

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSE TO ELL STUDENT WRITING: IEP INSTRUCTORS
AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Thesis

Submitted to

The College of Arts and Sciences of the
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of

Master of Arts in English

By

Emily Marie Walters

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Dayton, Ohio

May, 2013

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSE TO ELL STUDENT WRITING: IEP INSTRUCTORS
AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Name:

Walters, Emily Marie

APPROVED BY:

Patrick Thomas, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Bryan Bardine, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Jennifer Haan, Ph.D.
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSE TO ELL STUDENT WRITING: IEP INSTRUCTORS AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Name: Walters, Emily Marie
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Patrick Thomas

As the field of composition changes for both students and teachers, the focus on the global scale becomes more prominent, specifically when discussing schools with large amounts of international students. With the ever-growing amount of international students, the need to examine how we respond to ELL (English Language Learners) student writing is extremely pressing. The key to an international student's success is the written response given to the student by their instructor, specifically with regards to IEP (Intensive English Program) instructors and teaching assistants.

When examining ELL student writing, it is important to consider the response methods used by IEP and TA (Teaching Assistant) instructors. The main issue to be surveyed is where disconnects between IEP instructors and teaching assistants are happening and how these disconnects can be fixed to improve ELL students' writing and overall education. I have looked into the response to ELL student writing, specifically using one IEP instructors and two TAs' written response on ELL student papers to discover where the disconnect between IEP and college-level prose happens.

My thesis will pinpoint what is happening with teacher response to ELL student writing, specifically what IEP instructors and TAs are looking for when responding to student writing. By looking at these factors, I will be able to show how these findings will establish a better relationship between the teaching assistants and the IEP instructors, lead to future collaborations with each other, and help ELL students improve how and what they are learning.

Dedicated to my family and friends, who have provided me nothing but love and support during this journey. I don't know what I would have done without all of you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My grateful thanks are in order to Dr. Patrick Thomas, my advisor, for all his help, time, expertise, and suggestions for this thesis. I thank you for your assistance and patience.

I would like to thank my committee, who helped to make sure my thesis was the best work it could be and for taking time out of their busy lives to read one more paper.

Further gratitude goes to my fellow graduate students Katie Robisch, Rasheedah Alexander, and Christine Olding, who all kept encouraging me and supported me as I presented this work.

I am most indebted to my family and friends who kept me well-fed and sane throughout this process. To my parents, who have given me nothing but support over the years and kicked me in the tush when I needed it. To my sister, who sent hilarious texts and joined me for movie nights. To my grandparents, who understood my need to work, even when we were in Florida. To my Texas roommates, who encouraged a quiet workspace, Supernatural breaks, and sent love in the form of daisies. To Matt, who listened to me rant and rave long into the nights, who kept me awake on the drives home, and just kept saying “You can do it, I believe in you.” To Metallica, Florence and the Machine, and Lana Del Rey, Starbucks, and Panera who kept me company all those late nights. For all the tea and lattes, meals brought and sent to me at the library, and bars of chocolate. For all the random days of shopping, movie outings, surprise trips, and rides to and from airports. For all the good thoughts, prayers, phone calls, texts, and support. Bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii-iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODS.....	24
Participant Selection.....	26
ANALYSIS.....	28
Analytic Framework.....	29
Defining Categories of Teacher Commentary.....	31
Analytic Procedure.....	33
RESULTS.....	36
Fred.....	37
Jenny.....	39
Sally.....	42
Combined Responses.....	46
DISCUSSION.....	49
CONCLUSION.....	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	56
APPENDICES.....	60
A. Fred – Transcript.....	60

B. Jenny – Transcript.....	66
C. Sally – Transcript.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Categories of teacher commentary.....	30
Table 2 – Interrater comment choice compared to my comment choice.....	34
Table 3 – Fred’s verbal and written comment breakdown per student.....	38
Table 4 – Fred – Total number of verbal and written comments per category.....	39
Table 5 – Jenny’s verbal and written comment breakdown per student.....	40
Table 6 – Jenny – Total number of verbal and written comments per category	42
Table 7 – Sally’s verbal and written comment breakdown per student.....	43
Table 8 – Sally – Total number of verbal and written comments per category.....	46
Table 9 – Total amount of verbal and written comments by category.....	47
Table 10 – Interview pre-and post-think-aloud.....	48

INTRODUCTION

As have many universities throughout the globe, the University of Dayton, in order to expand and diversify our student body, has been accepting more English Language Learner (ELL) students. This influx of non-native speaking students are either directed towards the Intensive English Program (IEP), if they have not yet taken the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or to college classrooms, if their TOEFL exam score is high enough to allow them access to the UD classroom. The placement of students according to TOEFL scores creates a compounded problem with a compounded consequence for instructors, specifically those in the IEP and those working as TAs in the English department. This problem, that students may be able to gain a score on the TOEFL that is high enough to gain access into college classrooms yet not be able to participate fully in the college classroom, revolves around pre-TOEFL instruction, the TOEFL exam, post- TOEFL instruction, and whether ELL students are fully prepared to handle college classrooms. With the differences in instruction between the IEP instruction, the TOEFL exam, and the TA (teaching assistant) sections of college composition, perhaps there is a step or portion we as a field are missing, specifically with the IEP instructors and TAs. This difference is shown through the response given to ELL student writing through both IEP instructors and teaching assistants. This response could be focused on many different aspects of student writing, be that errors of a grammatical nature, structural nature, and contextual nature, lack of praise from the instructor to the student, or the overcorrection of errors on a student's written work. Too much or too little feedback can overwhelm any student but especially an ELL student, causing them to wonder what a teacher truly wants from their writing. ELL students' confusion can become

apparent with new instruction models – if a student has been taught to pay attention to grammatical structure and basics of a five-paragraph essay their entire life only to be thrown into a classroom where content and argumentation skills are valued over structure, flow, and format, this is a situation that can bring about significant cognitive disconnect. A difference between response practices of TAs and IEP instructors specifically can lend itself to the overall gap between pre- and post-TOEFL classrooms and writing. Only when this difference is identified can both students and teachers work together to create a more holistic and conducive learning environment for composition.

The TOEFL exam, created in 1961 (Alderson 621), is a language assessment test taken by ELL students, usually to gain access into American universities. The test has two modes of delivery, the Internet-Based Test (iBT) and the Paper-Based Test (PBT), which are scored in completely different ranges, allowing for different scores and interpretations of how proficient an ELL student is in the English language.

The iBT is scored in four sections: Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking and is scored on a scale of 1-30 points for a total score of 120 possible points. The Writing portion of the iBT is scored on a scale of 0-5, which is then converted to a 0-30 scale. The Speaking portion of the iBT is scored on a scale of 0-4, which is then also converted to a 0-30 scale. The writing rubric is scored in increments of .25 and starts at 8 on the scaled score rubric while the speaking rubric is scored in increments of .16 and also starts at 8 on the scaled rubric (“TOEFL iBT Tips” 53).

The PBT also has four sections: Listening Comprehension, Reading Comprehension, Structure/Written Expression, and the Test of Written English. The range of the PBT is much wider than that of the iBT; 310-677 points. Listening Comprehension is scored from 31-68, as is Structure/Written Expression, but Reading Comprehension is scored from 31-67. The Test of Written English (TWE) is scored on a scale from 1-6. These four areas are then converted by

statistical means to a number on what is called the TOEFL test scale (“Understanding Your TOEFL PBT Test Scores”). According to the University Language Services in their article “Interpreting Your TOEFL Scores,” scores on the iBT range between Weak to Good, specifically:

Reading: Low – 0-14; Intermediate – 15- 21, High – 22-30;

Listening: Low – 0-14; Intermediate – 15-21; High – 22-30;

Speaking: Weak – 0-9; Limited – 10-17; Fair – 18-25; Good – 26-30;

Writing: Limited – 1-16; Fair – 17-23; Good – 24-30 (“Interpreting Your TOEFL Scores”).

These ranges mean that a student could score highly in some sections, but lower in others and still score between the 60-120 range, the range of minimal acceptance for U.S. universities (“Interpreting Your TOEFL Scores 2) to get into the university/school of their choice. According to various American universities such as Brown University, Harvard University, Yale University, the University of California, the University of Missouri, the University of Washington, and the University of Wisconsin, the range in acceptable scores could be as low as 61 out of 120 to 109 out of 120 (“Interpreting Your TOEFL Score 2). Many schools clarify that they would like a score of 100 or higher on the TOEFL exam (“Interpreting Your TOEFL Score,” “What TOEFL Score Do You Need to Get into College?”) as a 60 out of 120 score equals a 51%, far below a standard passage rate. So, a student who gains the minimum score, which will allow them access to some universities, would earn the equivalent of a failing grade in a 4-year university classroom.

For the PBT, American universities such as Brown University, UCLA, Amherst College, The Ohio State University, the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Southern California, scores can range from 500 minimum to 600 recommended (“What TOEFL Score Do You Need to Get into College?,” “Interpreting Your TOEFL Score”). This is not as vast a range as shown with the iBT exam, but it is still shocking when one shows the percentage as a grade. A score of 500 out of 677 is 74%, which is a C, while 600 out of 677 is an 89%, a high B+.

No matter which test an ELL student chooses to take, whether it is the iBT or the PBT, the wanted outcome is often the same. According to the ETS TOEFL website:

“official TOEFL test scores can be used to help determine if: a student may begin academic work with no restrictions, begin academic work with some restrictions, eligible to begin an academic program within a stipulated period of time but is assigned to a full-time English language program first, or a student’s official status cannot be determined until he or she reaches a satisfactory level of English-language proficiency” (“How TOEFL Test Scores Are Used”).

These four outcomes are used to make placement decisions, especially at the University of Dayton. When a student is placed in a college composition class, ENG 100, they are shown to be ready to “begin academic work with no restrictions.” When a student is placed in an ENG 100 Language or Tutor section, they are shown to be ready to “begin academic work with some restrictions.” When a student is placed in the IEP, they are either “eligible to begin an academic program within a stipulated period of time but is assigned to a full-time English language program first or a student’s official status cannot be determined until he or she reaches a satisfactory level of English-language proficiency.” These placements show that the TOEFL is being used as a placement exam and predictor of academic success, even by the creators and distributors of the test, despite the fact that it is a language proficiency exam.

There has been some discussion of the TOEFL being used beyond its means or as a predictor of academic success. By clarifying that a student with a satisfactory TOEFL score may “begin academic work with no restrictions,” a university is basing the student’s entire college career on the fact that they did well enough on the TOEFL exam to merit acceptance. This data has been studied at length by many scholars, whose data suggest that the TOEFL should not be used as a predictor.

Mary Ruetten discusses the tie between evaluation of English as a Second Language students' work in writing classes and holistically scored proficiency exams. Ruetten notes that ESL error in work is sometimes accepted or overlooked, which can hinder proficiency exam abilities: "while faculty may tolerate ESL error in coursework, research suggests that error is the salient feature when readers judge proficiency exams, especially when the readers are not trained in ESL" (Ruetten 86). Ruetten proposes a way to help deal with this concentration on errors and allow for less error against ESL students on proficiency exams: holistic scoring (Ruetten 87) as shown in the appeals process of the proficiency exam. ESL students and native English speakers take the exam and while ESL students fail more, they also appeal more, showing folders full of work and improvement, and pass the exam. Through this appeal, the appeals folder is essentially a portfolio. Ruetten clarifies that "virtually all appeals for ESL writers assert that the proficiency exam is not representative of the student's work" (91): while improvement is not shown outright on the exam, it is shown in the appeal, and is a true representation of the student's work while the proficiency exam is not. Ruetten notes something else that is interesting: "another reason for improved performance by ESL students on the writing done during the semester is, I believe, lower anxiety levels. Because the proficiency exam is the final exam in the course, it looms large for both teachers and students" (92). Ruetten goes on to say that "a common comment written by teachers on appeals folders for ESL students is that the student was writing proficiently during the semester but 'choked' on the exam" (92). The use of appeals folder by ELL students points to the value of process over product and the necessity for teacher response. Students who take the TOEFL have no ability to appeal, to show work or improvement; they are simply allowed to take the test and earn the score that they earn. As noted by Ruetten, instructors may overlook repeated mistakes while a rater, human or machine, will not. Therefore, a student's score could be lower or higher based on what their instructor focused on when evaluating student work pre-TOEFL.

Pablo Gomez, Aris Noah, Mary Schedl, Christine Wright, and Aline Yolkut argue that the goal of the TOEFL reading test is to show proficiency description and that scale-anchoring, which is “a method of creating descriptors of the performance of test takers that is based on both empirical data and judgments by test developers” (Gomez 421), is one way of doing that. The authors were concerned with “a major goal of the TOEFL reading redesign” which was “to provide performance descriptors to test takers that would help them interpret their test performance” (Gomez 419). The authors analyzed test questions from the reading portion of the TOEFL, using a “sampling of basic comprehension and reading-to-learn questions” which was “analyzed in relation to the ability descriptors and the factors that determine their degree of difficulty” (Gomez 423). According to Gomez et al., there are two types of students: those who are reading to learn and those who are reading to pass the test. These questions are classified into a level based on three criteria (High and Intermediate) or one criteria (Low) (Gomez 421). The criteria for a question rated High or Intermediate are:

“more than 50% of the people scoring at a given level...had to answer the question correctly...fewer than 50% of the people scoring at a lower level answered the question correctly...the conditional P value at the next level down had to be at least 20 percentage points lower.” (Gomez 421)

This is different from the one criteria given for the Low level question; “at least 50% of people at the Low level answered the question correctly” (Gomez 421).

Based on this analysis, if the question level is High, that is a mark of a test-taker who is Reading to Learn; if the level is Low, that is the mark of a test-taker who is reading just for the correct answer. Because the questions studied for the reading portion are broken into these three categories, student proficiency in the TOEFL exam, specifically the reading section, could be improved overall, but one has to wonder what happens once these students are in college classrooms and their examinations are not broken into these three categories. If a student is a

High level reader for one question and Low for another, they could struggle in a college classroom.

Sara Weigle's examination of the revision of the Regents Test to the Alternate Regents Test at Georgia State University, a test filling a writing examination requirement for native and non-native students, clarifies that ELL students need more time, multilingual raters, small prompts, the use of dictionaries, and the implementation of pass/fail scoring on language assessment exams. These changes were called for when the institution changed but the test did not, specifically that "the test did not reflect current thinking about the nature of language proficiency or the best way to test it" (Weigle 33). Because of these reasons, the additions of the above aspects were implemented. When these particular aspects were given, the pass rates for this exam were higher, over 90% for non-native speakers (Weigle 38). According to Weigle, "the few students who fail...consistently have low language proficiency, which seems to be affecting their progress towards their degrees, as evidenced by low grades on writing-intensive courses and frequent withdrawal from courses" (45) as well as having "received failing or minimally passing scores on half or more of their English and History courses" (44). Weigle also notes in her introduction that "no single test is reliable enough to be depended upon for making important decisions about students' lives" (28). This study of the Alternate Regents Test draws a parallel to the TOEFL exam, which also has a writing portion, and brings up some interesting points about the failure of students who take this test, noting that they also are doing poorly in "writing-intensive classes," specifically English and History (Weigle 44). Drawing upon Weigle's earlier statement about that "no single test is reliable enough to be depended upon for making important decisions about students' lives" and the fact that students who fail the test are also doing poorly in "writing-intensive classes," one can only make the inference that the practices that are used during the Alternate Regents Exam should be used for the TOEFL and beyond. If a student is struggling during a language proficiency exam, then they will struggle in a college classroom.

Kateryna Kokhan conducts a study that is similar to Weigle's as well as Cho and Bridgeman's, pitting the English Placement Test (EPT) against the TOEFL. Both tests are used to test student's writing skills and are scored by raters (Kokhan 297). Kokhan discovered:

“while students with higher TOEFL iBT scores are typically placed into higher levels of ESL classes, there is no distinct pattern which would give me the evidence to claim that either total or subsection scores can be used for reliably predicting ESL placement”

(303).

Kokhan also discovered that the TOEFL exam scores have a shelf life of about a year and lose their relevance after that time passes: “it appears that a year is long enough for TOEFL scores to lose their relevance” (306). Kokhan's findings point to the need to reevaluate the TOEFL's use as a predictor for academic success and placement.

Isaac Wait and Justin Gressel also discuss the use of the TOEFL score to predict academic success, specifically with engineering students. Wait and Gressel took into account the student's age, gender, nationality, TOEFL score (paper-based test), high school style, high school grades, and the term admitted and broke these into subsets, specifically “students who had already graduated from the university, current students, inactive students who had ceased enrollment, and current students who had earned more than 29 credit hours” to “quantify the relationships between TOEFL score and academic performance using data most representative of current conditions are the university.” (391) Wait and Gressel “regressed...how much higher university GPA would be for a one-unit increase in TOEFL score” (391) During these regressions, Wait and Gressel discovered that “the results...confirm that a positive relationship exists between TOEFL score and overall GPA” however, “this relationship may be more important to students in arts and sciences majors” (392). Wait and Gressel clarified that “this means that academic performance is less dependent on English language proficiency for the engineering students included in this study than for students majoring in other fields, such as business and the arts” (396). The pair also

notes that “for these same engineering students...performance in English, History, and social sciences courses is more strongly affected by increases in the TOEFL score than their performance in engineering classes” and that:

“the relationship between the TOEFL score and academic performance likely depends partly on inherent difference between students who enroll in engineering majors and students in other majors, and also depends on the courses themselves, and corresponding variations in the degree to which English language abilities are required for academic success in these courses.” (Wait and Gressel 396)

Wait and Gressel’s take on the importance of noting that the TOEFL can help show proficiency and help predict academic performance in business and the humanities but not other areas is key. Wait and Gressel have clarified that the TOEFL can be used as a predictor of success in some areas, specifically English, arts, business, but not others, despite the fact that it is being used as a predictor for these areas.

Lawrence Strickler examines the correlation between the TOEFL and GRE to find if there is a correlation between the two. In this study, a total of 6,334 ESL students and 168 native English speakers took the GRE and TOEFL online. Native English speakers performed well on TOEFL and had a higher correlation of TOEFL test scores to high GRE scores. The correlation with the TOEFL for native English speakers and ESL for TOEFL shows “discriminant validity, given its scores’ higher correlations with the scores for the more verbally loaded sections of the GRE General Test,” which “actually underestimate the associations with the verbally loaded sections, in view of the skewness in the TOEFL scores for native speakers” (Strickler 169). Because both tests were in English and were taken by native English speakers, this could push the native English speakers’ data more favorably towards the positive and put the ESL students’ data in “discriminant validity,” or the question of the true data based on native versus non-native speakers.

While in all of these studies, it has been suggested students who score higher on the TOEFL exam could possibly do better academically or have higher GPAs, none of these studies have found a clear, distinct line between a student's TOEFL exam score and their academic performance. It must be said that an ELL student's score on the TOEFL exam only has the shelf life of a year (Kokhan 306) so if a student takes the TOEFL but doesn't immediately transition into a college classroom, they could have to take the exam again to gain a more accurate score. This use of the TOEFL score as a predictor of success is problematic because a student's academic success and proficiency of language are two completely different aspects of a student's academic progress. To use the TOEFL, a language proficiency exam, as a predictor for success or placement tool for college classrooms could severely hinder ELL students and cripple their teachers.

Because the test should not be used as a predictor of academic performance, the logical way to find out how students are doing in IEP and composition classes lies in the feedback and guidance given to them by their instructor in their written products. Examining what kinds of feedback students are receiving to improve their overall writing offers an explanation for how students' academic performance is related to their TOEFL performances.

The response methods of instructors of ELL students are key to inspiring and improving students' written work. The discovery of differing response methods and the importance of written feedback on ELL student writing led to my primary research question: how do IEP instructors and TAs respond to ELL student writing? This question, however, was extremely broad and so I narrowed my field of study with some specific secondary questions:

- What are TAs and IEP instructors looking for when responding to student writing with regards to assignment clarification, errors, and corrections?
- What do teachers expect their students to know about this feedback?

What I chose to focus on for this study was the use of multiple feedback choices, the focus on process vs. product, and the need for awareness of response methods as the best practices for assessment. These feedback choices are crucial to finding out what instructors are focusing on when responding to their students both pre-and post-TOEFL. These studies of teacher response included focus groups and classrooms where students were allowed peer review and where teachers were given several ways to respond to student writing such as direct and indirect feedback including error correction, content comments, a combination of comments and correction, and error identification without correction as well as the need for awareness on the part of the responder and the focus on process vs. product.

There has been an amazing amount of scholars discussing teacher response to student work, including response to ELL student written work, types of response, and different ways to teach response. For some basics of what teacher response should entail, Edward White's book Teaching and Assessing Writing clarified that there should be three stages to assessment; awareness of consistent grading and grading guide, the sharing of the grading guide and criteria with students, and the necessity of peer review and response (18). While White discusses assessment and grading in his book, his practices could also be used for response instead of just assessment. This book formed the basis of my curiosity in assessment and response and made me question if other instructors had specific guidelines or stages that they also followed when responding to students' written work.

