Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

WRITTEN FEEDBACK IN A FRESHMAN WRITING COURSE IN THE U.A.E: INSTRUCTORS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON GIVING, GETTING AND USING FEEDBACK

A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

Second Language Teaching at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Elva Anne Shine 2008

ABSTRACT

Instructors' frustration with the feedback/revision cycle in a tertiary setting provided the impetus for this study examining the complex issue of written feedback on L2 writing. Areas of contention considered included the type of feedback offered, when to offer it and how to present it to encourage maximum use by students as well as the actual use students made of the written feedback. An ethnographic approach led to three case studies being conducted in academic writing classes in a university in the United Arab Emirates. The students' and the instructors' perspectives were drawn on as well as those of other interested parties including other instructors in the department and writing center tutors. Interviews, focus groups and email exchanges were the principle sources used to gather participants' views. In addition, students answered questionnaires on instructor and peer feedback procedures. Essays were examined in terms of instructor and peer feedback, and the students' responses to that feedback were examined. The data gathered from these sources exposed contradictions and misunderstandings. It appeared that students had little faith in peer feedback but a strong desire for instructor feedback, which they believed they used when revising; however, instructors doubted that most students made any significant use of feedback or even revised productively. Examination of the essays suggested that: instructors did not always offer the feedback they intended to offer focusing more on grammar than content, and sometimes instructors underestimated how much feedback students attempted to act on. The study identified that key problems for students were: understanding the extent of revisions anticipated, knowing what to concentrate their efforts on and knowing how to act on the feedback, especially if they had exhausted their ideas on a topic. In addition, the difficulty of providing clear, usable feedback suggests that rather than relying extensively on written feedback, other ways of assisting students to revise their writing should be considered. The study suggests that feedback that relates explicitly to classroom instruction, and exposure to revision strategies are two techniques that offer a lot of potential for improving students' responses to written feedback. Instructors should also consider making their feedback strategies and expectations of the students explicit. Finally, individual variables mean that it is unlikely that one approach will work for all students; therefore, instructors need to be flexible and respond according to the needs of the student.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have many people to thank for their contributions and support throughout my PhD program:

Cynthia White for pertinent advice, encouragement, patience and confidence in my approach to the material

Cindy Gunn for acting as back up for me close at hand and encouraging me through some awkward moments

Don Cruickshank for giving me permission to conduct the research and encouraging me

The instructors and students who gave up their valuable time to talk to me about writing and feedback as well as allowed me to use their written materials

And that astounding cast of characters, my students, for showing me over the years the effort required trying to master academic writing skills in a second or third language

