

Diplomarbeit / Diploma Thesis

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

“Discrepancies between student understanding and teacher intention – an
analysis of teacher feedback in EFL tertiary education“

verfasst von / submitted by

Bernhard Mitis

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Magister der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2019 / Vienna, 2019

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears
on the student record sheet

UA 190 344 456

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch,
UF Geographie und Wirtschaftskunde

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Ute Smit

Acknowledgement

I would first like to thank my thesis supervisor Ute Smit, who always provided me with valuable, constructive feedback to focus on what's important, and who went out of her way to help me finish my studies.

I would also like express my very profound gratitude to my parents, who have supported me throughout my studies, and who have unfailingly encouraged me to pursue and achieve my goals.

Bernhard Mitis

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	V
List of tables	VI
1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical framework: Sociocultural theory: general overview and evolution of the theory.....	2
2.1. Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Theory	2
2.2. Higher and lower mental functions	3
2.2.1. Vygotsky's original conception of higher and lower mental functions	3
2.2.2. Modern perspective on higher mental functions	4
2.3. Mediation	5
2.3.1. Vygotsky's original conception of mediation.....	5
2.3.2. Modern perspective on mediation	6
2.4. Internalization	8
2.4.1. Vygotsky's original conception of internalization.....	8
2.4.2. Modern perspective on internalization	9
2.5. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).....	12
2.5.1. Vygotsky's original conception of the ZPD	13
2.5.2. (Modern) interpretations of the ZPD.....	14
2.6. General comment on the validity of modern interpretations of Vygotsky's work	21
2.7. Mediated Learning Experience – a contemporary application of the ZPD.....	22
2.8. Theoretical framework: Conclusion: a modified version of the ZPD within SCT	25
2.9. The relationship between SCT and L2 acquisition, learning to write and providing feedback.....	28

3.	Current state of sociocultural research on feedback on writing	29
3.1.	Sociocultural research in general.....	30
3.2.	Sociocultural research in the context of learning to write in the EFL classroom	31
3.2.1.	General overview of sociocultural research on developing writing in the EFL classroom	31
3.2.2.	Evaluation of three socioculturally-informed studies on developing writing in the EFL classroom, relevant to this paper.....	33
4.	Empirical study – methodology	36
4.1.	Summary and research questions	36
4.2.	Study context	37
4.3.	Study participants	39
4.3.1.	Students (S)	39
4.3.2.	Course instructors (CIs).....	39
4.4.	Data collection.....	41
4.4.1.	Teacher response to student writing	41
4.4.2.	Student interviews	43
4.4.3.	Course instructor interviews.....	44
4.5.	Data processing methodology – qualitative content analysis	45
4.5.1.	Transcription	46
4.5.2.	Coding	46
4.5.3.	Analysis.....	52
5.	Empirical study – findings and discussion.....	53
5.1.	Manifest level analysis	53
5.2.	Latent level analysis	56
5.2.1.	Influences of communicational aspects on providing and receiving feedback.....	56

5.2.2.	Influences of power relations on the reception of feedback	63
5.2.3.	Institutional influences on providing and understanding feedback	65
5.2.4.	Summary of the research findings and limitations of the study	69
6.	Conclusion	70
7.	References	72
8.	Appendices	79
	Appendix A – formal documents	79
	Abstract – Deutsch	79
	Student information sheet & informed consent form	80
	Interview schedule	81
	Appendix B – basis for the survey	83
	Oral feedback transcripts (CI2)	83
	Participant S6	83
	Participant S7	86
	Participant S8	88
	Participant S9	91
	Participant S10	95
	Participant S11	97
	Appendix C – Interview transcripts	99
	Student interview transcripts	99
	Participant S1	99
	Participant S2	102
	Participant S3	106
	Participant S4	109
	Participant S5	112
	Participant S6	115

Participant S7	120
Participant S8	124
Participant S9	127
Participant S10	131
Participant S11	135
Participant S12	138
Participant S13	143
Participant S14	146
Participant S15	148
Participant S16	152
Participant S17	155
Course instructor interview transcripts	158
Course instructor 1 (CI1)	158
Course instructor 2 (CI2)	173
Course instructor 3 (CI3)	190
Appendix D – data processing.....	201
Discrepancy table.....	201

List of abbreviations

ZPD	Zone of proximal development
SCT	Sociocultural theory
LMFs	Lower mental functions
HMFs	Higher mental functions
IRE/IRF	Initiation-response-evaluation/Initiation-response-feedback
MLE	Mediated learning experience
SCM	Structural cognitive modifiability
L2	Second language
EFL	English as a foreign language
WCF	Written corrective feedback
TR	Teacher response
TWF	Teacher written feedback
ILSS	Integrated Learning and study skills
CFT	Common final test
CI	Course instructor
S	Student
TF	Task fulfilment
O	Organisation
A	Linguistic accuracy
R	Linguistic range

List of tables

TABLE 1: LIST OF TEACHER RESPONSES GIVEN TO THE STUDENT PARTICIPANTS ON THEIR ASSIGNMENTS 46

TABLE 2: AMOUNT AND PERCENTAGE OF THE EXTENT OF DEVIATION BETWEEN STUDENT
UNDERSTANDING AND TEACHER RESPONSE53

TABLE 3: DISCREPANCY FOR EACH TR AND Q..... 201

1. Introduction

I had feedback experiences, where I was handed back my paper and it included lots of little marks that I couldn't read and we didn't talk about what these little signs meant beforehand. There were just so many (signs), that I no longer wanted to ask at that point, because there were about twenty different crosses and signs and I tried to repair myself and I tried to understand what they meant, but I just didn't want to ask. I know many people in my class had the same problems (student S12, Example of experience of good/bad feedback, p. 132).¹

Often in my positive times, I think something will stick. In my less positive times, I just think about what a waste of time this is, because I'm correcting the same things over and over again [...] (teacher CI2, TR#36_CI2_Q1, p. 174) ²

I believe that these two comments about a learner's difficulties with understanding feedback, and a teacher's struggle with maintaining a positive attitude when providing a response to student writing, perfectly encapsulate the difficulties that both parties encounter: feedback is a social practice, and as such, it involves a broad range of factors that influence whether it is perceived as helpful, or rather, as discouraging. As it is a social practice, and in addition, a special form of written communication, this thesis will examine feedback from the perspective of Sociocultural Theory, a set of principles that highlights the role of interaction for human development. As this theory has been introduced almost a century ago, it is necessary to introduce both the original and modern versions, and to balance their strengths and weaknesses, so that, ultimately, this paper will have its own definition of Sociocultural Theory that will serve as the theoretical framework for the empirical study of this thesis. This study investigates potential discrepancies between student understanding and teacher intention of feedback in relation to short term-, and long term development of student writing proficiency, as well as inquire into potential reasons for these differences. The

¹ In order to improve readability, the original spoken student remark has been altered; the original can be read in Appendix C (S12/p.132)

² This observation was mentioned by CI2 during the interview and can be found in Appendix C (p.174)

methodology that has been selected to achieve this objective is qualitative content analysis, an approach that is explorative and does not rely on predetermined hypotheses. The findings of the research show that there is a significant discrepancy between teacher intention and student understanding, and that these discrepancies are potentially related to difficulties in communication, hierarchical power relations, and the institutional context in which feedback is given.

2. Theoretical framework: Sociocultural theory: general overview and evolution of the theory

This section will provide an introduction to the theoretical framework on which the research of this thesis is based. Ultimately, the central concept for this study will be the 'Zone of Proximal Development' (ZPD), a concept that focusses on (human) development through the process of interaction (Vygotsky 1978: 84-87). The ZPD has become a frequently used framework in the field of L2 development in the last decades, and partly due to its popularity, the concept has often been misunderstood, and consequently also wrongly applied (Lantolf & Thorne 2006; Kinginger 2002). This misunderstanding is caused by studying the ZPD in isolation, instead of placing it within the wider framework of Sociocultural Theory (SCT). It will therefore be necessary to first take a look at both the original conception of the SCT, as well as some of its modern interpretations.

Using SCT as a theoretical framework is somewhat problematic, since the term is tied to several, different academic fields, ranging from sociology to psychology (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 2), that incorporate the term to refer to various topics and concepts. In order to avoid misunderstandings, this thesis utilizes the term SCT to refer to the subject area that has emerged from Vygotsky's 'Cultural-Historical Theory'. This section will therefore provide a concise overview of Vygotsky's most central ideas, and discuss especially those beliefs that are fundamentally related to the 'Zone of Proximal Development' (ZPD), including 'higher mental functions' (HMFs), 'mediation', and 'internalization'.

2.1. Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Theory

As mentioned above, the SCT can be traced back to the works of Russian scholar Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky, who committed himself to developing a model of "the development and function of the human mind" that was not tied to a single discipline, but

that actually combined several disciplines, including “semiotics, neurolinguistics, psychology, and psycholinguistics” (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 2). In his theory, Vygotsky examined human consciousness by distinguishing the behaviour of humans from that of other living beings (for instance, apes)” (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 3). He rejected the dominant theories of the time, such as the ‘cogito ergo sum’ assumption, or the works of Piaget (Vygotsky 1987: 87) and suggested that consciousness can be explained through “socially meaningful activity”, or in simpler terms, through interaction (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 4-5).

2.2. Higher and lower mental functions

This section introduces the first concept that has been suggested by Vygotsky in his Cultural-Historical Theory. It forms the basis for a number of related notions that will be discussed in subsequent sections. The first part will serve as a description of Vygotsky’s original idea, but also include an example developed by myself, while the second part provides a more contemporary reading of higher mental functions.

2.2.1. Vygotsky’s original conception of higher and lower mental functions

At the core of Vygotsky’s understanding of consciousness and the mind stood the idea of a distinction of mental functions into “lower order” (LMFs) and “higher order” functions (HMFs) (Vygotsky 1978: 39, referred to in Lantolf & Appel 1994: 5). While the former are biologically originated, and include the five senses, memory, and “involuntary attention” (which has never been fully explained by the author), the latter refers to “more complex, [...], socioculturally determined mental functions”, such as “logical memory, voluntary attention, conceptual thought, planning, perception, [or] problem solving”. LMFs provide the foundation for HMFs, but HMFs “are qualitatively different in that they are mediated by the social and cultural world” (Gauvain 2008: 407). This means that LMFs are necessary for the emergence of HMFs, but HMFs are not merely an extension of LMFs, but differ in accordance to the social and cultural context. The concept of higher and lower functions can be traced back to Vygotsky’s research on the difference between man and ape, since he concluded that “primitive man” can be distinguished from “cultured man” in the way they use language (Vygotsky & Luria 1993: 108, referred to in Wertsch, del Río & Alvarez 1995: 22-31). In order to establish a more comprehensive picture of this idea, it is helpful

to look at Wertsch's distinction between HMFs and LMFs (1985: 25-26). LMFs are stimulated by a person's surroundings, they are unconsciously and directly processed, they originate in nature (as opposed to society), and they are not subjected to mediation (this notion will be discussed in the next section). This description can be clarified even further by taking the visual perception of a rabbit as an example: being able to catch sight of the rabbit means that it must be within the field of vision of the observer, therefore it must be a part of the person's surroundings; the act of seeing the rabbit is something that happens automatically, as it is not necessary to take any further (mental) actions in order to visually perceive the animal; lastly, it can be deduced that the rabbit originated in nature, since it was actually seen, instead of a mental image that might have been shaped by the way a rabbit is normally represented in 'our' society. HMFs (Wertsch 1985: 25-26), on the other hand, are self-regulated, meaning that they are primarily determined by a person's individual behaviour and are influenced by external stimuli to a lesser extent. They are consciously realised, which implies that a person is aware of the activity of a certain mental function. They are social in origin and nature, i.e. they are determined by society. Once more, this description can be further clarified by taking the conceptual thought of a rabbit as an example: a person that possesses the mental image of a rabbit does not require seeing the animal in the outside world in order to bring it to mind, it is therefore self-regulated; the action of producing such a mental image is a procedure that is used consciously; lastly, a person's mental image of a rabbit is dictated by the representations of said animal that they have been familiarised with, including the English term *rabbit*, therefore it has been determined by society.

2.2.2. Modern perspective on higher mental functions

After having described and clarified the concept of higher and lower mental functions, it is also noteworthy to mention that this fundamental notion to Vygotsky's theories does not fully hold up to modern, scientific standards. Scholars like Valsiner (2012) or Toomela (2015), who are considered modern specialists of SCT, have scrutinised Vygotsky's conceptions from a contemporary point of view, and concluded that some of the Russian scholar's ideas needed to be selectively maintained, i.e. some parts needed to be highlighted, while others ought to be removed (Valsiner 2012: 47, referred to in Toomela 2015: 96). Utilising this line of reasoning, Valsiner concludes that the role of the "social

environment” should be prioritised, while the notion of the individual who “constructs one’s own self within that social context” ought to be withdrawn (2012: 47, referred to in Toomela 2015: 96). Toomela goes more into detail, as he identifies 11 characteristics of HMFs (in contrast to Wertsch’s five, 1985), which he subsequently examines thoroughly. He acknowledges that the existence of HMFs has been dismissed by the majority of the scientific community, but he does not come to the same conclusion and argues that all of Vygotsky’s characteristics of HMFs are still valid (2015: 115). At this point it is vital to point out that Toomela, even though he closely examines the primary texts, provides his own interpretation of these attributes, which focus heavily on the social aspect and neglect the role of the individual; that is to say, he adopts a perspective that is similar to Valsiner’s view. Additionally, it becomes apparent that a great number of Vygotsky’s original writings lack clear definitions and hence remain ambiguous; this ambiguity allows supporters of Vygotsky’s ideas to adhere to his theories, while simultaneously denying objectors to completely reject them. In general, I believe that the concept of higher mental functions must be taken into account when using SCT as a theoretical framework, because it is inextricably related to Vygotsky’s most fundamental ideas, but the notion must also be re-contextualised by including contemporary views on the issue. As a consequence, in the subsequent sections of this thesis, it will be necessary to provide additional explanations and definitions to the core concepts of SCT, so that the framework can still be perceived as valid, even from a modern standpoint.

2.3. Mediation

In the last section, higher and lower mental functions have been described as the foundation of several key concepts of Cultural-Historical Theory (the predecessor of SCT). One of the most essential concepts in Vygotsky’s writings is the notion of mediation. This chapter will provide a brief description of mediation, spanning a bridge between HMFs and the ZPD (which will be discussed in subsequent sections).

2.3.1. Vygotsky’s original conception of mediation

Lantolf and Thorne describe Vygotsky’s most central assumption by stating that “higher forms of human mental activity are mediated by culturally constructed auxiliary means” (2006: 59). In the subsection on HMFs, it has been established that only HMFs are subjected to mediation, therefore, in contrast to LMFs, they are not mere functions of an

individual being, but part of a more extensive/comprehensive system. This system can also be described as the “cultural, institutional, and historical settings” (Wertsch, Río & Alvarez 1995: 21), and in order to fully understand the relationship between mental functions and these types of surroundings, two new terms have to be introduced at this point: technical (physical) and psychological (symbolic) tools/artifacts (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 7; Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 60).

In general, tools empower humans to exert influence on their surroundings, they form the link between subject (a person) and object (a target) (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 7). While technical tools are “externally directed at the object of activity”, that is to say are utilised to affect the material world, psychological tools are “internally oriented at the subject of activity” (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 8), that is to say are utilised to affect behaviour (in oneself or others). Examples for physical artifacts can be found, among others, in the world of construction, and include hammers, saws, or even bulldozers, while symbolic artifacts are concepts that are more abstract and can vary in different cultures, institutions or historical periods, and include language, literacy, or mnemonic devices (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 60, Lantolf & Appel 1994: 8). To summarise, it might be helpful to revisit the rabbit example from the previous chapter. I have mentioned that HMFs are subjected to mediation, i.e. that they are part of a larger (cultural/institutional/historical) system, and that they are not activated by an individual itself, but through the use of certain symbolic artifacts. Attempting to evoke the mental image of a rabbit therefore requires a set of psychological tools that affect the way we visualise the animal in our heads. Depending on the individual and/or the situation, these tools include memory and/or typical, cultural representations/illustrations.

2.3.2. Modern perspective on mediation

In the previous chapter, it has been established that some of Vygotsky’s concepts lack coherence or were defined in a vague manner, and thus, the notion of mediation needs to be scrutinised and re-contextualised to correspond to a modern state of scientific knowledge. In an attempt to approach this issue, Wertsch has developed a variation of Vygotsky’s concept of mediation, namely “mediated action” (1991: 93-94). He puts the focus of attention on the individual and thereby involves the aspect of agency, i.e. a person utilises certain psychological tools to achieve a goal, instead of the tools acting as

the driving force. He adds the “toolkit metaphor” to illustrate that symbolic artifacts are not used homogenously by everyone, but as tools that may be used differently or in combination with each other, and therefore it is necessary to examine how these tools are used to perform an action. In addition, he argues that neither the agent, nor the action, nor the tool can be studied in isolation, because they are interdependent and cannot operate on their own. This postulation is also made in regards to the setting (= larger system), for which institutional, historical, and cultural aspects need to be taken into consideration as intertwined facets; Wertsch’s ‘mediated action’ can therefore be considered as a more holistic interpretation of Vygotsky’s ‘mediation’ (Wertsch 1991: 120).

Furthermore Wertsch and his colleagues specified a number of aspects that share certain similarities in other modern interpretations of mediation, and consequently, they defined five common assumptions (Wertsch, Río & Alvarez 1995: 22-31): Mediation is an “active process”, i.e. psychological tools influence action, but do not determine it (c.f. Burke 1966; Bakhtin 1986). This notion also forms the basis for Engeström’s ‘activity theory’ (1999). Mediation transforms mental functioning; the introduction of a new tool does not operate as an addition to an individual’s mental functions, but as an alteration of the whole system (c.f. Olsen 1995; Tsunoda 1995). Mediation is both an enabling and a restricting force, that is to say, the inclusion of a new mediational tool offers new ways of mental functioning, but it also involves additional limitations (Dewey 1938, not a representative of SCT, but a predecessor; Wertsch 1991). Psychological tools emerge for reasons that are unrelated to mediation. Language, for instance, has not originated to facilitate the use of mental functions, but as a form of communication; accordingly, the mediational use of psychological tools is merely a by-product (c.f. Río & Alvarez 1995; Rogoff 1995; Cole 1995). Lastly, it is crucial to various authors that mediation in SCT should not focus solely on exploring human activity but also on changing the way we act. The implications that arise from SCT should therefore result in real-life interventions (Rogoff 1995; Cole 1995). It can be concluded from this section that mediation, in its original Vygotskian sense, forms the link between HMFs and human action. This link manifests itself in psychological tools such as language or literacy; tools that are not universal, but may vary, depending on the cultural, historical, or institutional setting. This notion, however is slightly altered

in a more modern interpretation of mediation: here the focus is set on the process instead of the tool, the transformative nature of mediation is highlighted, and a call for action is demanded.

2.4. Internalization

The last concept that is crucial for fully comprehending Vygotsky's concept of the ZPD is the notion of 'internalization'. This section will lay the foundation for the ZPD by introducing Vygotsky's 'genetic law of cultural development', in which the Russian scholar has first established the term 'internalization' and its relation to HMFs and 'mediation'. Furthermore, this section will explore several modern interpretations in order to determine a theory that corresponds with the author's ideas about learning.

2.4.1. Vygotsky's original conception of internalization

In their chapter on Vygotsky's research of the ZPD, Lantolf and Thorne (2006: 265-66) provide two passages from the Russian scholar's works to describe the relation between 'internalization' and the ZPD; in the first he formulates "the general genetic law of cultural development", and in the second, he utilises this law to explain 'internalization':

[A]ny function in the child's cultural development appears on the stage twice, on two planes, first on the social plane and then on the psychological, first among people as an intermental category and then within the child as an intramental category. This equally applies to voluntary attention and logical memory, formation of concepts and development of volition. We have good reason to consider this proposition a law in the full sense of the word, but it stands to reason that the passage within from without transforms the process itself, changes its structure and functions. Behind all higher functions and their relations genetically stand social relations, real relations of people. (Vygotsky 1966: 40)

In this extract, Vygotsky establishes how HMFs emerge within a child by stating that the process of development first occurs between people (the child and another person) and afterwards inside the child. However, he does not assume a Behaviourist perspective, expressing that the child mirrors the other person (Lantolf and Thorne 2006: 167), but presumes that in the course of this development, HMFs undergo transformation. Lastly,

Vygotsky re-emphasises the critical role of the social aspect for the emergence of HMFs which cannot emerge in the absence of social relations.

In this first passage there is no mentioning of the process of internalization; the concept is, however, introduced at a later stage, at which it is defined as “the internal reconstruction of an external operation” (Vygotsky 1978: 56), and described as a transformational process. This process, which “initially represents an external activity is reconstructed and begins to occur internally”, is transformed from “interpersonal” to “intrapersonal” (a rephrasing of the general genetic law of cultural development), and “is the result of a long series of developmental events” (Vygotsky 1978: 56-57). In other words, ‘internalization’ is the process that induces development from a state involving two (or more) people to a state involving only the individual (that is undergoing development) itself. Despite the one state emerging from the other, it is crucial to realise that they are not exact copies of one another, but that the process of internalization results in marked change. When comparing the two passages, it becomes apparent that the key components of the concept remain the same, except for the addition of the term internalization and a more detailed description of the characteristics that are involved.

2.4.2. Modern perspective on internalization

In accordance with the previous sections, after having established the original conception of internalization, a number of more modern interpretations of the term will be introduced at this point. Similarly to other theoretical concepts of Vygotsky’s work, the main problem is a lack of precision, which is especially evident when it comes to definitions, e.g. the term ‘intrapsychological’ (= intrapersonal) that is never clarified, and could therefore imply complex processes that have not yet been explained, but also a direct transition from external to internal (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 153). As a consequence, representatives of SCT and other disciplines have come up with their own interpretations and added their own contributions to the concept of internalization.

“Apprenticeship”, “guided participation”, and “participatory appropriation”

One of these contributions is made by Barbara Rogoff (1995), who does not provide a new definition or clarification of internalization, but adds three stages of the developmental process (=internalization), that according to Lantolf and Thorne is meant as an alternative

to internalization (2006: 158), but in my opinion, it rather serves as a practical application of internalization. Rogoff proposes three planes of development that are interrelated: 'apprenticeship', 'guided participation', and 'participatory appropriation' (1995: 141-142). 'Apprenticeship' refers to development within a community, in which "active individuals partici[pate] with others in culturally organized activity"; these individuals are less skilful than others and mature in the process of the activity. 'Guided participation' refers to development that arises between people "while participating in culturally valued activity". Finally, 'participatory appropriation' refers to the way an individual transforms through participation in an activity and become equipped for subsequent activities. These stages are not hierarchical, but interrelated in that they refer to different perspectives and could therefore be happening simultaneously. This conceptualisation is criticised by Lantolf and Thorne, because it implies that an individual will end up performing an activity by him-/herself, but according to the two scholars, a person, even when carrying out an action alone, "never engage[s] in solo performance [...] because psychological tools are derived from sociocultural concepts, artifacts, and activities" (2006: 159). Considering 'psychological tools' in the narrow sense, I agree that an activity, technically, is never performed by an individual in isolation, however, I believe that Lantolf and Thorne have misconceived Rogoff's approach, who was (clearly) attempting to provide a practical account of the social context in which internalization can take place. In addition, it is also criticised that Rogoff fails to include the mutual relationship of 'internalization', meaning that not only is the less skilled individual, but also the guiding party (individual/group/community) affected by 'internalization' (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 159). Once more, I believe that this assessment is inaccurate, because Rogoff explicitly states in her introduction that "it is incomplete to assume [...] that influence can be ascribed in one direction or another" (Rogoff 1995: 141); she does focus on the lesser experienced individual in the rest of her text though. This is also supported by Gauvin (2008: 411), who concludes that guided participation harmonises with Vygotsky's theories, since the participation of everyone who is involved changes. Taking all of this into account, I would argue that Rogoff's planes of development can serve as a valuable addition to internalization from a practical and social perspective, but it should also be noted that the bi-directional relation, and the collaborative nature of 'internalization' must not be neglected.

“Appropriation” and “mastery”

Another interpretation of ‘internalization’ is proposed by James V. Wertsch, who points out that the individual is no longer seen as an active agent, but takes on a passive role in which they are controlled by ‘internalization’ (Wertsch 1993, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 160). In addition, he remarks that activities that are seemingly internalized, are often not actually performed internally, but still externally. He illustrates this notion by using multi-digit multiplication calculations as an example, because this kind of action is often performed externally by using pen and paper which in turn are considered as “cultural artifacts” (Wertsch 1998: 51, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 161). Following this critique, Wertsch suggests his own concepts, “appropriation” and “mastery” (Wertsch 1998: 53, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 161), which can be seen as types of ‘internalization’. Appropriation is defined as “taking something that belongs to others and making it one’s own”, and is further described as a process that is often inconceivable, at least until the agent is faced with different possibilities (in the case of language, this means becoming aware of another language). Moreover, the aspect of ‘making it one’s own’ is sometimes restricted; again, this applies to tools such as language, because even though there is the potential to make up words or structures, it is necessary to conform to certain conventions in order to successfully communicate with others (Wertsch 1998: 55, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 161). The second term, mastery, is defined as “knowing how to do something”, in other words, being consciously able to do something (Wertsch 1998: 53, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 161). Since the term mastery is often associated with perfection, and might result in misconception, Lantolf & Thorne have provided an illustration that makes the difference between the two terms comprehensible again by using language as an example: native speakers can make language their own (e.g. by playing with it, or by creating new words) and thus appropriate it, while L2 speakers only know how to use it, and thus master it (2006: 161).

The concept of ‘appropriation’ and ‘mastery’ has been rejected by other experts of SCT, such as Robbins, who advocates that it is not beneficial to invent another dualism within SCT and remarks that instead of having a dualistic nature, internalization aims at the exact opposite, at merging elements (Robbins 2003: 32, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 162). This becomes even more evident when considering that Vygotsky’s original

intention for developing the concept of internalization was the unification of the “Cartesian mind-body dualism” (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 151). Additionally, part of Wertsch’s critique, namely the aspect that the individual is seen as passive, is dismissed by Lantolf and Thorne, who state that Vygotsky actually perceived people as “active agents”; a similar point has also been made by authors like Valsiner and van der Veer (2000), or Newman and Holzman (1993), who assume the same stance (2006: 162). This stance is also taken by Gauvain, who describes the individual in Vygotsky’s concept as “not merely a passive learner [...] [but] a full and active participant” (2008: 411). Regarding Wertsch’s notion that some seemingly internalized processes are still carried out externally, Lantolf and Thorne advocate a narrow reading of Vygotsky’s work, and to refrain from adding new concepts which they deem to be unnecessary (2006: 162-164). Similar to my opinion on Rogoff’s contribution to internalization, I believe that it is unjustified to fully dismiss Wertsch’s ideas. While I do not support the critique that Vygotsky’s original concept proposes a passive individual, it still holds true that the agent should be perceived as an active participant. Moreover, despite being easily misunderstood, the terms appropriation and mastery can still be useful in broadening our understanding of the process of internalization, especially in regards to practical considerations, such as speaking a language.

The analysis of modern interpretations of Vygotsky’s concept of internalization once again demonstrates that experts from SCT and other scientific domains are divided on how Vygotsky’s writings are supposed to be read. While authors like Wertsch and Rogoff are attempting to make useful contributions to internalization in order to make the theory more accessible, other writers like Lantolf & Thorne dismiss any addition to the original concept and claim to represent the true intentions of the Russian thinker’s body of work. I will expand on the scientific debate on Vygotsky’s theories after discussing the last concept in the subsequent chapter.

2.5. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

In the previous sections the most fundamental notions of Vygotsky’s Cultural-Historical Theory, namely, Higher Mental Functions (HMFs), mediation, and internalization, have been presented both in their original sense and through a more modern lens. All of these concepts are crucial for understanding Vygotsky’s most popular theory: the Zone of

Proximal Development (ZPD). In adherence to the structure of the previous sections, this chapter will first introduce the original concept as it was first designed by the Russian thinker, and subsequently examine a number of contemporary renditions. Finally, from the disunity that can be observed among the different strands of present-day SCT, I will select the perspective that will serve as the theoretical framework for the study conducted in the course of this thesis.

2.5.1. Vygotsky's original conception of the ZPD

The basis for Vygotsky's theory of the ZPD can be found in the relationship between learning and development (Vygotsky 1978: 84). Before outlining the concept, he draws on existing approaches of how learning and development relate to each other, including the notion that the terms are unrelated, that they have the same meaning, and that they are similar but different. After careful consideration of these approaches, he decides to reject all of them, and as a consequence, he defines his own approach. According to Vygotsky, "learning and development are interrelated", and learning varies substantially at different stages of life (e.g. as a young child or one at school age³). In attempting to explain this difference, he proposes "two developmental levels":

The first level can be called the actual developmental level, that is, the level of development of a child's mental functions that has been established as a result of certain already completed developmental cycles. (Vygotsky 1978: 85)

In simpler terms, this developmental level can also be described as problems that children can solve on their own. The second developmental level, on the other hand, is the ZPD:

It is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or on collaboration with more capable peers. (Vygotsky 1978: 86)

By comparing the two levels of development, a temporal relationship is revealed, because while "a child's actual developmental level defines functions that have already matured",

³ It is noteworthy that Vygotsky and the majority of SCT scholars focus on children in all of their works, and neglect to mention potential differences for the development of adults, i.e. individuals with fully developed mental capacities.

the ZPD “defines those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation”. In order to advance a deeper understanding of the ZPD, Vygotsky offers the terms “buds” and “flowers” to replace those functions, since a bud is not yet a flower, but in the process of becoming one (Vygotsky 1978: 86). Moreover, this metaphor can be extended to relate to the aspect of assistance as well, seeing that a bud cannot grow on its own, but is in need of guidance from outside sources (water, sunlight) to be able to become a flower.

At the beginning of this chapter, it has been established that learning and development are interrelated. However, it has not been clarified how the two relate to each other, and how the ZPD comes into effect. Since learning something that relates to a child’s actual development (i.e. fully developed functions) does not result in new (potential) development, learning has to occur within the ZPD, in which potential development arises. Vygotsky therefore concludes that learning precedes development, and that learning, if well-managed, can result in development (Vygotsky 1978: 90).

It has also been mentioned a number of times throughout this thesis that in order to fully comprehend Vygotsky’s concept of the ZPD, it is crucial to first define HMFs, mediation, and internalization. In the preceding sections, the relationships between HMFs, mediation and internalization have already been discussed, but all of these notions are also directly or indirectly related to the ZPD. The most significant process is internalization. As already described in the previous section, the development of HMFs takes place on two levels, first between people, and then within the individual. This interpersonal process relates to the notion of cooperation with peers or adult that has also been suggested in the concept of the ZPD. In addition, it has been suggested that internalization induces development, therefore it can be concluded that internalization is the process that occurs within the ZPD that transforms potential development into actual development (Vygotsky 1978: 90). Regarding the connection between the ZPD and mediation/HMFs, the relationship is mostly indirect, since HMFs set up the foundation for Vygotsky’s ideas, and a significant feature of HMFs is their mediated nature.

2.5.2. (Modern) interpretations of the ZPD

In alignment with the previous chapters, this section will explore a number of contemporary interpretations of the ZPD. This will include Chaiklin’s (2003) interpretation

of the ZPD, and his assessment of three different types of common interpretations, and Kinginger's (2002) categorisation and evaluation of several modern interpretations of the ZPD.

Unfortunately, the concept of the ZPD was left unfinished and some formulations lack detailed clarification, while others potentially engender contradictions (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 268). Along with its potential for education, the unfinished state of the ZPD has led to the emergence of a variety of different interpretations, which are sometimes misused, wrongly applied, or incompatible to the principles of Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical theory (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 268). Due to the sheer multitude of modern interpretations of the ZPD, instead of selecting a small numbers of examples of contemporary renditions in order to demonstrate different schools of thought, this section will cover several classifications of interpretations.

Chaiklin's evaluation of different interpretations of the ZPD

Seth Chaiklin is considered to be a leading expert in the field of SCT, especially in regards to the concept of the ZPD (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 272), therefore his knowledge of the topic is invaluable when it comes to evaluating and assessing various readings of the ZPD. This section will summarise Chaiklin's three types of interpretation of the ZPD, as well as the author's opinion concerning their overall validity.

Chaiklin's first classification, the "generality assumption", presumes that the ZPD is "applicable to learning all kinds of subject matters", and hence, individuals can carry out certain tasks on their own, while they require assistance for other tasks (Chaiklin 2003: 41). For example, this view is taken by Tharp & Gallimore in their theory of "teaching as assisted performance" (1988: 42). Chaiklin (2003: 42) heavily criticises this approach, stating that Vygotsky chose the term development, instead of learning, deliberately, and that learning and development should not be intermingled (c.f. section 2.5.1.). Moreover, he rejects the use of the term "range of tasks" instead of "levels of development", since the former can only function as an indication for the latter. In my opinion, this judgement is unjustified, because Tharp and Gallimore provide a detailed description of Vygotsky's original concept, including the notion that learning precedes and results in development (1988: 46), and thus, it could be argued that the authors have fully understood the

relationship between learning and development, and are using it appropriately. Regarding Chaiklin's dismissal of the term "task", it should be noted that Vygotsky himself, in reference to the ZPD, mentions "problems that children cannot solve independently" (Vygotsky 1978: 86) and, in reference to an experiment, he writes about children, who are solving "a variety of tasks" (Vygotsky 1978: 85). Evidently, solving a problem or a task are related concepts in Vygotsky's texts, and the term task can be used in connection with the ZPD. I do agree however, that "range of tasks" should not be used alternatively to "levels of development".

Chaiklin's second classification, the "assistance assumption", postulates the dependency of learning "on interventions by a more competent other", i.e. it focusses on the interaction between the developing individual and the assisting person (Chaiklin 2003: 42). According to Chaiklin, Vygotsky never considered the more competent other to be significant, since the value of assistance was already widely agreed on during his time, and instead, researchers should focus on "understand[ing] the meaning of that assistance in relation to a child's learning and development" (Chaiklin 2003: 43). Regarding this assumption, Chaiklin does not provide an example, while, Tharp & Gallimore's "assisted performance" (1988), or the scaffolding metaphor are likely to fall into this category (and are thus overlapping). Given the unfinished and underspecified nature of the ZPD, I believe that it is not important how the ZPD was originally intended, but rather how it is utilized. Therefore, when taking a practical instead of a psychological perspective, it should be valid to focus on the practical aspect of how assistance is supposed to be offered.

Chaiklin's third classification, the "potential assumption", regards the ZPD as the "property of the learner", and supposes that it allows for an accurate assessment of a learner's potential, which in turn can be used to improve and refine learning. He then provides examples from modern textbooks, which mention the strength of "a person's potential" within the ZPD (Fabes & Martin 2001: 42 cited in Chaiklin 2003: 42), or the notion that the ZPD provides information that enables educators to challenge students without frustrating them. Regarding the potential assumption, Chaiklin (2003: 43) criticises the use of the term "frustration", and argues that Vygotsky never described learning within the ZPD as pleasant, and provides an example from the world of athletics:

Losing a race is potentially frustrating and unpleasant, but the action of preparing for and running in a race can still be part of the ZPD and hence lead to development. I believe that the inclusion of frustration is linked to the scaffolding metaphor, a concept that can be seen as an extension or application of the ZPD, and will be discussed in the next section. The notion of a balance between challenge and frustration might not be part of Vygotsky's original writings, but it might be conducive for understanding how assistance within the ZPD can be given, and as a consequence, it could add a more practical element. So, returning to Chaiklin's athletics example, running a race against opponents who are far superior might lead to a level of frustration that prevents an individual from becoming better, and hence, assistance might also involve evenly grouping participants. Therefore, it can be said that frustration does bear potential relevance to development within the ZPD.

Taking all this into account, it becomes apparent that Chaiklin has dedicated his professional life to the identification of Vygotsky's original intentions. As a consequence, he rejects interpretations that diverge from this perspective, and attempts to disprove them by focussing on individual terms, or by stoically adhering to Vygotsky's supposed, original intentions. However, if we allow for interpretations of the ZPD beyond the field of psychology, we might be able to delve into the specifics of a practical application of the concept, applications that go beyond the original context (generality assumption), applications that focus on the means of assistance (assistance assumption), or even applications that help to determine an individual's potential development (potential assumption).

Kinginger's evaluation of different interpretations of the ZPD

Celeste Kinginger has done extensive research on the ZPD and especially on the various modern interpretations that have emerged from the original concept, and has categorised a large number of contemporary renditions of the ZPD as a continuum that is based on the idea of "dialogic processes" (2002: 245). This work is highly praised by other experts in the field of SCT, like Lantolf and Thorne, who, instead of conducting their own research on contemporary interpretations, utilise Kinginger's analysis as a "taxonomy of research informed by ZPD" (2006: 273), and as a basis for their own examination. This section will

outline Kinginger's three classifications of how the ZPD has been used in educational contexts, as well as her opinion on the actual relevance these concepts bear for the ZPD.

Kinger's first strand, "[t]he 'skills' interpretation" (2002: 252-53), includes concepts that appropriate the ZPD so that it can be used to support established, traditional educational principles. Important cognitive aspects like mediation, or internalization are ignored, while the focus is shifted towards the social element (the presence of a more capable individual) and the degree of difficulty (in relation to the potential level of development). This kind of reading of Vygotsky's ZPD establishes a broader framework for pedagogical concepts that were not originally connected to the ZPD, like Krashen's input hypothesis (1985), or Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1985). Thorne supports this view by arguing that Krashen's theory is based on "language input quality" instead of development, and that it involves a passive recipient instead of an active individual who is collaborating, and therefore the theory does not fit into the concept of the ZPD (2000: 226).

Kinger's second strand, "[t]he 'scaffolding' interpretation", is linked to scaffolding, a method devised by Wood and his colleagues (Wood, Bruner & Ross 1976: 90) that involves an adult assisting a child in solving a problem that the child cannot overcome by itself; the assistance is then gradually reduced until the child is capable of completing the task on its own. Wood et al have never used the ZPD or SCT as a theoretical framework for scaffolding, but since the concept received a lot of attention, it was utilised and re-contextualised to become a part of the ZPD by other scholars (Bruner 1986: 73-74; Aljaafreh & Lantolf 1994: 468; Stone 1998: 345). Kinger (2002: 254) approves of the dialogic nature of scaffolding, but criticises that "the distribution of power" is not challenged. She supports this idea by claiming that scaffolding is often part of IRF/IRE structures (initiation, response, feedback/evaluation), in which the power clearly resides with the teacher, learner participation is minimal, and goals are established by the educator. Lantolf and Thorne (2006: 275) agree with the evaluation that scaffolding and the ZPD are incompatible and back up this argumentation by citing Stetsenko, who affirms that the teacher is the driving force behind scaffolding, that the method relied on "quantity rather than quality", and that internalization and psychological tools are not taken into account (1999: 243-4, cited in Lantolf and Thorne 2006: 275). I do agree that

IRF/IRE structures are incongruous with the concept of the ZPD, especially since it is more about efficiently including a large number of students, than collaboratively working towards development, but neither is scaffolding compatible with these structures. Scaffolding, when applied correctly, is a time consuming process, as it involves “graduated assistance” (Stone 1998: 352), i.e. the dynamic assessment of a child’s actual development and selection of appropriate assistance, therefore it is impossible to include in an IRF/IRE sequence that is intended to be carried out in quick succession and with a large number of learners. Moreover, regarding the claim that scaffolding lacks internalization or psychological tools, it is crucial to acknowledge that Jerome Bruner, one of the creators of scaffolding, was also involved in the first translation of Vygotsky’s *Thought and language* (1962), for which he wrote the introduction (Stone 1998: 345). Bruner’s work is considered to be heavily influenced by the Russian scholar, and he eventually declared the relationship between the ZPD and scaffolding (1986: 76), and explicated the links to psychological tools (language) (1985:30) and internalization (1985: 31). Finally, the assertion that objectives within scaffolding are solely established by the teacher, is refuted by Stone, who argues that it depends entirely on the task and that in some scaffolded activities, the child and the adult actually do share the same goal (1998: 352)

I believe that Kinginger, Lantolf & Thorne, and Stetsenko have mistakenly (or purposefully) considered scaffolding as an element of IRF/IRE structures, and were, apart from this misconception, unable to dissociate the ZPD from scaffolding. This additionally becomes apparent, when Lantolf and Thorne (2006: 276) suggest that there is a lot of research within SCT that indicates a relationship between the ZPD and scaffolding, but neglect to provide examples or supporting arguments. I do not want to advocate scaffolding as the ideal application within the ZPD, since the concept has flaws itself and needs to be refined in respect to certain aspects (Stone 1998: 361), but I would argue that in striving to locate an application of the ZPD that is both successful and true to its original meaning, it is counterproductive to summarily dismiss any implementation of the ZPD that highlight practical instead of cognitive aspects.

Kinginger’s third strand, “[t]he metalinguistic interpretation” (2002: 255), calls attention to Swain’s collaborative dialogue (1995), a concept that centres on “the significance of language production and the active role of learners in producing language output”, and

on the idea that language production involves a reflective (metalinguistic) activity. Kinginger especially highlights a modern perspective of the ZPD that is used by Nassaji and Swain in reference to collaborative dialogue (2000: 36), which states that in the ZPD, “the potential for further learning is expanded as new possibilities open up that were initially unforeseen” (Wells 1998: 345). Interestingly enough, Kinginger neither attempts to support nor disprove this perspective, but merely concludes that “only Swain’s interpretation hints at the possibility of recovering the unity within a dialectic synthesis that was missing from Vygotsky’s definition of the construct” (2002: 257). As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Kinginger (2002: 245) perceives interpretations of the ZPD as a continuum, on which their position can be determined in correspondence to whether they utilise dialectic synthesis (i.e. all participants are transformed in unforeseeable ways (2002: 250)). Being the only concept that falls on the ‘correct’ side of the continuum, Kinginger deliberately fails to include contesting views, and thereby weakens her own stance. Additionally, she neglects to mention that Nassaji and Swain describe scaffolding as a process compatible with the ZPD (2000: 36). Lastly, I’d like to mention that the notion of dialectic synthesis has not been utilised in this thesis until now, because the idea of ‘transformation in unforeseeable ways’ does not coincide with my own interpretation of the ZPD. I believe that this is an interesting and insightful addition to Vygotsky’s original concept, but in my opinion, from a practical, educational standpoint, a certain extent of control and predictability are necessary to achieve certain teaching/learning objectives.

This analysis of Kinginger’s three strands demonstrates that her classification of interpretations of the ZPD is an attempt to dismiss certain readings of the concept while promoting others, depending on whether an addition to the ZPD is used that was supposedly implied in the original concept. In this section, I have commented that some of these rejections arguably correspond with Vygotsky’s original description of the ZPD, and are able to offer valuable insights for the practical application of ZPD-related concepts in educational contexts. Despite all of that, I do not wish to denigrate Kinginger’s perspective on the ZPD, I simply adopt a fundamentally different ideology, and I consider myself a representative of a different scientific discipline. Therefore, the classification of interpretations of the ZPD that has been introduced in this chapter is conducive for

establishing order, but I do not concur with the evaluation that is linked to this classification.

2.6. General comment on the validity of modern interpretations of Vygotsky's work

As mentioned in sections 2.2 to 2.5, the majority of Vygotsky's theoretical concepts is heatedly debated among scholars from various disciplines. Some of them demand for a close reading and a straightforward interpretation (Chaiklin 2003), or a modest extension to the original (Kinging 2002; Lantolf & Thorne 2006; Stetsenko 1999), while others suggest a more open, innovative rendition of the theory, which is supposed to result in practical educational applications (Rogoff 1995; Tharp & Gallimore 1988; Wertsch 1995). These two types of interpretations represent two polar opposites, but instead of studying the theory from a multitude of perspectives, experts often debate about the appropriate scientific affiliation of the concept. On the one hand, experts like Chaiklin reject any adaptations, claim that the ZPD should only be used as "a concrete descriptor of developmental trajectories" (Chaiklin 2003, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 263), and suggest that the field of education developed its own theories (Chaiklin 2003: 59). On the other hand, experts like Valsiner and van der Veer argue that the ZPD can be perceived as a metaphor to "explain the social nature of individual psychological development" (1993: 58). Nevertheless, scholars from both fractions share the opinion that the ZPD is often misunderstood and misapplied, claiming that "the construct of the ZPD [...] is perhaps one of the most used and least understood constructs" (Palincsar 1998: 370), and both sides are attempting to refute each other's arguments, to ultimately be able to solely affiliate the concept with their own academic field. This notion of having an absolutely explicit classification of the ZPD does not appear to be very useful anyway, since it has to be taken into account that Vygotsky's first texts are almost a hundred years old and were translated from Russian into English, and the latter might only offer a distorted image. As a matter of fact, this translation has led to a lot of controversy as well, since translators and experts in the field of SCT are divided on the correct description of essential terms, such as internalization, which when directly translated merely means "ingrowing" (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 153).

I believe that this kind of dispute is unproductive, because it does not lead to results, but only to more debate, therefore I would like to introduce another potential classification for interpretations of the ZPD that arranges interpretations on a continuum between psychology and methodology (Newman & Holzman 2005 [1993]: 66). The use of this perspective allows researchers to move away from arguing against each other, and towards accepting the existence of several perspectives towards a concept, which could even work together in order to further our understanding of development, and to improve developmental processes. After all, Vygotsky was neither a psychologist, nor a methodologist, since he rejected a rigid distinction between the two, and regarded both as interconnected and as essentially inseparable (Newman & Holzman 2005 [1993]: 11-12). After having utilised several texts from the field of psychology, but also after having argued in favour of methodologist views, I would place myself at the centre of the spectrum, but leaning towards the methodologist perspective. This is because I am mostly interested in the application of the ZPD in an educational context, but this issue will be described in more detail in subsequent chapters.

2.7. Mediated Learning Experience – a contemporary application of the ZPD

The last two chapters were dedicated to modern interpretations of the ZPD, as well as divergent opinions on these interpretations from different scientific disciplines (psychology-methodology). This selection, however, represents no more than the tip of the iceberg, and especially in the field of “[l]earning as a communal process” an abundance of additions to the ZPD have been developed (Matusov 2015: 319). As a comprehensive discussion of popular extensions of Vygotsky’s theory would go beyond the scope of this thesis, this section will highlight one significant example, namely “mediated learning experience” (MLE) (Feuerstein, Rand & Rynders 1988) as a potential application of the ZPD.

The concept of MLE interactions has been introduced by Feuerstein and his colleagues (Feuerstein, Rand & Rynders 1988) as a part of a larger theory called “structural cognitive modifiability” (SCM) (Feuerstein, Rand & Rynders 1988: 5, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 335), a theory that shows remarkable resemblance to Vygotsky’s ZPD (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 335; Poehner 2008: 52; Tzuriel 2001: 23), as it postulates that cognitive

development is not biologically predetermined, but is determined by the nature of interaction and/or instruction. Moreover, he suggests that potential development can be estimated on the basis of actual development (using Vygotskian terms instead of Feuerstein's) and that the former can be manipulated by intervening (Feuerstein, Rand & Ryders 1988: 5, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 335). According to some experts (Poehner 2008; Tzuriel 2001), the resemblance between Feuerstein's theory and Vygotsky's ZPD is purely coincidental, since the former was designed without knowledge of the latter. That being said, it is noteworthy that the two theories are not identical, since SCM uses different terminology (except for mediation), and more importantly, offers more clearly defined terms and concepts (Kozulin & Presseisen 1995: 69), like the notion of 'development', a vague term in Vygotsky's texts that was further specified by Feuerstein and his colleagues as "cognitive development", including aspects like "reflective thinking", "inner representation", or "operational behavior" (1979, referred to in Lidz 1999: 275). This accuracy in respect to definitions and concepts is the reason the concept has been critically praised to "hold the most promise to transform classroom activity" (Poehner 2008: 53). Another difference between Vygotsky's ZPD and Feuerstein's MLE can be identified by comparing the possibility of predicting potential development. While Vygotsky assumes a fixed "age-related developmental model" that serves as the basis for measuring potential development, Feuerstein rejects these kinds of models, and suggests that a child's performance can only be measured before and after mediation, which allows researchers to assess the outcome of mediation, but does not provide the possibility to predict a learner's ultimate level of development (Kozulin 2002: 14).

On a general level, MLE theory presumes that learning takes place in one of two manners, either through "direct exposure to stimuli", or through MLE (Tzuriel 2013: 60). The first is described as learning through "unmediated encounters of individuals with stimuli in the environment", and the second as learning through a mediator, who positions him-/herself between stimulus and learner, and modifies the stimulus in order to facilitate perception and apprehension (Tzuriel 2013: 61). The way stimuli are mediated varies depending on the context (motivation, understanding, emotions), and can therefore be removed or expanded in accordance to the difficulty of the task. Lastly, "MLE processes are gradually

internalized by the child”, who is ultimately capable of using them independently. In addition to its comparability to the ZPD, MLE also includes aspects similar to scaffolding (c.f. section 2.5.2.) (Tzuriel 2013: 61), because both involve a (more competent) other, who mediates (scaffolds) learning experiences that cannot be overcome independently yet. However, since scaffolding is often criticised for its hierarchical relationship between tutor and learner, and the passive role of the learner (Kington 2002; Lantolf & Thorne 2006; Stetsenko 1999), the collaborative teacher-learner relationship in which both are attempting to accomplish a shared objective, that is proposed in MLE theory offers a more equal bond between teacher and learner, and attaches a more active role to the learner (Feuerstein, Rand & Hoffman 1979: 102, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 335).