John Bitchener's article "Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development: Current Knowledge and Future Research," looks at corrective feedback given to L2 students both previously and currently and why it should focus on "target only one to two linguistic forms or structures" and have direct "explicit correction" for "lower proficiency learners because it places a lighter attentional load on their processing capacity" (Bitchener 856-57). Bitchener notes that "learners need to attend to corrective feedback...be aware of and notice a mismatch between

their erroneous output and the target-like feedback they receive...be able to remember linguistic information from their long-term memory...and be developmentally ready to acquire the targeted forms or structures” (857). Bitchener says that since the studies of these types of feedback “have been quite small, local, close-up, short-term accounts...teachers will need to make individual decisions about the extent to which they take them into account when providing written corrective feedback” (Bitchener 859). Bitchener’s points of direct versus indirect and focused versus unfocused feedback helped me to clarify what I was looking for when interviewing my participants about what they were looking for in their students’ writing as well as when I was designing my analysis process.

Dan Brown’s article, “The Written Corrective Feedback Debate: Next Steps for Classroom Teachers and Practitioners,” discusses written feedback and the specifics of feedback, such as explicitness, scope, promotion of awareness, and motivating student engagement. Brown looks over previous written feedback types and their effectiveness overall. He refers to the number and types of errors made by students and how there should be a code between student and teacher so that they can communicate without having to write huge end notes, stating “a code should be manageable for students and teachers, limiting confusion and allowing students to internalize the categories and notice patterns” (Brown 863). For promoting awareness, Brown points to specifics, such as explaining the code, the rubrics, keeping the students informed of what is going on, being open with them. To help motivate students, he stresses that one should “remind students that errors are natural,” to watch what he calls the “climate, either encouraging or discouraging” when providing feedback to their students, to employ “a more supportive approach” which “might take into consideration student effort in the...process,” and to tailor the feedback to that student, meeting them where they are in their writing process (Brown 864-865). Brown’s careful approach to corrective feedback, just like Bitchener’s, intrigued me and further

pushed my curiosity towards what kinds of feedback, both corrective and suggestive, were being given to ELL students.

Ken Sheppard's study of the response to student writing, specifically with 26 ESL students over a period of ten weeks, clarifies that out of evaluation and revision and error feedback, students respond best to a combination of evaluation of written work and revision opportunities: "those who were consistently asked...to constantly evaluate their writing and make its meaning clear...learned more about sentence length than those who were exposed to constant error-oriented feedback" (Sheppard 107). Students who were given error feedback only were not allowed to conference with their teacher and gain further feedback while those who were evaluated and allowed revision were encouraged to conference. Sheppard's rationale for this design was that between these two groups, "no significant differences would emerge between the two groups with respect to these criteria" (Sheppard 106). This study of evaluation and revision tactics showed an improvement to student writing, one that allowed for clearer feedback and goals for students, but Sheppard cautions that "the critical issues is still the question of how to structure a post-composition conference so that the student can really understand how to strengthen what she has already written" (109). This caution at the end of his findings interested me and caused me to wonder what teachers are expecting students to do with student work when they are finished responding to it, which led to one of my research questions.

Based on the "wide variation in teacher response," (Hedgcock 289) John Hedgcock and Natalie Lefkowitz argue in their article "Some Input on Input: Two Analyses of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing" that students are not receiving proper feedback and that teachers need to be the audience and the evaluator. They also mention that sentence-level error correction does not help and that content should be focused on instead:

"effective text revision requires the engagement of the writer, as well as a careful application of feedback practices that guide the writer to an awareness of the

informational, rhetorical, and linguistic expectations of the audience within a specific discourse community” (Hedgcock 289).

Hedgcock and Lefkowitz conducted two studies “to characterize the content and form of teacher feedback as well as learners’ assessments of the usefulness of these practices” (290) – the first being a questionnaire to FL and ESL students about their enjoyment levels, motivation levels, preferences on feedback, how helpful teacher feedback has been, what kind of proofreading marks had they seen, etc. In the second study, L2 writers were shown to be trying to make sense of feedback. This study did not have a questionnaire, electing instead to go for a discussion. Students were asked to give feedback on feedback they have received. Some of the issues that were raised by students were composing for grammar, not for new ideas, feedback is “what I need to fix,” revision is only to get rid of errors, and that feedback is a guessing game to the students. According to Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, FL and L2 students look to make more progress on their writing, but when they are given surface-level corrections only/predominantly, revision is not on their mind. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz specify that “many L2 students – in particular, those studying an FL – reportedly expect to make the greatest improvement in writing quality and to ‘learn the most’ when their teachers highlight grammatical and mechanical mistakes” (299). Instead of correcting the mistakes, the students want to have them “highlighted,” alerting them to the fact that the errors are there but not changed for them. This helped to give me some insight into what students are looking for and wonder if teachers knew this about their students’ work and feedback on their students’ work. This helped to design the think-aloud, where I had instructors explain what they wanted from their student and why they chose the feedback/response/comment they did.

In another study by John Hedgcock and Natalie Lefkowitz looked at different corrective feedback types for L2 students, English as a second language and foreign language learners, specifically looking at evaluative “which essentially make a judgment of writing quality” and

corrective “which focuses on the corrections made by editors” (144). Hedgcock and Lefkowitz gave 247 L2 writers a 45-item questionnaire, inquiring what ways of response were most and least helpful (146). According to the surveys, ESL students had “consistently high concern...for matters of content, rhetorical structure, and writing style” while FL “further report that their teachers display feedback behaviors aimed largely at grammatical and lexical accuracy, as opposed to fluency, idea generation, and rhetorical organization” (Hedgcock 157). This feedback from students, especially ELL students, is helpful to the design of my study because it brings in the student’s perspective of what feedback best works for them, which could assist in my interpretation of the data.

Yet another study by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz looks at peer and teacher response to student drafts. In their article “Collaborative Oral/Aural Revision in Foreign Language Writing Instruction,” Hedgcock and Lefkowitz examine 30 native speakers taking a French class, breaking them into two groups, experimental and control. The experimental group used peer review while the control group used only instructor feedback. According to Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, the experimental group which only used peer review “performed on a level equal to that of the control group” (263) and that the control group was “positive in the area of grammar” while the experimental group was “positive in the areas of content, organization, and vocabulary” (263). This study points to a need for student awareness of what is expected of them during the response, which is shown through peer review and teacher instruction. This awareness can be shown through the rubrics that teachers provide for their students in my study. This combination of teacher response and student awareness of what the teacher wants through the rubric can cover both grammatical issues and “areas of content, organization, and vocabulary” (Hedgcock 263).

Dana Ferris discusses the debate of grammar correction in L2 writing or rather the lack of research and what instructors should do between studies. Ferris clarifies John Truscott’s take on error correction in L2 written work, “error correction is harmful and should be abolished,” (49)

and looks at the research backing this statement. Ferris then looks at the need for more research on this subject, specifically that “unless they [teachers] are sure that error feedback does not help students and may in fact harm them, it feels unethical to withhold it from their students simply for research purposes” (51). However, regardless of the fact that error correction studies have not been enough for Ferris, she gives a few helpful tips for the in-between time, such as:

“teachers must prepare themselves to effectively treat students’ written errors...the effective treatment of students’ written error must include a variety of carefully integrated components...error feedback is not the only approach to the treatment of errors” (59).

These tips are used to tide teachers over while the research becomes more prominent. This caution against grammatical error correction and error correction in general is something I want to look for in my study. I want to use the three tips given by Ferris when looking at the corrections made by my participants to see just what my participants are looking at when responding with error correction comments.

Dana Ferris also discusses the challenge for teachers when first responding to students’ writing in her article “Preparing teachers to respond to student writing.” Ferris studied students and teachers responding to essays, giving tips and tricks to both students and teachers on how to read and respond to essays. Ferris cautions students that “the first step in responding to a student paper is to read it through from start to finish without marking anything” (170) and “discuss[es] one of the biggest fears or questions inexperienced writing teachers have about feedback: where to begin” (170). Ferris then elaborates on this second tip, stating that responders “should consult the course rubric or grading criteria if such instruments exist...consider the specifications of the particular task or text type on which students are working” or “also provide feedback tailored to the needs and progress of the individual students” such as “feedback...focus[ed] on lessons - recently given in class” (170-71). These tips, much like the ones in the previously discussed

article, will be helpful when analyzing my data for what my participants respond to, how they respond, and what they use to respond, specifically reading before responding, using a rubric, and the tie-in of lessons used in class.

Parviz Birjandi and Nasrin Hadidi Tamjid investigated the differences among self-assessment, peer assessment, and teacher assessment in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students and which practice seems to help students best when giving feedback. For this study, Birjandi and Tamjid observed a writing class of 157 Iranian EFL students into five groups and had them assessed via journals, teachers, themselves, peers, or some mixture of both. Group 1 (G1) used a journal and had teacher assessment; Group 2 (G2) had self-assessment and teacher assessment; Group 3 (G3) had peer assessment and teacher assessment; Group 4 (G4) had self-assessment and peer assessment; Group 5 (G5) had teacher assessment only. When Birjandi and Tamjid analyzed their research, they discovered that the best approach to student assessment was a combination of the self- and peer assessment and the need to bring self-assessment training into the classroom: “as the research findings in this study prove the significance of self-assessment and peer assessment in promoting learners’ writing performance, it seems beneficial to incorporate self-assessment training into EFL classes in general, and writing classes in particular” (529). While my primary research only allows for teacher response, this could be helpful for the future and for the mindset I am hoping to achieve. Because there are multiple types of feedback given to students, this type of assessment can help to improve students’ overall writing and revision skills. If they are able to learn how to review each other’s works as well as their own, this will make their writing better and help to improve teacher feedback.

Phil Glenwright cautioned about the lack of awareness and over-awareness when responding to student work, citing his study of the LPAT (Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers) which focused on student teachers responding to essays. First, the student-teachers looked at the parts of the essay, not the whole, paying attention specifically to form over meaning

then were made aware of their focus: “student-teachers were then asked how they had responded personally to the pupil narratives, what content or language items they had praised, how they had conveyed encouragement and what opportunities they had seen to engage in teaching” (Glenwright 92). Once made aware of the comments they had originally made on the students’ papers, which significantly lacked the comments they were asked about after they responded, the student teachers were then trained on how to respond to student papers with praise. After the awareness was raised, the comments improved, more positive responses were used, and more individual feedback was given: “the student-teachers were asked to assess a set of six further essays on the same topic. This procedure revealed clear improvements in student-teacher correction strategies and techniques” (Glenwright 93). This need for awareness of audience, of looking beyond just the written work, of reminding oneself that there is a writer looking for feedback behind these written works, can help to focus both response and response methods. This is what I emulated with my think-aloud process; by having the instructor explain their comment choice or reason for marking the paper, they were forced to reflect on that decision and to clarify the need for a mark, comment, change, etc.

Mary Scott discussed the need for teachers to read their students’ papers fully instead of immediately assessing or responding to student work. Scott mentions what she calls “the motivated sign” (298), specifying that “‘reading’ in its contrast to ‘assessment’ can, however, be given more focus and substance if student texts are viewed as ‘motivated signs.’” (298). Scott goes on to clarify that reading as a ‘motivated sign’ “is a concept that can help to uncover aspects of students’ writing, which evade teachers’ categorizations” (298). She reads two ELL students’ papers specifically, Jacob and Myra, who tend to show their own thoughts in the first drafts of their paper, which is not what their teacher wants, and clarify their thoughts in the second draft. The teacher, however, launched immediately into assessment: “the course tutor was not happy with this paragraph. He advised Jacob to conform to given assessment criteria” (Scott 300).

However, after close reading, Jacob's paper, original and revised, shows that he had what the course instructor wanted, what was given in the assessment criteria. Myra, however, was shown following the assessment criteria exactly. These two students are doing what the instructor asks of them, just at different points of their essay, missing the "motivated sign" and the fact that texts should be read fully first. This could be what is happening in both the IEP and TA response processes, which is something research could point to that needs to change. This article helped to shape some of my questions for the pre-think-aloud interview, specifically the question asking my participants how they normally respond to papers.

Gary Dohrer questions if comments on students' papers actually help the student. Dohrer discusses teacher's comments on student papers and makes five recommendations to enhancing feedback that encourages students to revise: "teachers and students must come to an agreement about what they value concerning writing," "teachers must ensure that the comments do not betray the values established in the class," "teachers need to seek ways to separate from evaluation the process of writing and the feedback they offer students," "teachers need to be aware of the number of comments they are making on compositions," "teachers must avoid comments that do not give the students enough information" (48). Dohrer uses interviews and think-alouds to help his research, observing students who were given teacher feedback and what they did with the feedback. Dohrer then analyzed the think-alouds, looking for:

"the student's reactions to the teacher's comments, the student's strategies for processing each comment and for the total revision, the student's attitudes toward both the teacher's comments and assessment of the paper, the student's attitude toward revision, and the student's motives for revising" (48).

Dohrer gives the reader four questions to help instructors reach their students with feedback: what is the purpose? What is the relationship between the feedback and the response? What problems were encountered? Did the student make independent changes? Dohrer's questions mirror my

own choices of interview questions, but from the teacher's perspective. Instead of looking at how students interpret teacher response, I will look at how teachers explain their responses and what type of response, comments, they use on their students' papers.

Fiona Hyland discusses students' perceptions of what they require of instructors. Hyland focuses her study on 6 ESL writers who were given feedback as normal (like they were not being observed by Hyland) including form issues and marks. Throughout her study of these 6 ESL writers, Hyland notices that the drafts show improvement. However, she mentions two students that intrigue her – Keith and Liang. Keith concentrated on feedback from the teacher and was eager to improve, stating that he “believed that the teacher’s main role when giving feedback was to correct mistakes in grammar” and “he tried to correct every error in his essays, but was quite realistic about the potential for this immediately improving his writing,” (Hyland 224) while Liang wanted feedback, but repeated feedback because that worked best for her, stating “if you correct me once I may forget that time, and the next time and the next time. But the teacher should keep correcting me and some time I will remember” (Hyland 226). Many students didn’t understand that feedback was not an immediate fix to writing issues, that improving through drafts takes time, but Liang and Keith did. The takeaway Hyland wishes to remind the reader is that teachers should be aware that students’ beliefs of response should be focused on each student; “this study also re-emphasizes the importance of the individual when considering how ESL students respond to feedback” 228). Students may have a different expectation of response based on previous and current study. While one instructor focuses on content, another may focus on MLA formatting; while one may ignore repeated errors, another may crisscross the written work with comments and symbols. Response is subjective, which is a reason that response to ELL students, in both pre-and post-TOEFL classrooms, can become confused as to just what each instructor wants from the student’s writing. This is why I chose to employ a pre-think-aloud and

post-think-aloud interview with my think-aloud protocol, to understand what the instructor wanted their students to gain from the feedback given to them.

Christine Kepner reflects on how to give correct feedback to L2 students, focusing specifically on her own research with 60 L2 students. These students were given random journal assignments, specifically journals, for eight weeks. These journals were given to the teacher for response put in them and then returned to the student. The focus was on the type of feedback given to the student. The breakdowns of the response to the journals were: personalization, summarization of main point, reader's reaction, and questions/suggestions for improvement. Error-corrections were also used, though alone, they did not help the students:

“the data from the error-counts measures suggest that the consistent use of L2 teachers’ written error-corrections combined with explicit rule reminders as a primary medium of written feedback to...L2 student writing is ineffective for promoting the development of writing proficiency in the L2” (Kepner 310).

Kepner then goes on to say that

“it may be concluded that the error-corrections written feedback type is not helpful for either of the following outcomes: it does not help...student L2 writers...and it certainly does not facilitate...the production of higher-level writing by L2 writers receiving that feedback consistently” (Kepner 310).

Kepner's focus on error-correction and its lack of assistance when used in this study intrigued me. I wanted to know why error-correction was such a big issue, which also piqued my curiosity to other comments made on students' work and if they were needed or not, like in Kepner's study. Kepner's study is similar to my own in that she is observing written comments given to ELL students.

Nancy Sommers' article "Responding to Student Writing" discusses why teachers respond the way they do and the need to "dramatize the presence of a reader" (148) when responding to student writing. Sommers clarifies that:

"we comment on our students' writing for the same reasons professional editors comment on the work of professional writers...as writers we need and want thoughtful commentary to show us when we have communicated our ideas and when not, raising questions from a reader's point of view that may not have occurred to us as writers" (148).

Sommers also goes on to talk about her study of 35 teachers from the University of Oklahoma and New York University and the comments made on their students' first and second written drafts and that "written comments need to be viewed not as an end in themselves...but rather as a means for helping students to become more effective writers" (155). This attitude of being helpful towards students' writing is one I hope to see from my participants when they respond to their students' work. I will look for comments that promote helping students with their work instead of just fixing the work for the student.

Richard Straub focuses his research on teacher feedback and stresses that it is "dualistic...either directive or facilitative, authoritative or collaborative, teacher-based or student-based. One is encouraging and good, the other critical and bad" (224). Straub discusses four types of feedback among four well-known researchers; Edward White, Jane Peterson, Anne Gere, and Peter Elbow. Straub compares the response styles of each: "White seems clearly to assume a rather authoritative stance about this student's revision" (235) while "the dominant strategy in Peterson's response is the spattering of questions she presents in her marginal comments," (237) Gere "establishes a positive, easygoing atmosphere and creates herself as a supportive teacher-reader," and Elbow "offers some instruction, advice, and praise at the beginning and end of his response, but for the most part he acts as a sounding board for the writing" (243). Straub's different response styles intrigued me. I want to examine the different response styles of my

participants to see if anything they do mirrors what White, Peterson, Gere, or Elbow do when they respond.

Bryan Bardine, Molly Schmitz Bardine, and Elizabeth Deegan's study of teachers as responders is an enlightening study of how teachers respond and what kind of comments are being used by teachers when they are responding. Bardine stresses at the beginning of his study that "assessing student writing goes beyond merely grading papers. Teachers need to first understand their role as responder and make it an integral part of writing instruction" (95) and clarifies that there are two types of comment, appearance and function (96). Appearance comments are word, symbol, and combination while function comments are praise, question, instructional, answer, and attention (96). Bardine interviewed two teachers, Schmitz Bardine and Deegan, about their response and writing tactics before observing their classes, interviewing their students, which only happened with Schmitz Bardine's class, and looking at some essays that Schmitz Bardine and Deegan responded to with written comments. Bardine offers tips to "help teachers more effectively respond to their students' writing" specifically the "need to understand our own motivations and commenting style as we respond to our writers," "students...said they want specifics and clarity in the comments we write on their papers," and "we must continually emphasize, both in word and action, how our comments can be helpful for our students in successive drafts as well as future papers" (101). Bardine's comment styles and types will help me when creating my coding scheme as well as when clarifying what kinds of comments are being used in what context. Bardine's tips for teachers when responding to students' papers could also be helpful when looking at my participants' think-alouds as well as their pre-and post-think-aloud interviews.

Anthony Edgington's article "What Are You Thinking: Understanding Teacher Reading and Response Through a Protocol Analysis Study" also looks at type of comments given to students by teachers when responding. For this study, Edgington observed 8 instructors over the

course of a semester, performing interviews and think-alouds about their reading and response methods to students writing. Edgington then classified 13 types of comments derived from how teachers read students' written work. Edgington clarifies that "reading and responding to student writing is not just a textual act; it is a contextual act" which means that "personal beliefs and values, classroom experiences, relationships with students, and other contextual factors influence instructors" (141). He then goes on to explain that "response is as much an act of reading as it is an act of writing" (142). Edgington's findings, specifically with regard to the contextual versus textual act of reading and responding to student work, rings true with what I'm looking at in my research. In addition to seeing what kinds of comments that are put on students' papers, the manner in which those comments are given, audibly or written, could be helpful in finding out what kind of response method is given to a participant's student, especially when looking at the grades given, if the teacher has a rubric.

My focus on developing my own method of studying IEP instructors and TAs grows out of the need for awareness on part of the teacher as to what they are focusing on when responding to student writing, what they comment on, what kind of comments they are making, and how many comments they are writing on ELL student writing, as well as what kind of response is being given to students throughout the response/grading process. This particular set of awarenesses will show where the disconnect between pre-and post-TOEFL instructor issues are happening, allow for instructors to respond to student papers in a more consistent manner, and improve standards for both pre-and post-TOEFL instruction.

METHODS

My study was originally to replicate Lia Plakans study of her students' process of reading to writing. In her study, Plakans studies students' writing process when they respond to a text for a placement exam. She has the students produce think-aloud protocols, interviews the students, and collects the students' written work after they have completed the essay prompt (Plakans 566). She then analyzes this work, looking for the distinct break between discourse synthesis, which is what she is trying to discover, and academic writing process.

While Plakans discusses students' approaches to writing from reading and academic writing, I chose to look at teachers and teacher response to student writing. Teachers have to read their students writing in order to assess it, so why not have them explain their comments and clarifications, what they expect the students to gain from their feedback, while they are composing responses to their students' written feedback? Because teachers of composition are also writers and readers, Plakans' study could really help to show how a teacher, when writing from reading during their assessment of a student's paper, just what teachers are thinking, what they want their students to gain from the feedback given, what they want the students to work on when they return these papers. These clarifications are crucial in both the area of teacher response and the field of composition because a teacher should be able to explain what they want from written work, from any work for that matter, that comes from their students and how they plan to respond to those works. Without these clarifications, response would not be structured, would not be helpful for the teacher or student, and the act of revision would be almost non-existent. Response to student work that is clarified by teachers and easily understood by students is crucial to all classrooms and all students, but especially for students who are English language learners.

