. So, on that note let’s look at what you put down for error-marking techniques and for content. Ok. Your ratings show that you think that both language and content are important, but you rated content as a little more important.
S: Yes. In fact, in order to have a good paper you have to deal with both language and content. If they are both good, that means the paper is good. But I think content is more important because if you write
a paper that has some language problems, but you say what you mean, and the teacher understands it, that is the most important fact. Do you see what I mean?

I: Yes. When I took courses in French literature, I often got “B’s” on my papers even though my language was excellent. I would see other students who got better grades, but their papers were all marked up in red because of language problems. It seemed that the teachers would rather have the students say what they wanted them to say in bad French then to have them write something they didn’t want them to say in good French.

S: Yes. That’s right. What you say is more important than how you say it. It’s the message that counts the most ... the meaning ... the purpose.

I: Ok. Great. Now for error correction you gave a “3” to both the teacher makes the actual correction, and the teacher indicates and codes the errors. But you didn’t seem to like the idea of the teacher only indicating that there is a problem. As for the two techniques you gave a “3” can you tell me when and why these two techniques should be used?

S: I think the teacher should make the correction when it is a structure that I don’t know because I find it hard to find the correct way myself. Sometimes I just don’t know how to fix the problem myself.

I: Ok. I think you are talking about what I like to call usage problems. This is when a grammar book or a dictionary may not be able to help. It
is one of those cases when the best answer to why something is correct is “because that's the way it is”. You need what some people call native speaker intuition to be able to know why something is appropriate.

S: Yes. That is exactly what I am talking about. Sometimes, with, for example, vocabulary words, one word sounds the best in a certain case, but even if I use both a Turkish-English dictionary, and an English-English dictionary, I can't select the best word on my own. So then the teacher needs to tell me the answer. The problem when I was in English classes in Turkey was that the teachers only would underline or circle. I didn't know what type of problem it was ... grammar, vocabulary, etc.

I: What system does your teacher use for your class here at OSU?

S: He uses a mixture of the types. Sometimes he will say that it is an awkward word; sometimes he makes the correction; sometimes he says “so what?” , which means I need to add more information. So it's pretty clear what I need to do to improve my paper.

I: Is there any type of feedback that you are receiving, or activities that you are doing in class that you do not like?

S: No. But I would like the teacher to make more corrections for me when it is a vocabulary problem, because I am not good at finding the appropriate word myself all the time. But we work on that in the tutorials. But I still would like to see him put the most appropriate word on the paper for me.

I: Ok. Good. So let's talk some about the multiple-draft system. How many drafts do you write for each paper in this class?

S: Usually three.
I: Ok. So let's see how you rated these items on the questionnaire. You put a “3” for three is the best number of drafts, a “3” for having more than three drafts, and a “1” for having less than three drafts.

S: Yes. Three is a good number. Maybe four, but not less than three.

I: So can you tell me why you like the multiple-draft system?

S: Yes. For my first paper I wrote here, it was an annotated bibliography. My first paper was very bad. On my first draft the feedback was very very helpful. He put, for example, “Why don’t you have an introduction?” etc. He gave me directions for the format and he told me how to organize the paper. So I used this feedback information and improved my next draft. But I still have problems with usage. But, by the third draft both the language and content were very good.

I: Great. So, let’s look at an item that you gave a low rating. Ok, for the item about using a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system instead of receiving a letter grade, you strongly disagreed with this idea. So you like grades. Can you tell me about that?

S: Yes. If I only get satisfactory I don’t know how well I did. Is this an “A” an “A-” a “B” or what? An “A” through “B-” could be satisfactory. but there is a big difference in the quality of the papers with these different grades. If I get a letter grade I know how well I am doing; how much I am improving, or how much harder I should work. If I get a “B”, I will want to work harder, study more. If I get an “A” I know I am doing my best.

S: Great. So, have you ever done any peer-review activities? I know you don’t do them for this class.
S: Yes. I did that in Turkey.

I: I know that you taught English in Turkey. Did you do peer-review activities as a student or as a teacher?

S: Both.

I: Great. Could you tell me about these experiences?

S: When I was having my B.A. we did peer review in the English courses. I didn’t like to have the other students see my language errors and point them out. Also, because we were all at the same level, I didn’t trust that the students would know if there were language problems or how to correct them. But this activity helped a lot as far as the content is concerned.

I: Yes, that is what the research shows. That is, that it helps most with content.

S: That’s right. I remember that from the focus group. Anyway, as for the English classes that I taught in Turkey, I used peer review in them.

I: By the way, what was the level of your students?

S: I taught both in Middle School and in High School. But there were some problems with the activity. Sometimes the students were shy and didn’t want to participate. Also some of the students made fun of their friends’ papers, so they didn’t take the activity seriously. Also, some of the students didn’t think that they could trust the other students to help them with language problems. But there were times when it worked very well. It especially helped with content. Also, sometimes we had a class discussion about a student’s paper. Everyone had a copy of the paper,
and they made comments about the content. The students said that they thought that this activity was very helpful. I also encouraged them to participate and not to be afraid to make mistakes.

I: On that topic, let's see how you rated the items about being afraid to speak in class and having the teacher correct all the students' spoken language errors. Ok, you rated both of these items low. This is probably because you are a teacher, but you know, many students in this study rated both of these high. So that means they want the teacher to correct all of their spoken errors, and they are afraid to speak because they don't want to make a mistake.

