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ABSTRACT

Learner attitudes toward and use of L1 glossed feedback in an automated writing evaluation program, Criterion®, were investigated in an intact IEP classroom setting. In this 4-week mixed-methods study, students used Criterion to write and revise short essays and respond to surveys weekly. In addition, semi-structured interviews and screen capture video were used with two focus participants. In weeks 1 and 3, the students received English-only feedback (L2), but in weeks 2 and 4, the students also received automated feedback in their native language (L1). Open coding was used to analyze the data (Esterberg, 2002).

Because glossed feedback has been shown to be helpful (Prince, 1995; Laufer & Shmueli, 1997) in other areas of language learning (i.e. reading and vocabulary acquisition), it was hoped that they would prove to be helpful in writing as well. The students showed a positive attitude toward the tool in general, toward noticing of errors, and toward their increased autonomy. However, some students found themselves in a quandary, recognizing their need for translations, yet believing that they should not use the L1 feedback (Liao, 2006). They felt the use of L1 glosses should be tied to one’s writing level, with concessions being made for low-level learner use. Finally, the findings were mixed on the L1 and L2 weeks for holistic scores (6-point scale), submission rates, word counts, and time spent. Holistic scores and words counts were higher and showed weekly gains with the L1 feedback; whereas, the time spent on essays and submission rates both went down in the first L1 week, but rebounded and were highest in week 4, another L1 week. Overall, it seems that the L1 feedback may have a motivating effect for these low-level learners. Writing is a highly complex task, and for
these low proficiency learners who have not yet matriculated into the university, the L1 feedback may indeed prove to be a helpful tool (Atkinson, 1993; Cole, 1998; Cook, 2002; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2012).
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

L1 Glossing in Criterion

Automated writing evaluation (AWE) enables students to receive feedback on a piece of writing within a few seconds after submission. A student can receive holistic scores, reports detailing categorized errors, and feedback on those errors, all with the click of a mouse (Attali & Burstein, 2006; Lee, Gentile & Kantor, 2009; Quinlan, Higgins, & Wolff, 2009). It sounds too good to be true, and after hearing about this technology, it doesn’t seem to take people long to think of all the possibilities, for students and for teachers: It would save the teachers’ time. Writing class sizes could be larger. Students wouldn’t have to wait for the teacher to return grades. Students could make the corrections so much more quickly, but they would not like being graded by a machine, would they?

If one looks at these remarks through the eyes of a researcher, many possibilities for study come quickly to mind: Does it really save teacher’s time? What are best practices for classroom use? How are those defined? Could classes really be larger? Do students accept getting a grade from a machine? Is the automated grade trustworthy? How do teacher and student beliefs about trustworthiness affect its classroom use? Would training make a difference? The possibilities for study seem almost endless.

One may wonder why these programs are needed in the first place. At least part of the answer is that students need to be able to demonstrate proficiency in writing in order to pass high-stakes tests; this is a particular challenge for ESL students as described clearly by Warschauer and Ware (2006): “With proficiency in English language writing
being used as a gatekeeper for exit from high school and entry into institutions of higher learning, this places particular challenges in the way of English language learners and those who teach them” (p. 2). Warschauer and Ware go on to explain that because of the heavy loads many teachers carry, and the need for multiple drafts of writing per student for pedagogical reasons, the “ability to provide fair and detailed feedback on writing demands a level of skill and training that is beyond the capacity of many instructors” (Warschauer & Ware, 2006, p. 2). Advances in automated scoring in the last decades have opened avenues to help bridge this gap between what should be happening in terms of feedback for students and what teachers can reasonably be expected to accomplish.

Using an interactionist approach (Long, 1983, 1996, 2007; Gass & Mackey, 2007), the present study investigated how students perceive the helps and resources available in Criterion®, an automated writing evaluation program by Educational Testing Service (ETS), when feedback is available in their native language (L1 glossing) in addition to English. The exploratory nature of this study, its use of open coding, and the use of rich description in reporting fits well with an exploratory-interpretive approach to analysis. Recurring patterns found in the data were investigated, coded, described, and interpreted (Merriam, 2000).

To situate this study in a body of research, a review of literature follows. The areas of automated writing evaluation, glossing, L1 research, errors and noticing, and corrective feedback (CF) are discussed.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

AWE feedback: A multifaceted issue

The multifaceted nature of the issues surrounding whether and how to best use AWE, and whether and how to use students’ L1 requires bringing together research from varied areas of study: AWE research, corrective feedback research (CF), glossing research, and research on L1 use in the classroom. In the present study, these areas will be intertwined through and investigation of students’ reactions to and use of the L1 glosses in an AWE program. Due to the lack of previous studies on L1 glossing in AWE, it will be necessary to look at these areas separately. General findings in AWE and glossing research will be looked at, followed by a discussion of L1 use in the classroom. Finally, L1 glossing in AWE will be proposed as an area that should be studied further.

Research in Automated Writing Evaluation

Increasingly sophisticated AWE programs, such as MY Access! by Vantage Learning, Intelligent Essay Assessor by Pearson Knowledge Technologies, and Criterion by Educational Testing Service, have now gone mainstream. Initial investigations into AWE focused on the reliability and validity of the tools (Attali, 2004; Attali & Burstein, 2006; Chung & Baker, 2003; Hutchinson, 2007) and sometimes found high correlations with human raters (e.g., Attali & Burstein, 2006). Although originally designed for the testing community to grade large numbers of essays quickly, AWE can now go beyond writing assessment to offer writing assistance as well (Chen & Cheng, 2008). As can be predicted, the increased classroom use of these programs has led to increased research in
this area. Among the benefits of AWE that have been suggested from research are: cost effectiveness, workload reduction, and individualization opportunities for learners (Cotos, 2011).

Thankfully, present research seems to now be focusing on effective use of computer assisted language learning, or CALL (Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004), and on learner perspectives in AWE (e.g., Chen & Cheng, 2008), which are of particular interest here. One recent finding is that, depending on the context in which AWE is used, students may react quite differently to it (Chen & Cheng, 2008). When looking at non-native learner experiences with AWE in three classes of upper-intermediate, highly-motivated, third-year college students majoring in English, Chen and Cheng (2008) found that the students (n=68) were not very positive about their experience with AWE and they attributed this to the ‘limitations inherent in the programs’ assessment and assistance functions” (p. 107). However, AWE “was perceived comparatively more favorably” when it was used for the early stages of the writing and revising process and was “followed by human feedback from both the teacher and peers during the later process” (Chen & Cheng, 2008, p. 107). They hypothesize that the use of both AWE and human feedback may enhance the students’ autonomy by raising “their awareness of writing conventions and mechanics” through AWE and by learning “to write for meaning construction and genuine purposes” through interaction with the teacher and peers (p. 108).

The ultimate goal of research in this area should be to uncover ways to enhance AWE’s use in the classroom in order to aid student’s English writing development
To this end, findings in research regarding the marriage of computer and human feedback are discussed.

**AWE Use in Conjunction with Human Feedback**

The recommendation for using AWE in conjunction with teacher feedback has been echoed by many researchers in recent years (Burstein, et al., 2004; Cotos, 2011; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Shermis & Burstein, 2003; Ware, 2005; Warschauer & Ware, 2006). Reporting student preference for teacher feedback in combination with other sources of feedback, Hyland & Hyland (2006) pointed out that “many developers of automated feedback software insist that computer-generated feedback should only be considered a supplement to, rather, than a substitute for, classroom instruction” (p.95). Therefore, not only is it a matter simply of student preference, but it is a matter of professional recommendation as well. Researchers and educators alike should focus their efforts to find effective ways to use AWE while making pedagogically responsible choices (Chen & Cheng, 2008; Stockwell, 2007).

AWE seems to be more effective when it is used with lower-level learners, who seem to focus on mechanics, grammar, usage, and basic essay structure, areas for which AWE is tailored. More advanced learners, on the other hand, have complained that they would like more content-specific feedback and more flexibility allowed with writing styles (Chen & Cheng, 2008), so AWE does not seem to fit as well with their learning goals. The goals of students should be a consideration in determining use of technology in the classroom as well (Hubbard, 2004). For instance, in an IEP, student goals may include passing high-stakes entrance tests, so strengthening basic essay format and grammar skills would be important; as such, AWE seems that it could mesh well with
these goals. Also, it has been repeatedly reported that students desire feedback from instructors since it is more specific to the error and more individualized for the learner. This holds true even though the scores for human raters and AWE have high correlations (Attali & Burstein, 2006). It is probable, then, that AWE used alone would not be a best-practices choice for the classroom, but used in conjunction with additional human feedback (Burstein, et al., 2004; Cotos, 2011; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Shermis & Burstein, 2003; Ware, 2005; Warschauer & Ware, 2006), AWE may be useful in providing necessary scaffolding for learners. One of these ways to provide scaffolding is through glossing, an enhancement of some type added to a text for the purpose of aiding understanding for the reader (Lomicka, 1998).

**Findings in Glossing Research**

Glossing has been explained as “a short definition or note in order to facilitate reading and comprehension processes for L2 learners” (Lomicka, 1998, p. 41). In a program, learners may have the ability to click or drag the mouse over a word, with a pop-up appearing which gives the definition of the word, a visual aid, or even a video enhancement for the purpose of aiding in understanding. The Voice of America website (http://learningenglish.voanews.com/), for instance, provides articles for English learners on various subjects of interest which are fully glossed. Each word in an article is linked to a dictionary definition of that word (*Figure 1*).
Figure 1. Screenshot of glossed news article in Learning English, VOA website.

The Voice of America also produces a site called Many Things (http://www.manythings.org/) which provides listening/reading activities for ESL students and is also fully glossed, additionally providing activities such as “quizzes, word games, word puzzles, proverbs, slang expressions, anagrams, a random-sentence generator and other computer assisted language learning activities,” according to the site (http://www.manythings.org/).

With ever-widening possibilities in the development of glossing, it has been studied in both written and multimedia approaches in the areas of listening, reading, and vocabulary acquisition (e.g., Al-Seghayer, 2001; Chun & Plass, 1996; Laufer & Shmueli, 1997; Moshen & Balakuma, 2011; O’Bryan 2008; Prince, 1995; Yoshii & Flaitz, 2002; Yoshii, 2006;). The results of many of these studies showed increased retention, comprehension, and performance through the use of different glossing conditions, though some reported no significant differences.

On the positive side, with regard to L1 glosses studied, studies have shown that words glossed with a learners’ L1 are learned and retained better than words with L2
glosses only (Prince, 1995; Laufer & Shmueli, 1997). In fact, Laufer and Shmueli (1997) found that the L1 glossed words were always retained better. This finding harkens back to the noticing hypothesis (Long, 1998) from which Laufer and Shmueli (1997) draw their belief that it is important to notice new vocabulary, attend to it, and to relate it to the first language. Here, the first language is not seen as an afterthought or an uninvited guest, rather, it is seen as a vital step towards acquiring new vocabulary.