I chose to have my participants do a think-aloud process for their response to ELL student writing because I wanted to know specifically what teachers are thinking while they write response to their students, what teachers want to articulate to their students through written response. I also wanted to know how teachers respond to ELL student writing, what are they looking for, what they expect students to gain from their feedback, and what they as teachers gain from the feedback. This process of talking out what is happening while it is happening could lend itself to an awareness overall of just how much or little teachers are writing on students' papers, compared to their reading and thought process while responding.

My process for the think-aloud was to have my participants record as they responded to student papers. I asked them to mention any and all comments made, audible and written, read aloud corrections made, read end notes, explain what they mean when writing symbols or using lingo, and explain what they meant for the student to gain from their response to that specific comment. I chose these categories as a way of allowing my participants to defend and explain the comments being made and to show what these instructors were looking for in the papers.

I chose to have pre-and post-think-aloud interviews to clarify just what the instructors want out of these papers, what they want from their students. The interviews are a way of checking the specificity of what the instructors are looking for when responding to the papers, how they typically respond to student papers, if they make any changes for native versus non-native students, the assignment they are responding to, any challenges that are anticipated or confronted, as well as expectations set and met or not met. The interviews are a way for the instructors to gauge themselves against what they say in their pre-think-aloud interview, their think aloud, and their post-think-aloud interview, including what they expect from their response, what their response practice actually is, how it mirrors their expectations of response, and if they need to revise how they respond to student writing.

The collection of students' written work with teacher feedback is crucial because it helps to match visually what the teachers are writing to what they clarify in their think-aloud response. These visuals can also shed some light onto what the teacher is giving as feedback to their students and whether it matches what they specified in their pre-think-aloud interview that they wanted to focus or comment on when presented with these papers or how they respond to papers, among other answers. This data also helps to show the research just how many comments there are on the papers and what kinds of comments the instructor is using for analysis purposes.

Participant Selection:

My process was to select two English teaching assistants and two Intensive English Program instructors. My qualifications were that the TAs and IEP instructors had to have at least one year of experience teaching at the University of Dayton, had to currently have non-native speakers in their classes to respond to, and had to be willing to participate in interviews, think-alouds, and submit any and all paperwork requested, such as the overall assignment and the papers with written feedback on it. These guidelines cut the selection pool down significantly. I emailed several times to both the TAs and the IEP instructors, asking for volunteers and received a few responses from IEP instructors who were eager to help but did not meet the qualifications that I had previously set. When my first few rounds of emails didn't work, specifically with the TAs, I went around to offices and asked two TAs specifically if they would participate in my research.

I chose IEP instructors because they are teaching non-native speakers before the student takes the TOEFL exam and TAs because they are teaching non-native speakers after the student has received an exam score on the TOEFL that is sufficient enough to place them in a college composition classroom. I wanted to know what differences are shown between the response styles of TAs and IEP instructors and student work that could point to the need for the reevaluation of

the TOEFL exam, teacher response, or teacher training. One IEP instructor volunteered who met all the criteria (previously mentioned) and two TAs for my primary research.

As I selected my participants, I developed my questions for the pre-and post-think-aloud interviews. For the pre-think-aloud interview, I selected the following four questions (Appendices A-C). I would then leave the participants alone to respond to student papers and do their think-aloud. When they had finished, they came and let me know that they were done and we composed the post-think-aloud interview. This interview contained three questions (Appendices A-C).

Jenny was an IEP instructor with four years of experience in the University of Dayton's IEP program. She has taught levels one through five and currently teaches levels four and five as well as Oral/Listening level three.

Sally was a TA in the English department with two years of experience as a teaching assistant, three as a writing consultant in a writing center and one as a tutor in a section of first-year college composition. She has consulted all levels of non-native speakers and taught first year composition.

Fred was a TA in the English department with two years of experience as a teaching assistant, as well as more as an English as a second language instructor in Mexico and less than a year as a writing consultant in a writing center. He has taught both native and non-native speakers in the United States and Mexico and has taught first year composition.

ANALYSIS

Once I gathered my data, I then transcribed the audio think-alouds. After transcribing, I reviewed the transcripts, rubrics, assignments, and papers with written comments to note patterns in the data. I looked over the data given and broke the think-aloud and written data into t-units, the smallest unit of data one can analyze. For this project, the smallest unit of data is level of comment phrase and these t-units were segmented by comment topic in think-aloud verbalizations. I read and listened to my think alouds again, marking where my participants paused or ended their comments to determine segmentation of each comment phrase. I then reviewed the written comments on students' work and broke them down by the grammatical phrase. I additionally segmented when a comment transitioned from one topic to another (e.g. Explanation to Question). I then transferred the segmented t-units of both think-aloud and written comments into an Excel spreadsheet. I created one spreadsheet per participant. Within that spreadsheet, I organized my segmented t-units as they corresponded to each student, beginning with the think-aloud t-units, followed by the written t-units which corresponded to the same student. I reread these spreadsheets to notes which comments were appearing throughout my segmented data.

Analytic Framework:

I used a constant comparison method (Strauss 16) to develop definitions and distinguishing characteristics of comment categories. According to Anselm Strauss, a constant comparison method is when:

“many indicators (behavioral actions/events) are examined comparatively by the analyst who then “codes” them , naming them as indicators of a class of events/behavioral actions. He or she may give this class a name, thinking of it then as a coded category. By making “comparison of indicator to indicator the analyst is forced into confronting similarities, differences, and degrees of consistency of meaning among indicators. This generates an underlying uniformity, which in turn results in a coded” category. A second procedural step is that after “a conceptual code is generated, then indicators are compared to the emergent concept....From the comparisons of additional indicators to the conceptual codes, the codes are sharpened to achieve their best fits to data.” Meanwhile “further properties of categories are generated, until the codes are verified and saturated,” yielding nothing much new.” (16)

This method of constant comparison was used to distinguish categories of comments. Using this constant comparison method yielded fifteen categories of commentary, both verbalized and written, which I detail in below.

Categories of Teacher Commentary	Definition and Distinguishing Characteristics	Samples	Number of times comment appears	Percentage of comment appearing overall (out of total comments)
Evaluation	Comment that passes judgment(s) student's written work	This is a weak conclusion	386	26%
Explanation	Clarifies comment made, either audible or written	I have written "SP" on the paper so the student will know this word is misspelled.	211	14%
Praise	A positive comment	This is a great thesis! Strong and concise.	132	9%
Answering	A comment that gives a solution to an error	The period should go after the parentheses, not inside it.	125	9%
Error Correction	Comment where an error is fixed by the responder	Shauer Shower This should be changed to from an "au" to an "ow"	120	8%
Attention	Symbol used to draw reader's eye to an incorrect portion of a student's work	Circle, underline, arrow	95	6%
Reiteration of a written comment	Audible response of a comment written on a student's paper	I have written in the margin, "You have some issues with your thesis."	89	6%
Justification	Clarification for writing a written comment/grade	I will give him a four out of ten because he is missing a solid thesis.	84	6%
Questions	An inquiry written on a student's paper, used to guide the student to revision.	What do you mean by "protocol?"	52	4%
Rereading	Reviewing a student's written work	They say "Vermont's main export is syrup"	46	3%
Suggestion	Possibility given to student work, often using a modal auxiliary	Perhaps this word isn't the best choice for this sentence	40	3%
Predictions	Comment given where the instructor guesses what will happen	I think this student might be trying to use the source instead of his own voice	26	2%
Prior Knowledge	Reiteration of previous happenings with a student	Her works cited has been iffy in the past	22	2%
Inference	Referencing assumption(s)	This student mentions going out to The Ghetto on the weekends but doesn't clarify what that is to the reader	19	1%
Clarification	Statement about student's text that is an attempt to understand in more detail	I think what this student means to use is "literacy," not "literary"	17	1%

Table 1 – Categories of teacher commentary

Defining Categories of Teacher Commentary:

The first of these categories was evaluation. Evaluation was the most-used comment due to the fact that it was able to be used for both verbal and written commentary. Evaluation, defined as a comment that gives a deduction about a student's work, can refer to many, if not all, of the comments made when responding to student writing. If an instructor is passing judgment, positive or negative, they are evaluating.

The second category was explanation. Explanation is classified as a comment that offers rationale, which could be verbal or written. This comment was chosen because the think-aloud allowed for further illumination on the point of a comment made or written by an instructor.

The third category was praise. Praise is defined as a positive comment. This comment can be used for either verbal or written comments and was the third most-popular comment made by these instructors.

The fourth category was answering. Answering comments are defined as a comment that gives a solution to an error. These comments are different than error correction comments because the writer is given the answer directly instead of just having the error fixed by the instructor.

The fifth category was error correction. As stated before, this category of comment is defined as a comment where an error is fixed by the responder. This type of comment is different from answering as the instructor actually changes the student's written work instead of just writing or verbalizing a comment on it.

The sixth category was attention. An attention comment is classified as being a symbol used to draw reader's eyes to an incorrect portion of student's work. These comments could be arrows, brackets, lines, shorthand, or any other symbols used to draw attention to a part of the paper that the instructor deemed worthy of an attention comment. These comments only occurred in written form.

The seventh category was reiteration of a written comment. Since a think-aloud was used, instructors not only explained but also repeated the comments they wrote on student's papers. This repetition was the basis for this comment.

The eighth category was justification. Justification is defined as the "clarification for writing a written comment/grade" and was most often used on rubrics, when instructors were applying grades to their responses.

The ninth category was questions. A question was classified as an inquiry written on a student's paper, used to guide the student to revision. For the sake of using questions for both verbal and written comments, they were included in reiterations of written comments instead of just when the question was written on the student's paper.

The tenth category was rereading. This comment applies to anytime an instructor reviewed a student's work audibly. This was specific to the think-aloud and only worked with verbal comments.

The eleventh category was suggestion. Suggestion was defined as a possibility given to student work, often using a modal auxiliary. Suggestion comments often included "would," "could," or "should" and provided a guidance for the student's written thoughts.

The twelfth category was predictions. These comments were classified as being given where the instructor guesses what will happen. This happened most often during the think aloud, yet was one of the least appearing comments.

The thirteenth category was prior knowledge. This referenced any "reiteration of previous happenings with a student," verbal or written.

The fourteenth category was inference. Inference was classified as referencing assumption(s) and was often double-coded with prior knowledge and predictions. Most of these comments came from the IEP instructor, Jenny's, think-aloud.

The fifteenth and final category was clarification. This comment was defined as a statement about student's text that is an attempt to understand in more detail. This comment was used when a student wasn't being clear in their statement and was most often used to clarify a word choice or overall statement being made.

These comment categories were the ones that were noted as appearing the most often in the data and were often used together in double-codes.

Analytic Procedure:

After coding my segmented data according to these categories of commentary, I provided my interrater with a randomized 10% sample of the segmented data. Roxanne, a TA currently teaching first-year composition as a teaching assistant with over a year of teaching experience, was not part of my participant pool.

My rate of simple interrater agreement on this 10% sample of 88 comments was 65.9%. In all, the interrater and I matched on 58 of the 88 comments. Of the 30 non-matching comments, 16 were written and 14 were verbal. Roxanne was not informed that she could double-code as I had, which could have contributed to the low rate of interrater agreement. Another possible cause for this low rate could be the lack of clarification in explanation or definition of comments, specifically justification, suggestion, answering, and attention. For example, many of the comments Roxanne marked as "attention" were instead marked "evaluation" (Table 2). As these comments were not a symbol used to draw the reader's eye to an incorrect portion of a student's work, they cannot possibly be attention comments. Roxanne and I agreed on all the comments made by Fred and most of the comments made by Jenny, but we differed most with Sally's comments.

Example #	Type of Comment (Emily)	Type of Comment (Roxanne)	Think Aloud (TA) or Written Comment (WC)	Comment
1	Rereading	Attention	TA	"Many species are facing a grievous problem,"
2	Answering; Attention	Error Correction	WC	Needs underlined twice
3	Justification; Explanation; Rereading	Evaluation	TA	Thesis statement – let's look back at it again – it's decent, you know it actually achieves level four goals. Nothing exciting but it's doing what it needs to do
4	Reiteration; Rereading; Evaluation; Justification	Explanation	TA	I'm going to write under here "verb forms" sentence um and underline "sentence variety, complexity, and accuracy," and just let him know that it's not achieving level four goals, I'm going to give him a six. Not that much lower, but just visually so he can see that that's a big problem
5	Attention; Evaluation	Answering	WC	Verb forms (Grammar and Vocabulary)
6	Error Correction; Answering; Evaluation	Clarification	TA	oh wait, is that the verb though? Possess? Its ability of regulating...so maybe the issue is that it's a word choice issue and not that she's missing a verb. Yeah. It's a word choice issue
7	Evaluation; Explanation	Inference	TA	I think that it's so much larger that's it's just better to do global feedback for him
8	Explanation	Reiteration of a written comment	TA	So now that I've numbered those, I'm going to add to his comments
9	Evaluation	Answering	TA	This is a lot of...aside...like you would in conversation...not always making sense
10	Evaluation	Reiteration of a written comment	TA	I'm just gonna take off 10 points, he has 45
11	Reiteration of a written comment	Suggestion	WC	Paragraph – watch lengthy paragraphs
12	Explanation	Answering	WC	Uh oh, not a contraction! Though we use them in conversation and informal writing, contractions are a bit too informal for academic papers
13	Explanation; Evaluation	Answering	WC	Contractions
14	Evaluation	Attention	WC	90 out of 125 - 72%
15	Evaluation	Answering	TA	oh context! Cognate confusion, man
16	Inference	Evaluation	WC	I see how you are using this first sentence to introduce the quote
17	Explanation	Suggestion	WC	Instead, you tab the second and consequent lines to form a hanging indent.
18	Evaluation	Attention	WC	5 out of 15 - Grammar
19	Inference; Predicting	Suggestion	WC	I see what you mean here, but the phrasing is a bit funny
20	Explanation	Suggestion	WC	This is super picky, but I don't know if "getting a depression" is a phrase very common in English
21	Evaluation	Attention	WC	55 out of 55 - Content
22	Reiteration of a written comment	Suggestion	TA	– great job on giving us complete and informed citations, but (inaudible) you don't have to include so much information. If you cite this out –
23	Reiteration of a written comment	Suggestion	TA	– Another tricky (inaudible) but we should cherish, you shouldn't (inaudible), what we (inaudible) –
24	Reiteration of a written comment; Explanation; Suggestion; Praise	Evaluation	TA	–Student, great job on this essay, your structure is awesome and your main (inaudible) each paragraph (inaudible) important. Keep an eye on issues of MLA and grammar and (inaudible) peer review to (inaudible) help with these issues. (Inaudible) Overall, take pride in your writing style, let's put that, I look forward to reading your next paper. -
25	Explanation	Answering	WC	This is the tricky issues of agreement
26	Evaluation	Answering	WC	just a tiny bit short
27	Explanation	Rereading	TA	She can choose, it could say a pope or the pope
28	Reiteration of a written comment	Questions	TA	– this is the tricky issue of verb, subject-verb? Yeah. When you say (inaudible)... You can discuss this (inaudible) –
29	Inference; Predicting	Answering	WC	I see how you are using this first sentence to introduce this quote, but to do so
30	Evaluation	Answering	WC	Missing articles

Table 2 – Interrater comment choice compared to my comment choice.

Despite this rather low rate of interrater response, Roxanne and I did have a majority of agreement over what category of comments the t-units were to be classified under. While the

number is low enough to warrant an explanation, it is still agreeing for the majority of the comments.

RESULTS

In total, there were 1,464 comments in the data set, 882 written and 582 verbal. The top three most-used comments when verbal and written comments were combined were evaluation, explanation, and praise; the three least-used comments when verbal and written comments were combined were prior knowledge, inference, and clarification. All three participants used evaluation the most out of the fifteen given categories of comments. This evaluation can be classified as either an audible or written comment that passes judgment on student's written work. Because this specific type of comment worked for both audible and written feedback, it encompassed many different comments given by the educators. This particular comment was anticipated to be heavily used in instructor feedback and did so with 28% of the total comments given. Explanation was also anticipated to be used repeatedly, gaining 15% of overall comments. Surprisingly, when looking at the comments made, audible and written, many of the comments were explained and justified by the instructors as to what was being written, why it was being written, why that choice of words or phrases, and what they expected the student to gain from the comment.

Fred:

Fred was responding to his English 100 students' response with summary to a literacy narrative written by someone else they had previously read for English 100. He had three ELL students to respond to and spent 39 minutes and 26 seconds responding to the pre-think-aloud interview, his students' papers, and the post-think-aloud. Fred was responding to paper copies of his students' writing and used a pencil. His expectations for the paper were that his students

“have intro to the individual with a very brief uh summary of the narrative itself and then the vast majority of the paper should be focusing on the insights that they gained into this person's narrative and how they respond to it rather than what that narrative, what specific points they're addressing have to do with the person's life” (Appendix A).

According to Fred, “the first paper I graded was actually fairly solid, I mean in that it was passable...the last two are not acceptable for college-level work so I will not be grading them at all until I have a chance to speak with the students and ask what their thought process was” (Appendix A). This post-think-aloud interview reaction to his students' work is different than what he said in his pre-think-aloud interview.

On his first student's paper, Fred looks over the paper first before writing anything, looking specifically for proper format; “making sure that it's all formatted properly, looks as though it is, very good MLA format, one-inch margins, page numbers, last name, everything looks good, and it has a works cited page that is not formatted correctly but at least it's here” (Appendix A). Fred mentioned in his pre-think-aloud interview that he would be looking for formatting in his first read-through and then “read through it in much greater detail while marking it...and then I assign it a grade,” (Appendix A) which is consistent with his response style throughout his think-aloud. Something interesting that Fred says in his pre-think-aloud interview is that “I'm not a very big rubric user. I have a rubric for...a very general rubric that I use for most of my papers just to kind of serve as a form to give to students if they require some sort of

explanation as to how I ...as to how I came to that grade uh after I give the papers back” (Appendix A). Fred was the only participant to not actively use a rubric specific to his paper to assist in his assessment.

As seen in table 3, Fred had 95 coded verbal comments 71 coded written comments. As Fred responded to his three students, he discovered that his second and third student had not done the assignment correctly, something he notes in his think-aloud and post-think-aloud interview (Appendix A). As one can see in table 3, his realization is reflected in the data. The amount of verbal comments for students 2 and 3 drops off by almost half in coded comments; from 50 verbal comments for the first student to 26 for the second to 20 for the third. Written comments also drop off in numbers but not as significantly as the verbal comments; from 31 coded comments for the first student to 23 for the second to 17 for third. When comparing these decreasing numbers to Fred’s commentary during his think-aloud and his post-think-aloud interview explanations, one can see why the comment total dropped so severely in students 2 and 3’s papers.

Fred’s Students	Verbal Total Coded Comments	Written Total Coded Comments
Student #1	50	31
Student #2	26	23
Student #3	20	17
TOTAL	95	71

Table 3 – Fred’s verbal and written comment breakdown per student

As shown by the data in the table below (table 4), Fred had more verbal comments on his students’ written work than written comments with 96 verbal and 71 written for a total of 167 comments. His top three comments were verbal evaluation, written attention, and verbal praise. The categories of error correction, answering, questions, and attention comments were used significantly more written comments and less, if any, verbal commentary.

	Fred	
Categories of Teacher Commentary	Verbal	Written
Evaluation	38	19
Explanation	15	5
Praise	16	7
Answering	1	6
Attention	0	23
Reiteration of a written comment	4	0
Justification	4	0
Error Correction	0	6
Questions	0	5
Rereading	5	0
Suggestion	0	0
Prior Knowledge	6	0
Predictions	4	0
Clarification	1	0
Inference	2	0
TOTAL	96	71

Table 4 – Fred - Total number of verbal and written comments per category

Jenny:

Jenny had a total of 384 verbal comments and 136 written comments, significantly more than Fred. Her top three comments were verbal evaluation, written attention, and verbal explanation. Explanation and evaluation were not shocking as they were noted as being a part of the top three comments used by all three participants, but the increased use of written attention comments by Jenny was a little surprising when looking at overall total numbers of comments.

Jenny's Students	Verbal Total Coded Comments	Written Total Coded Comments
Student #1	114	46
Student #2	70	23
Student #3	114	43
Student #4	86	34
TOTAL	384	146

Table 5 – Jenny's verbal and written comment breakdown per student

Jenny was responding to four of her ELL students' end-of-the-session essay from her Level Four IEP class. She clarified that it is an in-class essay and the students draft in class throughout the seven-week course and that "we don't let them do it at home, because miracles happen at home. All the sudden, they can write perfectly" (Appendix B). Jenny responded to paper copies of this in-class essay. She responded to the pre-think-aloud interview, think-aloud to her students' written work, and the post-think-aloud interview in 1 hour, 24 minutes, and 42 seconds. As shown in Appendix B and table 10, Jenny was looking for a thesis, three predictors, and development of a point in her student's essays. In her post-interview, Jenny said that while most of her students followed what she wanted from them, she noticed a new issue with her students' writing; there were issues with transitions, specifically saying "we haven't really talked about transitions and connecting words yet, but it's clear that they've all had instruction on that in the past and they know that what it means to have a transition and how to connect words but I think common among all of them is that they need new and more complex ways of doing that" (Appendix B).