S: Yes. That is bad. I encouraged my students to speak in class and not to be afraid to make a mistake. Also, I didn't correct all of their errors. Thus is too disruptive. They need to practice, and not be afraid to make a mistake.

I: You know, research has shown that many ESL students say that they want their teachers to correct all of their spoken errors. If you ever have students who want you to do that, what you should do is try doing that for one class period. After they see how unproductive this practice is, I am sure they will never ask you to do it again.

S: Yes. That is a good idea. Also, I tell the students that because the content of what they are saying is important, and so I am listening for the message, I don't even notice many of their mistakes.

I: That is true. And from my own experience teaching both French and ESL, when an ESL student is speaking I tend to notice far fewer mistakes than when an American student is speaking French. I seem to
listen more for content when someone is speaking my first language. Anyway, I don’t want to keep you much longer. So, is there anything else you would like to add?

S: Well, even though we don’t use peer review in this class, we do look at articles and discuss them.

I: Ok. So that is sort of like a peer-review activity.

S: Yes. We discuss the article. If it is written well. What are the good points, the weak points.

I: Ok. What you are saying about this activity makes me think about the item about reading improving writing skills. Ok. Let’s see. You gave this item a “4”. I figured from what you were saying that you would have agreed with this item.

S: Yes. The articles give us good examples. We see how to do a good introduction etc. How to organize etc. And the teacher points out what he likes or doesn’t like and why. Having an example to follow helps me very much. So, I like this best in class, and the tutorial sessions.

I: Ok. Great. Thank you very much for your time. You have provided me with a lot of good information.

S: You are very welcome. I enjoyed talking about feedback. I believe it is very important to do so. Teachers need to talk to students about feedback.
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I: Thank you for doing this interview with me.
S: You are welcome.
I: First I'd like to ask you some basic questions that I am asking all the students who are participating in this study. Then we will look at your questionnaire.
S: Ok.
I: What are you studying at Ohio State?
S: I'm in the College of Education. I am working on my Masters in Curriculum Instruction. I have already applied to the Ph.D. program here.
I: Could you tell me about your background in English and in English composition?
S: In Kuwait we start studying English in the fifth grade until we graduate. So that makes eight years. After that, I had to take three courses in English during my first two years at the university. During those years I studied grammar, reading and writing. After I graduated from college, I worked at the university in the College of Education. At that time I was teaching English for undergraduates.
I: When you were studying English in Kuwait, did you have any composition courses.
S: Yes. There was always writing required in all my classes from the very beginning. And before I came to Ohio State I took two English composition courses at the University of Illinois.
I: Good. We will come back to that later because I want to discuss the
different types of feedback you received at the different places you
studied English. But for now, could you tell me what types of feedback
you most prefer and why?

S: I really like peer review. We are not doing it in this class, but we
did it last quarter in 106 G. I think it was very helpful.

I: So, could you tell me what you did for this in the other course and
why you liked it so much?

S: The teacher gave us a list of questions to ask about the controlling
idea, the organization, the vocabulary etc. We worked in groups of three.
After we finished our first draft of a paper, we would make copies of it for
the other members of the group. We then exchanged our papers and
made comments based on the list of questions given to us by the teacher.
The peers' comments helped a lot. When you write something, you have
a tendency to be writing for yourself. So you seem to be less focused
because you know what you want to say, so then you may not be clear
enough for others to understand. So my peers gave me ideas that make
the paper more focused and clear. This way others can understand my
paper better. They also helped me to find language mistakes I did not
notice. It is like when you have an editor proofread something that you
have written in your first language. They point out my mistakes, then I fix
them myself. It was really helpful. Also, when only the teacher reads
your essay, that is good, but it is better to get multiple viewpoints.

I: Which aspect of your writing do you think improved the most
because of these peer-review activities.
S: For me the organization and the conclusion became stronger because of the feedback I received from my peers. So basically the content was improved the most. It really is a wonderful thing.

I: Great. You made some very interesting comments. What about a type of feedback that you do not think is very helpful.

S: I can't think of one right now. I really like a variety of feedback. The more kinds the better.

I: Ok. Looking at your questionnaire, I see that you gave the item about tutorials a high rating.

S: Yes. For me, to write a composition in a second language is a really big effort. I spend many hours writing my paper. Because I work so hard on my papers, I have a lot of questions about them. But you can't sit in class and spend a lot of time talking about your essay personally. I need to set down with the teacher and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of my paper. What the teacher says in class is more general. At the tutorial everything that is said only concerns my essay. The tutorials also help build a stronger relationship between the teacher and the student. Because of this relationship the students are not afraid to approach the teacher with questions anytime, not just during the tutorials.

I: Do you think this relationship carries over to the classroom?

S: Yes. Definitely. The students feel comfortable to participate in class. Otherwise, it would just be a lecture type course. This is not good for a writing class.

I: Is there anything else you would like to say about the tutorials?
S: Yes. I like the privacy. Because the other students are not there, you are not embarrassed to have the teacher talk about your weak areas.

I: Great. You are really giving me a lot of good data.

S: I like talking about this topic.

I: Ok. Now I would like to discuss some of your previous experiences in English courses. For example, I know you did peer review here at Ohio State last quarter. Had you ever done this before elsewhere?

S: Yes. I did that at The University of Illinois.

I: Did you ever do this in Kuwait?