In another study, participants who used bilingual dictionaries (L1 and L2) learned more words and had higher reading comprehension scores than learners who did not (Knight, 1994). Still more research has shown that groups given access to multilingual dictionaries performed better than control groups on vocabulary acquisition tasks (Folse, 200; Hulstijn, 1993; Knight, 1994). Multilingual dictionaries are not glosses, per se, but the understanding that a students’ L1 is appropriate and helpful to use for L2 acquisition may be gained from research such as this. In fact, Folse (2004) calls the number of studies “numerous” that have upheld the value of L1 translations in vocabulary-learning activities (Chun & Plass 1996; Hulstijn 1993; Prince, 1995; Laufer & Shmueli, 1997).

Not all research has shown such strong favor for L1 glosses, however. For instance, some studies (Jacobs et al., 1994; Yoshii, 2006) have shown no significant difference between the L1 and L2 gloss conditions with regard to vocabulary acquisition where text + images seemed to produce the most significant results, regardless of the language used. Besides studies on the effectiveness of L1 glosses, a further avenue in this area of research has been in learner perception and preference for these glosses.
Learner Preference Regarding Language in Glossing Research

When looking at students’ preferences in L1 or L2 glossing, one may assume that students would welcome the L1 glosses and would use them extensively. However, one study found that students actually preferred the L2 glossing instead of the L1 glossing (Jacobs, Dufon, and Fong, 1994). We should consider whether this preference depends on the proficiency of the students or not, as only the higher-level students in their study showed more recall and preferred the L2 glosses.

Another factor to consider is that the students need to be motivated enough to access the glossing, which students often choose not to do (Hegelheimer, 1998; Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004; O’Bryan, 2005, 2008). Hegelheimer & Tower (2004) found that students not only used modified input more often when it was required by the teacher, which may have been expected, but also when the teacher introduced the modifications to the class. Although the researchers did find use of glosses in these conditions, students chose to use the textual glosses infrequently (Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004). Having access to options appears to be a “significant predictor of success” even more than “the time spent interacting with the CALL program” (Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004, p. 185). This finding may speak to the importance of CALL training, as has been investigated by researchers (e.g., Hubbard, 2004; Kolaitis, Mahoney, Pomann, and Hubbard, 2006; O’Bryan, 2008), which is needed to help students understand the available options and also evaluate when it is best to use them (Hubbard, 2004). In the present study, one of those available options is the L1 translations. Focusing on the issue of L1 use, the resource of students’ first language has often been overlooked in the language-learning classroom.
L1 Use in the Classroom: Research and Practice

Many language learning programs discourage or even prohibit the use of the L1 in the classroom (Cook, 2001; Folse, 2004; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). Cook (2001) reviews the history of this “anti-L1 attitude” (p. 411) and comments that “the justifications for this (attitude) rest on a doubtful analogy with first language acquisition, on a questionable compartmentalization of the two languages in the mind, and on the aim of maximizing the second language exposure of the students…” (p. 402). In plain language, L1 language learning has been equated with L2 language learning when these two do not necessarily occur in the same way. In fact, the “monolingual principle” has been called “the unique contribution of the twentieth century to classroom language teaching” (Howatt, 1984, p. 289; emphasis mine).

Communicative teaching methods stress the learner’s use of the L2 and seek to maximize it in class situations (Cook, 2001; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). With the rise in popularity of communicative teaching, the L1 has become neglected and even banned in the classroom context according to Cook (2001) who views this situation as a wasted opportunity and argues that using the L1, “rather than a guilt-making necessity…can be deliberately and systematically used in the classroom” (Cook, 2001, p. 420) to produce “authentic L2 users” and should not be viewed as “something to be shunned at all costs” (Cook, 2001, p. 402) as it has been in the past.

Even if language programs do not ban the use of the L1 outright, it is not generally being utilized as the resource that it could be (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2001). This is the case even though research has found the L1 to be a helpful tool for providing scaffolding, maintaining interest, developing management strategies (Anton &

Storch & Wigglesworth (2003) believe that because their students “perceived their L1s to be useful, regardless of whether they actually made use of them suggests that the topic warrants further investigation” (p. 768). If the L1 has been shown to be helpful in students’ learning (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000) and students believe it to be (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003), then in an ideal world, teachers would be fluent in their students’ L1 as well. To find a teacher with this ability may be possible teaching in an EFL context, but the majority of ESL classrooms are filled with several, or even many, different languages and “share an L1 only by chance” (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003, p.761). Using each of the students’ L1 to make connections with English would be nearly impossible for the average teacher in this situation. This is where the possibilities of computer assisted language learning (CALL) may apply. As the term is used in this study, CALL is defined as “learners learning language in any context with, through, and around computer technologies” (Egbert & Petrie, p. 4). AWE is one of these contexts where students can learn language while using technology.

The ability for a CALL program to provide glosses in each student’s L1 would provide an avenue to reach an ideal that is not possible through traditional means, yet is possible through computer mediation. Teachers may worry that CALL has the potential to take away from the human interaction they believe is needed to learn, but this is an instance where CALL may provide more than a teacher can provide alone.
One tool that can offer teachers and students the opportunity for individualized feedback in a writing classroom is automated writing evaluation (AWE) as these programs are now able to provide the opportunity for learners to receive feedback in their native language (L1).

**Intersecting L1 Glossing Research and AWE**

A student’s first language is a resource that, to a large degree, has been neglected in the classroom. This holds true even though research has shown L1 glossing to be helpful in vocabulary acquisition and in reading comprehension. Although many aspects of AWE are currently being investigated, the area of L1 glossing has not yet been studied in conjunction with automated writing evaluation (AWE).

Because glossing is such a promising area and has been studied with regard to vocabulary, listening, and reading, it seems that this should be expanded to see how and if glosses might benefit student’s writing. Hulstijn, Hallander & Greidanus (1996) says, “it is the teacher’s and course designer’s task to provide learners with easily accessible glosses and learner-friendly, non-tedious review opportunities in order to “follow up on incidental learning with intentional learning” (p. 337). Having glosses will do the learner no good, however, if they do not utilize them. In order for the student to use them, they need first to be made aware that they are available which can be accomplished by making their errors as salient as possible.

**Errors and Noticing**

Language learning can seem to be a long, sometimes discouraging, journey of practice and error-making. An error, rather than being viewed negatively, should actually be viewed as “an important opportunity for acquisition” (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004, p.304).
In order to make the most of this opportunity, an error needs to be made as noticeable as possible (input) so that the learner will notice a gap in their understanding. As the learners attend to the error (interact with it), they need to come to understand the feedback they are given so they can use this new knowledge in varied situations (output), and as Cotos (2011) states, feedback is an “essential aspect” (p.421) of this progression. Viewing acquisition from this approach can make sense of how “cognitive concepts such as noticing, working memory and attention,” can be linked, according to Gass & Mackey (2007, p. 176).

Having errors made salient may contribute to moving the learner down the path toward acquisition (Bowles, 2004; Cotos, 2011; R. Ellis, 2001; Schmidt, 1990, 2001; Yanguas, 2009). L1 glossing in AWE provides a real possibility for noticing and acquisition by providing opportunities for the learner to both notice and understand her errors (N. Ellis, 2002; Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). Although L2 glossing alone may meet the criteria for making errors noticeable, L1 glossing in AWE may serve to make crossing the bridge to ‘understanding’ more likely. Noticing, according to Schmidt (1990), is “the necessary and sufficient condition for converting input to intake” (p. 209); notice the use of the definite article here, “the necessary and sufficient condition” (Schmidt, 1990, p. 209; emphasis mine). In a 1995 study, he goes even further to say that noticing “seems to be associated with all learning” (Schmidt, 1995, p. 1; emphasis mine). In order to bridge the gap (Swain, 1985, 1995) from noticing to understanding, it may be necessary to help learners to attempt things they could not do alone, but can with the assistance of others (Levy & Stockwell, 2006). This assistance from others (Levy & Stockwell, 2006) does
not have to be human to human, but can include human-computer interaction as well (Chapelle 2007, 2009).

So then, research has found that when this progression of noticing, attending to, and correcting of errors occurs, subjects are more likely to make positive revisions in their writing (Sachs & Polio, 2007). The final factor in this progression, though, may include the learners’ attitudes and beliefs about the feedback they are receiving, as Storch & Wigglesworth (2010) comment that the learners’ “beliefs and goals may affect what learners notice, whether they accept or reject the feedback provided, and how much of the feedback they retain” (p.306). They describe a complicated process, which requires a learner to notice the error, to make a decision on whether they agree with the feedback or not, to decide whether to make changes to their writing as a result, and then to retain the information they just gained through this process. The steps the learner has to navigate in order to arrive at an acceptable solution brings the role of corrective feedback to the forefront and causes us to question whether it really is possible to help a learner accomplish all of that by simply helping them to notice comments on errors.

**The Role of Corrective Feedback**

The issue of corrective feedback in writing has been an active area for both debate and research in recent years. Truscott (1996) may have begun this debate by calling CF “ineffective” and “harmful.” In her first response in 1999, Ferris states that Truscott was premature and overly harsh in his statements about CF and argued that further research needed to be undertaken before making such claims (Ferris, 1999; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Rather than just offering rebuttals, others rose to his challenge of developing better designs for CF studies and began their own investigations (Chandler, 2003;
Bitchener, 2003, 2008, 2009; Ellis, 2006, 2008; Ferris, 2004; Sheen, 2007). Truscott himself took up the challenge and has continued to study this area. In his study with Hsu (2008), he made a distinction between CF leading to successful revision but not true learning. Likewise, Sachs and Polio (2007) state that “no empirical evidence has shown that error corrections on learners’ written compositions in fact facilitate language acquisition” (p. 69).

Though some of Truscott’s claims have been modified, he continues to maintain “his stance against the practice, even though he has suggested that written CF may be effective in certain limited situations” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012, p. 23).

As the research has continued, the two primary groups studying written CF are second language acquisition (SLA) researchers and L2 writing researchers. These two groups begin with different questions and follow by using different methods, according to Ferris (2010). SLA researchers ask whether written CF aids in long-term acquisition of certain features. Overall, these researchers are interested in development and accuracy, in metalinguistic factors (Sheen, 2007), in direct feedback, and in longitudinal designs with narrow focuses (Bitchener 2005, 2008, 2009; Ellis 2006, 2008; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Guénette, 2007; Sheen, 2007; and Truscott & Hsu, 2008). Limitations with SLA studies are that there is often no revision task and that they are narrowly focused, as such, the results of these studies do not seem transferrable. On the other side, L2 writing researchers are primarily concerned with whether CF leads to improvement in student’s overall writing. The limitation with L2 writing studies is that their studies tend to be less controlled (often in naturalistic settings) and have inconsistent designs (Ferris, 2010; Guénette, 2007). In addition, they usually follow the ‘written text, receive CF, revise
same text’ model, so they miss the longitudinal aspects that second language acquisition (SLA) studies have.

With these foundational weaknesses on both sides, Truscott & Hsu (2008) encourage researchers to maintain a “sharp distinction... between the value of correction for learning on the one hand and for improving a particular piece of writing on the other” in their research (p. 300).

Offering additional suggestions for future research, Ferris (2010) suggests that we use the positive aspects of SLA, but work to adapt the research questions and designs to include L2 research perspectives as well; Storch & Wigglesworth (2010) call for new studies to establish links between certain errors and certain corrections, but also call for naturalistic settings to study affective factors; and, Guénette (2007) suggests having strict controls (for instruction and collection) in experimental designs, yet demonstrate variance when possible. These researchers show with these suggestions that there is a road ahead for collaboration and mixing of methods in future studies from these two viewpoints.