Feuerstein and his colleagues further describe MLE by defining 11 characteristics, however, only the first three criteria are required for MLE to take place, namely, “intentionality and reciprocity, meaning, and transcendence” (Feuerstein & Feuerstein 1991, referred to in Tzuriel 2013: 61). The first criterion, “intentionality and reciprocity”, refers to the intentional manner in which the mediator interacts with the learner, and simultaneously, to the learner’s response to the mediator’s action. The action can only be labelled as MLE if both intentionality and reciprocity coincide (Feuerstein & Feuerstein 1991, referred to in Tzuriel 2013: 62). According to Lidz (1991: 74-75, cited in Poehner 2008: 57), intentionality potentially involves general aspects of teacher-learner interaction such as “initiation, maintaining, and terminating the interaction”, or motivational actions like “regulating and refocusing the child’s attention and participation”. In other words, the teacher attempts to modify the stimulus, so that it becomes “more salient and attractive to the child” (Feuerstein, Rand & Ryders 1988: 62, cited in Poehner 2008: 57). The second criterion, “[m]ediation of meaning” refers to the nature of the mediator’s response, which is supposed to communicate the importance of a stimuli (in respect to emotions, motivations, values, etc.), since this kind of response facilitates the contextualisation of new meanings, and the anticipation of established meanings in new and unfamiliar contexts (Feuerstein & Feuerstein 1991: ?, referred to in Tzuriel 2013: 62). Independently, the child is incapable of associating present incidences with past ones, or to speculate about the future on the basis of present or past incidences. In order to be able to comprehend these connections, “the significance of objects and

actions [...] must be mediated” to the learner (Poehner 2008: 59). Lastly, the third criterion, “[m]ediation of transcendence”, refers to interactions in which the teacher attempts to address current needs, but at the same time potential future needs. A teacher’s support should not only be directed at a specific kind of activity, but allow the learner to generalise, i.e. to apply certain abilities to an unfamiliar, but similar context. After mediating the rules of a game, for example, the learner could/should be able to generalise these rules to other games, or to other social situations that require clear rules (Feuerstein & Feuerstein 1991: ?, referred to in Tzuriel 2013: 62).

To sum up this section, MLE is a concept that is not officially a part of Vygotsky’s ZPD, however, a number of experts (Lantolf & Thorne 2006, Poehner 2008, Tzuriel 2013) agree that MLE can be perceived as type of interaction related to the ZPD. MLE is a valuable contribution to SCT and the ZPD, because it adds clear definitions to concepts that were underspecified before, such as development, but also completely new elements such as the collaborative and equal relationship between teacher and learner that has been suggested by scholars like Kinginger (2003), or Lantolf & Thorne (2006). On top of that, the concept is not purely theoretical, but it offers helpful considerations for the practical application of MLE interactions, like possible means of interaction that can be instrumental in maintaining a learner’s attention.

2.8. Theoretical framework: Conclusion: a modified version of the ZPD within SCT

In the first section of this chapter (section 2.1), it has been suggested that the ZPD can only be understood when considering Vygotsky’s SCT as a conceptual framework. As a consequence it was necessary to closely examine the most essential constructs within SCT (HMFs, mediation, internalization). Moreover, it was mentioned that a substantial part of Vygotsky’s theories was not clearly defined, and that some texts even contradicted each other. That being so, a large number of contemporary interpretations, extensions, and applications of SCT and/or the ZPD emerged, and hence, it was unavoidable to include a comparison between Vygotsky’s original descriptions and a select number of modern interpretations. Taking all of this into account, it can be said that this chapter mostly served as a means to establish a greater understanding of SCT and the ZPD, and to gain insights into the current debate on how these theories are to be utilised today. What is

missing is a clear specification of the constructs that will be used as a theoretical framework for the study that will be conducted in the second part of this thesis. This is why this section will briefly outline a modified version of the ZPD within SCT that is based on the insights that have been gained in the previous sections.

In section 2.2. higher and lower mental functions (HMFs and LMFs) have been introduced as the foundation of Vygotsky's theories. Following Valsiner's criticism (2012) and Toomela's interpretation (2015), mental functions should not be perceived as an activity of the individual, but rather as an activity that is heavily influenced by the social environment. Moreover, I believe that this high-low distinction carries problematic connotations, and since concepts like MLE do not require this classification and use "cognitive functions" within MLE instead, I will refrain from using this terminology.

Despite not being a part of the theoretical framework, HMFs were helpful in illustrating the meaning of mediation, i.e. the notion that cognitive functions do not emerge in isolation, but that there is a process that links these functions and an individual's mental activity. This process is determined by the historical, cultural, and institutional environment of the individual, and manifests itself in psychological tools. The theoretical framework will include Vygotsky's original concept of mediation, with the addition that the focus should lie on the individual utilising tools instead of the psychological tools themselves, and the transformative nature of mediation. The concept also plays an important role in MLE, where the teacher mediates between outside stimuli and the learner in order to facilitate development. Mediation therefore not only takes place within an individual using their mental functions, but also between people as a means to stimulate the emergence of psychological tools.

In section 2.4., internalization was introduced as one of the most essential constructs for the ZPD, because it describes the nature of the process of development, which first takes place between people and then within the individual itself. As the main term (intrapersonal) has never been fully defined by Vygotsky, other scholars like Wertsch (1993) and Rogoff (1995) have attempted to fill the gap by formulating additional contributions to the original concept. These contributions are helpful in understanding how internalization is carried out, but they were especially valuable because they have sparked debates within the field of SCT that have helped to identify the most essential

characteristic of internalization – the relationship between learner and teacher. The learner is not just a passive recipient, but an active agent, who is equally involved in the process of internalization, during which they collaborate with the teacher, who, just like the learner is transformed in the process. This perspective is almost identical to the one presented in MLE, except for the addition that learner and teacher are working towards accomplishing the same goal. The nature of this relationship will constitute a crucial element for this framework.

Finally, after revisiting and reformulating the most essential constructs of SCT, it is also necessary to carefully scrutinise the ZPD. Vygotsky originally defined it as the distance between actual and potential development, the former referring to what the child can do on their own, and the latter to what the child can do with assistance. This notion will serve as the theoretical framework for this thesis, but as this definition lacks precision, a number of aspects stemming from the debate on the validity of modern interpretations of the ZPD will be added. Firstly, in agreement with Chaiklin (2003) and Kinginger (2002), I believe that the ZPD, in isolation, is not compatible with any educational method, because in addition to assistance, aspects like mediation and internalization need to be taken into consideration as well. Secondly, regarding the relationship between tasks and the ZPD, solving problems or tasks can be considered to be integral elements of the ZPD, but solving a task does not equal development, since performing tasks can only provide indications towards the stage of development. Lastly, in contrast to Chaiklin (2003) and Kinginger (2002), I do believe that it is significant how assistance is given. Therefore the notion of balancing challenge and frustration that is included in the concept of scaffolding, or the idea that a stimulus should be modified in order to appeal to a child and spark interest that is central in MLE, constitute valuable additions to the concept of the ZPD.

Summing up this chapter, this thesis will utilise a theoretical framework that is based on Vygotsky's original conception of the ZPD as well as the constructs of mediation and internalization that are linked to the ZPD. All of these concepts are slightly modified in order to reflect a more modern, but also a more practical perspective. These modifications include a rejection of the term 'higher mental functions', a shift of focus in mediation, a reformulation of the roles of both learner and teacher and their relationship,

and a specification of the processes that are involved in fostering development within the ZPD.

2.9. The relationship between SCT and L2 acquisition, learning to write and providing feedback

As sections 2.1 to 2.8 have focussed on SCT, the ZPD, or learning and development in general, and the research part of this thesis will focus on providing and receiving feedback on writing in an EFL context, this section will examine L2 acquisition, learning to write, and giving feedback from the perspective of SCT.

Reading Vygotsky's original texts, the connection between the ZPD and education becomes obvious immediately, after all, the theory is based on the relationship between learning and development. Evidently, this relationship does not only apply to school, but to all kinds of contexts. However, Vygotsky also mentioned the significance for education by stating that "[t]he ZPD can become a powerful concept in developmental research, one that can markedly enhance the effectiveness and utility of the application and diagnostics of mental development to educational problems" (Vygotsky 1978:87). Consequently, many scholars in the field of SCT have focussed on learning and development in educational contexts and designed practical applications such as scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross 1976), assisted performance (Tharp & Gallimore 1988), or mediated learning (Feuerstein, Rand & Hoffman 1979). In addition, in regards to psychological tools, it is noteworthy to point out that language is considered "the most powerful and pervasive" tool (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 22), and that Vygotsky argued that means of communication like "[s]peaking (and writing) activity can function as a mediational artifact to control thinking" (1997: 92, referred to in Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 60). Since language is both subject matter and mediational tool in the EFL classroom, language plays a crucial role in the study of language acquisition in this context.

As writing is not only a mediational tool, but also a crucial part of L2 acquisition, it is logical to assume that a significant portion of SCT research is directed at this very aspect of language. In a book chapter on theoretical orientations in the field of L2 writing, Cumming (2016: 65) establishes that SCT is one of the four major theories that are utilised in L2 writing research, and that SCT has recently become the dominant position in studies on

writing (2016: 77). This popularity is likely to be related to a general paradigm shift in teaching that has redefined the roles of teacher and learner; while the former is no longer an all-knowing entity, but a combination of tutor, learning facilitator, and resource (depending on the context), the latter is no longer a passive recipient, but an active agent, who co-constructs learning in collaboration with the teacher. Consequently, SCT research that focusses “on collaboration among people, either students interacting with teachers or with other students, to produce writing and learn from each other” (Cumming 2016: 76), perfectly reflects this perspective on teaching and learning.

Lastly, it is noteworthy to emphasise the relationship of feedback and SCT research. Feedback plays a crucial role in learning to write, as it allows teachers to convey information to the learner on how they perceive the text, how it could be improved, or which parts of the text were well-written. Additionally, the teacher’s response is of particular importance from the perspective of SCT, as it can be considered a “mediation tool between the teacher and student” (Devrim 2014: 1). This view is supported by Bitchener (2016: 75), who argues that language is used as a “mediational tool” that teacher and learner use “to communicate and coordinate their action” (Wells 1999, referred to in Bitchener 2016: 75). He then elaborates that the application of feedback in the ZPD emerges in the “form of assistance” (Bitchener 2016: 73) as it tends to be used in scaffolding or similar methods.

It can be concluded that SCT and the ZPD are not only applicable to learning and development in general, but also to the more specific educational contexts of L2 acquisition, writing, and feedback, because these contexts use language as a mediational tool, and interaction to co-construct meaning. The next chapter will introduce a number of research projects that have used this perspective as a theoretical framework.

3. Current state of sociocultural research on feedback on writing

After having established a theoretical framework within SCT that serves as the foundation for the study that has been conducted for this thesis and that will be introduced in the next chapter, this section will provide some general information on sociocultural research, a broad overview of socioculturally informed research on teacher feedback to writing, and

present a number of selected studies that have a similar focus as the research that has been done for this paper.

3.1. Sociocultural research in general

According to Wertsch (1995: 56), “[t]he goal of sociocultural research is to understand the relationship between human mental functioning [...] and cultural, historical, and institutional setting”. Such a research could involve, for instance, a comparison between schools on “how mathematical reasoning practises are carried out”, i.e. a study that inquires into institutional differences. The institutional dimension proves to be particularly significant in the context of education at school/university, because these institutions usually adopt a certain ideology of what is appropriate, correct, or effective writing, which in turn has an impact on how writing is learned and taught (Bazerman 2016: 17). Wertsch then classifies two potential approaches for conducting sociocultural research: either on the basis of “an account of sociocultural phenomena” in order to make assumptions about “mental functioning”, or the other way round (Wertsch 1995: 57). Lastly, he proposes “human action as the unit of analysis for sociocultural research” (Wertsch 1995: 60-61), because “action provides a context within which the individual and society [...] are understood as interrelated moments”. This perspective of SCT research can be described as a comprehensive approach, as it does not focus on the nature of isolated units, but on the way the individual elements of an action perform in collaboration. This view is supported by Beach, Newell and VanDerHeide, who suggest that learning to write transcends the textual level, as well as the cognitive level, and it should be perceived as “a social event” (2016: 89) and that writing should be examined through the use of “social practices” (2016: 91). Even though it is not explicitly stated by the authors cited in this section, I would argue that the interaction of providing, receiving and re-contextualising feedback that is part of teaching and learning to write, constitute to such a social practice, or human action.

Taking all of this into account, conducting research on writing in the field of SCT should not focus solely on individual aspects of writing, such as the use of a specific textual feature, but instead utilise a more comprehensive approach that involves the social context and the historical, cultural, and institutional setting.

3.2. Sociocultural research in the context of learning to write in the EFL classroom

This section will provide a general overview of the research that has been conducted on feedback in the context of SCT. The first part of this section will examine a larger number of studies that only show low correlation to the study, but carry some minor implications, while the second part is dedicated to a few studies that bear a close resemblance to the research of this paper.

3.2.1. General overview of sociocultural research on developing writing in the EFL classroom

As teacher response to student writing in the context of EFL has been a popular area of research in the last decades, it is only to be expected that an abundance of studies has been produced during this time. Bringing order into chaos, it is necessary to categorise these investigations so as to be able to identify the ones that are relevant to this thesis.

On a surface level, there is a distinction between “written corrective feedback (WCF)” (Ferris et al 2013: 307), focussing solely on grammar, and teacher response (TR), a more general term that refers to any comment given to student writing (e.g. Lee 2007). While the former only refers to comments that have physically been written down by the teacher, the latter also includes oral feedback, for instance in the format of teacher-student conferences, or audio feedback. As this thesis includes a study on TR, this review will primarily examine research within this context.

On a more specific level, I would like to propose three general categories of research on TR, which should not be perceived as isolated subject areas, but as research topics that can potentially be used in combination in order to highlight the relationship between these matters.

- research on the format of TR
- research on students’ attitudes towards TR
- research on the effectiveness of TR

Studies that focused on the format of TR in isolation are rather scarce (Connors & Lunsford 1993; Stern & Solomon 2006), have mostly applied a quantitative approach, and their findings revealed that the majority of comments was concerned with the accuracy of the

students' language, i.e. aspects like spelling or grammar, while feedback on organisation or argumentation only amounted to a small portion of comments. There is, however, a much more substantial amount of studies that have considered the format of TR in relation to students' attitudes, (Agbayahoun 2016; Clements 2008; Hyland & Hyland 2001). Among other aspects, these studies have revealed the existence of a connection between TR that contains a substantial amount of error-correction and students feeling frustrated and overwhelmed (Agbayahoun 2016), the significance of individualising TR in order to cater to a student's emotional needs (Clements 2008) or impact of praise, criticism, suggestions or mitigation strategies on the teacher-learner relationship (Hyland & Hyland 2001). Moreover, there is a significant number of studies on the relation between the format and effectiveness of TR (Goldstein 2004; Nurmukhamedov & Kim 2010; Tee Pei Leng 2013), concluding that "clear, direct, and information loaded" TR (Tee Pei Leng 2013: 395), and/or that the choice of "syntactic forms of comments [...] [such as] questions, declaratives, or statements" (Goldstein 2004; Nurmukhamedov & Kim 2010) influenced whether students were capable of successfully revising their texts.

Using this categorisation of research on TR, on the basis of the selected studies, it can be concluded that error correction constitutes the majority of TR, even though it might induce student frustration. Moreover, the shape of TR can have an impact on the success of student revision, depending on the choice of syntactic forms, or the overall clarity or length of the teacher's comments. Despite all of this, it is crucial to understand that feedback cannot be perceived a magical formula that can be used homogeneously for all students, but as a device that needs to be carefully accommodated to an individual learner's needs, as it has the potential to facilitate or debilitate the relationship between teacher and student. Moreover, it is noteworthy to mention that it is not my intention to present a comprehensive overview of the work that has been done in the field of writing research in SCT, but to put forward a selection of socioculturally-informed studies that has impacted my personal opinion regarding the nature of feedback.

3.2.2. Evaluation of three socioculturally-informed studies on developing writing in the EFL classroom, relevant to this paper

Even though the research described in the previous section provides valuable insights into the use of TR for developing students' writing competencies, there is no strong connection to the research that has been done in the context of this very thesis. For that reason, this section will emphasise studies that investigate the relationship between student understanding of TR and improving their proficiency in writing in an EFL context; more specifically, this section will provide a detailed description of the research that has been done by Conrad & Goldstein (1999), Lee (2007), and Zhao (2010).

“Student revision after teacher-written comments”

The research by Conrad and Goldstein (1999) was conducted in an ESL composition class at a US university, in which students were supposed to produce multiple drafts of four graded essays within a period of 16 weeks. They received feedback in different formats, including teacher written feedback (TWF), one-on-one conferences, and focused activities involving the entire class. For the actual study, data from three learners at similar writing proficiency levels, but different language backgrounds was collected. The data comprised all TWF on two essays, focussing mostly on content (e.g. structure, argumentation), and also on lexico-grammatical aspects; however feedback was not provided on all of these aspects, but with an emphasis on a selected problem area (e.g. on argumentation, or form) (1999: 150-151). The objective of their research, was to examine the effectiveness of feedback by comparing different facets of TWF. Conrad and Goldstein concluded that the format of TWF was less important for revision success than the problem area, and that learners mostly struggled with aspects like argumentation or logic (1999: 171-172). Nevertheless, these results should not be perceived as standing in stark opposition to the studies that highlight the importance of syntactic form (Goldstein 2004; Nurmukhamedov & Kim 2010) that were introduced in the last section, but as suggesting an additional variable that is crucial for student revision. After all, Conrad and Goldstein also point out the significance of the syntactic form of TR, since it may have an impact on the learner's understanding of the teacher's comment. The researchers discovered that in some instances, “the intended meaning of the teacher's comments” was misinterpreted by the

student, and as a result, the student was unable to successfully revise their text (1999: 172). Conrad and Goldstein sum up that there is no direct relation between feedback and revision, but that there is a myriad of factors that can potentially affect the learner's revision success, and therefore it is vital to consider "the context within which the comments and revision take place" (1999: 173).

"Teacher [r]esponses and [s]tudent [i]nterpretations"

Younghwa Lee (2007) has conducted a study similar to the one by Conrad and Goldstein (1999). The research was carried out in an EFL composition course at a Korean university in which students were supposed to produce three assignments (only one draft for each) in the course of 15 weeks. Students received TWF for a variety of aspects, including "content, organization, [...] grammar, coherence, and layout" (2007: 105), and additionally, selected topics were discussed in class so that all students could benefit (equally). The data was based on the comments given by one teacher on 82 writing samples from 34 Korean EFL students of different proficiency levels. Lee collected all TWF on these writing samples and categorised them in regards to "nature and purpose of the comments" (2007: 107), such as inquiring information, or providing positive reinforcement, and in regards to "linguistic aspect", including, among others, questions and imperatives. In addition to this categorisation that was used for Lee's quantitative analysis to demonstrate the frequency of certain purposes and aspects, the researcher also carried out student interviews in order to determine the learners' understanding of their teacher's comments. Lee (2007: 115-116) concluded that in a great number of TR instances, students were unable to precisely identify the teacher's intention, and/or were confused about how to properly revise their work. However, like Conrad and Goldstein (1999) she disapproves of a general relationship between TR and student interpretation, because similar comments can lead to completely different results. In this sense, a detailed response about the learner's problems with grammar could result in deep frustration, but also in strong validation.

"Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing"

The last study that will be considered in depth in this paper was conducted by Huahui Zhao (2010), and even though there is a strong focus on peer feedback, Zhao provides

valuable insights into learners' understanding of TR. The research involved 18 students, who attended a writing class at a Chinese university, and who performed at a similar writing proficiency level. The learners were observed for a period of 16 weeks, during which they were supposed to produce several essays. While students usually only had to hand in one draft, for two texts, they were allowed to write a first as well as a final draft. For one of these essays, learners received teacher feedback, and for the other one, they received peer feedback; the participants were instructed to incorporate this feedback into their final drafts. Zhao utilised both student drafts, teacher and peer feedback, and stimulated recall interviews in order to determine which type of response was used more often, and more importantly, which type of feedback was understood better, and how students dealt with the response (2010: 5-7). The Chinese researcher found out that students incorporated more instances of teacher feedback into their final essays, but there was a higher percentage of TR that they did not fully understand, as well as a larger percentage of TR that was utilised, even though students did not realise why the modification improved the text (2010: 11-12). Zhao concludes that "learners' understanding of feedback should be regarded as at least an equally essential aspect as learners' use of feedback" in the context of developing writing proficiency (2010: 13-14).

Linking these studies to SCT

It has been mentioned at the beginning of this section that the three studies that are most relevant to this thesis can all be placed with the spectrum of SCT. However, only Zhao (2010) directly references Vygotsky and the ZPD, while Lee (2007) and Conrad and Goldstein (1999) focus on findings and implications of existing research that has been conducted in the field of writing research. Nevertheless, I would argue that all of these studies can be considered to fall within the framework of SCT, because they highlight the significance of interaction (in the format of teacher response) for learner development, and they all agree that there is no direct relation between TR and student understanding, implying the significance of individual mental functioning for understanding; this kind of understanding has been introduced as internalization in the last chapter. Zhao supports this interpretation by referencing several representatives of SCT, such as Lantolf and Thorne (2006: 167), who assume that development does not result from copying another person, but through internalization, during which transformation takes place. In the

context of receiving feedback, this means that using TR without understanding its significance does not result in actual internalization, because only understanding the feedback can lead to long-term transformation of the learner's language use (development), while mirroring only has a short-term effect that is unlikely to be reproduced, especially in a different context.

In this chapter, I have attempted to establish a link between the theoretical and the practical part of this thesis. It is crucial to understand that research in SCT does not simply refer to any analysis that involves interaction and development, but that there is mostly a focus on mental functioning and/or the cultural, institutional, and/or historical setting where it takes place, e.g. social practices or institutional differences. Subsequently, as a means to bring order into the abundance of studies that have been conducted in the field of writing research, I have proposed a new categorisation, and provided a selected number of studies to highlight that there are various factors that can potentially affect the success of student revision, and that TR should be individualised to a student's needs in order to be effective. Lastly, this section has introduced three studies that draw attention to the significance of aspects like teacher intention, and student understanding for revision and development. This research serves as the foundation for my own study, in which I am investigating the discrepancies between teacher intention and student understanding, and in which I am attempting to discover potential reasons for a lack of understanding TR.

4. Empirical study – methodology

This chapter covers the description of the methodology that has been selected for the study conducted for this paper. It contains several sections on the formal criteria of the research, including the research question and a brief summary of the study, a description of the study participants, an overview of the data that was obtained, and a specification of the method that has been employed (qualitative content analysis).

4.1. Summary and research questions

This research investigates potential discrepancies between student understanding and teacher intention of teacher feedback on student writing in tertiary education. Disparities between understanding and intended meaning are examined in regards to their

immediate effect (how feedback is interpreted, and how a text could be re-written), as well as in regards to their long-term effect (the general significance of the feedback). The study is based on these research questions:

- How do students interpret the teacher feedback they received on a written assignment?
- What do teachers want to convey to their students by the use of said feedback?
- Is there a difference between the students' interpretation and the teachers' intended meaning? To what extent?

4.2. Study context

Given the idea that the context (or setting) is perceived as a determining factor in SCT, this section will first examine parts of the curriculum and the rating scale that is being used at the institution in which the study is conducted, and then inquire into the classroom context, describing assignments as part of the grading system, and administrative aspects of the course.

Institutional context

In the previous chapter, it has been mentioned that the cultural, institutional, and historical setting is an important aspect when doing research in the field of SCT. This is due to the idea that this setting influences how cognitive functions emerge (c.f. section 2.8). However, since including all three aspects would go beyond the scope of this thesis, it will focus on the institutional context.

The study was conducted in a writing composition course called "Integrated Language & Study Skills 2 (ILLS2)" (Universität Wien 2013 [2002]: 2) at the department of English and American Studies at the University of Vienna. As part of the language competency module of the Bachelor's programme for English and American Studies (and English as a teaching subject), students have to attend the courses ILLS1 and ILLS2, lasting a semester each, and at the end of ILLS2, students have to pass the "Common Final Test (CFT)" (Department of English/University of Vienna 2017b: 2) to be able to continue their studies. The exam consists of a reading and a writing part, but the study of this thesis focuses on the latter. The most crucial aspect of the CFT for the institutional context is the assessment scale that has been developed for this writing task, since it is not only used for the CFT, but also

for assignments in ILLS1+2. The measuring system consists of four categories on which students can achieve a maximum of five points, namely, “[t]ask [f]ulfilment”, “[o]rganisation”, “[l]inguistic accuracy”, and “[l]inguistic range”, two categories on which students can achieve a maximum of two points, including “[p]unctuation” and “[s]pelling”, and lastly, students can also get one point for “[l]ength” (Department of English/University of Vienna 2017a: 2-5)⁴. In addition to the significance of the measuring system, it is also noteworthy that the CFT is not graded by a student’s course instructor, but a different one who has not taught said student in either one of the ILSS courses (this aspect will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter). Since it is crucial for students to pass the CFT to be able to progress in their studies, it can be assumed that this exam, and especially its assessment scale constitute a decisive aspect of the institutional setting that determines the development of students’ cognitive functions in the context of this module (and beyond).

Classroom context

Integrated Learning & Study Skills 2 is an EFL writing composition course at tertiary level, which is mandatory for all students and a prerequisite for a number of other courses in the programme. In the course, learners have to produce three written assignments of 300-400 words in the format of an argumentative essay on a general topic provided by the course instructor⁵. The prompt for these assignments contains a broad introduction, a question that has to be addressed, and visual (graphs and charts) and textual (text extracts) sources that have to be used in the essay (Department of English/University of Vienna 2017b: 9). In general students only have to produce one draft per assignment, some course instructors, however, encourage their students to write a revised draft on a voluntary basis. Students receive feedback on the three graded assignments in an extent and format that selected by the course instructor. The classes meet twice a week for a total of 150 minutes, and the contents of each sitting were selected by the course instructors. Taking all of this into account, it becomes apparent that there is a clear

⁴ The full document can be read online; the link can be found in the references section.

⁵ Information taken from my personal experience when attending the course a couple of semesters ago.

framework for the grading system of the course, but that the particulars are within the decision making scope of the teacher.

4.3. Study participants

This section will outline the sampling procedure, and provide a detailed description of the participants. In the first part, the student participants are introduced, and in the second part, the course instructors and their approach to giving feedback are characterised.

4.3.1. Students (S)

The study conducted for this paper included 17 student participants, who attended ILLS2 in three different classes, between October 2018 and January 2019. They had similar writing proficiency levels (between B2+ and C1), studied English as a foreign language, and most of them were German native speakers (except for two, one had English and the other Arabic as their mother tongue). Due to time restrictions, “[c]onvenience sampling” (Dörnyei 2007: 129) was selected as a sampling strategy, which means that participants who were available were utilised. In practical terms, this means that I was allowed to briefly present my thesis to the students, who were then able to volunteer for my project. I believe that this sampling has had an influence on my findings, but this aspect will be discussed in the section on limitations.

4.3.2. Course instructors (CIs)⁶

As already mentioned above, three CIs participated in the study, and, just like for the student participants, due to temporal restrictions, convenience sampling was conducted, and several teachers were asked to volunteer to participate in the project. Ultimately, three CIs have agreed to take part in the study. These teachers come from various academic backgrounds: they hold university degrees in several subjects, including teaching EFL, linguistics, and literature, are actively involved in the development of tertiary education in EFL, and are engaged in research projects at the University of Vienna. In addition, the CIs adopt different approaches to providing feedback:

CI1 provides handwritten feedback on the students’ assignments using abbreviations to specify the link to the rating scale, underlinings, circles and other marks to highlight

⁶ Since the term ‘teacher’ is often associated with secondary education, educators are mainly addressed as ‘course instructors’, but in order to avoid repetition, ‘educators’, or ‘teachers’ is used as well.

problem areas in the text, and short comments in the format of statements or questions. In addition, the CI also provides global feedback on the four main categories of the rating scale (task fulfilment, organisation, linguistic accuracy, and linguistic range) in the form of one or two short and precise phrases. Students who require additional feedback, or elaboration on the TR provided are advised to schedule a one-on-one meeting during which the assignment is discussed in more detail. Lastly, textual errors that are made by a sizeable portion of the students are discussed during class.

CI2 provides oral feedback on selected aspects in the form of digital audio files that are sent to the students via email, as well as word-processed corrections of the assignment. While the first is supposed to help students to approach complex issues like argumentation or organisation, and hence to improve the students' long-term writing proficiency, the latter serves as a language model that learners can use immediately to refine their texts. The oral format of the TR allows the instructor to provide extensive criticism to their students, resulting in much longer comments than CI1 and CI3. Moreover, similarly to CI1, after handing back an assignment, CI2 spends a substantial part of a session to review common mistakes and pitfalls with the whole class.

CI3 has a similar approach as CI1 in regards to written feedback, since this instructor also utilises abbreviations, underlinings and other marks, short comments, and global feedback on some of the main problem areas. The global feedback, however, is a bit different, because it consists of full sentences, and in some instances reasons for critical comments are provided. Additionally, after handing back an assignment, CI3 utilises different approaches to incorporate the feedback into the session. In this sense, the learners are usually engaged in a task that forces them to actively work with the teacher's response, while the CI talks to each of the students individually in order to address immediate questions, or to provide additional feedback. Finally, like the other instructors, CI3 discusses frequent mistakes with the entire class.

Given the small sampling size of the students, and the fact that the CIs utilise additional feedback practises in combination with the TR on the written assignments, it is hardly possible to draw comparisons between the course instructors, and therefore this paper will not contain an analysis that determines which approach is the most effective.

4.4. Data collection

This section will introduce the different types of data that were gathered, and discuss the means of data acquisition. The study uses three kinds of data:

- Teacher response to student writing
- Student interviews
- Course instructor interviews

In addition, the students' assignments were used so that students and teachers were able to make sense of the feedback during the interviews, but in order to protect the confidentiality of the learners, their essays will not be included in this thesis.

4.4.1. Teacher response to student writing

As teacher response is the basis for student and teacher interviews, it is crucial to first define the term as a unit of analysis, and subsequently, to describe how TR is perceived in the broader context of written teacher-learner interaction.

Defining the term teacher response

Since the terms teacher response (TR) or feedback are the topic of a myriad of academic and non-academic publications, there is also a variety of different definitions for these terms (that will be used synonymously in this paper), and thus, it is necessary to first define how TR is specified within this study. One of the most widely used definitions can be found in Hyland, who considers "[a]ny comment, underlining or correction made on student text by the teacher [...] as a written intervention" (2003: 220). While this might be useful as a starting point, the indefiniteness of the description would result in an absurdly high number of comments, and hence, go beyond the scope of a diploma thesis. In addition, some aspects of this definition are not compatible with the study's focus on understanding and revision; this may apply, for instance, to some corrections, because the revision has already been done by the teacher, and many lexical or grammatical mistakes are easily understood by the students.

Therefore, for the frame of this study, the term feedback requires further specification. Another definition is given by Conrad and Goldstein, who define a comment "as a stretch of discourse having a unified intended function" (1999: 153). This allows the authors to

perceive various sentences, signs, and abbreviations as a single instance of feedback, instead of treating all of them as individual comments. This study will utilise a combination of these two definitions: Feedback is a stretch of discourse having a unified function that may contain interventions such as abbreviations, underlinings, marks, or comments.

In addition, to attain to the objectives of the research, only instances of TR that are not easily understood (require mental functioning) are taken into consideration, and for the purpose of limiting and balancing the amount of data, only one instance of feedback for each of the main categories of the CFT rating scale (for each student) is selected. In case there is no instance of one (or more) of a problem area, a different TR is selected, so that there are four teacher comments for each student.

Feedback as a part of teacher-learner interaction

Before examining the interview transcripts of the study participants in order to investigate how discrepancies between student understanding and teacher intention emerge, it is crucial to revisit some of the main points that were introduced in the theoretical part of this study. The most central argument in Vygotskian SCT is the idea that development takes place in the context of interaction, in other words, in isolation from the outside world, humans cannot improve. In the context of developing writing competency at university, students are not forced to magically improve without receiving assistance, but there are a number of resources that are utilised by course instructors to increase learners' proficiency. One of the most commonly used resources is feedback which is sometimes also referred to as teacher response to student writing. The term response might be more fitting in this context, because technically, response illustrates that this measure for developing writing is actually part of an interaction between learner and teacher; in this sense, a potential interaction between student and course instructor could take the following form:

1. Teacher initiates interaction by confronting a learner with a prompt for a writing assignment
2. Student replies to the (question in the) prompt by composing an essay, and handing it to the course instructor
3. Teacher responds to the learner by providing feedback to the learner

4. Student replies by producing a second draft, or alternatively, by incorporating the teacher response in a different essay

This could be a stereotypical interaction between course instructors (or teachers) and learners that occurs in universities and schools on any given day, and as mentioned before, this interaction is not arbitrary, but it is usually the intention of the educator to support the student in developing their writing proficiency. The question is just whether this communication is always successful, especially since this kind of written interaction does not involve typical features of communication, such as requests for clarification, or back-channels. The basic idea of this study is to analyse whether the interaction between teacher and student is successful by examining potential discrepancies between teacher intention and student interpretation of teacher feedback, because these deviations could potentially result in misunderstandings or even a breakdown in communication, and therefore also in a delay of writing development.

4.4.2. Student interviews

Using this definition, four instances of feedback have been selected for each student (with the exception of one, who only received three comments), resulting in 71 teacher comments in total, and serving as the basis for the student- and course instructor interviews. As a research method, the structured interview has been selected as a means to obtain information. This is due to the circumstance that “the researcher is aware of what [...] [he] does not know” and can therefore formulate questions that will serve to gain this information (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 412). More specifically, the interview is conducted in the format of a standardised, open-ended Interview; i.e. all interviewees are faced with the exact same question, but they are not restricted in their response. This type of interview produces comparable answers and data that “is complete for each person” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 413), characteristics that are crucial when it comes to detecting potential discrepancies. In an attempt to ensure compliance, an interview schedule has been formulated that is utilised for every participant (see appendix A).

Before the interview, participants are informed about the purpose of the research, and thanked for their participation. At this point students have already signed a written authorization (see appendix A) that grants the researcher access to the students’

assignments (and the teachers' feedback), and they have also been informed about the ethical dimension of the study, that is to say, about "informed consent, guarantees of confidentiality, beneficence and non-maleficence" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 422). Afterwards, participants are asked for permission to record the interview. Finally, before the actual beginning of the interview, the conduct of the interview is explained to the participants: Several instances of feedback have been selected by the researcher and are presented to the participants so that they can reacquaint themselves with the text and the feedback. Subsequently, for each instance of feedback, they will be asked to respond to a number of questions relating to their understanding of the feedback. The use of stimuli in order to assist participants in recollecting certain events or actions is called "stimulated recall", a method that is often used in interaction research, because it potentially yields revealing insights into a person's thought process, even after the action has come to an end (Dörnyei 2007: 148-149). In addition, it is explicitly welcome that students respond, "I don't know", if they are not able to interpret an instance of feedback. The following questions were carefully formulated and piloted to ensure a productive and successful interview:

1. What does this feedback mean to you?
2. If you could revise your essay, what would you change?
3. How would this change improve the text?

During the interview, prompts are used, if questions are unclear and require additional explanation, and probes, if an interviewee's response lacks detail (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 420). Finally, at the end of the interview, in addition to the three questions per instance of TR, students are given the opportunity to recount a personal experience in regards to good or bad feedback. This question was initially intended to be prepared by the students in advance, but since the first two participants did not receive this information, for the sake of conformity, I decided to alter the procedure, and to have students respond to this question spontaneously, but on a voluntary basis.

4.4.3. Course instructor interviews

The general guidelines of the student interviews are basically identical to the ones with the teachers. The format is also a standardised, open-ended interview that is based on the students' assignments and the teacher's comments. CI1 responds to 19 comments (5

students), and both CI2 and CI3 to 23 each (6 students)⁷. However, since they have to address a much larger amount of TR instances, the CI interviews last much longer, and they are faced with slightly different questions:

1. What do you mean with this feedback?
2. If the student was able to re-write this part of the text, what are they supposed to change?
3. Please describe how this change would improve the text.

Finally, instead of sharing a personal story about receiving feedback, CIs were asked about the feedback practices they applied in addition to TR on written assignments. This information potentially carries implications about the reasons why students were (un-)able to understand a teacher's comments, and will be discussed further in the section on research findings.

4.5. Data processing methodology – qualitative content analysis

This section will examine the method of data analysis that is carried out for the study of this thesis; this includes a brief introduction and description of qualitative content analysis (the method), as well as a detailed specification of the four phases that constitute qualitative content analysis: transcribing, coding, memoing, and interpreting (Dörnyei 2007: 246).

Qualitative content analysis refers to an investigative procedure of analysing texts that can either be descriptive ("manifest level analysis"), and consider superficial aspects, interpretative ("latent level analysis"), and explore implicit features, or both. The most fundamental feature of this method, however, is that the analytical categories are not predefined, but emerge gradually as the result of an explorative approach (Dörnyei 2007: 246). In other words, instead of attempting to dis-/prove various hypotheses that were prepared in advance, researchers approach the study in an unbiased manner, systematically searching for novel and interesting insights.

⁷ It was originally intended to have an equal number of learners for each CI, but several students have made use of their right to withdraw from participating in the study.

4.5.1. Transcription

Since the sets of data derived from recorded interviews with students and course instructors, the first step of the analysis of this study involved the transcription of said recordings. Given the objective to inquire into the learners' understanding, and the teachers' intentions, "suprasegmentals, such as stress, [...] intonation, and paralinguistic factors, such as acoustic sounds", as well as imperfect speech, like "false starts, word repetition, or language mistakes" (Dörnyei 2007: 129) were left out intentionally, as these aspects are irrelevant for the study. However, some non-verbal outbursts, such as laughter or sighs were included into the transcriptions, because these sounds do carry a certain implicit meaning.

4.5.2. Coding

The next step that was applied within the scope of data processing is coding. The teachers' comments were coded twice; before the interviews TRs were colour-coded in order to assist students in identifying several stretches of discourse as one comment that has a unifying meaning; after the interviews, all the teachers' responses were assigned a code between TR#1 and TR#65. A list of all teacher comments, as well as their allocation to students, course instructors, and problem area according to the CFT rating scale (TF = task fulfilment, O = organisation, A = linguistic accuracy, R = linguistic range) can be found in table 1.

Table 1: List of Teacher responses given to the student participants on their assignments

	feedback	student(#)	course instructor (#)	Problem area
TR#1	Wavy line under the word "attrition", and the phrase "Closing these shops"; global feedback (GF): only minor issues	S1	CI1	A
TR#2	"Missing"-symbol in the name "Michell"; abbreviation "TF"; GF: only minor issues	S1	CI1	TF
TR#3	Wavy line under the word "benefit", and the phrase "increase prosperity and standard of living"; abbr. "A" (twice); GF: only minor issues	S1	CI1	A

TR#4	GF: you spend too many words on simple issues. You could have easily written 3 arguments in the given space	S2	CI1	TF
TR#5	GF: The furniture example does not feel too relevant in the context; Wavy line under the word “preferably purchased face to face”	S2	CI1	TF
TR#6	GF: some serious linguistic issues which are confusing and force the reader to pause;	S2	CI1	A
TR#7	GF: some issues with range and style; wavy line under “shopping-based relationships”; abbr. “R”	S2	CI1	R
TR#8	GF: in the third paragraph you come to a very unclear conclusion; “since it gives them the possibility to be a part of their chosen culture” underlined; question mark, comment: very unclear, abbr. “TF”	S3	CI1	TF
TR#9	GF: some problems with pronoun reference that is at times confusing; pronouns “this” and “that idea” circled; arrows pointing to the pronouns’ referents; abbr. “O”; comment: “connection to topic?”	S3	CI1	O
TR#10	GF: Higher frequency of linguistic problems, some resulting in unclear sentences; “there” underlined; question mark; abbr. A	S3	CI1	A
TR#11	GF: some stylistic issues; wavy line under “has gone through changes”, abbr. R	S3	CI1	R
TR#12	GF: essay [...] is marred by the fact that you are plagiarizing Postrel –you are using his words, yet give him no credit!	S4	CI1	TF
TR#13	GF: Your first paragraph would need some examples as to why/how cities are dependent; wavy line under “is highly dependent on”; arrow and comment: more examples needed to illustrate how this is the case; abbr. “TF”	S4	CI1	TF

TR#14	GF: a number of linguistic problems, one of which (“essential to an animate town and connect people”) is highly confusing and forces the reader to pause; wavy line; abbr. A, exclamation mark	S4	CI1	A
TR#15	GF: some problems with range and style; wavy line under “achieve savings”; abbr. “R”	S4	CI1	R
TR#16	GF: The information drawn from Sterling is rudimentary and lacking detail; comment: detail; abbr. “TF”	S5	CI1	TF
TR#17	GF: Some issues with cohesion; comment: cohesion;	S5	CI1	O
TR#18	GF: Very unclear 1 st sentence of the 1 st body paragraph, which forces the reader to pause; lines marking the first sentence; question mark; comment: unclear; abbr. “A”	S5	CI1	A
TR#19	GF: some stylistic issues; wavy line under “done online”; abbr. “R”	S5	CI1	R
TR#20	Comment about thesis statement ⁸	S6	CI2	O
TR#21	Comment about quoting	S6	CI2	TF
TR#22	Comment about language use and lexis	S6	CI2	R/A
TR#23	Comment about use of “firstly, secondly...”	S7	CI2	R
TR#24	Comment about thesis statement	S7	CI2	O
TR#25	Comment about conclusion	S7	CI2	O
TR#26	Written comment: “As your thesis is focused on the role of the individual, then you need to make sure that the examples you choose are things that individuals can control. Here, they can turn off electrical devices, but are powerless to influence illuminated advertising.” ⁹	S7	CI2	TF

⁸ All TR given by CI2 is only briefly described here; the full comment can be found in Appendix B.

⁹ In general, CI2 used oral feedback, but in two cases, the instructor forgot to mention an aspect and added it later to the word-processed correction of the assignment.

TR#27	Comment about relationship between thesis statement and conclusion	S8	CI2	TF
TR#28	Comment about word choice when expressing stance	S8	CI2	A
TR#29	Comment about paragraph structure	S8	CI2	O
TR#30	Comment about quoting	S8	CI2	TF
TR#31	Comment about personal pronouns	S9	CI2	TF/A
TR#32	Comment about quoting	S9	CI2	TF
TR#33	Comment about redundant aspects of text	S9	CI2	TF
TR#34	Comment about the difference between “housing” and “households”	S9	CI2	A
TR#35	Comment about the meaning of the phrase “to play a crucial role”	S10	CI2	A
TR#36	Comment about punctuation	S10	CI2	-
TR#37	Comment about language use	S10	CI2	A/R
TR#38	Written Comment: “Always???”	S10	CI2	A
TR#39	Comment about cohesion	S11	CI2	O
TR#40	Comment about language use	S11	CI2	A
TR#41	Comment about argumentation	S11	CI2	TF
TR#42	Comment about language use	S11	CI2	A/R
TR#43	GF: The essay presents some good points, but it should respond to the main question in the prompt more directly: To what extent do you agree with the statement that law-abiding citizens have nothing to fear? It should not just discuss advantages and disadvantages of mass data surveillance;	S12	CI3	TF
TR#44	GF: The information from Google’s Transparency Report (2012) needs better embedding; arrows at the beginning and end of the sentence; comments: coh. (cohesion), link; missing symbol; abbr. “O (coh)	S12	CI3	O
TR#45	GF: The topic sentence of the third paragraph is ineffective because it does not refer to the main	S12	CI3	O/TF

	idea of the paragraph; two lines marking the sentence; comment: ineffective topic sentence			
TR#46	Wavy line under “it is questionable, though”; comment: ambiguous; abbr. “R”	S12	CI3	R
TR#47	GF: The topic presented in the first part of the introduction is a bit broad: You may want to stick to the topic of the prompt more closely; line marking the sentence; comment: topic	S13	CI3	TF
TR#48	GF: You may want to reconsider the choice of direct quotes (cf. Miller 2013). Use direct quotes if the wording is important or interesting for some reason; otherwise indirect quotes are preferable; line marking the sentence; abbr. “TF”; comment (direct vs. indirect quote)	S13	CI3	TF
TR#49	GF: You could score even more highly in Task Fulfilment if you compare/contrast/evaluate/challenge the given information (see rating scale), so you may want to try some of this in your next assignment;	S13	CI3	TF
TR#50	Wavy line under “the rationale behind”; abbr. “A (voc.)	S13	CI3	A
TR#51	GF: The information taken from Google’s Transparency Report (2012) could be integrated into the paragraph more effectively; arrows between the sentence and the next; comment: coh.	S14	CI3	TF
TR#52	GF: There are several problems with pronoun reference. The referents of some pronouns (“this”, “it”) are not clear or explicit enough; wavy line under “it”; abbr. O (ref?)	S14	CI3	O
TR#53	GF: Some constructions are fairly complex and may strain the reader. Strive to make your writing clear and straightforward and, thus, easy	S14	CI3	A

	to read; abbr. “R”; comment: (simplify constr.!); wavy line next to the construction			
TR#54	Wavy line under “Some reason that”; comment: Ambiguity forced me to pause and reread	S14	CI3	A/R
TR#55	GF: The thesis statement could be more directly linked to the question whether or not law-abiding citizens have nothing [to] fear; two lines marking the thesis statement; comment: cf. main question in prompt	S15	CI3	TF/O
TR#56	GF: Similarly, the conclusion would be more effective if it referred back to this question more explicitly; line to mark the paragraph; comment: refer back to the main question in prompt	S15	CI3	TF/O
TR#57	GF: The last body paragraph could be linked more strongly to the preceding paragraph; two arrows pointing to the previous paragraph; comment: link; comment: to resolve the issue, ...	S15	CI3	O
TR#58	Wavy line under (consumers) “state it as” and (much is known)”over”; abbr. A (voc.)	S15	CI3	A
TR#59	GF: The organization of the paragraphs is generally effective, with occasional lapses in cohesion, for example between the first and second sentence in the second paragraph (“Hence,...”); wavy line under “Hence”; arrows between the first and second sentence; comment: coh.; abbr. “O”	S16	CI3	O
TR#60	GF: The information from Google’s Transparency Report (2012) could have been used more effectively; line marking the sentence; abbr. TF	S16	CI3	TF

TR#61	GF: Some expressions need reconsideration (marked with “R” for range); wavy line under “freedom of staying anonymous”; abbr. “R”	S16	CI3	R
TR#62	Wavy line under “invasion” (privacy invasion), abbr. A (voc.)	S16	CI3	A
TR#63	GF: The information provided by TRUSTe (2012) should be more strongly linked to the main point; arrows between first and second sentence; comment: coh.;	S17	CI3	O
TR#64	GF: Some expressions need reconsideration. They are marked with a wavy line; e.g. “lawfully behaving people”; abbr. “R”	S17	CI3	R
TR#65	Line under “for” (interest for the topic); abbr. A (voc.)	S17	CI3	A
TR#66	Wavy line under “Consequently,” abbr. “O (link)”	S17	CI3	O

After the interviews were conducted and transcribed, the students’/CIs’ answers to each question were coded in the following way:

TR#X_SX_QX

or

TR#X_CIX_QX

The first part, TR#X, refers to the teacher response that has already been described above and can be found in table 1. The second part, SX and CIX, respectively, describes the students (S1-S17; see table 1) and the course instructors (CI1-CI3, see table 1). Lastly, the third part, QX, indicates the questions that have been introduced in section 3.4 (Q1-Q3). The full interview transcripts can be found in appendix C.

4.5.3. Analysis

According to Dörnyei, the data analysis already starts during the transcription and coding phase, since this is when the mode of transcription and the coding scheme is selected, and initial ideas are formed (Dörnyei 2007: 246). The actual analysis, however, is realised in the third and fourth phase, the first refers to producing “analytic memos” (Dörnyei 2007: 254), a stage during which researchers take notes about initial impressions on the object of study, while the latter refers to “interpreting the data and drawing conclusions”

(Dörnyei 2007: 257), which is when the initial impressions are expanded, and summarised into major topics. For the research of this thesis, the third phase has been carried out using handwritten notes, therefore, the subsequent section will directly delve into the fourth phase.

5. Empirical study – findings and discussion

As mentioned in the previous chapter, qualitative content analysis can have both a descriptive and an interpretative part, and since the framework of the research allows for examining discrepancies in understanding feedback, both on a surface level, and on a deeper level, this section will first provide a general overview by examining the amount and extent of discrepancies, and then attempt to gain a deeper understanding of these deviations by scrutinising the participants' stimulated recalls in more detail.

5.1. Manifest level analysis

This first part of the analysis serves as a bird's-eye view of the study, that is to say, it provides a comprehensive perspective of the results that is intended as a broad overview of the relationship between teacher intention and student interpretation of TR.