S: No. I never heard of peer review before I came to The United States. It could be a cultural difference. In my country students don't do well working together. It's more like a lecture class. Also, the schools, until we get to college, are separate for boys and girls. When you take a class in college the students wouldn't work well together because they would be embarrassed.

I: Yes. Research has shown that in some countries it goes against cultural traditions to have the students participate in group activities. Students don't think teachers are doing their job unless they are always the center of attention.

S: That seems to often be the case in my country.

I: However, my research here at Ohio State has been showing that students here give strong support to methodologies that would not be considered appropriate in their countries.

S: I think when students come here they do not know what to expect, so they are more willing to try something new.
I: According to your questionnaire, you prefer the multiple-draft system to the single-draft system.

S: It's a very good idea. It gives you a chance to improve your writing. You can make changes and see the results of your changes. It also helps you to get a better grade. For example, for my first paper I got a "C" on the first draft, a "B" on the second draft, and an "A" on the last draft. You can really develop your writing skills this way.

I: Were the classes you took at Illinois single-draft or multiple-draft?

S: Multiple-draft.

I: What about your courses in Kuwait?

S: Single-draft.

I: When you wrote a paper for a single-draft course did you approach it differently than when you write a paper for a multiple-draft course?

S: Yes. Because I didn't have a chance to revise the paper later, I would put all of my efforts into the paper. This would also influence my style. If I don't have a chance to revise, I would hesitate to try something new. I would only use language, for example, that I knew was correct. So then my level, my style would stay the same. It would not improve, but remain elementary.

I: So you are saying that you would be afraid to do hypothesis testing.

S: Yes. Exactly. And as we know in education, hypothesis testing is very important for learning.
I: I would like now to discuss error-correction techniques. On your
questionnaire you indicated that your preference if for the teacher to
indicate the problem and tell what type it is so you can fix it later yourself.

S: I find that if I make the correction myself, I will remember it later.
But, if the teacher makes the corrections for me, I may continue to make
the same mistakes in the future. Also, it is better for the teacher to let the
student to try to fix the problem because the student may be able to fix it
even if it isn't the way that the teacher would do it. It might even be a
better way. This practice makes the student more independent in writing.

I: Do you ever worry that the teacher, especially concerning content,
may be guessing what you are trying to say?

S: Yes. I have seen this happen and the teacher guessed wrong. It
is no good to guess; just say you don't understand and I will try to make it
clearer the next time. That is what my teacher for this class does.

I: What I'd like to do now is look at some of the compositions that you
have written for this class and see how you processed the feedback that
you received between drafts.

S: Ok. Here are the first two drafts of a paper.

I: How many drafts were required for this assignment?

S: It was a two-draft assignment.

I: Ok. Please continue.

S: Ok. The topic for this essay was to write about a recent
development in our particular field. My topic is changes in curriculum
development in my country. This is the first draft. You will see that there is feedback in both pencil and red ink. When he returned the paper, my first draft, the only feedback that was on it is what is written in pencil.

I: And what about the red ink?

S: The red ink are things that I wrote on it during the tutorial. You see that he mostly indicated where there are language problems, but sometimes he gave a clue to the problem, and sometimes he made the correction himself.

I: What about the content?

S: Several places he put question marks where it was not clear enough for him to understand what I was trying to say. Or, for example, here he put the word “flat” at the margin beside the conclusion.

I: What did you think about the feedback provided for the first draft? For now let’s just concentrate on the feedback that you received before the tutorial.

S: I think that it was very helpful. The problems that he only indicated were careless mistakes on my part. Once I saw them marked, I knew what was wrong. For example, the agreement problems I made and problems with articles.

I: What about the words he circled and coded.

S: The biggest problem was that I used an informal word instead of an academic word. These are the places where he wrote the word “informal” below the circled word. I can look these words up in my
dictionary and find a better choice. It is better if I find more appropriate words, because then I will remember them later. But I don’t remember vocabulary very long if someone just gives them to me.

I: What did you think about the actual corrections he made for you?

S: I think that some of these changes are probably the best way for them to be, and I probably would not have been able to make them myself.

I: Yes. I see what you mean. These seem to me what I would call usage problems. I think these are the hardest problems for students to correct themselves.

S: Yes. Usage problems. It’s best, sometimes, for the teacher to correct these types for the student.

I: What did you think about the content feedback.

S: The main type of feedback was when he put the question marks. I know that means it is not clear. It is best to do that instead of guessing what I am trying to say. Here he put the word “flat” beside the conclusion. I know that means I need to support it more. Add more details, for example.

I: Can you tell me what you did with this feedback before the tutorial, and then what you did at the tutorial?

S: I didn’t do a lot with it before the tutorial. I like to discuss at the tutorial what the problems are, and try to solve many of the problems there. I look at the feedback that he put on my essay, and I do try to think of some possible solutions before I go. But, I don’t rewrite the essay before I go. There we discuss possible solutions and this is when I write
them on my paper with red ink. For example, here where he put "informal
word" I suggested a change. He liked my suggestion, so I wrote it in with
red. We also discussed some of the weak areas, and I took notes about
some of the suggestions he liked and some that he made, and added the
changes later.

I: What did you do next?

S: I rewrote the paper based on the feedback that I received on it
and what we did together at the tutorial.

I: Ok. so, let's look at the second daft and see how you revised it and
the feedback that was then put on it by the teacher before he returned it
to you again.

S: Ok. Here it is.

I: Why don't you let me have a few minutes and I will read over the
two different drafts.