In addition to ideas for research design, recommendations for using corrective feedback in the classroom use have emerged. On the positive side, it has been found that written CF which targets a single linguistic feature and provides metalinguistic feedback is effective (Sheen, 2007). Further, this feedback can be oral or written and should be something students are “regularly exposed to” since “upper intermediate L2 writers can improve the accuracy of their use of rule-governed linguistic features” with this type of CF (Bitchener, Young, and Cameron, 2005, p. 203). For lower level learners, however, error correction alone may be an effective feedback strategy (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009).
On the negative side, one specific complaint against written CF is that if teachers find a mistake, they may not know how to teach learners how to fix it. Even if teachers can explain it, students may not understand it, may forget it, or may not care enough to apply it (Truscott, 1996). Though Truscott’s points about how teachers’ skills and students’ attitudes affect the effectiveness of CF may have merit, it has been repeatedly found that students feel it is important to receive CF (Ferris, 1999; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hyland, 1998; Leki, 1991), and because students believe it is important, they expect it and are dissatisfied if they do not receive written feedback.

Additionally, higher student motivation can be achieved if there is some negotiation between teachers and students regarding errors on which to focus (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). In addition to choosing features to focus on, teachers should provide written CF and strategy training to help them achieve autonomy and success in their classes (Ferris, 1999).

It seems imperative, then, for educators to have a clear understanding of how to provide and use CF effectively in order to help students to achieve their academic goals. Clearly, the debate between CF and no CF and between direct and indirect CF may feel dizzying times, but Hyland & Hyland (2006) remind us of where our focus should lie: Since the most important role of response is to help students to develop into independent writers who are able to critique and improve their own writing, another key area of research is the need for studies into the role of feedback in promoting autonomous writing skills (p. 15).

In order to move students toward the goal of autonomy in L2 writing, computer-based feedback may be utilized, both as a help in providing at least a portion of the
corrective feedback that is desired, and in collecting data to assist teachers in clearly understanding students’ needs. Furthermore, because student motivation in accessing the available glosses (Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004; O’Bryan, 2005) is of concern, learner perceptions of the glosses in AWE should be investigated. A rationale for this call is offered by Levy & Stockwell (2006), who say, “One cannot ignore students’ attitudes toward the tasks they are asked to complete, because there is every likelihood that their attitudes will affect their performance” (p. 174). The present study collected data on learner perceptions through surveys, interviews, and essays in an attempt to view the writing and revising experience with L1 glossing in AWE through a student’s eyes.

**Research Questions**

In order to guide the investigation, the following questions were asked:

1. *What are Intensive English Program (IEP) students’ perceptions of the usefulness of the L1 glossed feedback?*

2. *How do IEP students make use of the L1 glossed feedback themselves?*
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Introduction to Study Design

This study was carried out by the teacher in an IEP writing classroom; with the dual role of teacher-researcher came the responsibility of continuing to meet the learning objectives of the class. Teaching while conducting research, particularly research that lasts for a length of time, requires careful planning; this complexity is acknowledged by Mackey and Gass (2005) who explain, “…classroom research is a particularly complex and multifaceted endeavor that must be planned carefully…but is ultimately extremely valuable for the field of second language research” (p. 212). Conducting intact classroom research is called for by many (Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004; Hyland & Hyland, p.96; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003, 2010), but has been largely neglected in the past, with Hegelheimer & Tower (2004) noting, “research in CALL involving authentic learning environments, or learning environments in which the CALL activity is used regularly as part of the classroom work, has yet to be a focus” (p. 190). Studies combining authentic environments with CALL, specifically AWE, have also been called for by Hyland and Hyland (2006) who note that “we have little information on students’ views of these programs or the effects of computer-generated response, so research examining students’ perceptions, and use, of electronic feedback system in naturalistic settings is needed” (p. 96). Minding these suggestions, this study was undertaken in an intact class in order to strengthen the connections between findings in AWE, L1 research, and learner perspectives. For a fuller explanation of the study, the participants, materials, procedure, task, and method of analysis is detailed below.
Participants

The participants, enrolled full-time in an Intensive English Program (IEP) at a large Midwestern university during the fall semester of 2012, were placed in a level 3 writing class, having tested into this mid-level class out of six IEP levels. These eleven students could be classified as low intermediate and were chosen for the study by convenience sampling, as they were members of the class the researcher taught. They were given the opportunity to choose to participate in the study and signed Institutional Research Board (IRB) releases, although the task itself was required for everyone since it was integrated with the learning objectives for the class. Two students volunteered to be focus participants for the study, agreeing to take part in weekly interviews. Table 1 gives a brief look at the class demographics (original in alphabetical order).

Table 1.

*Class Demographics.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Years studying English</th>
<th>Years writing in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be observed, a predominance of the class is Chinese and a majority is male. This is a typical distribution for current classes in this particular IEP.

Additionally, the students have all studied English between 6-12 years, with a much greater range reported in years of writing in English (1-10). This could be due to different interpretations of what they considered “writing in English.” For example, one student, who marked that she had only written for one year, explained, “I wrote before but it was very basic thing,” so then this may account for the greater variation in this number.

In week 1, all 11 students in the class participated. There was one student, Nyah, who did not have access to Arabic feedback, so only in week 1 was her survey counted, giving baseline perceptions for the entire class. In week 2, only six students participated due to absences of four students, plus Nyah. In week 3, ten students were counted: again Nyah was not, one student was absent, and one new Japanese student, Mary, joined the class and was counted because she would be able to experience one entire cycle of not
having the L1 feedback and then having the L1 feedback. In week 4, all students’
surveys were counted except for Nyah’s survey.

**Materials**

Using a network of research tools to “capture as completely as possible an
understanding of the students’ experience and learning” is recommended for CALL
researchers (Levy &
Stockwell, 2006, p.157). Consequently, surveys, interviews, and tracking devices
(*Camtasia* and *Criterion*) were used to collect the data.

The instruments used to collect the data were: (1) an automated writing evaluation
program, *Criterion*, developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) which allows
students to submit essays and immediately receive feedback on their writing in grammar,
usage, mechanics, style, and organization & development (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), (2) a
screen capture program, *Camtasia* by TechSmith to record screen moves and audio
during student revision days, (3) a video recorder for recording semi-structured
interviews with the focus participants, and finally, (4) the surveys and interview questions
themselves.

Using those tools, the data were collected from: (1) the students' *Criterion*
submissions, which the program itself saves the first and last submissions of the students’
writing, (2) the videos with audio of the revision moves of the two focus participants,
recorded in *Camtasia* and exported as mp4 files, (3) complete transcripts of the
interviews of the two Chinese students, (4) the results of the whole class surveys, and (5)
a bio-data questionnaire.
**Criterion, the AWE Program Used**

*Criterion*, a web-based writing evaluation program by Educational Testing Services (ETS), was used in this study. It evaluates essays based on NLP (Lim & Kahng, 2012) and evaluates essays on grammar usage, mechanics, style, organization, development, lexical complexity, and vocabulary in relation to the prompt. This program has been used to score the GRE, TOEFL, and TOEFL practice online (Lim & Kahng, 2012). It was chosen because it is the evaluation program currently used at this university for the ESL composition classes. Once the participants are matriculated, they will be using this program in the ESL composition classes, so this prior knowledge may be beneficial to them.

This automated writing evaluation program uses *e-rater* scoring engine (*Burstein, et al., 1998*) which checks essays based on a statistical model and then gives a holistic score to the essay along with feedback on specific errors the student made. These errors fall into five categories (grammar, usage, mechanics, style, organization/development) that are evaluated through *Critique*, the second application used in *Criterion* (Attali, 2004). The various areas that this program can evaluate are: grammar, usage, mechanics, style, and organization & development.

*Criterion* allows for a number of choices when creating an assignment. The first choice an instructor makes is in which level the students should be placed (*Figure 2*).
Figure 2. Choices for class level in Criterion.

For this study, the level labeled TOEFL was chosen. The TOEFL, by ETS (Educational Testing Service), is the Test of English as a Foreign Language and is one of the tests often required for International students to gain admittance to U.S. universities. Passing this test is a major goal of most of the students currently in the IEP.

Once the level is selected for the students, there is an opportunity to choose specific prompts. For a listing of the prompts chosen for use in this study, consult Appendix A. Additional choices are shown in Figure 3: If a teacher only wants her students to focus on grammar errors, for example, she could turn off the correction of the other categories for this purpose; likewise, if a teacher is trying to get students to use a dictionary, he may want to unselect the spell check feature in order to increase the need for dictionary usage (Figure 3).
Figure 3. Create assignment page in Criterion.

For this study, the students were allowed to see feedback in all categories of feedback that Criterion offers which is delivered to the learner in three main ways, through blue highlights, green feedback boxes, and through the Writer’s Handbook.

Types of Feedback Offered in Criterion.

Criterion offers several layers of feedback, which students can access within the revision screen and are illustrated below (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Feedback types within Criterion.
As the student enters the revision screen, errors can be seen highlighted in blue, and students may choose to revise based solely on this visual feedback. However, if students want to know more about an error, they can take two additional actions: (1) they can move the cursor over the blue highlights to see green feedback boxes which pop-up upon scroll-over and provide written feedback about the error. If this is not enough explanation, (2) they can click on the Writer’s Handbook and scroll down through explanations and examples of similar errors. The green boxes and the Writer’s Handbook both have the possibility of having L1 translations for the students in addition to the English feedback.

The Screen Capture Program (*Camtasia*).

Using screen capture has been recommended by Levy & Stockwell (2006, p.158) as a complement to other methods of data collection, in order to provide a more complete picture of the phenomena under investigation. Pujolà (2002) used a screen capture program to identify the various helps that students accessed (i.e. dictionaries, cultural notes, subtitles, etc.) in addition to the observations and surveys used. Seeing how the computer-generated feedback is viewed, and then seeing if it leads to revision before resubmission, can “inform the design and development of CALL programs and language-learning tasks” (Levy & Stockwell, 2006, p. 154).

*Camtasia* ([http://www.techsmith.com/camtasia.html](http://www.techsmith.com/camtasia.html)) was chosen as the screen capture program because a free trial was available for the duration of the study and was used to record the screen moves of the focus participants during the revision days. At the end of each recording session, the file was saved and exported as an mp4 file for
playback and analysis. The data collected from these captures was then used during the interviews for any needed clarification or verification.

**Weekly Surveys**

Surveys, consisting of both open-ended and Likert-scale questions, were given at the end of each week. The surveys took only ten minutes of class time at the beginning of class each Thursday, minding the suggestion of Umback (2004) to keep surveys less than twenty minutes. The Likert-scale was based on a 4-point scale (agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and disagree) in order to eliminate the middle choice (Dörnyei, 2010) and to keep the decision-making more simple for these learners. Surveying the class weekly throughout the study was done to reduce the possible ‘novelty effect’ of using this new technology (Levy & Stockwell, 2006). The surveys themselves were based on AWE surveys developed for use in the ESL composition classes for matriculated students and were adjusted to focus on areas of inquiry for this study and for the level of the learners. Additionally, the adjusted surveys were piloted during the spring of 2012. After the completion of the pilot study, adjustments were again made to the surveys after getting input and suggestions for revisions from two professionals in the field, a tact suggested by Porte (2010). The weekly surveys (week 1-week 4) are found in Appendix B.