Based on the data in table 5, for the first and third students, she provides more comments overall, but for her second and fourth students; her comment count is almost half. When looking at the coded data, one could note that the second and fourth student were the students who

received the lowest scores as outlined in Jenny's think-aloud transcript (Appendix B) and the lowest amount of comments overall, t-units and coded comments included.

When looking at Jenny's transcript of her audible comments, one can see that she is concerned with how many comments she should put and is currently writing on her students' work, stating "I'm actually going to start here where um by giving him holistic comments first before I even grade anything else on the essay because it's – he's got larger issues at play" (Appendix B) on her second student's paper. She then mentions this student's essay when responding to her third student, clarifying:

"I will say that I didn't comment specifically on areas of (student's name)'s essay because his issues are so global that I don't think commenting...on his specific uninteresting ideas is really going to make that much of a difference, I think that it's so much larger that's it's just better to do global feedback for him" (Appendix B).

Jenny's judgment that she has chosen to give her second student "global feedback" because she doesn't think "commenting on his specific uninteresting ideas is really going to make that much of a difference" is an interesting one and one that she repeats with her fourth student's essay.

Jenny notes that "Really I think that that is the most useful comments that I can write on that student's paper. The global feedback and the numbering because any more text on his paper than that is probably going to cause some panic" (Appendix B). Jenny is making a decision based on her previous knowledge from working with this student to give him global feedback instead of other feedback, as given to the first and third students.

Jenny did state, however, in her post-think-aloud interview that "they, all of them, I think, understood how to group ideas into a paragraph, even if they weren't able to co-clearly develop them, they were able to create a paragraph that focused on one of those ideas in their thesis so that was good," (Appendix B) which is a sign that she meets each student where they are in the writing process. By clarifying that "any more text on his paper than that is probably going to

cause some panic” for her fourth student’s paper, Jenny shows an awareness of who she is responding to when responding to her students’ writing samples.

	Jenny	
Categories of Teacher Commentary	Verbal	Written
Evaluation	116	36
Explanation	57	3
Praise	25	4
Answering	6	13
Attention	7	63
Reiteration of a written comment	24	0
Justification	49	1
Error Correction	3	3
Questions	7	7
Rereading	34	0
Suggestion	4	4
Prior Knowledge	10	0
Predictions	17	0
Clarification	14	1
Inference	11	0
TOTAL	384	136

Table 6 – Jenny – Total number of verbal and written comments by category

Sally:

Sally had a total of 379 verbal and 399 written comments, by far the largest amount of comments given to any of the students’ papers. Her top three comments were verbal evaluation,

written answering, and written error correction comments. Sally spent much of her time in her think-aloud explaining and reiterating comments she made on students' papers as well as rereading student work, (Appendix C), something that is not, for the majority, reflected in her top three comments but is reflected in table 8.

Sally's written and verbal comment types were higher than other participants and more evenly distributed across her students' work with the exception of more coded comments being written on her final student's paper (table 7). Like the previous participants, the number of comments given to the students' writing decreased with each student's paper.

Sally's Students	Verbal Total Coded Comments	Written Total Coded Comments
Student #1	99	72
Student #2	81	81
Student #3	65	50
Student #4	68	75
Student #5	62	116
TOTAL	375	394

Table 7 - Sally's verbal and written comment breakdown per student

Sally was responding to five ELL students from her English 100 class. Her students had written a response with summary to a Catholic Intellectual Tradition article, previously read in class. Sally spent 1 hour, 42 minutes, and 7 seconds responding to the pre-think-aloud interview, think-aloud response to her students' work, and post-think-aloud interview. Sally used Track Changes in Word to respond to her students' writing. As shown in table 10 and Appendix C, Sally was looking for okay to average scores, lack of student engagement to the text they chose, and a lack of response, tying back into the lack of student engagement. In her post-think-aloud interview, Sally noted that she was surprised, as her students had, in fact, engaged with the text chosen and there was a myriad of response.

Sally specified in her pre-think-aloud interview that “I try to do not as many are they direction comments, where you just plug in the right answer um you know like putting in a comma or crossing out words, I try to use a lot of explanations in the comment bubbles” and notes that she “paste[s] the rubric for the assignment at the end of the document” (Appendix C) so her students can see it. She also says that she “write[s]...a brief paragraph note at the end kinda Peter Elbow style” (Appendix C) when finishing her response to her students’ work.

Sally’s use of explanation was by far the most insightful of all three of my participants. She clarified that none of her five ELL students were Catholic, but were responding to an article about the Catholic Intellectual Tradition (Appendix C) and took great care to explain comments she made on their papers about her students’ cultures. One such example is her first essay, where she clarifies a comment she’s written on a Saudi Arabian student’s paper, saying: “I don’t know a lot about Saudi Arabian culture um but my students have indicated that women are treated differently which...that’s what I’ve heard so I’m trying to cautiously ask him to offer more information but at the same time, I don’t want him to think I’m criticizing his culture or his beliefs” (Appendix C). Sally notes that she doesn’t know much about the culture and therefore asks her student to clarify so she can learn something about the culture and also help him strengthen his paper.

Sally also makes several attempts to ease her students’ fears over some of her comments by explain them with humor or generalizing them as ones made by native speakers as well, specifically with her second, third, and fourth students. For her second student, Sally notes that “I usually tell them random facts like that, not just to make them feel better, but I don’t want to act like I’m a spelling genius because I’m not,” (Appendix C) which shows that she not only cares about what her students think about her written comments but that she wants them to know that even she makes mistakes, which means it’s okay for them to make mistakes. For her third student, Sally tells her student “Please let me know if we should discuss it further in class” before

stating “I hate explaining parallel structure, it’s so hard, and in a comment bubble, it isn’t as awkward if it’s done in class,” (Appendix C) which, again, points to an awareness of her audience and the need for her to explain both parallel structure in the comment bubble and in class, should the student need that extra help. Sally’s fourth student had article issues, something she addressed and explained in her think-aloud as to why she responded with an underscored line where an article should be, “I usually write in articles when they’re missing...when I go over these in person, they know exactly which article, they point to it, so I’m going to try and copy that electronically in response” (Appendix C). Sally is noting that she usually goes over this particular issue in class or fixes it for the student, but instead leaves it up to the student in question to fix for themselves. Sally, again, knows who she is responding to when she is clarifying these issues and allowing the student to decide the article for themselves.

	Sally	
Categories of Teacher Commentary	Verbal	Written
Evaluation	113	64
Explanation	89	42
Praise	30	50
Answering	6	93
Attention	1	1
Reiteration of a written comment	61	0
Justification	30	0
Error Correction	7	101
Questions	14	19
Rereading	7	0
Suggestion	10	22
Prior Knowledge	5	1
Predictions	2	3
Clarification	1	0
Inference	3	3
TOTAL	379	399

Table 8 – Sally – Total verbal and written comments per category

Combined Responses:

The total amount of comments across all three participants and all 12 papers was 882 verbal and 582 written comments. When split into verbal versus written categories, the top three comments were different than when verbal and written were combined. As seen on table 9, evaluation was the most-used comment, both verbal and written, followed by verbal explanation,

and written answering. This is different than the original breakdown of comments as shown in table 1 which has evaluation, explanation, and praise at the top three comments.

Rank	Verbal	Written
1	Evaluation – 267	Evaluation – 119
2	Explanation – 161	Answering – 112
3	Reiteration of a written comment – 89	Error Correction – 110
4	Justification – 83	Attention – 64
5	Praise – 71	Praise – 61
6	Rereading – 46	Explanation – 50
7	Attention – 31	Questions – 31
8	Predictions – 23	Suggestion – 26
9	Prior Knowledge – 21	Predictions – 3
10	Questions – 21	Inference – 3
11	Clarification – 16	Clarification – 1
12	Inference – 16	Justification – 1
13	Suggestion – 14	Prior Knowledge – 1
14	Answering – 13	Rereading – 0
15	Error Correction – 10	Reiteration of a written comment – 0
	882	582

Table 9 – Total amount of verbal and written comments by category

When looking at table 9, we can see that the first, fifth, and eleventh most-used comments are similar, regardless of verbal or written connotation. As shown in many of the previous tables, evaluation is the most-used comment. This could go back to the definition of evaluation and its permeable use with both written and verbal comments. Praise is another

comment that is highly ranked with 71 verbal and 61 written. This could be because praise was classified as both a written and verbal comment, just like evaluation.

	Jenny	Sally	Fred
TA or IEP	IEP	TA	TA
Normal Response Practice	Read through once, then respond	Read through once, then respond	Read through once, then respond
Assignment	End of the session essay	Response with Summary to Catholic Intellectual Tradition Article	Response with Summary to Literacy Narrative
Looking for...	Thesis, 3 predictors, development of point	Structure, quotes, more response than summary	More response than summary
Expectations/Challenges	Cause-effect thesis, 3 points, topic sentences that match the thesis, point/thought development	Okay to average scores, lack of student engagement, scarcity of response	Summary confined to first few paragraphs, response shows insight
Divulgences from normal	Not much change	Not much change	Not much change
Results/Challenges	Most students followed what Jenny wanted, new challenge – transitions need work	Students engaged with the reading, included a myriad of response	Students understood the assignment, yet only one turned in a product that was passable/acceptable

Table 10 – Interview pre-and post-think-aloud

When looking back over the participants' interviews (table 10 and Appendices A-C), one can note that while some of the students followed what the instructor wanted yet each instructor was surprised by the quality of work. For example, Fred notes that one of his challenges was the fact that two of his three students didn't turn in "a product that was passable/acceptable" while Jenny notices that her students have a new challenge with transitions and Sally's students completely shocked her by engaging with the texts they chose to respond to (table 10).

From reviewing the transcript of the think-alouds and the written comments, many of the comments given by Fred and Jenny, specifically, are mainly attention, answering, or error correction while Sally's comments are more questions to her students about their writing (Appendices A-C, table 10).

The lack of certain comments, such as attention, could also be due in part to the mediums used to respond. Sally responds electronically, using Track Changes in Word to respond and assess her students' papers, while Jenny and Fred both wrote on paper copies of student writing, allowing for more attention comments, defined as a "symbol used to draw reader's eye to an incorrect portion of a student's work," to be used on students' written work. As Sally did not use any real symbols in her work, her lack of attention comments was noticeable (see table 7).

The sheer number of comments was also unanticipated. When factoring in the written and audible feedback given to these twelve papers between these three participants, the amount of comments was enormous. The amount juxtaposed with the fact that a written or audible comment could fit within more than one type of comment category added a richer understanding to the level of response.

DISCUSSION

At the beginning of this project, I aimed to answer these research questions:

- What are TAs and IEP instructors looking for when responding to student writing with regards to assignment clarification, errors, and corrections?
- What do teachers expect their students to know about their feedback?

In the following discussion, I will use data from my results to answer each question individually.

What are TAs and IEP instructors looking for when responding to student writing with regards to assignment clarification, errors, and corrections?

Based on the responses to the pre-think-aloud interview questions and the think-aloud itself, all three instructors were extremely clear when discussing what they were looking for in their students' work. Fred, who was responding to his students' Response with Summary to a Literacy Narrative, was looking for more response than summary; specifically he wanted the summary to be confined to the first few paragraphs and for the student's response to show insight (Appendix A). Jenny, who was responding to her students' end-of-the-session essay, was looking for a thesis, three predictors, and the development of the student's point (Appendix B). Sally, who was responding to her students' Response with Summary to Catholic Intellectual Tradition Article, was looking for structure, quotes, and more response than summary (Appendix C). All of these clarifications were reflected on in the think-aloud and post-think-aloud interview as well as in the overall number and type of comments given to students' writing.

Based on tables 3-8, we can see what the instructors were focusing on when responding to students' written work. Fred's most used comment was evaluation followed by attention and praise. Fred noted that he was looking for more response than summary and insight to the response given by his students. By the amount of comments, we can see that Fred clearly responded to his three students, but it's interesting to note in table 3 that his number of comment dwindles with each passing student, from 50 verbal comments on his first student's paper to 26 on the second student's paper to 20 on the third student's paper. This is interesting when you read Fred's think-aloud and post-think-aloud interviews and see when he starts to realize that his final two students' work is not as good as he anticipated.

Jenny noted that she was looking for a thesis, three predictors, and for her students to develop a point (Appendix B). Jenny had the largest amount of fluctuations in her comments, as shown on table 5. She jumps from 114 verbal comments for her first student to 70 for her second, 114 for her third, and 86 for her final student. This pattern is on par with each student's work. As shown in Appendix B during Jenny's think-aloud, when a student receives a lower grade, as students 2 and 4 did according to Jenny's think-aloud and written comments, Jenny does not give that student as many written or verbal comments. When a student achieves a better grade, as students 1 and 3 did, Jenny gives more comments to those students, by a significant amount: 70-86 versus 114.

Sally had the closest range in comments, even though her overall comments also decreased, with the exception of her final student's written comments. Sally noted she was looking for more response than summary but that she didn't anticipate her students to engage with the text. Her students, however, did engage with the text, something that surprised Sally, as shown in her think-aloud and post-think-aloud interview (Appendix C). Sally's close number of comments is simply incredible – 375 verbal and 394 written comments total. As Sally was using Word and Track Changes to respond to her students' papers, the written comments are not as

shocking, but it does cause one to wonder if Sally had been writing on paper copies of these students' works, if there would be more or less written comments. Sally explained nearly all of the comments she gave her students and followed my instructions the best throughout this process.

What do teachers expect their students to know about their feedback?

This question is answered in each of the explanations and justifications given by the instructors during their think-aloud. When explaining what they were writing, commenting on, or the score they were giving a student based on a rubric, the instructors answered what they expected their students to gain from their feedback. When changing the spelling of a word, crossing out whole sentences, or writing "VT" instead of verb tense, the instructors also answered what they expected their students to gain from their feedback. Whether they have explained to their students what the symbols and corrections mean or not, that shows what they expect their students to gain from their feedback. Error correction is feedback. Giving an answer to a student instead of guiding them to find that answer on their own is feedback. Questioning a student's point is feedback. The instructor's choice of comment is what shows the student what the instructor expects them to gain from their feedback.

Sally noted that she not only responded throughout her students' essays but that she also used an end note like Peter Elbow, something noted in Straub's research. Sally and Jenny's response tactics seem to be a mixture of Gere's friendly approach, Peterson's use of questions and marginal comments, and Elbow's need for an end note personalized to the student, which Fred's response methods lean more towards White's authoritative method of response to a student's text. All of the participants state that they read their students' work before responding, something stressed in both of Ferris' articles, while the importance of reading and types of comments that come from my participants, both written and verbal, lean heavily on Bardine and Edgington's classifications of comments.

I completely agree with Edgington that reading students' work is contextual, as shown with how each participant responded to their students individually. This awareness of audience, skill level, anxiety level shows that each of these instructors have a contextual relationship with these texts; they do not see the text as simply a paper written for their class, but as each of their individual students. If they did not, Fred would not have written "come see me" on two of his students' papers instead of grading them, Jenny would not have tailored her comments on her second and fourth students' papers to include only global feedback so not to overwhelm those students, and Sally would not have included so many explanations and clarifications for her students about their work or her comments on their work.

These instructors do not read their students' texts at face value, they are reading to see how their students are improving, what they are struggling with, what they, as teachers, need to clarify in class. This can be shown specifically in Jenny's response in her post-think-aloud interview about how she noticed that students were trying to use transitions and perhaps they need new ways of introducing those transitions and Sally's response throughout her students' papers when she explained, in both verbal and written comments, just what the issue was with a particular part of that paper as well as easing her students' anxiety by explaining and offering further support inside and outside of class.

What is interesting, however, is the almost constant caution against error correction on ELL writing by the previous research, specifically with Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, Ferris, and Kepner, that is not taken into consideration by most of my participants. Sally mentions that she usually corrects certain errors, specifically mentioning articles, but she instead suggested and questioned her students' missing articles while she crossed out whole sentences, corrected spelling and citations, and fixed errors made by her students. Sally, however, usually explained these corrections, mainly in her think-aloud, as did Jenny.

Jenny did the same when faced with a student with many errors, often crossing out words, correcting errors, or writing a suggestion such as “VT” over a word. These previous comments and corrections happened most often with her second and fourth students, the ones who we have discussed previously as the lowest-scoring students for those four papers, and could go along with Jenny’s earlier statement that she needs to focus on global errors for these two students.

Fred’s comments, as previously mentioned, focused on the format of his students’ writing and then the content, often correcting the formatting errors but not the content errors, so he is actually following what Kepner, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, and Ferris are suggesting for error correction. While he does not add much explanation to his corrections, he does not focus on fixing a student’s errors, instead adding questions and comments to their errors and circling them.

CONCLUSION

Based on what I have found from this data, if I were to carry on with this study, I would examine more data from other TAs and IEP instructors apply my same method of data collection and analysis, to see if I achieved similar results. With this new set of data, I would compare it to my previous data, breaking the new data into charts as I have done previously, and note whether or not similar patterns of response have emerged from this new data set. If so, I will examine those new patterns. If not, I would reflect on my findings and see where the issues and breakdowns are happening for IEP instructors, TAs, and ELL students. For future studies, it would be interesting to see if ELL and gender lend anything to this data, if the study was performed at a university that has a larger number of ELL students or longer record of ELL students in college composition classes, and if the study was opened to graduate students who need to take IEP or English 100 in order to gain access to other university-level classes.

The limitations of my current project are the amount of participants overall and the use of a small Midwestern university with a relatively small ELL student population. If I had a larger pool of participants and a school that had more ELL student work to respond to, perhaps my results would be more vast.

For my recommendation of what others could do with my findings, I recommend the reevaluation of training of those responding to student writing, especially ELL student writing. Instructors should be completely clear with their comments. As shown by my data, when forced to explain their comment choices, instructors had to put themselves in their students' shoes when responding. There should be a training session for teacher response for both IEP instructors and TAs, specific to different ways to respond to ELL student writing.

There should also be an option provided to train instructors in audio commentary and written commentary instead of just written comments on student papers. I think that this combination allows for the student to bridge the gap between guessing what the instructor wants and hearing and seeing what the instructor wants from their paper, for their revisions. This is an ideal way of responding to students because verbal and written comments, as shown throughout the data, can often show more or less to a student. If a comment is verbalized, it can be explained more quickly and easily than if a comment is just written on a paper. This method of responding with both written and verbal comments is one that should be implicated because it allows for the student to hear the instructor's voice while they are revising or looking over their paper with comments and it allows the instructor the ability to respond with more explanation about certain comments or parts of the paper that would normally have just a symbol or marginal comment.

These findings are important because they give us a glance into how instructors who are not full-time, such as TAs, or who only work with ELL students, such as IEP instructors, handle responding to non-traditional college students both before and after the TOEFL exam. These findings are also important because they show what the differences are among faculty members when responding to ELL students. The differences between TAs and IEP instructors are vast enough; if tenure-track, tenured, non-tenure-track, part-time, full-time, lecturer, and adjunct professors were added into this data, we would be looking at a myriad of different types of response methods and comment type.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alderson, J. Charles. "Test of English as a Foreign Language: Internet-based Test (TOEFL iBT)." *Language Testing*. 26.4 (2009): 621-31. Print.
- Bardine, Bryan, Molly Schmitz Bardine, and Elizabeth F. Deegan. "Beyond the Red Pen: Clarifying Our Role in the Response Process." *The English Journal*. 90.1 (2000): 94-101. Print.
- Birjandi, Parviz and Nasrin Hadidi Tamjid. "The role of self-, peer, and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 37.5 (2012): 513-33. Print.
- Bitchener, John. "Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development: Current Knowledge and Future Research." *TESOL Quarterly*. 46.4 (2012): 855-59. Print.
- Brown, Dan. "The Written Corrective Feedback Debate: Next Steps for Classroom Teachers and Practitioners." *TESOL Quarterly*. 46.4 (2012): 861-65. Print.
- Dohrer, Gary. "Do Teacher's Comments on Students' Papers Help?" *College Teaching*. 39.2 (1991): 48. Print.
- Edgington, Anthony. "What Are You Thinking: Understanding Teacher Reading and Response Through a Protocol Analysis Study." *Journal of Writing Assessment*. 2.2 (2005): 125-48. Print.
- Ferris, Dana. "Preparing teachers to respond to student writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 16 (2007):165-93. Print.