As a preparation for this examination, the students' and course instructors' responses for each question of every instance of feedback were compared and categorised in terms of the extent of deviation between teacher intention and student interpretation. Instances, in which there was no correlation between the responses were described as having "strong discrepancy", instances in which there was a partial overlap as having "some discrepancy", and instances in which there was a complete overlap as having "no discrepancy". In addition, in the process of coding, it was discovered that there was a total of five occurrences where a participant neglected to give an appropriate answer to one of the three questions, and as a consequence, these instances were excluded from the descriptive analysis, and specified as "unclear response". A comprehensive table showing the extent of deviation can be found in appendix D. The table below depicts the extent of discrepancy for each of the three questions.

Table 2: Amount and percentage of the extent of deviation between student understanding and teacher response

	Q1	(%)	Q2	(%)	Q3	(%)
--	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----

(#) strong discrepancy	11	17,46	16	25,40	24	37,50
(#) some discrepancy	12	19,05	11	19,05	17	26,56
(#) no discrepancy	41	65,08	37	58,73	24	37,50
(#) unclear response	2	-	2	-	1	-

For Q1, students and CIs were supposed to explain what an instance of feedback meant, or in other words, how they interpreted (students) or intended (CIs) it. In the majority of cases, teachers were successful in conveying their message to the students, however, in about 20% of instances, students only partially understood their CIs, and a similar percentage shows no correspondence between the way students and CIs understood the teacher comment. These results are similar, although slightly more successful, to the outcome of Zhao's (2010: 12) study, in which 58% of instances of feedback were utilised with a thorough understanding. Having said that, when taking this number as a frame of reference, it is crucial to mention that Zhao did not directly inquire into the students' understanding, but he actually used the learners' revisions as a basis for his interviews (2010: 9).

Looking at the percentages of the second question, the table illustrates that in a slightly lesser amount of TRs (58%), students and teachers shared very similar ideas on how to revise parts of the students' texts on the basis of the CIs' comments. This is a much higher percentage than the one that Conrad & Goldstein have arrived at when they examined "the relationship between syntactic structure and revision success" (1999: 156); in their study, declaratives were the most successful structure (57%), while questions showed the least success (34%), and the overall success rate was at about 43%. However, the high percentage of my own study has to be interpreted with caution, because students did not have to formulate an explicit revision, but only described hypothetical modifications in general terms, and on top of that, in a substantial amount of instances, CI2 provided their students with a corrected version of their textual problems. As a consequence, the figures

for Q2 cannot be taken at face value, but need to be examined in greater detail in the latent level analysis of this paper (section 5.2).

Finally, the third question shows the extent to which students and CIs showed agreement regarding the significance of a revised version of a student's text, i.e. how revision potentially improves a text. This category bears the worst results, as only a third of instances illustrates a complete correspondence between learners and teachers, while in the exact same number of cases, students had entirely different theories about how a corrected version could improve their essays than their CIs. Unfortunately, I was unable to acquire a research paper that contains comparable numbers, but both Zhao (2010) and Lee (2007) examine cases in which students revised parts of their texts after receiving feedback without understanding the significance of said revision. This also applies to some instances of TRs in my own study, which will be discussed in the subsequent section.

Having made comparisons between the study of this thesis and research that has been carried out by other researchers, it is noteworthy to mention that the descriptive analysis of this paper does not include a comparison between the three course instructors who participated in this examination, even though this kind of juxtaposition is seemingly appropriate. As mentioned in section 4.3, not only do the three teachers favour different approaches to providing feedback to their students' assignments, but they also adopt a host of additional measures to assist learners in developing their writing proficiency that can potentially impact their students' understanding of feedback, and hence, the outcome of such a comparison. In addition, the student sample size for each CI, ranging from 6-8, is relatively low, which would result in a considerably wide fluctuation margin, and therefore in a somewhat inconclusive outcome. Apart from that, researchers also have to consider students' individual, personal characters that also have an impact on the way students utilise feedback (c.f. Clements 2008). Taking all of this into account, it can be concluded that the enormous amount of variables that can potentially affect the way feedback is processed by learners makes this kind of juxtaposition, in this very context, impossible.

All in all, the manifest level analysis of this paper only produces surface-level results. It can be said with certainty that a substantial number of students do not fully understand the intended meaning of their course instructor's comments on their writing, and that an

even higher percentage of learners does not share their teacher's opinion on the significance of using said feedback.

5.2. Latent level analysis

This part of the study, the interpretative analysis, takes a closer look at the students' and teachers' subjective perception on the meaning of TR. During the third phase of qualitative content analysis (memoing), a significant number of reasons that potentially affect discrepancies in interpreting the meaning of TR have been discovered in the interview transcripts. These reasons were scrutinised for their suitability with SCT, and grouped into three categories: communication success, power relations, and institutional influences.

5.2.1. Influences of communicational aspects on providing and receiving feedback

The first section of this analysis examines several factors that can potentially impact whether TR, as an aspect of interaction between instructor and learner, is successful, or whether it results in a breakdown of communication. This includes students facing challenges when communicating their problems, students misunderstanding or misconceiving feedback, or CIs misunderstanding students' texts. Teachers are aware of this situation, and attempt to resolve this issue by adding additional channels of feedback; a method that can be effective, but is highly dependent on the individual student.

Discrepancies sometimes emerge due to communication difficulties

One of these factors is the extent to which learners apply metalinguistic knowledge, i.e. the extent to which students are capable of understanding the terminology used by the teachers, or formulate their interpretation of TR in an exact and accurate fashion. There is a high number of students who are basically on the right track, but they cannot precisely express themselves:

S1: I guess that's about my range and about how this word doesn't really fit into the topic, or into my sentence, as like the next one, the "closing the shops"-one. Maybe it's a little bit of a silly expression.

I: Do you mean, it might be too colloquial, and it should be more formal?

S1: Yes (**TR#1_S1_Q1**)

In this instance, the student realises that the term *attrition* cannot be used in a certain context, but is unable to exactly pinpoint why this is the case, and explains their thought process by defining the word as “a silly expression”. During the interview, I interpreted the student’s specification as colloquial, or informal language, to which they¹⁰ agreed, even though the term is actually inappropriate because it is not idiomatic.

S4: [...] I always try to use different words and somehow exotic words, or good words, and not always the same that I [incomprehensible], so I look for it on the internet and yeah, I sometimes think that this word is cool (laughs), and it fits, and it sounds sophisticated then I use it, but it just doesn’t fit that well.

I: So, again, the word isn’t appropriate for a certain context.

S4: Mhm, it’s about linguistic accuracy and linguistic range. That’s the problem here. **(TR#15_S4_Q1)**

S12: I think that I tend to use very specific vocabulary, which is, when you use too much of it, it gets a hard read, and in some situations it is better to use easier vocabulary, easier words to really state your point and to make clear what you want to say and I think if I would do this more often, then my essays would be better in general, I have to find a mixture of words and phrases which kind of make it professional, but also easy to understand and that did not really answer your question, I know but. **(TR#46_S12_Q3)**

Similarly to S1 in the instance discussed before, the students in these two extracts (S4 & S12) experience similar difficulties when attempting to describe the kind of terminology that they are striving to use, but are not fully capable of incorporating into their essays. Both students are lacking the language to accurately label their lexis, but they do show different levels of progression. S4 describes this type of language as “sophisticated”, “cool”, or “exotic”, and is unable to clearly specify what they are trying to accomplish, but it is likely that the participant is attempting to refer to the term ‘formal register’. S12, on the other hand, uses the phrase “very specific vocabulary”, and the term “professional”, in order to refer to the same style of language, and as these terms are more closely related to ‘formal register’, they are capable of communicating their needs more effectively. In both cases, learners show a lack of metalinguistic knowledge, but, depending on the

¹⁰ In order to ensure complete anonymity, all students and course instructors are addressed using a form of the plural pronoun *they*.

individual's language proficiency, learners are sometimes able to circumvent this problem by successfully paraphrasing their difficulties.

Unfortunately, the limited scope of this thesis does not allow for an analysis of the subsequent phase of interaction between student and course instructor, therefore, on the basis of the extracts above, it is unreasonable to make predictions as to the extent to which metalinguistic knowledge affects communication. On the one hand, it is possible that experienced CIs can easily deduce the learners' intended meaning, but on the other hand, this kind of ambiguous language could potentially result in misunderstandings.

Breakdown of communication due to a lack of student understanding

In various cases, the student does not (fully) understand teacher's feedback, but they do not convey the true scope of the problem to their CI. Here is a stereotypical example for when a learner misinterprets a CI's feedback.

S5: Cohesion, I think that they mean, or they mean that the sentences aren't written very fluently, that there is some sort of difficulty in understanding what I mean.

I: Okay. So, in this sentence, or in the first sentence of the paragraph, it's hard to understand what you mean?

S5: Yes, and what I mean by using "they", "they provide a foundation for".

I: Oh, what you're referring to when you're using "they".

S5: Exactly. **(TR#17_S5_Q1)**

CI1: There needs to be some connection between their statement and the direct quotation, and that's missing, oddly enough, it works if the quotation marks are deleted, but you can't do that, because it's a direct quotation. **(TR#17_CI1_Q2)**

In this case, the teacher provided global feedback stating "some issues with cohesion", and specified a particular part of the text by writing "cohesion" next to the text. The student interprets this as an issue with pronoun references, but the teacher actually intended to tell the learner that one of their sentences and a quote are not properly linked. Here is another example (TR#51).

S14: That I should have used the Google transparency report or that graph more, or better, or more, cause I just wrote one, one part of the graph, but I didn't refer to a lot more, and apparently I should have.

I: Okay, so basically they're saying you're not using it effectively and you think that it means that you haven't used all of it, or you should have used more of it.

S14: Not all of it, but more of it. **(TR#51_S14_Q1)**

I: I've just realised this, but this is very similar to feedback you gave on the first essay (=TR#44), do you basically mean the same thing? **(TR#51_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: It's very similar, that's exactly right, so it's to do with how the given information is incorporated into the text, whether it's well integrated, or just added on some words, that's exactly what I mean, so this is very similar to the other piece of information, to the other piece of feedback.

[...] this is again a feature that we find in many students essays, is they, students pick information, most of the time the information is meaningful, most of the time the information relates to the main point of the paragraph, but it's not embedded into their own text, so we find something like, students, you know, suggest an idea, then they pick some information from the quotation, but there is no link, no sort of, the link is not direct enough between their own point and the given information [...] **(TR#44_CI3_Q1)**

In TR#51, the teacher suggests that "the information taken from [...] [the source] could be integrated into the paragraph more effectively". While the student believes that they should have utilised a more substantial portion of the source, the CI expected the learner to link the reference more closely to their own text.

In a study that examines potential reasons for revision success, the researcher concluded that in order to be effective, feedback requires directness, clarity, and a large amount of information (Tee Pei Leng 2013: 395). This is arguably a reasonable suggestion, but it is crucial to point out that this is not a general principle that applies to all cases; this becomes apparent by comparing TR#51 with another example:

I: So what does this mean to you? I think in the global feedback it says it needs to be embedded more effectively.

S12: That what I wrote does not directly respond to the topic sentence, which I wrote wasn't too good either, but it should be embedded in a way that I introduce the topic with the first sentence and then use this statistic as a way to support my topic sentence, and after that maybe write one or two sentences, which link it back, you know, which links this part back to the main idea which I had in this paragraph, and especially the sentence that comes after that does not really have anything to do with the main idea, it's more like a new idea or something, yeah, it's just there and it doesn't fit together. **(TR#44_S12_Q1)**

S12 and S14 have received an almost identical feedback on the same textual problem, but while S14 infers a different meaning than CI3 intended, S12 is capable of understanding the instance of feedback exactly as it was planned. Therefore, it can be concluded that it

is not solely the form of the TR, that is responsible for the success of student comprehension, but a learner's personal qualities and skills also play a crucial role.

I believe that the main problem in these instances is the lack of features, such as back-channels (e.g. nodding), or requests for clarification that are utilised in oral communication to ensure mutual understanding. As this is simply not possible in the context of an interaction that consists of providing and receiving written feedback, in this kind of communication, the interlocutors only have a single chance at getting their intended meaning across to each other. CIs usually attempt to avoid this problem by adding additional feedback channels, like one-on-one conferences, or presentations on common mistakes (c.f. section 4.3.2).

Breakdown of communication due to student misconception

A similar, but slightly different problem occurs when students misconceive a TR to have a certain meaning, when the teacher actually intended something entirely different. This can be observed in this example (TR#13):

S4: I thought that I explained it in the paragraph as a whole, but somehow they thought that it would need more examples and explanation, so, I thought it was clear, because I discussed it in the argument and the argument was based on the consequences, but maybe I could write some more examples at the end.

I: So you don't fully agree, but you interpret it in a way that it needs more examples, but you feel like it's clear enough.

S4: I understand it, but I thought it was clear enough, but I know what they meant, so, yeah. **(TR#13_S4_Q1)**

CI1: Kind of means what it says, but the point here is that they write this argument, and then they end the argument, "as a matter of fact, the economy of a city is highly dependent on local businesses" if you end the sentence like that, you're opening another question, and the question is why, that question also needs to be answered in some ways, you can't end a paragraph with an open question, in another text you might be able to give the answer in the next paragraph, but that's not happening here, so if you say that, if you claim that this is not the case, because cities are dependent on local businesses you should give an example why and how they are dependent, because otherwise the argument just breaks, because you're supporting a claim with another claim that is not supported, so the argumentation is not working well here. **(TR#13_CI1_Q1)**

While S4 believes that CI1 wants them to support their argument using additional examples, the teacher explains that the student's existing, supporting example is actually

a claim and therefore does not validate the argument. The main problem here is not that the learner misinterprets the comment, but that they are certain about having properly understood the CI. This is highly problematic, because in an instance in which the student is not (fully) capable of understanding a certain TR, they could usually exploit one of the other feedback channels in order to improve comprehension, but given the fact that they feel confident about their perception of the mistake, it is unlikely that they will seek for clarification.

Communication difficulties originating from CIs potentially misinterpreting students' intended meaning

The three examples described above (TR#13, TR#17, TR#51) illustrate that students sometimes cannot accurately interpret what a CI intends to communicate to them with a certain comment. However, the same applies for the educators as well, as they occasionally cannot make sense of what the student wanted to express with a stretch of discourse, so they can only attempt to interpret the student. One of these instances can be seen in the extract below:

S6: Definitely. However, I don't see my thesis statement in a way that they actually understood my thesis statement.

I: You think they didn't understand it and when they rephrased it, it didn't have the original meaning?

S6: No, it did, they rephrased it in a better way, but they, in my opinion they didn't quite change the meaning that, so my original thesis statement still holds, in my opinion, the same meaning that they just rephrased. However, it is written very confusedly and probably quite easy to misunderstand, so I assume that they misunderstood actually the intended meaning of my thesis statement and rephrased it the way I actually intended it, however, the way I phrased it, I already intended it that way. **(TR#20_S6_Q1)**

In their feedback, the CI mentioned that the thesis statement does not correspond to what S6 writes about in their body paragraphs. That being said, the student criticises that CI2 has misunderstood the intended meaning of the thesis statement, because, according to S6, the rephrased version that the teacher provided conveys exactly the same as the student's original one. Therefore, the TR is not entirely successful, as it should have focussed on the learner's language instead. CI2 describes the challenge of interpreting their students as such:

CI2: [...] because often these students who have these problems, when I just read the essay, I can't give them good feedback, because I don't really know what they were thinking when they were writing [...] (TR#33)

Taking all of this into account, similarly to what has been mentioned about students, a lack of teacher comprehension (of student writing) can also result in a breakdown of communication.

Potential solution to prevent breakdown of communication – the addition of another layer of interaction

The CI who specifies their issues with interpreting student texts, also offers a potential solution by adding another feedback channel into their teaching:

CI2: [...] so sometimes, obviously, I can't do this for every student, because I would never be finished, but occasional I say to a student, "okay, when you're writing your essay and the things that you struggle with, write in the track changes what you're thinking and then I'll pick up on that and tell you, you know, yes, you're right what you're thinking, or no, this is what the problem is" [...] so these kind of things, I don't know if this is helping them, but if I know what exactly the problem is that they're thinking about when they're writing it, and then respond to that then I think we might have an impact, to sort of see where they went wrong from the point of view of the reader. (TR#33_CI2_Q1)

CI2 explains that Microsoft Word offers the option to insert comments next to a text, and in some cases, when students are having difficulties, the teacher offers them to describe the problem they are dealing with, or the message that they want to communicate, so that the CI does not have to interpret the student's writing, and can therefore provide more relevant, constructive feedback.

More interaction does not necessarily facilitate understanding

A similar approach is taken by CI1, who adds a feedback channel by offering their students to have a one-on-one conference during their office hours, in the course of which they discuss the students' problems in greater detail. Participants S2 and S3 seized this opportunity, and in the interview, they mentioned that this has led to a more thorough understanding of the teacher's response. However, in several instances, there was still some or even strong discrepancy between their understanding and the instructor's intention.

I: What does this mean to you? (TR#11_S3_Q1)

S3: I had a problem with stylistic issues, because stylistic issues have been very vague I think, it's always the preference of the reader, I guess,

I: Did you talk about this with CI1?

S3: Yeah, I did, and they said that "has gone through" is not a very nice way of saying it, and I shouldn't use it.

I: Did they further explain "not a nice way" or do you know what they means with "not a nice way"?

S3: Well, they has, like "get" is a forbidden word, so we can't use it, and I put it in the list of not using the words, like "has gone through" is on the forbidden list now (laughs).

I: What does that mean? **(TR#11_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: That it's colloquial bordering on the poetic, and it should be more formal.

I: Alright if the student had to change this, what should he or she do?

(TR#11_CI1_Q2)

CI1: "has changed", so just, you know, just be less poetic, "has changed".

I: And then how would this improve to text? **(TR#11_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: More concise, nothing serious.

In this case, after talking to CI1, the student does understand that the use of "has gone through" is stylistically problematic, but they are still unclear about the exact reason, since the learner mentions a "forbidden word", while the teacher explains that the level of formality is not appropriate in this context. As the one-on-one conference between student and CI has not been recorded, it cannot be clarified how this discrepancy has emerged, so any attempt at explanation would be pure speculation. The only conclusion that can be made with certainty, is the fact that additional conversations between student and teacher do not necessarily result in complete understanding, but in some instances, supplementary information from a teacher can facilitate learner comprehension.

5.2.2. Influences of power relations on the reception of feedback

As discussed in the theoretical part (e.g. section 2.7), applications within the original concept of the ZPD are often criticised because of the hierarchical relationship between teacher and learner, and therefore certain aspects of Feuerstein's MLE were added to the theoretical foundation of this paper. Through this modification, the relationship has been redefined as an equal and collaborative one, i.e. a relationship that involves equal interests, in which educator and student perceive each other as peers, and work towards a common goal. This kind of relationship is crucial for development, because it implies an active participant, who shows intrinsic motivation to improve themselves, instead of a passive recipient, who merely acts for the sake of the teacher. In practical terms, a CI who

grades their learners, and is therefore capable of having a significant impact on the student's future, does not (always) represent an equal and collaborative partner. The example below illustrates how this can affect student understanding:

S6: [...], because in my opinion, the way I've written it, the language use felt fine to me, and while there are some cases where I can see from my corrections, okay this sounds better and this word might be more appropriate in that context than another word, it doesn't necessarily show me how to really improve my language use, because it still doesn't make me feel that my choice of words was wrong in any way, so I could say, next time when I use this word in that case, no I shouldn't do that, because this kind of language use is inappropriate in this context. So this was kind of the biggest thing for me to think of and this is the most difficult part to imagine myself improving [...] **(TR#22_S6_Q1)**

I: Okay, so basically you would use their corrections as a model and then imitate those in future essays.

S6: In future essays corrected by him/her.

I: So if you had another teacher, then you would use ...

S6: Yeah. Because what if the other teacher tells me that this is not the way to use it [...] **(TR#22_S6_Q2)**

In this instance, S6 does not agree with CI2 that their choice of language was inappropriate; i.e. the student does not see the teacher as a peer who is aiming to achieve a common goal, but as a superordinate, who sets arbitrary objectives that are potentially different to the objectives set by another CI. With regard to the question of revision, S6 mentions that they would only implement the feedback in future essays if they are corrected by CI2. The main problem with this attitude is not that the student disagrees with the teacher, but that from this point on, interaction in respect to this type of language use no longer takes place, as the feedback is only addressed for a brief period of time (until the end of the course) and then neglected. Alternatively, in an ideal situation, the student could address their disagreement with the comment, stimulate a discussion about the significance of a revision, and potentially improve their language use in the course of this communication.

Similar student remarks can also be found in a number of other interviews (e.g. TR#36, TR#62):

S10: Yeah, I'd add it for their sake (laughs), because I know they put a lot of emphasis on using colons, semi-colons, but if I would rewrite this entire essay, I'd still leave it as I had it before. **(TR#36_S10_Q2)**

S16: That they don't like this word. (TR#62_S16_Q1)

Again, the learners do not perceive their teacher as an equal partner, who is trying to assist them in becoming better writers, but S10 and S16 believe that the TR is the result of a personal choice, and instead of confronting the CIs with their opinion, they pretend to agree with their teachers. I do not intend to criticise the students for avoiding confrontation, because due to the hierarchical relationship, they are in an unfavourable position in which they have to act strategically. A potential solution for this issue has already been introduced partially, as students taking the CFT exam (the final test after the two writing composition courses ILSS1+2) cannot be graded by teachers whose courses they attended. In addition to this measure, I would propose that the graded assignments that students have to produce as course-work during the semester should be assessed by different course instructors too, because this adjustment would fundamentally change the role of the teacher to a more equal partner for the learners, and consequently allow them to have a more open conversation about their feedback.

5.2.3. Institutional influences on providing and understanding feedback

One of the key aspects in SCT is the idea that mental functions do not always undergo the same stages of development, but they are determined (or at least influenced) by their surroundings, or in other words, by the institutional, historical, and cultural context (c.f. section 2.3). In Section 4.2, in order to remain within the scope of a diploma thesis, it was decided that the research of this paper focusses on the institutional context. This context was then described as being profoundly influenced by the CFT exam (c.f. section 4.2).

The assessment scale of the CFT influences the teachers', and students' metalinguistic language

This becomes apparent when analysing the terminology that is utilised both in the feedback, and in the interviews, as teachers and students tend to apply the terms accuracy, range, or task fulfilment, in order to describe language use, or the significance of revision (e.g. TR#1_S1_Q1, TR#36_CI2_Q3, TR#53_CI3_Q3, TR#64_S17_Q3). I do not suggest that this is problematic, since CIs are required to introduce the rating scheme in their teaching, and it is necessary for students to become acquainted with the assessment

scale to be able to prepare for the CFT. This procedure is actually conducive for the development of the students' writing proficiency, because they are forced to engage with terminology that allows them to describe and specify their language use, but unfortunately, in some cases, this terminology is used purely in terms of assessment:

I: So, if you had changed this, how would it improve the essay? **(TR#64_S17_Q3)**

S17: Well, if this is incorrect, I guess my accuracy would be a bit higher.

It can also be observed that CIs are heavily influenced by the CFT and its rating scale:

CI3: That's right, it's to do with text organisation, we consider the thesis statement of the text organisation, this is our assessment criteria, and in fact the thesis statement is a very important part of our assessment criteria, if there is no thesis statement, or even an ineffective thesis statement, then students can score a maximum of two out of five in text organisation **(TR#55)**

Here, the CI refers directly to the significance of the thesis statement for the assessment, and how well a student can do when using an "ineffective thesis statement". This is similar to another extract:

CI3: Well, this was actually quite a good text, as you can see from the score, what we're trying to do then is, we try to, you know, encourage them to aim for more, and this piece of feedback relates to our rating scale descriptors, and to score top band five points in task fulfilment, students have to compare, contrast, challenge and evaluate the information **(TR#49_CI3_Q1)**

In this instance, the teacher directly references the rating scale in which the top score for task fulfilment specifies that "the student [...] has fully grasped the contents of the sources and compares/contrasts/evaluates/challenges information/viewpoints" (2017b: 2). In addition, CIs not only use the CFT and its assessment criteria as a framework of reference, but they also provide tips on what to avoid during the exam:

(TR#32_CI2_Q1), and so again, these are points I pick up on, because they're so crucial, they're so key to the CFT essay, and they need to get that right, because of people will forgive a lot of things to do with, when I say people I talk about the other markers, because for the CFT, I'm not marking my students, they're marked by somebody else [...]

Teachers' short- and long-term goals when providing feedback

In this instance, the teacher highlights the significance of the formal guidelines of quoting, because graders place great value on this aspect of writing, and therefore, this information could be crucial for passing the CFT.

CI2: [...] it was true like years ago, you said, don't use any "I", or "we", or anything, but that is changing and people do use that, however, so we have a problem here, because for the point, for the CFT, if they write like that, they will be picked up, and they will be downgraded, so they shouldn't do it for the CFT
(TR#31)

This is similar to TR#32, as the CI provides a piece of practical advice for the CFT, saying that the student should not use personal pronouns when writing the text for the exam. However, the teacher also mentions that language is changing, and that these terms are used more frequently in academic writing today. This illustrates the CI's struggle to guide their students through the CFT, while at the same time preparing them for the future. In a number of other extracts, it can be observed that the teacher actually expresses the idea of a short term, and a long term goal:

CI2: Yeah, I mean the point is, for me, this feedback is about, like the whole process of writing, and the idea, that, you know, what I hope, I mean, I don't know if this is idealistic, but what I'm hoping to do is to train them to be good writers, not just to write an essay to pass the CFT **(TR#30_CI2_Q1)**, that's their immediate goal, but, for me, there's a bigger thing, A enabling them to express themselves, and B, if you can be a good writer, you've got a very strong skill set

These goals are frequently repeated during the interview:

CI2: Yeah, this is another can of worms, because, again, this ties in a little bit to what I said about how, in my mind of what I'm doing, I have a greater goal than the CFT

CI2: I don't want that student to think, oh this is really bad, so they should see that that was actually good and it supported their argument, however, the smaller goal, as we keep saying, is a CFT

CI2: Exactly, in this bigger goal that I have, which is beyond the CFT.

During the interview, CI2 placed great emphasis on preparing their students for the future, and not only teaching to the test; I do not mean to suggest that CI1 and CI3 are not sharing this prospective, as this aspect was not really part of the interview, and therefore they have not been asked directly about this topic, so it is understandable that they have not

prioritised the issue in their responses. Nevertheless, there are also a number of instances in which CI1 and CI3 mention the significance of some aspects of their feedback beyond the CFT:

CI1: I'm not sure if it weakens the thing, but it's the beginning of a bad habit and it's not so important in the ILSS essays, this is more for later on, so I and most of the other lecturers see the ILSS essays as preparation for your proseminar papers, seminar papers, that sort of thing and the idea is, should always be, that your argument should be concise and to the point, **(TR#4)**

Here, the teacher describes how they (all course instructors) perceive the ILSS courses as a preparation for academic writing in general. Therefore, even though a textual problem in the student's text did not have a great impact, CI1 does not want to contribute to the formation of "a bad habit". Lastly, in the instance below, CI3 explains the reasoning behind the strict guidelines for argumentative writing for the CFT:

CI3: This would then satisfy our definition of what an introduction in this specific text type looks like, and remember this is text type is very, sort of, guided, it's very, sort of, very much defined in terms of what the moves are, it's very predictable in that sense, but at that level, we feel that this what students need to develop, their writing skills, they need to be more flexible later on, and be more flexible in their application of text type features. **(TR#47_CI3_Q3)**

The teacher explains that they believe that it is necessary to have students focus on a text format that has very strict guidelines at the beginning of their studies, so that they have something to hold on to during the initial stages of developing writing, so that later on, they are can employ a more flexible approach.

Taking this all into account, it becomes clear that the CFT and its assessment scale have an enormous impact on teacher feedback, but also on student understanding. This institutional influence is not necessarily a negative factor, as it facilitates the acquisition of metalinguistic knowledge, an aspect that, as discussed earlier, is crucial for the interaction between student and CI. However, there is also a risk that this influence results in a 'teaching to the test'-format, as it is logical that educators are striving towards properly preparing their students for the CFT. This tendency has not been observed in the study of this paper, as the interviews have shown that the three teachers are focussing both on preparing their learners for the final exam, and on training them to become better writers.

5.2.4. Summary of the research findings and limitations of the study

The in-depth analysis of student-, and teacher interviews have shown that the development of learners' cognitive functions is influenced by discrepancies between student understanding and teacher intention. These differences are a consequence of incommunicative aspects like metalinguistic knowledge, or misunderstandings, the nature of the relationship between CI and student, and the assessment scale of the common final test as part of the institutional setting.

A high number of differences are linked to communication success, i.e. whether interlocutors are able to convey their intended meaning of, and/or whether they are able to accurately comprehend each other. Feedback interaction between course instructor and student are not successful when students lack the language to precisely describe their problems, or when the two parties misunderstand or misconceive each other.

In addition to these interactional aspects, discrepancies between intention and understanding can also be the consequence of a perceived, imbalanced relationship between teacher and learner. When students believe that their instructors do not share the same objectives, but are primarily concerned with grading them, it can result in a one-side break in communication. In other words, learners start neglecting their teacher's feedback (for one aspect or several), and therefore no longer make use of this method to develop their writing proficiency.

Moreover, not only the specific setting created by the educators, but also the general institutional context influences the way students and teachers communicate. This becomes evident when one considers the impact that the CFT rating scale has on both parties. In some instances this can be helpful, e.g. for providing a shared register on certain language areas, but sometimes this impact can be obstructive, especially when students primarily focus on assessment instead of personal progression. With regard to the educators, the institutional setting results in a complex tension between preparing students for the exam, while at the same time attempting to make them more proficient writers.

Finally it is noteworthy to mention that the study involves certain limitations that are mostly related to a lack of resources, or the limited scope of this thesis. As the interviews are based on a single unit of analysis (teacher response), in many cases there was a lack of information on the (feedback) interaction between student and teacher outside of the response to student writing on their assignments. Therefore, a follow-up study could utilise additional pieces of information, such as one-on-one conferences, or classroom activities. Additionally, it was mentioned in the methodology section that convenience sampling was conducting in this study; this is likely to have an effect on the representativeness of the findings, as the research does not offer a broad range of learners, but mostly students who were either participated, because they were confident in their writing, or because they planned to accept my offer to provide them with additional feedback. In a subsequent study, it would be interesting to work with a higher number of learners, so that a selective process of sampling can be adopted.

6. Conclusion

Providing feedback on student writing is not just a tool that allows teachers to point out students' mistakes, or to indicate aspects that could be improved, but feedback is actually part of an interaction between educator and learner that ideally results in the development of writing proficiency. In Sociocultural Theory (SCT), interaction is the key principle to understanding how people develop, as they cannot progress their abilities in isolation, but only with the assistance of other, more capable people (or objects). A student who did not receive any feedback on their writing would not be able to improve, but repeat the same series of steps over and over again. However, the existence of teacher response does not automatically result in learner development.

The study that has been conducted in the course of this thesis has attempted to locate discrepancies between teacher intention and student understanding of feedback on three levels: the meaning of TR, its use for revision, and its significance for writing proficiency. The findings of this study have shown that the written feedback interaction between student and course instructor (prompt – student writing – feedback – revision) is distinctly different from oral feedback interaction, because it does not involve interactional features like back-channels or requests for clarification, which are typical in this type of oral

communication to ensure successful communication. This lack is a potential reason for a more considerable number of misunderstandings, or for breakdowns in communication, which consequently also results in a discontinuation of development. Another reason for discrepancies is the relationship between teacher and learner; as modern iterations of SCT suggest that an equal, collaborative relation is the most effective for development.

The research of this paper has suggested that in some cases, students bring the communication to their course instructors to an end, because they do not perceive them to be a partner who has the same objective, but merely a person who grades their assignments. As a consequence, students simulate development by implementing the CI's feedback only for the time that the learners are graded by them. These circumstances could be improved by strictly differentiating between graders and course instructors. Lastly, SCT suggests that development does not always follow the same path, but it is determined by contextual factors like the institutional setting. In regards to this study, one of the main factors impacting the way feedback is provided and understood, is the final test at the end of the writing composition module. This factor has an impact on the language students and course instructors use, and due to the strict rating scale of the exam, there is the risk that feedback becomes a means of teaching to the test. In spite of that, the findings of this study have proven that the CIs are not only striving towards preparing their learners for the CFT, but they also show a deep devotion towards training students to become better writers in general.

All in all, I believe that the main conclusion that can be drawn from this thesis, is the fact that feedback is anything but straightforward; there is a tremendous amount of variables that can potentially influence the way TR is understood by the learners, and in addition, individual, personal factors play a crucial role too. Similar comments often result in different interpretations, and it is impossible to formulate general guidelines for the use of feedback that would result in full correspondence between teacher intention and learner understanding. The only thing teachers can do is attempt to cater to their students' needs, to offer additional feedback channels in order to facilitate understanding, and to create an atmosphere in which students feel like an equal partner, so that they can feel safe when entering an interaction with their teacher.

7. References

- Agbayahoun, Juvenale, Patinvoh. 2016. "Teacher written feedback on student writing: teachers' and learners' perspectives". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 6(10), 1895-1904.
- Aljaafreh, Ali; Lantolf, James, P. 1994. "Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development". *The Modern Language Journal* 78(4), 465-483.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, Mikhailovich. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. In Emerson, Caryl; Holquist, Michael (eds.), McGee, Vern, W. (trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bazerman, Charles. 2016. "What do sociocultural studies of writing tell us about learning to write?". In MacArthur, Charles, A.; Graham, Steve; Fitzgerald, Jill (eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd edition). London: The Guilford Press, 11-23.
- Beach, Richard; Newell, George, E.; VanDerHeide, Jennifer. 2016. "A sociocultural perspective on writing development: towards an agenda for classroom research on students' use of social practices". In MacArthur, Charles, A.; Graham, Steve; Fitzgerald, Jill (eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd edition). London: The Guilford Press, 88-101.
- Bitchener, John; Storch, Neomy. 2016. *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
- Bruner, Jerome Seymour. 1986. *Actual minds, possible words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1966. *Language as symbolic action: essays on life, literature, and method*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Chaiklin, Seth. 2003. "The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction". In Kozulin, Alex (ed.). *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 39-64.
- Clements, Peter. 2008. "Instructors' written comments on students' compositions in an intensive English program: international standards, local pressures". *Bulletin of Faculty of Education*, 199-212.

- Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence; Morrison, Keith. 2011. *Research methods in education*. (7th edition). London: Routledge.
- Connors, Robert, J.; Lunsford, Andrea, A. 1993. "Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers". *College Composition and Communication* 44, 200-223.
- Communication, 44, 200–223.
- Conrad, Susan, M.; Goldstein, Lynn, M. 1999. "ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: text, contexts, and individuals". *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8(2), 147-179.
- Cole, Michael. 1995 "Socio-cultural-historical psychology: some general remarks and a proposal for a new kind of cultural genetic methodology". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 187-214.
- Cumming, Alister. 2016. "Theoretical orientations to L2 writing". In Manchón, Rosa; Matsuda, Paul, Kei (eds). *Handbook of second and foreign language writing*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 65- 88.
- Department of English / University of Vienna. 2017a. *CFT: test specifications: ILSS student information*. https://spl-anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/i_anglistik/Department/ELC/CFT_Specifications_October_2017.pdf (20. Sept. 2019)
- Department of English / University of Vienna. 2017b. *Rating scale: common final test: integrated language & study skills* https://spl-anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/i_anglistik/Department/ELC/Rating_Scale_September_2017.pdf (20. Sept. 2019)
- Devrim, Devo, Y. 2014. "Theorizing written feedback as a mediation tool within the Sydney school's genre pedagogy: a focus on ZPD and scaffolding". *Functional Linguistics* 1(1), 1-13.
- Dewey, John. 1938. *Logic: the theory of inquiry*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engeström, Yrjo. 1999. "Activity theory and individual social transformation". In Engeström, Yrjo; Miettinen, Reijo; Punamäki, Raija-Leena (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fabes, Richard; Martin, Carol, Lynn. 2001. *Exploring development through childhood*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ferris, Dana, R.; Liu, Hsiang; Sinha, Aparna; Senna, Manuel. 2013. "Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers". *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22, 307-329.
- Feuerstein, Reuven; Feuerstein, S. 1991. "Mediated learning experience: a theoretical review. In Feuerstein, Reuven; Klein, Pnina, S.; Tannenbaum, Abraham, J. (eds.). *Mediated learning experience (MLE): theoretical, psychosocial and learning implications*. London: Freund Publishing House Ltd., 3-52.
- Feuerstein, Reuven; Rand, Ya'acov, Hoffman, Mildred, B. 1979. *Dynamic assessment of retarded performers*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Feuerstein, Reuven; Rand, Ya'acov, Rynders, John, E. 1988. *Don't accept me as I am. Helping retarder performers excel*. New York: Plenum.
- Gauvain, Mary. 2008. "Vygotsky's sociocultural theory". In Haith, Marshall, M.; Benson, Janette, B. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of infant and early childhood development*. Vol 1. Amsterdam: Elsevier Academic Press, 404-413.
- Goldstein, Lynn, M. 2004. "Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: teachers and students working together". *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 63-80.
- Hyland, Fiona. 2003. "Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback". *System* 31(2), 217-230.
- Hyland, Fiona; Hyland, Ken. 2001. "Sugaring the pill: praise and criticism in written feedback". *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, 185-212.
- Kinginger, Celeste. 2002. "Defining the zone of proximal development in US foreign language education". *Applied Linguistics* 23(2), 240-261.
- Kozulin, Alex. 2002. "Sociocultural theory and the mediated learning experience". *School Psychology International* 23(1), 7-35.
- Kozulin, Alex; Presseisen, Barbara, Z. 1995. „Mediated learning experience and psychological tools: Vygotsky's and Feuerstein's perspectives in a study of student learning". *Educational Psychologist* 30(2), 67-75.
- Krashen, Stephan. 1985. *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. London: Longman.

- Lantolf, James, P.; Appel, Gabriela. 1994. *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Westport: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Lantolf, James, P.; Thorne, Steven, L. 2006. *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Younghwa. 2007. "Teacher responses and student interpretations in an EFL composition classroom". *English Teaching* 62(2), 101-121.
- Lidz, Carol, S. 1991. "MLE components and their roots in theory and research". In Feuerstein, Reuven; Klein, Pnina, S.; Tannenbaum, Abraham, J. (eds.). *Mediated learning experience (MLE): theoretical, psychosocial and learning implications*. London: Freund Publishing House Ltd., 271-294.
- Long, Michael. 1985. "Input and second language acquisition theory". In Gass, Susan, M.; Madden, Carolyn, G. (eds.). *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 377-393.
- Matusov, Eugene. 2015. "Vygotsky's theory of human development and new approaches to education". In Smelser, Neil, J.; Baltes, Paul, B. (eds.). *International encyclopedia of social & behavioural sciences Vol. 20*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 316-321.
- Nassaji, Hossein; Swain, Merrill. 2000. "A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: the effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles". *Language Awareness* 9(1), 34-51.
- Newman, Fred; Holzman, Lois. 2005 [1993]. *Lev Vygotsky: revolutionary scientist*. London: Routledge.
- Nurmukhamedov, Ulugbek; Kim, Soo, Hyon. 2010. "'Would you perhaps consider...': hedged comments in ESL writing". *ELT Journal* 64(3), 272-282.
- Olsen, David, R. 1995. "Writing and the mind". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 95-123.
- Palincsar, Annemarie, Sullivan. 1998. "Keeping the metaphor of scaffolding fresh – a response to C. Addison Stone's "the metaphor of scaffolding: it's utility for the field of learning disabilities"". *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 31(4), 370-373.

- Poehner, Matthew, E. 2008. *Dynamic assessment: a Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. New York: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Río, Pablo, del; Alvarez, Amelia. 1995. "Tossing, praying, and thinking: the changing architectures of mind and agency". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 215-248.
- Robbins, Dorothy. 2003. *Vygotsky's and A. A. Leontiev's semiotics and psycholinguistics. Applications for education, second language acquisition, and theories of language*. Westport: Praeger.
- Rogoff, Barbara. 1995. "Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 139-164.
- Stern, Lesa, A.; Solomon, Amanda. 2006. "Effective faculty feedback: the road less travelled". *Assessing Writing* 11, 22-41.
- Stetsenko, Anna, P. 1999. "Social interaction, cultural tools and the zone of proximal development: in search for synthesis". In Chaiklin, Seth; Hedegaard, Mariane; Jensen, Uffe, Juul (eds.). *Activity theory and social practice: cultural historical approaches*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Stone, C. Addison. 1998. "The metaphor of scaffolding: its utility for the field of learning disabilities". *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 31(4), 344-364.
- Tee Pei Leng, Kelly. 2013. "An analysis of written feedback on ESL students' writing". *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 123, 389-397.
- Tharp, Roland; Gallimore, Ronald. 1988. "A theory of teaching as assisted performance". In Light, Paul; Sheldon, Sue; Woodhead, Martin (eds.). *Child development in social context. Vol 2: learning to think*. London: Routledge, 32-41.
- Thorne, Steven, L. 2000. "Second language acquisition and the truth(s) about relativity". In Lantolf, James, P. (ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 219-243.
- Toomela, Aaro. 2015. "What are higher psychological functions?". *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 50 (1), 91-121.

- Tsunoda, Tadanobu. 1995. "An approach to an integrated sensorimotor system in the human central brain and a subconscious computer". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 124-138
- Tzuriel, David. 2001. *Dynamic assessment of young children*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Tzuriel, David. 2013. "Mediated learning experience and cognitive modifiability". *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology* 12(1), 59-80.
- Universität Wien. 2013 [2002]. *Curriculum für das Bachelorstudium English and American studies*.
https://senat.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/s_senat/konsolidierte_Bachelorcurricula/BA_EnglishAmericanStudies.pdf (20. Sept. 2019).
- Valsiner, Jaan. 2012. *A guided science. History of psychology in the mirror of its making*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Valsiner, Jaan; van der Veer, René. 1993. "The encoding of distance: the concept of the zone of proximal development and its interpretations". In Cocking, Rodney, R.; Renninger, K., Ann (eds.). *The development and meaning of psychological distance*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vygotsky, Lev, Semyonovich. 1966. "Genesis of the higher mental functions". In Light, Paul; Sheldon, Sue; Woodhead, Martin (eds.). *Child development in social context. Vol 2: learning to think*. London: Routledge, 32-41.
- Vygotsky, Lev, Semyonovich. 1978. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cole, Michael; John-Steiner, Vera; Scribner, Sylvia; Souberman, Ellen (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, Lev, Semyonovich. 1997. *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. Volume 4. The history of the development of higher mental functions*. In Rieber, Robert, W. (ed.). New York: Plenum Press.
- Vygotsky, Lev, Semyonovich; Luria, Aleksandr, Romanovitch. 1993. *Studies on the history of behavior: ape, primitive, and child*. In Golod, Victor, I.; Knox, Jane, E. (eds. and trans.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Wells, Gordon. 1998. "Using L1 to master L2: a response to Antón and DiCamilla's 'Socio-Cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom'". *Modern Language Journal* 83(2), 248-254.
- Wells, Gordon. 1999. *Dialogic inquiry: towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, James, V. 1985. *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, James, V. 1991. *Voices of the mind: a sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, James, V. 1993. "Commentary". *Human Development* 36, 168-171.
- Wertsch, James, V. 1995. "The need for action in sociocultural research". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 56-74.
- Wertsch, James, V. 1998. *Mind as action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia. 1995. "Sociocultural studies: history, action and mediation". In Wertsch, James, V.; Río, Pablo del; Alvarez, Amelia (eds.). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1-34.
- Wood, David; Bruner, Jerome Seymour; Ross, Gail. 1976. "The role of tutoring in problem solving". *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 17(2), 89-100.
- Zhao, Huahui. 2010. "Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: a comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom". *Assessing Writing* 15, 3-17.

8. Appendices

Appendix A – formal documents

Abstract – Deutsch

Die Rückmeldung von LehrerInnen, ProfessorInnen und KursleiterInnen auf die Texte ihrer SchülerInnen oder StudentInnen ist eine Praxis die keineswegs als revolutionär benannt werden kann, denn diese Form des Feedbacks wird bereits seit Jahrzehnten praktiziert und gilt außerdem bei vielen Lehrpersonen als unumstritten. Diese These wird allerdings bereits seit einigen Jahren von einer Vielzahl an Forschern in Frage gestellt (z.B. Conrad & Goldstein 1999; Zhao 2010; Ferris et al 2013) und deshalb wird seit einiger Zeit häufig die Effektivität von LehrerInnenrückmeldungen anhand verschiedener Anhaltspunkte gemessen. Im Speziellen wird diese Forschung oftmals ausgehend von Vygotskys Soziokultureller Theorie, welche Interaktion als die Grundlage menschlicher Entwicklung betrachtet, behandelt. Die Studie, welche im Rahmen dieser Diplomarbeit durchgeführt wurde folgt ebenjenem theoretischen Rahmen, allerdings wird die Effektivität von Feedback im Zuge der Forschung nur am Rande gemessen, da als eigentlicher Fokus die Ausgangslage, bzw. die Interaktion erforscht werden soll. In diesem Sinne soll erarbeitet werden ob Lehrende und Lernende erfolgreich miteinander kommunizieren, oder ob diese aneinander vorbeireden. Zu diesem Zweck wurden 17 StudentInnen und 3 KursleiterInnen eines Schreibkompetenzkurses auf dem Institut der Anglistik und Amerikanistik auf der Universität Wien zu Ihrem Feedback auf ein argumentatives Essay befragt. Die Ergebnisse der Studie zeigen, dass es eine hohe Diskrepanz zwischen der Intention der Lehrpersonen und der Interpretation der Studenten gibt; dies umfasst die Bedeutung von Feedback (35%), dessen Überarbeitung (41%), sowie dessen Signifikanz für die Zukunft (62%). Wichtiger als diese quantitativen Daten, ist aber die genaue Gegenüberstellung der Lehrenden und Lernenden: es hat sich gezeigt, dass Kommunikationsbrüche, institutionelle Rahmenbedingungen (v.a. die Abschlussprüfung), sowie ein hierarchisches Ungleichgewicht zwischen den beiden Parteien, dazu führen, dass die Kommunikation nicht einwandfrei abläuft, und dass deshalb die Entwicklung der Studenten manchmal ins Stocken geraten kann.

Informed consent form for diploma thesis

This informed consent form is for students who are currently enrolled at the Department of English and American Studies at the University of Vienna, who are currently attending the course Integrated Language and Study Skills 2 (ILLS2), and who are invited to participate in the study that is conducted in the course of this diploma thesis.

This informed consent form contains:

- an information sheet
- a certificate of consent

Information sheet

My name is Bernhard Mitis, I am a student of the University of Vienna, who is enrolled in the teacher's program (English/Geography and Economics), and I am currently writing my diploma thesis in the field of Second Language Writing (feedback). The purpose of my research is to find out whether there is a difference between the students' understanding and the course instructors' intention of feedback on writing. This is done from the perspective of Sociocultural Theory. If you have more questions about the topic feel free to ask me.

This research will involve an assignment that you wrote in ILLS2 that will serve as a basis (but not be used directly) for a qualitative interview during which you will be asked to respond to a couple of open questions on your understanding of the feedback that you were given by your course instructor. The interview will take between 10-15 minutes.

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. It is your choice whether to participate or not and if you would like to refuse or withdraw from this study, you may do so at any point during the research.

Confidentiality: I will not share any information about you with anybody outside of this research project. In order to protect your personal data, you will be assigned a random number that is only known by the researcher, and after the interview, your assignment will be destroyed, since it is not directly used in this thesis.

If you have any questions about this project you can ask them now, but you can also contact me, Bernhard Mitis, via email (XXX¹¹), or mobile phone (XXX).

Certificate of consent

I have read the information above, or it has been read to me. I have been able to ask questions. These questions were answered to my satisfaction. I consent voluntarily to be a participant of this study.

Name of Participant _____

Signature of Participant _____

Date _____

Interview schedule

Before interview

- Meet student in front of the library (Department of English and American Studies)
- Go together to the media room (has been booked in advance) of the library, where the interview will be conducted
- Thank student for participation
- Briefly re-summarise the general topic area and the purpose of the study (elaborate if requested)
- Remind participant about anonymity and confidentiality
- Explain the conduct of the interview to the interviewee
- Provide opportunity for participant to ask questions
- Ask for permission to record the interview

During interview

¹¹ Researchers email address and phone number not included in this publication for data protection reasons.

- Provide a (digital) copy of the student's assignment and feedback (the latter has been colour-coded so that the student can easily pinpoint the instances of feedback)
- Go through each of the selected instances of feedback
- Ask the three questions for each instance
- Use prompts if a question is unclear; use probes if you want the student to elaborate
- End the interview by asking about the question that the participant was able to prepare in advance (on irritating OR great feedback)
- Provide room for the student to make additional/final remarks

After interview

- Thank student for participating
- Provide information on when/where the finalised paper (i.e. the results of the study) can be found
- Provide opportunity for interviewee to talk "off the record"

This schedule is the same for both the student- and the teacher interviews with the exception that the latter will be conducted at the teachers' offices, and require a much longer amount of time.