**Weekly Semi-Structured Interviews**

In addition to the class surveys, four semi-structured interviews with the two volunteer Chinese focus participants were conducted outside of class each week. This multiple interview format has been suggested to reduce the “halo effect” that has been found in some research (Mackey & Gass, 2005). These interviews were conducted in the
researcher/teacher’s office and lasted fifteen to twenty minutes each. Interviews provided the students an opportunity to elaborate and expand on their surveys and Camtasia recordings. Before the interviews, the teacher reviewed their surveys, which were filled out the day before, and watched their Camtasia recordings in order to be able to ask informed questions about interesting moments. The conversational style of the interviews was chosen for two main reasons. First, because the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee was already established, this semi-structured interview style seemed more authentic. Also, this was viewed as an opportunity to see what types of insight could be gained from a more open style. The use of open-ended questions is suggested in research as a way of making room for “unexpected and insightful data” that may arise during the study (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.93). Sample transcriptions of the eight interviews can be found in Appendix C.

Using these tools just described, the students were asked to complete writing tasks each week for four weeks that are described more fully in the next section.

The Task

The task consisted of responding weekly (for four weeks) to TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) prompts which were provided in Criterion, revising essays with either English or bilingual feedback, and sharing perspectives from this experience through surveys and interviews. Each Monday, during a 50-minute lab class, the students wrote a short essay from a prompt, chosen by the teacher from a list of TOEFL prompts provided in Criterion. Revising that short essay was their task during the next lab day, Wednesday. Following the revision day, they were asked to complete a survey about their weekly experience with the program. Finally, the focus participants
participated in a 15-minute semi-structured interview each Friday, based on their survey
answers and on their Camtasia videos. The weekly schedule is summarized below in
Table 2.

Table 2

*Weekly Task Schedule.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Write essays: online in <em>Criterion</em>, in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Revise essays: in class lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Take surveys: in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Conduct interviews: outside of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tasks, then, produced a substantial amount of data. The data points
collected from the focus participants, Allan and Amos, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

*Number of Data Points Collected from the Focus participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data points</th>
<th>Allan</th>
<th>Amos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Criterion submissions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Camtasia revisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of weekly surveys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of weekly interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-data questionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information was then combined with the weekly surveys, submissions and bio-data information from the entire class to constitute the total data set for the study. In the following section, the procedures followed and a rationale is outlined.

**Procedure**

The task was carefully designed with the both the learners and class objectives in mind. For the Level 3 intermediate writing class in the IEP, there are five basic learning objectives for the class. This study touched on three of those objectives number 3, 4, and 5. These relevant learning objectives (LO) are given below:

*LO3: Write 1-3 paragraph essays in formal, academic language about familiar topics within the descriptive and classification modes with correct subject/verb agreement, word order, and correct mechanics (capitalization and punctuation) with a minimum of 70% proficiency.*

*LO4: Incorporate cohesive devices, such as repetition of key words and phrases, pronouns, demonstrative adjectives, and transition words, within the descriptive and classification modes at or above 70% proficiency.*

*LO5: Demonstrate formality, clarity, and grammatical/mechanical accuracy and of expression in writing by applying intermediate editing and revising skills (word choice, organization, mechanics, Writing Levels 1-3 grammar features) with a minimum of 70% proficiency.*

Learning outcome (LO) 3 and 4 were the focus of the Monday task each week. On Wednesdays, when the students revised their essays, the focus was LO5. Before the actual study commenced, they had training in Criterion and in the task during two weeks of their lab classes.
Learner Training Period

The students were given two weeks to get familiar with the AWE program before beginning to collect data. *Criterion* was introduced to the class as a tool that may help them with their writing and revising. Particularly, the class objective of writing 3-paragraph essays and their personal goals of passing the TOEFL, were emphasized to them. This was done to help the students “understand the importance of making a connection between a particular CALL activity and some desired learning outcome or progress toward it” as Hubbard (2004, p. 53) lays out as his second principle for learner CALL training. The students were trained in using Criterion over a two week period. First, the students were led through a video preview of the task developed for training at this university. Additional materials for student training, produced by ETS, were also presented and explained. Finally, they were able to actually use the program, going through two cycles of writing and revising so that they would be familiar with the program before beginning the study. In the training weeks, the students only had access to English feedback, but in the study, they were provided feedback in their L1 half of the time as is explained further in the following section.

Glossed Feedback Schedule

Criterion offers feedback in five languages: English, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean and is given in tandem with the English feedback (*Figure 5*). There were nine students who had L1 glossed feedback available. The green box feedback, incorporating the L1 and L2 feedback, appears upon roll-over of the blue highlighted errors and will also appear when you enter the Writer’s Handbook, on-click, a feature giving additional explanation and examples of the pertinent error.
The students were given access to their L1 feedback only on week 2 and week 4. This pattern was designed to allow this group of learners to compare and contrast their experiences of English-only feedback versus L1 feedback with English. The language-glossing schedule is shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of glossed feedback given</td>
<td>L2 only</td>
<td>L1 and L2 glossing</td>
<td>L2 only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

The results of the study were evaluated in a similar manner to Goh (2002) who also focused on two Chinese subjects; however, the overall focus was on strategies in listening comprehension techniques rather than on L1 translations in AWE. In the 2002
study, retrospectives of students were taped and transcribed for purposes of identifying, interpreting, and coding, and the findings were analyzed qualitatively using thematic coding to demonstrate the findings.

Because of the similarities in method, Goh (2002) was chosen as a guide for the present study in analyzing the data for Research Question 1: data were collected, the surveys were amended, and interviews were conducted and transcribed. Open coding was used to analyze the interview transcripts by focusing on what the data presented rather than on previously used coding schemes (Esterberg, 2002). Inter-rater reliability was calculated for both the interview transcripts themselves (20%) and for the coding of the transcriptions (25%; Mackey & Gass, 2005), found in Appendix D. Though this process, the themes taken from the interviews transformed over time and resulted in five main coding themes dealing with feedback (type-specific, amount given, L1 glosses) and also factors in student’s use (changes in perspectives and autonomy) are presented in Table 5.
Table 5.

*Examples of the Coding Themes Taken from the Interview Transcriptions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Examples from the transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy:</strong> These comments deal with the learner talking about their ability (or lack of) to write, revise, and understand on their own. This can be in the past or now.</td>
<td>“…because Criterion can make us to write the essays more independently and because if we just writing by myself and ask the teacher they will waste lots of time and maybe you can’t find the teacher sometimes and Criterion is more freedom” (Allan, week 4 interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs about language (L1, L2):</strong> These comments deal with student beliefs dealing with what language should be used or not used, the levels of students which should/should not use them, teacher use of the language feedback</td>
<td>“Native language is harmful for us to learn English, but is...effect is some useful things. Just in the writer’s handbook can give you more information for you to understand what they said” (Amos, week 4 interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes/growth:</strong> These comments deal with changes (positive/negative) in perspective/behavior with writing and/or Criterion in general.</td>
<td>“Because I think...errors is more less than before, because I remember the first here, maybe it’s about, um, the grammar or the second and the...usage, maybe about, um, the beginning 6 or 8 (mistakes), but this time it’s a 5 or 6 and when I fix it, I think it’s better” (Amos, week 1 interview; parenthetical information, mine).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noticing:</strong> These comments deal with Criterion helping learners to notice errors, noticing parts of the system (Criterion), noticing misunderstandings during the interview.</td>
<td>T: Criterion and its feedback helped my writing improve this semester, and you agreed with that. S: Ya, because it let me know what error I always do. Fix that (Amos, week 4 interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferences:</strong> These include comments about preferences for different types of fb (blue/green, writer’s handbook), amount of fb (too much, too little)</td>
<td>“Because he put some academic words and some and if the green box very long, I will lose my patient to see. Ya, I will REALLY lose patient to have a look at that because I have, because I always try to find the easy way to figure out the program…” (Allan, week 1 interview).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-rater reliability (Goh, 2002) was calculated for both the interview transcripts themselves and for the coding of those transcriptions. Near unanimous agreement was reached for the interview transcriptions with a PhD student as the second-rater checking approximately 20% of the transcription. Another PhD student in applied linguistics checked the coding of the interviews; she had also checked coding in the Spring 2011 pilot study, so she was familiar with the procedure but was trained with the new coding. She analyzed 25% of the transcripts, fulfilling the suggested amount by Mackey & Gass (2005), and inter-rater reliability was calculated to be 0.94, a sufficiently high level of agreement. The distributional properties of the Likert-scale questions from the surveys were analyzed (mean, standard deviation, maximum, minimum).

To address research question two, the screen capture videos were watched and transcribed, noting the time spent on each activity. These transcriptions were then used to understand what the students did with the feedback. After this, data were taken from Criterion itself regarding student holistic scores, submission numbers, time spent on essays, and on essay length in order to more fully show the results of the students’ efforts.

Finally, because comments had been made in the pilot study (Spring 2011) regarding the difficulty of the L1 translations, the Chinese feedback was checked. Three native Chinese speakers, PhD students, reviewed the simplified Chinese feedback in five categories: fluency/flow, grammar, difficulty of vocabulary, work choice, and mechanics, based on a 5-point scale (Goff-Khourí’s rubric, adapted from Heaton, 1990, p. 110; example found in Appendix F). Overall, the ratings for the translations were positive with 44 out of 55 ratings receiving a four or five; however, the original complaint that the words were hard to understand did seem to have some merit. Seven
ratings of 3 or less were given in the ‘difficulty of words’ category. Further, word choice was marked four times with a three or less. One reviewer remarked, with regard to word difficulty and word choice, “The translation is kind of awkward to me because some translated phrases, such as ‘proofread’ are not commonly used in Chinese.” This issue will be further discussed in the following chapter, where the findings from all these data sources will be outlined.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings in Learner Perceptions and Use

Survey results, interview transcripts, and Camtasia recordings all contributed to a greater understanding of the attitudes and use of Criterion feedback, specifically the L1 feedback, in this class of learners. The class showed generally positive attitudes toward Criterion and reported satisfaction with the feedback it gave. Further, class averages in several aspects of their writing (submissions, holistic scores, time spent) increased, rather than decreased, as the study continued. Individual revision strategies of the focus participants differed in several ways, but their end results yielded nearly the same outcomes. In this chapter, we will discuss how IEP students viewed feedback in Criterion and how they felt it impacted their writing, followed by a closer look at our focus participants’ perceptions. The second half of the discussion will focus on what these students actually did with the feedback they were provided, ending with a summary of the revision behaviors of Allan and Amos.

Research Question 1. How do IEP students view the L1 feedback in Criterion?

Surveys were given weekly to monitor the student’s reactions to their experiences with Criterion. Findings dealing with the students’ general beliefs about Criterion’s feedback and with their perception of the ease of understanding the feedback are presented in Table 6 and Table 7.
Table 6.