- Ferris, Dana. "The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?)." *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 13. (2004): 49-62. Print.
- Giberson, Greg. "Process Intervention: Teacher Response and Student Writing." *TETYC*. (2002): 411-17. Print.
- Glenwright, Phil. "Language Proficiency assessment for teachers: The effects of benchmarking on writing assessment in Hong Kong schools." *Assessing Writing*. 8 (2002): 84-109. Print.
- Gomez, Pablo, Aris Noah, Mary Schedl, Christine Wright, Aline Yolkut. "Proficiency descriptors based on a scale-anchoring study of the new TOEFL iBT reading test." *Language Testing*. 24.3 (2007): 417-44. Print.
- Hedgcock, John and Natalie Lefkowitz. "Collaborative Oral/Aural Revision in Foreign Language Writing Instruction." *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 1.3 (1992): 255-76. Print.
- Hedgcock, John and Natalie Lefkowitz. "Feedback on Feedback: Assessing Learner Receptivity to Teacher Response in L2 Composing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3.2. (1994): 141-63. Print.
- Hedgcock, John and Natalie Lefkowitz. "Some Input on Input: Two Analyses of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing." *The Modern Language Journal*. 80 (1996): 287-308. Print.
- "How TOEFL Test Scores Are Used." *ETS*. ETS, 2013. Web. 6 March 2013.
- Hyland, Fiona. "Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback." *System*. 31 (2003): 217-30. Print.

“Interpreting Your TOEFL Scores.” *University Language Services*.

Kepner, Christine. “An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills.” *The Modern Language Journal*. 75 (1991): 305-11. Print.

Kokhan, Kateryna. “Investigating the possibility of using TOEFL scores for university ESL decision-making: Placement trends and effect of time lag.” *Language Testing*. 29.2 (2012): 291-308. Print.

Plakans, Lia. “Discourse synthesis in integrated second language writing assessment.” *Language Testing*. 26.4 (2009): 561-87. Print.

Ruetten, Mary. “Evaluating ESL Students’ Performance on Proficiency Exams.” *Journal of Second Language*. 3.2 (1994): 85-96. Print.

“Scoring Sets the TOEFL Test Apart.” ETS. 2011.

Scott, Mary. “Student writing, assessment, and the motivated sign: finding a theory for the times.” *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 30.3 (2005): 297-305. Print.

Sheppard, Ken. “Two Feedback Types: Do They Make A Difference?” *RELC Journal*. 23.1 (1992): 103-10. Print.

Sommers, Nancy. “Responding to Student Writing.” *College Composition and Communication*, 33.2. (1982): 148-56. Print.

Straub, Richard. “The Concept of Control in Teacher Response: Defining the Varieties of “Directive” and “Facilitative” Commentary.” *CCC*, 47.2 (1996): 223-51. Print.

Strauss, Anselm. Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1987.

Strickler, Lawrence. "The performance of native speakers of English and ESL speakers on the computer-based TOEFL and GRE General Test." *Language Testing*. 21.2 (2004): 146-73. Print.

"TOEFL iBT Tips." *ETS*. ETS, 2008. Web. 6 March 2013.

"TOEFL Test of Written English (TWE) Scoring Guide." *TESOL Quarterly*. (1990): 159-62. Print.

"Understanding Your TOEFL PBT Test Scores." *ETS*. ETS, 2013. Web. 6 March 2013.

Wait, Issac and Justin Gressel. "Relationship Between TOEFL Score and Academic Success for International Engineering Students." *Journal of Engineering Education*. (2009): 389-98. Print.

Weigle, Sara. "Integrating reading and writing in a competence test of non-native speakers of English." *Assessing Writing*. 9 (2004): 27-55. Print.

"What TOEFL Score Do You Need to Get into College?." *About*. About Education College Admissions, 2012. Web. 6 March 2013.

White, Edward. Teaching and Assessing Writing. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1994.

APPENDIX A

FRED – TRANSCRIPT

Pre-Think-Aloud Interview

Emily: Okay, so first things first, I'm gonna interview you, I'm gonna ask you a series of questions, four questions, and then I'm gonna leave you after we're done doing that interview

Fred: All right

E: And what you're going to do is you're going to grade your papers so um after you grade your papers you're just um as you grade you're just going to tell me what you're doing, so if you're correcting something, if you're writing a comment, if you are writing just an end note, whatever you are doing on the paper, anything that you're writing, anything that you would like your students to get out of the comments just let me know

F: Okay

E: So basically tell me who, what, when, where, why, how um all of your students' names will be changed, your name will be changed, this is the procedure

F: Can I be called 'Fredrick?'

E: (laughing) You can, you can be called Frederick.

F: Fantastic

E: And then this, I need you to sign this.

F: Okay, sure, sure

E: Okay, so after you're done with this interview, I'll leave you alone for the protocol and we'll just let this run and then (clears throat) I'll come back when you're done, just come grab me and I'll come back and we'll do the post interview, which is three questions.

F: Do you know UD's thing?

E: What thing?

F: Address, like the address, UDayton...what's their zip code?

E: Uh 45409

F: 300 College Park

E: Yeah

F: What is it: 45?

E: 409.

F: Okay, there and...

E: 19th.

F: 19th. I knew that.

E: (laughs)

F: All right, cool. There's that.

E: Okay.

F: Okay, so...

E: All right.

F: What's up?

E: I'll give it back to you to make sure you can follow along. Uh please describe your normal response process for papers.

F: Well, I, I usually read the paper through first uh one time before um uh marking it up at all. I use a pencil so I can erase if I find something in the paper that was missing. The first read-through is more of a is is in all honesty much more of a of a skim than a full read through, I just want to make sure they have the written format for the paper, make sure it's all MLA, make sure it has a works cited page, that's needed, make sure all the margins, all all that stuff make sure that's all as correct as it can be and then I read through it in much greater detail while marking it um and then I assign it a grade um I'm not a very big rubric user I have a rubric for... a very general rubric that I use for most of my papers just to kind of serve as a form to give to students if they require some sort of explanation as to how I... as to how I came to that grade uh after I give the papers back.

E: Okay

F: That's just generally what I do (inaudible).

E: It should be talking

F: Oh yeah yeah

E: I mean it's it's there, I mean it's just

F: It, they're pretty good, I mean I I did the same thing recently

E: Um what is the assignment you will be responding to today?

F: Um I'm grading my uh response to literacy narratives uh and I have three here, I think that two of them chose the Malcolm X article and one of them chose the Fredrick Douglass article. So they're supposed to have intro to the individual with a very brief uh summary of the narrative itself and then the vast majority of the paper should be focusing on the insights that they gained into this person's narrative and how they respond to it rather than what that narrative, what specific points they're addressing have to do with the person's life. I care much more about how those circumstances impacted the reader and so I'm looking primarily for that in this paper.

E: Okay, you kinda answered question three a little bit uh what specifically are you looking for when responding to writing regarding this prompt?

F: Oh okay, uh, I I I I can add a little bit more. Um I want to make sure that their – that summary uh to this article is confined to the introduction and and maybe one or two paragraphs following the introduction, I really want the students to be focusing on their own insights uh and their own reactions to this narrative rather than just telling me what happened uh you know point for point I personally don't find that interesting (laughs) and I also don't really think that helps them to develop insights as a writer, so that's pretty much what I'll be looking for.

E: Okay uh last question what expectations do you have for this set of papers?

F: Based upon the first set of papers that I graded from these particular students, the three that I'm grading again today, um, I expect mostly good things, these three have shown themselves, although they are second-language speakers, they have shown themselves to be very good about following the uh the prompts of the assignment um sticking close to the objectives of the of the paper so I expect good things but I'm also aware that formatting rules are definitely different based upon what they've told me their own experiences have been in writing in their native languages um and so I'm confident that they will address the main goal of the assignment well but I'm not, I'm going to withhold expectations about how they uh address the format or perhaps the organization of the paper because in the past there has been, they, each of them have experienced some difficulty with that.

E: Okay, so I'm gonna leave you now

F: Okay

E: And then I'll um come back when you let me know that you're done

F: You want me to just kind of talk out loud about how I'm, how um what I'm doing a little bit as I grade
 E: Yes
 F: Great, okay
 E: And even if you wanted to, if you had to read something out loud, feel free to do that, um I do need copies of your student's work
 F: Sure
 E: With your writing on it
 F: Okay
 E: So we can run down to the copier
 F: Sure, no problem
 E: And I'll black out their names
 F: All righty
 E: Okay, cool
 F: See you in a bit
 E: (muffled) Thank you

Think-Aloud

F: Yep. All right, well I'm taking the first paper here, taking a little scan, making sure that it's all formatted properly, looks as though it is, very good MLA format, one-inch margins, page numbers, last name, everything looks good, and it has a works cited page that is not formatted correctly but at least it's here, make a couple of notes about revising this section, All right, skimming through a little bit of content here first, we have pretty decent citations for their quotes, (inaudible), now I'm doing a little bit more of an in-depth reading, starting from the beginning. ... Okay, pretty uh pretty decent introduction and uh summary here um they su – they put a citation at the end of the intro paragraph which makes me think that they view that as a kind of summary not sure how I feel about that, especially because the second paragraph lacks that citation and yet is still a summary. But uh I just uh give them a little benefit of the doubt there (clears throat). Seeing some uh grammatical errors so far ... few here and there, less for this student than on their last paper fortunately, their last one was not quite this good in terms of grammar ... (page flip) some good insight here ... very good ... the second page has quite a few quotes in the main paragraph, take away a little of their own voice, still has some good...some good comments though ... good insight ... there's a sentence here – he can be assimilated to armadillo because of his thirst for reading and writing skills - I'm not sure what's happened there, if they had some sort of autocorrect, spellchecker, or they wrote the wrong word and then used the synonym tool, I'm not sure what's happening but that's definitely a pretty glaring word choice error ... There's still quite a bit of summary throughout, I made sure to tell them several times over the past couple of weeks that they need to keep the summary to a minimum and definitely try their best to confine it to the first couple of paragraphs of the paper, but that's uh not happening too well here so at least a sentence or two of summary per paragraph throughout so marking that a little bit, pointing that out ... trying to make sure that the notes that I write on the side are relatively simple, not because the person is not capable of understanding more complex notations, but I want to make sure that if they do have more questions rather than they seek me out rather than just rely on those notes, I find that the best way I respond to papers is to have some kind of conversation at some point, probably should have included that with the interview (laughs) ... some good insight here and allusion ... (page flip) ... okay, I finished reading the paper, I'm just going to go back through it here and give one last little skim read-through, make sure I didn't miss anything obvious in the paper ... found a little bit of a...gonna add a positive comment here ... had a little insight at the beginning of the first page ... okay I'm going to go back to the last page, going to write a couple of notes here ... okay so um at the end of the paper, on the last page, I wrote a few

general notes, kind of referred them back to the markings that I made throughout the paper, maybe a couple of things that I didn't address that I (inaudible) from their writing, a little uh grade here at the end ... all right, well, we go on to the second paper.

(clears throat) We have massive margins on my first sort of glance through and no works cited page, so this is definitely not MLA, gonna make a couple of note here at the beginning ... "margins too large" ...right again no works cited page, that's a big problem, and the margins kind of prevent them from reaching the length requirement, of course it would be like two and a quarter pages long instead of the three that it is, these are nearly two-inch margins, do a little read-through here ... spelling mistake in the first sentence ... okay, I'm trying to ...having a difficult time finding a defined thesis statement...decent introduction...again, fairly good summary, pretty concise ... okay, here we go ... again a good summary, but there are quite a few grammar and spelling errors here so ... the second page (clicks tongue) ... noticing that there are absolutely no ... no there is one quote at the end ... I told them that they needed several quotes throughout, but they did not do that...the last paper did... this one does not ... I'm gonna keep the comments on this paper very light, I want this student to come meet with me in my office to talk about this, they aren't really going to be able to glean anything (laughs) from comments, based on what what I'm reading here. I really want to encourage an office conference to talk about this paper ... Good, good point here ... on the last page now, this ... this is not the best work (laughs) um okay I'm going to go ahead and just stop making comments on the paper I'm just going to write here ... "Come to my office for a meeting" ...

The third paper here ... no page number, a bunch of empty space at the top of the page, it looks like the lines were tripled spaced for the name and class information ... the bottom margin is about three inches ... okay it looks like the first paragraph ends with "these three things change his whole life and open a new and interesting world to" blank, there's nothing that follows that and the next page is an unindented paragraph, not sure if that's a formatting error or if they just didn't know how to do that properly, which would be strange because the last paper did not have that mistake, perhaps it was just being inattentive ... (clears throat) ... one page paragraph that continues to the next page, looks as though... I think the student intended for this first paragraph to be three pages long because following that there is three paragraphs of just three or four lines each, so I'm not sure (clears throat) what the thinking was here ... (clears throat) ... okay, in the last three paragraphs, they are short, it looks as though they are almost restarting the paper, because they're talking again about forms of sponsorship, reintroducing what that really is ... okay, I'm just going to write at the end of this paper "Come to my office for a meeting" and I'm going to be sending an email to this student and the one who wrote the previous paper ... I'm quite shocked at this and the works cited page is completely wrong, at least they have one unlike the last two, but um it just says "Reading for English: University of Dayton," which is not the title of the paragraph or the reading, rather, nor the title of the textbook, so that's a problem, I'm just gonna go ahead and email these two students um (clears throat) yeah so well okay these papers are done and now I'm going to be moving on to my regular American class students, American students, um I don't know if regular is the right term, I'm going to go on to my other students, so all right, thanks (door slams).

Post-Think-Aloud Interview

E: Ah, okay.

Daniel: How was it?

F: Fine

E: Daniel, you're going to be a part of my thesis ...

F: How long was it?

E: It's 33 minutes, but I still have to um do the rest of it so

F: Oh I can get you some personal reflections a little bit later

E: What?

F: The the uh – I have some other ones, the papers I was kind of disappointed

E: Oh um, I have three questions to ask you

F: Oh cool, by all means

E: (laughs)

F: Just wanna go in there or?

E: Yeah we can go in there, I don't wanna disrupt Daniel...it's gonna be awesome, I get to transcribe this! This is by far the shortest one I've had so

F: Well that's more of a result of the papers instead of me

E: Oh no, not not blaming you at all. Okay... um, um, tell me about responding to this set of papers, what did you notice, was there anything similar or different to other papers?

F: Um that's actually uh the key thing that I noticed. All three of these students had papers that were, for lack of a better word, gradable the first time. I certainly gave quite a few markings to each of these papers but I (inaudible) to put final grades on them because uh the first paper I graded was actually fairly solid I mean in that it was passable, like a paper that will probably pass in grade. The last two are ... not acceptable for college-level work so I will not be grading them at all until I have a chance to speak with the students and ask what their thought process was so

...

E: Would you be willing to speak to these students, regrade, and record your comments?

F: It would certainly depend upon the timeline, I'm not certain what I'm going to be doing with these papers period so I'll have to talk to them first, I don't know.

E: Okay.

F: Yeah.

E: Let me know. Uh does this method of response change from your normal response method? If so, how?

F: Uh no I mean um you know with the regular students, the American students, uh um national students, I guess, it really, I have to hold everyone to the same standards um I look for the same things regardless of the student's country of origin uh they're in an English class so they've certainly proved themselves to be eligible to take this level of coursework so I really can't change my kind of response to students okay, now whether or not that eligibility is legitimate is certainly a matter of debate, uh, for example, I know that the TOEFL exam is not designed in the most efficient way possible, but uh...

E: Okay. Were any of your expectations, previously mentioned, I believe you said ... uh good things, ELL students were good at following the prompts and objectives, the formatting may be different, and the expectations for format were (inaudible). Were any of your expectations met or exceeded? If so, in what ways? If not, which expectations were not met and in what ways?

F: I would say that all three students definitely understood what the assignment was supposed to be about, especially the first paper that I graded was um um fairly good, I expected um grammatical errors in these papers only because these students have demonstrated that in the past um I I I of course have had students who have done exceedingly well with grammar and content both but uh I would say that especially because these three students um all presented passable papers their first time around, their personal literacy narrative, I expected that same uh level of dedication and that certainly, on two of the papers, was not met so that was an expectation that I had that was certainly not met. If that makes sense.

E: Mmhmm. Let's see...what about the formatting?

F: Um you mean just like the paper format?

E: You mention that that might be different

F: Oh yes yes! Um the formatting of the first paper was great uh they have and I spoke a little about that on my think-aloud grading, but the only real problem with format-wise with the first paper was the works cited page um and uh the other two had formatting errors rather severely and

I mention this during the think-aloud but for example um one of my students, their paper was essentially one paragraph for the first three pages um whether or not that was intentional, I am not sure especially because on their fourth page, they have three short paragraphs of four, three to four lines each, so that's a huge uh, glaring lack of uh content reflection that I've seen so far, so I was not...I had higher expectations than products that I was given.

E: Okay, thank you very much for your participation

F: You're welcome

E: Let me know if you're going to actually read the last two

F: I actually have to talk to the students

E: Okay, thank you so much.

APPENDIX B

JENNY – TRANSCRIPT

Pre-Think-Aloud Interview

Emily: So, this is your consent form.

Jenny: Okay.

Emily: Just need you to read over that and sign it.

J: This is for the-for the IRB?

E: Yes.

J: So, it probably says ridiculous things that aren't going to happen.

-silence-

J: Jo, you want copy of their work, is that right?

E: Yes.

J: Okay. I have copies back at my desk. I don't have them with me.

E: That's fine.

J: You want copies of my comments too? Is that what you're saying?

E: Yes.

J: Okay, so I'll have to make a couple copies then.

-silence-

J: You'll remind me of all this stuff, too, right?

E: Yes.

J: 'Cause I don't want to forget (inaudible).

-saw buzzing in background-

J: It's not as bad as um trying to grade student's speaking skills with a leaf blower going on outside your room, that is just – like shut up I am trying to grade right now. Any other time, I don't care, but when it's determining someone's grade...

-silence-

J: And you're the eyewitness, I guess?

E: Yeah that – I believe that's for if, um, you...yeah.

-pen scratching-

E: Okay...all right, so I'm going to ask you four questions before, and then you'll do your think aloud and I'll leave, and then you'll do four questions after, okay?

J: Okay, and there's no way I'm going to get through all of these, so do you want me to just maybe pick a couple

E: Sure

J: For however long I can do it?

E: Mmhmm.

J: Okay, sounds good.

E: Okay. Please describe your normal response process for papers

J: So we're talking about like an essay

E: Mmhmm.

J: Usually what I do is I read through the entire paper without writing anything first so I can kinda get an idea of, you know, is there an issue with development, is there an issue with they can't organize things, or is the issue that their word choice is so terrible that I can't understand what they're saying. So I try to get an idea of the big issues I want to focus on. Then when I read it again, I look more specifically at their thesis statement and see if it matches the content that they're talking about in their paragraphs. While I'm reading it the second time, that's when I start making comments on their essay about those major points that I noticed in the first reading. And I try to limit my comments to only those big things for the first draft because issues like their grammar, it's really not useful at all to them to really get into the grammatical structures for a first draft because so many of them are still working on their ideas. I really limit myself to figuring out if I'm going to talk about grammar. The only time I would talk about grammar is if it was a persistent error that happens all the time that it would make it useful to talk about right – in the first draft. So I give them back the first draft um they revise it and I might read it again and again, focusing on those bigger problems and um I think when we get to a draft three or four, that's when I start pointing out their patterns of errors and ask them to revise based on their most common errors – I will say “oh you have verb tense problems, you need to edit your paper for verb tense.” ‘Cause I won't give them a list of six things that they need to do, I'll give them a list of one or two things.

E: Okay. What is the assignment you will be responding to today?

J: Today I will be reading – it's called In-Class Writing One. And throughout the seven-week term, they create a cause-effect essay and they draft parts of it in class. We don't let them do it at home, because miracles happen at home. All the sudden they can write perfectly. And um so we understand that there is really a need for them to write it in class so we are certain that it is what they are actually capable of doing. So what I'm reading today is only part of that essay. I told them that I will – only wanted to read the thesis statement and their first two body paragraphs. And then at a separate sitting, they will write their introduction including their thesis statement again and body paragraph three and a conclusion. So that's what I'm reading today is thesis statement and their first two body paragraphs.

E: Okay. What specifically are you looking for when responding to writing regarding this prompt?

J: I'm going to be looking at do they have a clear thesis statement and if they have three predictors in the thesis statement that anticipate what the topic sentence or the main idea of each paragraph is going to be so I want to make sure that those match and then I'm going to look for the overall development of each point.

E: And what expectations do you have for this set of papers?

J: I'm hoping I would really like to see that everyone has a cause-effect thesis statement with three main points and um I'd like to see them all have topic sentences that re – that um match what's happening in the thesis statement. I'd like to see um adequate development, maybe not anything that wows me but just can they develop a point for a sustained – er, can they sustain their thoughts over a period of three or four sentences and really develop a thought.

E: Okay. That concludes the pre-think aloud. So I'm gonna leave you.

J: Okay.

E: And then come get me when you're done.

J: Okay.

E: And we'll do the post.

J: Okay, cool. How long do you think the post will take?

E: Just about the same amount of time.

J: Ten – fifteen? Probably ten. Okay. And this is good? I don't need to do anything with that guy?

E: No. It should just be running and going.

J: Okay.