S: Ok.

I: In my opinion, it does look like you did make a great deal of
progress in the content of the paper. As for the language, it looks like you
fixed the problems that were in the first draft. However, it looks like that in
adding more content, you made several grammar mistakes.

S: Yes. I did.

I: I see that for the most part the teacher went ahead and made the
actual corrections for you. What do you think about that?

S: It was probably best that he made these corrections for me
because this was the last draft.
I: That's right. You did tell me this was only a two-draft assignment. Would you rather if had this been a three-draft assignment?

S: Yes. I think that would have been better. Then I would have liked to try and fix more of the problems in the paper. I also would like to work more on the content. As you see, there are still some places where he says that it still is not clear.

I: Will you do anything else with this paper?

S: Not really. I looked it over but I will not try to rewrite it.

I: We have already discussed the differences in how you approach writing a paper for a single-draft course versus a multiple-draft course, and we have discussed how you process the feedback for a multiple-draft course. Could you tell me how you processed the feedback that you received in the single-draft courses that you took in Kuwait?

S: Actually, I never really did much after I got those papers back.

I: That is what research has shown also. Could you tell me why didn't do anything else with the papers?

S: Because I did not have a chance to do any revisions, I wouldn't know if I was correcting it or not. Also, when the teacher tries to do everything on one paper it is confusing.

I: I know what you mean. It comes back a mess and you can't figure out what to do with it.

S: Yes, it was a mess.

I: At this point, I want to see if there is anything else you would like to add, and I have just a couple of more questions to ask you.

S: Ok.
I: So, is there anything else you would like to add concerning your beliefs about composition feedback?

S: Yes. I really like how the courses are set up here. We not only study grammar, but also different styles of writing. The topics are important because they are things in my major that I need to be able to write in academic style.

I: Is there anything you would like to add or change about the feedback that you are receiving in this class?

S: I hope they can add peer review to 107 G because it’s wonderful. I would also like to increase the number of tutorials. We have the tutorial after the first draft. It would be better to also have one after the second draft. We need to meet again to go over the revisions that we made to the first draft. So, two tutorials per essay would be best.

I: I have two more questions to ask. First, does your teacher discuss why he uses the types of feedback that he does?

S: During the tutorial?

I: Yes, or in class.

S: I don’t think so. In 106 yes. The teacher talked about his methodology.

I: Do you think this is a good idea?

S: That is a really good idea because students need to know the teacher’s position. If we understand the teacher’s way of thinking, we can use the feedback better.
I: Ok. I don't have any more questions. Do you want to add anything else?

S: No. But I really enjoyed talking with you about feedback.

I: And I have enjoyed talking with you. You have provided me with a lot of great data. And I thank you again for all of your help.

S: You’re welcome.
APPENDIX K
INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW
UNDERGRADUATE SECTION ONE
I: = Interviewer
T: = Teacher

I: First I would like to thank you for agreeing to do this interview with me.
T: You are more than welcome.
I: Ok. What I would like you to do is tell me about some of the types of feedback you provide your students, and why. I am particularly interested in your opinions about peer review, error correction, and the multiple-draft system. You may also discuss any other types of feedback you wish.
T: For error correction, I usually underline or circle and add a comment, such as run on sentence, sentence fragment, etc. If it is not clear to me what the student is saying, I’ll put in a question mark. At the beginning of the quarter, after I returned the first draft of their first paper, I gave them a list of my coding system, and explained the meanings. I require the students to have a tutorial after their first draft, but they are free to schedule a second one after the second draft. When the students come to the tutorial, it is their duty to have responses to the problems that I indicated. They can come with an answer, or ideas about how they might fix it, or say they don’t know how to fix it.
I: So basically, your preferred error-marking technique for a first draft is to indicate and code the problems.
T: Yes. That’s right.
I: Do you ever make the actual corrections for them?
T: I hardly ever make the actual corrections for them. I want them to come up with the answers themselves. Also, I don't want to put words in the students' mouths. Maybe they want to say something other than what I think they are trying to say. So I make comments about areas I don't understand.

I: Yes. Some of the students who indicated they prefer to make the corrections themselves also felt that way. That is, they are worried the teacher may say something other than what the student actually was intending to say. So, how well does your system seem to work? That is, what are the results of this type of feedback when they come to the tutorial?

T: Most come with good suggestions about what they need to do to fix their problems. Sometimes they come with a rewritten version in hand, and it is often much better than the first. Also, the students during the tutorial seem to be more focused, and if I say, "What are you trying to say here?", they give a good explanation and they incorporate that into the next draft.

I: How many drafts do you have per paper?

T: Three

I: So, we have seen how you handle feedback on a first draft. Do your methods change for the second draft?

T: On the whole it does not. But if there are minor problems such as article or preposition problems, I'll just go ahead and fix them. But if there are still problems such as sentence fragments, I still indicate it, and they have to fix it.
I: And what about the third draft?

T: By this time most of the problems are basically fixed, so I just give it a grade. But, one thing I have found that is a little strange, is that when I make corrections on the first or second draft, sometimes the students do not incorporate these changes into their revisions.

I: But when you require them to make the corrections themselves, they do it, right?

T: Yes, for the most part.

I: So this seems like more support for the students making their actual corrections.

T: Yes it is.