Finally, my family for putting up with me being distracted and mostly unavailable for a long period of time and for providing tangible support by cooking delicious and sustaining meals as well as proofreading chunks of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ABSTRACT | ii |
|--|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xii |
| INTRODUCING THE RESEARCH | 1 |
| 1.1 The Role of Writing in ESL: An Area of Change | 1 |
| 1.2 Teaching Writing in the UAE | 3 |
| 1.2.1 Academic Writing and the Process Approach | 3 |
| 1.2.2 The Place of Feedback | 4 |
| 1.3 The Initial Impetus to Examine Written Feedback | 6 |
| 1.3.1 Instructor as Researcher | 6 |
| 1.3.2 Doubts and Queries Arising from Experience | 7 |
| 1.4 Aims and Central Questions | 8 |
| 1.5 Conclusions and Overview of the Thesis | 10 |
| CHAPTER TWO | 13 |
| LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION IN THE UAE | 13 |
| 2.1 The Growth of the United Arab Emirates | 13 |
| 2.2 Tensions in the Role of English and Arabic in the Community | 14 |
| 2.3 Diversity in School Experiences in the UAE | 14 |
| 2.4 Language in Schools in the UAE | 15 |
| 2.4.1 Language in Government Schools | 15 |
| 2.4.2 Languages in Private Schools | 16 |
| 2.5 Pedagogical Issues in Schools in the UAE | 17 |
| 2.5.1 Pedagogy in Government Schools | 17 |
| 2.5.2 Pedagogy in Private Schools. | 19 |
| 2.6 The Growth of Tertiary Education in the UAE | 20 |
| 2.6.1 The Setting of the Study: Gulf States University | 21 |
| 2.6.1.1 The Student Body at GSU | 21 |
| 2.6.1.2 A New Educational Experience | 22 |
| 2.7 Summary | 23 |
| CHAPTER THREE | 24 |
| THE LITERATURE REVIEW | 24 |
| 3.1 Introduction: Written Feedback on L2 Students' Essays | 24 |
| 3.2 The Process Approach to Writing | 24 |
| 3.2.1 Conceived in L1 - Eased into L2 | 25 |
| 3.2.2 L2 Writing Before the Process Approach | 26 |
| 3.2.3 The Process Approach Reinterpreted in L2 | 26 |
| 3.2.4 Process or Product - a Deceptively Simple Binary View | 27 |
| 3.3 The Feedback Conundrum | 28 |
| 3.3.2 Timing and Motivation to use Feedback | 30 |
| 3.3.3 Content or Form: A False Dichotomy | 31 |
| 3.4 Understanding and Dealing with Error Feedback | 34 |
| 3.4.1 Speaking Out Against Error Feedback | 34 |
| 3.4.2 Selective Feedback Responses and Proficiency Levels | 36 |
| 3.4.3 The Use of Direct or Indirect Feedback | 38 |
| 3.4.4 Reformulation, Error Correction and 'Noticing' | 42 |
| 3.5 Understanding and Dealing with Content Feedback | 44 |
| 3.5.1 Sources of Confusion: Hedges, Questions and Clarity Issues | 44 |

| 3.5.2 Criticism and Praise | 45 |
|--|------------|
| 3.5.3 Preparation and Strategies for Dealing with Feedback on Content | 46 |
| 3.5.4 The Quality, Clarity and Usability of Feedback | 47 |
| 3.6 Peer Feedback | 48 |
| 3.6.1 Doubts about the Use of Peer Feedback | 48 |
| 3.6.2 Seeing the Good in Peer Feedback | 50 |
| 3.7 Feedback: Students' Needs, Wants and Utilization Techniques | 51 |
| 3.7.1 Generation 1.5 Needs | 52 |
| 3.7.2 Writing for Different Academic Discourse Communities | 52 |
| 3.7.3 Feedback on Feedback | 54 |
| 3.7.4 Wanting What the Instructor Wants | 56 |
| 3.7.5 Reception and Use of Feedback | 57 |
| 3.8 Institutional and Sociopolitical Factors and the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 59 |
| 3.8.1 Socio-Political Factors and the Impact on Writing Classes | 60 |
| 3.9 Over-Emphasis on Writing | 61 |
| 3.10 Summary: Few Certainties and Cautious Steps Ahead | 61 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 63 |
| METHODOLOGY | 63 |
| 4.1 The Setting | 63 |
| 4.1.1 The Department | 63 |
| 4.1.2 The Students | 63 |
| 4.2 The Writing Courses | 64 |
| 4.3 Institutional Issues and the Impact on WRI 101 | 65 |
| 4.3.1 Adjusting the Curriculum | 65 |
| 4.3.2 Attitudes to Writing | 66 |
| 4.3.3 Attitudes to Reading | 66 |
| 4.4 Departmental Issues and Practices in WRI 101 | 67 |
| 4.4.1 Writing Instruction and Assessment | 67 |
| 4.4.2 Feedback Procedures | 68 |
| 4.5 The Research Design | 69 |
| 4.5.1 The Research Problem | 69 |
| 4.5.2 Research Questions | 7 0 |
| 4.6 Selection of Participants | 70 |
| 4.6.1 Instructor Selection | 71 |
| 4.6.2 The Role of Instructor Participants | 71 |
| 4.6.3 Student Selection | 73 |
| 4.6.4 The Role of the Students | 74 |
| 4.6.5 Additional Participants | 75 |
| 4.7 Ethics Approval | 76 |
| 4.8 Confidentiality and Anonymity | 77 |
| 4.9 Framing the Methodological Approach and Procedures | 77 |
| 4.9.1 The Ethnographic Approach | 78 |
| 4.9.2 Case Study | 79 |
| 4.9.2.1 L2 Case Studies | 81 |
| 4.9.3 The Writer-Oriented Approach | 81 |
| 4.9.4 The Ecological Perspective | 82 |
| 4.10 Addressing Weaknesses of an Ethnographic Approach | 83 |
| 4.10.1 Researcher Bias | 84 |
| 4.10.2 Internal Validity | 85 |
| 4.10.3 Generalizability | 87 |