Appendix B – basis for the survey

Oral feedback transcripts (CI2)

[This section includes the full transcripts of the audio feedback students received from CI2. The four instances of feedback that are used in the subsequent student interviews are colour-coded to facilitate student understanding.]

Participant S6

So S6, here is the feedback for your second assignment. And I'm going to go through each paragraph and give you some feedback about things you need to focus on next week when we do the midterm exam. On our discussion in class, when was that, yesterday, or the day before, I know that you were concerned about the thesis statement, and so, unfortunately, that concern has been proven to be valid in this particular case, because

the thesis statement does provide one of the main problems here. So, if you look at the introduction, you set up the issue, the context is clear, I see what the problem is that you're going to be writing about, however, your thesis statement as you had it originally, before I added these changes imply that the government parties were responsible, however, when I read on then, and looked at your body paragraphs, both of the body paragraphs focus on things that the individual can do and how they are kind of responsible for solving climate change, so there was a mismatch between your thesis statement and then in what you said in the body paragraphs, and I read on, and also in your conclusion, body paragraphs and conclusion make a clear point that individuals are really the ones who can affect this change. So then I changed your thesis statement to make the two clear points that although government parties are elected to improve the state's situation, so the government is in power, your thesis is really that it's individuals who are responsible, and notice how I really answered the question there, very directly, and then we have the two things that you are going to pick up on your road map, so to speak, that you are going to pick up on in the body, which is: they need to change their consumer behaviour, which you deal with in paragraph one, and they are also responsible for electing environmentally concerned parties, which is your second

paragraph. So the first main problem was the fact that the thesis statement and body really didn't match together. **(=First Instance of feedback)**

In terms of task fulfilment and organisation, that was really the low point, because the two body paragraphs themselves, good, they have clear topic sentences, you explain well, you make good use of the sources, you know we talked about this a lot in class that you mustn't just put the sources in any (form??2:31) put actually they should sort of support the points you're making and that's all very good.

The only thing I don't understand, S6, where on earth you got this from, that you don't need to put quotation marks around Jones and Kammen, it's just their names, so that is not necessary at all, and you also, again another thing to do with punctuation and the sources, it doesn't occur in paragraph one, but it occurs in body paragraph two, that when you say, McKibben 2012, 19, you don't need a comma after McKibben, and likewise later on you don't need a comma after Taylor and Vaughan. **(=second instance of feedback)**

Right, so yeah, both paragraphs are clear and your conclusion is a logical conclusion to the body paragraphs, however, as we saw, it doesn't reflect the thesis statement, which was why the thesis statement had to be changed, but in the conclusion you say, you make this point, okay central policy decisions are made by authorities, nevertheless, individuals have the, kind of, responsibilities to elect the political parties that represent their views, the responsibility to reconsider their lifestyle in order to support the environment, so the, I mean of course it could have been expressed sort of, more clearly, basically, the conclusion is okay and restates your point of view.

The second major problem with the essay is really the same as it was in the first essay: language, have a good look at all these things, there's a lot of vocabulary, or various, it is actually mainly lexis, it's not really too much grammar that come up, but sometimes you have a kind of awkward turn of phrase or just the wrong word or form of word which is sometimes, I suppose that's the grammar part really, and that you need to look at, so really take what you can from this, because the language, you know, it's really, several times you have to, as a reader, you have to really think, what exactly do you mean? **(third instance of feedback)**

And when I was doing that, I was thinking, S1, It's actually quite an interesting situation, because when you speak in class you are extremely fluent and you have a good vocabulary, so also, just as there's a mismatch between your thesis statement and the body of your essay, there is a little bit of a mismatch between how well you perform orally and your written work. Now, I don't want to suggest that this not a, is a gap that cannot be, you know, bridged, you clearly can, because you obviously have good ideas and that is not a problem for you, but yeah, language, the only thing I can say, I mean of course improving language is not a quick fix, there is nothing you can do that'll make you improve this tremendously by next week, however, there is plenty of things that you can do that will be long-term help you, so one of the which, again I kind of would imagine that you do, but if you don't you certainly need to be doing is plenty of reading, every day or every other day you should get a good newspaper, so the ones that are free to access on the internet from the British side are things like the Independent or the Guardian, and these are, you know, good broadsheet newspapers, and just pick up a couple of articles and read through them, maybe do a bit of vocabulary work, look for some good phrases that you can then use, and over time this certainly helps you to get a better feel for word order for example, exposes you to a lot of vocabulary, what you can also do is, you know, not particularly in this essay, there's nothing particularly, that is a major, one thing that comes up over and over again, but if you look at several essays that you've written, both in ILLS1 and our previous essay, then maybe you will see one or two common grammar points, some things that come up over and over again, and then you could do some very specific grammar exercises on those, but it's really just like, I think the key, in terms of improving language, the key point is that you have to really do a little bit very often, that's the way to success.

So, this essay, I mean, although you might think to yourself, well I'm going backwards because now I got, I got 17 points before and 15 now, it's not really, because at least you've maintained the grade, often when we do the first assignment with using sources, people really go down a grade or even a couple of grades, so you've maintained your status, which is the positive news, but we don't want to sort of pretend everything's fine when it's not, there's a lot of work to do on the language and if you didn't understand anything that I was telling you here in this, please ask me in class, I'm kind of happy to

talk to you about it, so I guess if I encapsulated my feedback, it's there's a lot of work to do, but it's doable and don't despair, okay thank you S6.

Participant S7

So, S7, this is the feedback for your second assignment and I'll just give you some points to think about before you do the midterm test. So, you start out with, again as with your first assignment, quite an effective introduction, the context is clear, you pick up on, you do pick up on the idea of responsibility, and point out the individual really is, are the ones that can affect a change in all these areas. However, what I do think, because of the way the question is phrased, I think you do need to make some mention that it's not governments that would be responsible, so it's not governments but that it's individuals, I think that would really tighten it up to the question more closely, however, the good point is that you did pick up on the idea that it is about responsibility and not about climate change as such.

So, when we go into the body paragraphs, then again what I think you can definitely work on is this firstly, secondly, I mean as we've said in class that it's not really wrong, but, you know you want to show that you're able to make a sort of better link between the different paragraphs. **(First instance of feedback)**

And then, a very important point of feedback ties in to what we were talking about today, earlier on today in class, and that has to do with your topic sentences, because while in both cases, for both paragraphs, the topic sentence is, you know, quite a focussed topic sentence, it doesn't link very well to your thesis statement, because your thesis statement focusses on the individual, and so you need to pick up on the individual in the topic sentences to reflect that, so instead of having a focus in your topic sentence, for example in the first body paragraph on transportation, then, better would have been to say something like, one significant area, where an individual can have a great impact on climate change or on CO2 emissions is transportation, and you see you've got this, the focus of the topic sentence is still on transportation, but it's looking at it from the angle of the individual, which is what your thesis statement said you were going to do. **(Second instance of feedback)**

What you do do well though in this particular first body paragraph is the final sentence, when you link it back to your overall thesis and this idea of responsibility, that's good, you explain it well, the choice of sources to refer to is also appropriate here, what I do think, just notice, what I found myself doing when I was reading through it is just changing things to make the links between sentences a little bit clearer. So, have a look at and see how I did that, or what I changed, particularly things like search recommendations, because that shows, ok that links it again to the idea that this is what can be done in order for individuals to accept their responsibility.

Then, we go on to the second body paragraph, and, as I said, the same applies there, you'd need to think of a topic sentence that focusses on how the individual can make changes to their wasteful use of gas and electricity in order to combat climate change, but, hang on let me just see, I'm reading, and here, yeah, ok you have your examples then that pick up on your idea about gas and electricity, but what is not so successful in this paragraph is in the final sentence, cause, in a way, you're just repeating what you said in the main body, so here, a better ending would be something, that again, just like you did in your first body paragraph, that links it back to your overall point of view that the individual can do certain, can take measures, and is responsible for improving the situation, so you could've said, for example, instead of saying "these measures ensure that", you could have said "these are all factors well within the control of each citizen, and so can easily be employed to minimise the impact of climate change", so again, that links back to the idea of this is what the individual can do to change things.

In the conclusion, then, again, the basic idea is good in that you're sort of summarising. I wonder about the first sentence "climate change is caused by greenhouse effects in the Earth's atmosphere", I mean, I'm not saying it's not true, but don't know if it's really relevant, or if it adds anything here, you might be better to just get straight to the point that if every individual, again, adding in the idea of the individual, because that is your whole thesis, is that the individual is responsible, so if you notice the changes here, I pulled it back to the idea of the individual and the idea of responsibility, so that you, in your thesis statement, you answer the question, and then you come back and kind of restate your point of view in the conclusion. **(Third instance of feedback)**

So, one or two things to think about in terms of organisation. Language-wise there's still a few things to look at. However, what I did think you were doing better this time is really showing that you've got a range of more higher register language to use, so this is good, keep on with that, yeah I think that's it, I'm just checking my notes if there's anything else I want to, yeah, that's really my main point, so look at the language things, see what you can take from that, prepositions, etc., or with things to make notes on, but, yeah, I think that's everything I wanted to say to you, ok S7, thank you.

Written Feedback

I thought when I was doing the oral feedback that I had forgotten something, and I had! As your thesis is focused on the role of the individual, then you need to make sure that the examples you choose are things that individuals can control. Here, they can turn off electrical devices, but are powerless to influence illuminated advertising. **(Fourth instance of feedback)**

Participant S8

So S8, this is the feedback for your second assignment, and, right let's go through it because there's some very important piece of feedback for your essay writing for when you take the midterm exam.

Because, S8, the main problem you have with this essay comes in task fulfilment, because you actually contradict yourself in your thesis statement and in your conclusion. So in your thesis, when I read your introduction and your thesis statement, we're gonna talk about the thesis statement in more detail in a minute, but just as a general point. So it's clear to me from the introduction that you're basically focussing on the individual, however, when you come to the conclusion, you say the governments have a more significant role to play in the issue of climate change, well the question itself is asking about responsibility: who is responsible to solve climate change? Governments or individuals? So if you say in your thesis statement, or you imply at least, it's the individual, and then you say in the conclusion, it's the government who has the most significant role to play, then it's kind of, you haven't really answered the question clearly, because that contradicts everything you've said. So, this you have to be very careful about. **(First instance of feedback)**

And coming back to the thesis statement itself, you set up, in the context, the first part of your introduction, you set up the context, well this idea that well is it the government or is it the private individual, but then when you, this sentence “it seems however that individuals can do a great deal to contribute to the betterment of the environment”, that I’m taking as your thesis statement, but it’s not a very strong thesis statement cause it’s quite vague, because if you say something “it seems”, that doesn’t necessarily mean they have responsibility, but the question is asking about who has responsibility, it’s not about about how to solve climate change, it’s about who is responsible for solving it. So you need to make sure to have a stronger statement about responsibility. So, for example, you could have said something like “it is clear, however, that the role of the individual has the greatest contribution to make to the betterment of the environment”. Something like that is a much stronger, it clearly says, you know the role of the individual, that’s making clear that they are responsible, whereas it’s much milder or weaker if you say “it seems the individual can do a great deal”, well yeah the can do a great deal, but are they responsible for doing it, there is the difference. **(Second instance of feedback)**

So, be very careful that you don’t contradict yourself in your conclusion, and secondly, make sure that you, you know, when you’ve broken down the question and seen that it’s about responsibility, because I think you did understand the question, from your first sentence in the introduction, it seems to me like, that you understood that it’s about responsibility, but your thesis statement wasn’t a strong enough statement, it was a little bit too vague.

So then we go on to the body paragraphs, and in themselves, yeah, a little bit in the first one there was a bit of, I think organisation-wise, a clear topic sentence, that’s good, but then you went straight into giving examples of how, you know, of how to achieve this reduction, but you haven’t said which area you’re talking about, so really the, you needed to identify, you know, ok where in which areas can they cut their greenhouse gas emissions, well transportation. So, that second sentence would have been better at the end as your kind of sentence that shows, ok this is how it links to my overall thesis that the individual has to do, or take these steps to reduce climate change. **(Third instance of feedback)**

So, the second point in here, look at the bits I highlighted there, I think this is editing, so look how you spell EUROSTAT, carefully, you've got to copy it correctly from the question sheet, and then that sentence "per household in a year is about 30% in America comes from transportation", this is an editing point, S8, so I'm pretty sure that it came from you perhaps changing things, you know like sometimes you cut a few words out, or you change things around, but when you do that you've always got to read extremely carefully to make sure that something like this doesn't happen, because I'm pretty sure you didn't think that this is right, you just somehow changed something and then didn't read it carefully afterwards. **(Fourth instance of feedback)**

Then we come onto the second body paragraph, yeah, this one, nice again, good topic sentence, when you, a good comparison you made when you refer to, I think you did a real good job here of referring to Karpf in this paragraph, unfortunately, that first comparison that you make, you've got it the wrong way around, because the way you've written it, it's that one person's efforts seems mockingly large, but actually, it's the drastic nature of climate change that seems mockingly large, so here perhaps a better part of the quote to have used would have been, that would have worked with the order you have it in, would have been to say "feels like too little too late", because that would have been the right, that one person's effort feels too little too late, but then you do a really good job at the end when you say well even though they say one person's efforts are not enough that everybody combined does make a good, you know, does make a difference, so I thought that was very good how you used Karpf in that paragraph.

Just let me see if I wanted to say anything else there, yeah, no that was good.

Then, we've talked already about the conclusion, so then when we come to the conclusion, just watch out, you really do contradict yourself there, you know, you're saying exactly the opposite of everything you've argued, but however, without that, your conclusion in itself, if you'd had said, you know, the individual does have the most significant role to play, then you've done the conclusion is well structured, because you've restated your point of view and summarised your main points, so from that, that works okay, but it's just unfortunate that you phrased it as you did.

So, not as, less successful than your previous assignment, however, there are plenty of good things about this, it's really, the two points that you get for task fulfilment, because of that contradiction, is really a shame and again, with organisation, had you had a clear

thesis statement that made a very strong and very you know clearly focussed on responsibility, you've gotten more points on organisation, which would have pulled you right up. So, it's not as good as the first one, but, you know, don't get too disheartened by this, because, you know, you've shown, once you've addressed these issues then you'll be definitely be back on track, I think. Okay, thank you, S8.

Participant S9

So, S9, here is the feedback for your second assignment, and I've got quite a lot of notes here, so I think you're gonna have to settle down to listen to this. Okay, introduction, very nice, I liked this, you have a very clear context, you have a clear answer to the question in your thesis statement, and I see that you're going to be looking at, I'm imagining when I read the introduction, I imagined, and it was really like that, that you are going to have one paragraph on the government, one on the individual citizen, this is nice.

Kind of a tricky issue is the register in this one, you can see I've highlighted all the we's, ours and us, when we talked about academic style we said, you know, avoid this, and my basic feedback to you is, yes avoid it in the essays, particularly in the CFT, it's not a typical feature of academic writing, however, having said that, in this particular essay, because of the kind of argument that you have, it does work quite well, because your argument is basically "we're all in this together to save, work for the better of the planet", so the "we" actually emphasises that and, you know, really makes the reader see, aha we, you can't just push it off onto the government, it is everybody, so, yeah, here it works, but S9, don't use it in the CFT, because it will be picked up on, and it's unlikely that you'll get this question in the CFT, so, yeah, that was the main point I wanted to say there. **(First instance of feedback)**

So, let's go into the first body paragraph when you pick up on the individual. Right, so, good, you make good use of the quotes, I think, what you do need to notice is, well it's not the quotes actually, you used the graphs here but works well, just notice where we put the date, in the EUROSTAT, where you say "according to EUROSTAT", it would be okay afterwards to put 2016, it works okay when you put EUROSTAT 2016 at the end as well, if I was doing it, I would put the 2016 immediately after EUROSTAT, and likewise Jones and Kammen, you can just put 2011 there rather than repeating Jones and

Kammen at the end, if you use the name of the people who've written the research, or made the quote, then usually you put the date and page number immediately after their names, it's only when, sometimes you don't use the names specifically, you might have said "research revealed that more than half of the emissions" then, if I said it without the names of the people, I would put it like you had it there, bracket, Jones and Kammen, 2011, bracket, but when you mention the names in the text, just put the date and the page number there. **(Second instance of feedback)**

Right, your first comment then, well, I think, actually, what you're doing here is kind of giving the solution, and it works well because your topic sentence of this paragraph is basically the second sentence "the individuals need to open their eyes and be aware of the difference they can make", so I see this paragraph as the first part of it with the data, you're kind of showing that they need to do something and open their eyes, and then, the second part where you've got the first comment "Luckily, there are a host of ways", you are now showing the difference they can make, so from that point of view, what I really think here is that perhaps I would have left away the very first sentence of the paragraph, because although it's not wrong as such, it doesn't actually contribute anything, it's a little bit redundant, so then your topic sentence would be "individuals need to open their eyes and be aware of the difference they can make", and then you'd explain why and you show the difference they can make, the part in green, what I would do is leave out real estate companies, your focus in this paragraph is on the individuals, so just talk about individuals, what they could do, and then you say "firstly", well you say "there is a host of ways to improve this situation", and then you say "firstly", however, that doesn't work because that's all you talk about is the photovoltaic and solar panels, so here I think what I would have said would be, you know, "to cut down on energy pollution, households may decide to invest in" and rather than give the specific thing there, I would have said "in green energy", and then use "photovoltaic and solar panels" as the examples, and I would also, again it's a little bit like you're bringing the real estate companies, which of course is true, but it's kind of getting away from the main point you're talking about, which is individuals and the difference they can make, so the same point applies to that sentence, "This would also be the more economic option, as it

would finance itself over time”, true but that’s nothing really, that’s another aspect of the argument, you’re not really trying to argue that it would be cheaper, you’re trying to argue that they can make a difference and that they have to do this, so that is again, it’s a little bit of a, getting side-tracked, so leave out the real estate companies, leave out the aspect of finance, and just talk about how green energy could solve this problem of households and energy usage. So, but otherwise it’s a successful paragraph. **(Third instance of feedback)**

The second body paragraph, well, first of all, you need to make a link between them, so you could say something, for example, “individual citizens alone are powerless to make significant change”, or something along those lines “the government also has to take responsibility and action”. Then we come on to your Taylor and Vaughn, it’s a good choice I think there to make the, to use it as a support, with regard now to your second comment, what I think here is, well, it’s not supporting anything, but your point, your thesis statement is that the government has to take responsibility and action, so now I want to read your explanation of that any why and how, so the first time you refer to Taylor and Vaughn, when you, the quote “the UN intergovernmental panel”, there you’re kind of elaborating now on, you know, this is, people have claimed that there is still a chance to change things and obviously something like that then, as you say, the, in order to enable this to happen politicians and governments have got to start making changes and I just added now, because it adds to the urgency of it. So, as far as I’m concerned what you’re doing with that quote is just explaining why, you know, it’s significant or why it’s important that they do that, because they can still make a change and then when you go, when you talk, the second time you refer to Taylor and Vaughn then you are, it’s a good paraphrase, and you know, you are showing the situation that needs, let me put it a different way, what you’re showing is how we can generate this change, and so that you know, if they see people will vote for them, okay then they’re more likely to change, but what it doesn’t work very well here is the final sentence when you say “Governments first need to spread awareness in the population”, because there again what I was expecting to read is something more about, you know, how will it, how will the government been reminded of their duties by individuals voting for political parties that emphasise the environment, how will that work? So, I would’ve wanted

here, instead of your sentence, I would've wanted to read something like, and for example, just let me read what I was thinking, yeah for example, "once the government realises the electorate will no longer tolerate inaction, they will be more inclined to introduce policies that lead to increased sustainability and equality", so do you see that would then link back to your idea of action that you mention in your topic sentence and it also picks up on the quote from Taylor and Vaughn about sustainable, a sustainable, cleaner and more equal, global system. So, that final sentence in this second body paragraph is a little bit like the real estate companies and the finance in the first body paragraph, it's kind of bringing in another element, which whilst it is true, is kind of taking us away from the point you're making. So, you know, it's, what you need to really try and do, Christoph is, always stay focussed on just the couple of points that you can make and don't bring in any, sort of, extraneous material, because that kind of side-tracks it, it's all true what you mention, but it's sort of not the main point, stick to your topic sentence and what you're focussing on. I can make the same point about one part of the conclusion, because again, nice, you restate your point of view, I just added "for the planet", just to be, again, emphasise what we're talking about, but then you say "Should the different parties be able to put aside differences", well, in your whole essay and in your thesis statement, there's nothing about, you haven't mentioned anything about the government and the individuals are at sort of odds, or have different purposes, what you want to focus on here is the fact of working together, that's what your whole essay is about, so again, you're going off at a little bit of a tandem/tandrum (?) when you say "put aside their differences", forget that and just focus on, you know, they have to work together, and then it's a nice ending "we might just be able to stop this meltdown", because that, as you say, it links very well back to your introduction. So, just hang on, I'm just reading and I've got so many bits of notes on this piece of paper, I'm just checking that I've said everything I wanted to see. Yeah, I mentioned about the topic sentence, in the first body paragraph, I think the first sentence was not good and one note I made that I don't think I've said yet, the topic sentence in the second body paragraph is much better, yeah so, basically, again, this essay if we look at it compared to the first one, it's very successful in the sense that it's much more, much better task fulfilment, I think you've really answered the question quite well. What is not so good this time, there's a lot, or a lot, there's more language things to look at, sometimes it

was just cases of adding things in, just to be more precise, like “for the planet”, some vocabulary stuff about the graphs “can be attributed” and “are derived from”, these are.

Oh I know what I wanted to say there, housing and households, in the graph I know it says housing, but that’s just the general factor of, you know housing refers to how many houses there are, or building houses, but what the, so although it’s used as a heading in the graph, what it’s really talking about are households, the household is like the family unit in a, one particular house, they are the ones who are using the electricity, the household sort of stands for the people, whereas housing is just the factor of a house, and so the housing itself can’t be, sort of, using, or cutting down on energy, it’s the household, so check that difference **(Fourth instance of feedback)**

But otherwise I thought this was much better than the first essay, although there are more language things to look at, but you’re definitely, sort of, pulling, getting it in the right direction and what is really good, S9, is that you use the data well, but it’d been the first essay that we’ve done that. Right, so again, I know I’ve said a lot of things now, but if you’ve got any questions, please ask me in class, so I can sort of clarify, but otherwise, yeah, good job.

Participant S10

So, S10, this is the feedback for your second assignment and this is a great improvement S10, you’ve done a much better job with this one, so I’ll just talk through it a little bit just to give you an idea of the things that were so good, so that you can then hopefully replicate that in the midterm test.

So, we start out with the introduction, again a very good summary of what the problem is, a very clear thesis statement, where I see exactly who you are focussing on, cause the question is all about responsibility and you make that very clear,

just notice how the vocabulary I changed at the end, if you say, you said “plays a more crucial role”, that suggests that they are causing the problem, but what you actually mean is that they can solve the problem, so then you have to say “has a more crucial role to play” and then mention that in solving the problem or tackling the issue, or something along those lines, so that there’s a clear difference, although it’s the same phrase more or less, it’s how you use it. **(First instance of feedback)**

Then we go into the body paragraphs and this is where you really come into your, well I mean you had good topic sentences in your previous essay, but here you do the same again, very clear topic sentences and I think that is a reason why it's so well organised, it's that you, your topic sentence kind of guides you and it keeps you focussed, so, very nicely put together, nice explanation, good use of the sources, and also one of the points I made for the first assignment, it was a bit like a list and here you've really tackled that problem and it flows very nicely, the links between things are perfectly clear.

Yeah, body paragraph, just look at the second body paragraph, again, nice paragraph, well explained,

just notice, that would be a good place to use a colon, you say "Governments have already launched several projects to counteract this problem" and then you can use a colon when you go into, to sort of list what they are. So, that's a nice way to punctuate it. **(Second instance of feedback)**

The only major problem you have in the whole essay is the kind of, one that can easily happen, but you have to be very careful about and that's in your third body paragraph, when you make the rebuttal, which again is a good thing to do, you've got the wrong reference, it's not Taylor and Vaughan that said that, it was the one underneath it, Hill, so just watch out for things like this, you know, it's an easy mistake to make, when you're sort of writing and looking at the question sheet, just watch out for that.

Conclusion, very nice, I like the way that you really summarized your main ideas, your point of views here again, so you see, in terms of organization this is really good, and I mean, I can't think of anything you that you did that would need to have a point taken off, so very well done with that. Everything else, yeah, don't forget to put the word count on it, it looks about right, but it really is much improved from last time,

and also the accuracy, there's still some things to look at in terms of language, but again, just take note of the changes that were made, and some are to do with, that's a good like a word like, hold on, where was it, right "attributed", yeah, you can't use a counter there, these kinds of things, cause attributed you'll be able to always use, cause there'll always be a graph to look at. **(Third instance of feedback)**

So, things like that are important to pick up on S10, but overall you've done a great job, you really show me what you can do with this, so let's keep going in this direction. Okay, thank you S10.

Written Feedback

First sentence: Always??? (**Fourth instance of feedback**)

Participant S11

So S11, this is the feedback for your second assignment, so let's go through and I'll just point out a few things you need to think about next week when you write the midterm exam.

So, there is one main piece of feedback that I have for you, S11, and that is, you have a very clear argument, but what you're not doing, is you're, with each paragraph, you're not linking it back to your thesis statement about why is the information in the paragraph important, why am I mentioning this, how does it support my argument?

So, in your introduction, you've clearly set up the context, although, notice how just I made a few changes to make clear that this is a problem that needs solutions, because then you can say who is responsible for the solutions, but good that you picked up on the idea that it really is about responsibility, it's not about climate change in general,

and you have a very clear statement about that, I changed, again, just in terms of having a strong stance, you had said "governments appear to have", well, I would change that to "governments do have more responsibility", because again, that's your stance, that's what you think. If you say "appear to" it's a little bit vague, does it mean they do, or does it mean they don't? So, try and be very specific and clear.

So, introduction works nicely, in fact the organisation is good all the way through, S6, so that's a very strong point of yours. But when we go to the very first body paragraph of yours, again, language comes up a little bit here, I kind of get the idea, notice some of the changes I made there, it's a little bit awkwardly phrased, but

you have a topic sentence and you develop it then with your reference to Jones and Kammen, which is good support there, but then, at the end, when you say, you have the Taylor and Vaughan quote, you say the real challenge is politicians etc., then you need to

make clear why it's a real challenge, because your whole point in your thesis statement is that the governments have more responsibility, because they can actually do something, and so here you need to make clear that the individuals themselves can't control the rate of consumption for major companies and therefore you need to make clear that, you know, it would have to be, the governments would have to, I don't know, pass laws, or do something that would mean people can't use so much, or whatever, and that's what's missing here, and it's exactly the same in the second paragraph, where you talk then, again you've got a better topic, language is better, clearer topic sentence, but again, these frameworks for manufacturers, they can only be imposed by the government and you need to make that clear, so there's kind of a piece of the jigsaw missing in each paragraph.

So, in the third paragraph then, good, you show the opposite point of view, but again, you know, why is, it's still not, you need to make the point that we need to have this idea about, you know, making clear which products are then, you know, how environmentally friendly are they, and again, you need to make some kind of clarity then, you know why is labelling important then, why, how will that help? Yeah, so when you say "Consumers are ultimately in charge of a product's influence on global warming", how? Well, it's because they can make choices, when they buy things and the government can then influence that by making companies have to put that labelling on them, I'm talking about labelling, because Lenzen, that's really his point is about labelling, so I'm assuming that's what you're meaning. So, do you see that you need to take, so, you've got, how you've constructed the argument is quite good, but what you haven't done is you haven't made it clear why you are making this argument. In the conclusion, good, you put it all together, there's not too many problems there,

the bigger problem is, as it was in the first essay, particular vocabulary, there's a lot of places, S12, where I had to change, I kind of got the idea of what you probably meant, but it wasn't expressed very clearly, so you really need to do some important language work, and again, that's one of those things I probably said this in the last assignment feedback, it's just little bits and very often, and you know, start with this and pick up things that you think, okay right that's something that I can, you know, take on board, because I can use it in lots of different essays, you know, really look not only at the word

I've replaced the word you had with, but also look at the word you had, it's looking at the word you have and the word I gave you instead, looking at those two together, for example in that third body paragraph, what's the difference between problem and trouble, when do we use which, that's the kind of thing you need to focus on, so language-wise it's a bit on the edge S6, you know, that's some, where you need to really do some work

, but the positive things are, the structure was nice, you know, topic sentences, thesis statement, conclusion, all these are the strongest points and you basically have a, you've used the quotes quite successfully to support the points you've made, you just haven't made those points clear with relation to your thesis statement. Okay, thank you S11.

Appendix C – Interview transcripts

Student interview transcripts

[Some parts of the interviews that were unrelated to the topic, or the questions and responses concerning TR, have not been transcribed]

Participant S1

Participant S1 did not have a talk with CI1 about the essay and the feedback they received.

First instance of feedback (TR#1)

I: It's always going to be three questions, the first one is: What does this mean to you? The feedback here would be the squiggly line. **(TR#1_S1_Q1)**

S1: I guess that's about my range and about how this word doesn't really fit into the topic, or into my sentence, as like the next one, the "closing the shops"-one. Maybe it's a little bit of a silly expression.

I: Do you mean, it might be too colloquial, and it should be more formal?

S1: Yes

I: Okay, and if you were able to revise this, if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#1_S1_Q2)**

S1: I, maybe look, I don't know, look up synonyms, or just collocations that fit better into those kinds of things.

I: So, you'd replace this word and this phrase and then

S1: Yes

I: you'd look up on dictionaries and collocation dictionaries

S1: Probably, If I can't think of anything myself, yeah

I: So, after this revision, how would this improve your essay? How would this improve the text? **(TR#1_S1_Q3)**

S1: So, this essay, or?

I: So, let's say the paragraph, if you were able to change these two instances, with, I don't know, better words, better phrases, how would this improve the text? How would this change the text?

S1: It would make my, it's really weird to say, my language better, but it sort of does. I don't know if that's

I: D'you mean the language would become more appropriate in this context?

S1: Yeah, that's what I mean

Second instance of feedback (TR#2)

I: The feedback here would be these, I don't know, these two lines, and the TF, task fulfilment. What does this mean to you? **(TR#2_S1_Q1)**

S1: Well the task fulfilment usually stands for, the TF stands for task fulfilment, but here in this case it's just a task fulfilment problem, because I've quoted incorrectly, because the name is Mitchel and not

I: So you missed the "t"?

S1: Yeah

I: Okay, so you've basically already answered the second question, if you were able to change it, you'd insert the "t". **(TR#2_S1_Q2)** And, how would this improve the text? **(TR#2_S1_Q3)**

S1: Yeah, it would make the quote, I mean it doesn't really improve the text, it's just quoting correctly.

I: Alright, so it would become more correct. [not transcribed: explanation that this is a silly choice for an instance of feedback]

Third instance of feedback (TR#3)

I: Alright, now the next one, the purple one, it's just like in the first instance, it's a couple of lines, or squiggly lines and two As for accuracy. Now, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#3_S1_Q1)**

S1: I think the problem with this one is that I kind of stumbled over my words and didn't really know how to say what I wanted to say properly.

I: Yeah, but what do you think C11 means by using those lines and putting the As next to those? Or how would you interpret those?

S1: Maybe in a similar way then above, so there's better ways to phrase this, there's better ways, better words and phrases to use to give my argument, or to state my argument properly.

I: Alright, and again, if you were able to change something what would you do? Similarly to the first one? **(TR#3_S1_Q2)**

S1: Yeah.

I: So, you'd have some strategies for looking up in dictionaries and then trying to replace them.

S1: Yeah.

I: And would this have the same change, or the same improvement to the text as the first instance? **(TR#3_S1_Q3)**

S1: Yes, I think so, it also would make, I think reading, it would make it easier for the reader to get my idea, because I can hopefully improve the sentence in a way that makes it more, like precise.

I: So it would become more reader-friendly?

S1: Yeah.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#1-3)

I: Okay great and the last one is this here (points to yellow marking), this was part of the global feedback you got, so they basically only mentioned "there is only some minor issues". What does this mean to you? "Some minor issues".

S1: (laughs): I don't really know, like "minor" is a very broad word. Yeah, I guess I would, I mean probably the range and yeah (laughs)

I: Okay. Would you know what you had to change with these minor issues? When they say minor issues?

S1: I mean, if I had only had this feedback – No, but considering that I've got the marks on the sheet and on the issue, yeah, probably.

I: So, you'd know, the other marks would tell you there's the minor issues.

S1: I think they know that the Mitchel one is not (student cannot come up with a word)

I: That it's a typo and not a mistake?

S1: Yeah, thank you, yes and the minor issues, I don't know, so my argumentation is okay and that these minor issues are in, yeah, the underlined parts.

I: Yeah, so basically, if you were able to change something that would be in relation to all of those squiggly lines and underlinings.

S1: Yes

I: Okay, so I guess we don't have to talk about how this would improve the essay, because we've been talking about this for all of the instances. Okay great, so that's basically it.

Example of good/bad feedback

I: Did you think of any special experiences in regards to feedback?

S1: No, not really, I just think that CI1 is the first professor, that really thinks about giving their feedback in a way that helps me get better, not just tell me what I'm doing wrong and, I don't know, could have done it better, but to kind of [has problems formulating]

I: So, it's conducive for you to improve your writing?

S1: Yeah, and it's more action-based, I think, and not that, I don't know, "this is wrong, you should have done it this way", but "this is wrong, you could do these things to get better and to write better".

I: So, they also has suggestions for you to improve?

S1: I've particularly noticed that after my oral presentation, and so that's what I wanted to talk about, but that's not really matching

I: Yeah, but it's feedback, so that's okay. It's just basically, a point to get us talking, and maybe there's some insights that I could also use in my thesis.

Participant S2

Participant mentioned that they had a one-on-one talk with CI1 about the essay

First instance of feedback (TR#4)

I: So, what does this mean to you? (TR#4_S2_Q1)

S2: So, this means to me that, I know that CI1 prefers three arguments, because they says that it's easier to argue an essay well with three instead of two, but I, during my writing, it just didn't make sense to me. So, I just wrote two, even though I knew they wanted me to write three, but, so I knew that this would be a critique, and I think it just means that it's easier to write three well arguments than two. [...] what they also told me that some of my arguments were repetitive, so that's what they means with "too many words"

I: Okay great, if you were able to revise this, if you were able to write a second draft, what would you change to respond to this feedback? (TR#4_S2_Q2)

S2: I would probably go through my essay once more and just look if I've mentioned the information before, in one of the sentences before, and then also, before I would write the essay, I would probably think it would be smarter to write three arguments, but I think I would still write two, if I'm sure that it makes more sense to me.

I: You mean it would be a bit of a hassle, a bit of a struggle to actually do three arguments, because you'd have to change so much?

S2: No, sometimes it makes more sense to me, personally, so I don't think in those instances I would change that, because they also said that, if it is two arguments and they are well argued then it's not a problem. So, I think if it makes more sense to me, I would still keep the two arguments, but I would definitely check my arguments and see if they are repetitive or if I can leave something out.

I: Okay, and then you'd just remove those phrases?

S2: Yeah

I: Okay, and then, how would this change, or improve your essay? If you did this?

(TR#4_S2_Q3)

S2: I think it would be more (waits, laughs) it would be more, a higher quality I guess, because if I just repeat information, there's not really anything new to it, and I think in an essay you should be very compact and clear, and if you argue around it, around your argument, then it makes it hard to read or something.

I: Okay, so you think it would become more clear to the reader, and more, maybe do you mean more reader-friendly?

S2: Yes.

Second instance of feedback (TR#5)

I: Okay, great, so then let's look at the second example, the red one, and I've also underlined this in your essay. Okay, maybe you read through it again and then let's talk about it. [...] What does this mean to you? Or maybe first, did you talk about this with C11? **(TR#5_S2_Q1)**

S2: No, not really, they just mentioned that it was, it wasn't that well-formed argument I guess, but I think, well I agree, yes, I just kind of tried to fit my source into my essay and it was the best way I could come up with. I didn't really think it was a good way to do it, when I wrote it, but I couldn't find a way to do it better.

I: What do you mean by "I agree with it"? What do you agree with?

S2: I agree that it's not too relevant for my point and I think, I guess you could use the source more, so it would be more relevant to the point I made, or to my argument.

I: So you mean the argument and the example doesn't fit? Or they don't match together very well?

S2: I think, but I don't think the example is anything new, or anything exciting.

I: You mean maybe it's not a strong example?

S2: Yes, thank you.

I: Okay, perfect and how, if you were able to change this again, how would you change this? **(TR#5_S2_Q2)**

S2: I would try to find a better way to incorporate the source (laughs), yeah, I think that's really hard, but I don't know.

I: So you might struggle doing this?

S2: Yeah, I think so.

[... interviewer explains that "I don't know" is a potential answer as well]

I: Okay, so you

S2: Well, I understand, but I don't know

I: But you said you'd struggle improve it.

S2: Yeah, I'd struggle to improve, I think it's a process. I don't think that it's something you could change just like, just because you know it's bad, I think it's something you have to practice.

I: Okay, if you had been able to revise it, how would it improve the text? **(TR#5_S2_Q3)**

S2: If I would have used it better?

I: Yeah, if you were able to answer to this feedback that they gave you, and if you were able to revise it efficiently, then how would this improve the text? Or how would this change the text?

S2: My argument would be stronger, and yeah.

I: Okay great.

Third instance of feedback (TR#6)

S2: We did talk about that. So, they explained to me, and it was pretty clear to me when they showed me actually and we agreed that it's not really clear what I mean with "at home", because, well, I could just leave it out, or I would have to describe it more clearly, because just "at home" doesn't really give the reader a lot of information.

I: So, "at home" would have to be expanded and described in more detail?

S2: Yeah, either expanded or just left out, cause it's not really necessary.

I: Okay, and before you talked to CI1, did you understand what they means?
(TR#6_S2_Q1)

S2: Yeah, before I talked to him, I thought it was just that it's not clear whose home it is, but then they said it's not really necessary as well.

I: Okay, so actually you've already mentioned this, if you were able to change this, you'd either leave it out, or you'd expand and describe it in more detail. **(TR#6_S2_Q2)**

S2: Yes.

I: Then, lastly, how would this improve the text? **(TR#6_S2_Q3)**

S2: I think it would be more reader-friendly again? And also it would sound better I guess, because, yeah, mainly it would be reader-friendly, because the reader doesn't have to think "Oh, whose home?", they can just read along.

I: Okay, by "it sounds better"? Do you mean it's more appropriate, or it's a more appropriate language for such an essay?

S2: Not really, but (thinks), I don't know, maybe, yeah, maybe it's more appropriate, yes.

I: Okay great, let's look at the last example.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#7)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#7_S2_Q1)**

P: Yeah, I also talked to CI1 about that and I thought it was just too, I don't know, because I really tried to make the words sound good, but they explained to me that it

wasn't really clear what that is, "a shopping-based relationship", so I should probably rephrase that, the sentence, so maybe "relationships formed at shopping" or something like that, they just said that it wasn't really clear what it meant and I understood that.
(TR#7_S2_Q2)

I: Okay, and before you talked to him/her? Did you at all understand what they means by this?

S2: I didn't really think about the aspect of it not being clear what that was, because to me it was so clear what that was, I just thought they didn't like the expression.

I: Okay, so you think they wanted you to use different terms, different vocabulary?

S2: Yes

I: You've already mentioned what you would improve, not what you would improve, but what you would change. How would this improve the text, again? **(TR#7_S2_Q3)**

S2: Well, it would be better, maybe a better sentence structure, so I think the range would be more appropriate for the text, I guess, and it also would be more clear, because, as they mentioned, you don't really know what "the relationships" are.

I: Okay, so it would be more clear to the reader and easier to understand?

S2: Mhm.

Experience of good/bad feedback

I: Perfect, that was the last example, just one more thing [mentions the request for a good/bad example of feedback from the student's educational experience]

S2: Can I mention two things?

I: Yeah, of course.

S2: Because in my ILLS1 class, I had a teacher that was really nice, and she graded my essays pretty well, but then she couldn't really tell me what I did well, or what I did wrong, and so if I asked her, she couldn't mention anything specific, which really helps me, if somebody tells me "exactly this is what you do wrong and this is what you could improve" that really helps me to understand what I need to work on, and CI1, in the interview, in the talk I had with him/her, they really took his time, we talked for one hour and they really explained to me, especially the commas, the comma mistakes I made, they really tried to make it clear to me and then I really understood it, because I had never really learned it specifically in school or anything, so it was really useful to me that they really showed me what I did wrong and how I could improve it.

I: Okay, so basically this is both your good and bad example, so if a teacher is too broad or too vague, or cannot really specify what the issue is, then this is a bad example for you, and if somebody really takes his time, or takes her time and is really specific then you like that.

S2: Yes

Participant S3

Student had a talk about their essay with CI1, during which they explained textual errors and provided additional feedback

I: Alright so as we go through the instances of feedback, just tell me when something comes up that you talked about with CI1 and how you understood it before the talk and how you understand it now

First instance of feedback (TR#8)

I: What does this mean to you? (TR#8_S3_Q1)

S3: They had a problem with the whole argument, it wasn't very clear to him what I was trying to say.

I: Did you talk to him/her about this?

S3: I did, yeah.

I: And before you talked to him/her, what did it mean to you before you talked to him/her? Do you still remember?

S3: Well, it said "very unclear", so my first impulse was "why?" (laughs), and I did not really understand why they didn't like it, but after I talked to him/her, they explained to me that it was a bit unclear what I was trying to say.

I: Okay, so what does it mean to you now? Just the feedback that it's unclear and that you come to an unclear conclusion? What does it mean to you now? Or how would you interpret it now?

S3: That maybe I should explain my arguments a bit more reader-friendly, since it made perfect sense to me, but it didn't for the reader, so I should always ask myself "does someone understand it without my knowledge?", and they obviously didn't (laughs).

I: Okay, again, if you were able to change this, how would you change this?
(TR#8_S3_Q2)

S3: I would probably look for a whole different argument, since it was not very strong and it didn't really do anything for my essay, so I would look for a different argument.

I: So, you'd delete the whole part and think of a new argument and rewrite the whole paragraph?

S3: Yeah

I: And then, how would this improve the essay? (TR#8_S3_Q3)

S3: It would make the argumentation way stronger, probably, it would make more sense I guess, because it wouldn't be that unclear any more, yeah.

Second instance of feedback (TR#9)

I: So, again, the first question, what does this mean to you? Did you talk about this with CI1? (TR#9_S3_Q2)

S3: I did, I did not understand at first what they was trying to say. I had an idea of what all the errors meant, but I did not fully understand what they was trying to say with it, and after I talked to him/her, they explained to me what was the actual problem here.

I: Okay, so how do you understand it now, or what does it mean to you now?

S3: I guess the same problem as before, that the reference just doesn't make much sense, like "this" could refer to many things in the previous sentence and also "that idea" is not very clear what idea I am talking about, so if it's the "less communication" or the "results" even, from the previous sentence before that, so, yeah, again my thought process is not very clear.

I: Alright, and then again, if you were able to change something, what would you do in this instance? (TR#9_S3_Q2)

S3: I would try to find other words again, try to substitute it with something else?

I: Instead of "this" and "that idea"?

S3: Yes, "this" and "that idea", I think maybe make it more clear what I'm talking about, because the sentence itself, I actually like that sentence. I'd probably change the previous, like this sentence "this might result in less communication" to make it clear that the next sentence is referring to that idea.

I: Okay, Do you think you'd be able to do this, or would you struggle?

S3: (laughs) Probably, yeah, because I'm, when I wrote it, it made perfect sense to me, so it's kind of hard to change something that made sense previously.

I: Okay, and then again, if you were able to revise this, if you wouldn't struggle, if you had a good way to revise this, how would this improve the essay? (TR#9_S3_Q3)

S3: Probably make it more reader-friendly as well, and would, I think the idea or the argument itself would come across better, more clear, like the argument itself, not just the paragraph but the argument I'm trying to make here.

I: So the argument would also be stronger?

Third instance of feedback (TR#10)

I: What does this mean to you? (TR#10_S3_Q1)

S3: It was unclear whether the "there" referred to "local communities" or "small businesses and chain stores", so it was unclear what it referred to and after I read the sentence again, I actually understood why it was ambiguous and they did explain afterwards, when I had the talk with them, as well, that my thought process and my pronouns are very confusing in general, but I did understand why there was a question mark here.

I: Okay, and even before you talked to CI1?

S3: Yeah, because I read the sentence again and I saw that it was ambiguous.

I: Okay, so this means to you that it's ambiguous to what the "there" refers to?

S3: Yeah.

I: Okay, so if you were able to change this, if you were able to rewrite this, what would you do? You don't have to think about how you would exactly phrase this, but just in a general manner **(TR#10_S3_Q2)**

S3: I would think of a way to refer to the thing I was actually referring to, you know in a more specific way I guess, I probably would try to leave the sentence, as much as possible, as it is, and just try to change the last part.

I: So, you'd delete "there" and use a different noun for it?

S3: Yeah, for example, yeah.

I: Okay, so how would this change improve the essay? **(TR#10_S3_Q3)**

S3: It would make it a bit more clear and a bit more understanding to the reader.

I: So it would become more reader-friendly?

S3: Yeah.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#11)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#11_S3_Q1)**

S3: I had a problem with stylistic issues, because stylistic issues have been very vague I think, it's always the preference of the reader, I guess,

I: Did you talk about this with C11?

S3: Yeah, I did, and they said that "has gone through" is not a very nice way of saying it, and I shouldn't use it.

I: Did they further explain "not a nice way" or do you know what they means with "not a nice way"?

S3: Well, they has, like "get" is a forbidden word, so we can't use it, and I put it in the list of not using the words, like "has gone through" is on the forbidden list now (laughs).

I: So basically, just to summarise, you didn't understand what they meant before you talked to him/her, and now that you've talked to him/her you have a better understanding, but you're still not clear on what it means that it's like a "bad word".

S3: Yeah, because "has gone through" makes perfect sense to me, and I don't think it's very colloquial or anything like that, and they didn't say that it was too informal or anything, they just said that they didn't like it. So, I think with stylistic things, the feedback has been very vague, since forever.

I: Alright, again, if you were able to change this, what would you do? **(TR#11_S3_Q2)**

S3: (laughs) substitute it again, I guess.

I: Do you have any idea what you could substitute it with, or do you have any strategies for finding a better substitute?

S3: I actually do not, no. With stylistic issues, I have a problem, since the style is just very vague.

I: And did CI1 suggest anything?

S3: I think they did, I can't remember what they said, I wrote it down, I think they did say something I could substitute it with.

I: Alright, again, how would this improve the essay? (TR#11_S3_Q3)

S3: Make it sound more professional? I guess.

Example of good/bad experience with feedback

S3: When it comes to writing, I think the feedback I get on the essays themselves are always a bit unclear.

I: It doesn't have to be related to this course, but just in general, if there's something that really struck you, something, in your whole career as a pupil or as a student, if there was something that really struck out as really confusing or irritating when it comes to feedback, or doesn't have to be that, or the other side, if something was really positive, a really great instance of feedback. But if you can't think of anything and if you didn't prepare anything, it doesn't matter.

S3: I mean, I really appreciated the talk I had with CI1, I think they took almost 45 minutes to explain to me, and they was really thorough and tried to make it as clear as possible to me and I really appreciated it, and what was really good as well, is that at the end they said that they would believe in me and that they thinks that I could do it, which made me kind of happy, because if they believes in me then I could too I guess, so that talk was really great, it's probably the best feedback I've gotten so far.

I: So basically, the length or duration of the feedback, and that they also used positive affirmation.

Participant S4

Participant has not had a one-on-one conversation with CI1

First instance of feedback (TR#12)

I: So the first question is always going to be: What does this mean to you? Or how would you interpret this? (TR#12_S4_Q1)

S4: Okay, I think that they thought it was a good essay, but I somehow plagiarised, I didn't want to, so I didn't realised it was plagiarism, but they're right, I did, I didn't thought of the effect, because I wrote, it is this sentence here (shows sentence).

I: Oh, and then they additionally wrote "source", exclamation mark.

S4: Yeah.

I: Okay, so the second question is always going to be: If you were able to change something, if you were able to revise, what would you change in this instance now? (TR#12_S4_Q2)

S4: Yeah, I would cite correctly, because I know now that it is, this sentence is from Postrel, it's his citation and I should quote it.

I: And you feel like you'd be able to do that? Or would you struggle?

S4: No, I would be able to do it (laughs). I just forgot, it's not, kind of, a big deal.

I: And then the last question is always going to be: If you changed this, or if you revised this, then how would this improve the text? **(TR#12_S4_Q3)**

S4: Okay, I think it wouldn't really improve the text itself, it's just, these are the rules and I have to do it, so it wouldn't change anything about the essay.

I: Okay, maybe if you're saying it would be according to the rules then maybe it would be more appropriate?

S4: Yeah, somehow, it would be appropriate to do it, but yeah, it wouldn't change the essay.

Second instance of feedback (TR#13)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#13_S4_Q1)**

S4: I thought that I explained it in the paragraph as a whole, but somehow they thought that it would need more examples and explanation, so, I thought it was clear, because I discussed it in the argument and the argument was based on the consequences, but maybe I could write some more examples at the end.

I: So you don't fully agree, but you interpret it in a way that it needs more examples, but you feel like it's clear enough.