*Class Attitudes in Weeks 1 & 3, Without L1 Gloses (4 point scale).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks with English only</th>
<th>I was satisfied with the feedback Criterion gave me this week.</th>
<th>The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.</th>
<th>If I could have feedback in my own language, I think it would help me to understand the feedback more fully.</th>
<th>The feedback was harder for me to understand this week because I only had English.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 1 N=11</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 3 N=10</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.

*Class Attitudes on Weeks 2 & 4, with L1 Gloses (4 point scale).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks with L1</th>
<th>I was satisfied with the feedback Criterion gave me this week.</th>
<th>The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.</th>
<th>I liked having feedback in my own language (in addition to English) this week.</th>
<th>Because I had feedback in my own (native) language, it helped me to understand the feedback more fully.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 2 N=6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 N=11</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the students were asked to rate the rather general statement, “I was satisfied with the feedback Criterion gave me this week,” they consistently answered affirmatively, with the first and last week’s responses being virtually identical (M=3.45, SD=0.52; M=3.42, SD=0.79). The student responses were consistent when they were asked if the
English words were easy for them to understand, from the first week to the last (M=3.64, SD=0.5; M=3.67, SD=0.49). Even with their apparent ease of understanding the English words, it was not expected that the students would not think that having feedback in their own language would help them to understand the feedback more fully (M=2.83, SD=0.75, somewhat disagree). A corresponding question asked whether the feedback was harder to understand in the weeks they only had English, and they answered a fairly resounding “disagree” (M=1.6, SD=0.70), also an unexpected answer for this level of students.

In summary, these ESL students were satisfied with the overall feedback from Criterion, a result which differs from Chen and Cheng’s (2008) study where their subjects were less than satisfied with their experience with AWE, albeit the population studied, Taiwanese English majors, differed in proficiency level from the present ESL subjects. In the aforementioned study, the students felt that the AWE program would be more appropriate for lower-level students due to the focus on mechanical and organizational issues rather than on content, which they desired (Chen & Cheng, 2008). The present IEP class followed along with the predictions that lower-level students would find the AWE feedback on their mistakes helpful, though they did agree with Chen & Cheng’s (2008) higher-level students that the feedback was, at times, too vague.

In order for feedback to be helpful, students need to be able to first understand it. Somewhat surprisingly, the students in the current study did not think their understanding was hampered by English feedback. When asked if native language feedback would help them understand the feedback more fully, they disagreed, though slightly. Even after having their native language in the second week and then being deprived of it in the third
week, they did not think the English feedback was hard to understand and did not express the desire to have the L1 feedback. However, this finding does not necessarily mesh with the fact that the students were observed using the L1 feedback frequently, though to varying degrees. Allan used the glosses frequently and felt a great need for them while Amos often looked at them, but had greater reservations about using them. Both felt the L1 glosses aided in understanding the feedback.

While students may understand the given feedback, if they do not act on it, it will make no difference in their final product. In Table 3 and Table 4, the students’ attitudes toward how Criterion’s feedback may have impacted their writing are reviewed by week, with the first table (Table 8) showing weeks with English glossing only and the next table (Table 9) showing the weeks with the addition of L1 glossing.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks with English only</th>
<th>The corrections I made to my paper were just as good and accurate as they were last time (even though I didn’t have my native language feedback this week)</th>
<th>Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most)?</th>
<th>Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 1 N=11</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 3 N=10</strong></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.

*Student Attitudes toward Feedback’s Impact on Weeks with L1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks with L1</th>
<th>I made more and better corrections to my paper because I had feedback in my native language.</th>
<th>Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most)?</th>
<th>Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 2 N=6</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 N=11</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question that produced the steadiest response over the four weeks was, “*Criterion* helps me to correct my essays by myself” (M=3.55, 3.45, 3.50, 3.50).

Knowing how it helps them to feel this increase their autonomy could yield valuable information. One possibility is that *AWE* may assist students in reaching this goal through aiding them in noticing their mistakes, giving them a basic awareness of the mistakes they often make so that they may be able to better anticipate their errors.

Reinforcing this line of thinking, the students had high agreement in the first official week with the statement, “Since using *Criterion*, I have noticed which errors I make frequently” (M=3.82, SD=0.40) and they ended the study with a mean of 3.92 (SD=0.29), an even higher agreement, though the middle weeks’ averages did dip to the mid-3s, one week with L1 glossing and one week without. These students, then, felt that *Criterion* helped them to notice the errors they often made and helped them to correct their own papers.

Since the focus of this study is to investigate how the L1 translations were perceived and used by the students, they were asked to evaluate the English feedback and the L1 feedback. Even though the students did not necessarily desire L1 feedback, as
seen in Tables 1 and 2, the students agreed in the second week (Table 4, M=3.5, SD=0.55) that they made “more and better corrections” to their paper because they had feedback in their native language. However, the next week (Table 3, week 3) after having the English-only feedback once again, they also responded in agreement to the statement, “The corrections I made to my paper were just as good and accurate as they were last time (even though I didn’t have my native language feedback this week)” (M=3.5, SD=0.53). Though these answers seem to conflict, when the students were again asked to respond to the statement, “I made more and better corrections to my paper because I had feedback in my native language” (week 4), they “somewhat disagreed” (M=2.82, SD=1.08), demonstrating that at the end of the study, the students seemed to have come to the conclusion that they did not feel that the overall quality of their corrections came as a result of having native language feedback.

This attitude could be due to the belief that they should not be using their L1 for language learning, an attitude found in other studies (Liao, 2006), or it could be that the students were becoming more familiar with the feedback in general and felt the native feedback was less needed.

These broad responses from the class are helpful in getting taking the temperature of the class, as it were, but we will now turn to the interviews conducted with the focus participants to gain further insight as to why the students may have responded as they did.

**Focus participant’s Perceptions toward the Feedback**

Amos and Allan’s overall preferences for the types of feedback, their beliefs about using L1 translations, and their beliefs about their autonomy will be included in the following discussion, beginning with an introduction to the focus participants.
Introduction to Allan’s Perceptions

While Allan has had 12 years of English study, tied with Amos for the longest in the class, his speaking was often labored as he searched for words to convey his meaning. He explained, “...my English is not as good other, I cannot concentrate on writing lots of times, so for me, I will want to just concentrate use my energy concentrate on the point I need...” (Allan, week 2 interview). Perhaps because of this feeling that his English was not as good as the others, he did not seek out interaction with his peers during class; however, he did not hesitate to respond to the teacher. Allan appeared to have worked hard on his essays, submitting an average of 6.25 times, writing an average of 335.5 words per essay, and reaching average holistic scores of 5.75, out of a possible score of 6. After having had two weeks of training, Allan reported having positive feelings for Criterion in the first week of the official study and predicted that, “After I know the function of this software, I feel I can it will help me to figure out lots of problem that I usually make” (Allan, week 1 interview).

This was perhaps a draw for him, because when he described his current ability to revise essays, he did not report feeling overly confident, marking “somewhat agree” (3) for the statement, “Even before this class, I felt confident correcting my essays.” However, it was discovered in the interview that he did not fully understand this survey question, and after discussing the misunderstanding, he changed his answer to a 2, slightly disagree. When he first read the question, he thought the survey was inquiring about his confidence in Criterion itself, so he said, “Yes (I have confidence)...because I saw the ETS (Educational Testing Service). I think ETS is real, is really straightforward, and after I use this, after I know the function of this software, I feel I can, it will help me
to figure out lots of problem that I usually make” (Allan, week 1 interview; parenthetical information, mine).

Allan’s overall feelings of confidence in writing are summed up well with the following quote, “Just by myself, just by myself, maybe I can look at something obvious mistake, but I still need a teacher to help” (Allan, interview week 1). He feels capable of correcting obvious mistakes, but still feels the need for support in correcting his essays from the teacher, Criterion, and his L1.

Amos, the other subject, shared similar attitudes with Allan about types of feedback, but also differed in some respects, especially in his attitude toward receiving some of these forms of support.

Introduction to Amos’ Perceptions

Amos has also studied English for twelve years and functioned well in English, though sometimes his listening ability caused miscommunication. He always sat at the front of the room and was much more social than Allan, often talking to friends before, during, and after class.

He submitted slightly less frequently than Allan and received slightly lower holistic scores overall, but wrote slightly more words (submitted 5.75 times, wrote 341.3 words, and received an average holistic score of 5.5), very similar results overall.

When Amos was asked about his confidence in correcting his own essays, he rated his confidence as a three (somewhat agree) and explained why he didn’t fully agree (4), “Yeah, I just I don’t choose four because I just have problems in some academic words and some...sentence. I’m still Chinglish English. Is not very...so just a three”
(Amos interview, week 1). He showed awareness of his shortcomings and even uses a slang term, “Chinglish,” to describe his own perceived level of English competence.

Amos showed high positivity toward Criterion throughout the study. An example that demonstrates his feelings is that after he found out in the third week that our class was the only IEP class using Criterion, Amos sought confirmation of this fact several times throughout the interview, coming back to the question at the very end of the interview:

S: Ok, so only our class uses this now?

T: Yeah.

S: Ok. We are so lucky! (Amos, week 3 interview)

His feeling that he is lucky to use Criterion sets the stage for many of his responses, but his specific comments and behaviors do not always match with this exuberance, as will be seen in research question two. Amos has reservations about using the L1 feedback, possibly harkening to a belief that L1 translation is “likely to generate Chinese-style English” (Liao, 2006, p. 201) and that it is not good for his English development, mentioned in Gefen (1987) who says use of the L1 results in “lazy minds” (p. 42). If students hold these beliefs as well, it is unlikely they will utilize the L1 translations to the full extent that they may otherwise use them.

Overall, however, both subjects felt positively toward their experience in Criterion in general, though they offered critiques of specific types of feedback provided in the program.
Perceptions of feedback types.

Knowing the type of feedback in *Criterion* that students prefer (blue highlights, green box feedback, or the Writer’s Handbook; see *Figure 6*) is helpful since their preferences may affect both whether and how much they utilize the L1 feedback, delivered in two areas: the green box feedback and in the Writer’s Handbook (WH). The third type of feedback, blue highlighted words, does not have glossing.

*Figure 6.* Three types of feedback provided in Criterion.

Repeatedly, Allan and Amos reported that they preferred using the blue highlighted feedback over the other kinds of feedback because it was “easy to understand” (Allan, week 1 interview) and “obvious” and “convenient” (Amos, week 1 interview). Allan further emphasized his preference for the blue feedback by explaining that reading the green box feedback was unnecessary “*because I already learned some grammar*” (Allan, week 1 interview). Because he felt that he already knew grammar, he did not see the need to read the green box feedback in order to arrive at a positive outcome for his errors. When asked in the class survey which type of feedback they used most, six students out of eleven said they used the green feedback most, but Allan and
Amos were the two students who said they preferred the blue highlights. This preference for using a visual form of feedback may have cut down on their use of all types of written feedback, which in turn, would have reduced their use of the L1 feedback. Giving insight as to why they might not have chosen to use the green feedback boxes more extensively, Allan critiqued them in an English-only week, by saying:

The green feedback box sometimes difficult for me to understand...because Criterion put some academic words...and if the green box very long, I will lose my patient to see. Ya, I will REALLY lose patient to have a look at that, because I have, because I always try to find the easy way to figure out the program, and I learn lots of grammar and notes, so I'll never choose to see how long and difficult to understands green box. Just instead, I figure out the problem by my knowledge and by myself. (Allan week 1 interview; emphasis mine)

In many similar comments throughout the study, Allan talked about losing his patience with difficult to understand feedback in the green boxes and in the Writer’s Handbook. Therefore, it may be that if feedback is too long or deemed too hard to understand at this level, students may not choose to access the feedback, no matter how helpful it may have the potential to be.