| 4.10.4 Triangulation | 88 |
|--|-----|
| 4.10.5 Qualitative Research Justified | 89 |
| 4.11 Instruments and Analytical Procedures | 89 |
| 4.11.1 Questionnaires | 90 |
| 4.11.2 Interviews | 91 |
| 4.11.2.1 Instructor Interviews | 91 |
| 4.11.2.2 Student Interviews | 92 |
| 4.11.3 Data Analysis of Interviews and Questionnaires | 92 |
| 4.11.4 Focus Groups | 93 |
| 4.11.4.1 Instructor Focus Group | 94 |
| 4.11.4.2 Student Focus Groups | 95 |
| 4.11.5 Data Analysis of Focus Groups | 95 |
| 4.11.6 Informal Observations | 96 |
| 4.11.7 Instructors' Emailed Comments | 97 |
| 4.11.8 Data Analysis of Students' Essays | 97 |
| 4.12 Making Sense of a Plethora of Data | 98 |
| 4.13 Summary | 99 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 100 |
| RESULTS | 100 |
| CASE STUDY ONE: LYDIA AND HER STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES O | |
| THEIR WRITING/REVISING EXPERIENCES | 100 |
| 5.1 Introduction to Case Study One | 100 |
| 5.2 The Impact of the Instructor's Teaching and Cultural Background | 100 |
| 5.3 University Classroom Culture: Expectations and Obligations | 102 |
| 5.3.1 Molding Behaviors | 103 |
| 5.3.2 Negotiating and Adapting | 104 |
| 5.3.3 Adding to the Picture: Students' Impressions of the Instructor | 105 |
| 5.3.4 Grades and Evaluations | 105 |
| 5.3.5 English Fluency and Literacy Issues | 106 |
| 5.4 The Writing Process Approach | 107 |
| 5.4.1 Actual Use of the Writing Process | 108 |
| 5.5 The Instructor's View of Responsibilities in the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 110 |
| 5.5.1 Reaction to Requests for More Feedback | 111 |
| 5.5.2 Varying the Feedback Offered to Students | 112 |
| 5.5.3 Disappointment at Students' Approach to Writing and Revision | 112 |
| 5.6 Actual Feedback Offered | 113 |
| 5.7 Students' Perspectives of the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 115 |
| 5.7.1 Students' Responses to Questionnaire One | 115 |
| 5.7.2 Students' Impressions of the Preparation for Writing | 116 |
| 5.7.3 Students' Responses to Questionnaire Two | 118 |
| 5.7.4 Focus Group Response to Overall Preference Questions | 120 |
| 5.8 Information on Feedback and Revision from Interview Students | 121 |
| 5.8.1 Students' Self-Assessments and Previous Writing Experiences | 121 |
| 5.8.2 Perspectives of the Relevance of WRI 101 to Other University | 123 |
| Courses | 123 |
| 5.9 Tally of Feedback Received and Individual Students' Responses | 123 |
| 5.9.1 Huda's Revision Process | 124 |
| 5.9.2 Rana's Revision Process | 126 |
| 5.9.3 Mahar's Revision Process | 128 |
| 5.9.4 Abdulla's Revision Process | 130 |