S4: I understand it, but I thought it was clear enough, but I know what they meant, so, yeah.

I: Okay, so, again, if you were able to change something, what would you do here? **(TR#13_S4_Q2)**

S4: (sighs) Yeah, I would add examples and an explanation, and/or, I would add examples.

I: Okay, do you think you'd have struggles doing that? Or would you see this as something straightforward.

S4: It is straightforward, I don't think I would have struggles, I will think of it and other essays when I will write something like this, like "highly dependent on something", always write why (laughs), yeah, because blab la..

I: Okay, and then again, how would this improve the text? **(TR#13_S4_Q3)**

S4: It would improve the text in, yeah (sighs), it's just more, it's clearer to the reader maybe, because I always tend to think that this is clear, but it's only clear for me sometimes and not for the reader, so, yeah, it is good to see someone who is

I: From a different perspective

S4: I wanted to say that (laughs)

Third instance of feedback (TR#14)

I: Again, how do you understand this? Or what does this mean to you? (TR#14_S4_Q1)

S4: I know what it means (laughs), I wanted to paraphrase phrases that I used before, not to write the same sentence, same structure, and I thought that animate would be a good verb, but in this context I think that it just doesn't fit. It looked good to me, but I understand that it, yeah, it's not appropriate in this sense here.

I: So, were you trying to paraphrase yourself or is it from a source?

S4: I was trying to paraphrase myself.

I: So you had a similar topic sentence in the first paragraph and to change it up a little, to make it less repetitive, you wanted to

S4: Yeah, because in the, is it? No it's not, it's not the conclusion. Okay, what was I trying to do? I think, yeah (sighs) I was somehow trying to use other words, better words, and sometimes the easy ones are better.

I: So basically, in a nutshell, you were using certain, or the term inanimate, not correct, or not accurately and that's why it was confusing to the reader. So, again, if you were able to revise, what would you change here? (TR#14_S4_Q2)

S4: I would just change the verb, or the whole phrase, it depends, because here "are essential to" just "to the town" or "to connect people", yeah, or just leave it out, or just change it.

I: Okay, and again, would this be something you'd struggle with, or d'you think you wouldn't have any problems with this?

S4: Maybe I would struggle a bit to find the right word that fits in this context, but if I just leave it out, I know now what I could change and what I will change in the future, but no, I wouldn't struggle a lot, maybe a bit to find the right word.

I: Okay, great. Again, if you had changed this, how would this improve the text? (TR#14_S4_Q3)

S4: It would improve the text, in the sense of, maybe word accuracy, because the word is not really accurate in this sentence here and, yeah, it would definitely improve the essay, if I change it.

I: Alright, so the accuracy, or the linguistic accuracy, like it says on the

S4: yeah.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#15)

I: Perfect, so let's look at the last example, which is this one, the red one [...]. It says "some problems with range and style". (TR#15_S4_Q1)

S4: It is somehow related to the problem with "animate town" and that I, I always try to use different words and somehow exotic words, or good words, and not always the same that I (incomprehensible 9:56), so I look for it on the internet and yeah, I

sometimes think that this word is cool (laughs), and it fits, and it sounds sophisticated then I use it, but it just doesn't fit that well.

I: So, again, the word isn't appropriate for a certain context.

S4: Mhm, it's about linguistic accuracy and linguistic range. That's the problem here.

I: Okay, let's look at this example here, if you were able to change something, what would you do? (TR#15_S4_Q2)

S4: (reads) "in order to achieve savings". Mhm, I somehow, I would just look for another phrase that fits better, but here I was trying to look for a phrase and I thought okay this is good, because I used another phrase just one sentence above and I just thought that I'd look for something different.

I: Would you struggle finding something else? Cause you were already looking for this?

S4: I think I would struggle, because it is not that easy to find, how do I explain it, to find something that means exactly the same, but is another word and another phrase, yeah, and has the same meaning, because sometimes words are marked as synonyms, but they are not quite really synonyms that mean the same.

I: Okay, okay perfect. Last question: What would this change again? How would this improve the essay? (TR#15_S4_Q3)

S4: It would also improve the essay in terms of linguistic accuracy and word range and it would make the essay better if I used always the right word to, yeah, the right meaning.

I: Okay, perfect. [...]

Example of good/bad experience with feedback

S4: Yeah, in my school, we had a teacher that was, yeah his feedback was always confusing, it was just you wrote an essay and then it was good, or it was not good, or it was just nothing (laughs), and then you were just like okay, okay, okay (laughs), you didn't know what to do better, or I personally thought that it depends on his just personal thought of view, or

I: So he didn't mark anything, but he only wrote one or two letters at the end, either good or okay, so he didn't give an explanation of why it's good or bad.

S4: No, no, no, sometimes he wrote something like, okay this word or this word is bad, I don't know, but not really how to improve it, and it started all that he didn't explain the rules properly, he just said, okay, write an essay about, I don't know anything, and you didn't know how to write an essay, how is it structured, yeah, there was just a real problem, but then he wrote something, everybody's essays, they were different, because nobody knew exactly what to do and then the one essay was good and the other essay was bad and nobody knew okay why, but okay (laughs), next time I'll do it differently, next time I'll try to do it like the others.

Participant S5

Student has not had a one-on-one with CI1 about this essay.

First instance of feedback (TR#16)

I: What does this mean to you? How would you interpret this? (TR#16_S5_Q1)

S5: I think they meant that I didn't really talk about what's in the graph and that I just took some information out of it and used it as part of my paragraph without going into detail too much.

I: Okay, so not using enough details from the source.

S5: Exactly.

I: Okay, and then the second question is always going to be: If you were able to change that, if you were able to write a second draft, what would you change? You don't have to phrase it, or formulate it exactly the way you would, but just in general, what would you change to respond to the feedback? (TR#16_S5_Q2)

S5: In terms of the sentence?

I: Like, if you've gotten his feedback, what does it say, "it's rudimentary and lacking detail", if you could reply to this, if you could write a second draft and get another grade on it, what would you change in the essay?

S5: I would definitely try to add more detail and look at the graph more, so that it fulfils his request in terms of detail.

I: Okay, and then the last question is always going to be: how does this improve the text? How does the text become better, or does it even become better, or is it good the way it is and it wouldn't improve if you changed it? (TR#16_S5_Q3)

S5: I think the reader would understand my point more, and my point would come across better.

I: So your argumentation would become more clear?

S5: Yeah.

I: okay great. So that was the first one, let's look at the next one.

Second instance of feedback (TR#17)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? (TR#17_S5_Q1)

S5: Cohesion, I think that they mean, or they mean that the sentences aren't written very fluently, that there is some sort of difficulty in understanding what I mean.

I: Okay. So, in this sentence, or in the first sentence of the paragraph, it's hard to understand what you mean?

S5: Yes, and what I mean by using "they", "they provide a foundation for".

I: Oh, what you're referring to when you're using "they".

S5: Exactly.

I: Alright, and if you were able to change something, what would you do?
(TR#17_S5_Q2)

S5: Maybe how I, maybe change the pronoun and replace it with something else so that it refers back to what I actually meant, what I was actually referring to.

I: Okay, so that it becomes more clear to what you're referring to.

S5: Exactly.

I: Okay, so how would this improve the essay? **(TR#17_S5_Q3)**

S5: The reader understands my point better and doesn't have any difficulties reading it.

I: Okay, so it's easier to understand for the reader. Great, let's look at the next example.

Third instance of feedback (TR#18)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#18_S5_Q1)**

S5: That the reader doesn't understand what I meant with my first sentence.

[...] *short interruption for administrative reason*

I: Okay, so it's unclear, it's hard to understand for the reader. Anything else? Or that's it?

S5: No, I that's it.

I: Alright, so again, if you were able to change something, what would you do?
(TR#18_S5_Q2)

S5: Maybe rephrase it, so that the reader understands it better.

I: Okay, so if you were to rephrase it, d'you think you'd struggle doing that, or d'you think you'd have some troubles or problems rephrasing this?

S5: Depends.

I: Or, do you already have a clear idea how you could rephrase it so that it's less confusing or less unclear?

S5: I don't know. I could maybe rephrase it so that

I: Or do you know which part you would have had to rephrase? Or do you think the whole sentence because he's kind of, I think the squiggly line is saying it's the whole sentence.

S5: I think the main part that is not that understandable is "creates communities which can be observed in locally owned businesses", I think that's the main part that confuses the reader.

I: Okay and then what do you think is important to change? Like the "create", or the "communities that can be observed"?

S5: I think it's rather the "communities that can be observed"

I: So basically you've been using the wrong terms

S5: Yeah.

I: Okay, and you have strategies to find words that are more appropriate?

S5: Yeah.

I: Again, how would this improve the essay? (TR#18_S5_Q3)

S5: It's just, the reader understands it better (laughs).

I: Okay, so similarly to before. Then let's look at the last example.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#19)

I: Again, what does this mean? This "stylistic issues" and the squiggly line? (TR#19_S5_Q1)

S5: It's very colloquial and it does not really belong in an essay.

I: Alright, so the style or the language is not appropriate?

S5: Yes

I: What would you change if you were able to change it? (TR#19_S5_Q2)

S5: Rephrase it, maybe use different vocabulary, or different phrases, so that it fits the essay.

I: Okay, and again, d'you think you'd struggle trying to rephrase this or d'you think it would be easy for you?

S5: I think it would be easy. It's something that happens quite often subconsciously, because we obviously talk differently in comparison to how we write and yeah, I think that won't be a huge problem, rephrasing it.

I: Okay, and then again, how would this improve the essay? (TR#19_S5_Q1)

S5: It would just, it's understandable this way, but I think it would fit, it would make the essay better to read and it would just sound better.

I: It would sound better. Okay.

Example of good/bad experience with feedback

Can't really think of anything.

Participant S6

First instance of feedback (TR#20)

I: So the first question would be: what does this mean to you? How would you interpret this? (TR#20_S6_Q1)

S6: So, I mean, the thesis statement has always been a problem for me in prior cases and one thing I was a bit confused about was that although their corrections clearly show me how it is done and I see the point that their corrections are way better and better show my main points of the two paragraphs, but I didn't see my version of the thesis statement as necessarily the way they transcribed it, so I don't share the same opinion with them on that case actually, I believe that my thesis statement was definitely worse than theirs, and theirs brings my main points way better over to, presenting my main points, god, way better as a thesis (struggles formulating)

I: They're doing better formulations? Or language-wise?

S6: Definitely. However, I don't see my thesis statement in a way that they actually understood my thesis statement.

I: You think they didn't understand it and when they rephrased it, it didn't have the original meaning?

S6: No, it did, they rephrased it in a better way, but they, in my opinion they didn't quite change the meaning that, so my original thesis statement still holds, in my opinion, the same meaning that they just rephrased. However, it is written very confusedly and probably quite easy to misunderstand, so I assume that they misunderstood actually the intended meaning of my thesis statement and rephrased it the way I actually intended it, however, the way I phrased it, I already intended it that way.

I: Okay, I understand, so you think it didn't change for the better?

S6: It did change for the better but, how do I put this, what they actually meant to tell me is that my thesis statement didn't match with my body paragraphs and my argumentation and points, the way I see it however, is that my thesis statement did match, but was really, really insufficiently constructed and written and formulated. So, their formulation is better in every way, and this is a feedback I really appreciated, because I have a hard time of starting and initiating thesis statements and how to phrase them and how to make them more clear, because making a thesis statement really clear, what am I going to talk about is the main difficulty for me in writing essays, but at this time, I believe that my thesis statement wasn't particularly wrong, just not well written.

I: Alright, I think I understand. So, you don't agree with their statement that there is a mismatch between thesis statement and body paragraphs.

S6: Correct.

I: Alright, so the next question would be, if you had to revise this, if you had to write a second version, a second draft, how would you then rewrite this? **(TR#20_S6_Q2)**

S6: I would definitely stay with my argumentations, meaning that the points I made in the essay still hold true, however, I would definitely rewrite the thesis statement, seeing that it is hard to understand the way it has been written before and maybe try to bring in a better connection, like more fluent and cohesive connection all through the whole essay, so not only the argumentations on their own are one big bundle so to say, but the whole essay just builds up from the thesis statement down to the argumentations to the conclusion and that is clearly visible for all the readers of this essay basically.

I: Okay, so your most important change would be the language of the thesis statement.

S6: Yes.

I: But the meaning would still stay the same as your original, or would that change as well?

S6: Since my opinion is that the original meaning isn't anything other than the meaning they actually tried to implement in their version, of course I would stay with the original meaning, being that I want to validate my two points in the body paragraphs.

I: Okay great and the last question for this instance would be, now after this change, this hypothetical change we're talking about, how would this improve the essay, how would it become better? **(TR#20_S6_Q3)**

S6: The essay or me as a writer?

I: No, no, the essay.

S6: Since it was not properly understood by the reader, it would definitely make the readability easier. Another thing that is also, is that the language use is kind of hard, or hard is the wrong word, my use of language is kind of hard to understand for the reader.

I: It might be confusing?

S6: It might be confusing or too complex written, especially since I tend to write longer sentences, I get to struggle a bit with the word order, if you're already in the midst of a sentence, in the train of a thought, and then you want to write something else, something new and include it in the sentence then you sometimes miss out something that you've written at the start of the sentence and miss something important for the word order, which is probably a part of my thesis statement was so confusing, because it was actually quite long.

I: Okay, so basically, the essential thing is readability or reader-friendliness.

S6: Yeah.

I: So, let's move on to the second instance of feedback

Second instance of feedback (TR#21)

I: So, again, what does CI2 mean with this, or what does it mean to you? **(TR#21_S6_Q1)**

S6: It shows me that I've been inconsistent on quoting or on referring to other sources, which was quite helpful, because it was the first attempt of implementing sources in the whole essay. Being that I was actually quite unsure of how I should approach it, so this helped me a lot. However, and this is a mistake on my part, but something that they didn't quite, that I didn't really, that they didn't quite understand from my side of things about the Jones and Kammen, because I don't have any background knowledge to those, and they assumed that it was naturally just two names, which is why you wouldn't just put on quotation marks. What I assumed though, was that it was a sort of, what would be a good comparison, a sort of brand, not a brand in a way of Mercedes or anything, but more of a branding or name.

I: Like a category?

S6: Not quite a category, but think about, there are like two or three big names in the field of rating credibility of countries, what are they called, Fitch is one of them, but there is another.

I: D'you mean rating agencies, like Moody's?

S6: Yeah, exactly, there's for example, I believe there is a rating agency which has two names, and those two names basically form a brand, and I saw those two as sort of a brand for making statistics, and the name of the brand would be Jones and Kammen,

which is why I put the name of the brand into quotation marks, but not as a quotation mark, but as a, this was a single mark, to single out and emphasise their name.

I: Okay, so you didn't want to quote Jones and Kammen, but you wanted to say that an example is also "Jones and Kammen" and that's why you put it under quotation marks. Okay.

S6: And this was just a misunderstanding on their part in my opinion, but to put it in another way, how should they know, honestly? Because I understood it wrong in the first place and then she can't read my mind.

I: Okay great. If you were able to revise this again, if you were able to write a second draft, how would you change this part of the essay? **(TR#21_S6_Q2)**

S6: First off, I would be way more consistent in my referring, meaning where to put a comma or not to put a comma and all those things about, everything in the brackets and I would, since I know that the one who's actually reading my essays and checking my essays is him/her, and the quotation thingy was misunderstood, I would just refrain from it.

I: So basically, you'd use the same guidelines or the same format throughout the essay.

S6: Yeah, the format that they has told me about, so the format they suggests and instances of things which could be misunderstood, I'd just leave out.

I: Alright, and finally, how would this improve the essay? How would this improve the text? **(TR#21_S6_Q3)**

S6: I mean, from a formal standpoint, it would just improve it overall by being just consistently in its referring throughout the whole text.

I: So, level of formality, d'you mean that? And it would be consistent.

S6: Mhm.

I: Okay, let's look at the last one, which is this here.

Third instance of feedback (TR#22)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#22_S6_Q1)**

S6: Okay, where do I start? This was probably the biggest thing in the whole feedback, because you got to differentiate between vocabulary range and language use and I was told by him/her multiple times that my vocabulary range was admirable and this is quite different from language use, so what I took from it was I have a good vocabulary and use it in the wrong places and wrong way and with the wrong forms, meaning mainly lexis. However, even when looking at the essay, the corrected essay, it was kind of hard for me to recognize what makes the use of this language better than mine, or inappropriate, inappropriate not in a way of register, but in which way is that too complicated, or not really well implemented, or like the small instances where some words work better than others, but they are not necessarily wrong, but just in this context they feel better, or specific phrases, I mean one of

I: Are you referring to style? You said it wasn't register, but do you mean style?

S6: It's kind of, actually, now that you mention it, it could be what they meant by a style thing, because

I: I was just trying to see what you were meaning.

S6: Not really, it's the language use, it's not the language itself that I'm using but where I'm using it, just telling me, okay you use the language wrong at some places doesn't necessarily help me to get better in using my language, because in my opinion, the way I've written it, the language use felt fine to me, and while there are some cases where I can see from my corrections, okay this sounds better and this word might be more appropriate in that context than another word, it doesn't necessarily show me how to really improve my language use, because it still doesn't make me feel that my choice of words was wrong in any way, so I could say, next time when I use this word in that case, no I shouldn't do that, because this kind of language use is inappropriate in this context. So this was kind of the biggest thing for me to think of and this is the most difficult part to imagine myself improving, because I don't really have a way of knowing how I could really improve it, and just that (incomprehensible) it could be a grammar part, it could be lexis, or anything. What it could be, it doesn't necessarily help me.

I: Alright, so basically, you've already partly answered the second question, but let's go through it again, so that I have a clearer understanding. So then using this feedback, how would you revise, what would you change in the essay? **(TR#22_S6_Q2)**

S6: Using this feedback, I mean, from what they've changed on my essay, I can use certain terms and phrases and words and pick them up for my own vocabulary, which is actually a thing of vocabulary range again and not language use, which makes it so confusing. I mean there was one instance "in a fashion way", was it called, I believe it was in the second part, yeah "in a more environmentally-friendly fashion". I mean that this sounds better, I can recognise that.

I: What did you write? Did you write manner, or way?

S6: I believe I actually left it out, but the whole thing was a bit up-phrased.

I: Oh, so you wrote "generating electricity more environmentally-friendly".

S6: And I mean looking at this, of course "a more environmentally-friendly fashion" sounds better, but this doesn't mean that mine was wrong, or I would really appreciate in what way it was and why it was wrong, so that I can actually think of it when I use it next time. What I can take from it, is of course I can take phrases and then use them when I see an option to use them, but that doesn't necessarily mean that I use them because I think they are right, but I'm using them because I see that they work.

I: Okay, so basically you would use their corrections as a model and then imitate those in future essays.

S6: In future essays corrected by them.

I: So if you had another teacher, then you would use ...

S6: Yeah. Because what if the other teacher tells me that this is not the way to use it, and "environmentally-friendly fashion" would be an exactly interesting example, because we were told that idioms and all those kinds of phrasal things should be really

used with care, if not avoided, so they comes with a correction with that and that just makes it even more confusing. When should I give myself more freedom to use idioms for example, or just some more phrasal stuff

I: You mean phrasal verbs?

S6: Not phrasal verbs, but just phrases on their own.

I: Okay, so then, finally, how would this improve the essay? Your changes? Or would they? **(TR#22_S6_Q3)**

S6: I mean of course implementing those changes would improve the essay, because, after all, they does know her stuff, it would improve only the essay, but not my writing though, because I don't see any sort of model how to actually use their feedback on other essays, other then just, well try it out there in such a case, or I have this list of words which are recommended, positive language to use, now try to implement those, but from a spontaneous point of writing another essay, implementing those changes would be actually quite hard, because, okay those are examples of good language use, but how to use good language was not explained, because when is which kind of use of language better than other kinds of uses of language, and of course this probably goes way to in depth into such an essay feedback and is probably not even the point of the course, I mean there is 'language in use' on its own, but still, giving it such a heavy importance in grading and in mentioning in the feedback, I would have appreciated to get at least a bit of a view or some sort of outlet on how to actually use that feedback better for my upcoming essays.

I: So, you mean you would have wanted to learn before writing the essay, how they would respond to it, or what their model of response is so that you can adhere to it? Is this what you mean by this?

S6: I mean learning stuff that you misuse before using it ...

I: I mean not learning, but just being informed about it beforehand.

S6: Although it wouldn't necessarily help my essay writing, considering that I use what I think of as right, it would have still been helpful to a certain extent comparing it to ILSS1 feedback where there was like a feedback sheet and you had like, this point, some other points for this and this and this, and they writes down the points, don't get me wrong, but it's giving me a better overview, I have this sheet beforehand, I can like compare with the sheet, comparing my essay, editing before handing it in, which doesn't mean that their way of giving feedback is wrong, I actually really appreciate it, I think that the oral feedback is much more personal and there is lot of more information that can be included than just on the sheet, the choice of which information to include and in which way to actually put it makes it a good or a bad feedback though.

Example of good/bad feedback

(See last paragraph)

Participant S7

First instance of feedback (TR#23)

I: Okay, so what do they mean by this? (TR#23_S7_Q1)

S7: Well. I started my paragraphs by writing 'firstly', 'secondly', and it's not wrong, but it's, there are better ways to start a paragraph, like, I rewrote it, and I started with 'moreover', yeah, something like this.

I: Okay, so basically it's not a good way to start a paragraph.

S7: No.

I: I think you've already started saying this, if you were able to change something, what would you do? (TR#23_S7_Q2)

S7: Well (longer pause)

I: You can also look at your essay at the same time, if you'd like to.

S7: With 'firstly', I wouldn't start with 'moreover', but with 'secondly' I would start with, I would replace it with 'in addition' or, there are several other ways to do this, so I'd google it, but with 'firstly' I, it was like a phrase I found that fit very well in there.

I: Okay, so you found something, you have strategies to find resources, okay, and you'd just replace the 'firstly', 'secondly'.

S7: Yeah.

I: If you had done this, how would this improve the essay? (TR#23_S7_Q3)

S7: It reads a little bit more (long pause), like in ILSS1 I always wrote 'firstly', 'secondly', that was kind of fine for her, but in ILSS7 you should find other ways.

I: Okay, so that's kind of the course requirements, or that's what they want you to do in the course, but just to be a more successful text, or effective text, do you know how this would improve the text? Like, if you don't really know that it's better, or whether it's better, that's okay to say as well.

S7: (long pause) Well, if I read 'firstly', 'secondly' then, well it's like, okay there is a reason number one, there is a reason number two, but if I use different beginnings, than it, I have the feeling that the writer is not proficient, has written many texts already.

I: Okay, so maybe do you mean there's more variation?

S7: Yeah. Or more experience.

Second instance of feedback (TR#24)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? (TR#24_S7_Q1)

S7: Well, (laughs) my thesis statement was more general (long pause), well I've said that, that the population has some influence on changing the climate, but I, but in my paragraphs I (long pause), can I read the feedback again?

I: Of course.

S7: Okay, so, sorry, in my thesis statement I wrote that the individual can change certain things in their daily lives to change the climate, but in my examples, I wrote that, well

these examples were not very good, because I wrote something like, I remember that the lightings of the stores can be, should be turned off, but an individual cannot really, I mean I don't really have an influence, I can't really change that.

I: So, basically, the examples you've been using didn't fit the thesis statement.

S7: Yes.

I: Okay, so if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#24_S7_Q2)**

S7: Well, I would use different examples.

I: Okay, so ones that fit the thesis statement more properly. Okay great and if you had used these examples, how would this improve the text? How would the text become more successful? **(TR#24_S7_Q3)**

S7: Well, here I received a D, so I

I: I mean, not in terms of assessment, but in terms of just having a better text, how would the text be better to read maybe, or how would it improve, if you don't think about how it's graded, but just how it's perceived by somebody who reads it. Again, if you don't know, it's perfectly fine to say you don't know how it would improve.

S7: I actually think that most people, if someone reads this, they wouldn't even notice that my thesis statement was focussed on individuals.

I: Okay, so you think it wouldn't really improve. So you think it's kind of picky maybe, or kind of, very, very specific, okay.

Third instance of feedback (TR#25)

I: Okay, so again, what does this mean to you? If you'd like to look at the essay, we can open the essay as well, so you can look at the conclusion. Here it is. **(TR#25_S7_Q1)**

S7: Can I see the feedback again?

I: Of course.

S7: My summary was a summary basically, my conclusion was a summary basically, but it was too, too general maybe for her, and yeah I think it would have been better to link it back to the thesis statement.

I: Okay.

S7: And I have to say that, first I didn't know much about this topic, I googled a lot.

I: Okay. So, if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#25_S7_Q2)**

S7: (long pause) I think I would leave out the first sentence.

I: So basically you'd use their suggestion.

S7: Yes, their suggestion, yes.

I: And then you'd leave the rest as it is, or including their corrections?

S7: Yes I would include their corrections, definitely, yes.

I: Okay, great, and then finally, how would this improve the text? **(TR#25_S7_Q3)**

S7: Well I think it would be a good ending.

I: Okay, so it would be a better ending than before.

S7: Yes, definitely, yes.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#26)

I: Alright, again, what does this mean? **(TR#26_S7_Q1)**

S7: Well, well, my thesis statement was fine, but the examples in the body paragraphs, they didn't fit with the thesis statement.

I: Okay, so again, like in the second instance, thesis statement doesn't fit the examples. Okay, so then, what would you do, use, like you said before, use different examples? **(TR#26_S7_Q2)**

S7: Yes, exactly.

I: Okay, and, I don't remember, what did you say, how does this improve the essay? Use different examples, I think you said it wouldn't improve, or was that the third instance? **(TR#26_S7_Q1)**

S7: Yeah, I, I mean I can understand why they says that, but, for me personally, I think it would not improve, yes (laughs).

Example of good/bad experience of feedback

S7: Well, last year, can I say the name?

I: I'll just delete it, if it's not okay.

S7: Well, ILSS1, I did ILSS1 in XX's course, and he's very, very nice, but I didn't like his way, he gives feedback, to be honest, he, well he just writes with a pencil, and the first thing was that I couldn't really read his writing, his corrections, and I also didn't very closely look at my mistakes, so, because it was, I think it was kind of, not very personal, I prefer this way of giving feedback, because it is definitely more personal, they sometimes repeats the name of the student.

I: So it has motivational aspects for you as well?

S7: Exactly, yes, and I don't really like her (lacks word)

I: The corrections?

S7: So, you don't really like the corrections, but you prefer the comments you receive.

I: Alright, and basically, XX, did he only write short sentences, or only words and that's why it was so impersonal?

S7: Well, I couldn't really read his

I: Okay, so the first problem, it was unreadable.

S7: Exactly, yes, and sometimes I didn't know what he wants, and CI2, they, I understand their corrections much better, it's very clear for me.

I: Maybe because there's so much detail, right? They talk like, I don't know it's like 12-15 minutes sometimes.

S7: Yes, and they take the effort to, like it's, it's their time to sit there and speak into the microphone.

I: Do you feel like it's a bit like talking to them in person when they send you these recordings?

S7: Yes.

Participant S8

First instance of feedback (TR#27)

I: Alright, so the first question is always going to be: What does this feedback mean to you? How would you interpret this? **(TR#27_S8_Q1)**

S8: What I understand from what they says, I, I mean the marker was about the text reference, because I, in the introduction I was talking about something different, like the individual being also, having the responsibility of the individual to actually do something about climate change, or to make a change, and then in the conclusion I sort of contradicted myself by saying that the government has the most significant role to play, so it doesn't really answer that question, it's kind of confusing, who is not, who's responsibility is it, is it the government or the individual, because I started off with it being the individual, but then at the end I was, I cannot put it like, is the government, the government has the most significant role to play, so, yeah.

I: Okay, so basically they're saying that there's a mismatch between those two.

S8: exactly, so my introduction and my conclusion doesn't match, given to, especially if you consider that everything I wrote about before, I was talking about the individual and at the end I just put the government's part which was not ideal.

I: Okay, so the last part, the conclusion doesn't fit to the introduction or the body paragraphs.

S8: Exactly.

I: Okay great, now, the second question is: if you were able to revise, if you were able to write a second draft, what would you change? **(TR#27_S8_Q2)**

S8: I'll probably take the government part out of the conclusion, or formulate it better, so they are, so that the whole weight doesn't lie on the government, so maybe like, instead of they have a significant role to play, they have a role to play, but the individual has the most significant role to play, the government can do something to help, but however, the individual, like the whole, most of the work should be done by the individuals, not the government.

I: Okay, so you'd put the focus on the individual instead of the government, and then it would fit.

S8: Exactly, exactly.

I: Okay, if you had done this revision, how would this improve the text? **(TR#27_S8_Q3)**

S8: Probably the task fulfilment would be more better, like I would have filled the task more appropriately then what I did before, so

I: So basically that's in terms of assessing the text, but do you think the text would become more effective or more successful if you had done these changes?

S8: I think so, yeah.

I: And why do you think it would be more effective, or why would it be more effective?

S8: Because for one, apart from just fulfilling the task, they, like to be more successful the text, I answer the question, not answer the question partly and then at the end I cannot deviate from I was talking about, like I cannot deviate from my main focus, yeah, so that kind of (unintelligible) the success of the text better.

I: Okay, great.

Second instance of feedback (TR#28)

I: Alright, so again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#28_S8_Q1)**

S8: Maybe I should, my, wath they says, my thesis statement was too vague, was a bit too general, it wasn't answering the question properly, so like, it was not about what they can do, it's about who's responsibility is it, is it the responsibility of the individual or the government, so it's not about, maybe I should, poor choice of words, so I cannot have poor choice of words, yeah.

I: Okay, so you think that you that the choice of words

S8: Yeah, doesn't emphasise my point, doesn't put weight on what I wanted to say.

I: Okay great. Again, if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#28_S8_Q2)**

S8: Maybe take out this "it seems" and concentrate on, more on how, or what is it the responsibility of the individual, or how is it the responsibility of the individual, so that, I mean the whole thing was like a little bit too general, I would say, and I was to write it differently, I would consider it more about the individual, like emphasise how is it their responsibility and what they have to do.

I: Okay, so basically you'd take their suggestion and then use it. Alright, if you had done this, how would this improve the text? **(TR#28_S8_Q3)**

S8: I think it (unintelligible) quite well, so like, maybe made my whole point a little bit clearer to the reader, for I assume the readers to be people who do not know anything about climate change, maybe to the normal reader, everyday reader, not like those people who are specific, like experts in this topic, and it would have made it a little bit more clearer, because it was kind of confusing, given the fact that, although I chose to concentrate on the individual, but it wasn't really clear whether or not I was really

focussing on the responsibility, or who's responsibility it was, to make a change in climate change, yeah.

I: Okay great

Third instance of feedback (TR#29)

I: Okay, so, again, what does this mean to you? (TR#29_S8_Q1)

S8: This bit I think was, what they was, what they led me to do there was maybe organise my work properly, so they was like, at the bottom supposed to be, or the top was supposed to be at the bottom, kind of, and apart from that I really don't know (laughs).

I: So you're saying the sentences were kind of mixed up in this paragraph.

S8: Exactly, so it was not clear to like, if I had arranged it differently, or written it differently, it would have been a lot better than it turned out, yeah.

I: Okay great, and then again, what would you change, if you were able to change something? (TR#29_S8_Q2)

S8: What they said, like maybe put the example, no, or is it in the example, this bit, yeah so the second sentence would have been better at the end, kind of, just interchange, or structure it properly, or rephrase the whole thing.

I: Okay, so again, you'd take their suggestion and try to implement it in the essay.

S8: Exactly.

I: Okay, and if you had done this, how would this improve the text? (TR#29_S8_Q3)

S8: I honestly don't know.

I: Okay.

S8: I mean I think what I did was okay, but apparently it wasn't, so yeah, I don't know how it would have changed the outcome of the text.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#30)

I: Alright, so again, what does this mean to you? (TR#30_S8_Q1)

S8: Maybe read carefully before I, reread my work before I send it in and be careful with the editing, so when I edited maybe I just took out one word and then it kind of changed the whole thing and check my spellings.

I: Alright, so again, what would you change, I mean basically you've already said it. (TR#30_S8_Q2)

S8: Like, do what they says, for a start, starters, and yeah basically quit editing and take more time to write my papers instead of, when you ask me, so that might change a lot of things, because if I'm under time pressure, it's just going to, (unintelligible) I should just give it in at the, before the time, before time runs out, so doesn't really leave time for editing, for reading through, and yeah.

I: Alright, but in this particular case that they're referring to, what would you do to just revise this bit in your essay.

S8: I'll probably do, what bit are you talking about? Like this part?

I: Yeah, the EUROSTAT quote they're referring to that you've kind of edited incorrectly, if you were just able to revise this part, what would you do?

S8: First I will probably read it again and understand what it says and put it correctly into the, like stock it up correctly into the text, and make it a little bit more, like, they were like, it wasn't, kind of, yeah, like be careful when editing, when cutting something out, like if I want to, if I see that there's something (unintelligible) then I take something out of the text, I just have to be careful, reread it again, to make sure that there's no mistake there, there's not something messed up there, or something.

I: Okay, and finally, how would this improve the essay? (TR#30_S8_Q3)

S8: Overall, maybe it would improve in the structuring part, like if I done everything they said, before writing the text, maybe I should have

I: Yeah, but in this particular instance?

S8: So in the, okay, okay, okay, maybe make the whole thing more understandable for a non-academic reader, I would say, because maybe even an academic reader wouldn't understand what I'm trying to say, or understand my point, I understand what I want to say, but they wouldn't because they're not in my head, so it would be a little bit confusing, when you go, like what's that, I don't understand what she's talking about, so yeah.

No Example of experience of good/bad feedback

Participant S9

First instance of feedback (TR#31)

I: Alright, so what does this mean to you? (TR#31_S9_Q1)

S9: For me, I didn't actually think about using 'we' and 'us', I just forgot about it, that we shouldn't do this in formal register, but as CI2 said, it was not that bad with this topic and I think that's what subconsciously led me to forget about not using 'we', because it was so fitting, in my opinion, to this topic of saving the planet and whatnot, so I just went with my gut feeling and said 'we' and 'our', and "we're in this together", but I like this type of feedback as they sees where I come from and they says it's not too bad, but also advising me not to use it in the CFT, which is nice.

I: Okay, so basically they're telling you not to use pronouns in the CFT, but in the context you used it, it was perfectly fine.

S9: Yeah. So, they differentiates between now, the actual situation, and the norm, that was real nice to me.

I: Yeah, plus they're not going to be the only one, or they're not going to be the one grading it, but there's going to be other teachers grading your CFT. Alright, if you were

able to change something in your essay on the basis of what they said, what would you do? Or would you change anything? **(TR#31_S9_Q2)**

S9: That's a tricky question, I would say for the assignments at home, if I kept that in mind to not use pronouns.

I: I mean this very essay.

S9: Yeah, yeah, okay, so if I had the time at home, I maybe would have changed it, but in the CFT I would not bother with that because of the time pressure, at home it's, yeah you should spend 75 minutes, but if it's a little longer nobody bats an eye of course, so at home I think that I would write my way around 'we' and 'our'.

I: Also in this very essay, even though they said it was fine in the context you used it.

S9: If I knew that it was fine with this context, for sure I would not change it.

I: Okay, so if you wouldn't change it, we can leave out the third question.
(TR#31_S9_Q3)

S9: I think that would be too complicated for the reader, if I tried so hard not to say 'we' and came up with some different forms that just don't get the point across that well, and to think about that always makes me a bit anxious and is that the write way to say, can I say it like that, so I would just go 'we'.

I: So you're saying if you changed it, it might even decrease the clarity of the text.

S9: Yeah

I: Okay, so that might be not an improvement at all.

Second instance of feedback (TR#32)

I: Alright, so what does this mean to you? **(TR#32_S9_Q1)**

S9: I think that it's nice that they said that is okay as I did it, because I looked at the slides how to quote correctly and I recalled that and then I did it as I did it, but they said that it would be okay and even better, and I agree with him/her, if I just put the date and page directly after saying who I quote, and yeah, in the midterm test I actually did it, I did this, because it is true that it's easier to read if it's not repeating every time who read it, who wrote it and when, to just get that out of the way as soon as I mention the source, I think that's a good thing to do.

I: So basically they're saying that this is an alternative way to quote and you've also used it in another essay.

S9: Yeah, of course.

I: Okay, so if you were able to change something in the essay, this response is to, what would you change? **(TR#32_S9_Q2)**

S9: Well in this essay I would just go with what they said and not say EUROSTAT said this and that, and then at the end again say EUROSTAT, 2016, page 4, or whatever, I would just go EUROSTAT said and then brackets, 2016, page 4, I would do it as they asked me or told me that it was possible to do.

I: Alright, so, if you had done this, how would this improve the essay? (TR#32_S9_Q3)

S9: It makes it easier to read, I mean both ways are correct, as they said, but it's just easier for the reader to keep the flow of the text going when it's not repeated time and time again, the source, so yeah, I think that, so context-wise, or in terms of task fulfilment and correctness of quoting it makes no difference, but as you read it, it's better to read it, yeah.

I: Alright.

Third instance of feedback (TR#33)

I: So, what does this mean to you? (TR#33_S9_Q1)

S9: What the problem was with this paragraph is I wrote down too many words at the end of the, or the paragraph was, the text as a whole was too long and then I cut this paragraph specifically, and I didn't reread it that thoroughly, that's why I made a couple of mistakes, and they noticed the parts that didn't make sense, for me it's always been a problem that I write too much, and that I'm above the word limit, so what they told me was to don't say anything just for the sake of saying something, to just make the sentences as meaningful as possible and I actually use that tip very well, in the future essays I wrote, I made sure that before I write a sentence I know what this is, I know that this will be the main idea and I know that this sentence will be the supporting detail, and as they said that with getting side-tracked, that I mentioned real estate companies and all there was, because in the past I used to make a structure diagram, and every main idea had to have, in my head, two supporting details, and then I talked about it with him/her, and they said no that's not a must, it's okay but if the one supporting detail is enough and fits very well it's actually better than what I did in this essay, to say yeah, it's also, it finances itself, it's very nice, and as they said I don't talk about it, or the focus of my text is not about this, so I should leave it out, and yeah, I took that to heart.

I: Alright, so basically, just to summarise, it means to you that you shouldn't go beyond your argument, you shouldn't digress.

S9: Yes, exactly, yeah.

I: Okay, again, if you were able, on the basis of what they're saying here, if you were able to change something in your essay, what would you do? (TR#33_S9_Q2)

S9: I mean it's difficult because, I would say that the paragraph got a bit messed up as I cut down on words with it, so it, it's, I mean the original paragraph is not as bad, I would say, as it seems now, because it was, it had better cohesion and made more sense as a whole, but when I cut down on it, there were some holes in the sense of what I say, and if I could rewrite this paragraph I would do what they says and just focus on what I'm supposed to talk about, what I brought myself to talk about, and keep doing that and not spread off into financials or real estate companies, just focus on what's the topic, households in this case, and go with that.

I: Okay, so basically you'd stick to their suggestions, to what you're supposed to remove and try to focus.

S9: Yeah.

I: Alright, and then, if you had changed, if you had included these changes, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#33_S9_Q3)**

S9: I would say it would increase the focus on what the point of the text, because after all it was about stopping climate change and to protect the environment, and so it doesn't, if I kept in what I wrote originally, it distracts from the original topic, and if I made those changes, it would have been just about the topic and it would have been not actually easier to read, but it would have more sense to read it, if you know what I mean.

I: So, do you mean it's clearer to the reader what your argument is, or what your focus is?

S9: Yes, yes, yes.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#34)

I: Alright, so what does this mean to you? **(TR#34_S9_Q1)**

S9: That I misunderstood the meaning of 'housing', I haven't read that in that context before and I would say it's just everything that has to do with living in a house, but as I, as C12 said, that was wrong and I should have used households more, yeah I think it was just a bit unfortunate that I didn't know the correct way of using 'housing', but they made me aware of that and, yeah.

I: Okay, so basically they're trying to tell you that 'housing' cannot be used in the context you used it?

S9: Yeah, exactly.

I: So, if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#34_S9_Q2)**

S9: I mean I would have repeated myself with 'household' a lot if I scraped all of 'housing' and replaced it with 'households', I think I would have looked at other ways to say 'households', but when I wrote it I saw 'house' as a synonym for 'household', 'housing', as a synonym for 'household', which was wrong, so if I could rewrite it, I would use other synonyms than 'housing' which isn't one actually, yeah, just change those with more fitting words.

I: Okay, so you'd remove 'housing' and put 'households' or synonyms for 'households' instead.

S9: Yes.

I: Alright, if you had made these changes, how would this improve the text? **(TR#34_S9_Q3)**

S9: For somebody that knows the correct use of 'housing', it would be distracting to read it in the context I put it in, because, what the hell, that doesn't have to do something with that here, so it, using words incorrectly with such confidence as I did may be irritating to a lot of readers who know better and decrease the quality of my text quite a bit I would say, because they, okay the doesn't even know what this means, so why should I follow his opinion or something like that.

I: So you mean it would sound less professional, using the wrong word?

S9: Yes

Example of good/bad feedback

S9: Well, the way CI2 gives feedback, I like that very much, because they takes her time to send those voicemails, which I like very much, because they then can explain herself, why they ticked it as wrong, or how you could make it better, and sometimes they even asks or just assumes what you were going for when doing a mistake, and when I know that a professor says "I think you meant that and that and therefore you did this mistake", and I say "yeah true, that's where I went wrong", I like that very much, because in my ILLS1 the professor didn't really give too much feedback and I improved not as much as I did with CI2, so the professor in ILLS1 just said "wrong", and I couldn't , I couldn't tell her, or wasn't encouraged to go to her and say "Yeah, but actually what I meant was this and that", so with CI2 it's more of a, a better communication I would say, that's what I really like about him/her.

I: Okay great, so basically what you're saying is that, on the one hand you like that they gives so detailed and elaborate feedback, but also that they're trying to consider your thought process.

S9: Yes, definitely.

I: And that's why the communication, or the feedback as a communication works better.

S9: Yeah.

I: And then, just one more question to you specifically, I've seen that you've added these comments, is that something that you yourself came up with, or did CI2 tell you that that was an option?

S9: Yeah, I mean I was very, well, I put a lot of effort into this, in this text, and wanted it to be as good as it could get, so when I was a bit uncertain about what I should write, or if that's okay, I just, as I wrote it down, added it at the bottom of the page and then when I went to CI2 after class, they said, I asked "how could I do the comments" or "how should I upload it", and they said "do this with the comments in word" and they would have a look at it, and so yeah, I mean I get where they're coming from, that it's easier to read like this, and it's context bound, not like when I write it at the bottom of the page, so, yeah, I like that change.

I: Okay, so basically you came up with the idea to give her some additional information on what your thought process was, and then they told you that this was a good style, or this is a good form to do this.

S9: Yeah

Participant S10

First instance of feedback (TR#35)

I: Again, what does this mean to you? (TR#35_S10_Q1)

S10: It just meant that I didn't quite, fully know the definition of certain vocabulary, because I always thought that what I used had the same or similar meaning to what they suggested and I didn't actually, really think about it, they just told me to use 'attributed' in future essays, so that's what I took from it. I don't actually know what the difference is, but it does make sense in some way.

I: So, do you mean that sometimes you're using words incorrectly, or not, let's say not in the right context.

S10: Yeah. That I am very well aware of (laughs).

I: Okay, if you were able to change something, on the basis of this, what would you do?
(TR#35_S10_Q2)

S10: I would change the vocab, because after I changed it, I normally, I have my first draft and my final draft and then I have the corrected version, and I compare them to see "is there a major improvement?", it does improve the reading flow, because it's just like mine makes sense, but it's not ideal for a choice.

I: Alright, so basically, you'd just remove some of the words that they've marked and I think they also suggest corrections, yeah, they also add their suggestions. Yeah. If you had done these changes, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#35_S10_Q3)**

S10: It, I think, on the basis that I, most of my mistakes are language accuracy and that I misuse some words, I think it would just eliminate confusion for readers sometimes, because I might use, there was an instance where I used undermine instead of emphasise and that does create confusion, because they have completely different meanings. One is more negative, the other one is kind of neutral, so I do think it would improve the understanding and yeah that's basically it.

I: Okay, so it's easier to understand you, the writer.

S10: Easier to see my point of view that, the point that I'm making, I'm trying to make.

Second instance of feedback (TR#36)

I: Okay, so what does this mean to you? **(TR#36_S10_Q1)**

S10: I wouldn't necessarily say they improved it, I mean it does make sense, but I thought my original draft was actually, it doesn't create a better understanding, it is feedback, I don't necessarily think it's feedback that improves my draft. That's what I think of it.

I: Okay, but by saying this, what does they mean by this?

S10: I could connect two sentences, because after my initial full stop, I list things and I state examples, so they would be like, "you could use a colon to say 'in these instances'", but (pauses)

I: But you don't fully agree with it?

S10: It's not, I fully, I don't think it's an issue, because they deducted one point, I feel like that's a bit, you know, a bit too strict and a bit too picky, but it does make sense, it's not false, just, I could have added it, it's optional in my opinion.

I: Alright, so basically you're saying, if you were to change something, you'd just add the colon instead of the full stop. **(TR#36_S10_Q2)**

S10: Yeah, I'd add it for their sake (laughs), because I know they put a lot of emphasis on using colons, semi-colons, but if I would rewrite this entire essay, I'd still leave it as I had it before.

I: So, you're saying it doesn't really improve the text? **(TR#36_S10_Q3)**

S10: No.

Third instance of feedback (TR#37)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#37_S10_Q1)**

S10: I mean I do see that they has a point, because when I see their feedback and I read through mine, theirs does make more sense, but in my opinion it doesn't change too much of the meaning, so, I mean I appreciate the feedback, but, I can see where they're coming from, it's just like a marginal difference, so, I don't know.

I: So, there's something that they doesn't agree with on the meaning of the phrase that they've been using?

S10: It's not that they doesn't agree with it, it's just that they emphasises on one certain point, and I just said it more generally, so, I mean it's personal opinion, because I showed my essay to multiple friends and they're like, "this is completely clear, I get what you mean", this is just like, a bit more specific.

I: Okay, if you were able to change something, what would you do in this instance? **(TR#37_S10_Q2)**

S10: You mean in my essay, or?

I: In your essay. Say you were able to write a second draft and you could rewrite something on the basis of this feedback, what would you do?

S10: I would take their feedback, I would write it the way they said it, because it does make a difference and sometimes a small difference can alter like your grade for the worse or for the better. Just because I can see where they're coming from, it wouldn't hurt if I added, if the word count allows me to do so, because that's my main problem.

I: Alright, so basically you'd go with their suggestion.

S10: Yeah.

I: Alright, if you had done this, if you had made this change, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#37_S10_Q3)**

S10: It would just make it more clear for the reader and avoid any kind of confusion, I guess, because, as I said, they focuses more on the topic and the problem that's at hand, and I'm talking more generally about it, and in my essay, in my main body paragraph, it does make sense that they altered it the way they altered it, because it's like, this is the main focus, so I might as well add it in the thesis statement as well, so, yeah.

I: So basically, it would improve reader friendliness. It would be easier to understand.

S10: Yeah.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#38)

I: I think it's in the introduction, they just asks "always?" What does this mean?
(TR#38_S10_Q1)

S10: It's a bit too strong of an argument, I state it as if it was a fact, and I'm very guilty of this, my stance is always a bit too fixated on a point of view, so for an essay, for an argumentative essay, you're supposed to be relatively neutral, even though you have a point, a very strong stance, so, it's just, I could use some hedging, because in my essays I always use 'could', 'should', 'might', so I shouldn't use 'always' all the time, or like such strong, words with such strong connotations, so.

I: Alright, so basically you're saying by the use of 'always' this becomes too strong a stance?

S10: Yeah.

I: Alright, if you were able to improve this, what would you do in this instance?
(TR#38_S10_Q2)

S10: I would leave out always and just say "recently" (laughs).

I: Alright. And then how would this improve the essay? (TR#38_S10_Q3)

S10: It's a bit milder of a, it's just a more general statement and I think it's a statement that most people can agree on instead of 'always', like some people might say, yeah it hasn't always been a controversial topic, like fifty years ago, we had completely different problems, so just eliminate that, this claimer, it's not always the case, yeah that's about it.

I: Alright, so basically, something that everyone can agree on, so that your essay would speak to a broader audience?

S10: Exactly.

Example of experience of good/bad feedback

S10: In my final year in High school, we had to write a VWA, I don't know the English name of it, my topic was on alcohol consumption among teenagers and young adults and I really struggled with the topic, because I couldn't find any literature, like, focussing on teenagers, it was mostly about adults, and my mentor always said "Okay, I think this is the furthest we will ever come, because there's simply nothing we can work with" and another Biology teacher of ours wanted to look at it, because she also had a paper in Biology that she had to work on. I showed it to her, she flicked through the pages and she said "Yeah you would fail in my" (laughs), in German "das wär bei mir unten durch". She didn't say why, she just, I mean she did say it's a bit too personal, because I used a lot of 'I', 'I', 'I' in my introduction and everything and she just said "Yeah, this wouldn't work for me, this would fail" and I started crying, I was so stressed about it from the beginning and then, it was a week before we (pauses), what's the word?

I: Before you had to hand it in?