I: Ok. So let's look at some of the results of the questionnaire your students completed. As for error-marking techniques, they most prefer that you make the corrections for them. However, indicating and coding also received a fair amount of support. As for only indicating, this item received mostly low ratings. Students who preferred the system of indicating and coding said that they want that on earlier drafts, but if they sill have not solved the problem by the last draft, they want the teacher to fix it. And if it is a type of usage problem that they may not be able to find the answer to, then they prefer the teacher to make the correction even on a first draft.

T: Yes. That makes sense.

I: So, because the topic of multiple-drafts has come up a few times, is there anything else you would like to say about it?
T: I think it gives the students, of course, an opportunity to make changes. Many of the students, of course, are not very fluent in English. So, if it were just a one shot deal, these students would probably not score very well. So with multiple-drafts, it helps their grades plus they learn where their major problems are and how to fix them. I also think that because the students know that they have two opportunities to improve a composition, this helps keep anxiety levels down.

I: Do you think your students would approach their writing assignments differently if they were in a single-draft course?

T: I think if they didn't have a chance to rewrite their compositions they would probably try not to have any mistakes in the first draft since they don't have a second chance. The content probably wouldn't be as good because they would be mostly worried about the language.

I: And I know from my own experiences in French composition classes, which were always single-draft, that I only stuck to language that I knew was correct and was afraid to try anything new, I mean, hypothesis testing.

T: Yes exactly. Their style would stay elementary.

I: Ok. Good. Now, I am also interested in your opinions about peer review. Was that what your students were doing today when I stopped by?

T: No. They were working on a collaborative essay. It was an in-class group assignment.
I: Ok. But from what I saw, they were making comments and asking each other questions about each others' contributions to the essay. So, in a sense, it was a sort of peer-review activity.

T: Yes. I guess you are right.

I: Is this the first time you have done this activity?

T: No. It's the second time.

I: So, how often do you do peer review in this class?

T: Actually, I have never done it with this group.

I: Ok. So how well is the collaborative-writing activity working?

T: The first time they did it they turned to me for a lot of help. But this time they were asking each other the types of questions they were asking me. And what they have been producing is very good. I think it worked well also because I didn't do it too early in the quarter. This way the students got to know each other, and thus form better group dynamics.

I: What was the topic of the essay?

T: They were responding to questions about a short story.

I: That brings me to asking your opinions about reading improving writing skills.

T: Of course I believe that reading helps to improve writing skills.

I: And if you look at your student data, you will see that they also believe this. So this may be a reason why this activity is working well.

T: Yes. I would like to do this activity more often.

I: Back to the student questionnaire, you will see from the data that they seem to think that peer review is a fairly helpful activity. Furthermore, on the section of the questionnaire where they were free to
make comments about anything at all, several students said that they wanted to do peer review. This was the most common comment for this section. This brings me to one of my last questions. Do you think teachers should discuss the topic of feedback with their students?

T: Yes. This way they would know better how to meet their students' needs.

I: Do you do this?

T: Not as much as I should.

I: How would you go about doing this?

T: I would have a class discussion. First, I would have the students tell me what they prefer, and then I would add my feelings, and some of the information from the literature. As a matter of fact, last quarter I had an expert on peer review come to my class and give a presentation about it. This was before I had done this activity with them. I think that because of the presentation, this activity was more successful than in past courses. They were more open to try it.

I: Do you think that the data that I received from your students will have an influence on the type of feedback you give in the future?

T: Yes. I can better service my students if I know what they like.

I: Ok. I thank you very much for your time.

T: You are quite welcome.
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I: First I'd like to thank you for participating in this interview.
T: You're welcome.
I: I'd like to start by having you tell me about some of the types of feedback that you use for your students who participated in this study and why you use these types of feedback.
T: What I try to do with the students' first draft is to look for problems with the content and the organization. I am mostly concerned with the structure of the paper at this point and not the language. As for the language, at this point I do not like to make the actual corrections for them. If I see there are a lot of language problems, then I will mark these problems and give clues about what is wrong.
I: Do you ever make any actual corrections on the first draft?
T: Yes. I do if there is a consistent type of language problem throughout the paper. I will correct it the first time, and then indicate where the same problem occurs in the paper. But the content is the major focus. As a matter of fact, at this point the biggest language concerns I have are with language problems that impede communication.
I: At what point do you have a tutorial with a student?
T: After I return the first draft I give them enough time to do some revisions. After that they are required to have a tutorial with me.
I: What generally happens at the tutorial?
T: The first thing I do is verify that the student understood my feedback and, if necessary, make clarifications. The student often at this point will make suggestions that will solve problems and improve the quality of the paper.

I: Do the students often come to the tutorial with the corrections already done?

T: Yes. As a matter of fact, I encourage them to come with some corrections.

I: How much improvement do you usually see between the first draft and the second draft?

T: For the most part there is much improvement. However, sometimes there are still some problems. Sometimes the student didn't fix a problem the way I expected. Then I figure this may be a problem that the student can not solve alone. In this case, I will then make the correction myself.

I: Ok. Good. So, let's look at some of the results of the questionnaire your students completed and the questionnaire that you completed. Let's start first with your questionnaire. We have already spoken about error correction, so let's see how you rated the items concerning this. You gave a high rating to indicate and code and a low rating to make the actual corrections. That is consistent with what you previously said. You also put the comment: “That depends on the number of the draft”.

T: Yes. Like I already said, I prefer to give them an opportunity to make the corrections before I would do it.
I: Ok. So, could you tell me why it is a good idea for the students to make their own corrections?