| 5.10 Focus Group In-Put on Feedback | 131 |
|--|------|
| 5.11 Peer Review Practices in Lydia's Class | 133 |
| 5.11.1 Responses to Questionnaire Three | 134 |
| 5.11.2 The Peer Review Sheet | 135 |
| 5.11.3 The Interview Students' Comments | 135 |
| 5.11.4 The Instructor's Attitude to Peer Review | 136 |
| 5.12 Summary | 136 |
| CHAPTER 6 | 138 |
| RESULTS | 138 |
| CASE STUDY TWO: KITTY AND HER STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES | |
| THEIR WRITING/REVISING EXPERIENCES | 138 |
| 6.1 Introduction to Case Study Two | 138 |
| 6.2 The Impact of the Instructor's Teaching and Cultural Background | 138 |
| 6.3 University Classroom Culture: Expectations and Obligations | 139 |
| 6.3.1 Manipulation and Response | 140 |
| 6.3.2 Adding to the Picture: Students' Impressions of the Instructor | 140 |
| 6.3.3 Grades and Evaluations | 141 |
| 6.4 Initial Evaluation of the Students' Writing Skills | 142 |
| 6.4.1 Expectations, Resistance and Prior School Experiences | 143 |
| 6.4.2 The Reading/Writing Connection | 144 |
| 6.4.3 Face-Saving Behavior | 145 |
| 6.5 The Place of Writing across the Curriculum | 145 |
| 6.6 The Writing Process Approach | 146 |
| 6.6.1 Actual Use of the Writing Process | 147 |
| 6.7 The Highs and Lows of Engagement with the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 148 |
| 6.8 Actual Feedback Offered | 149 |
| 6.9 Students' Perspectives of the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 151 |
| 6.9.1 Students' Responses to Questionnaire One | 151 |
| 6.9.2 Students' Impressions of the Preparation for Writing | 151 |
| 6.9.3 Students' Responses to Questionnaire Two | 154 |
| 6.9.4 Focus Group Response to Overall Preference Questions | 155 |
| 6.10 General Information on Feedback from Interview Students | 156 |
| 6.10.1 Students' Self-Assessments and Previous Writing Experiences | 156 |
| 6.10.2 Perspectives of the Relevance of WRI 101 to Other University Cour | rses |
| | 158 |
| 6.11 Tally of Feedback Received and Individual Students' Responses | 159 |
| 6.11.1 Dima's Revision Process Essay One | 160 |
| 6.11.2 Dima's Revision Process Essay Two | 163 |
| 6.11.3 Maitha's Revision Process Essay One | 164 |
| 6.11.4 Maitha's Revision Process Essay Two | 168 |
| 6.11.5 Mustafa's Revision Process Essay One | 168 |
| 6.11.6 Mustafa's Revision Process Essay Two | 171 |
| 6.12 Focus Group In-put on Feedback | 174 |
| 6.13 Peer Review Practices in Kitty's Class | 175 |
| 6.13.1 Responses to Questionnaire Three | 175 |
| 6.13.2 The Peer Review Sheet | 177 |
| 6.13.3 The Interview Students' Comments | 177 |
| 6.13.4 The Instructor's Attitude to Peer Review | 178 |
| 6.14 Summary | 178 |
| CHAPTER 7 | 180 |