S10: Yeah, before I had to hand it in and she just smacked me with “Yeah, it would fail” (laughs), “if I was your mentor”, I was like “okay”.

I: So basically, what you didn’t like about this was her lack of subtleness and her not giving you a reason, or not explaining what’s wrong with it, but just assessing it?

S10: She just, my problem was she just stated blatantly “Yeah, you would fail if I were your mentor”, she didn’t say the reason why, before I started crying, she just panicked after I started crying and she told me some, like the reasons, which didn’t help, and then I found out afterwards that she had a completely different focus on her paper, so I was like God damn woman, why?

I: Oh, so then in the end her opinion didn’t count as much when you found out.

S10: Yeah, because she had a different focus and it’s, from that point of view it’s like, okay I have a different focus, so, my teacher grades me in a different, like differently, because she had a focus and she had a different focus, so, just because her standards weren’t met by my paper doesn’t mean it’s bad, but yeah that’s the, that was great.

I: Alright, so basically, probably also her lack of empathy in saying it this blatantly.

S10: Yes.

I: Alright, but I guess you’ve been able to finish it and have a positive grade in the end right?

S10: She apologized to me multiple times.

Participant S11

First instance of feedback (TR#39)

I: Alright, so the first question is always going to be: what does this mean to you, or how would you interpret this? (TR#39_S11_Q1)

S11: It means I have an idea about something, but I could not support it in the other paragraphs, in the body paragraphs, so I try to connect the information in body paragraphs to what I meant, but I couldn’t convey what I mean actually, I think that’s the problem, and I always have that problem in my essays.

I: Alright, the second question is always going to be: if you were able to rewrite this essay, what would you change? You don’t have to like formulate sentences, but just in general, what would you change? And of course, if you don’t know, or if you’d have trouble doing that, you could just say, well I don’t know how to change this.

(TR#39_S11_Q2)

S11: Actually I didn’t think about, I really didn’t have time to try to think about it and rewrite it, but I think under no pressure, when there’s no time pressure, I can think a little bit better, but I’m not sure how, how can I change it.

I: Okay, the third question is always going to be: if you had been able to change it, how would this improve the essay? So if you were able to respond to their feedback, and if you didn’t have any trouble to revise it, or if you were able to revise it perfectly

according to her feedback, then how would this improve the essay? How would the essay become better? **(TR#39_S11_Q3)**

S11: That's a really difficult question.

I: If you don't know, then it's always okay to say, well I don't know how this, I don't even know if it would improve, that's a perfectly fine answer.

S11: You know, if I know how to rewrite it, of course it would improve the essay, cause I exactly know my mistakes and my errors and what did I do and what haven't I done, but the thing is, you know, I just know what is my errors, but I don't know the way, I don't know how should I change it, you know, so.

I: So, you don't really know how this would improve the text.

S11: No.

Second instance of feedback (TR#40)

I: Alright, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#40_S11_Q1)**

S11: Yeah, it means I'm not strongly, I don't have, actually I'm not, I haven't a strong idea about something, but I cannot mention it in the essay.

I: So the language doesn't represent the, your perspective?

S11: Yeah, exactly, exactly, yeah.

I: Again, if you were able to change it, or if you were able to change something, to revise something, what would you do? **(TR#40_S11_Q2)**

S11: Of course this word 'appear', for example, or word like 'seem', words that show a bit like, not certainty in your essay, about this, I think I should change it.

I: Okay, you should just remove those?

S11: Exactly.

I: Okay, great, and then again, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#40_S11_Q3)**

S11: It really, if I can rewrite it in a good way that they told, it's gonna really show my, it proves what I really meant, it shows certainty.

I: Alright.

Third instance of feedback (TR#41)

I: Alright, so again, what does this mean to you? How would you interpret this? **(TR#41_S11_Q1)**

S11: I think, you know the kind of information I give here is really general, I cannot specify, exemplify what I meant, so I know what I mean, but if a person reads that, they cannot get what I meant, I think that's the problem.

I: Okay, so basically it's, you can say it in a general way, but then when it comes to specifying

S11: Exactly.

I: Okay, if you were able to change this, what would you do? **(TR#41_S11_Q2)**

S11: I didn't think about it but if I wanna change it, you know they just told me here that you can give some examples maybe, or, actually I haven't thought about it, so I'm not sure, if I can rewrite it in a better way or not.

I: Okay, but probably a way would be to add examples.

S11: Yeah, I think so, yeah.

I: Okay, and then again, how would this improve the essay? How would the text become more efficient or better? **(TR#41_S11_Q13)**

S11: It will be easier to understand what I mean.

I: Okay, so it would be more clear to the reader?

S11: Exactly.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#42)

S11: Yeah, the choice of words, yeah.

I: So, again, what do they mean by this? Or what do you get from this? How do you interpret this? **(TR#42_S11_Q1)**

S11: You know, I think the major problem with this is I think in my mother tongue, in my mother language and then I try to translate it in English, in speaking I don't have a problem, but in writing, cause I wanna, I try to be a little bit more professional, it's always a problem, you know, I mess it up, so, again I cannot convey what I mean, because I don't choose good words, that's the thing, the choice of words.

I: Okay.

S11: So I confuse the reader.

I: Okay, so because words don't fit in a certain context?

S11: Exactly, yes.

I: Alright, and if you were able to change something, just in a very general way, how could you revise, how could you choose better words? Is that something you'd struggle with, or do you have any strategies to do that? **(TR#42_S11_Q2)**

S11: The thing is, I think I should really read more and more, the more you read, the more you get idea about how should you write, the choice of different words in different places, what different words mean in different contexts, that's the thing, so it's not something that I can help immediately, when I want, so I have to read and then I have to make my reading and my writing better.

I: Okay, so basically, at this point you'd struggle, or you wouldn't really know how to revise, how to change your words for more accurate ones.

S11: Not so, no not exactly.

I: Alright, and then the last question, how would this, if you had been able to change the words for more accurate ones, then how would this improve the essay?

(TR#42_S11_Q3)

S11: Again, it really makes the reader understand what I meant, of course that would be really better, a better essay, and, yeah, convey what I meant in my thesis statement.

Example of experience of good/bad feedback

S11: No.

Participant S12

First instance of feedback (TR#43)

I: So, what does this mean to you? **(TR#43_S12_Q1)**

S12: This means that I didn't answer the question that the prompt told me to answer, in a way that is good enough, or could be better.

I: So, you mean you've digressed, or gotten side-tracked?

S12: Yes, I was kind of distracted by the fact that I have to explain the advantages and disadvantages, but that took just so much time and I've already written so many words that I kind of forgot to, like respond to the question that is asked, which is, yeah, law-abiding citizens have nothing to fear, and I kind of wrote about what is good about mass data surveillance and so on, but I didn't really implement that, didn't really talk about that in detail, what I should have done.

I: Okay, so if you were able to change something in the essay, what would you do?

(TR#43_S12_Q2)

S12: I think I would respond to the question directly in my first paragraph, and I think I did it, but only in the end, in the final body paragraph, shortly before the conclusion, but I would, after the introduction, I would directly, maybe quote the guy who said that and then try to structure my essay more based on that question and not kind of the other way around, because I, you know, I wrote advantages, disadvantages, and as a conclusion I responded to that question, it was something like this.

I: Okay, so basically, you'd leave a lot of what you've written about mass surveillance, but you'd try to stay more closely to the question?

S12: Yes and maybe shorten some parts of the argumentation to focus more on the prompt.

I: Okay, so basically, you'd remove some of the things you've said, but include something about the law-abiding citizens instead.

S12: Yes, specifically, maybe on the guy who said that, because it was kind of a quote, a direct quote, and I was not sure if I'm, if I was supposed to quote him, or not, or if I have to mention him, because that was not quite clear at the point I wrote the assignment.

I: Okay, if you had made this change, or if you were able to change this, how would this improve the text? How would the text become more successful or more effective?

(TR#43_S12_Q3)

S12: Well, I think it's only in the way that I would, like, it would fit better to the task, like the task asked me to do that, in my opinion, I wanted to write an argumentation, an argumentative text with pros and cons and not just respond to one question, so in my opinion it would not have really improve the text in the sense that it would be better to read or something, but I would just score higher in the points for task fulfilment, but I couldn't say which essay is better, or worse than the other.

I: Okay, so basically it wouldn't improve, but it would be more closely related to the question from the point.

S12: Yes.

Second instance of feedback (TR#44)

I: So what does this mean to you? I think in the global feedback it says it needs to be embedded more effectively. **(TR#44_S12_Q1)**

S12: That what I wrote does not directly respond to the topic sentence, which I wrote wasn't too good either, but it should be embedded in a way that I introduce the topic with the first sentence and then use this statistic as a way to support my topic sentence, and after that maybe write one or two sentences, which link it back, you know, which links this part back to the main idea which I had in this paragraph, and especially the sentence that comes after that does not really have anything to do with the main idea, it's more like a new idea or something, yeah, it's just there and it doesn't fit together.

I: Alright. If you were able to change something, what would you do here?

(TR#44_S12_Q2)

S12: (long pause) Just try to explain a little bit more about the consequences, maybe, of the report and the way in which this statistic shows that my argument is correct, or that it is a valuable argument.

I: So you'd try to create a better link that it shows that it supports your topic sentence.

S12: Yes, but I don't know exactly, now I'd have to take a longer look at it, but I don't know exactly how I would do it right now, but that's just, yeah, that's just how I would approach it.

I: Would that be something that you'd struggle with?

S12: It is a little bit, so far I guess, but I know from our lessons, I've learned about that, I think I can do it better now, I think I can do it better with my third assignment, because theoretically, I know how the body paragraphs should look like and I, it's easier for me now to recognise that some sentences just don't match, or that an argument or a supporting sentence does not really support my argument, it sometimes is just there because it's a nice idea that I have or something I just want to implement, but it's not really coherent, so I know I've become better at this, but it's still hard especially when it's a topic I really don't know anything about, or have to do a lot of research about it, or if I don't have much time to write this essay, then it's really hard.

I: Alright, if you had done these changes, how would this improve the essay, or the body paragraph? **(TR#44_S12_Q3)**

S12: It would be easier to read, and one would be able to read it more fluently and to have a really good idea of what I'm talking about, it's easier to follow my argumentation, if the statistics and the quotes I talk about are really good embedded and everything fits together and I don't have point A, point B, point C.

I: Okay, so it reads more fluently and it's not like a list.

S12: Exactly, yeah.

Third instance of feedback (TR#45)

I: So, I think this says "ineffective topic sentence" and they just has these two lines to tell you that it's about the first sentence. So, what does that mean to you? **(TR#45_S12_Q1)**

S12: That this is not an idea that I have or an argument which I can really talk about, but it's more of a supporting sentence, I think I could use it as a second or third sentence in a paragraph, but I would really have to make a point in my topic sentence, and, yeah, it's a fact, but a fact should be used to support and not to introduce an idea in this paragraph.

I: So, it should be an idea or an argument instead?

S12: Yes, maybe something controversial or something, this is just a random sentence, a random fact, it doesn't really raise interest in the topic, it's just kind of there

I: Alright, if you were able to change something, what would you do in this instance? **(TR#45_S12_Q2)**

S12: I would write about the, for example the consequences, or some negative aspect in the topic sentence, or a positive aspect, and then, just look if I can use the sentence, which I (unintelligible) as topic sentence, or if I can leave it out, but I'll just write something more interesting for the reader.

I: So you'd introduce a whole new idea that hasn't been in your essay at this point and then try to support this idea with the second sentence, perhaps?

S12: Yeah, either that, or try, I would always try to stick to the topic, so I wouldn't just take any idea that just comes to my mind if it doesn't really fit to my paragraphs before, but I, yeah, try to find something more innovative and not just a sentence like this, which is quite boring.

I: So in this instance, would this be something you'd struggle with?

S12: No, I don't necessarily think so, because in this case I also, I talk about a survey and I would just try, that's, it's just a sentence which can be replaced very easily, I believe.

I: Okay great, and if you had done this change, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#45_S12_Q3)**

S12: It would improve in the sense that the reader has a better understanding, if my text is, or my argumentation is positive or negative, what my point of view really is, if there

are clear topic sentences, and it's just easier to follow the other sentences in the paragraph, and so it kind of biases the reader and gives them, yeah, like a picture of me, more or less, what I believe, what my opinion really is.

I: So your opinion becomes more clear to the reader.

S12: Yeah, and not just what the facts are, that I have looked up.

I: Ah, so the link to your personal opinion becomes more clear by having a clearer or more effective topic sentence.

S12: Yes.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#46)

I: Again, what does this mean to you? Just this feedback, the "ambiguous" and the line, the underlining. **(TR#46_S12_Q1)**

S12: That it's just not, not clear enough, the expression is not clear enough and doesn't, yeah, just, there would be better expressions for what I want to say, and people could understand it differently from what I thought, it's not very clear what I said or want to say with this phrase.

I: Okay, so the reader might misunderstand you.

S12: Yes.

I: If you were able to change this, what would you do here? **(TR#46_S12_Q2)**

S12: I think I would just try to find a phrase which is clear in its meaning, or, yeah, just reformulate it in some way.

I: Is this something you'd struggle with, or do you think it'd be easy for you to do this, to use a different phrase, or to find a different phrase that would be more appropriate?

S12: Yeah, it depends on the situation, in an exam situation, I would struggle with it and I wouldn't even notice these things, I believe, because I'm so under stress. If I have more time to write my essay, I think I should be okay.

I: And in this very instance? If you had to remove this phrase and look for a better one, having resources and dictionaries and all that kind of stuff?

S12: I think it would take some time, I would be able to do that, but the problem is, it could very well be that I do not want to just exchange what they underlined, but maybe write a completely different sentence, or even a whole new introduction paragraph, yeah, it made me aware that this paragraph might not be as good as it should be after all, if it's not clear what I want to say with my second sentence, or with this part, so it could very well be that I just write two completely new sentences, which are maybe easier to understand.

I: Alright, and again, how would this change improve the essay? Or the introduction? **(TR#46_S12_Q3)**

S12: I think that I tend to use very specific vocabulary, which is, when you use too much of it, it gets a hard read, and in some situations it is better to use easier vocabulary,

easier words to really state your point and to make clear what you want to say and I think if I would do this more often then my essays would be better general, I have to find a mixture of words and phrases which kind of make it professional, but also easy to understand and that did not really answer your question, I know but.

I: So do you mean maybe by using a higher level of simplicity, the essay would become more reader friendly?

S12: Yes. It depends on the topic, but I know that if you use vocabulary which you looked up and heard for the first time yourself, you tend to misuse them, or use them incorrectly, because you don't really know the collocations and, what to say, co-occur with, but you don't know that, you don't know that these words are, to me it sounds good, but in some cases it's like that, it would be better if I use vocabulary which I really know before, really know what that means.

I: So do you mean, in this case, it could be, the reader might understand you, but it would just sound kind of off or odd?

S12: Yes.

I: Okay, and then having made this change it would no longer sound odd, but more natural and more authentic, is that what you mean?

S12: Yes, basically what I mean.

Example of experience of good/bad feedback

S12: Both. I had feedbacks, feedback experiences, where I just got my paper back with lots of little marks which I couldn't read and we didn't talk beforehand what these little signs, letters, mean, and there were just so many that I didn't want to ask at that point, because I thought, like, there were twenty different crosses and signs and I don't know, and I tried to repair myself and okay what could that mean, but I didn't want to ask, I know many people in my class had the same problems, and it was not like, that the teacher gave general feedback, explained the signs, or gave maybe feedback on what more people concerns, doesn't always have to be a hundred percent individual, but there was, there are certain mistakes which everybody makes at the beginning and we didn't get that in one class that I remember. In another class there is an example of very good feedback, I think, because we focussed on some major point in every essay, and in every class we discussed one point, the structure or something like that, and then we had a closer look after that and get examples, how to do it better and compare different versions of, or different texts from each student, and the students compare together, try to help each other with their text, and that is, I think, great, very useful.

I: Do you think what's great about it is that you would focus only on one aspect, or that you had so many other examples from other students that you could compare yourself with? (longer pause) Or am understanding incorrectly that you were only focussing only on one aspect with each text?

S12: One major aspect, like if we take the statistics, we talked about how to embed the statistics, for example, and then after class we would really know how to do it theoretically. Before writing, or handing in final versions of the text, it's very useful for me to talk to other students, get some ideas, and that's not really feedback, but, well it

is actually, because we present different ideas and approaches and show each other paragraphs and they read through it, and, I think you get new ideas, you get different opinions from many other people, not just one teacher, but that's something which I really enjoy doing and I also like to give feedback to others.

I: So you're saying the great thing about it was the ability to have peer-feedback at a, or to have the space to receive and also to give peer-feedback to others, or feedback to other students.

S12: Yeah, and you have, just have so many new ideas and new aspects which you didn't think about beforehand, and really helps you correct your essay and rewrite it, and that's, I think it has worked great for me so far.

Participant S13

First instance of feedback **(TR#47)**

I: Alright, what does this mean to you? **(TR#47_S13_Q1)**

S13: So, when I read, first, when we received the assignment back, I only had the feedback on this sheet, so it was like, okay maybe I was a bit too broad with writing this introduction, or maybe it's too far away from the general topic, and after I received the feedback sheet, I knew that that was, what it was about, so I thought that the topic presented in the first part of the introduction, this will mean the first sentence when I start with "during the cold war, nations became accustomed to espionage" which is quite a bit away from data preservation, which was the overall topic, I can understand the feedback, the criticism that I should stick more to the topic of the prompt and, yeah, I think that's what I'm going to do next time, my idea behind it was to just start with something, something else, so it doesn't seem so formulaic, to just start with "data preservation is an important topic now", because that sounds so boring.

I: Alright, the second question is always going to be, if you were able to change something, what would you do, in this very instance? So to, to respond to this feedback. **(TR#47_S13_Q2)**

S13: I would probably start with something more specific, just that it's closer to the topic, like not "during the cold war, nations became accustomed with espionage", but something like

I: You don't have to formulate something right now, but, basically you'd write something more closely related, and d'you think this is something you'd struggle with?

S13: No, I don't think so, I think it's a fairly specific feedback and it's easy to change it.

I: Okay great, and if you had done this, how would this improve the text? How would the text become more successful? **(TR#47_S13_Q3)**

S13: Well, apart from that I would have more points on the text (laughs), I think that, yeah, it just makes it easier for the reader, if the first sentence, or the first part of the introduction sticks closer to the topic, that the reader knows faster what the text is going to be about, that's how the text would be better.

I: Okay great.

Second instance of feedback (TR#48)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? (TR#48_S13_Q1)

S13: As they writes, I should reconsider direct quotes and more often use indirect quotes, I personally tend to use direct quotes, because they are easier to use, especially if you can just put them at the end of a sentence, like I wrote, "as Miller would put it, government agencies need to be able to access this data and use it in the investigations", it's just easy to use it and maybe I was, yeah, not that motivated to find a good paraphrasing of it, or to summarise it otherwise and just used the direct quote because it's easy, I can, that's why I can understand the criticism behind it.

I: Okay, so basically they wants you to use indirect quotes more often.

S13: Yes, and direct quotes only if they are useful, like the wording is very important.

I: Okay great, if you were able to change this bit, what would you do? (TR#48_S13_Q2)

S13: I'd use an indirect quote.

I: You'd just rephrase it, so it's a paraphrase instead. Okay, so then, how would this improve the essay? How would it become more effective, the text? (TR#48_S13_Q3)

S13: I think, it would make the text maybe more fluent, if there's a direct quote, it often makes you stumble upon it in some way, and it just doesn't seem as organic as if it's your own word, so maybe through that, the text would simply be easier and more interesting to read.

Third instance of feedback (TR#49)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? (TR#49_S13_Q1)

S13: Well, it's a rather broad statement, just that my text could be better, if I, simply, worked better on my argumentation and worked more with counter-arguments, and how they are (unintelligible) important for, for what I'm going to tell us, not just use arguments for my opinion, and also arguments that are against it, so I think as I already said, it's a rather broad statement, I don't know which argument in detail maybe made him/her think that it's not strong enough for the text to stand alone, but yeah.

I: So basically, they doesn't want to you to argument just for one side, but to use both sides and to just, to strengthen your

S13: Which makes of course sense, it makes a text, the argumentation just better if you already show that the argumentation against it isn't as strong as your argumentation for it, but yeah, that's of course difficult to do.

I: Okay, so let's move on to the next question, what would you do in this very essay, to use this feedback? (TR#49_S13_Q2)

S13: I don't really know, I have to say, I have three arguments and maybe I would just, skip the second argument, because it's not that long in length and instead produce a counter-argument and just say, right it isn't important, but yeah, I don't think that this would be easy, especially my argumentation should have a line of argument, to just now change it, I would basically have to change the whole text.

I: Ah okay, so this would be quite a lot of work for this very essay.

S13: But in the next essay, yeah, sure I'm going to try to use counter-arguments and to evaluate and challenge these.

I: Okay, so you basically already talked about how the text would become more successful, could you just elaborate, or could you just repeat what you said about how the text would become more successful, if you included this feedback? **(TR#49_S13_Q3)**

S13: The, my argumentation for the topic would be stronger, if I would counter, counter-argument, if I were to just have more opinions than just mine, and contrast them.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#50)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#50_S13_Q1)**

S13: Normally, when I have a mistake like that, I probably would look it up, I forgot to do that though, so this means that, yeah the vocabulary isn't as sound in this case, that it should be something else, and maybe it's something I had in my head, from German, that I just translated, or used in this way, that you normally wouldn't use in English.

I: Okay, so the word, or the phrase doesn't fit here.

S13: Yeah.

I: Okay great. What would you change? **(TR#50_S13_Q2)**

S13: I would use a different phrase (laughs), or I would look it up, and how to use it correctly.

I: Okay, do you think you'd struggle doing that?

S13: No, I think this would be the work of some minutes only.

I: Okay great, and then finally, how would this improve the essay? If you had revised it? **(TR#50_S13_Q3)**

S13: It would be better from the vocabulary perspective, it would just be, more correct, from a prescriptive standpoint, so yeah, it would simply be a better essay, because the, it would be more accurate.

I: Okay it would be more accurate.

Example of good/bad experience of feedback

S13: My KV in school, so my Klassenvorstand, was always very interested to give us good feedback, she always tried to do it in a method that she would point out positive things, then things you should change, so not negative things, but things that could be done better, and then end with positive things, so through that I have a good grasp on how to give good feedback in a way that also helps to improve, and so I have many instances of good feedback in my school career, that really helped me improve, not only text but also presentations and all of these things. Bad feedbacks, well, also in school career, you have some teachers that just say, okay you did this wrong and nothing else, so they would just point out mistakes, and not how to change them, how to do better next time,

and this is of course the worst kind of feedback, because it doesn't help you at all, it destroys your motivation.

I: Okay great, so basically motivational aspects, and ways to improve are the highlights of your feedback career

Participant S14

First instance of feedback (TR#51)

I: So, what does this mean to you? (TR#51_S14_Q1)

S14: That I should have used the Google transparency report or that graph more, or better, or more, cause I just wrote one, one part of the graph, but I didn't refer to a lot more, and apparently I should have.

I: Okay, so basically they're saying you're not using it effectively and you think that it means that you haven't used all of it, or you should have used more of it.

S14: Not all of it, but more of it.

I: Not just one tiny aspect, but more. If you were able to change something, what would you do in this instance? (TR#51_S14_Q2)

S14: (longer pause) D'you mean how I'd write it? Rewrite it?

I: Well, you don't have to say how you'd formulate it exactly, but just in general, like to reply to their feedback, so that it would improve, that it would become a more effective text, what would you do, on the basis of this feedback that you've gotten, that it's not effective enough.

S14: Maybe I would compare it with something else, or I would use the exact number, because it says "in just three years the requests for private materials have almost doubled", but it doesn't say which number it was, first or later, maybe I could do that, or I could use, I can't remember what the graph was, but yeah.

I: Okay, so you'd try to rephrase it, maybe compare it with something else, and alright. If you had done this change, how would this improve the text? (TR#51_S14_Q3)

S14: Maybe it would (stops briefly to think and laughs). First of all, I think I would give a better, I would give it a number, because for this it could be, I mean it says here "there were 1.200 requests", okay, but maybe then the number, if it says 24.000 or I think it was 20000 something, it would be more effective, in the end, to have a proper number standing there.

I: Alright, so you mean to be more specific maybe, or less vague?

S14: Yeah, less vague.

I: Okay, and that's why the whole argument would become more effective, or the use of the source?

S14: Alright.

Second instance of feedback (TR#52)

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#52_S14_Q1)**

S14: Well, that I should, the 'it' and the 'this', that it needs some kind of reference, that it needs to refer to something

I: Alright, could you maybe elaborate on that.

S14: Well, honestly, I don't really know how to do it differently, because for me it makes sense to write for example this 'it' here makes sense to me. Because it doesn't need to refer to anything, for me, but (laughs).

I: Okay, so you don't fully understand what they're meaning.

S14: I know what they means, that it needs to refer to something, but I don't know how to refer to something.

I: Okay. So, basically you've already answered the second question, you wouldn't know how to revise this. **(TR#52_S14_Q2)**

S14: No.

I: Alright, say, you had been able to revise it, how would it improve the text?
(TR#52_S14_Q3)

S14: There would be less 'it's in it, possibly, because if I could rewrite it or something and leave the 'it' out completely.

I: Do you mean there would be less repetition in it?

S14: First of all, and I think, 'it' is not very academic.

I: Okay, so it's informal and would become more formal like this.

Third instance of feedback (TR#53)

I: Okay, so again, by this feedback, by the squiggly line, the "simplify", and what they said in the global feedback, what does this mean? **(TR#53_S14_Q1)**

S14: That it is a long sentence, I mean it goes over five lines, and I need to, kind of, either break it off, or somehow simplify the construction, if I still leave it in one sentence, but what I think what they meant was breaking up the construction into several or at least two sentences. **(TR#53_S14_Q2)**

I: Alright, so if you were to change it, you'd just write it in two sentences, split it up? Okay, and then, how would this improve the essay, if you had done this?
(TR#53_S14_Q3)

S14: It would be easier to read, I think, and also for the people who read it, easier to understand maybe, if it's not that, because I can follow, kind of, this construction, but that was my thinking, that's what I thought, would be understanding enough, but that doesn't mean that other people.

I: Okay, so other people, it would be helpful for other people to understand your line of argumentation as well?

S14: Yeah.

I: Okay great. Alright I think there is one more.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#54)

I: I think it says here “ambiguity, forced me to pause and reread”, what does this mean to you? (TR#54_S14_Q1)

S14: That for some reason, I had to ask twice what they meant by that, for some reason, that the reason could be understand as a noun, it could be understood as a noun instead of a verb, but I honestly think that it’s, for me it still, if I read a sentence like that, where somebody says “some reason that blablabla”, it’s more a verb to me than a noun.

I: Alright, so if you were able to change something, what would you do?

S14: Some argue that blablabla, some. (TR#54_S14_Q2)

I: Okay, so you’d just remove ‘reason’ and use another word. And then, how would this improve the essay? (TR#54_S14_Q3)

S14: I don’t know. I really don’t know.

I: Or would it?

S14: Maybe for how the people understand it, how, how they said that they had to reread it, okay, maybe that.

I: Okay so it would be easier for readers to understand it. To have one meaning. Alright.

Example of experience of good/bad feedback

S14: There was a professor and I wrote something and she said that it didn’t make any sense, the text didn’t make any sense and I can’t write it that way, but she couldn’t explain to me why I can’t write it that way. She said, I can’t remember what it was, I think it was two semesters ago, I wrote something and somebody else wrote it the exact same way and she couldn’t explain to us why it was fine for this essay and why it wasn’t fine with mine, and she also said, “I can’t explain it, it’s just the way it is”.

I: Oh okay, so basically, on the one hand a lack of clarification, which would make you unable to improve right? And then also not assessing people the same way?

S14: No, I think that was okay, I don’t think she made a difference between the two of us, but there was something obviously wrong with my essay, but she just couldn’t tell me what exactly it was, she said she couldn’t explain it to me, it’s just wrong.

I: And not even the difference between your colleague, who had something similar, and it wasn’t graded or marked as wrong.

S14: Yeah.

Participant S15

First instance of feedback (TR#55)

I: Okay, so what does this mean to you? (TR#55_S15_Q1)

S15: What it means is that, I mean I struggle, I knew that this was going to be a problem, because I did struggle when writing the essay, but what happened was that one of the questions of the thesis statement, or one of the questions of the prompt was whether or not law-abiding citizens have to fear the artificial intelligence and I didn't really address that, I went a bit the opposite way, and yeah, so that's what I should have done, I should have linked it a bit more to the prompt.

I: Okay, so you're saying that you've written about a whole different topic?

S15: No, cause then I would have gotten less points. It wasn't completely off topic, it was just I could have addressed it more, so I think I wrote more about the actual benefits and the issues of artificial intelligence, and only in like one or two sentences, I've kind of scraped the surface of the issues for law-abiding citizens, so I didn't completely ignore it, I just wrote not enough.

I: You digressed a bit?

S15: A bit, yeah.

I: Okay, if you were able to change something, just to address this yellow bit of feedback, what would you change? **(TR#55_S15_Q2)**

S15: I would definitely change the thesis statement itself, so have maybe a part of the sentence, add a sub-sentence about the fear and then some part in the actual body of the text, I'd need to address it as well, so either in the last paragraph I think it would actually fit, or in the first, but yeah, I was kind of struggling with the word count, so that was also (laughs), I was like 399, so I didn't really know where to include it.

I: Okay, so you'd have to remove something in exchange?

S15: Yeah, I'd have to remove a few other things, but yeah.

I: Okay, so if you had done these changes, how would this improve the essay? Not in terms of assessment, or your grade, but how would the text become more successful? **(TR#55_S15_Q3)**

S15: Well, it would address the prompt more correctly, so it would actually be a better answer to that prompt. I think it's still a good essay, but it's not specifically a good essay, if you look at the question, it's not addressing the question as much as it probably could.

I: Alright, then let's look at the next one.

Second instance of feedback **(TR#56)**

I: So, again, what does this mean to you? **(TR#56_S15_Q1)**

S15: Well, what it means is that, again with the conclusion, I should have addressed the prompt more explicitly, so I did try to refer back to it, because, you know, they told us to refer back to the question in the conclusion, but obviously, as in the whole essay, I wasn't addressing the law-abiding citizens part enough, obviously I didn't do it in the conclusion as well, so that was missing, yeah.

I: Okay, so similar to the first, to the thesis statement?

S15: Yeah.

I: So, if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#56_S15_Q2)**

S15: I would, I think I would add, I think I'd actually add it as a last sentence, because I really think it would serve as a good conclusion of the entire essay, but yeah, I would add another sentence, or maybe even scrap some other argument, if I really had to do a whole argument on this, which I probably should, so I would add another argument, and then in the conclusion I could address it, and refer not only to the prompt, but also to my own essay, my own argument.

I: Okay great, and then again, how would this improve the text? Similar to the first one? **(TR#56_S15_Q3)**

S15: Yeah, it's very similar in that it improves the addressing of the prompt, and it improves what the essay actually should be, but I also think it would improve the essay overall, because obviously the conclusion needs to be linked to the entire text, so yeah, it would just improve the flow of the text as well I think

Third instance of feedback (TR#57)

I: Okay, what does this mean to you? **(TR#57_S15_Q1)**

S15: Well what it means was that the paragraph before that, I talked about, kind of the disadvantages of these surveillance programmes, of what the dangers are, but then in this paragraph, I talked about what the future should look like, what we should devise, what we should change, and I didn't link it correctly, so CI3 especially, is very keen on a line of argument, and that it flows, and that it connects, and in this instance I didn't really connect it that well, I thought it was very implicit, in that, if I talk about the dangers, obviously the next thing I'm going to talk about is what could be changed, but yeah, what they say is that I should actually use a link in there.

I: Okay, so not only an implicit link but one that is actually put into phrases and sentences?

S15: Yeah, so to resolve this issue, comma, dot, dot, dot.

I: So, if you were able to change something? What would you do? Would you use his suggestion? **(TR#57_S15_Q2)**

S15: Yes, because I actually had that, as I said, I was struggling with the word count and I only found out afterwards that the quotations actually don't count, so that was like five words, and I had 440 at the beginning, and it took like an hour to get it down to 399, so I actually had a link there, but on the first assignment, they told me to not use linking devices at the beginning of the paragraph, so to not use "however" and all those linking words that you use in the argument, so in your supporting arguments, and I kind of took that as "don't start a body paragraph topic sentence with a linking device, even if you need it", so that was kind of my own fault, I actually had it and thought I shouldn't use it, so I kind of misunderstood what they meant.

I: So basically, you had something different, or did you have the same "to resolve this issue"?

S15: I'm not sure, it was either actually that, or it was something very similar, but the meaning was the same.

I: Okay great, and then how would this improve the essay? If you had changed this?
(TR#57_S15_Q3)

S15: I think it's very clear that it would improve the flow of the essay and obviously the connection from the second to the third argument, so you would not only implicitly, but you would really, you would know what the connections from the second to the third argument is.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#58)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#58_S15_Q1)**

S15: The "voc." actually refers to the "over" and not to the "stated", at least as I understood it, the "stated" is the squiggly line, because, it's not wrong per se, but it's not ideal, but the over obviously is wrong, and I don't know how I read over it, because when I got the essay back and I saw they underlined it, I looked at it and thought "oh, yeah that's wrong", that's not the preposition you use after "know".

I: So it's just the wrong preposition? Okay so you're saying basically, those two aren't connected to the linguistic accuracy, but this is something different, so what do they mean with the squiggly line under "stated"?

S15: That, at least I know it's not wrong, "consumers state it", maybe the "it, because I refer back to the survey as an issue, I mean, I'd have to look it up, but I actually think it's not wrong, it's just a bit unprofessional, or not formal enough, or just, it's not wrong, but it's not right either, but yeah, "not much is known over", obviously that's wrong, so it's "not much is known about"

I: Okay, so basically, if you were able to change something, in the second instance you'd replace it (the preposition) with "about", and in "stated", you'd look it up to find something different? **(TR#58_S15_Q2)**

S15: I think that I would use "claim it is an issue", or, yeah, I mean we did, I think the last session what we did was using other reporting verbs instead of "claim", so I'd use one of those, now that we've actually had that lesson on it, so reporting verbs, depending on how strong I wanted to make it, whether I want it to be, they are convinced it is an issue, or, yeah.

I: Okay, so you'd basically replace them with other words that are more appropriate in the context?

S15: Yeah, a different one, but also not claim "it" as an issue, but "they claim it is an issue", so the "as an, I think I would also change around, because it does read a bit awkward.

I: Okay and then finally, how would this improve the essay? If you had made these changes? **(TR#58_S15_Q3)**

S15: Well, it's grammatically correct, and yeah, I think it's again the flow, because if you have grammatical or vocabulary issues in your text, obviously it would distract from the

actual text, because you get confused by what is actually meant, and also, yeah, what does that mean?

Example of good/bad feedback

S15: I think CI3s way, the way they address feedback, not only the written way, but also the way they hand back our feedback is really, really good. I'm not sure if you know this, so they don't give us back this (points to global feedback), so the actual feedback, but, at least for the first essay, we got three feedbacks, and one of those was our own, and they gave us back the text with the annotations and then the three feedbacks, and then we'd have to find out which one is our own, we had to give us points and then see how much of them are given correctly compared to what he does and it really, really helped in actually looking at the feedback, because they're right in saying that normally you'd get it back, you'd look at the points and then you forget about it, so the way they do it actually helped me to really look at my own mistakes and decide how much of a point deduction do I get for this, how big a mistake was that, and what could I have done differently, and then they go through it and talk to each and every one of us, and you can ask them if you don't understand.

I: Oh, so they talk to everybody?

S15: Yeah, they actually take the whole lesson, I mean the first one, they actually talked the whole two lessons, almost the whole two lessons, two hours that we had, because, yeah, obviously, we're a lot of people, but also, for some things like vocabulary that's kind of self-explanatory, once I looked at it I was like yeah that's wrong, but at the beginning they did like the main mistakes all of us made, or the bigger ones we all did, so that really helps me, and it always helped me in school as well, when after a test, we went through the common mistakes and even if you did great at a test, you know what to look out for, so yeah, I always really did like that.

Participant S16

First instance of feedback (TR#59)

I: So, what does this mean to you? **(TR#59_S16_Q1)**

S16: That it's not a good connection between the two sentences, but I don't know how to do that in a better way, actually.

I: That would also be my second question. If you were able to revise it, what would you do? You say you wouldn't know to revise it? **(TR#59_S16_Q2)**

S16: I mean, I would, well, maybe take another word like 'therefore', cause this word is never marked in my essays, maybe this would work, or just delete 'hence' and just start with "as Google transparency report and so on", but I think this would also not be a better way, because then there would be no link at all, so I think it would insert another conjunction or something.

I: Okay, so if you had done this change, how would this improve the essay? **(TR#59_S16_Q3)**

S16: Well, maybe CI3 wouldn't complain about this 'hence' any more.

I: Okay, so that's how they would grade or assess it, but for a neutral reader, how would it improve for somebody neutral, who's just reading this for the sake of entertainment?

S16: Well maybe he can grasp the whole link better?

I: So it's easier to understand how this and this is connected?

S16: Yes.

I: Alright

Second instance of feedback (TR#60)

I: So, what does this mean to you? Would you like to see this one again? "The source could have been used more effectively", what does this mean to you? **(TR#60_S16_Q1)**

S16: Well, that I should have maybe used some other information, I can't really think of what exactly was the source right now, but

I: You think you've used one part of the source and you should have used another, or some other information from this source?

S16: Yeah, or maybe in less words or something.

I: Okay, so you mean 'more effective' would mean 'more precise' in this instance. Okay, so if you were able to change something in this bit, what would you do?

(TR#60_S16_Q2)

S16: (long pause) Good question.

I: If you don't know how to change it, if you feel like that's something you'd struggle with, or you wouldn't really know how to do this, that's okay to say as well.

S16: Yeah, I would definitely struggle and have to think about this like for a longer time. So, I can't come up with something, like, really easily, because I wrote this sentence for a reason, so, hard to say what I would really do.

I: Okay, let's say you had been able to make these, or to use the source more effectively, how do you think this would improve the essay, or this part of the essay?

(TR#60_S16_Q3)

S16: Well, if it's really more effective than maybe it, maybe the reader understands it better?

I: So, it's easier to understand for the reader?

S16: Yes.

I: Alright. Anything else?

S16: Well, maybe one can read through it faster, because it's more precise.

I: You mean the flow would be better, or easier?

S16: Yea, the flow.

Third instance of feedback (TR#61)

I: What do they mean with this feedback? Or what does it mean to you?

(TR#61_S16_Q1)

S16: I actually asked them that and they told me that some bits and pieces sound unnatural and there should be like more natural collocations, or something.

I: So, d'you mean words sometimes don't go together in a certain context?

S16: Yeah, or they just sound a little strange or odd.

I: Oh, okay, so you can understand it, but it doesn't really sound like somebody would naturally say it, or authentic maybe.

S16: Yeah, it's not a repulsion between the words, but it's not really something that a lot of people would say.

I: Alright. If you were able to change something, like in one of these instances, what would you do? **(TR#61_S16_Q2)**

S16: I would try to simplify them, so, in this case maybe, (longer pause), well maybe I just would erase "likely of staying anonymous" here, because it's not really that important in that instance, for example.

I: So sometimes, you'd just delete or remove a phrase if it doesn't work well, and sometimes you'd rephrase it in a simpler way?

S16: Yes.

I: Okay, and the rephrasing part, do you think that's something you'd struggle with?

S16: In some instances yes, in some it's okay, because then I feel like, okay this really sounds a little bit strange and then I know a better way to do it, but it depends on the phrase.

I: Alright. If you had been able to change these instances, and respond to his feedback, how would this improve the text? **(TR#61_S16_Q3)**

S16: Well, it would sound more natural.

I: It would sound more natural. Alright, I think there's one more bit.

Fourth instance of feedback **(TR#62)**

I: What does this mean to you? So, his feedback with the abbreviation and the underlining. **(TR#62_S16_Q1)**

S16: That they doesn't like this word.

I: That they doesn't like this word. Could you maybe elaborate on this?

S16: Well, I've actually looked it up, if one can say it like that, and it was fine on the web, where I searched it, and, but they told me that, if they scribbled something under it then it's not wrong, but it could be improved, but I don't know how in this case, so

I: So, in their opinion 'invasion' does not fit in this context here, or isn't the correct word to use.

S16: Yeah, something like this, so I think they would just use another expression.

I: Okay, but you don't really agree with that right?

S16: No (laughs), because I actually looked it up, because I wasn't sure how to write something like this and on the web it was like, yeah you can do it that way, so it actually is a word, I found out, I mean I don't know if it's correct, because the internet is the internet, so

I: Not always the most reliable source?

S16: Yes.

I: Okay, if you were able to change something, what would you do? Or would you even change something, if you don't think it's inappropriate or incorrect. **(TR#62_S16_Q2)**

S16: Well, for this task, I would of course change it, because then I would get a better grade in the end, so I would definitely do it, and I would definitely think about it, before I would use it again somewhere else and maybe look it up on a few more dictionaries, what they would say about it, but in this case, how would I change it, well I would just write about their privacy.

I: So, basically, if your audience also grades it and is C13, than you'd change it, and if you had a neutral audience that you'd just write for fun to, you'd just leave it like this?

S16: Well, maybe I would look it up before I would, I would still look it up again.

I: Okay, so you'd double-check.

S16: If it's really correct then I'd leave it like that.

I: Okay, let's say you had changed it, how would this improve the text? Or would it improve the text? **(TR#62_S16_Q3)**

S16: Well, I think the information would still be the same, so maybe it's more understandable then?

I: Maybe easier to understand or more clear to the audience?

S16: Yes.

Experience regarding good/bad feedback

Can't think of anything.

Participant S17

First instance of feedback (TR#63)

I: So, what does this mean to you? What does his feedback to you mean? **(TR#63_S17_Q1)**

S17: I feel that it does not really support my point of view, or my argument, in this paragraph, it's just like, "the bad reputation of online data collections unjustified", it kind of refers to the bad reputation, but I think it's not very coherent, my argument, I

have to say that I struggled to include this data at all and I was aware of the fact that it wasn't included successfully.

I: Okay, but it said in the prompt that you had to use it so you, okay.

S17: yes.

I: Okay, so basically what you're saying is that this source doesn't fully support your argument, or doesn't serve as an effective support.

S17: Yeah, I guess that I would have to change my argument in order to include it successfully.

I: Okay, so you're already going into my second question, which is if you were able to rewrite this, if you were able to respond to the feedback he's given you, what would you do? You said you'd write a second, a different argument, maybe? **(TR#63_S17_Q2)**

S17: Yes, because usually I first focus on the data and then I develop an argument, but this strategy, I did not apply when I wrote the second essay, just afterwards when I realised that I did not include my data successfully, so I guess I would just write another argument and then try to support my argument by the data.

I: Okay, do you think that would be something you'd struggle with?

S17: If I have enough time no.

I: Okay, so no time constraints and it wouldn't be an issue. Alright, the third question is always going to be, if you had done this change, how would this improve your essay, or how would it improve this part of your text? **(TR#63_S17_Q3)**

S17: I think it would be more convincing.

I: So, a stronger argumentation because the source is a better support?

S17: Yes.

Second instance of feedback (TR#64)

I: So what does this mean to you? Their feedback that some expressions, what did they say, "some expressions need reconsideration" and then there's a squiggly line. What does this mean to you? **(TR#64_S17_Q1)**

S17: That you wouldn't use exactly this expression in this context and sometimes they told me that native speakers wouldn't use this expression, although it's logical, but they wouldn't just use it. So, yeah, but to me it means that people who abide by the law, but I'm not fully, I'm not sure if this is such an expression that a native speaker wouldn't use, or if it's not correct in the context.

I: Okay, so it's either not authentic, or it's not appropriate in the context to use this phrase.

S17: Yeah.

I: Alright, if you were able to change this bit here, what would you do? **(TR#64_S17_Q2)**

S17: I think I would say "people who abide by the law".

I: Okay, so you would rephrase it, is that something you talked about with C13?

S17: Yes. I've asked him/her what it means.

I: And they told you that this was a different phrase that you could use.

S17: Yes.

I: So, if you hadn't talked to him/her before, would you struggle trying to rephrase this, or in any of the other instances?

S17: I think I used this phrase, because I have already used "people who abide by the law", so sometimes it's difficult for me to find a synonym.

I: So it's either avoiding repetition, or sounding maybe a bit odd sometimes.

S17: Yes.

I: So, if you had changed this, how would it improve the essay? **(TR#64_S17_Q3)**

S17: Well, if this is incorrect, I guess my accuracy would be a bit higher.

I: It would be more correct, just, or more appropriate?

S17: Yes, yeah.

Third instance of feedback (TR#65)

I: So, what does this mean to you? What are they trying to say with this?
(TR#65_S17_Q1)

S17: That I've used the wrong preposition.

I: Okay, if you were able to change it, you'd use another preposition instead?

S17: Yes.

I: And how would this improve the essay? **(TR#65_S17_Q2)**

S17: I think it would make it also more correct.

I: It would make it more correct. Okay.

Fourth instance of feedback (TR#66)

I: What does this mean to you? **(TR#66_S17_Q1)**

S17: Well, I think I've misused the linking device, because it's not really a consequence, it's rather an addition to what I've said before.

I: Alright, just to, because you've mentioned it before, did you talk about this with C13?

S17: I don't think so.

I: Okay, so you've misused the linking device, and if you were able to change something, what would you do? **(TR#66_S17_Q2)**

S17: I'd use 'thus'.

I: You'd use 'thus' instead, okay. And then how would this improve the text, or this bit?
(TR#66_S17_Q3)

S17: (longer pause) It would show that I am more aware of which words I use in a specific context and.

I: But for the reader? How would it improve the text for the reader? Who's not judging you or assessing you?

S17: It would make it more convincing, I guess, because if you use something, an example, and then say consequently, but there is no relation then it sounds a bit, not so professional, but if I use 'thus', I do not state something by saying 'thus', but by 'consequently I do.

I: Okay, so it would be more convincing and more professional also.

S17: I guess yeah.

Example of good/bad feedback

S17: I do not enjoy it, if teachers show your essay, even if it's anonymous, they just want others to see what you should not do, I think.

I: so presenting mistakes to the whole class.

S17: Maybe presenting single mistakes, but not a whole paragraph.

I: Alright, so that's something that you really don't like, feedback given to the whole class that would be basically, that you would feel would be rather confidential, or should be confidential, something between the teacher and you?

S17: Well, it's okay, if for example we receive a sheet with common mistakes and it's a list of all mistakes, but not if there's just one essay that is discussed, or one paragraph.

I: Oh, okay.

S17: Yes, because we once discussed three paragraphs, three different people, one of them was mine and I didn't feel very well.

Course instructor interview transcripts

Course instructor 1 (CI1)

TR#1

I: So, the first question is always going to be: What does this mean? And here, the underlining is the feedback. **(TR#1_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: The wavy feedback basically means „there's better ways to put it“ (laughs), so it's not precise, it's not wrong, but it's not precise, it's not entirely correct, but it's not a big problem, essentially, so it's just a way, basically, sort of expression thingy, range thing,

but not something that, a wavy underlining always means, I wouldn't consider it incorrect.

I: So, it's not incorrect, but it's not perfectly accurate maybe?

CI1: It's not accurate, it might be imprecise, it might be a matter of register, or style, so depending on, I didn't even write something in the margins here, which means that I consider it a very minor problem, so if I have considered this sort of not a very minor problem, but a minor problem, I would have written 'A' or 'R' to indicate that this is a range or an accuracy problem, but in this case I felt that it's possibly, well, indicating that it's, it needs improvement, but, you know, it's no catastrophe if no improvement happens.

I: Okay, I understand. So, if the student were to change something, what would you like the student to change in this instance? Maybe one of these instances? **(TR#1_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: The first, I think the first term is here, I don't find it precise enough, I'd like something like, I can't think of anything that good, I need a dictionary, basically a word that expresses the concept accurately. And the second one has a problem that, in this case "closing these shops" is kind of ambiguous, because it's not clear who's closing them or if they have to be closed, so again, this needs more precision, in both cases actually a matter of precision, be more precise about these things, find an expression or a word that hits the nail on the head more, centrally.

I: Alright, and if the student had implemented these changes, how would this improve the text, or part of the texts. **(TR#1_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Well, just the idea would come across more clearly, so, in this case it's a matter of clarification, really, really bringing across a precise idea and not allowing for any kind of ambiguity.

TR#2

I: I think the feedback is this sign here, and 'TF'. **(TR#2_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: So in this case it was, it's a parenthetical citation, so you have the name of the person and you know indicating the source from which this was taken, but Mitchell is written with a 't' and the student left out the 't'. This might be considered a spelling mistake by some, but we have decided among the teachers who teach ILLS2 that copying something incorrectly from the source is a task fulfilment mistake, so it's a formal problem, so this doesn't count as a spelling mistake, but it counts as a formal problem with the citation that the name is not spelled correctly, indicating with the line, something's missing here, and if they look it up on the sheet, they will see that Mitchell is in fact written with a 't' and not without a 't'.

I: Okay, so I guess if the student would have to change something here it would just be adding the 't'. **(TR#2_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: Yeah, adding the 't'.