T: First, I believe this procedure will help them to become better independent writers. That is, when they no longer have a teacher to help them with their writing, they will have acquired the skills to do it themselves. Secondly, there is not always only one way to fix a problem, so my students may come up with a way to fix it that works, but was not necessarily the way I would have fixed it.

I: I have had several students in this study mention your second point, and say that is why they want to have a chance to fix things themselves. Another point that students have made is that the teacher may be guessing what a student is trying to say, and will guess wrong, so the correction would not be appropriate.

T: Yes. I agree. We should not try to guess students' intentions nor put words in their mouths. If I am not sure what a student is trying to say, I will indicate that with a question mark and we will discuss this at the tutorial.

I: Ok. Great. I know that you are a strong supporter of peer review, and I see that you gave this it item a "4" on the questionnaire. So could you tell me how and why you use peer review. The data that I have collected thus far from the students and the other instructors seem to suggest that peer review can be very effective if it is approached in a particular way, and ineffective if it is not set up properly. Because I know that you have had much success with peer review, could you explain to me how you approach this activity?
T: For this class I have only done peer review twice. But, I usually do it more often. The first thing I do is talk to the class about this activity. Then I have the whole class participate in a peer-review activity of a paper that was written by a student in a previous class. I give them a guideline of questions to ask about the composition. These questions deal mostly with content and organization. By doing this, when they do the peer-review activity with a fellow student's paper in the class, they will already know how to go about it. When they do a peer review for real, the first thing I have them do is to write written comments about the paper. They usually do this as a homework assignment. These comments will be given to me along with the paper that they are peer reviewing. This way they will know the teacher is monitoring what they are doing. I also am particularly careful about who is in the peer-review groups.

I: How many students do you usually have per group?

T: Three. I try to not have students who speak the same first language comprise a group or else they may use their first language and not solve the problems in English. I also try to group students according to major so they will be able to help more with the content of the paper. One of the main reasons I feel that teachers do not have success with peer review is because some students may not participate well in the activity. This is why it is important for the students to be well prepared before the do the activity orally in class. That is why it is important for them to do the written part as a homework assignment. Also, when they do the in-class part, I go around the class and visit the groups. This way I can add my own input and help keep things running smoothly.
I: I am wondering about how they process the feedback they get on their first draft since it is a combination of feedback from the teacher and from peers. Are you worried that they may be reluctant to incorporate feedback from their peers in their revisions because they feel that yours, being the teacher, is more important?

T: No. They incorporate feedback from all sources. I tell them, especially the graduate students, that because I am not an expert in their fields, their peers’ feedback may often be more important than mine. Also, when I visit the groups I can add my support to feedback that has been suggested by a peer.

I: For my last question, could you tell me your beliefs about students and teachers discussing the role of feedback?

T: As I mentioned, I do discuss peer review with my students before we do the activity. I also discuss with them things like my error-correction system. I tell them, for example, why it is important for them to make their own corrections. By the way, to what degree did my students agree with me about feedback?

I: The students pretty much rated the items the same as you did, and the follow-up and the interview produced comments similar to yours. So basically, you and your students are in agreement on the topic.

T: I look forward to looking at the things that you have given me.

I: I know that you need to be going soon, so I thank you for your participation.

T: You’re welcome.
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I: First I'd like to thank you for participating in this interview.
T: Sure.
I: To begin, I'd like to discuss the types of feedback you provide your students who participated in this study. These could be types of feedback covered on my questionnaire as well as others. I am also interested in your opinions about types of feedback you feel are not very helpful.

T: To some degree the feedback I provide is on a student to student basis because different students have different needs. Most of the students in this class are fairly solid where language is concerned; however, there are a few students who are still struggling with language issues. At the beginning of a tutorial and when I read a first draft I am most concerned with content, organization etc. If a student is having a lot of language problems, then I will make some comments and tell what the major problems are.

I: Ok. As I was going over the results of the student questionnaire for your class, I saw that most of them agreed with what you are saying about being more concerned with content than language, especially on a first draft.

T: I think this is especially true because we are dealing with graduate students. Although, if they were undergraduates I would still put the
emphasis on content. But the undergraduates are a little less confident about language issues, so I would adjust my feedback accordingly.

I: Because we are talking about language and content, how do you go about providing feedback in these areas?

T: At the beginning of a quarter I provide the students with a handout of the correction symbols I use on their papers. So when I am reading over a paper I will underline problems and supply the appropriate code.

I: Do you ever make that actual corrections for them?

T: I will do that sometimes. I realize there are things that students will not be able to figure out themselves. For example, word choice. In this case they may not realize that another word would work more appropriately. So I will often mark out the original word and write in the new word. Or if there is a complex grammatical problem, I may feel that it is just easier for me to go ahead and make the correction. Also, if I see the same language problem occurring several times in the same draft, I will correct it a couple of times, and tell the student to keep an eye out for this same problem throughout the rest of the paper. It also depends on the individual student. If they have many language problems, I may provide more corrections to illustrate the problem. Sometimes too I ask my students in a tutorial about their preferences for feedback, and I will take that into consideration.

I: As for the results of the student questionnaire for your class, your students gave high ratings to both the teacher making the corrections, and the teacher indicating and coding the problems. In the follow-up and the interview it was discovered that students who preferred both systems
said that it depended on the error type and the number of the draft. Their comments were similar to yours. For example, they said that when it was a question of word choice, they said you should supply the most appropriate word for them. And for less obscure problems they wanted a chance to fix the problem themselves, but wanted you to indicate the nature of the problem to help guide them to the solution.