| RESULTS | 180 |
|---|------------|
| CASE STUDY THREE: JANE AND HER STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES O | F |
| THEIR WRITING/REVISING EXPERIENCES | 180 |
| 7.1 Introduction to Case Study Three | 180 |
| 7.2 The Impact of the Instructor's Teaching and Cultural Background | 180 |
| 7.3 University Classroom Culture: Expectations and Obligations | 181 |
| 7.3.1 Adding to the Picture: Students' Impressions of the Instructor | 182 |
| 7.3.2 Grades and Evaluations | 182 |
| 7.4 Initial Evaluation of the Students' Writing Skills | 183 |
| 7.4.1 Expectations, Resistance and Prior School Experiences | 184 |
| 7.5 The Place of Writing across the Curriculum | 185 |
| 7.6 The Writing Process Approach | 185 |
| 7.6.1 Actual Use of the Writing Process | 186 |
| 7.7 The Instructor's Perceived Obligations in the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 187 |
| 7.7.1 Varying the Feedback | 188 |
| 7.7.2 Reaction to Requests for More Feedback | 189 |
| 7.8 Students' Perspectives of the Feedback/Revision Cycle | 190 |
| 7.8.1 Students' Responses to Questionnaire One | 190 |
| 7.8.2 Students' Impressions of the Preparation for Writing | 190 |
| 7.8.3 Students' Responses to Questionnaire Two | 193 |
| 7.9 General Information on Feedback from Interview Students | 195 |
| 7.9.1 Students' Self-Assessments and Previous Writing Experiences | 195 |
| 7.9.2 Perspectives of the Relevance of WRI 101 to Other University Courses | |
| 7.10 Tally of Feedback Received and Students' Responses | 197 |
| 7.10.1 Leila's Revision Process Essay One and Two | 199 |
| 7.10.2 Najla's Revision Process Essay One | 203 |
| 7.10.3 Suad's Revision Process Essay One and Two | 206 |
| 7. 11 Peer Review Practices in Jane's Class | 211 |
| 7.11.1 Responses to Questionnaire Three | 211 |
| 7.11.2 The Peer Review Sheet | 212 |
| 7.11.3 The Interview Students' Comments | 212 |
| 7.11.4 The Instructor's Attitude to Peer Review | 213 |
| 7.12 Summary | 213 |
| CHAPTER 8 | 215 |
| DISCUSSION | 215 |
| 8.1 Classroom Culture and Impact on Student/Instructor Interactions | 216 |
| 8.1.1 Grades and Affective Responses in the Classroom | 218 |
| 8.1.2 Adjusting to the Demands of Academia | 219 |
| 8.2 Grade Expectations and Generation 1.5 Issues | 219 |
| 8.3 Discrepancies in Perspectives of the Actual Use of Feedback | 221 |
| 8.3.1 Instructors' Perspectives | 222 |
| 8.3.2 The Writing Center Tutors' Perspectives | 222 |
| 8.3.3 Students' Perspectives | 223 |
| 8.3.4 Favoring Personal Assistance | 223 |
| | 224 |
| 8.3.5 Underestimating the Use of Feedback 8.4 The Impact of Septence Skill Feedback on Povision | 224 |
| 8.4 The Impact of Sentence Skill Feedback on Revision | 224 |
| 8.4.1 Line Editing a Single Paragraph 8.4.2 The Use of Codes | 225 |
| | |
| 8.4.3 Direct Feedback 8.4.4 Avoidance Behavior | 226 226 |
| 0.4.4 Avuluance Denaviul | 220 |