I: How would this improve the essay? **(TR#2_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: (laughs) it would be correct. It would be formally correct, it can be a problem with a different name or in a paper with more sources, you have people who might be spelled similarly, or something like that, or if they misspell a name, an author, somebody might refer to the wrong source in the bibliography or something, so just to make sure that this doesn't happen, although, you know we have, it's not a problem here really, but it might be a problem in a long paper, depending on the name, you know.

TR#3

I: Again, what does this mean? Again, we have this wavy line and this time there's an 'A' next to it, or two 'As'. **(TR#3_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: In the first case, the verb 'benefit' is the wrong verb, cause it shouldn't be used as an active verb, a transitive verb, in the second case, this is actually a semi-wavy line, it's interesting that I actually did those (long pause), it's a non-causal, it's stating something that implies causality, where there's no causality and an article is missing as well and, oh that's actually a fairly complex issue, (long pause)

I: So there's actually several issues, as part of this phrase?

CI1: Several issues involved in this phrase, the first being that if they write "they increase prosperity in standard of living", it's, you know, not by being there, this doesn't happen by being there, by just being there and doing nothing, so. The verb expresses what they really do, but the effect of what they do may have, but it's phrased as if they really did that, so something like their presence increases prosperity, or their, the interactions caused by these businesses increased prosperity and standard of living, it's just that this verb and this phrase can't really be used in this context to expressed this precise idea, and of course the article is missing, because it should be 'the' standard of living. So it's multiple issues really here, it's a matter of accuracy with, you could say it's a vocabulary issue, or you could say it should be phrased entirely differently, so it's hard to pinpoint, say this exactly this kind of problem, because it's a bigger thing than that, it's just that the whole thing should be rewritten really.

I: Okay, so that's what you're trying to say to the student, or to tell the student by using this semi-wavy line.

CI1: Well, actually, also I'm underling the long bits, not just "increase prosperity" or something, I could have just underlined "increase prosperity" and inserted the, the 'the' is missing, I underlined everything to indicate that the entire phrase is problematic.

I: Alright, and what would you have the student change in this instance. **(TR#3_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: First of all, a different verb, "have beneficial impact on the local market" for example, instead of 'benefit', and in the second case, I'd say rewrite it, so that it becomes clear what exactly is that increase in prosperity and the standard of living, and cause it's not them, it's what they do basically, or, so they would have to focus on an aspect that they do and that again would clarify the idea on why they are beneficial for local communities which was the topic. And that just doesn't come across precisely enough.

I: And again, if they had implemented these changes, how would this improve the essay. **(TR#3_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Again, it's a matter of clarity, it's, also in the case of the verb, it's like this verb is slightly off, because you wouldn't expect this as an active verb, usually it would be something benefits from the local market, which it is of course not, it's the reverse idea of what they're expressing here, so what happens here, you read this and then something's missing, and the structure of the sentence is not what you expect it to be after this verb, so you make a slight pause and interrupt your reading, and if that verb were correct, a correct phrase were here, it would be easier to read as well, because you would just stop slightly when reading this, so thinking about, oh something's not right here, and you would just be able to read on and stay in the flow of the text basically, it's not just imprecise it's also disruptive to some extent, but it's not so disruptive that you would actually have to think about what are they trying to telling me. So it's not that kind of thing.

I: So, you'd understand it, but you'd have to pause and think about it briefly.

CI1: Very briefly actually, because it's really very clear what they mean, there's other things where you have to pause for a longer time, which actually causes them to lose a lot more points than this, but here it's kind of clear what they want to say, it's just odd. So you slightly, maybe you don't even pause, but it reads strange, and if you have the correct phrase there, you just read and ignore the words and just take up the meaning and the second is definitely imprecise, the second is like aha, okay, yeah.

I: So the second one, you're not really sure as a reader what this person is trying to convey?

CI1: No, again, I think it's clear what they mean, it's just not precise enough, it's not, if they correct it, they could come more to the point, they wouldn't talk about (incomprehensible), this is vague, "they increase prosperity", okay, but how?

I: So, you'd have a stronger stance?

CI1: Absolutely.

Global Feedback for S1

I: In this part, I used the global feedback as a separate entity, or a separate instance, could you just briefly state again what do you mean by this? By "very minor issues"?

CI1: "Only very minor issues", I mean little that goes beyond these words, it just means that okay you don't have a lot to worry about, you see in the text what's wrong and that's not a lot, that's not something where you would lose points, so generally, you know, it is what it is, it's an excellent essay, and of course I have to write something, I guess, if I subtract points, it doesn't mean a lot, basically it's there because of the "excellent essay", because I want to give some positive feedback as well, other than that.

I: So, basically, it just refers back to the few mistakes that you've indicated, alright. I guess we don't really have to talk about what to change and how it would improve, because we've already talked about this.

TR#? – *[This instance was addressed mistakenly and can therefore be ignored]*

I: What does this mean?

CI1: Again, it's a wavy line, the "R" is in brackets, which means not a serious range thing, it's a stylistic problem, I just wouldn't write, you know, "preferably purchased face to face", "preferably purchased in person", face to face doesn't make, it's possible I guess, but it's not formal language and it doesn't really expressed, you know, going to a shop and being there in person, that's basically the concept you would go for, so replacing face to face by in person, just to have the correct formal phrase

I: Alright, and how would this improve the text?

CI1: Well it would have a positive effect on register, would be a more formal register.

I: Alright, so it would be a higher level of formality, more academic?

CI1: Yeah, it would also be more precise, but it's really a matter of formality.

TR#4

I: What does this mean? (TR#4_CI1_Q1)

CI1: You spend too many words on simple issues, you could have easily written three arguments in the given space, this is connected with the fact that I often see in this class depending on whoever they had in the previous, I told them in the previous courses, they often choose to, well, let me start from the beginning, in the word limit that you have in this kind of essay, which is 300 to 400 words, you can either, two or three body paragraphs, so we can include two arguments are three arguments, and some people come out of ILSS1 and the essays they do in ILSS1 with the fixed concept that they, that two arguments is the best solution, whether they've sort of decided this for themselves or whether they've been told, I don't know, but this happens and what I what I experienced in my classes that very often, not always, but very often, the people who write two paragraphs, write two very convoluted paragraphs, because they have a lot of space for these two paragraphs, so they start with a main idea which might be good and then they start bringing forward arguments, but very often they lose themselves in the argument, or repeat the idea over and over again, because basically the argument is a very simple one, or they do not have enough sources, which can happen with these kinds of essays, so they fill it up with words, they produce buffers, like too many words, right, but they still do not come up with the idea that it might be a good idea to, you know, to keep your paragraph short and write a third paragraph instead, I tell them a lot, you know, so they always, at least try it in one or two essays to write three arguments, because that, you know, sharpens your mind for being more concise, being more to the point and getting your ideas across in a better way, this essay might, I haven't read it, this might be an example with somebody that put too little in too many words, just because they wrote two paragraphs instead of three, which is which is why I write that, okay your arguments are very simple and straightforward and still you take a long time to, or many many words to expressed these things and the essay overall might have been a lot stronger, if you hadn't just, you know, you spend all those words on just two basic arguments, but instead, you know, three basic arguments, or the alternative would have been one more complex argument, but you know I can't force them to write a more complex argument, if they cannot come up with the idea, so essentially, this is a kind of incentive, you know, next time, please, if you have simple arguments that you

don't have, that you cannot back up with too many examples or sources, please try to write three arguments, so that at least you don't have so much filler.

I: So basically, do you mean it is a weaker argument, if it is a simple argument, if the argument is blown up too much, or as it includes too many words

CI1: I'm not sure if it weakens the thing, but it's the beginning of a bad habit and it's not so important in the ILLS essays, this is more for later on, so I and most of the other lecturers see the ILSS essays as preparation for your proseminar papers, seminar papers, that sort of thing and the idea is, should always be, that your argument should be concise and to the point, and you know, not contain a lot of filler that pretends that you did work, which pretends to make something more complex than it actually is, writing just to fill the word limit or something like that, that shouldn't happen, so why I'm telling her to do it in this way is basically, because later they shouldn't, this may make it easier to understand, this may make it more tedious to read, usually it's not weakening the argument, it's just more tedious, because there's not a lot of substance there, but you read through all these words and things repeat themselves, so you it's not really weaker, it's just unnecessary and tedious, but basically I'm giving this feedback in the light of papers I have to write later on, where precise and concise writing is very important, and the task should not be reduced to filling the word limit, but rather to say something, to have substance, and I'd rather have three short arguments that are as short as the substance that is in them, than to long arguments that are filled up with filling material, and that's basically a matter of writing discipline, so it's not so much understanding, you know, just in order to become a better writer you should try to remember that sort of thing.

TR#5

CI1: So that's a task fulfilment mistake then if you can see this as a task fulfilment mistake, then it is not about the words at all, but about how well this works in context of arguing the idea, and apparently, I felt that it was not a good example but I can't really, you know, I would have to read the whole thing again to really specify why I did, I didn't feel that this was a good example but apparently it didn't work in the line argumentation, that was brought forward. **(TR#5_CI1_Q1)**

I: All right, just in general terms, having used an example that wasn't relevant, I guess the student should have chosen a different example? **(TR#5_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: Either a different example or insert, what they often do not do, is between the argumentation and example, they forget to include a sentence between these parts that establishes the relationship between what they said and the example that they're about to give, and either in this case, I actually don't know it in this case because I'd have to read the entire thing again, but it's either a case of, you know, pick an example that suits better, what you're trying to prove, or insert at least a sentence that tells me why the furniture example is relevant.

I: Alright

CI1: To make it clear to the reader that, why you're choosing this example, I don't know which of the two is the case here, whether it's just the sentence is missing or whether, you know, a different example should have been chosen.

I: Alright and if they had implemented this or any of these two changes how would it improve the text? **(TR#5_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Strength of argument of course, like this the argument is kind of weak, because the example is not good, and a better example, or more clarity about why the example is here, definitely improve the argumentation and strength of the argument.

TR#6

I: What does this mean? **(TR#6_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: “These products are not available at chain stores at home”, where is “at home”? Is at home in? The question mark and the underlining says “what do you mean by ‘at home’”? Is that in your flat? Is that in your country? Is that in your city? What do you mean by “at home”? I’m not sure, it’s either in chain stores, or it’s at home, but “in chain stores at home” is strange, so what are you trying to tell me? What do you mean by “at home”?

I: Okay, so the reader is confused by what this is supposed to mean?

CI1: Absolutely, because “not available in chain stores at home” is just strange, either “not available in chain stores” or something else, but chain stores are usually not at home.

I: Alright, so if they were to change something, if they were to implement your feedback and had to change something, what would he or she have to do? **(TR#6_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: Well, if it means “in chain stores in the city where you live”, maybe she could write something like “in local chain stores”, although it’s strange because the, because it runs against the topic anyway, it says something about chain stores and online stores are bad for a city, more or less, so why something is good in chain stores, but bad online is kind of strange, but if you want to specify the “at home”, you use an adjective and say something like “in local chain stores”, or like “in chain stores in your home town”, or “in chain stores in the city”, or “in chain stores that are close to where people live”, although that’s not a good solution either, but you know specify exactly where these chain stores are, because they are definitely not at home.

I: Alright.

CI1: And again that would add clarity of course, right, that would sort of be more precise, or be actually, give an indication, remove the confusion, they could also just remove the “at home”, maybe, and it might work. **(TR#6_CI1_Q3)**

TR#7

CI1: It’s a term that they coined, so they invented this thing, and I guess it’s possible to some degree, but I don’t consider it, you know, formally correct, again it’s a matter of register or style, where I wouldn’t consider this the formal way to expressed this kind of thing. **(TR#7_CI1_Q1)**

I: Alright, if they were to change this, how should the student change this bit? **(TR#7_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: That's hard because it really involves the whole rest of the sentence, because they're adding a part that [unintelligible] structure near as well and that would have to be re-written as well. So I could give you an alternative for the shopping based relationships, but that wouldn't work with the participle construction, so the relationships that are established between the, what you call it,

I: Well, you don't you don't have to formulate something on the spot, but basically they would have to rephrase this bit and by having to rephrase this bit, they'd have to re-write the whole sentence because

CI1: At least the verb, the noun phrase, they would have to rephrase the whole noun phrase, so up until the verb basically the verb, which is "are", right, so everything before the "are" needs to be rephrased, just do away with that invented "shopping based relationships", relationships between shop owners and costumers enable customers to make the decisions and are also essential for social connections and mistake that I didn't see, so rephrase the whole thing

I: and how would this improve text? (TR#7_CI1_Q3)

CI1: Make it more formal again, so it's a register thing and it just would make it more formal

TR#8

I: So what does this mean? (TR#8_CI1_Q1)

CI1: Actually the problem is bigger than just the yellow area here, so the first sentence is unclear, because "Millennials buy 67% of the products online since it gives them the possibility to become part of the chosen culture", what does buying online have to do with being a part of the chosen culture, like why do I have to buy them online in order to be able to be part of my chosen culture is my chosen cultural also my local culture? So where is the connection? Why is it a causal connection? Still to the unclear, and then it says "this phenomenon must not be understood as a negative effect on local identity but an enrichment of local culture", but they're buying online, they're buying not locally, so I do not see how this conclusion is, where this conclusion is coming from, from what is written here, it just doesn't follow logically, but I'm not sure what they want to tell me in this sentence, and I'm not sure how this sentence follows from the previous one, because as a conclusion this doesn't work, it's contradictory, it's all, that stuff doesn't work.

I: Okay, so I know this is difficult in this instance, but what would the student have to change in this part, just generally? (TR#8_CI1_Q1)

CI1: You know, basically, give a clear idea of what they want to say, because I I'm not even sure what they want to tell me, so, make the relationships between these various clauses more obvious, because it can't be a causal one, so how do these things connect? Make clear how they connect, so basically rewrite and then tell me what you really wanted to say, it's hard for me to determine what what's in this, or why, even, not even why it's not a negative effect on local identities, and there's not even a reason given for why it's also a negative effect, so give reasons, you know, the argument is broken essentially. (TR#8_CI1_Q2)

I: So basically the writer has omitted crucial parts of the sentence that would allow the reader to understand what he means.

CI1: Not understands, but the whole idea is expressed in a way that's hard for me to say what the idea actually is, so, the idea was unclear to the writer themselves or they lack the necessary linguistic skills to express the idea correctly, but to me this sounds a bit like a half-baked idea, so that they weren't entirely sure about the whole thing themselves and definitely not do any revision on the essay, because they would have noticed this, right, so this is the kind of, these broken paragraphs are often the result of no revision, because if you write this and then look at it the next day you realize yourself that it is very unclear what was written here, so basically, maybe revision might even have helped and so that after writing this and going back to it after two days, they realize, "uh that's not what I wanted to say let's just really express this, so I can write about what I wanted to say". (TR#8_CI1_Q3)

I: Okay great I think you've also mentioned what how this would improve to text let's look at the next bit.

TR#9

I: What does this mean? (TR#9_CI1_Q1)

CI1: I circled this and I drew an arrow to what this refers to, this in this case refers to looking at this feature of shopping, "at its future of shopping without leaving the house", so "looking at", that does not result in less communication, but shopping without leaving the house might result in less communication, so this is referring to the wrong thing, because the phrase "when looking at" was chosen, the phrase which I don't particularly like, I also underlined it as a matter of range or actually style, and, you know, this at the arrow indicates where, what it's really referring to, and not what it should have referred to, and the same thing is "the popularity of online shopping would support that idea" and that idea must be, you know, the object of the previous sentence, which is "less communication", and that again is wrong, so again I circled "that idea" and drew an arrow to what it really refers to, when it should have referred to something else, "that idea" in this case will be referring back to the first sentence where it's "another reason for the death of local communities", and then that's far out of range, so it cannot be expressed with a demonstrative pronoun any longer, because that will always refer to the most recent possible object or concept.

I: So basically the student would have to remove "that idea" and include a different phrase that would actually refer to (TR#9_CI1_Q2)

CI1: "the death of local communities", they would have to rephrase the whole thing, the first one can be dealt with by simply removing this "looking at" thing, "all that shopping could be taken as another reason for their local community because it allows people to shop without leaving the house", and then this is correct, but since there is the "looking at" the "this" refers to "looking at" and that was not correct, so it is basically this strange phrase which they keep insisting on, which is being used all the time but it's, most of the time, it just cause problems.

I: Alright, if they had implemented this change, how would this improve the text? (TR#9_CI1_Q3)

CI1: [unintelligible], because when you read this, then you're confused by these demonstrative pronouns and you're wondering "what does this refer to?", because you have to check what it actually refers to, because, as I said, this is wrong, "that idea" is not "that idea", so you would have to stop and check the sentence again, and if it's correct then you can just read it, so it's a matter of readability, avoiding confusing the reader.

TR#10

I: What does this mean? (TR#10_CI1_Q1)

CI1: To me it was unclear, I mean I guess it refers to local communities, but I'm actually not sure what I meant.

I: But basically you mean it's unclear what the "there" refers to?

CI1: It must be the local communities, so that that can't be the problem, not sure, I can't tell you exactly what this was, I see it was a range problem, actually, now, I must have had a reason, not sure.

I: So probably because it has an "A", an "accuracy" next to it, that you wanted the student to use a different word instead of "there", that was more formal or more

CI1: Obviously my perfect solution would be "its inhabitants" instead of "the people who live there", but that would be a range problem and not accuracy, so maybe I made a mistake, or, "there" is also strange, because that would be an organisation thing, that's kind of a pronoun thing, so if I'm not sure what "there" refers to it would have been an organisation thing, not an accuracy thing, so I'm not entirely sure why it's marked this way, it is definitely not great in terms of range, "the people who live there" should have been replaced with "its residents" or "its inhabitants", and "there" might as well refer to the "economic situation" rather than the "local communities", and which is off, right, but then it would be an organisation, not an accuracy thing, but I'm not absolutely sure why I marked it as an accuracy thing, I guess it's definitely not an accuracy thing, so maybe it was a mistake and I wanted to write an "O" or an "R", but it's not an accuracy thing, I don't see a problem with that in terms of linguistic accuracy, that's wrong, that's a mistake on my part.

I: Let's say you wanted the student to write "inhabitants" instead, maybe.

CI1: Yes, but then I would have underlined everything, "the people who live there", I would have underlined "the people who live there", I would have made an "R" and said, this is a range feature, because obviously you don't know the word "inhabitants" or "residents", and therefore you write "people who live there", so that, but then I would have underlined everything and written an "R", but "there" with a question mark points to, I don't know what the "there" was referring to but then it would be an organisation thing, not an accuracy thing, so the "A" is wrong, it should be, but that's definitely something that I did wrong, so that is confusing feedback, cause that is wrong.

I: Okay in this case maybe let's move on to the last instance.

TR#11

I: What does that mean? (TR#11_CI1_Q1)

CI1: That it's colloquial bordering on the poetic, and it should be more formal.

I: Alright if the student had to change this, what should he or she do? (TR#11_CI1_Q2)

CI1: "has changed", so just, you know, just be less poetic, "has changed".

I: And then how would this improve to text? (TR#11_CI1_Q3)

CI1: More concise, nothing serious.

TR#12

I: So what does this mean? (TR#12_CI1_Q1)

CI1: In this case it means that the sentence, it is not only the businesses that form local communities and get places their character", that's a sentence that is almost fully taken from a source on the prompt sheet, there's no there's no citation given, the next sentence then starts with "Postrel even asserts that", and this could be taken to mean that, you know, if he 'even' asserts that, he may have asserted or said something before, but that in itself is not sufficient to make it clear to the reader that the first sentence is also from Postrel, so what's happening here is, a de facto plagiarism because, it's a sentence from another source and the source has not been given credit, and that has a severe impact on task fulfilment points.

I: Alright so what does the student need to change in this bit? (TR#12_CI1_Q2)

CI1: Give the source, indicate that according to Postrel, it is not only the businesses, or insert the Postrel after the sentence, whichever they choose to do, but give the source, it has to be made clear that this sentence is from a source, which it is.

I: Alright, and then how would this improve the text? (TR#12_CI1_Q3)

CI1: It would, sort of, remove the plagiarism, (laughs) it would turn a text that contains plagiarism into a text that does not.

TR#13

I: What does this mean? (TR#13_CI1_Q1)

CI1: Kind of means what it says, but the point here is that they write this argument, and then they end the argument, "as a matter of fact, the economy of a city is highly dependent on local businesses" if you end the sentence like that, you're opening another question, and the question is why, that question also needs to be answered in some ways, you can't end a paragraph with an open question, in another text you might be able to give the answer in the next paragraph, but that's not happening here, so if you say that, if you claim that this is not the case, because cities are dependent on local businesses you should give an example why and how they are dependent, because otherwise the argument just breaks, because you're supporting a claim with another claim that is not supported, so the argumentation is not working well here.

I: Alright.

CI1: Which is why I wrote, you need to give examples why and how this is the case.

I: Okay I think you've basically already answered the second and the third question, so the student needs to insert examples and support his claim. (TR#13_CI1_Q2)

CI1: Support this claim why or how it's dependent, it doesn't even have to be another sentence, just, you know, needs to be a couple of words or a clause or something.

I: And then the argumentation would be stronger? (TR#13_CI1_Q3)

CI1: The argumentation would be a lot stronger, it's not just okay, I'm backing up a claim with another claim which is not backed up, that doesn't work.

TR#14

I: What does this mean? (TR#14_CI1_Q1)

CI1: The "A" with the exclamation mark means that it is a serious accuracy problem, because this is disruptive and confusing for the reader and in terms of syntax it just doesn't work, "they are essential to an...", no, it's not, somebody needs to get more points.

I: So basically you are saying with this bit of feedback

CI1: I saw the bracket here in terms of syntax, but if you put the brackets here, it actually works, if you say "they are essential to an animate town and they connect people", but I felt like they are essential to, and then two things, right, and then it doesn't work, "they're essential to a town" and add "essential" to "connect people", that doesn't work but if the bracket actually goes back to here then it actually works, so that's an oversight on my part, it actually works that's not incorrect at all that's not incorrect at all, that's correct, so I need to get more points I need the name, cause I need to give them more points, or I need to check my notes to my feedback for whomever I gave that kind of feedback, but that is definitely correct

I: Okay, could we just maybe go through what you were trying to say with this instance of feedback?

CI1: I was trying to say that the phrase, as I saw it, was syntactically incorrect, and forced the reader to pause to figure out, you know, the relationship between "the animate town" and "connect people", I would have suggested "connecting people" because they're essential to connecting people, right, that's what I saw but of course if I look at it from a different sentence structure, it actually works and it's not wrong at all, but what I wanted, you know, is have an ing-form here.

I: Alright because

CI1: "essential to", verb one, and noun one, and noun two.

I: Then it's syntactically correct

CI1: But it actually works with object one and object two, so, and not connecting two nouns that, which are "essential to", but connecting two objects which have to do with the stores and then it's right, so that's not a mistake at all.

I: Okay, I guess in this instance it's hard to say how this would improve, or how would this have improved the text, maybe no, I think it's better if we leave this out, because **(TR#14_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: It could have been improved with inserting a second subject after the “and”, “and they connect people”, because then I wouldn't even have had the idea that “connect” might refer to something that's “essential to”, that this is noun two, which is missing, so it's a minor syntactic issue where “they” would have helped, you know, with avoiding all that confusion.

I: Alright, so basically a change would have avoided reader confusion. **(TR#14_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Some reader confusion must have happened, because otherwise I wouldn't have seen it that way, it's possibly just too complex, a bit too convoluted, so that this thing can happen, and inserting the “they” after the end would have totally avoided this, it would have been clear from the start what this meant, so that is the Improvement that I'm suggesting inserting the “they”, so that this thing becomes clear, but it's definitely not a serious grammar issue, not a serious syntax issue, just a matter of not putting a second subject there, and therefore creating some confusion, but it's still syntactically correct it's just possibly too complex, but it's syntactically correct.

TR#15

I: What does this mean? **(TR#15_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: I don't know, the squiggly line means that I don't exactly know what “achieve savings” means other than somebody's saving money, but I don't believe that this is the way to phrase it.

I: Alright, so the student would have to rephrase this. **(TR#15_CI1_Q2)**

CI1: “In order to save money”, depends on who wants to save money, but “achieve savings”, okay I get your idea that somebody wants to save money, but it's just..

I: It's phrased oddly.

CI1: It's phrased oddly, it's phrased in a very strange way, which I put down to limited range, because otherwise they would have, you know, expressed that idea more clearly, so that's imprecise.

I: If they had to implement this change, how would this improve the text? **(TR#15_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Mostly readability, I guess, also form of register could be, could be a point, it could be, like just more straightforward, I guess, it's mostly readability and expressing the fact that they actually have the range to express to the whole thing, so it's not beating about the bush, but you know, saying what they want to say, I guess.

TR#16

CI1: Yes, Sterling provides exact numbers as to how many percent of items are shopped where, and in order to get, you know, a certain amount of points, some indication of

how much shopping is done online must be given, so some sort of number must be given.

I: So this is too vague? **(TR#16_C11_Q1)**

CI1: This is not enough detail, a “lot of shopping” can be anything, and “a lot of” is a range problem, because that's on the handout of things, words they shouldn't be using, so, but it's, the task fulfilment problem is that no indication is given how much it is, and “a lot” is not enough.

I: So they should indicate how much furniture or what kind **(TR#16_C11_Q2)**

CI1: They have the numbers on the graph, so they must indicate 65 percent, or I don't know how much it is, so and so much money is spent, or something like that, but not “a lot of”.

I: How would this indication improve the text? **(TR#16_C11_Q3)**

CI1: The reader would get an idea of how much shopping is done online, because that's part of the argument right, you're trying to argue the significance of online shopping, so they can't just say “people shop online a lot”, so they have to give numbers in order to strengthen the argument.

I: Okay, so basically the argumentation would be much stronger in this case.

CI1: Well depending it's really, but the reader would get an idea of why they should believe them.

TR#17

CI1: Hm, there is cohesion, so, once again I'm not sure why I'm doing this so apparently you found all the parts, where I made mistakes [reads] there is cohesion there.

I: Okay, but basically looking back at what you were intending to say with this feedback

CI1: That the sentences were not connected, that there's no obvious connection between the two of them, just trying to figure out why I felt that way, maybe this goes back to the fact that, the first sentence is kind of strange.

I: Is it maybe unclear with “they” refers to? Whether it's the “businesses” or the “communities”.

CI1: Yeah, but it's still cohesive, even if “they” is unclear, it's still cohesive, it could be either, alright your marking obliterated the quotation marks, that's the problem, there's quotation marks there, because they wrote the sentence and then they inserted a direct quotation and there's no link between the sentence and the direct quotation, so the direct quotation pops up out of nowhere and it is just not linked, you cannot write one sentence then starts with a direct quotation without any link between them, so that's the problem. **(TR#17_C11_Q1)**

I: Okay, so they would have to add a phrase that would link the two together.

(TR#17_C11_Q2)

CI1: There needs to be some connection between their statement and the direct quotation, and that's missing, oddly enough, it works if the quotation marks are deleted, but you can't do that, because it's a direct quotation.

I: Otherwise it would be plagiarism.

CI1: Otherwise it'd be plagiarism, but if you see it as a direct quotation, this quotation is not integrated into text, and it's not clear whether they refer to the "communities" or the "businesses", and that problem arises from the fact that is not clear whether these are communities which can be observed through the locally-owned businesses or whether it's comma is missing and the creation can be observed, and since that sentence is not unclear, the link between these two is not unclear either, so there needs to be some statement between these two in order to establish that.

I: And how would this improve the text? **(TR#17_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: Readability and clarity for the reader. It's argument development, so when you develop an argument, you have to lead the reader through certain points so that it becomes clear what you mean and that too is missing here, so we have separate.

TR#18

CI1: The very unclear first sentence of the first body paragraph which is exactly the [unintelligible], it's unclear whether these are communities which can be observed through these businesses and the "in" is wrong, or whether there should be a comma and the fact that it creates communities can be observed, and that's unclear
(TR#18_CI1_Q1)

I: So what would they have to have to change? **(TR#18_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: Either put the comma there, or ideally rewrite the whole thing, I think that the comma is missing, but it works the other way as well, so do away with that ambiguity in some way, or write the sentence differently, so that it's clear whether the communities can be seen through the businesses or whether the creation of communities by businesses can be seen but that needs to be clarified

I: Okay, great, so it would become more easy to understand for the reader, or become more clear? **(TR#18_CI1_Q3)**

CI1: It is not clear what this actually means, what the sentence wanted to tell me, and if they clarify that, it becomes clear, so it's adding clarity, providing understanding basically.

TR#19

I: What does this mean? **(TR#19_CI1_Q1)**

CI1: That "done" this is an increasingly vague verb, and "purchases are done" is colloquial, so don't use "done", use a different verb. **(TR#19_CI1_Q2)**

I: And using a different verb would improve the text?

CI1: It would raise the register to a more formal level, basically, this is very colloquial, it's no problem, but it's colloquial, and it's repetitive, because it pops up again later.

(TR#19_CI1_Q3)

Course instructor 2 (CI2)

In some cases, for CI2, the second question was not addressed, because the teacher already provided a correction for the student that includes a revised version.

TR#20

I: What does this mean? **(TR#20_CI2_Q1)**

CI2: So this is one of the main problems we have in ILSS2, is just, cohesion is really important, and the way that the whole thing, the essay has like a thread going through it and very often, this kind of thing where the thesis statement, which is so important, is the guiding principle of the essay, it doesn't match with what they've written in the body paragraphs, so these are the kind of things I usually pick up to try and help them to see how important a thesis statement is, because if the thesis statement says one thing but the body paragraphs are arguing something else, then of course the essay is unsuccessful, and so that's what I'm hoping here, that my explanation along with the change I made to the original thesis statement that they will have a, like, aha moment, where they say, "oh" they compare what they had and then see how I changed it, and hopefully if it works well, they will say "alright I see", the changes make the thesis statement and the body of the essay congruent.

I: Alright, so if they had to change something, if they had to revise, what would you have them do? Change it the way you changed it? **(TR#20_CI2_Q2)**

CI2: Yeah, I mean, because that's the thing, originally, when I used to do feedback, I used to just, I would have given them this text or said this and ask them to change it, but then I often found that they changed but they didn't change it correctly, so in this sense, they don't have to revise anything because what I've written for them, how it would work, how it could work, I mean and they could perhaps, I mean, the good ones will do, if they will think "alright, I see that", and they might think of other alternatives, because the way I wrote it, it is one way, but it's not the only way, so they might think "okay, how could I have said that in my own words?"

I: So basically you're providing a stereotypical example

CI2: Yeah, I'm providing the model for them to see "aha, this is what I could have done and it would have been perhaps more successful"

I: Alright, how then does this change improve the essay or the text?

CI2: Well, this change that I have given them would improve this text, but the intention, that's not really the point of the feedback, the point of the feedback is that when they do the next essay, this will be something that they will hopefully think, "okay, this is like", what I ask them to do usually is to kind of say, look at when you get the feedback make a note of a few points and have that next to you when you write your next essay, and so then they might, they'd be more aware of, okay, I've got to make sure that my

thesis statement leads into the body of the essay and then okay, I said it in my thesis statement, I'm going to focus on these two things and that the body paragraphs pick up on that, so in many ways it's not really going to help them with this particular essay, because by the time, this is done, but the intention is to help them in the next one.

I: Alright, but how exactly would this improve maybe the next one, d'you mean in terms of cohesion?

CI2: Well in terms of cohesion, it would improve, basically its content, organisation really, that there is a clear link between the thesis statement and the body part, so that they're not too, because what seems to be the problem with this one is that the thesis statement suggested one answer to the question, but the body paragraph focused on, like the opposing side, and so of course that is not congruent, it's confusing in many ways.

I: So reader understanding would also be improved? (TR#20_CI2_Q3)

CI2: As a reader of the text, that is the case, because for me that is the whole point of writing the essay, that it's got to, often I say that you can have the most brilliant ideas in your head, but if you can't communicate those to anybody else then it's as good as not having those ideas because you know, they're in your head

TR#21

CI2: Right, this must be to do with the, kind of, formalities of quoting; So what we do in ILSS2, one of the things we pick up on is quoting from a source, because that's got to support their ideas in the essays, and this seems to be focused mainly the way you put the commas and the quotation marks, so it's more like the nuts and bolts of writing. This will be something for example, it's just like something to learn, it is a simple thing, you just have to look at it and how the, where the quotation marks go, where the full stops go, where the commas go, and to me, this is something that can be simply dealt with as the first one, we just looked at a minute ago, that's a more complex thing that, will take some time. I would expect somebody who has trouble with that might take them several essays to really get a grip at that, whereas this kind of thing is just

I: It's just referring to one of the rules of quoting (TR#21_CI2_Q1)

CI2: Exactly, yeah, it's like a rule of punctuation, you put the commas here, yeah, when I say, you can see from the way I said, "where on Earth did you get this one?", because the first mistake is quite understandable, it's difficult to write these essays, but this is like, you only have to look at that piece of paper and copy down, you know, copy what they did with commas, it's avoidable, so this is one that is an unnecessary mistake completely.

I: Okay, so if they had to change, I think you've just mentioned it, it's just look up the rules. (TR#21_CI2_Q2)

CI2: Yeah, we have the sheet from the, the stylistics sheet from the department, they just have to look at that and then, kind of, recreate it in their own essays and that's very straightforward

I: Okay, how would this then improve the text or why is it significant? (TR#21_CI2_Q3)

CI2: It's significant, because that is one of the key things in the CFT that is being tested. Can they use, not just write about their own ideas, but can they use sources and refer to other information to support their ideas, because that's what they're going to be doing in all the other courses, so it's kind of a basic thing and it's significant, because it's such a significant part of ILSS2 it's weighted quite heavily in the rating scale, so this can have a big effect on, from my point of view, it's a simple mistake, but it can have a much larger impact on their grade, and so that is significant for them.

TR#22

CI2: Alright, so as I said with the first example, so what I do is, I don't ask them to change it in the sense of go and find out what's wrong, I don't underline and say this is the wrong word, go find the right one, stop doing that, In their essays, there will be phrases like in this case it's obviously vocabulary or like sometimes people write things that I know, I kind of know what they mean, but that nobody would say like that, and I usually change that, so this is what they have to do with these things, is they know that they have to look at the, not just the word that I put in there corrected, but they need to look at that word in conjunction with the one they had wrong to try and see, okay where is, is this something that went wrong, because these two words are quite similar, and I just kind of mix them up, or am I just completely on the wrong track because I have a word here that, the one that I actually need is a completely different one, there's no similarities and I just don't know that word, is it the turn of phrase ones are often things where it's just kind of, the word I always use is awkward, which is just, that's what nobody would say it like that, although we would get the meaning. And so what I'm intending them to do with this it to draw, A is to draw attention to the fact that they really need to be working on the vocabulary, because alongside all of these essays, they're doing the vocabulary log, remember that, and so this is part of the vocabulary work, it's formally incorporated in the vocabulary logs, that they have to use their own essays and pick out examples and do work on that. And so here I would want them to really, at the beginning we said, okay, we're kind of expecting that you do this, but in case it's like this, there must have been quite a lot of mistakes, I just always mention it again to say, well, kind of jog their memory and say what are you really doing there, because you obviously need to, and so what I'm expecting is that they will go do some work on it. I don't think they should do it for everything, they need to develop like an awareness of what is important. So when they look at that, it's got like twenty, thirty mistakes, it's possible, then it's not feasible to do all of them in any depth, so I always try to encourage them to pick up five, ten and really focus on those words that you could use again in essays like this, because a lot of the vocabulary is kind of, it's like from the genre of writing an argumentative essay and some of it is linked to a topic, well the stuff from the topic you have a lot of luck if that topic comes up again, but the stuff for the, you know, arguing and expressing opinions, these things are going to come up in any essay, and so I want to encourage them to really pick up on this, but I don't specify which, because, you know they need to look at it because I don't know, is this just a mistake because they really didn't check it, or is this really a mistake that they just don't know, they can make that judgment better than me, they'll know, okay, I should have really looked that up, I thought it was perhaps wrong, or some will say, well I will really check this out and I really thought this was right

I: Alright, so basically you don't want them to correct it, because you've already
(TR#22_CI2_Q1)

CI2: I've already corrected it

I: And they have to do some additional vocabulary work to be able to incorporate it into their lexical knowledge. (TR#22_CI2_Q2)

CI2: And this work is part of the vocabulary log, or could be, they have to kind of, and this is the key thing with this kind of feedback, that it works the best if they really do that, and I know that some people will look at this and just say alright, okay, yeah, I'll remember that next time, and some of them will say okay and they'll really go away and work with it, and then, of course, you know, if you just look at it and it's already changed for you, I don't think you will get as much from it, as if you actually do something with it.

I: Okay, basically that's also why it's significant. (TR#22_CI2_Q3)

CI2: Very significant, because at the end, they are language classes, at the end of the day, for me, this is where they work on the language, in class we don't really do a lot of individual "What does this word mean?", there is too many other things to do, the kind of language work for me comes at this stage when they get their essays back with the feedback and the corrections, and then they can make of that what they will, and pick it up, or not as the case may be.

TR#23

CI2: Yeah, so the first one is one of the things that we talk a lot about is, you know, this idea of cohesion, but what we sometimes find is an unintentional consequence of this, is drawing the students' attention to all these cohesive devices, like however, and you know, on the other hand, some of them pick this up and they start every single sentence with a cohesive word, a sort of connecting adverb and it starts to sound ridiculous. So what I try to do is to discourage that, and one of the things that I know a lot of people when we mark the CFT don't like, is this very simplistic form of doing firstly for the first paragraph, and secondly, so I always tell them in class, I say, well to me that's a kind of emergency measure, in an exam if your mind goes blank and you cannot think of anything to link with these connectors, then it's perfectly fine, before I said sit there and don't do anything, then I would write firstly, secondly, but for certainly for homework and ideally in an exam, that's too simplistic, firstly, secondly, and so it's part of this whole cohesion thing, and so if they write it in an essay for homework, to me that is just like, couldn't be bothered and they should have really, cause we said it so many times in class, but it's something that I think they could do better with. (TR#23_CI2_Q1)

I: Alright, so if it were to change something they should just use a more appropriate or a less neutral cohesive device. (TR#23_CI2_Q2)

CI2: Yeah, I mean, what we try and encourage them to do is not just to use a word like firstly, but to pick up on the content of the previous, you know for example, if the end of the paragraph beforehand, it said something like there are several measures that could be taken to solve this problem, then your next paragraph could start, one of the most important measures would be bla, and then you've got the cohesion still, but it's better than saying firstly

I: So it's not just a cohesive device in isolation, but it actually picked up on the content

CI2: That's what we're trying, I'm trying to get across, and along with that is this emphasis on just not, I mean this person isn't doing that it seems, but just not starting every single sentence with a firstly, secondly, thirdly, you know it happens sometimes

I: And if the student had incorporated this change, how would the text become more successful? **(TR#23_CI2_Q1)**

CI2: Because it would impact very much on organisation, because of course for the reader, If you pick up on the content of the previous paragraph of course it's easier for the reader to sort of follow your train of thought, it impacts on that, it impacts because one of the other categories we look at is range of language use so of course this is very simplistic, but it's a more complex connector, if you use this kind of picking up in the content.

I: So it shows language proficiency?

CI2: It shows language proficiency, but also it helps the reader, because it makes the argument clearer, style, stylistically it's also much better.

TR#24

CI2: This is again, it's very similar to the very first student and the very first point again, it's cohesion really, a lot of, you know, having this red thread through, so what I'm trying to encourage them, another key point in ILSS1 and ILSS2 is the topic sentences, and this idea, you know you're trying to, you know what you mean, but you, the reader has to know what you mean, and so often people, and not just students, we all do this, when something is so clear in your head, when you know what you want to say, you kind of make assumptions and jump ahead, so that the reader isn't thinking, you forget that the reader doesn't necessarily think the same as you, and this happens a lot, and so in this case it seems that again it's the thesis statement has said one thing **(TR#24_CI2_Q1)**, and obviously focused on this topic from the point of view of the individual, so ideally, the topic sentences will link back to that because again, this is this red thread going through it, so here I'm just making suggestions about how it could be better **(TR#24_CI2_Q2)**, and it's the same, what I wanted to do with this is the same, it's not necessarily, it's to see how could it have been in this essay, and then when they write the next essay to think about "aha I have to look at my thesis statement and this is my point of view and I've said in my thesis statement, these are the two ideas I'm going to pick up on", or three, whatever, and then my topic sentences have got to relate directly back to that, and this again is significant for the point of view of cohesion, showing, you know, task fulfilment, answering the question, creating, presenting a very clear, logical argument to impact on the grade, but also just as a writer, you have to be able to get your points across very effectively, and this is a key factor in that.

I: Okay, so again reader friendliness, or being able to understand it more clearly is very important in this case. **(TR#24_CI2_Q3)**

CI2: Exactly. I think for nearly all the feedback I give, for me, the focus, the language is the least of their problems, language mistakes, the problems are more on another level, the problems have more to do with reader friendliness and getting the points across,

language, of course there are mistakes, but they're not, a lot of the language mistakes, in a small number of students, the weaker ones, it's a problem, but in a lot of the good students, the language problems, yeah there are mistakes, nobody would say that, but I still understand what they mean, but where I don't as the reader understand them is in the way they put the argument together and they often make big jumps between things, or connect two things that to me is not obvious, what is that how is that, you know, just because this happens, why does that mean that, it's like a, the link in between is missing that explains it. That's the bigger problem than language.

TR#25

CI2: I obviously focus a lot on organisation, because this is again, it's the next steps, so the thesis statement and then we sort of show them, okay so thesis statement controls how you're going to answer the question, then you got your topic sentences and in the conclusion, you kind of need to come back to that, so here I'm trying to get them to see how they could have more effectively picked up on that thesis statements to draw it all together, so again, it's to do with this idea of, you know, just making your argument clear to your reader and getting them to understand what you're saying, and also have a strong conclusion where you really restate what your point of view is so that, you know, with the intention that that the whole point of writing an essay, an opinion or argumentative essay is to try and convince your readers to agree with you know, you're trying to end strongly, so here, again, all these things to do with organization are only relevant in raising awareness, I hope that they will look at this and say, "all right, okay", compare what they wrote, what I suggested might be better, and just think about, try to understand and see "ah, yeah it is, I see here that this links to the thesis statement", and then in the next assignment have that in mind that they're trying to recreate that with a different topic and a different set of arguments.,

I: Okay, great, I think you're actually saying in the feedback that the student should just delete the part that isn't really related, or that is a new idea.

CI2: There's also that point, the first part, it's not completely wrong, I mean, I don't remember what the whole essay was, but that sentence is probably redundant in the sense that is true but not really relevant to their arguments (**TR#25_CI2_Q1**), so again, that's something that they want to kind of try and stay focused and not get off on a tangent, which, (**TR#25_CI2_Q2**)

I: And that's how they'll have a stronger stance? (**TR#25_CI2_Q3**)

CI2: They will have a stronger argumentation, because that's another thing that's often, because the ILSS essays are very strict, strict word limits, and it's quite challenging to answer the question in so few words, so therefore they want, every word is necessary, so you don't want to get too much redundant kind of blah blah in there, because that's taking all the words away, they could be using to sort of, what I wanted to say said, I mean we talk a lot about this in class, thinking about, what are your main points, and is everything necessary, are you adding in, sort of padding, that is just, I would say blah blah, but you're not really saying anything, you're not contributing to your argument it's not necessarily wrong, but it's just not necessary.

TR#26

CI2: So here it's just, picking up again, on this idea of organisation, content, having a strong argument, because I'm just pointing out that if their whole argument is based on the individual, the effect of the individual, then they need to make sure that their arguments are things related to what the individual can do, and this one, obviously "illuminated advertising" is something that individual people are not

I: So the argument and the support don't really fit? **(TR#26_CI2_Q1)**

CI2: Yeah, exactly, because the argument that the individual should do something, and the individual can do certain things, but they can't really influence these big illuminated advertising boards, so later on, I must have written something in my notes, I've got a lot of notes, I oversee something, probably in this case, or I forget to say it.

I: So basically, what the student should have done, or should do the next time, is make sure that the support, the quote, or the examples they use for support, match the, or in this case, just use different examples. **(TR#26_CI2_Q2)**

CI2: That matches their thesis

I: And then how does an example that fits the argumentation, how would this be significant, or how would this improve the text? **(TR#26_CI2_Q3)**

CI2: Because, again, improving the argumentation, you know, somebody who reads this might, I mean obviously I did pick up on it, but it wasn't enough, that sort of struck me when I was going through correcting, so, you know, often people will have examples that are not particularly good, but a reader would read over that, sort of, the general idea, but if you're looking at it in detail, you might, it's inconsistent in a way, because okay, if your whole argument is "the individual should be able to do this and this", and then your example is something an individual cannot, it's impossible for them to do, they're powerless, then it's not really a good example, so again it's awareness raising about things that are inconsistent in what they've done in the hope that they, next time, will have all these things that they're kind of aware of them, because these are mistakes that are not simple mistakes, these are quite complex, when they're writing these essays, they're thinking of a thousand things, so things like this slip under the radar, because they're thinking about writing it right, is this the right word, they're not always focused only on content, and so this is drawing their attention to the kind of things in content that they could, kind of, remember and put into practice next time.

TR#27

CI2: Yeah, again, it's interesting to see this, because it's obviously a big thing in my feedback is this kind of, the argument and having consistency and being congruent **(TR#27_CI2_Q31)** and so this again, it's the same thing, I would say, it's not as common as the other ones, but there are people then who have, the questions are always the same thing, "is this a good thing, is that a bad thing", "is person responsible", there's two things and you have to pick one of them, and so it does happen, as in this case here, in an introduction, somebody will say, whatever, obviously this one was about who's responsible for climate change, the individual or the government, and they've said in the introduction one, and then you get to the conclusion and they say the other one, the whole argument is then void, because it doesn't make sense, Which one is it? You could say it's both of them, and if you thought that you have to make that clear in your thesis

statement, and so this is just again pointing out something, that probably this student was thinking so much about the language and writing, and getting the correct word, and other things that they're just not focusing on, task fulfilment, which is one of the key components, and so, yeah, just showing them that you have to, in your essays you have to make sure these two things match up, that they're not different. **(TR#27_C12_Q2)**

I: Okay, so if the two did match up, if in the conclusion the student said the same thing as in the introduction, how would the text improve? **(TR#27_C12_Q3)**

CI2: Well, because it would make sense, it's completely senseless if you say it's the individual, and then you argue all the way through your essay that the individual is responsible, and then in the conclusion you say, well it's the government, that is completely senseless.

I: So the reader would be confused

CI2: Yeah, cause the whole point is you're trying to get across your point of view, well when I've read your essay and I'm still no wiser about your point of view, as you've said one thing here and one thing there, so really, these are, in terms of the rating scale, this would lose a lot of points for this kind of inconsistency.

TR#28

CI2: This again is, it's trying to, some students have real, real trouble, working out what the question is really about, so they see something like in this essay particularly, they see something like climate change, and before they, they seem to go off on, like a whole tangent about climate change good or bad, they don't look at the question carefully **(TR#28_C12_Q1)**, because the question is always formatted in the same way, there's like a little blurry bit, climate change is a terrible problem and blah blah blah, and then there's always a tag line at the end that says, do you think that the government or the individual is responsible for improving climate change, something like that, and they need to look at that very carefully, because that's what they've got to answer, and not get side-tracked by the general topic that's in the blurry bit, and so there's again, quite a few, in this case there were a lot actually, who went straight off on a tangent, because the question said, who is responsible, they need to answer that and they didn't, so this is again, it's trying to show them, look, this is what you said in your thesis statement, but it's not strong enough to be a clear answer, you're not, if I read that I'm not sure what your opinion is, and so I'm trying to give them an alternative, again in the hope that they look at these two things together and say alright, I see, what I wrote, it's open to interpretation, but what they suggested makes it very clear, this is the person who's responsible, because if they can get a good thesis statement, they'll generally get a better essay, if they follow it, that's the next problem. **(TR#28_C12_Q2)**

I: Okay, so I think you've already put a suggestion on there, how they could improve, so that's part of feedback, how would this improve to text or how would the text be more successful if the student used your suggestion?

CI2: Because they would give a very clear point of view, and that's task fulfilment **(TR#28_C12_Q3)**, we want to see, what do you think, there is no answer to these questions, we're not expecting any, if they say it's the individual, they should be able to explain that, what things make you think that, and if they say it's the government they

need to be able to explain it. If they say nobody's responsible because everybody has to work together, that's okay as well, but they would have to, their arguments should, but I need to be able as a reader, I should be able to read that and say, this person thinks that the government should do a b and c, and this person thinks the individual should do a b and c and this person thinks that both of them together, and that's what I want to see.

I: So as a reader you should be able to clearly identify what your point of view is.

CI2: Yeah.

TR#29

CI2: So, this is all about organization, this will be, again, links, a bit, back to what I said before, very often, in the paragraphs, It's like we said a little bit earlier, that they know what they want to say, what their argument is, but they forget that the reader doesn't necessarily think, or doesn't know what they're trying to get across (**TR#29_CI2_Q1**), so they have to make sure that they explain very clearly, and from what I'm reading, the idea with this kind of feedback is, as they're listening to me say this, they're looking at the text, because in isolation, it is kind of difficult to see what is meant, but if you're actually looking at the text, you should be able to see, okay this sentence, so we're actually talking about the topic sentence, so body paragraph one, so they're kind of looking at that, so here it seems to me that what they've done is they've made too big a jump between two content points, and so it's not clear to me what exactly did they mean, and so I'm suggesting, it seems to me, that they should change the order around, and move one sentence, so that it's clear what the examples are that they're using, and how they relate to the topic of the paragraph and so on (**TR#29_CI2_Q2**), so and again that's all to do with, you know, getting your point across to your reader and the readability, reader friendliness.