T: I also think that students are not always aware of the differences between formal and informal usage, which is especially a problem for the graduate students because many of them have been exposed to much informal English. I see in their writing that they may say, “I got these results” as opposed to using the verb obtain. I find students often do not know the more formal alternatives, so I will generally supply the better alternative. I find that the students appreciate these changes.

I: Could you tell me how you deal with content feedback?

T: Because these are writing courses more so than language courses, I prefer to give a lot of feedback about content. I give both positive and negative feedback. My comments about the content are then used by the students during the revision process.

I: How many drafts of a paper do your students write?

T: That depends both on the assignment and the individual student. If they are writing, for example, a paper that I plan to be a three draft assignment, but after two drafts they have produced a very good paper, I see no reason to require a third draft. But if a student is still struggling after three drafts, I may have the student write as many as five or six drafts.
I: Could you tell me why you prefer the multiple-draft system?

T: Because we are dealing with students who may be dealing with a type of writing that is new to them, in addition to the fact that they are composing in a foreign language, to think that they can fully grasp what we are asking them to do rhetorically in terms of content and in terms of language all in just one draft would be unfair. That would put too much pressure on the students. After all, even native speakers have difficulty doing something really well in just one draft. Furthermore, in a single-draft course you are not really teaching writing. To teach writing you need to look at a draft, provide feedback about the strengths and the weaknesses, and allow the students the opportunity to process this feedback. This is how they learn the process of writing.

I: Could you tell me about your grading system?

T: The most important factor I consider is to what extent they have used the feedback that they had been given on earlier drafts. If I see that they have used this feedback to improve their papers, then I want to reward them for that. In addition to the written comments on the different drafts, I think that because they have a chance to speak with the teachers about their papers, this helps them a lot.

I: On that note, we should talk about the tutorials. How often do you have tutorials?

T: That depends on the assignment; how many drafts of a paper they are to write. For a two-draft assignment the tutorial is after the first draft, for a three-draft assignment after the first two drafts, and for a four-draft
assignment, after the first three drafts. That gives a total of five per quarter. However, if they want more, I'm willing to give more.

I: Almost everyone in this study has given very high ratings for the item on the questionnaire about the importance of tutorials. Why do you think the tutorials are so valuable?

T: You get to address a particular student’s situation, as opposed to in class where you would be speaking in more global terms. It also gives the student the opportunity to make sure that he or she has understood the feedback that the teacher has written on the student's paper. Also, because the students are often writing about a journal article they have read, the problem with their writing may be a reading problem. That is, they may lack the skills they need to obtain from the article what they need to write the paper. They bring the article to the tutorial and we look at it together. That way I can see if they have problems with their reading strategies that are interfering with their writing. Also, you get to establish a rapport with the students. They may be afraid to speak in class; however, they tend to open up during the tutorials.

I: That makes me think about the item about teachers correcting spoken errors in class? Many students have indicated that they want the teachers to correct all of their spoken errors in class, and often these same students say they are afraid to speak in class because they may make mistakes.

T: I rarely correct spoken errors in class, and I tell the students not to be worried about making mistakes. Even if they say they want their teachers to correct all of their spoken errors, I still think this could be a bit
painful for a lot of the students. Furthermore, it is a writing class, so we are there to discuss writing, not to be preoccupied with spoken errors.

I: About the only major area of my study that we haven't talked about yet is peer review. I know you are not a strong supporter of peer review. Could you tell me why you have the feelings you do about peer review?

T: I don't want to say that I dislike peer review, or think it's awful. It just has never worked out that well for me. We don't do any peer reviews in this class. Also, I think that often many students do not trust that their peers can really help them with their writing.

I: Yes. As you may remember from the focus group, some of the students mentioned that for it to work well you need to have the right partners. I am at the point now that I believe that it can be quite helpful if it is approached in a certain way.

T: Yes. That may have been the reason why it never worked well for me. I probably didn't frame it properly. It does need to be introduced and set up well for it to work. On the other hand, in the undergraduate courses they are doing collaborative writing assignments. For this the students work in small groups and write on the same topic, which is about something that they have all read. In this case they are giving each other feedback about what their peers are suggesting to incorporate in the paper without actually "picking apart" an individual student's paper. This activity seems to work well, so in this case I am a supporter of peer review. However, in the graduate courses they are writing about specific fields, and so there may not be anyone else in the class who has the expertise to help with the content.
I: I think that having students participate in a collaborative writing activity such as the one you just described might be a good way to introduce the concept of peer review. As a matter of fact, the student from your class who I interviewed made this suggestion.

T: Yes. Exactly. I haven't closed the door on peer review. I do think it could work well if introduced properly.

I: I don't want to keep you any longer, and I have another interview scheduled. Thank you very much for your time.

T: You're welcome.
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I: First I'd like to thank you for participating in this interview.
T: And thank you for asking me. I hope this will be of benefit for your research.
I: To begin I'd like you to tell me what types of feedback you provide your students who participated in this study and why you prefer these types of feedback.
T: The error correction that I provide them on their first two drafts I believe is the most important.
I: Ok. So could you tell me about the technique or techniques you use for error correction and why?
T: I often tend to make the corrections for them. However, I must admit that this probably is not the best method and I should refer them to materials that will allow them to make the corrections themselves. So, although I do use all three of the methods on your questionnaire, I tend to mostly make the corrections for them.
I: How many drafts do you have for each paper in this course?
T: Three.
I: So, when you indicate and code, how do you go about doing this, and under what circumstances?
T: They have a grammar book for this course, so I refer them to the page number that will help them with a particular problem. Because they are graduate students, it is important for them to learn how to do independent work.