| 8.4.5 Misunderstanding and Misdirecting | 227 |
|---|-----|
| 8.4.6 The Should We or Shouldn't We of Error Response | 228 |
| 8.5 The Impact of Content Feedback on Revision | 229 |
| 8.5.1 The Complexity of Activating Content Revision | 230 |
| 8.5.2 Grades, Criticism and Praise and Content Revision | 231 |
| 8.5.3 Oral Feedback and Content Revision | 232 |
| 8.5.4 Task Demand and Content Revision | 233 |
| 8.6 The Impact of Rubrics on Content and Form Revision | 233 |
| 8.7 Appropriation and Resistance to Feedback | 234 |
| 8.8 Varying the Feedback According to Perceived Need | 236 |
| 8.9 Reactions to Requests for More Feedback | 237 |
| 8.10 Workload and the Quality of Feedback | 237 |
| 8.11 Demonstrating Revision Strategies in Class | 238 |
| 8.11.1 Linking Classroom Instruction and Feedback | 240 |
| 8.12 The Impact of Peer Review on Students' Revisions | 240 |
| 8.13 The Impact of the Reading/Writing Requirements across the Curriculum | 241 |
| 8.14 Addressing the Research Questions | 242 |
| 8.14.1 Research Question One | 242 |
| 8.14.2 Research Question Two | 243 |
| 8.14.3 Research Question Three | 244 |
| 8.14.4 Research Question Four | 244 |
| 8.14.5 Research Question Five | 245 |
| 8.16 Summary | 247 |
| CHAPTER 9 | 249 |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 249 |
| 9.1 Revelations and Contradictions | 249 |
| 9.2 Reflecting on the Research Questions | 252 |
| 9. 3 Pedagogical Implications | 253 |
| 9. 4 Limitations of the Study | 256 |
| 9.5 Future Research | 258 |
| 9.6 Summary | 259 |
| REFERENCES | 261 |
| APPENDIX A | 277 |
| Degree Programs Offered at GSU as of 2007 | 277 |
| APPENDIX B | 278 |
| Department of Writing Studies Writing Courses | 278 |
| APPENDIX C | 282 |
| Activities Involving the Instructor | 282 |
| APPENDIX D | 283 |
| Instructors' Information Sheet | 283 |
| APPENDIX E | 285 |
| Instructors' Consent Form | 285 |
| APPENDIX F | 286 |
| Students' Information Sheet | 286 |
| APPENDIX G | 288 |
| Students' Consent Form | 288 |
| APPENDIX H | 289 |
| Pilot Study Questionnaires | 289 |
| APPENDIX I | 291 |
| Ouestionnaire One Feedback Received from the Instructor | 291 |