Amos explained his process of deciding which type of feedback to use in what order by saying, “Yeah, because when I see some blue highlights in the writing, before I will think something wrong, so I will think how to fix it. If I don’t know, I will look the green and look in the Writer’s Handbook” (Amos, week 1 interview). In week 2, he continued this thought by saying, “Because always some question, can’t find the answer in the blue highlights or only green feedback, you need to come back to the Writer’s
Handbook.” So, he began with the blue highlights, and if necessary, used the green boxes and the WH. However, like Allan, Amos critiqued the green box feedback (week 1), but added a new dimension to the critique by mentioning its vagueness:

_I think that is NOT useful because just something the answer or something the answer comments, it take can tell me how to do, but...but something like this...they don’t. I cannot understand what’s the meaning and how to fix it. It just says you need to look at the Writer’s Handbook._ (T: It’s not necessarily the words that you don’t understand, it’s that the information…) _I understand the information, but when I saw that, I still don’t know how to fix!”_ (Amos, week 1 interview)

While he was not a fan of the green box feedback, Amos talked about the Writer’s Handbook (WH) quite often, tying the amount of times he used the WH to the ease of understanding it:

_T: Do you think you used it (WH) more when you had the Chinese translation?_

_S: I think that is true, if I, _if we have Chinese translation, maybe we will use more Writer’s Handbook._

_T: Ok, why?_

_S: Because...some academic words in the Writer’s Handbook, we cannot understand in English very easily, but in Chinese, we can know what I say and we can find which one we need to search, which one we need to look._

_T: Ok. How did..._

_S: Oh! Yeah, so...maybe, maybe the blue highlight and green, maybe the blue highlight and green...boxes do not need to use Chinese, but yeah, _Writer’s Handbook maybe have Chinese very helpful_ (Amos, week 3 interview).
To him, the L1 was especially helpful in the Writer’s Handbook because it helped him to easily find the information he was searching for. His opinions here were borne out in the way he used the Writer’s Handbook, searching out the Chinese translations and skipping over the English feedback, discussed in research question two. Allan, likewise, felt “the handbook is most difficult to understand” but “if you have a Chinese language maybe you can understand the grammar and other things” (Allan, week 4 interview).

In summary, these students, then, have a preference for using the blue highlights, have been critical of the green box feedback, and have mixed feelings on the helpfulness of the Writer’s Handbook. On the weeks when L1 translations were available in the feedback, these two students reacted positively to them, but when questioned more deeply, some reluctance to embrace them was found.

**Student Beliefs about the Use of L1**

The L1 translations themselves were mentioned in surveys in the pilot study as being difficult to understand, prompting the translation checks described in the analysis. Again, this issue surfaced in the interviews in the present study with Amos explaining that, “The Chinese words is not hard words, but the meaning is very complex…the words is easy, but the sentence meaning is…not easy to understand” (Amos, week 4 interview). Allan, likewise, explained that the, “Chinese word maybe easy to understand and to know what they said…also they hard because the Chinese especially is so different from the American words” (Allan, week 3 interview) and explained that the structure of the languages and the difficult content is what makes the L1 translations complex.
At the same time, Allan and Amos report finding the L1 helpful; one reason they gave for this is that it made the academic terms used in the feedback understandable to them. Allan described it this way, “I don’t very familiar with the language, and I don’t very familiar with the name of the mistake...what called...so maybe need the native language to help me to understand more well” (Allan, week 4 interview). Amos mentioned virtually the same point in the first interview when he explained:

Some ac...academic words like something in the grammar, that’s like these things (pointing), I understand, but some, some examples in the Writer’s Handbook, I can’t understand....Just like in grammar class, some, some academic grammars phrase like blah, blah, blah phrase, something...I don’t know, but, but totally I know that in Chinese, but just don’t know in English.” (Amos, week 1 interview)

During our interview in week 2, Amos answered that he understood what “run-on” meant, but when he was asked if he understood what “sentence fragment” meant, he replied, “... this time it’s the Chinese, so I can understand ‘fragment’ (smiling), ya” (Amos, week 2 interview). Because he had the Chinese this week, he was able to understand this term when it arose during his revision time. By the third week, Amos saw a connection between the need to understand the system better and the amount of time he spent with the system, saying, “I think I need to... recognize, I need to understand this system more deeply so just a like some button on the right or something else, I will fit better. And that means more time.” He continued, “Yeah, I think maybe we use Criterion reading more times, then we know much, much the academic that word...so we can understand easily than before” (Amos, week 3 interview). Therefore,
over time, Amos feels students can learn the academic words in order to understand the English feedback more easily.

His drive to use the English feedback seems to come from a reluctance to use the L1. Amos explains, “Native language is **harmful for us to learn English**, but is…effect is some useful things” (Amos, week 4 interview; emphasis mine). When Amos spoke in the interview of his initial reaction (week 2) to seeing the Chinese translations, he said, “*I thinking can know, I can know what is my wrong. I can, in the first time, I can correct the answer.*” He is reflecting here on gaining a sense of hope after having used the L1 translations; at the same time however, he seems to believe that using his L1 is not appropriate and is even “*harmful*” (week 4) when learning the L2. In week 2, Amos explained a quandary in which ESL students may find themselves:

*I think I agree that because, because we should not used my cell phone in the Chinese to search the English words, but if I want to do that, I think we need to…but some just like me, English to English dictionary, I cannot understand...the meaning...but we need to turn to that way, but I don’t know how to do that better, so I agree we don’t need to use that for, but I don’t know, (if) we can’t do that (using the Chinese), how can we do another ways to works better?* (Amos, week 2 interview)

The recognition of their need for translations, along with the belief that they should not use the L1, is also discussed in Liao (2006):

However, students also showed a somewhat contradictory feeling toward translation. On the one hand, they apparently believed that they needed translation in their current learning process. On the other hand, they were concerned that L1 translation might (1) cause interference of Chinese into
English, (2) inhibit their thinking in English, and (3)…become a ‘bottleneck’ in their advancement in English learning. For these reasons, they thought that they should gradually refrain from their tendency of translating as they made progress in learning English.” (p. 209)

Further, Amos expressed frustration that he does not know strategies to understand the information without using the L1. Teaching of strategies on how and when L1 is appropriate may help alleviate this struggle in ESL learners’ minds. One positive effect of this training could be they would come to understand that “strategic use of L1 or translation would be helpful in developing learners’ reading efficiency and maintaining the flow of their conversations and writing tasks” (Liao, 2006, p. 210). After possible positive effects are demonstrated to them, students may be more willing to use their L1 strategically to aid in learning their new language.

Presently, however, Amos seems to feel strongly that he should not use the L1 very frequently and expresses his desire to not fall back on his L1 in the final week’s interview:

*S:* *I think English more useful, this here, because only in this way, we can change the idea, don’t (change) the thinking-style because in Chinese…do you understand?*

*T:* *I think I do, ya, I think I do. You want to start thinking in English?*

*S:* *English, English, not translating into Chinese, then come back”* (Amos, week 4 interview; parenthetical information, mine).

When Amos is writing in English, he wants to be consistent in thinking in English as well and does not want to switch back and forth between his languages.
Recall Amos’ first impression of the helpfulness of having L1, “I thinking can know, I can know what is my wrong. I can, in the first time, I can correct the answer” (Amos, week 1 interview). Correcting errors can be a struggle for ESL students and simply not understanding the name of the error in English may impede corrections even for these students from grammar-heavy language learning backgrounds like China. For these students, a simple translation may be able to move them forward more quickly in their work, as Folse (2004) says, “…a brief translation of a key concept at the right time can be invaluable” (p.60).

The focus participants had differing opinions on whether the L1 feedback was personally helpful or not. For Allan, the native language feedback did prove valuable in helping him to understand the feedback, “Better, much, much” (Allan, week 4 interview), as he put it. Though he was positive toward the translations, Amos felt the native language did not make much difference to him, as he explained, “Because maybe some mistakes, I also need some clearlier, clearly explained, but, but I think we can only use the English to know to understand what it says” (Amos, week 3 interview). He felt confident enough in his English to be able to understand enough without using the translations.

After being asked their opinions on the value of translations for themselves, these students were asked to opine on the value of the L1 translations for differing levels of English proficiency. Both, somewhat predictably, thought low-level students need the native language feedback the most. Allan explained, “Ya, I think that low level is most need. Is need native language most because maybe they can’t understand that, even master grammar very well, so they need their native language help them to understand,
help them to learn the grammar again” (Allan, week 4 interview). This idea of lower proficiency students benefitting from the L1 is found in research, with Storch & Wigglesworth (2012) stating that the “L1 may facilitate L2 classroom activities, particularly for low proficiency students on complex tasks” (p.761). Illustrating this point, both focus participants utilized bilingual dictionaries during their revision time, a tool that Schmitt (1997) also found helpful to 85% of his subjects.

While they agreed the lower-level students needed the translations, their opinions were mixed on whether high-level students should have access the L1 as well. Allan explained, “Students always lazy. I think if they have an easy way to understand, they will choose the easy way. Even the high level student, if there is easy way to fix theys mistake, I think they will choose to use the native language to help them understand more well” (Allan, week 4 interview). Amos, however, thought the higher level students did not need the L1 explanation at all saying, “The lower level give more Chinese in their...the higher level, I think, do not need Chinese to explain.”

In a further comment, he gave insight as to what strategy he leaned on in order to understand the feedback, “…a way is many difficult words I can’t understand, we can ask you (the teacher) and many friends to understand, so I don’t think the native language...ya (T: made a difference?) (nods) (Amos, week 4 interview; parenthetical information, mine). Because Amos was willing to rely on human interaction to complete the task, he did not feel as great a need for the L1 feedback in AWE as Allan did, who shared reservations about having to rely on human feedback. Allan did, however, feel that the teacher’s feedback was more individualized than was the feedback in Criterion. Regardless of which type of feedback the students report preferring, the main concern for
the teacher is that they actually use the feedback in order to become both more proficient and self-sufficient in their L2 writing.