-door shuts-

Think-Aloud

J: Okay so this thesis statement has three points – deforestation causes desertification, extinction of species, and abnormality of climate, so not good word choice, but the thesis statement is cause-effect and it does have three points. Okay, so I see topic sentence that refers back to their first point – desertification – first of all, without being covered by enough forest, soil couldn't store water and could lead to desertification, so that's good. Okay, so this first paragraph, he did a decent job of explaining what he means by desertification and gives an example, something that happened in China, um, so I think that that's decent, so I think that he did a decent job on his first paragraph. Probably above what I was expecting for a level four student, so that's good. Okay, so second topic sentence does have um oh wait a minute, there it is. Okay so the second paragraph talks about the extinction of many species which is mentioned in the thesis, so that's good. The next couple sentences are repetitive, it's a lot of big words that say the same thing, so he could be just buying time here and not really developing a point, so that's something to look at. Got a nice statistic here, don't really know where this information came from but it looks like he's trying to develop a point by referring to some unknown report by the United Nations. Okay, so that's my first reading this essay and I think that, looking back at my rubric, so his thesis statement provides – he did achieve of the goals of that I expect in a thesis statement, there was nothing exciting about it, it wasn't very complex, so I'm going to say that he achieved the goals. Each paragraph explains one relationship. I think he did a decent job of explaining the cause-effect relationship here so I'm actually gonna say um achieves the goals. There were some places where he was being repetitive so I'm not going to say achieves above Level Four goals. Clear examples, provides background information, I'm gonna say he did a good job of that so I'm going to put him at above Level Four goals out of nine. Paragraphs have clear topic sentences, I think so. I'm going to look back to see if those topic sentences were complex or pretty straight-forward. First topic sentence looks pretty simple – er not simple, um complex. The second one is more simple, so I'm going to give him above level four goals of four and point five. I'm looking for transitions and connecting words. And let's see we have some (inaudible) clauses after we have some for example transition. First of all to start a paragraph, additionally, an okay job. Nothing exciting, so I'm going to say that his relation-that he uses transitions and connecting words to achieve the goals of the course. Grammatical structures are they complex and accurate, I think in general he's doing an okay job. At least his grammatical structures are – actually they are kind of above what I usually see in level four, so I'm going to say that his complexity is above level four, at a nine. And consistent verb tenses? I think that he did an okay job of that. Let's just check here. I see one shift in verb tenses in the first paragraph, I'm just going to note that that might be a pattern. Then he continues on in the present tense for the remainder of the paragraph until he gets to China's lowest plateau and then he does something interesting, he moves from simple present to present perfect to simple past and back to simple present, so that could be a pattern of error for him to look at for the future, so I'm gonna just note for him, and I'm doing this simply because the student is demonstrating a good understanding of complex grammar so I think that he could be ready earlier in the writing process to really look at his verb tenses so I don't think it's going to be overwhelming for him to think about that at this point. So consistent verb tenses, I'm actually gonna say 'almost achieved' so he knows that it's something he needs to work on. Paragraphs don't have choppy or stringy sentences, not really, I'm gonna say 'achieves goals' and good punctuation/capitalization. Now that I've looked at the rubric and see that the student has a high B or low A, I'm going to go back through and just think of longer comments that I can write on his paper. I'm writing that he has a good, clear thesis...(long pause)...I'm gonna add since this student looks like he's ready for it, I'm gonna add at the end of his second paragraph that he should be using a concluding sentence to bring all of his ideas together (pen scratching). I'm

gonna ask him in this example about China's lowest plateau, I'm gonna ask him why they were cutting down trees, he mentions that it happened, um, I'm just gonna ask why so many trees were cut down, if it was an issue, um, of overpopulation, or um so great need for trees, so I'm gonna put 'why did people cut trees down?'. I'm gonna actually 'cut so many trees down' so he knows it's about the number. And I'm going to mention that I really like that he mentioned the effect of the river becoming yellow and the presence of sandstorms in Beijing, so I'm gonna comment that that was um good explanation of an effect. Because I want him to recognize that I am seeing how he is developing his ideas. I'm looking at the second paragraph now. I'm getting the feeling that this paragraph is really empty of ideas. It has complex grammatical structures, but I don't really know that he's saying a whole lot or really saying why these species are becoming extinct. He says "destruction of these area's forest cover has resulted in a reduction of biodiversity," okay great, "forests support biodiversity by providing habitat for wildlife. Moreover, forests offer almost everything wildlife needs." So he's saying that cutting down forests eventually hurts the biodiversity. "Many species are facing a grievous problem," okay, I think, I think...I think I see what he's saying. Maybe the issue is that, it says "providing habitat for wildlife" and then "almost offer – offer almost everything wildlife needs." So maybe the issue is that he's not clarifying what those needs are, he's mentioned habitat and that's clear but I don't really understand, by what, what he means by "wildlife need" so he needs to clarify that. So I'm writing "clarify this idea" to the word "needs." And I'm writing "how is it different than habitat?" The next two sentences essentially say the same thing, they say that it's a problem. I mean, that's a paraphrase of those two sentences, so I'm going to ask him if he needs those sentences, we already know that it's a problem, so I'm going to put some brackets around these sentences and ask him "Are these sentences needed?" And I'm adding "We already know it's a problem." I think that's all he can really um focus on in this draft, I'm not going to address um the uncredited report yet, um, I'm gonna really, I'll have him work on his other ideas first and if he decides to keep that idea, we'll address it in a later draft, so...Now I'm gonna write some comments on the front, under the rubric page, just some overall comments about his essay (pen scratching). So my comments that I wrote him on the front were:

"you have a clear thesis in that you have developed in your two body paragraphs. Take a look at my comments on how you develop your ideas more for your next draft. Also, start thinking about your use of verb tenses. Sometimes you shift tenses without a clear reason." Um so that finishes that draft.

I'm picking up another student's um I am familiar with this student. I know before I even read his paper that he's probably going to have a lot of simple sentences um maybe underdeveloped ideas because he is a student that struggles with making writing complex. I'll start reading it now. Okay, so we have decent thesis, it's not perfect yet, but it's 'water pollution is caused by the waste of chemical factory, the waste of people living, and cutting down the forest.' We do have three predictors for his body paragraph and that's good. So in this first paragraph, underdeveloped, I already know they have read it so he's basically just saying 'factories are increasing and substances come from these factories and therefore the water is polluted. So very simple, doesn't really tell the reader any new or interesting information, it's stuff that the reader probably, already knows. This is something that I've been talking about with this student in particular, he doesn't like to take risks, he likes to be safe, and he likes to talk about things that he knows he can write, but that's really holding him back in developing an idea. Okay, in the second um paragraph, also um underdeveloped, not very interesting, doesn't really provide complex ideas, I mean the idea is basically that people make trash and the government asks us to do something with the trash, but if we don't do this some bad things will happen. He doesn't really tell us what bad things. Are – and then he says "for example our living trash include bag and battery" but that's not an example of the bad things that will happen, so there's um logical gap there, problems organizing sentences. So really, um, this student, we really need

to go back and work on developing more interesting ideas because if he just tries to clean up what's here right now, it's just going to be a simple and grammatically correct boring essay, and in level four, we're really trying to get them to develop interesting topics that a reader will want to read, we have been working on that the past few weeks, so this is an opportunity for him to understand that this kind of simple writing is not appropriate for level four. So I'm actually going to start here where um by giving him holistic comments first before I even grade anything else on the essay because it's - he has larger issues at play so I'm going to compose a note to him here (pen scratching). So so far, I've written -

"you have a clear thesis statement and ideas in your body paragraphs but your ideas are not very interesting. You give your reader information that that they already know. Before you revise the grammar of your essay, you really need to rewrite your ideas and examples of your body paragraphs. Consider giving your reader specific information about China that can help demonstrate these ideas."

And I haven't written any more yet, but uh the reason that I'm giving him that uh that advice about using an example from China is we're not um having them look for research yet for this writing and so I know that this student is going to be like, 'well I don't have any ideas, I don't have anything, this is all I know' so by giving him a specific way he can improve this, 'hey give me an example of what happens in China,' now it's a little more interesting, now it's more focused, more developed, it's something that he probably knows more about than I do or other students in our class that are not from China, so um, so he has a way forward, so it's not just 'hey make your ideas better,' I'm actually giving him a specific piece of advice that he can use to make his ideas better. So now I'm going to go back and try to s-fill out the rubric for Jun Xi. Thesis statement - let's look back at it again - it's decent, you know it actually achieves level four goals. Nothing exciting but it's doing what it needs to do. Do the paragraphs explain a cause-effect relationship? Uh...I mean, it does explain a cause-effect relationship. It's not interesting and it's not always incredibly clear, I mean, we get to the part about the gov-'if we don't do this, bad things will happen,' we don't really know what that is, so I'm gonna say "almost achieves level four goals," I'll give him a three out of five. Clear examples and background information? This is the part that he really had trouble with; it's simple and there is some explanation but the explanation is very simple, so I'm gonna go on a lower "almost achieves level four goals," a six and a half out of ten. Topic sentences...they're there. Not great but they're present, so he achieved those goals. Clear transitions? He's got transitions. So I'm gonna say that there aren't a lot of ideas to connect because it's so ... so sparse, so I'm gonna say "almost, almost achieves," 3.5 out of 5. Now his grammatical structure is a different story, um, we're really not seeing a lot of sentence variety, complexity, and accuracy. We're seeing things like 'our build' so verb form problems, 'coming' is another verb form problem, I don't know if I'm going to tell me about it yet, I don't think he's ready to hear that, 'was happened,' another verb form problem, 'coming' another verb form. Basically anything he has to do something besides simple present or a modal in the present, he can't do it with appropriate form, so that's a really bad sign, with the exception of he uses the passive voice in the very first sentence, and he does that well, but that may not mean anything because that is exactly like the model sentence I gave them so I don't know. So this student is really struggling to do anything complex when it comes to verb forms and clause structure, it's pretty difficult for the student to achieve that. So I think that we're going to have to go with a 6.5, both considering accuracy and complexity, actually you know what, that doesn't mirror what's happening, because I am clearly talking about a student that doesn't achieve what we need to be doing at this level so it needs to be even lower than that. I'm going to write under here "verb forms" sentence um and underline "sentence variety, complexity, and accuracy," and just let him know that it's not achieving level four goals, I'm going to give him a six. Not that much lower, but just visually so he can see that that's a big problem. "Consistent verb tenses?" Um I mean it's hard to tell because the verb forms aren't always right so we don't know if

coming is present or perfect or present or past. I'm going to say "does not" it's too difficult to tell. "Choppy and stringy sentences?" Well, it's not bad, erm, it's not terribly exciting, I'm going say it achieves goals. Punctuation, spelling, sure. Achieves goals, so here we go for that student, so that's.

Picking up another student essay. We have. She, so far her work has been usually appropriate for level four or above so it could be a higher essay we are reading here. Okay so so far her thesis statement is pretty clear – "Forest fires cause destruction of wood resources, death of wild animals and plants, and air pollution," so we have three predictors for her paper. Not the best word choice, but she has – her ideas are clear. Okay so the first thesis, the first topic sentence in the first paragraph, she explains the benefits of trees, I think that's what she means by "wood resources," but there's no mention of forest fires which is a problem. In the topic sentence, she really needs to develop this cause-effect relationship. I'm gonna keep that in mind, I won't write anything yet. She does talk about forest fires, but she doesn't mention it in her first sentence, so maybe this is an issue of organization, it could be she just needs to add a sentence before some com-she-this is the kind of student that tries to do maybe more than she's capable of, I-I like it when a student takes a risk, sometimes they-they-sometimes they fail, but it's good to see a risk, so she says "wood resources known as an important part of the national economy possess its ability of regulating the climate, beautifying the environment, and purifying the air we breathe," so there is no clear main verb in here, so she is trying to kind of do backflips in her write when she really needs to work on doing a solid somersault. So we'll get to that later. Content of this paragraph...she can definitely develop her ideas here, she's saying "it's hard to restore the forest," doesn't explain why. She expla-she says that losing valuable plants and small bushes causes serious loss but we don't know what that loss is, something I'll comment on later. Okay so the second body paragraph, we do see a topic sentence, does it relate back to the thesis, that's good. I like that she uses a specific example of the cedar fire in 2003 so it must be something I'm assuming is in China, but we need to find out where that happened. Okay so, let's go over the rubric and figure out what her issues are. Her first- her fir-her thesis statement is clear with the exception of word choice, but we're not going to talk about that yet, so I'm going to say that it achieves the goals. Each paragraph explains cause-effect relationship...(page flips)...well she is lacking that last step where she explains what this loss is and why it is so hard to restore forest, so development is not completely there, but I think that has to do with the third point, uses clear examples, so as far as clearly explains cause-effect relationship, I'm gonna say she achieves those goals, but for clear examples and support, I'm gonna say she almost achieves and I'm going to give her a 7 out of 10 for that. Topic sentences...there was an issue in that first one, so, I'm gonna say almost achieves out of 3.5. Transitions...after the (inaudible) clauses in addition what's more, that's a favorite thing for my Chinese students to say, as a result, it seems that, for example, in addition, so not a lot of variety but she is, they are achieving the purpose, so I'm gonna give her a 4 out of 5 on that. As far as how complex and accurate her structures are, she is usually pretty good. I'm gonna reward her trying to do more complex sentences, even if she doesn't succeed, because we can take those sentences and make it a learning point and make it a teachable moment so she can know how to make that structure better later and what I'm thinking is specifically in that first topic sentence where she's trying to use a series of gerunds – it's ability of regulating the climate, beautifying the environment" – that's, that's great it's that right before that where we don't have a main verb – wood resources comma known as an important part of the national economy comma possess – oh wait, is that the verb though? Possess? Its ability of regulating...so maybe the issue is that it's a word choice issue and not that she's missing a verb. Yeah. It's a word choice issue. This possess its ability of, I'm gonna actually underline that phrase 'cause I think that she's ready to reconsider how to say this and I'm gonna actually leave it – I'm gonna write WC for word choice and I'm gonna write "unclear, what do you mean" this is the kind of student that can, that can really handle this comment and think about it, um, she's not gonna give

up on it, she's a pretty tenacious student, so she won't - not just ignore that. I'm gonna say that she achieves the goals. Maybe even achieves above, I think even achieves above, so let's do a nine here, for complexity, variety, vocabulary, consistent verb tenses, let's take a look. The forest will be took place, so a little verb form problem there - she uses most everything in present tense except for this example of Cedar Fire, I'm gonna say she achieves the goals. Didn't notice choppy or stringy sentences so I'm gonna say achieves above because she did a number of different complex structures and did them well and good punctuation, above. So there we go. So now I'm gonna go back to hers, comment more fully um on specific areas. I will say that I didn't comment specifically on areas of 's essay because his issues are so global that I don't think commenting specifically on the ideas is going - on his specific uninteresting ideas - is really going to make that much of a difference, I think that it's so much larger that's it's just better to do global feedback for him. So I'm going to say that she has a clear thesis, I'm writing that on here... I'm actually going to put - above wood resources - I'm writing Word Choice, WC, and I'm going to give her a suggestion here and say "trees" because she may not come up with that by herself, she may not understand the difference between the material of wood and the plant trees. Now in the - I'm going to put brackets around her topic sentence and mention "you need to include forest fires in your topic sentence." That should be enough for her to figure out what to do. And next to "it's hard to restore forest" I'm going to make a little arrow and ask her why. Can you explain this further? And I'm asking it as a question so she kinda sees an audience awareness so she remembers hey I'm writing to an audience, to my teacher, to my classmates, um so she can be reminded that she needs to clarify her ideas for her audience (page flips) and 'these effects will bring serious loss' - I'm gonna, right above 'serious loss,' I'm gonna make an arrow and say 'what kinds of loss, can you explain more?' (pen scratching). And for the cedar fire, I'm going to underline it and draw an arrow and say "where did this happen?" And after she says that um it wasn't, this forest wasn't able to regrow even after four years, I'm gonna add to that um a comment about connecting that back to the death of wild animals because that's her whole point in this paragraph and she did not finish that thought so I'm going to write 'what happened to the animals and plants? Did any go extinct?' Er, we'll say, not go because that might - she might be confused - 'did any become extinct?' Okay. Now time to go back and write her some holistic comments and I think what I'm going to say is first I'm going to mention her strengths, so I'll write it and then I'll read it (pen scratching). Okay so what I wrote for is

"you have a clear thesis statement and some good examples in your paragraphs. You can develop some ideas further by considering and answering the questions that I put on your draft. Remember for your topic sentence of your first body paragraph, you need to give a clear cause-effect relationship. You explain the benefits of trees but you didn't mention forest fires." So that...those are my comments for .

I am going to skip ahead to a student who is a more difficult one to do so I'd like to get an example of how I deal with that. Um this particular student has tremendous spelling problems and it feeds over into his grammar problems too so it's always kind of a challenge to respond to his writing, so let's see how he did (page flip). Okay so we do have a clear thesis statement here. It's simple but it's there - there are many cause air pollution such as car, factory, and power lines - see how he does now. First paragraph (page flips). Oh my, so we have a very long cause-effect chain to follow. We start with air pollution, he moves on to air pollution is caused by cars, that's the premise of this whole paragraph, then he says - people are driving a lot of cars, therefore we have smog, smog causes health problems, and then all the sudden we're onto another cause - er another effect of smog, which causes holes in the ozone layer and uh somehow we get from the hole in the ozone layer to we're risk - we're at risk for harmful diseases from the sun's rays, okay so there's a connection, he's talking about maybe skin cancer. All this problems found because of the smog in the car, okay, we are all over the place in this paragraph, so we need - this is an issue of focus, we need to, maybe limit, maybe the suggestion is to limit the whole issue, take out cars

and maybe it's a smog problem. Air pollution is caused by smog, but then factories also cause smog. Let's see how the second paragraph is different than the first. He's also talking about smog here, it's the same idea, factories increase smog. He even mentions it's the same effect from cars. I'm a little bit – um, I've gotten lost because of the spelling, um, now we're at – factories destroys plants and maybe nature? Natural? Create looks sort of wow cry-ate, create, factory – okay so he's saying that we have to clear land to build factories. Oh dear. It's interesting – he ends this paragraph with a concluding sentence where he's predicting, um, what he's going to say in his third paragraph, which he didn't write today so that's a real challenge with this student's essays, he tries to do a lot, he tries to compensate for his spelling and grammar issues by developing his ideas a lot in quantity but not in quality, it's not focused. It's a lot of stuff but it's not very focused. So I think what to do first here is to – I'm trying to think if it's better to write directly – I'm going to start with a global underneath the rubric, I'm gonna write some comments there first before I actually write on his essay. So I'm gonna say – Some (pen scratching)...It occurs to me now that actually his paragraphs are focusing on effects and not causes. He really wants to talk about the effects of air pollution. He starts with the cause at the beginning of these paragraphs but then he quickly moves into the effects – health problems, ozone layer, destroying plants – so I wonder if really the advice I need to be giving him is that he really needs to focus on describing effects because he just keeps repeating the same causes. Okay so let's do that (pen scratching). Okay so what I wrote to this student, I said

“you mentioned in your essay that cars and factories both create smog. As a result, these paragraphs have many similarities. I think you actually need to rewrite your ideas to focus on three effects. This will help you better distinguish the ideas of your paragraphs. You could mention the common causes in your introduction and then focus on effects in your body paragraphs”

And I think that that really gets to the heart at what this student is really struggling with, so now I'm going to go back and figure out – I think what I'll do is I'll number the effects – health problems, one – so he can clearly see how many effects he talks about. Holes in the ozone, two – harmful diseases from sun's rays, three. Actually it's health problems, I think he's talking about breathing problems first, so maybe, I'll erase the health problems er hmm I wonder, I'll put one for health problems and then maybe one-A, one-A for the breathing problems and then change the three to one-B to show that they're related. And so he can see like how he's organized here, trying to organize, second paragraph, cars factories burning oil, destroying plants, nature, destroy uh same idea, really he only has one idea in that whole paragraph and that effect is destroying plants and nature. So now that I've numbered those, I'm going to add to his comments Look at the numbered effects that I show you in your essay. Okay and really I think that that is the most useful comments that I can write on that student's paper. The global feedback and the numbering because any more text on his paper than that is probably going to cause some panic. So let's keep it to that and let's go to the rubric. So...does he have a thesis statement? Well that's uh questionable now because it doesn't match what happens later in the essay. I'm going to say almost achieves goals and add “needs to match content of paragraphs” er not content, content might be a confusing word for him, ideas of paragraphs, actually main ideas 'cause that's really the idea. Each paragraph explains the cause **one** that's a key word because he really has a huge chain of cause-effects so I'm for that I'm going to say does...does not, I'll give him a two and a half out of five. Clear examples and support? He's really all over the place um I'm going to say need to focus development and give him a seven out of ten. Topic sentences...he knows how to use them and for how he thought he was organizing, he did a good job, but it's not the topic sentence he needed. I'm gonna say um almost. Transitions? He tries, you know, he does things like first, in this days, next, not a lot though, today, oh wait, there's one today. He does, you know, common Arabic speaking problems like for that instead of because of that, I think that's what he meant. He could do more, so I'm gonna put almost. Now since variety complexity and

accuracy, oh dear, so well let's go all the way down to spelling and say does not achieve the goals since it's pretty poor. Variety...it burning oil...that is not appropriate verb form...verb tenses are a little all over the place, they burn the same effect we have, verb tenses are all over, helped to killed plane and create we need past to present, present to past, let's do the verb tenses um almost achieved, stringy, choppy, you know, actually he may have achieved that, he may not have done such a bad job there. Let's change that to achieves, because he tried that pretty well. Oh dear...I'm going to underline accuracy because that's really his issue. He's trying a lot of complexity but it's just not accurate. So I'll have to give him an almost achieves goals at a six and a half. And I think that's all I'm gonna write for this student because his issues are really more um larger than just grammar. He really needs to focus on developing and focusing those ideas.