| APPENDIX J | 293 |
|--|-------------|
| Questionnaire Two Instructor Feedback Wanted | 293 |
| APPENDIX K | 29 4 |
| Questionnaire Three the Peer Review Process | 294 |
| APPENDIX L | 295 |
| Instructors' Interview Questions | 295 |
| APPENDIX M | 297 |
| Students' Interview Questions | 297 |
| APPENDIX N | 299 |
| Student Focus Groups' Prompts | 299 |
| APPENDIX O | 300 |
| Additional Participants' Consent Form | 300 |
| APPENDIX P | 301 |
| General Trends from the Study for Discussion | 301 |
| APPENDIX Q | 302 |
| Instructors' Comments on Essay One and Two | 302 |
| APPENDIX R | 310 |
| Students' Responses to Questionnaire One Feedback Received from the Instru | |
| | 310 |
| APPENDIX S | 313 |
| Students' Responses to Questionnaire Two Feedback Wanted from the Instruc | tor |
| | 313 |
| APPENDIX T | 317 |
| A Record of the Number of Feedback Items on Students' Essays by Instructor | 317 |
| APPENDIX U | 320 |
| Students' Responses to Questionnaire Three Peer Feedback Received | 320 |
| APPENDIX V | 323 |
| Peer Review Sheet Prompts and Reviewers' Responses | 323 |
| APPENDIX W | 327 |
| Departmental Responses to Questions on General Trends Emerging from the | |
| Study | 327 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 2.1 UAE Population Growth | 14 |
|--|-----|
| Table 4.1 Instructor's Involvement in the Study | 72 |
| Table 4.2 Number of WRI 101 students per semester | 73 |
| Table 4.3 Interview Students' Involvement in the Study | 75 |
| Table 4.4 Additional Participants' Involvement | 76 |
| Table 5.1 Evaluations by Students: Lydia, Department & College | 105 |
| Table 5.2 Lydia's Class Final Grade Range | 106 |
| Table 5.3 Timeline Essay One | 108 |
| Table 5.4 Summary of Grading Rubric Divisions Essay One | 114 |
| Table 5.5 Lydia's Students' Self-Assessments of Writing Ability | |
| and Final Grades Awarded | 121 |
| Table 5.6 Table 5.6 Huda: Revision of Conclusion Essay One | 125 |
| Table 5.7 Rana: Avoidance Behavior in Response to Feedback | 127 |
| Table 5.8 Rana: Thesis Revision in Response to Feedback | 127 |
| Table 5.9 Mahar: Changes to the Introduction | 129 |
| Table 5.10 Lydia's Class Essay One Grades | 130 |
| Table 6.1 Evaluations by Students: Kitty, Department & College | 141 |
| Table 6.2 Kitty's Class Final Grade Range | 142 |
| Table 6.3 Timeline for Essay One | 147 |
| Table 6.4 Grading Rubric Essay One | 150 |
| Table 6.5 Essay One Grade Range Kitty's Class | 153 |
| Table 6.6 Kitty's Students' Self-Assessments of Writing Ability | |
| and Final Grades Awarded | 157 |
| Table 6.7 Dima: Sentence Skill Revision | 161 |
| Table 6.8 Dima: Content Revision Adding Clear Details | 162 |
| Table 6.9 Dima: Resistance to Sentence Skill Feedback Essay Two | 164 |
| Table 6.10 Maitha: Avoidance Behavior in Response to Grammar Feedback | 166 |
| Table 6.11 Maitha: An Example of Adding Detail but Reducing the | |
| Content Revision | 166 |
| Table 6.12 Mustafa: Confusion over Feedback | 170 |
| Table 6.13 Mustafa: Two Examples of Material Added to Essay One | 170 |
| Table 6.14 Mustafa: Grammar Revision and Misleading Advice Essay Two | 173 |
| Table 7.1 Jane's Class Final Grade Range | 183 |
| Table 7.2 Jane's Plan for Essay One | 186 |
| Table 7.3 Jane's Class Essay One Grade Range | 193 |
| Table 7.4 Jane's Students Self-Assessments of Writing Ability | |
| and Final Grades Awarded | 196 |
| Table 7.5 Leila: Sentence Skill Feedback and Misunderstanding | 200 |
| Table 7.6 Najla: Syntax Problem in the Final Draft | 205 |
| Table 7.7 Najla: Ignoring Content Feedback | 206 |
| Table 7.8 Suad: Responding to Instructor's Feedback but Looking No Further | 208 |
| Table 7.9 Suad: Misunderstood Feedback | 209 |
| Table 7.10 Suad: Haphazard Revision in Essay Two | 209 |
| Table 7.11 Suad: Material Added to Essay one but Errors Persisting | 210 |
| | |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 5.1. Lydia's students' views on the clarity of the grading system | 116 |
|---|-----|
| Figure 5.2. Questionnaire One: A comparison of essay one grades by instructor | 117 |
| Figure 5.3. Questionnaire Two: Lydia's students' preferences for additional help | 119 |
| Figure 5.4. Lydia's students' overall preferences of instructor feedback | 120 |
| Figure 5.5. Lydia's students' assessments of their roles in peer review | 134 |
| Figure 5.6. Lydia's students' assessments of the help received through | |
| peer review | 135 |
| Figure 6.1. Kitty's students' views on the clarity of the grading system | 152 |
| Figure 6.2. Questionnaire Two: Kitty's students' preferences for additional help | 154 |
| Figure 6.3. Kitty's students' overall instructor feedback preferences | 155 |
| Figure 6.4. Kitty's focus group students' overall instructor feedback preferences | 156 |
| Figure 6.5. Kitty's students' assessments of their roles in peer review | 176 |
| Figure 6.6. Kitty's students' assessments of content/grammar help received | |
| through peer review | 176 |
| Figure 7.1. Jane's students' perspectives of the usefulness of the instructor's | |
| feedback when dealing with sentence skill errors | 192 |
| Figure 7.2. Jane's students' overall instructor feedback preferences | 194 |
| Figure 7.3. Jane's students' assessments of content/grammar help received | |
| through peer review | 212 |
| | |