**Possibilities for gains in autonomy through feedback in Criterion.**

Both felt that *Criterion* did help advance their autonomy in writing. In order to gauge the perceived effectiveness of the types of feedback they were receiving, they were asked to compare the feedback of *Criterion* and teachers. Allan shared that for him, teachers’ feedback is more “special,” though he did worry about both their lack of availability and about wasting their time with questions. This touches on an oft-discussed issue, that writing teachers do not have enough time to provide learners with quality feedback on multiple drafts of student essays (El Ebrary & Windeatt, 2010; Grimes & Warschauer, 2010). Whether it is true in a particular class or not, if this belief hampers students asking questions, they may go unanswered which, in turn, could inhibit their language development, at least to some degree. When Allan was asked whether he believed *Criterion* fostered his independence, Allan answered positively saying, “*because Criterion can make us to write the essays more independently, and because if we just writing by myself and ask the teacher, they will waste lots of time, and maybe you can’t find the teacher sometimes, and Criterion is more freedom*” (Allan, week 4 interview). One observation from his comment is that with teacher feedback, students may have concerns beyond the information they are seeking; they may worry that they will not be able to get a hold of the teacher and/or that they may be wasting teachers’ time with their questions, which is exactly what Allan mentioned. A second observation is that Allan describes his feelings about increased autonomy by saying, “*Criterion is more freedom.*” This increased sense of freedom in using the target language should not
be dismissed as being a non-necessity for ESL students; it seems, rather, that it could be a pivotal factor in determining future motivation and even success in their language learning.

In order for this independence to take place, students may first need to notice the mistakes that they currently make and then understand how to correct those errors. Allan said that *Criterion* helped him to notice errors, especially in the area of spelling, and described the frustration of making repetitive mistakes without the aid of feedback, “*And when you’re writing by yourself, not use the Criterion, you write lots of, make lots of spelling, but you don’t know where it is and maybe the next time, you will you made this wrong spelling again, again, again…*” A bit later, he made an observation about how *Criterion* can help rectify this situation, “*...so he (Criterion) can tell you the popular mistake, the mistake you always make and can help you to fix some mistake that is very ob...obvious, obvious, obvious*” (Allan, week 4 interview; parenthetical information, mine). Amos, likewise, made a similar comment about how Criterion aids him in noticing his mistakes and thereby reducing them, in the first week’s interview:

*Yeah, it (Criterion) can give us give me some information about what mistakes I always do, and I think sometimes later I can remember and to correct, don’t mistake in the future. Because I think...errors is more less than before, because I remember the first here, maybe it’s about, um, the grammar or the second and the...usage, maybe about, um, the beginning 6 or 8 (mistakes), but this time it’s a 5 or 6 and when I fix it, I think it’s better.* (Amos, week 1 interview; parenthetical information, mine)

Because of the reduction of errors Amos has experienced, he saw *Criterion* positively and would like to continue using *Criterion* after this class, “*Ya. For in the*
future, we have many essays we need to give to the professor, so we can use that to make our essays more, no 'more,' just better” (Amos, week 4 interview). First, Amos saw using Criterion for future essays, a plan that Allan did not share. Also, Amos’ correction of his spoken English came with an interesting explanation. Again, in the interview he said, “...make our essays more...no ‘more,’ just ‘better.’” Criterion flagged this very mistake in his essay this week, “more better,” and he had fixed it correctly; now, in the interview, he corrected his spoken language right before he made this same mistake. This could be regarded as an example of corrective feedback impacting future output, something Truscott and Hsu (2008) doubted happening as a result of CF, correction leading to learning in a future situation. In the final week, Amos shared that he felt that Criterion and its feedback helped his writing improve this semester, “because it let me know what errors I always do. Fix that” (Amos, week 4 interview), and in this example, he did just that.

By the end of the study, Allan said that his feelings about writing in English became more positive, which he attributed both to writing practice and to familiarity with his mistakes, believing these two factors will help him avoid making these same mistakes in the future. When asked whether he saw using Criterion as part of his long-term writing advancement, Allan also saw possibilities, but only “until pass the TOEFL,” (Allan, week 4 interview) and did not anticipate using it for his university classes. He anticipated being too busy and believed that Criterion would be unable to evaluate his future assignments, as we have only been using TOEFL prompts in class. He also sees the L1 glosses eventually becoming less necessary than they are presently:

T: Oh, you didn’t make any mistakes in run-ons this week. That’s good!
S: So I can understand, the run-on sentence. So now I’m familiar with the run-on sentence, so now if I see the green box, I can understand that what’s the mistake I make.

T: So do you think that over time then, it’s less necessary to have the Chinese because you’re becoming familiar?

S: Yeah.

T: Is that what you’re saying?

S: Yeah familiar. After familiar, it is not needed, the Chinese anymore.

T: Ok!

S: …but not still (laughing)! (Allan, week 4 interview)

Allan wanted to make sure that it was understood that he was not yet ready for L2 feedback only; he felt that he still needed the Chinese translations until becoming more familiar with the explanations about his mistakes, when it would not be needed anymore.

While the surveys and interviews were helpful in understanding students’ reactions to the L1 feedback they received, it is important to look at what the students actually did with the feedback they received as well (Warschauer & Ware, 2006).

Research Question 2: How do IEP students make use of the L1 glossed feedback themselves?

To investigate this question, data from two sources were used: (1) From Criterion, data were extracted from the students’ submissions over the four week study (holistic scores, submission numbers, word counts, and time spent on each essay), and, (2) from Camtasia videos, the focus participants’ revision behaviors during the study were viewed to discover possible patterns or relationships between the English-only (Weeks 1 & 3) and/or the English-plus-L1 (Weeks 2 & 4) feedback weeks. Data discussed are class
averages taken from *Criterion* on holistic scores, essay lengths, minutes spent, and submission numbers.

**Class holistic score averages**

The students’ (n=11) holistic scores given by *Criterion* increased each week (*Figure 7*), starting with an average of 4.55 (SD 1.63) and ending with 5.36 (SD 0.67) in week 4. This represents a 13.5% increase in average holistic scores for the class over the four weeks of the study; the number of words the students wrote increased each week as well (*Figure 8*).

*Figure 7. Average holistic scores from Criterion (6 point scale).*
A correlation between the length of essays and the holistic scores given by AWE has been previously observed (Attali, 2004, 2007; Chodorow & Burstein, 2004; Enright & Quinlan, 2010; Lee, Gentile & Kantor, 2007). It has been noted that human raters also give importance to length (Enright & Quinlan, 2010) and has been further observed that essay length often “co-occurs with other highly valued aspects of essay quality” (Lee, Gentile & Kantor, 2007, p. 409). In fact, in Lee’s study, essay length was found to be the “strongest predictor of each of the six multi-trait scores as well as the holistic score (Lee, Gentile & Kantor, 2007, p.410). While essay length may be seen as a mere number which should have no bearing on scores, human raters also see it as a factor, perhaps because it does correlate with other marks of essay quality, such as “fluent production, development, and elaboration” (Enright & Quinlan, 2010).

It would be expected that writing these longer essays would also necessitate more time to write them; the findings regarding the amount of time taken by to produce the essays each week are presented next.
Average Time Spent on Essays

The average time the students spent on their essays, as recorded by Criterion (Figure 9), increased as a whole over the four weeks, as did the word counts, though the time spent during weeks 1 and 2 were reversed.

![Figure 9. Class averages of time spent on essays (recorded in Criterion).](image)

When a student works on an essay, the time is recorded in Criterion and these numbers, among others, are available to the teacher and to the students. The class began, in week 1, by spending an average of 71 minutes on their essay and increased their time, spending 98 minutes on their week 4 essays, on average.

If students’ holistic scores, essay length, and time spent are indicators, the students’ effort seems to have increased rather than waned as the semester continued; however, there was one area which did not show a general increase from week-to-week, the number of times the students submitted their essays to Criterion for evaluation.
Average Class Submissions to Criterion

Although the number from the first week to the last week did show a slight increase, essay submission numbers to *Criterion* was one area which did not increase weekly (*Figure 10*).

![Figure 10. Average number of essay submissions.](chart)

Total class submissions actually decreased each week until the final week, when the highest number of submissions was recorded. Seventy-eight submissions were recorded in the first week, followed by sixty-one, forty-three, and eighty-five submissions in the subsequent weeks (*Figure 10*). The increase between weeks 3 & 4 was over 50%, a marked increase; however, why this jump occurred is unclear. Though it may be impossible to make the claim that higher submission rates necessarily equals a better quality product, Attali (2004) did account for the number of student submissions in his large-scale study (n=33,171) and found that there was “a general linear increase in the improvement with increasing submissions” (Attali, 2004, p.18), so there may be room to leave that possibility open. The one student, Nyah, who did not have Arabic translations
also increased her holistic scores each week (4, 5, 6, 6) and her word counts (207, 257, 282, 350), however her time spent varied as did her submission numbers (12, 5, 6, 8), following the class pattern.

The overall positive attitudes of the class toward *Criterion* may be an example of student’s attitudes affecting task performance (Levy & Stockwell, 2006), which in this case, would yield a positive effect on the task. Perhaps demonstrating this effect, holistic scores and word counts increased week-to-week, time spent showed a general increase, but the submission numbers decreased each week until rebounding in the last week to show an overall increase.

The numbers reported thus far were averages taken from the entire class, but we will now look with more detail at the revision behaviors and outcomes for the two focus participants.

**Weekly Revision Behaviors of the Focus participants**

Criterion saves information about a student’s use of the program and is available for the teachers to view. Data, such as holistic scores, submission rates, and word counts, were retrieved from Allan and Amos’ submissions and are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Even a cursory glance at these students’ data over the four week study shows rather high similarity in their outcomes (Tables 10 & 11).
Table 10.

Outcomes of Allan’s Revisions Over 4 Weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Feedback by week</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>Times submitted</th>
<th>Word count</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn from Mistakes: week 1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1 hour, 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for Trip: week 2</td>
<td>L2 &amp; L1</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1 hour, 17 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/books: week 3</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1 hour, 16 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Style: week 4</td>
<td>L2 &amp; L1</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1 hour, 40 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.

Outcomes of Amos’ Revisions Over Four Weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Feedback by week</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>Times submitted</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn from Mistakes: week 1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1 hour, 6 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for Trip: week 2</td>
<td>L2 &amp; L1</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1 hour, 12 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/books week 3</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1 hour, 1 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Style: week 4</td>
<td>L2 &amp; L1</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1 hour, 3 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The holistic scores of these two students were virtually identical throughout the study, with Allan receiving only one more point, in total, over the four weeks. While Allan submitted essays 24 times, writing a total of 1,342 words, Amos submitted 23 times and wrote 1,365 words. Allan worked on his essays for a total of in 5 hours, 33 minutes, which was an hour and eleven minutes longer than Amos worked. Similar times would be expected, because the students wrote and revised their essays in class; however,
Allan stayed after class and worked on his essays each week, which likely accounts for at least some of the difference.

Numbers alone cannot tell the whole story, but used in conjunction with observed or recorded behaviors of specific behaviors, the picture becomes clearer. Although the outcomes of the two students are very similar, their revision behaviors show intriguing differences.

Allan’s Revision Behaviors

Although he had difficulty with certain aspects of English, especially oral communication, Allan was able to achieve consistently high holistic scores in his writing, perhaps through the diligence he displayed. This characteristic was observed in his revision behaviors, as he worked through a difficult category of errors that most of the students in the class neglected.

On our first revision day with English feedback only, Allan checked the green feedback boxes seven different times, beginning with article and comma errors. From watching his cursor movements, Allan seemed to do a thorough search for additional errors in sentences which were not even marked as having errors. Through this revision time, his word count increased from 345 to 370 words and his holistic score increased from a 5 to a 6.