I: So basically you're saying that there there's a step missing and it's difficult to follow (**TR#29_CI2_Q3**)

CI2: Yeah, it's difficult to follow, I don't know what the sentence is, but it's obviously the second sentence, whatever they had is the second sentence, the topic sentence seems to have been successful, but it doesn't seem to have been clear that they're talking about transportation, and so they needed to change the order of the sentences perhaps, that would have made clear that these examples relate to transportation and not just to whatever.

I: Okay. So basically the reader would have had to infer this link, or how to get from the topic sentence to the examples.

CI2: Yeah

TR#30

CI2: This is something I'm always getting on their backs about, it's a little bit, accuracy, they get this sheet, the question sheet has the question and then it has graphs and quotes and things that they have to use, some of which they have to use, and so often you get people then who, like we had in the previous example with the quotation marks in the right place, so they put commas wrong, or spelling mistakes, or they misquote, various things like that, and so this is just drawing attention to the fact about editing,

how important that is, sometimes I know, when just I'm chatting to students, they often say when they get these essays to write, sometimes, I always say, do it like in the exam, so write in the 1 hour 15 minutes, which is the time they have, and then when you've got that, that's your kind of first draft, and then that's what you work with, and then you tidy it up, with an assignment you can work on that, check out all the things that you had trouble while you were writing and thinking and that's not the right word, do all that, and I really put a lot of emphasis on the fact how you, that 75 minutes, 1 hour 15 minutes that they have, they have to really think about how to use that time, so like when they get the question, you know, spend 5 minutes reading the question checking you understand, then, you know, planning, making an outline, writing, and I always really stress that they should have at the end, a good 10 to 15 minutes to edit, and so if I think that they haven't edited, when I read it, when think there's a lot of, kind of stupid mistakes, and this student is a good student, they definitely, if they read it carefully, they would pick these up, I always pick that out, because I think, if they understand how important that is, it might encourage them to do it.

I: So basically, what's more important here in this instance, is not the mistake or the misusing the quote, or I think are the numbers wrong or something,

CI2: Yeah, I mean the point is, for me, this feedback is about, like the whole process of writing, and the idea, that, you know, what I hope, I mean, I don't know if this is idealistic, but what I'm hoping to do is to train them to be good writers, not just to write an essay to pass the CFT (**TR#30_CI2_Q1**), that's their immediate goal, but, for me, there's a bigger thing, A enabling them to express themselves, and B, if you can be a good writer, you've got a very strong skill set, and so I would like to try and encourage them to think about not just about, I've got to get this essay done, but how can I, you know, how do I go about it, the whole process is important too, and this kind of feedback is picking up on that, you've got to remember to do this, it's not just kind of a random procedure, there's a structure to how you do these, write these essays.

I: So the significant part about this would be that part of writing proficiency, or a big part of writing proficiency is editing. (**TR#30_CI2_Q3**)

CI2: Yeah, and so pointing out things like I said, of course when you're writing things, nobody writes it straight off and that's perfect, so often you cross stuff out, and you always find a better term here, and you do a lot of this, but when you do that, you've got to then read very carefully just to make sure that it still makes sense, cause of course when you change one thing somewhere, it has an impact somewhere else.

TR#31

CI2: Yeah, this is another can of worms, because, again, this ties in a little bit to what I said about how, in my mind of what I'm doing, I have a greater goal than the CFT, and so, one of the things that, you know you probably remember from the ILSS classes, is what we're trying to do is to get them away from this school writing, I think this and. I and this very informal style, so we push them to write in a more academic style which they need for the department anyway, but that is sort of, it's tricky, because writing of course is not static, styles and trends and everything changed, and so, it was true like years ago, you said, don't use any "I", or "we", or anything, but that is changing and people do use that, however, so we have a problem here, because for the point, for the

CFT, if they write like that, they will be picked up, and they will be downgraded, so they shouldn't do it for the CFT, but I want them to be aware that sometimes, so in this case, again, I can't remember the essay, but obviously here, the whole argument was about the whole of the society is involved in climate change prevention, and so the use of "we" there actually works very well, so I don't want that student to think, oh this is really bad, so they should see that that was actually good and it supported their argument, however, the smaller goal, as we keep saying, is a CFT, so I wanted just to be clear that better not do that in the CFT, but to know that this is something that, you know, academic writing, you see lots of journals where it says "we did this" and "I think this", it's not necessarily wrong. **(TR#31_CI2_Q1)**

I: So you're basically warning the students, "be cautious about using personal pronouns in the CFT", but also to say that it is okay in some instances and that this would be an example.

CI2: Exactly, cause I don't want to present them with all these rules, because I don't believe that this is how it is, it depends, there's so many constellations of audience and purpose there's so many things they have to think about, and I think they should be aware of that, but we should know for the CFT, "don't do it".

I: Okay, so basically in this instance, the student wouldn't have to change anything, because it's used accurately, and then there's also, did we talk about why it's significant? **(TR#31_CI2_Q2)**

CI2: It's part of the, I think it comes under range of language used, register is a point there, and so this will be, if you use "we" and "our", or "I" excessively then it will be downgraded, because it's not academic register.

I: So it's not appropriate in certain contexts. **(TR#31_CI2_Q3)**

CI2: Yeah.

TR#32

CI2: Yeah, this is again, these kind of formalities of quoting and just showing them, well, you know, you can, where you can put the date, and how you can put the reference in, because that's something that fits under, like the previous bits of feedback, this is all the formalities of the text type, and so they should just know these options exist, and you can basically choose which one you do, but I try to show them, they kind of combined two ways, which wasn't actually necessary cause they kind of repeated themselves by saying the name of researchers is in the text, and then putting it at the end **(TR#32_CI2_Q1)**, and it would have been enough just to say the names of the researchers and put the date **(TR#32_CI2_Q1)**, and so again, these are points I pick up on, because they're so crucial, they're so key to the CFT essay, and they need to get that right, because of people will forgive a lot of things to do with, when I say people I talk about the other markers, because for the CFT, I'm not marking my students, they're marked by somebody else, and so people are quite forgiving about, I don't know, the topic and if you don't have any, you know, you might just not know brilliant arguments, but this kind of stuff that you could, you know from day one that you're going to have to do this, so this is something you should do right, because if you do this wrong, it gives a

bad impression, that you couldn't be bothered to learn that, again, it's key.

(TR#32_C12_Q3)

I: So, it's significant on the one part, because of the preparation for the CFT, but also, like you mentioned before, for the other student, as a preparation for academic work.

CI2: Exactly, they're going to be doing this not only in the ILSS classes, but they're going to do this across the board, so it's a key piece of knowledge.

I: Yeah, and I guess the worst case scenario it could count as plagiarism.

CI2: Exactly, so they need to be behind this stuff.

TR#33

CI2: So this is different, ever so often, there's a student, who really works really hard and tries hard, and they sort of, if I think this is a really good student, and I really want to help this one, so then I sometimes say to them, "well, if you are struggling with whatever", like when I do the feedback on their essays, I do it under the track change, so they look at their essay, and they see down the side, the things I've changed, and any comments, and then they listen to the oral feedback, so sometimes, obviously, I can't do this for every student, because I would never be finished, but occasional I say to a student, "okay, when you're writing your essay and the things that you struggle with, write in the track changes what you're thinking and then I'll pick up on that and tell you, you know, yes, you're right what you're thinking, or no, this is what the problem is", because often these students who have these problems, when I just read the essay, I can't give them good feedback, because I don't really know what they were thinking when they were writing, so this looks to me like it's one of those, where I've asked them to write something, and now I'm commenting on what they said.

I: Exactly, that's one of those cases.

CI2: This is one of those, and I can't remember who the student was, this is obviously a student whose problem is getting, staying focused in a paragraph, and so what I'm trying to do here, is show them, on the hand of one paragraph, well look, this bit is not really necessary, because you know, you're drifting away from what you wanted to say, this is your topic sentence, and trying to show them sentence by sentence how to, sort of, stay focused, I highlight to them to bits where they've side-tracked, or gone off the topic, in the hope that they will then understand why the parts that are unnecessary actually are unnecessary, and to see how it could have been more focused and cohesive

(TR#33_C12_Q1) basically, so these kind of things, I don't know if this is helping them, but if I know what exactly the problem is that they're thinking about when they're writing it, and then respond to that then I think we might have an impact, to sort of see where they went wrong from the point of view of the reader.

I: So basically, what the student could have done, is just leave out some parts which you said were redundant and the student would be more precise. **(TR#33_C12_Q2)**

CI2: Yeah, precise, and focused, because it seems to me from what I said is that they had a good topic sentence, and they started following that, but every so often they just added in something that's redundant, and again, because they're on a very tight word limit, they can't afford that, they have to really stay very focused and tight.

(TR#33_CI2_Q3)

TR#34

CI2: Yeah, this is just a kind of vocabulary point, sort of drawing attention to the difference between two very closely related terms, and trying to explain what the difference is **(TR#34_CI2_Q1)**, again, it has no real significance, it's, you know, sometimes I change, you know, I change vocabulary, but I don't for every single change explain the difference, but I think this was because this was the graph, very often the graphs have headings and students take the words from the graph, be it at the headings or on the axis or something, and just use it interchangeably in their essays, but they don't always take into account, well on the heading it's often like a generic term, but they actually need a more specific term in the essay **(TR#34_CI2_Q2)**, and I probably just randomly picked up on this one, because it was key to the topic of the essay, so it's just that this is something I would expect this person to put this in their vocabulary log and perhaps do some work around this word field of like "housing", and "household", and "homeowner", and all these kind of things, yeah, and of course the significance is that it improves your vocabulary, there are minor differences between. **(TR#34_CI2_Q3)**

I: Okay, so kind of, the hidden meaning is what you mentioned, that, also in preparation for the CFT, they need to be careful when using terms from the graphs.

CI2: Although I think if I was a student reading this, I wouldn't necessarily, well do I mention it, yeah I think I do they might not pick up, that's my intention, but they might not pick up on it as something, like the other things, like organisation, topic sentence, thesis, they know that this is related to the CFT essay, I'm not so sure that they would pick that up here, they might just see it quite as a vocabulary point.

TR#35

CI2: Yeah, that is again, that will be me, when I see this here, it's obviously something to do with the way they phrased something in the paragraph **(TR#35_CI2_Q1)**, obviously at the end, but if you don't see the whole context of the essay, this isn't really elaborate, it's not clear exactly what is meant, it's something to do with the way they phrased this about the crucial role, so what it would be doing is getting them to think again about, not just, I mean this kind of phrase, like "play a more crucial role" that is very topic, genre related, so they can use that in loads and loads of essays, it doesn't really matter what the topic is, so I often pick up on things like that to make them think of this difference, so that, should they talk about this in a different essay with a different topic, they might think about what's the difference between "plays a more crucial role" and "has a more crucial role to play" **(TR#35_CI2_Q2)**, so it's again raising awareness, I wonder if the student will have picked up on that from just this feedback, they might just see it as like, okay, this is wrong and this is right without thinking too much about why, but it's basically vocabulary, I would say.

I: So you're mentioning, or you're suggesting a different way, or a more appropriate way to use this phrase, but why is it significant or how would this improve the text?

(TR#35_CI2_Q3)

CI2: It improves the text from the point of view that it will be more precise and more focused, but I think, I wonder if the student would pick that up, I think they would just see this as a vocabulary thing and this is right and this is wrong, which would actually be counterproductive, because both of those phrases, it's not that one is wrong and one is right, they're both right, it's the context that is used, rather than the phrase itself, so a good student would do some work with that, they might realise the difference, and how it was used, a student who just looked at this and thought "oh yeah, right", I think they wouldn't take anything from this.

TR#36

CI2: Yep, so punctuation, again, there's so many things in ILSS that you have to do and you don't really have time to do, and punctuation is something that, it is a category in the assessments, so there are points allocated for that, I always think when we get to the end of term, I always think, "oh crap we haven't done enough punctuation", because really, we have one short class on punctuation, and it's really skating over the surface, so if I come across, this is about the usage of the colon, often I point things out to students about how they can use it **(TR#36_CI2_Q1)**, and strangely enough, although many, many things that you do, that I give feedback on, that I just, often in my positive times, I think something will stick, in my less positive times I just say what a waste of time this is, because I'm correcting the same things over and over again, but punctuation is one of the things that strangely enough, it has quite an effect, when I give people, you know, some little piece of advice like this, I often find that in another essay, a subsequent essay, I think that they might use it whether is linked to punctuation, feedback on it, I don't know, but because I write notes when I'm doing the, you know, I'm making notes to do the oral feedback, just like "use the colon here" **(TR#36_CI2_Q2)**, because I have it all on the same piece of paper often, when I do another assignment, you know, I just glance at what they did previously and I have noticed, from time to time, oh they used a colon and I actually said something, or now they're using the semi-colon, perhaps it's just coincidence, but I like to think that maybe that had a little bit of, they thought about that, and of course it's significant, a good writer can punctuate.

I: And in in this very instant, how does the different punctuation improve the sentence or how does it become more effective? **(TR#36_CI2_Q3)**,

CI2: Probably they had two shorter and simpler sentences, and this would be, again, cohesion, it's another way of cohesion, it's not just, because one of the categories in range of language, the two language aspects of the assessment are language accuracy and language range, and so, language accuracy is obviously mistakes, but language range is showing, okay, well, I'm very competent I can use you know, I don't just write a string of simple sentences, and so this would be a way of making, showing, oh I've a range of sentences I can use, other means of cohesion, and of course, stylistically it usually reads better, so it has quite a significant impact.

TR#37 *[Questions weren't really addressed]*

CI2: Yeah, so this is just again, sometimes if you have a student, what I really try to do with the oral feedback, is I try to be kind of upbeat and quite positive because I think it has, you know, maybe that will encourage them to keep going and not be too bad, so when you have, sometimes you have students who really have so many mistakes that their language is weak, and you know, it's not clear that they're going to get through the CFT, and so sometimes with ones like this, it helps, there's always something I try to sort of give some positive feedback, well, this is a good word, and we talk a lot about register and using more academic register, well this is an example of it and sort of join their attention to the fact, well look, if you use words like this you can use this in any essay, it's not linked to this topic, so with the hope that they will, you know focus on these kind of vocabulary items that are more applicable in lots of different essays, so this could have been somebody, who really had really a lot of language problems, and so this is trying to get them a bit of a pep, to say it's not all bad, there is some hope.

I: Alright, I'm not sure if it makes sense to talk about why this is significant in this case, because it's a more general, or global feedback.

CI2: Well, I mean it's significant, because language accuracy and range, as something, if you are a very weak student and there are several of those, you can't just improve the whole thing by just scattering random academic words throughout the essay but it certainly will stand in their favour, that kind of be borderline cases, if you have a lot of language accuracy mistakes, but you're using good language, good range of language, you can counteract a little bit of the accuracy, I mean it's not really going to save you, if you're so bad, but so trying to get them, the significances is to, look at this kind of stuff, try and incorporate it, you're on the right track.

TR#38

CI2: Yeah, because one of the things that we pick up on, is like, again, having a good argument is hedging,, and you know, so if we say things like this, "it's just always being a heated discussion topic", well that's not strictly speaking true, because a hundred years ago, nobody's interested in climate change (**TR#38_C12_Q1**), so these are just to to draw attention to, we talk about this a lot in class, about, you know, not every government is evil and not every person is careless, so trying to get them away from writing these all absolutes, "every" and "always", "never" and so to show them you really need to, there's a lot of hedging that "maybe" and "sometimes" and things, and again, it's difficult, because it's a fine line between being imprecise and being too absolute, you've got to find that sweet spot in the middle, so things like this are just to say well that's not true.

I: Alright, so basically in this instance the student should have incorporated a hedging device? (**TR#38_C12_Q2**)

CI2: Yeah, they could have said something like "in recent years climate change has become an issue of concern".

I: And why is this significant? (**TR#38_C12_Q3**)

CI2: Because, if you're writing a good argument, if you say, if you use all this kind of language, then you undermine your argument cause nobody will take you serious, and anybody knows about these kinds of things, and say, well it's not always, if too many

people question too many things that you're writing then they will not believe you, it will undermine your argument, it makes you not seem less competent in your facts and things, so they should try and avoid that.

TR#39

CI2: Yeah, so what I do is, sometimes there is a very clear problem, you know, you have a student, who is really quite, writes quite well and then then there's like in this case here, there's one thing, if they could just improve that, that would improve the essay tremendously, and so that's always the key feedback, and I always give that first, and this is again cohesion, it's such an issue, even for many, many good students, often the cohesion of making it all fit together is problematic, and so this here, I'm trying to show, A by expressing it like this, I want them to see, this is really important, you have to do, if you do nothing else that I've said here, do this, and again, getting them to pick up on this link between thesis statement and content of your paragraphs **(TR#39_CI2_Q1)** and that's significant because that's the whole essay, is built around that, it impacts so many different categories of assessment, task fulfilment, organisation, language, and so they need to do that well. **(TR#39_CI2_Q3)**

I: Alright, so it's significant because the whole text would become more cohesive, easier to follow for the reader.

CI2: Exactly, you get your point across so much more effectively.

TR#40

CI2: Yeah, again, I think we had something similar right here, it's a little bit linked to what we said a minute ago about "always", that is very, very difficult for students, to get the right stance towards things, so while you shouldn't say "everybody always does this, or nobody ever does that", equally, you don't want to be too vague **(TR#40_CI2_Q1)**, because what we're asking for is your opinion, what do you think, "the governments appear to have", well, it's not wrong, but it's also not very strong, so it hurts her or his argument, is going to be, because this was an essay about responsibility, say, governments are responsible, then they need to say that, like clearly and directly, and avoid things that are vague, because once you're vague, what exactly do you mean, so it's to do with precision and having a strong stance, that they then develop and support, and it's significant, because the task fulfilment category, how well can you present your argument, how well can you persuade somebody, even if they don't at the end of your essay agree with you, that they can say, well I see your point, I see where you're coming from. **(TR#40_CI2_Q3)**

TR#41

CI2: This is to do with what we said as well, it's funny how the same things keep coming around, but this is again, having, probably this one sounds to me like it's somebody who writes well, but they still, in their mind it's a very clear argument, but they're missing something out, that kind of explains a key point of a paragraph **(TR#41_CI2_Q1)**, so it seems to me that from this essay, it was all about the government is responsible, and in these paragraphs, they're explaining something, why, or how the government is responsible, but they're making a big jump between a point they make and what that means, and there's a missing link somewhere, so when I read it, I sort of, maybe could

guess what they mean, but again, they should say what they mean, because then there's no, if you write a good argument, somebody can follow you, and they don't have to make inferences, because as soon as somebody has to make an inference and they could make a wrong inference from your point of view, so they think differently to what you actually intended, and so this is stupid, so it's sort of trying to draw their attention again, the person cannot do anything in this essay, because it's already done but hopefully this feedback will make them really think about it, and see what was missing. so that next time, they will have that when they sort of put their paragraph together, they might be in their head, thinking, okay, have I linked all these sentences together, is there anything that somebody could misinterpret.

I: Alright, and I guess again it has something to do with having a clear argument and also not to confuse the reader because if you have to infer something then there's always a level of interpretation. **(TR#41_CI2_Q3)**

CI2: Exactly, you should say this is what I think and this is my opinion.

TR#42

CI2: Yeah, this is drawing attention to the, when I said way back, this, think is the last assignment we did, so this is already the end of semester and at the beginning of the semester when we start out and I go through this whole vocabulary log thing, I say that I'm expecting that when you do your essays that you are working on the vocabulary, so this is obviously a student whose vocabulary was, I can't work out from where I said, it could be either a student whose really weak, and is a very weak student, but equally, it could be a student, who's pretty good, but has kind of, silly mistakes, that wouldn't be necessary, they could easily deal with, and so what I'm trying to do here is just encourage them, get them to remember that you got to look at this vocabulary **(TR#42_CI2_Q1)**, so I just explain the process, don't just look at the word I changed, but contrast and compare it with the one you got wrong and try to see where was the problem and so it's again trying to give them a nudge in the right direction, but if they're not doing that, they should be doing it, and that again it's really important, this is obviously one of their, they're probably losing a lot of unnecessary points in language accuracy, but I would think, well they could easily, you know, they could improve that quite simply, so, yeah.

I: So just in terms of significance, as a, sort of, preparation for the CFT, but also I think in one of the last instances, you've mentioned lexical knowledge is an important part of writing. **(TR#42_CI2_Q3)**

CI2: Exactly, in this bigger goal that I have, which is beyond the CFT. It's like, range and vocabulary, in my eyes that's really what separates the good students and the really good students, it's not much more than the really, really good ones have a better vocabulary, they can express themselves more precisely and in a range of ways and a good student can do that as well, but they then over a longer text, they start to be a little bit repetitive, whereas somebody who's really got a great vocabulary, you know tiny little differences between things, and so a good student should be working on vocabulary all the time, it's endless, a never ending joke.

TR#43

I: So what does this mean? What did you intend to say with this bit? (TR#43_CI3_Q1)

CI3: This refers to the prompt, to the essay prompt, cause as you might know, all the essays have a prompt, and students have to respond to the prompt, and we don't want them to come up with any argumentative text, but an adequate response to the prompt, and what we do is normally, every prompt has sort of a question, and we want them to provide a direct answer to this question, so then the whole essay, specifically the thesis statement and the conclusion then ideally should refer back to this question, and apparently this was not done directly enough, so that's a very common feature that many students' essays show, they write some points about the topic, related to the topic, but not the specific answer to the question and that was the case here, so this is a question from the prompt then, it asks the students to answer to what extent they agree with this statement that law-abiding citizens have nothing to fear, this is about data surveillance, mass data surveillance, and there was one quote by the former British secretary of state, who said that if you are a law-abiding citizen, you've got nothing to fear, in terms of data surveillance

I: So what should this student have done? (TR#43_CI3_Q2)

CI3: The student should have provided a more direct response to this question given in the prompt, in the body of the essay, I should develop a response to this question specifically, not the advantages or disadvantages of data surveillance in general, but really referring to this specific question and then arguing, and to what extent this is a meaningful statement

I: Alright, and how would this improve to text? (TR#43_CI3_Q3)

CI3: It would provide them with a more adequate response to the prompt, and this is what we require in task fulfilment, so students come up with an appropriate answer to the question posed in the prompt, and if that's not the case then in our understanding of the prompt, in our understanding of the task, it hasn't been fulfilled adequately, right, as I said, we don't want them to come up with any, you know, argumentative text on a very general topic, but in fact, we want them to come up with a specific response to a specific prompt, and very often the reader then can, sort of, infer to what extent the student agrees or disagrees with the main question in the prompt, but what we try to get our students to do, is to come up with a more direct response, a more explicit response to the prompt, not just in vague terms, not the reader, in fact, has to do all the work by inferencing, but the writer has to do the work by being more direct. More explicit, more reader friendly at the end of the day, that's it.

TR#44

CI3: In general the feedback means, you may remember the prompt again, or the task type, and for this task type, students have to incorporate and integrate given information into their own argument, so the basic idea is to come up with an argumentative text, but not just based on their own experience, their own knowledge, their own background, but they would also have to incorporate other people's views,

other people's quotations, given information into that text, so we give them information in form of visuals, so graphs, charts, tables, and so on, and in the form of quotations, and they have to refer to both sources of visual information. So it's always two graphs, two charts, and so on, they would have to incorporate information from both these sources, and in addition from one of the given quotations, so there is about four to six quotations, and they would have to incorporate one of them, or refer to one of them in their texts, and the feedback here, this is again a feature that we find in many students essays, is they, students pick information, most of the time the information is meaningful, most of the time the information relates to the main point of the paragraph, but it's not embedded into their own text, so we find something like, students, you know, suggest an idea, then they pick some information from the quotation, but there is no link, no sort of, the link is not direct enough between their own point and the given information, and very often what we find in students texts is that students, at the end of the paragraph then, because they have to incorporate this information, or they have to refer to the quotes, they add this information at the end of the paragraph, this is not necessarily the case here, because we find something else after the quote, but as you can see from my markings here, there is no connection, or the connection isn't explicit enough again, and that's what I mean by, either there is lack of coherence, or there's just not enough linking between the quotations and what the students have come up with themselves. **(TR#44_CI3_Q1)**

I: Alright, so I guess you've already been hinting at it, so the student would have to add one or two phrases to link the source, this sentence including the source with the rest of the paragraph? **(TR#44_CI3_Q2)**

CI3: Ideally, in some form, the student should refer back to the quote in some way saying somehow, making it clear somehow, why they've mentioned this information, why they're bringing up this information, otherwise the reader is left wondering, so what, interesting fact, but how does it add to your argumentation, how does it refer to your line of argument, and this very often isn't clear enough, so yes students can select information from given information, but the embedding into their own text, or the incorporating into their own text doesn't always work well enough, and this is what this information refers to, so ideally then they would have to provide a more explicit link, saying in somehow, in some why this information is relevant, or the reader should, at the end of the day, know why this information has been selected or as in this case providing a more explicit link between the quote and the rest of the paragraph.

I: Alright, and how would this improve the text then? Having this better link? **(TR#44_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: The text would be more coherent, more coherent, more cohesive, that's very much to do with paragraph organisation, on the one hand, sometimes also with task fulfilment, right because as I said, we expect them to select information from given sources and incorporate it into their own text, so it's on the one hand a question of task fulfilment, but at the same time a question of coherence, cohesion, what we defined as text or what we label text organisation.

TR#45

I: So what does this mean? **(TR#45_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: Very generally, I would say, I would have to read the paragraph again, but very often I give this type of feedback when the topic sentence doesn't capture the paragraph in its entirety, it may be a selected idea in the paragraph, but it doesn't capture the full idea, and what we teach at that level anyway, that it's very much about, you know, providing a very basic structure, essay structure, text organization, kind of guidelines that we ask students to follow directly, what we want them to do is to come up with a topic sentence that really captures the main idea and the overall idea of the paragraph, not just part of the paragraph, not just the first part of the paragraph, but the whole paragraph, and if it doesn't, if it only refers to the next sentence, and if it only forms a coherent unit with the next sentence, but not the entire paragraph, that's when I give this type of feedback.

I: What should the student do then? Like to respond to this feedback? **(TR#45_CI3_Q2)**

CI3: There's basically two things depending on what the line of argument is, on the one hand, they change the topic sentence, make sure that the topic sentence does cover the whole paragraph, or they change the paragraph if they feel, well the main idea is actually covered by the topic sentence, then perhaps it needs some additional ideas in the body of the paragraph, so these are two things that they can do, because ideally, every paragraph should form a coherent unit, there should be one unit for one idea, and we normally teach them to, you know, that every topic sentence has a topic and controlling idea and that the body of the paragraph develops this topic and controlling idea further, if there are too many topics then in the body of the paragraph, then the paragraph may not be coherent enough, may not form a coherent unit, but just a collection of too many separate ideas.

I: Okay, so if the student then sticks to his one idea, how would this improve the text? **(TR#45_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: Again, this would be a question of text organisation in this paragraph, what I try to do is to teach my students to develop a line of argument, a coherent line of argument, and every paragraph in the body essay should kind of develop this line of argument, so then any paragraph in the text should refer to one step in this line of argument, so a question of organising again, question of logical development, developing a line of argument and if the paragraphs are coherent it's easier again for the reader to see what this line of argument is, rather than just a collection of ideas, which may not be connected enough, or again with the reader have to do a lot of inferencing to see what the line of argument could be.

TR#46

I: What does this mean? **(TR#46_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: This is a lexical issue in this case and it's to do with it the understanding of the word "questionable", right, so "questionable" in this case doesn't make sense, cause "it is questionable, if all of these people need to be worried about privacy", then what kind of questioning this idea, it's to do with the understanding of "questionable", and that means it's stated ambiguously.

I: Alright, so would the student have to change? **(TR#46_CI3_Q2)**

CI3: The student would have to replace the word “questionable”, look up a different word, otherwise it is ambiguous.

I: Alright, if the student had implemented a more appropriate or a more accurate word, how would this improve to text or the paragraph? **(TR#46_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: It would reduce the ambiguity, it would make the statement clearer.

TR#47

I: So what does this mean? **(TR#47_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: This refers to, obviously the first sentence in the introduction, and this is not a major issue, but what we teach in connection to the introduction, is to state the topic first somehow, then to move on to the more narrow focus or aspect of the prompt and then come up with a thesis statement, so these are basically the three moves in the introduction, and in this case the statement of the topic is too broad again, this relates to our prompt, the essay prompt, and the essay prompt is not about the Cold War, it's not about espionage, but in fact it's about data surveillance, and although there is a link between these things, this in fact is not the topic, in this case, the topic statement would be too broad, and I would perhaps ask the student to come up with a more specific version of the topic statement.

I: Alright, if the student used this more specific version, I guess that's what you mean by having to change something, or what this student would have to change **(TR#47_CI3_Q2)**

CI3: Exactly, so more specifically related to the prompt, or the topic given in the prompt.

I: And then how would this improve the essay, or the text? **(TR#47_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: This would then satisfy our definition of what an introduction in this specific text type looks like, and remember this is text type is very, sort of, guided, it's very, sort of, very much defined in terms of what the moves are, it's very predictable in that sense, but at that level, we feel that this what students need to develop, their writing skills, they need to be more flexible later on, and be more flexible in their application of text type features.

I: Alright, so the text doesn't really become much more successful, but rather the assessment of the text in this specific context.

CI3: That's right, although in terms of assessment, this would not have any impact at all, it's actually not covered directly in our rating scale descriptors, so although the first statement is very broad and not specifically related to the prompt, this wouldn't lead to a downgrade or a penalisation, so this is just, you know, as an add-on, but it doesn't do anything in terms of assessment or grades.

TR#48

I: What does this mean? **(TR#48_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: That basically means that students, and this one is particular, use direct quotes, when in fact an indirect quote would have been more, more effective, what we teach is to actually go for indirect quotes rather than direct quotes, because direct quotes are

normally used when also the wording is interesting, when wording is unique, some would also want to refer to the phrasing, but if it's just a very general concept of a very general idea and students use a direct quote, then perhaps a paraphrase would be more effective, so in this case, yeah, and even the way the student's actually introduced this quote, or the kind of, the reporting verb, "as Miller put it", this kind of indicates that what I'm going to write about next is a unique way of saying, or expressing an idea, right, but in fact, the quote doesn't provide any kind of unique wording or any interesting phrasing, and that's why perhaps a direct quote is more effective in this context **(TR#48_CI3_Q2)**, right, so this kind of, make sense, think about the choice of quote, direct quote or indirect quote, and you know, use an indirect quote rather than a direct quote, and students often just use direct quotes, because it's handy, because the wording is given, they don't have to think about a paraphrase, but in fact we want them to go for indirect quotes more than direct quotes especially when the wording doesn't do anything to the argument.

I: Alright, how would this improve the text then? **(TR#48_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: It would refer to the way the quotations are integrated into the text, having the student incorporate the given information into the text, and that's why I said we encourage them to go for indirect quotes rather than direct quotes, because of this tendency to overuse direct quotes, and very often we find paragraphs in students' texts which are basically full of direct quotes, there are more direct quotes in the text than, you know, text written by the students, and kind of prevent that type of scenario to prevent this tendency to overuse direct quotes.

TR#49

I: What does this mean? **(TR#49_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: Well, this was actually quite a good text, as you can see from the score, what we're trying to do then is, we try to, you know, encourage them to aim for more, and this piece of feedback relates to our rating scale descriptors, and to score top band five points in task fulfilment, students have to compare, contrast, challenge and evaluate the information, so not just use it as part of the argumentation, but also compare and contrast information given in the quotes themselves, and this is explicitly stated in our rating scale descriptors, for band five, so in order to score the top mark in task fulfilment, the text would have to show this comparison, contrast, or evaluation of given information, if that's not given, then the score is four.

I: Alright, so this is really something that is intended for future essays. So there's not really a change in this very essay, I guess, and you've also mentioned that this would be assessed higher, or there would be higher score, but how would such an implementation improve a text? **(TR#49_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: It would improve the text, this again related to our rating scale longer descriptors, to our assessment criteria, and we believe, it's, you know, one feature, one quality feature of a text, of this type of text is to kind of to use the given information critically, in a critical way, so not just, you know, taking everything at face value, not just using it because it's given, but actually using the quotes critically, selectively, not just taking the information at face value, but also challenge the information, given here by challenging,

or evaluating the given information, and this is normally a sign of higher proficiency, so if students are able to do that in addition to, you know, good language, in addition to cohesive writing and so on, that's a sign of high proficiency, and that's why we say, well in order to score the top band, the top mark in task fulfilment, we want to show this critical approach to using the quotes, and not just use the quotes because they have to be, this refers to how we define task achievement, how we consider good task achievement, good task fulfilment.

TR#50

I: What does this mean? **(TR#50_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: I would have to read the whole paragraph, or the sentence at least. This is just a vocabulary issue then, so "the rationale behind" in this context is perhaps not the best word choice and the student would just have to look up an alternative to improve the text. **(TR#50_CI3_Q2)**

I: Alright, so how would this alternative then improve the text? **(TR#50_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: Well, perhaps make word choice more idiomatic, more natural.

TR#51

I: I've just realised this, but this is very similar to feedback you gave on the first essay (=TR#44), do you basically mean the same thing? **(TR#51_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: It's very similar, that's exactly right, so it's to do with how the given information is incorporated into the text, whether it's well integrated, or just added on some words, that's exactly what I mean, so this is very similar to the other piece of information, to the other piece of feedback.

I: Alright, so I'll just use the same information you've given me to the other instance, and we'll skip to the next one.

TR#52

CI3: Yeah, this refers to organisation, we consider this as part of organisation, as to do with pronoun reference, and again, that's a very common feature in student texts, sometimes pronoun reference is not clear, so students use pronouns, "it, this, that" and what have you, and it's not actually clear enough what the pronoun refers to **(TR#52_CI3_Q1)**, and sometimes it's not clear whether it refers to the previous text as a whole, whether the previous sentence, a concept in the previous sentence, so very often then pronoun reference is ambiguous, so to improve the text then students would have to make sure that there is no ambiguity in that choice of pronoun, so to make sure that the referent of the pronoun is clear, and we consider it as part of organisation. **(TR#52_CI3_Q2)**

I: Alright, so this lack of ambiguity would make it more reader friendly? **(TR#52_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: Would make it more reader friendly, would reduce ambiguity, because sometimes it really leads to ambiguity in the sense that, yes, this "it" for example could refer to this but it could also refer to that, or even something else, and then it's not clear what the "it" actually refers to and then the student would have to be clearer in the use of

pronouns, either not use a pronoun reference, but you know, lexical repetition, could use a synonym, just make it clear in some other way what you're referring to, and then, yes it would make the text more reader friendly.

TR#53

CI3: As you can see, this is a fairly long sentence, so it has a number of clauses, and the reader would have to, you know, at least I had to reread the passage a few times to make sense of it **(TR#53_CI3_Q1)**, and this is sometimes the results of students trying to be, trying to use complex language, I mean we encourage them to use more complex language, less frequent language, but sometimes the result is the opposite, when the text really becomes difficult to read, difficult to follow, and the reader would probably have to stop and reread a couple of times to be able to follow the construction, especially when really the choice of construction, or the choice of language is not always as idiomatic as it could be, so to improve the text, the students would have to simplify this sentence, either by breaking it down into several sentences, several shorter sentences, or by reducing the number of sub-clauses in the text **(TR#53_CI3_Q1)**, just somehow simplify this construction to improve the text, and this would be part, well we consider this under range, range of language, linguistic range, which has to do with this idea of reader friendliness, and clarity. **(TR#53_CI3_Q3)**

TR#54

I: What does this mean? **(TR#54_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: Oh yeah (laughs), again, I had to read several times now to make sense of it, and that's exactly the problem, now "some reason", the way that this is started, I interpreted this to be a noun, right, but in fact the student used "reason" as a verb and that's what caused the ambiguity, I guess, this is grammatically this is actually fine, because "some reason" as a noun is perhaps the more frequent use of the word reason, that's why I interpreted it to be a noun rather than a verb, but I guess it's not just me then stumbling over this, but other readers as well, the suggestion would be to start the sentence in a different way so that it's actually clear that "reason" here is used as a verb, not as a noun, especially in combination with "some", "some reason", in this case, it means "some people", you know, think that, but not "some reasons", so this is what the ambiguity here is about, and again, my suggestion would be to rephrase the sentence, to avoid this kind of ambiguity. **(TR#54_CI3_Q2)**

I: Alright, how would this rephrasing then improve the text? **(TR#54_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: It would avoid the ambiguity, it would prevent people from having to reread the text. So reader friendliness again is the issue.

TR#55

I: So what does this mean? **(TR#55_CI3_Q1)**

CI3: This again has to do with what we said before, we expect students to come up with a direct response to the prompt, to the question, the main question given the prompt, and the thesis statement should get the reader a sense of direction, what is the writer going to argue in main body of the text, so I just after having read the thesis statement, the reader should know, kind of, what the argument is going to be, at least in general,

and in this case, I guess there was a thesis statement, but the thesis statement was not strongly linked again to the main question in the prompt. So, if I could look at the text, I could tell you exactly what happened. Yeah, so again, this thesis statement perhaps refers to, you know, the pros and cons of data surveillance of mass data surveillance, but not really, specifically relates to the question whether law abiding citizen would have anything to fear, so to improve the text then, the student would come up with a thesis statement that's more directly related to the main question in the prompt.

(TR#55_CI3_Q2)

I: Alright, and regarding how this would improve the text, I think we've had a very similar question for the first participant, so I guess it's the same. **(TR#55_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: That's right, it's to do with text organisation, we consider the thesis statement of the text organisation, this is our assessment criteria, and in fact the thesis statement is a very important part of our assessment criteria, if there is no thesis statement, or even an ineffective thesis statement, then students can score a maximum of two out of five in text organisation, so that shows how important the thesis statement is, and that's why we teach thesis statements explicitly, or how to write thesis statements explicitly, and we ask students to kind of refer to the main question in the prompt directly, and the I think the advantage of this also is that students, if they have a thesis statement that's directly related to the prompt, they're less likely to digress in the main body, so there is this connection between text organization, or writing a thesis statement and task fulfilment, and that's why we actually want students to write a direct response to the prompt and not just something remotely related.

TR#56

CI3: Yeah, this again is part of text organisation, and ideally then, in the introduction, including the thesis statement and the conclusion, they also form a unit in the sense of they provide some sort of response to the prompt, to the question in the prompt, if that's not given, we don't consider the conclusion to be effective, so again, in this case, I think the student wrote about advantages and disadvantages of surveillance, mass data surveillance, but didn't come up with a direct response to the question within the prompt **(TR#56_CI3_Q1)**, so that's what this feedback refers to, again, to improve the text, the student would have to, again, refer back to this main question in some way, this doesn't necessarily, this shouldn't be a direct repetition of what they wrote in the introduction, or thesis statement, but a restatement of what the thesis statement was, perhaps a summary to some extent, but in any case some reference back to the to the main question. **(TR#56_CI3_Q2)**

I: Alright, and how would this improve the text again? **(TR#56_CI3_Q3)**

CI3: This would again be part of text organisation, it would also improve the coherence of the text, because then introduction and conclusion would also form a unit, and in fact, the main body of the text, should they kind of develop this, you know the ideas stated in the thesis statement, and summarise the restatement in the conclusion, should be developed in the main body, so text organisation would improve.

TR#57

CI3: Alright, so here I provide a suggestion for what this could be, could look like, I guess the last body paragraph is a bit abrupt, or there is no clear transition between the previous paragraph, or explicit transition between the previous paragraph and this paragraph (**TR#57_CI3_Q1**), and by providing a link, a more explicit link, perhaps it's clearer to the reader how this paragraph relates to the previous one, or how it relates to the line of argument so far, that doesn't always have to be, obviously, an explicit link, but if it's not clear from the content, how the paragraph relates to the previous one, then we would have to spell out what that link is, okay, so by providing an explicit link like the one suggested here (**TR#57_CI3_Q2**), it would be clearer to the reader how this paragraph, or how the idea developed in this paragraph relates to the previous text, how it relates to the line of argument. (**TR#57_CI3_Q3**)

TR#58

I: What does this mean? (**TR#58_CI3_Q1**)

CI3: "A" stands for accuracy and the bracketed information refers to the vocabulary, so it's about word choice, yeah, it's kind of this construction, "US consumers state it as an issue", okay, so this isn't, not just word choice, but also in terms of construction, and students would have to rephrase to, you know, to word this idea more effectively, and the second one, oh that's the choice of preposition "is known about", it's not "known over", so it's a grammatical issue and students would have to correct to improve accuracy of the text. (**TR#58_CI3_Q2**)

I: Alright, so after correcting these inaccuracies, how would this improve to text? (**TR#58_CI3_Q3**)

CI3: That would improve linguistic accuracy, and I don't know if this instance, or if these two instances alone would make a difference in the scores, but this would certainly, these two instances would certainly be considered under linguistic accuracy, and by improving, by changing the language, this would improve the accuracy of the language.

TR#59

CI3: Okay, now this refers to the choice of link words, or the choices of transition words, and perhaps the hence in this context is not the most effective one (**TR#59_CI3_Q1**), so, overall, apparently, paragraph organisation was fine, but occasional transition, so link words, don't work, so by changing the transition word here (**TR#59_CI3_Q2**), cohesion would be perhaps more effective, so it's a question of cohesion, and then generally, then perhaps the quote as such.

I: I think we'll get to the quote in the next instance, so what you're saying is, if that change had been implemented, it would be a more cohesive text? (**TR#59_CI3_Q3**)

CI3: Exactly, so the link between the previous sentence would be more meaningful.

TR#60

CI3: Yeah, so as you can see from one thing, the link between the information given in this quote and the previous sentence, for one thing, it's not very strong, and then after this information, the student immediately mentions Miller, and again the connection between the information from the visuals and the Miller quote is not given

(TR#60_CI3_Q1), so again, there needs to be better embedding (TR#60_CI3_Q2), so the student could have, should have, referred back to the information, it should be clear to the reader why stating this information, why including this information, the point should be clear to the reader, how it adds to the main point, to the main argument, and this is not given there, so that's why I'm saying the use of this information is not as effective as it could be.

I: Alright, so if there had been better imbedding or if the student was able to improve that, how would this improve the overall essay, or the paragraph? (TR#60_CI3_Q3)

CI3: That would again make clear to the reader how this information, or why this information is relevant to the main point, how this information supports the main point, because again we teach our students to use the information to support their own points, right, so ideally the information would not replace their ideas, but support them, that would mean they would have to state their main points in the first place, right, and they would have to make clear what their main point is and then it should be clear to the reader how the given information supports this point, if that's not clear enough, again, readers are left wondering, so what, right, so why has the writer used this information, how does it support?

TR#61

I: What does this mean? (TR#61_CI3_Q1)

CI3: This refers to range and usually this is about expressions, so if, for examples, word choice is not idiomatic, or perhaps not natural enough, or if there's a more effective way if a phrasing this idea, that's when the wavy line comes in, that's what the "R" stands for, so linguistic range, so perhaps this could indicate that the student doesn't show, you know, enough range of language to express what they want to say, or that they could express this idea in different ways, more effective ways, more idiomatic ways. (TR#61_CI3_Q2)

I: Alright, if the student were able to rephrase this, how would this improve the overall paragraph, or the text? (TR#61_CI3_Q2)

CI3: This again would be a question of choice of language, and in our case it would add to linguistic range.

TR#62

I: What does this mean? (TR#62_CI3_Q1)

CI3: That's again a bad word choice again, and in this context the word "invasion" is perhaps not the most effective way of saying what the student wanted to say, so again, the students are encouraged to, perhaps, look up the word "invasion", to check back whether it can be used in this context and/or how it is normally used in other contexts and whether this is actually the most effective way of expressing want to express, so again replacing the word "invasion" (TR#62_CI3_Q2), so perhaps that would improve the text in terms of accuracy, now that's a very local thing though, it's just one example, one word, just a very local issue, so replacing that word may not fundamentally change the text in terms of accuracy, but taken together with all the other things, it adds to linguistic accuracy right. (TR#62_CI3_Q3)

TR#63

CI3: So this is perhaps similar to some other points we've already mentioned, where information given from the sources, given in the sources is not strongly linked to the student's main idea, so in this case, the student kind of writes a topic sentence which is about the reputation of online data collection, and then the information that the student quotes here is not really directly linked to this main idea (**TR#63_CI3_Q1**), so in this case, what the student would have to do then is perhaps elaborate this idea a little bit further, or kind of, provide some sort of expansion, or development of the main idea stated in the topic sentence (**TR#63_CI3_Q2**), and then perhaps it's clearer how this information is linked to the main idea (**TR#63_CI3_Q3**), okay, so perhaps adding some text in between would improve the text, and then again, it's clearer how this information is linked to the main point, how it supports the main point, it's again very much about the use of quotes, and remember we've said, we try, or we teach our students to use the given information to support their own points, to develop their own points, you know, illustrate their own points, and in this case, the link is not strong enough.

TR#64

CI3: Again, that's range of language, and whenever expressions or not fully idiomatic, or perhaps a bit clumsy, then that's when we use the wavy lines (**TR#64_CI3_Q1**), and in this case, the student would just have to rephrase or reconsider this phrase (**TR#64_CI3_Q2**), to improve lexical range, so again it's to do with idiomaticity, naturalness of the language, phrasing expressions in a sort of natural and authentic way. (**TR#64_CI3_Q3**)

TR#65

I: What does this mean? (**TR#65_CI3_Q1**)

CI3: That's to do with "A" for accuracy again, bracketed information referring to vocabulary, in this case it's actually a preposition that's wrong, we have decided to consider prepositions under vocabulary, because, the rationale behind being that prepositions can be looked up in dictionaries, especially also in this connection, "interest in something", that's information that dictionaries provide and that's why we consider this to be lexical issue, we don't distinguish necessarily between vocabulary and grammar, this also refers to our previous rating scales, and previous rating criteria, where instead of range and accuracy we distinguished between vocabulary and grammar, and moved away from this distinction to range and accuracy, so in terms of range and accuracy, the distinction whether this is a vocabulary issue, or whether this is a grammar issue, and where to place prepositions, this distinction is not relevant anymore, I do like sometimes to add this information in brackets though, because it helps students to understand the issue, so why is this inaccurate, or what exactly is the problem here.

I: Alright, so if the student had changed the preposition, how would this improve the paragraph or the sentence? (**TR#65_CI3_Q2**)

CI3: This would just improve the accuracy of the preposition in this case, again it's a very local thing, so this may not change the scores in any way, but it adds to the accuracy dimension. (**TR#65_CI3_Q3**)

TR#66

CI3: Yeah, so again, this refers to the, sort of, link, or transition word, and in this case, “consequently” is not the best choice (**TR#66_CI3_Q1**), so link words, generally, are considered organisation, so by changing, or replacing “consequently” with something else (**TR#65_CI3_Q2**), that would improve cohesion, linking between sentences. (**TR#65_CI3_Q3**)

Appendix D – data processing

Discrepancy table

- + no discrepancy
- ~ some discrepancy
- full discrepancy

Table 3: Discrepancies between teacher intention and student interpretation for each TR and Q

	Q1	Q2	Q3
TR#1	+	+	-
TR#2	+	+	+
TR#3	+	+	+
TR#4	+	+	~
TR#5	~	~	+
TR#6	~	~	+
TR#7	~	~	~
TR#8	+	+	+
TR#9	~	-	+
TR#10	-	-	-
TR#11	~	-	-
TR#12	+	+	+
TR#13	~	~	~
TR#14	-	-	-
TR#15	+	~	~
TR#16	+	+	+
TR#17	-	-	-
TR#18	~	~	~
TR#19	+	+	~

TR#20	-	-	~
TR#21	+	+	+
TR#22	+	+	-
TR#23	+	~	~
TR#24	+	+	-
TR#25	-	+	-
TR#26	+	+	-
TR#27	+	+	~
TR#28	~	-	-
TR#29	+	+	-
TR#30	+	+	-
TR#31	+	+	+
TR#32	+	+	+
TR#33	+	+	+
TR#34	+	+	~
TR#35	~	+	-
TR#36	X	+	-
TR#37	X	X	X
TR#38	+	+	+
TR#39	+	-	-
TR#40	+	+	~
TR#41	-	~	+
TR#42	-	-	-
TR#43	+	+	+
TR#44	~	-	~
TR#45	-	-	~
TR#46	+	+	+
TR#47	+	+	+
TR#48	+	+	+
TR#49	~	X	-
TR#50	+	+	-
TR#51	-	-	-
TR#52	+	-	-
TR#53	+	+	+

TR#54	+	+	+
TR#55	+	+	+
TR#56	+	~	~
TR#57	+	~	~
TR#58	~	+	~
TR#59	+	-	-
TR#60	-	-	~
TR#61	+	+	+
TR#62	-	-	-
TR#63	+	~	-
TR#64	+	+	+
TR#65	+	+	+
TR#66	+	+	-