Post-Think-Aloud Interview

J: Hey just finished.

E: Oh awesome.

J: Yeah, good timing, come on in. Yeah got through these four.

E: Was the noise too much?

J: No, actually well it was kinda bad at the beginning, but it calmed down but now it came back so...

E: Oh good.

J: I got through a couple upper tier students, someone in the middle, and someone who really struggles – actually these two struggle both in different areas.

E: Okay.

J: Yeah.

E: Would you like to do the post now?

J: Yeah!

E: Okay. Um tell me about responding to this set of papers – what did you notice, was there anything different or similar to other papers?

J: You uh in regard to these four? To each other?

E: Yes.

J: The students who understand essay structure had similar issues um it was just development, they just needed to develop a few ideas a little stronger. Um structure wasn't a problem, their grammar wasn't really a problem so there were similarities among these two. And then um for these two guys, they are actually quite different students, this student doesn't like to take risks on writing, he wants to stick with really simple ideas that he can write with accurate or what he thinks is accurate grammar but it ends up being really boring and very shallow in development. This student, um he tries, he tries to take a risk. He will, he will take you down a very long path where he will end up where he's like whoa how did we get here? And then he ends a paragraph, so um he needs, he needs help focusing um and after he focuses, he can really figure out how to focus his ideas, um, his other issue is he is um a very bad speller, to the point where you're like 'what is that word, I have no idea,' and that's something that he and I are working on, I have him signed up for a site that helps him spell so but of these two students, I have more faith that the student with the bad spelling and bad grammar can go can make significant strides because he's willing to try something different and something new and this one I just don't know if he has the guts to do it. Maybe, maybe not, we'll see.

E: Okay. All right, so does this method of response change from your normal response method? If so, how?

J: Mmm...this is typically my process for dealing with a first draft because I try to give them just a few big comments that are going to be helpful, I don't really like to attend to a lot of the minutia so I think that's pretty similar to how I usually respond to drafts.

E: Okay. Okay for question three...

J: Mmhmm.

E: Were any of your expectations, previously mentioned, met or exceeded? Um, if so, what expectations were met and in what ways? Were any not met and if so, which expectations were not met and in what ways?

J: Um well most of them were meeting the expectation of the thesis statement. They may need to revise the thesis to match the actual ideas in their paragraphs but they, they understood what a thesis statement was and they showed that by giving me a cause-effect relationship and three points after it so that was good. They, all of them, I think, understood how to group ideas into a paragraph, even if they weren't able to co-clearly develop them, they were able to create a paragraph that focused on one of those ideas in their thesis so that was good. Um they had inconsistent use of grammatical structure, some of them did quite well for level four and some of them not so well, but that's, that's typical, that's not something I was really surprised about. Um as far as trans – we haven't really talked about transitions and connecting words yet, but it's clear that they've all had instruction on that in the past and and they know that what it means to have a transitions and how to connect words but I think common among all of them is that they need new and more complex ways of doing that. Yeah.

E: Okay well thank you very much.

J: That was it?

E: Yeah

J: So should I um when do you want these copies? You can come with me right now and I can copy them now and you can take 'em.

E: Sure and I'll just – I can black out the names or any information.

J: Sure

E: That

J: Yeah, here you go. These are kinda like – (audio cuts off)

APPENDIX C

SALLY – TRANSCRIPT

Pre-Interview

Sally: Yes, it is now recording.

Emily: Fantastic. Hold on one second. And now I'm going to have to transcribe just all of me talking.

Sally: That's okay.

E: Hmm, hmm, hmm, where'd it go? (sigh, keys clicking) Where'd it go? Okay all right, that's actually gonna work, hooray. For some reason, my files wouldn't open, so I was having a minor, minor freakout, little baby freakout.

S: Cool. We've got two weeks to go.

E: Okay, so um – what?

S: We've only got two weeks to go for freakout.

E: Haha, yay.

S: No come back.

E: -pre think aloud interview and then I'll let you do – what do you mean, 'oh, come back,' what'd I do?

S: The screen froze for a second, no big, no biggie.

E: Oh it says there's an internet connection problem

S: It's lyin'.

E: (laughs) It's lyin'. Um there's four pre-think aloud interview questions and then I'll let you do your think aloud so if, I don't know if we need to sign off for that or anything

S: It might be – we don't have to but it might be easier if I do and then record it with the webcam and then send it to you.

E: Okay

S: In case the internet decides to be a bitch.

E: Yeah. And then we can do the callback for the three final questions.

S: Okay, sounds good.

E: Awesome. Okay, so the first question is describe your normal response process for papers.

S: Normal response process, well it's never in a timely manner but um I grade everything on Isidore, which means I use Microsoft Word Track Changes and so I'll open the paper that was turned in digitally on Isidore our online learning database thinger and I'll um I save it as a new file in a Dropbox folder and then I set the Track Changes. Um I try to do not as many are they direction comments, where you just plug in the right answer um you know like putting in a comma or crossing out words, I try to use a lot of explanations in the comment bubbles and then I paste the rubric for the assignment at the end of the document um I fill out you know points off for each section and some explanations and then I write like a brief paragraph note at the end kinda Peter Elbow style.

E: Okay. Uh what is the ri- the assignment you will be responding to today?

S: Uh don't judge me on this, it is the summary and response to a piece on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. I gave my students a little more time on these because they grumbled so I have a few left.

E: Mmkay.

S: And I should note that um of my international students, I don't think any of the five are Catholic, I don't think that will matter for this assignment but um just FYI. Granted, I think only half my students are Catholic whether they're native or non-native speakers.

E: Okay. Uh what specifically are you looking for when responding to writing regarding this prompt?

S: Um mostly... I guess it's mostly structure. I want them to be incorporating quotes from the source they're discussing. I'd like it to be more response-driven and response that shows critical thought and know more than just "I like this story" or "this story really inspired me." I try to get them to draw connections to their own lives. I put on the rubric 'a controlling thesis' but I'm finding that a lot of them are more implied thesis statements so I guess it's just the structure – do they have all the parts necessary and do they flow in a way that the reader understands.

E: Okay. And what expectations do you have for this set of papers?

S: Um I think they'll be between okay and better than average but my students really didn't like this assignment. They seemed to not like the text that they were to choose from and I was okay with that in class, so this assignment is a little shorter. Um a lot of them weren't sure how to interpret the Catholic Intellectual Tradition so I think, I think they understand the text, I'm not sure how much responding they will do.

(end of audio)

Paper Response

S: Okay! The first paper I'm going to grade is um from one of my students from uh Saudi Arabia. Pull it up. Okay, looks like he has most of his MLA information correct, that's good. Needs to be formatted a little differently. Title's a little boring – World Literacy Video. I'll tell him – Title is good, but think of a way to make it a bit more exciting for your reader. Okay. Make sure that Track Changes is on – I'm gonna delete all, I don't usually just delete words, but I'm gonna delete it – the video of the World Literacy Summit 2012, it was published on March 27th, that needs to be (inaudible), I'm gonna delete it. Um I wouldn't normally do it but with my second-language, (inaudible) language learners, sometimes I think it's easier that they see the grammar issues. (inaudible) education, poverty country... countries don't have enough education, used a contraction, I usually take points off (keys clicking) and I say – Uh oh! Not a contraction! Though we use them in conversation and informal writing, contractions are a bit too informal for academic papers – Every child received the education... those poor countries, they wouldn't made more difference in their economy, better increases, better economy for the future... every child received the education ... those four countries... it would have made... hmm, that's a little confusing so, I'm gonna highlight it for now and come back to it... of course education... this is so important... almost for every country (inaudible). This is how education is so important for the children today (inaudible), we do not reputation (inaudible)... regardless some... might not help all of the children in this part of the countries however, it will help a lot of them for now and decrease (inaudible)... the amount of uneducated children. Furthermore, those children in those countries, when they are adult, they can help the next generation to keep (inaudible) faith. This is a lot of... aside... like you would in conversation... not always making sense. Let me show him how to start off with commas and make a note later that he should check out the Write Place or see me in my office or after class to go over this – increase in (inaudible) dollars to include... paying money on wars that should not happen in these worlds today... in better way... In the video, it said 'everyone... situation...' Good quote to include! You just have to do correct in-text citation but I'm gonna compliment him. "Good quote to include at this point, just remember to include the in-text citation so your reader knows the... (inaudible)" The more educated children we have, the more they discover in the future to help out. For reference (inaudible)... also, if children have the education, they will learn about (inaudible) diseases and most of their children

will have HIV and AIDS. Also the video shows most of the people are just homeless and children on the street. With better education, then they would have a better economy, and be able to pay for those homeless people. Most people don't have money for a real home – if they had the education, they would get the degrees for their future, work real job/ (inaudible) They would also have better, healthy conditions and most of them will die at the age five. Education is so important for these children for so many reasons. Um... (inaudible) summary... so I'll make a note of that. "You know that (inaudible) quote from the video, it's still a good idea to cite after summarizing parts of the video. That way your reader can distinguish between your opinion and explanation in your summary." I'm trying to put a lot of it in terms of the reader which works well with most of my students um, I think... sometimes I feel like I'm just trying to be mean in a nicer way. (inaudible) The video talks about women and girls are not educated, what's an example from the video, is... says "60% of uneducated children are girls" and that's a lot comparing to other countries. He's given them a couple messed up citations here so I'm just gonna put this in here... A female needs the education as well as male. Also, of my option of why females in most countries are not educated because of a core reason ... are the (inaudible) countries. They would prefer the males to be educated for their wages. For females to be educated is so important as well as to decrease single mothers, female (inaudible), and at a young age of marriage. Huh... that's really insightful. In my opinion... you know, that's a really good point. (keys clicking) What about adding a (inaudible)... importance of females to be educated in those countries? Can females get higher wages there? I don't know a lot about Saudi Arabian culture um but my students have indicated that women are treated differently which... that's what I've heard so I'm trying to cautiously ask him to offer more information but at the same time, I don't want him to think I'm criticizing his culture or his beliefs, um until I understand them better. The Literacy Summit Foundation helped children to get education by sending books, teachers, and building classrooms for those children to learn. The world gets together and every year help million of children. The solution will be solved in education... poverty countries will be increased, some more women will be educated, for all humans to have degrees and they will have more teachers. All those rich countries need to donate to poverty countries and take serious? ... serious why they need help with education. Those countries can get together and send the nine, 1.9 million teachers for children and the faster they work, it makes it better for the world. Not a bad conclusion. Oh no! No works cited! Okay..."Uh oh, what happened to the works cited page? Could you provide an example of how you format this... (inaudible)" So overall... he didn't have a ton of (inaudible), c'mon computer, um but he had some good points. He also did not exactly... he didn't cite correctly, he didn't quite meet the page requirement, where's my rubric? Right now I'm pasting my rubric from a different Word file directly onto the paper so he can read it. Okay... he does have quite a few sentences that indicate that he's a second language learner... let's see. I give 15 points for mechanics, which includes right MLA format, citations, spacing, that kind of thing, so I'm going to put 'missing works cited page, missing in-text citations after quotes and summary' I'm giving 15 points... he does refer to the video, so I'll give him 5 out of 15. Let's see... uh I give 15 points for grammar... which includes spelling, using complete sentences, uh correct commas, lack of second person, formality issues... used contractions, and I'll just put 'major sentence clarity issues.' I'm only gonna give him 5 points for grammar as well, I try when I grade second-language students to hold them to the same grammar standards as native speakers. Let's see – correctly summarized text... okay, for content, I give 55 points out of the 125, it's for correctly summarizing, dedicating more content to response than summary, uh response that shows critical thinking, and using details and examples from the text to support argument, so that the thesis that adequately (inaudible) the paper. He did a good job with the summary so I'll put 'good job' next to that category. Dedicates more content to response... 'would like to see more response, especially from... women and education...', critical thinking... good job thinking of cultural examples... uh he does use details well... I'm just gonna

take off 10 points, he has 45...let's see...the length? It's just a tiny bit short. Adding the explanation could (inaudible), don't want to count him twice so I'll only take a few points off for that. Wonderful flow, paragraphs (inaudible), did I? This is usually the point where I go back and reread it, so I'm gonna do that right now. (Inaudible) a lot of companies in America (inaudible)...Wait, what do you mean? Here's the sentence I highlighted. First thing I'm going to do is unhighlight it. Now when I look at it, I see what he's saying, it's just kind of (inaudible) – every child received an education in those poor countries, comma, it would have made more difference today with our economy and increase in our economy – still not totally clear, but I'll make a note of that at the end. This is so important. This...this is how education is so important. Well, good argumentative claim, you know (inaudible) might not help (inaudible) countries more about, can help the next generations' literacy, education in this country includes two...(inaudible)...unfortunately...spending billions of dollars to increase education do more summits then paying money on wars that should not happen in the world today. I decide it will make a greater difference and a better world. In the video, (inaudible), needs to be discovered...also children have an education, a better education, this is a little lengthy – you have done quite a good job of packing an argument into a paragraph. You may want to consider breaking it into smaller paragraphs. That way your reader can focus on each one thing that you (inaudible) and can better follow your overall argument. (Inaudible) helps the children (inaudible) normally educated. All those rich countries need to donate to the poverty countries and take a serious (inaudible) into the education system (inaudible) teacher...(inaudible) the faster they work on the rest of the world. Okay. Let's see, logical flow. Yes. Paragraph – watch lengthy paragraphs. I'm just gonna take off five points for organization, which brings me to 35. Right, now we use the calculator...I can't do math. 5 plus 5 plus 45 plus 35...is 90 divided by 125...72, I think, is fair. He can definitely revise so he only missed five points on organization and ten points on content which are the bulk of the paper. Content is out of 55, organization is out of 40, um did not get full credit for mechanics and grammar, but those are easy mistakes to fix. I'm going to make a note of that for him, I'm also going to put the percentage on here. (inaudible) and why I'm working with it, I'm going to put the points in my grade spreadsheet. Brings his grade to a C. Student - I'm saying his name but I'm not going to (inaudible) – great job on paper, (inaudible) cause and action, how to help world and countries, and I appre – no – I like how you examine the world of culture in women's education. You lost a lot of points because of MLA and grammar – misspelled grammar...ironic – issues, but these are easy to fix. I strongly recommend that for your next paper you have someone help you read and polish. (Inaudible) Another pair of eyes will help you to catch those pesky (inaudible), also I'd like to see more response for you – from you – yeah, for you, especially when you talk about women's education. I can tell from your writing that you are thinking critically, but I – but, as a reader, I would like to know more about how you got those conclusions or what examples you made. Other...Please let me know if you would like to meet to discuss revising this paper and I look forward to your next essay. I do tell most of them that don't uh do as well to please let me know if they'd like to meet, that's not just for (inaudible). Okay, so I've put in my end comment. I will submit that to Isidore.

Now for the next one, it's another – oh he's from Kuwait, let's see...he's writing on the Pope, nice header, but double-space it. Okay – great header, just remember that this should be double-spaced like the rest of the paper – Okay, some total of social condition which allow people either as groups of – or as individuals to reach their fulfillment more easily this is how the ... the Pope John Paul the Second define the Common Good – John Paul – the importance of the Common Good, not God, ah! Make sure my Track Changes are on! It's really not fair to ensure the stability of society. It's the wrong form of "ensure," we better tell him that – This is the one of those tricky English words that gets spelled two ways. It (inaudible) to commonly misused (inaudible) – I usually tell them random facts like that, not just to make them feel better, but I don't want to act like I'm a spelling genius because I'm not. People have their own choice to

perform what they believe in while giving others a chance to reach their goals without invalidating space or beliefs. That could be accomplished by understanding the idea (inaudible) in the beginning, it is really important for the society to understand the idea of the common good uh that people are all equal each on one of them? (Inaudible) which ensure them a comfortable life. Contraction! – uh oh, not contraction. Though we use them all the time in (inaudible)...writing (inaudible)... just make sure the camera's still working. Cool. You have to understand the concept in order to implement it and it can't be done individually. Therefore the society will start caring for each other and the common good will be easy to identify. Yeah...then people will work to insure the fairness for everybody because of their ... (inaudible) – Nice work! – understanding and maintaining the idea is really a huge part of the common good. That's a good argument. Secondly, since the concept requires the participation of all the society members, responsibility comes along with it. This world demand has many beautiful features to offer. People will sacrifice for others to get what they need, will make them enjoy their lives, um...let's see. He's listing two things and splitting them with a comma. So we'll say – Since the second part of this sentence is (inaudible) along as its own sentence, you need to join it either with a conjunction or a semi-colon. See your Lunsford guide about details and ex...examples. – Misspelled conjunction! I usually ask them to look at their Lunsford guide to offer a tangible...it's not just me explaining it, but there's exercises they can practice. So in the evil gab, gap? Gab between the rich and the poor? People, they will choose those who will represent them the right way, away from denying the role of the minority. Governments will start to listen to their people...people need...and give them what they are asking for. This concept is one of the godgifts? delivered by the holy man, Jesus. Being responsible is another huge part that we need to make the concept represented by (inaudible) dependable of the government. (Inaudible) The action that everyone should feel, including me, is agreeing and supporting the conflict of the Common Good, starting from the main structure of this society, which is people, we should be equal to be a unit while maintaining their dignity that is mentioned in every aspect of social life must be related to if it to attain its full human extension of the quality of all people. Now he's just citing it as Paul, not John Paul. I'm just gonna make a note. I know if – to parenthetically cite Pope John Paul the second, so I have not been strict about options, however since the beginning of the paper, you use "John Paul," then the page number is supposed to be consistent when you parenthetically cite there – all people should be part of the idea because it can be accomplished by few people on the Earth, (inaudible) together is a possible achievement. The way of treating people with different, each one will treat the other human being away from personal advantages, not only in normal situations but also in any other, (inaudible) like when dealing with a person society inwishes, that wishes and intends to rent services (inaudible) society about the common good. He did introduce it with a colon so I'm gonna call... - I see how you are using this first sentence to increase the quote. What punctuation should you use just after "person" to do so? – So I can understand the importance of (inaudible) and sacrificing your own words in order to (inaudible), the person cannot find (inaudible), you reach that point in finding society (inaudible). In the part of the society I weave in, I believe that my responsibilities make a difference. It only takes a spark to ignite a huge fire. I'm gonna change that to a semi-colon. Kinda cliché, but...but in this context, oh context! Cognate confusion, man. The spark is represented by the belief in the concept of the idea and our responsibility to hold (inaudible) people. (Inaudible) when people pull together...(inaudible) will spread. All right, he keeps using the fire metaphor. This fire won't be stopped by (inaudible)...the importance of treating others...(inaudible) people people...(inaudible)...and turn it into a world of beautiful characters who want to teach. (Inaudible) these people will stop acting shallow and look deep into people's heads and feelings and work to ensure justice for all people. This is too cheesy to let go. I'm just gonna say – This is a really lofty goal! I like how you are exploring a possibility for people working towards the common good. Do you think people will really look deep into people's heads and feelings? I like the positive tone, but I also want you to be honest in

your response. – This (inaudible) grading. The government's role is now really important, it should make people work to achieve these goals of society to develop on the inside and the outside. Government (inaudible) holy land... a light that will show us the right way to the light. Who hold the message, massage, (laughs), I don't mean to, (laughs), who hold the massage of the illusion of truth (inaudible) begins and ends in Jesus. – I like the John language here, but I'm just a bit confused as to how he links to your earlier point. How... What might you add here to (inaudible) clarify what you mean to your reader? – Memory, the society can get appreciation of human (inaudible), being responsible, and being represented as you truly think. Not you! Get that a lot here... - Not you! Remember, you is informal and should be avoided. (inaudible) – ehh, he cited the Pope twice. So ... and he numbered it so first I'll say – For MLA style, you do not need to number entries, instead you have a second inconsequence one to form a (inaudible) – I hate to describe these to kids, it's just hard to visualize – see the example in your Lunsford guide for further explanation. - He cited the Pope twice, once is an article from the reader for class and one's the clip from the original one. – Wow! You found (inaudible) for (inaudible) I'm impressed, however once the work's cited, you can just choose one to cite, since they are the same text though located on different pages. – Okay. Are his citations correct? MLA header...spacing is an issue... - Spacing in header, in-text citations should be consistent, works cited was not (inaudible) – None of these are really severe so I'm going to take off five points which gives him a ten. Spelling using correct commas, (inaudible), - view traction, spelling and sentence clarity issues, - uh I'm gonna give him five out of fifteen because the formality isn't as big of a deal as the sentence clarity. Okay...let's see, content, fifty-five. Correctly summarizes, eh, dedicates more content to response, shows critical thinking with details from the text, we'll talk about that... all done, - adequately framed paper, nicely done. - Okay... - paragraphs about message took from (inaudible) a bit hard to follow towards the end. – mark that paragraph, now I'm going to go back and read it again, quietly because my throat hurts...Okay, this paragraph's a little longer than I remember. – Pack, though none of the (inaudible) points into this section, what about splitting up this paragraph so your reader can better focus on Pope John Paul (inaudible) – That's a short conclusion. –Nicely and concisely done. – (sigh) okay so in addition to the one paragraph not transitioning well, break up the other, take off ten points overall for that. Um the response is a little different but I like, and it's more of a call to action, which a couple other students had. I think it shows critical thinking so I'm gonna give him full points for content. I think he really worked with this text so let's see what that gives him... 10 plus, so we got 10 for mechanics out of 15, 5 for grammar out of 15, 55 for content out of 55, 30 for organization out of 30, gives him 100, if we divide by 125, it's 80, I think this paper earned an 80. Gonna put that in my spreadsheet so I don't forget. (sigh) Adding up points...he's got a B for the class...(inaudible) – Great work here, I love your speech-like style and call to action. A few places sound a bit idealized like looking deep into the hearts of others – if I didn't know this student as well, I probably wouldn't say that, but this is a very confident, talkative student – but overall you convinced the reader of what the Pope says and why it is important. Keep an eye on MLA, formality, and sentence clarity. All of these are easy to fix, polish, with help from some peer review or consultant at the Write Place. Also watch your paragraph, especially when you drift to a new point at the end. You've got a lot of good points so the easier you can make it for your reader to see them individually, the better your writing, the more convincing your writing will be. – Okay, done, I've saved it. Going to Isidore.