I: Ok. According to the results of the student questionnaire, your students tend to believe that peer review is very helpful to them. You also gave this item a high rating on your questionnaire. So, do you have the students in this class participate in peer-review activities?

T: No, not much. From the beginning I saw that they were not inclined to work well in groups.

I: What did you do to discover this fact?

T: For example, we have grammar exercises to do out of the book. I tried having them do this in groups. However, they tended to do the work independently.

I: How did you decide who would be in particular groups?

T: Mostly it depended on the seating position in the classroom.

I: Because you use the multiple-draft system for this class, could you tell me what you think about this system as opposed to the single-draft system?

T: I don’t think the single-draft system is an appropriate technique. With multiple drafts you can see the process, and the students’ papers should improve during the process from the first draft to the last draft. With just one draft the focus is on the outcome, and that is not the purpose of this course.
I: Do you focus on different aspects of the paper depending on which draft it is?

T: The focus of my feedback on the first draft is content and organization. Language is considered more on the second draft. On the first draft I want to make sure they have a good introduction, body and conclusion. I make comments about what may be needed to strengthen these areas.

I: Could you tell me about the tutorials for this class? How many do you have?

T: Three.

I: Is that per paper or per quarter?

T: Per quarter.

I: How many compositions do your students write per quarter?

T: Three.

I: So, at what point do you have the tutorial. That is, at what stage of the process?

T: After they have had their first draft returned they are required to have a tutorial about it.

I: Could you tell me what basically happens during a tutorial?

T: Basically it is the student who needs to ask the questions. It is my job to clarify the comments. When they come to the tutorials they should have already made some changes. However, sometimes they need more clarification about my comments.

I: Do you find that they make many changes during the tutorial?
T: Yes. Also, sometimes they didn’t have time to make revisions before the tutorial. Many of my students are in the sciences. This keeps them very busy, so they don’t have a lot of time for their English class. Also, they don’t think that this class is as important as their major courses, so the work for this class sometimes gets put off.

I: Are there any other types of feedback that you would like to discuss?

T: Yes. I also like my students to ask questions in class or after class.

I: Do you think some of your students may be afraid to speak in class because they are worried about making spoken errors? My research has found that several students both want the teacher to correct all of their spoken errors but also say they are afraid to speak in class because they don’t want to make spoken language errors.

T: I don’t think my students are afraid to speak in class nor are they concerned about making spoken errors. I try to build self confidence in them not to be worried about making mistakes. So they seem to be fairly talkative.

I: For my last question I would like your opinion about teachers discussing the role of feedback with their students. That is, talking about what they do and why, as well as obtaining students’ input on the topic. Do you do this, or if not, would you consider doing it in the future?

T: I leave this option to the students. But, because no one has ever raised the question, I just go on my own way assuming that what I do is the right thing.
I: My study has been showing that the students have a lot of strong and valid opinions on the topic of feedback and they do want to discuss it. Knowing this, do you think that in the future you may want to consider having such discussions with your students?

T: Ok. But the problem with writing is there is no one best answer. For example, I had a student who wanted me to provide the class with a composition that I wrote myself as an example of what I wanted them to do. I explained to the student why this was not an appropriate method. I told the student that writing is very individual. Different people have different styles and I didn’t want to impose my style on my students. I should only give direction, not answers.

I: But that is exactly what I mean. With this student you were discussing why you believed that a particular type of feedback was not appropriate.

T: Yes. You are right.

I: When did this discussion take place?

T: During a tutorial.

I: Other instructors have also told me that discussions about feedback arise during tutorials. This could be one of the reasons why the students like them so much and why the tutorials seem to have such a positive effect on the students’ writing skills.

T: Yes. I think you are probably right.

I: In this case, it does seem that the topic of feedback needs to be discussed with the students.
T: Yes. I agree. And because the tutorials are very informal, it is a good place to do it.

I: Ok. But, let's say, for example, that you were teaching someplace where they did not have tutorials, and you had so many students you would not be able to discuss the topic of feedback with them individually. Would you then consider the idea of having in class discussions on the topic?

T: Yes. I think that would be a very good idea. As a matter of fact, when I was teaching in Zaire I had several classes with fifty students each. Tutorials would not be possible in such a situation. I believe in a case like this it would be a good idea to discuss feedback in class. Also, for the classes in Zaire, I used a lot of peer review because it would have been too much to do for just one teacher.

I: I would like to hear about that.

T: It worked out fairly well for the most part. However, there were some students who were reluctant to participate in the activity because they didn't think their peers were qualified enough to help them.

I: That makes me once again think about the importance of discussing feedback with the students. Because research on peer review has shown it can be very beneficial, if the students were given a presentation by the teacher on the value of it, the students' attitudes about this type of feedback may become more positive, and maybe then they would be more willing to try it. I also think that this positive attitude could also increase the benefits of this type of activity.

T: That is a very good point.
I: I don't want to keep you any longer. Thank you very much for your time.

T: You are very welcome.