My next student is from Sweden. He's been studying English for about 10 years. Uh he's pretty fluent, though there's some discursive differences, obviously. Oh beautiful header. Boring title though! – While this title is...true, what about making it a bit more creative for your readers? Would you want to read an essay called (inaudible)? – Poverty is one of the biggest issues in our modern society, in our third world countries, the absence as well as the need of education is clear. Education in third world countries had to improve and become more acceptable so everyone can

go to school. Today, too few children have access to education in developing countries where education is too poor. It is crucial for them...get, er, boys and girls to get, there we go. Synonyms are hard. To get boys and girls both equally educated to prevent ongoing poverty and to increase our living standard because through education, you can achieve great things like prosperity, development, and good health, ah! Not you! Every, (inaudible), my students use second person despite my rant and raves against it. – Uh oh, not second person! Remember, you is informal and should be avoided in academic writing. – Education is (inaudible). Our first introduced in (inaudible)...quoting. I'll let that go, technically not a...but he does mention that the video segment and in then quoting someone else. Today over a hundred million children in third world countries use, are not used, (inaudible) children are not included in lives...today, two-thirds who attend school are even (inaudible) benefits (inaudible). As America (inaudible), most women are not education, even though it is well-known that educating women is the best way to prevent poverty. (gasp) Beautiful in-text citation for a summary! I'm gonna compliment him. – Great job citing a summary! – the education women get can get them ahead and if you have a literate mother, your chances of surviving past the age of five increase by 50%. To achieve this, we need further educational resources, nine million teachers and nine million classrooms, we also need to work together to change the way the millions who are in poverty from their futures getting worse. This information is being printed out, together with classical music and more and more smiles from children in third world countries in their own environment. Hmm, interesting. The first grades in this video by Nelson Mandela speaks for itself loud and clear. Education is necessary and the best way if you want to change something in the world. It does not matter if it was to crush the government or stop poverty and famine. It is directly applicable to this scenario, we have to educate the people in order to get them out of poverty. Very insightful. I'm gonna tell him that. I think he's done a lot of literary analysis. It is well known that a lot of southern third world countries do not go to school simply because sometimes they do not have the right conditions such as distance, school, money, or bad health, what is remarkable is that those who attend school do not even get a proper education with the poor teachers and studying environment. Oh, good (inaudible). First up should be to increase the education quality, so it makes a difference to go to school than not. The more they get educated, the better can the society develop from poverty and bad health. It is also (inaudible) to create a more equal gender percentage in school. It is proven in the video that the way to create prosperity, (inaudible), in third world countries? Is to educate women more than we are today. Equal gender percentage...we'll just do wording... - I think what you mean here with the (inaudible) sits funny. How else might you say that you, explain this to your reader? – Another aspect of business is to say how to better help overall. It was presented that health and education is proven together from the fact that literate mothers showed to have a much better chance of living past age five. Because literate mothers...education is seen more rights around women. Comma...mortality for children around age of five have decreased in younger, (inaudible), child receives an education, comma!, seven million cases of HIV and AIDS could be prevented, no citation!, instead of being an...a liability for the society, everybody who avoided the diseases could infect (inaudible) of the society. Education also points to a higher awareness about how to maintain good hygiene and knowing how to...knowing common diseases and how to avoid them. Music in the video is very appealing and yet natural, classical music that increases in pace at the end making it less dramatic for everyone there scope and all. (Inaudible) called the same pattern with pictures and children in areas of the city doing chores just looked into the camera. Uh! Parallel structure! – Is the tricky issue of parallel structure which basically means that when you have items for some (inaudible), they should be in the same comment. Since you see...since you say 'children control their (inaudible) inner city doing chores,' instead of saying 'just looked into the camera,' you would want that part to follow the same structure as the (inaudible) as the tribute issue. Please let me know if these should (inaudible) in class. – I hate explaining parallel structure, it's so hard, and in a comment bubble, it isn't as awkward if it's

done in class. (Inaudible) pictures and sound were suitable and relevant to the information, it made one feel like there was a problem to be solved, not that effort which is exactly what it is. The person in the video opens (inaudible) of education in third world countries in a good, not too heavy way so you are able to absorb everything without getting a depression. Uh...hmm...this is super picky. – Picky. I don't know if getting a depression is a phrase very common in English. It may be more common to say 'getting depressed'. – he says the best way to press for education in third world countries and also (inaudible) countries is also (inaudible) quote and good luck poverty. Men must go to school and get a real education to combat the downward spiral to an upgoing one towards health and prosperity. The kids are in our society and should be held responsible for one who is in need of it, oh! Stupid agreement issue! – This is the trickiness of agreement. Since you say one which is plural, the verb should also be plural. – We must work together on the (inaudible) poverty, famine, (inaudible), oh! Beautiful works cited! – This is actually quite the beautiful works cited page. – this is probably one of the best papers of anyone in the class so...all right...did he do the header right? Didn't have any major MLA issues. We are going to give him a fifteen on mechanics, which is the first one I've ever given for this class. Spelling, using complete sentences, correct commas (inaudible) – few sentence clarity and spelling issues – (sigh), I'm gonna give him five outta grammar, he had a few repeated mistakes which I'm only taking off once. Unclear words...okay...content, he gives a great summary, he has more response... – Nicely done on the critical thinking – Does incorporate the text...he gets a fifty-five. About the length...all right, he gets a forty on organization. This one obviously went a little faster. I could say that it's better written but it also flowed really well and I didn't stop as much to correct small issues which just means that I didn't have to go back and reread it. So he gets a total of 115, so he missed ten points for grammar. Now this...what does that give him? A 92? I think it's a 92, I think that is deserving. Because I'm new with rubrics, sometimes when I grade, you know I'll take the points off I think and then I'll look at the grade and say, you know 'does that really reflect the ability?' and then I go back through to see how many mistakes they actually made. A lot of times I read, but sometimes I (inaudible) just because I'm not used to quantifying it. 92%. Put it in the spreadsheet. 115...wow, (inaudible) minor. – Student's name, good work with this essay, your citations are perfect, you have clearly explained the text and respond to it correctly. You do have a few minor grammar and formality issues. You can easily fix these with some practice. For now, take pride in your work. I look forward to reading your next paper. – All of my students, I try to say something positive at the end. I almost always say I look forward to reading your next paper, not because I'm bullshitting them but because it's true, I like seeing where they go from there. I'm gonna check my webcam. I've recorded for an hour, I've got two more to go, both Chinese students, so let's open the first one. Ah, Ms. I'm glad they said an S, nobody says that anymore. Ah, the world literacy, what is with these boring titles? – Is a comprehensive title, but what about more (inaudible) what you want to talk about with the world literacy (inaudible)? – I'm not just asking if they'd want to read it but again it's this idea of encouraging them to think about the reader. Children enjoyed a colorful daily life and received high quality education in the city, but the same age children are starving and they have to receive poor quality education in some regions such as in Asia and Africa, hmm...I like the contrast. Great opening, I'm gonna tell him that. –I love how the contrast is (inaudible)... – don't even have no chance to receive education because of poverty, poverty and lack of enough resources. They cannot change their lives or outcomes because they have never received education. After I saw...(inaudible) educations...after I saw this video, I realized that literacy is a serious problem in the world and needs to be solved soon. World Literacy Summit video is effective...I usually write in articles when they're missing. Well, maybe I could, you know what, I don't wanna do that. I'm gonna put a space and I'm gonna say...oh dammit, I hit the wrong shortcut and I just flipped my computer screen, oh I hate that, okay so let's (inaudible) – whenever I put a space in the sentence, it means that an article should come before the

preceding word. What article could you use here? – when I go over these in person, they know exactly which article, they point to it, so I’m going to try and copy that electronically in response, let’s see how it goes. (Inaudible) help and improve education, here are more details. I like that (inaudible). There is about 60 million (inaudible), ah! – Since you are talking about more than one child, then you would need to use a plural verb like ‘are’ – instead of citations, he said that the number of problems from the world literacy video on YouTube. I’m gonna mark that wrong because it’s the first citation I see. He can change it if needed. Their parents cannot afford nutrition (inaudible), out of school, girls are only two-thirds of literate adults in the...they can receive an education. This concept is totally wrong. Yeah, in fact literate parents want to impact their children. Some parents might hold education useful but they think to do this can save money, but to do this is loss. Parents who (inaudible) but they destroy their children’s future ambition, lack of teachers, (inaudible), and education equipment causes millions more who are sitting in classrooms (inaudible), education is such poor quality, okay the citation keeps saying the problem is serious and what causes it’s from. Good ending statement. Okay, so (inaudible) funky citations, aw – great job on giving us complete and informed citations, but (inaudible) you don’t have to include so much information. If you cite this out – make sure he has a works cited page...he does not – world literacy summit for the first part of your works cited entry, then your reader will know where to find the (inaudible) information. We can work more on MLA style in class so you can get some help on your papers. (Inaudible) Okay. I’m gonna compliment him – Good job (inaudible) ... - Diseases cause many deaths at this age because people don’t know how to prevent them. If the children have education, HIV and AIDS can be prevented in the next decade. What’s more is they can enhance their lives’ outcome a few years later. They can make (inaudible) better and better in the future. To reach this goal, just got a comma, they need nine million more teachers, that would enable every child to receive an education. It would be an incredible cost. We should help (inaudible) together such as depending on donations from charity. These details show the reason of why we should help them to improve education and education is important for them. As Nelson Mandela said, ‘education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world’ – cite? Now explain. – Since you are quoting a Nelson Mandela quote from the video, you would cite this as quoted in the World Literacy Summit. Better preface this. – This is a tricky MLA rule. – Education can (inaudible) and it makes people wise. It is education that helps people gain basic knowledge of the world and distinguish between right and wrong. What’s more, people can change their lives and enhance their incomes. That’s why education is important. Everyone should receive a high quality ation, quality education that should help them improve their education in their country. On the other hand, most people are lucky when compared with people so we should cherish what I have owned. Agreement issue. – Another tricky (inaudible) but we should cherish, you shouldn’t (inaudible), what we (inaudible) – I’m not gonna explain that one that much. We already started using contractions. There was the first one, on page three, man, he almost made it! – Uh oh! Oh not a contraction! Even though we use them when talking informal, contractions are a bit informal, are I should say too informal to use in academic writing. – He’s got some good response in here but I didn’t see a works cited page, I’m gonna say – Oh no! What happened? There is no works cited page! – Okay. – Missing works cited page, correct info but formatting – did I forget any other issues? Nope. All right he’s missing a page, I’m gonna give him eight because I’m gonna take off five for not having the page and take off two more points for not having the right form of citations for the information. Grammar...uses you, contractions, sentence clarity issues, (inaudible)... - Nice job responding (inaudible) – (inaudible) aw...Here’s where he could expand, such as depending on information – Interesting statement, why (inaudible) this idea, other options just a bit more to help you (inaudible) – okay, so he’s missing a page. (Inaudible) He’s got really good structure, so he’s gonna get 40 points for organization. (inaudible) – About solutions (inaudible) – so five points off, I think so, that gives him 50. Let’s see how this adds up...8 plus 5...so 8 for mechanics out of

15, 5 for grammar out of 15, 50 for content out of 55, and 40 for organization out of 40. That gives him a 103, which puts him at an 83. I think that's fair, yes, I think he's (inaudible) an 83. The biggest issues were, oh it's an 82, yeah that's for sure. Put that in the spreadsheet... Last one! This is my last student, oh wait, I didn't write my note! – Student, great job on this essay, your structure is awesome and your main (inaudible) each paragraph (inaudible) important. Keep an eye on issues of MLA and grammar and (inaudible) peer review to (inaudible) help with these issues. (Inaudible) Overall, take pride in your writing style, let's put that, I look forward to reading your next paper. -

Last one and yes I usually sing! The top of my nose itches, I'm not picking it. Beautiful header and missing a title – including a title – Uh common good, Pope John Paul II talks about the common good, (inaudible) everyone for the common good (inaudible), make this a separate (inaudible), looks like it the spacing's there, she put the article in italics – this is a tricky article to (inaudible) and it is part of a longer (inaudible). This also (inaudible) comes from a larger includes (inaudible), should be able to (inaudible). – Pitched the Lunsford. Oh my God, it's been an hour and fifteen minutes. Okay, in the Principle of the Common Good, Pope John Paul talks about the meaning and primary implications of the common good. First he writes a definition and he describes (inaudible) finally...let's do the article thing again. – When I put theses spaces, it means that you should place an article before this (inaudible). What article would you use here? – She can choose, it could say a pope or the pope. And point out good of society (inaudible) another space...(inaudible)...the pope gave simple definition of the common good which describes (inaudible) which is good for readers who do not have a general idea about the common good. (Inaudible) Oh, use some quotes on the citation! Whenever my students get the citation formatting wrong, I do it correctly for them so they can see what gets crossed out and then I write a more explanatory note at the end. She ended this with a comma – I see how you are (inaudible) ahh misspelled, this quote, but to do so what (inaudible) should you use? (Inaudible) common good that he (inaudible)...about? I guess we'll go...(inaudible) Uh! You can tell I'm getting tired (inaudible). So the second part of the paragraph, the author describes the response for the variable for the common good. I do think everyone should have to do some work for the common good. The mans of the common good are indepen, are dependent on the social condition of ... correcting the citation again. – What punctuation should you use to introduce this quote (inaudible)? – I try not to sound too formal but I think it's...I mean, I would say preceding, if she has questions, she'll definitely ask me. Most of my students will, I'm pretty approachable. I think. (Inaudible) article (inaudible)...inside the common good therefore involves all society. I'm gonna start a paragraph, gives the task of the political movement, I think the explanation of you alone...(inaudible) the state, also, the state (inaudible) I'm gonna make a note about the agreement – this is the tricky issue of verb, subject-verb? Yeah. When you say (inaudible)... You can discuss this (inaudible) – (Inaudible) It also gives another knowledge about the duty from other countries. – I see, what I'm going to say is, I see where you are heading here (inaudible), how many (inaudible) – This is an article. In democratic state, the decisions are usually made by a majority but (inaudible) they have more freedom to make their own decisions. Hmm, that's the idea, not sure if (inaudible). – (inaudible)– Now the pope describes connection religious context, I agree with his idea that God is the ultimate member of his (inaudible). When readers first read this paragraph, let's see, the pope gives his own opinion in reading the primary implications of responsibility in relation to the common good, and I'm gonna talk about me, these three parts above give the idea (inaudible) ah...gives...gives the idea of, describes the primary thinking that the common indifferent objects in the common good (inaudible) open for everyone to do things for each other or his idea that the common good is for everyone. The common good (inaudible)... (sigh) Wow, she went with the traditional citation. – Good job (inaudible) this is just a bit (inaudible). – Let's see now how do I want to say this? – Check your Lunsford guide for an example of an article and work to see what parts (inaudible) – Oh man. Okay. (Inaudible)

Mechanics...in-text citations, should be...should be...good. How did she cite them? (inaudible) Oh let's see...she really didn't do contractions...oh formatting quotes...good correct punctuation, I'm gonna give her 8, okay she did not format her in-text citations correctly so that's usually minus five, um, tiny issue with her works cited list and she has some quotes that aren't introduced correctly. I'll give her a seven. So the major points off are for in-text citations and then a couple others for kinda picky, tricky issues. Spelling, using complete sentences, let's see...minor sentence issues...missing articles. It did take a lot of time to go through her grammar. I'm going to give her a five and she'll work on it. Correctly summarize the text, does it dedicate more response, (inaudible) quietly...okay...um she's got a big summary, she (inaudible) what your understanding, a few places especially where you talk about government...(inaudible), thesis is good. I'm gonna give her 48 points, 5 points off for clarity issues, not quite ten points off. Let's see...paragraphs...done. She hit the (inaudible), had good flow...she gets 40 points for organization. She missed seven points for content, ten points for grammar, and a 7 out of 15 on mechanics so...we, okay...we...no... 35 plus 38...plus 40 equals 100, 80%, I think is fair. 80% double check that math...(inaudible). I'm gonna put it in my spreadsheet and I'm done. I'm gonna turn you off!

Post Think-Aloud Interview

E: -ning to Wham!

S: Wham? Really? Wake Me Up Before You Go-Go?

E: Last Christmas.

S: Oh man, did you hear the –

E: Relevant Wham, relevant Wham.

S: Cover...Whatever I heard a cover of Feed The World at the store today.

E: Eww...

S: I think it was –

E: That's my least favorite.

S: Really?

E: Yeah.

S: Hey, sweet cross in the background by the way.

E: Where?

S: It's on – okay, look through that door

E: Oh! Right there.

S: Yeah. Very Catholic.

E: Yeah, they're all over the place.

S: I wish I had positioned myself in front of my cross but I didn't. Heehee

E: Jesus. Heehee

S: Pun intended. All right, it took me a while um for all five of them.

E: That's fine.

S: I feel bad for your transcribing, there's some random word vomit.

E: That's fine.

S: But what follow-up questions do you have?

E: Okay, are you recording?

S: Indeed I am.

E: Sweet. Okay, so the post-interview questions...there's only three of them and it's pretty similar to the pre-interview questions.

S: Okay.

E: And then tomorrow um we'll make sure that you have everything so you can hand in the rubric and the copies of all the comments and all the papers and stuff.

S: Okay.

E: Um okay, so, tell me about responding to this set of papers. What did you notice? Was there anything different or similar to other papers?

S: Um this set...one thing that was similar is that they were all horrible – well, not horrible, they all tend to be very informal. No matter how many times I say not to use second person or not to use contractions, they're all informal, so that was straight across the board again, which is great 'cause I'll do a lesson on that tomorrow. Um a major difference – one of these papers was by far the best of this group in this class, which was awesome. Um this group had more grammar issues – a lot of missing articles, verb, er subject-verb agreement issues, that kind of deal. MLA was all over the place – some were perfect, some were missing, I had one student who after everything he cited from the video put uh “information obtained from the World Literacy Summit video on YouTube” which was very sweet and complete so I wrote a nice note, but I think that was the biggest difference. More of these did not meet the page limit, well no I take that back – I guess two of these did. It was the same level, I thought this group drew a few more, I think they drew more, um, conclusions, a lot of their responses had to do with cultural backgrounds, so they responded more personally and related it to other cultures, not necessarily their own, but that seemed to be more specific to this set of papers than others.

E: Okay. Um does this method of response change from your normal response method? If so, how?

S: Um...a little bit, I did figure out that how to do, like if a missing article's there, sometimes I just type it in, uh but I figured out how to like draw a line and write a note. I did do a lot more...not attention comments, direct comments? Where I just wrote in an 's' or a comma, I think more on these papers, not because I think these students are different but I think this group of individuals learns more from looking at a correction and then trying to figure out why then some of my other students. (inaudible...laughing...inaudible)

E: And...were any of your expectations, previously mentioned, met or exceeded...the ones you were looking at were...um... 'better than average...students didn't enjoy the assignment" so you really weren't looking forward to grading 'cause they didn't...they didn't enjoy the assignment and uh, they, you thought it would be better than average because they have been reading better critically.

S: They were –

E: Uh, if – if so, sorry, if so, what expectations were met and in what ways? Were any not met and it – if so, what expectations were not met and in what ways?

S: Uh the first one that wasn't met was that they seemed to really engage with the materials, which was interesting because I had uh two non-religious students writing about the Pope and I had other students writing about the World Literacy Summit video and they really seemed – (audio cuts off).