In week 2, Allan had access to Chinese feedback as well as to English feedback. However, the students had not been told that they would have their L1 this week, so when Allan discovered the translations by clicking on a green box at the beginning of the class, he was very surprised. He can be heard in the Camtasia recording, saying, "Oh, teacher! How did you do that? You did an amazing thing... Really helpful! Now I understand..."
This general feeling seemed to be shared with the others in the class as other positive exclamations could be heard in the recording as the students discovered the L1 translated feedback.

As the revision time went on, Allan began focusing on one particular area of feedback under *Style*, word repetition, where words deemed overly repetitious are marked (Burstein & Wolska, 2003). With this level of learner answering prompts, this category consistently returns the highest amount of marks to students, often twenty or more, and in this class, students did not generally attempt to correct many of these marks (personal observation). Allan, however, seemed to take it as a challenge and his strategy to tackle this task was to extensively use a Chinese-English online dictionary (http://www.iciba.com/), to find synonyms for the repeated words. Going outside of *Criterion* to look up synonyms is not something other students in this class have been observed doing often, though some used their phones to check spelling errors (personal observation). After changing several words, Allan sought advice from the teacher as to how many repetition errors are reasonable in an essay. It was suggested that he try to reduce the repetitions by ten and to also try looking at the Writer’s Handbook, which he did for a substantial amount of time, exceeding the observed time for most other students using this feature (personal observation). In the Writer’s Handbook, Allan appeared to read all the explanations in the Chinese with the cursor slowly through this section of the handbook, but scrolled quickly through the English examples until coming to the next section with Chinese translations, and again, he slowed down. He also used an L1/L2 dictionary to look for synonyms, going back and forth between iCIBA and *Criterion*. When I checked on Allan again, he told me that he had gone from almost forty repetition
marks down to ten. In fact, when it was checked, Criterion did not identify any repetition errors in his final essay, even after the word count increased by 33 words, after beginning with thirty marks in the first draft (*Figure 11*). Allan spent most of the time this week engaged with the Writer’s Handbook, an online dictionary, and the green feedback boxes, all of which utilized L1 translations.

*Figure 11*. Allan’s week 2 repetition error reduction.

In week 3, determining whether the L1 translations would be missed by Allan was of interest since he did not have access to the Chinese feedback this week and since he had used them so extensively the week prior. At the beginning of the revising time, he opened both Criterion and iCIBA, the same Chinese/English online dictionary that he used previously. He used the green box feedback eleven times in only thirty-three minutes of revising. Twice Allan hovered over the green feedback boxes for at least thirty seconds; whereas, typically the students use the boxes for only a second or two,
often what seems to be less than the time it would take to actually read them (personal observation). The green box feedback requires a person to hover over the blue highlights, so releasing the mouse causes the green feedback boxes to disappear, increasing the chances that Allan was actually attending to the words for the amount of time the green boxes were visible on the screen.

Allan did seem to have been confused by the English-only feedback several times this week. For instance, when he was reading the fragment/missing comma error feedback in the grammar section, he clicked on the green feedback several times and audibly (in the Camtasia audio) said, “Hmmm?” as he read the feedback aloud. Another category that seemed to frustrate him this week was the repetition of words, though the bulk of his time was spent here. On the positive side, he began with sixty repetition marks and reduced them to forty-four (Figure 12).

![Style Comments](image)

**Figure 12.** Allan’s week 3 repetition error reduction.

However, his frustration came out as he was heard laughing to himself on Camtasia, “How to fix this problem?” After this comment, he immediately went to two online
dictionaries, iCIBA (with Chinese translations) and Dictionary.com (English only), to find synonyms, but did not appear to see any; nonetheless, he did reduce his repetitions by 27%, although this was lower than the previous week’s success rate. Later, in the interview he was asked about his frustration heard in the screen capture audio recording:

*T:* This repetition of words, was that where you got frustrated and you didn’t know how to fix it?

*S:* Yeah.

*T:* And when you see so many blue highlights, how do you feel?

*S:* Terrible. That mean a lot of mistake. Who want to make by his one essay? No one wants (Allan, week 3 interview).

He gives an understandable description of why he felt frustrated working through those errors, correctly noting that no one wants to make that many errors in one essay. He was then asked if the Writer’s Handbook helped him to work through these repetition errors:

*S:* ...And you help me to the Writer’s Handbook to understand, but the question is that they don’t put up because you want, you need to change the words...

*T:* But they don’t give you choices.

*S:* But they don’t give you choices, that is the (problem).

*T:* I saw you went to the dictionary several times, is that what you were looking for?

*S:* Yeah, because...dictionary can help me to write the sentences, the vocabulary of so many, can help me.

*T:* Did it help you?
S. Yeah, the dictionary work, but the green boxes and the handbook cannot, so I know they can’t help me with this problem, so why I waste time to watch that? I would rather go to...spend more time in the dictionary because they can maybe help me work out this problem (Allan, week 3 interview; emphasis mine).

Recall that Allan earlier said, “...my English is not as good other, I cannot concentrate on writing lots of times, so for me, I will want to just concentrate, use my energy concentrate on the point I need...” (Allan, week 2 interview). Because of his low level of proficiency he seems to feel the weight of the high cognitive load (Sweller, 1988, 1994) revising brings, and trying to use feedback that he has deemed unhelpful seems overwhelming. In the interview excerpt above, Allan explained that he cannot find the help he wants from the green feedback boxes and from the Writer’s Handbook, so his motivation is nil to “waste time to watch that” (Allan, week 3 interview).

In the fourth week, Allan began with ill-formed verbs, read the green feedback box aloud in Chinese, and then went to the Writer’s Handbook, a feature which gives fuller explanation and examples of the green box feedback, although it is general feedback and is not specific to the particular error the student made. Regardless, Allan spent three minutes looking at the Chinese feedback in the Writer’s Handbook, scrolling quickly through the English feedback before slowing again at the next Chinese section once again. Later, in the interview, Allan complained that this feature was not very “special,” a term he often seemed to use in contexts where he seemed to mean “specialized” or “specific” (personal observation). This feeling that the feedback in AWE is not very specific has been found to be a common complaint of students in perception studies (Chen & Cheng, 2008).
Overall, Allan showed a pattern of using the L1 feedback over the English feedback during the four weeks of the study, when given the choice. Even on weeks where he did not have access to the Chinese feedback, he used Chinese/English dictionaries extensively. In the weeks where he did have Chinese feedback, he used it, often skipping over the English feedback when given the choice. As a student, Allan demonstrated high motivation, for example, on a week where he had already gained a holistic score of 6/6, and after reducing all error categories to zero, except for repetition, he continued revising throughout the last ten minutes of class, a time that is often a struggle for students to stay engaged. Many days, he stayed in the computer lab after class and kept working on his essays, as was previously mentioned. No other students in the class did this.

My second subject, Amos demonstrated similar behaviors to Allan’s in several respects, though others were quite different.

**Amos’ Revision Behaviors**

Like Allan, Amos used the Writer’s Handbook and the green feedback boxes in week 1, but in contrast to Allan, Amos viewed the green boxes briefly each time and used the Writer’s Handbook less extensively, with viewings for both generally ranging from three to eight seconds. Amos did continue using these features throughout the revision time, however, going to the handbook five times and to the green boxes a total of four times during this revision session. Several times, Amos was observed trying to fix errors without reading any feedback, but was unsuccessful; however, he did successfully correct other highlighted errors, such as subject-verb errors and article errors, rather autonomously, without reading any feedback.
Further, in one instance he showed autonomy in decision making when *Criterion* gave him an incorrect error code and he was able to correctly fix the true error. The original sentence was, “*I am firmly convinced that every individual could learn a lot from they mistakes,*” and *Criterion* marked it as a missing comma error. Amos consulted the green feedback box which said, “*You may need to place a comma after this word.*” He did not add a comma, rightly so, and then changed “they” to “their,” successfully making a correct fix in response to incorrect feedback. Being willing to go against *Criterion’s* feedback seems to show a rather high level of confidence in his own English knowledge and decision-making ability.

After working through many of his errors, Amos went to the repetition errors and stayed on the screen for three minutes without appearing to do anything related to revision. He then moved on to mechanics, having not changed even one repetition error, which was very different from Allan’s revision behavior.

The second week offered the addition of the Chinese feedback. After looking through his scores and a few of the categories without making any changes, Amos clicked on an error to see the green box feedback. He looked at it for three seconds, which would be long enough to read the short feedback, and then went to the Writer’s Handbook, which also included the Chinese feedback. He scrolled slowly through the Chinese portion of the explanation, moved very quickly through English, and slowed down when he again came to the Chinese, the exact behavior that Allan demonstrated. Amos spent some time looking through additional sections of the glossed handbook before I came to check on his revisions. As I arrived at his desk, he immediately said, “*This changed to Chinese, the handbook!* I think this can, their free time, they can learn
something by themselves.” Amos made an immediate connection here between having the L1 and the possibility for increased student autonomy. Both he and Allan immediately responded positively to the addition of the L1, but the focus of Allan’s comment was on his own increased ability to understand the feedback, and Amos’ focus was on the possibilities for having increased autonomy in revision, a characteristic that he has personally displayed.

Even though he had just expressed excitement over the possibilities for the use of L1 glosses, Amos revised the rest of the time almost without using the green box feedback or the Writer’s Handbook at all, the very feedback which contained the Chinese translations. About twenty minutes into the class, he did read the glossed feedback for about three seconds one more time and, subsequently, made a correct change to his essay. This behavior was different from the amount of times that Allan used the Chinese translations. Even though Amos only used them slightly, he elaborated on his positive first impression of the L1 later in the interview, saying, “I thinking can know, I can know what is my wrong, I can first time, I can correct the answer.”

In week 3, Amos began by making corrections autonomously, even without the Chinese; for example, he immediately deleted “more” after seeing that the phrase “more better” was highlighted in blue, without checking written feedback. He did use the written feedback later, checking a green box and the Writer’s Handbook (English only) about a preposition error. He scrolled through the feedback in the Handbook but did not appear to find what he was looking for, yet he made a successful change anyway. Several more times, Amos checked the green box feedback and subsequently made correct revisions, however, on three occasions, he read the green feedback boxes and yet
did not make any changes, though he should have. In his interview this week, Amos gave a reason for his lower use of the Writer’s Handbook this week:

S: I think that is true, if I, if we have Chinese translation use more Writer’s Handbook.

T: Ok, why?

S: Because, because, because some academic words in Writer’s Handbook, we cannot understand English very easily, but in Chinese we can know what it say and we can find which one we need to search, which one we need to look.

T: Do you think it would encourage you to use the Writer’s handbook more if it had them (the Chinese translations)?

S: Yes. (Amos, week 3 interview, parenthetical information, mine).

Again, though he didn’t use them as extensively as Allan, he reported feeling positively about the L1 glosses and that felt he would use the helps, such as the handbook, more often if the translations were available.

Throughout the week, Amos spent time deleting and writing new sentences and adding details to his paragraphs. This was a behavior that Allan was not observed doing, focusing instead on correction. In the interview, he noted that the students could be assigned correction as homework and then could talk about it in class the next day noting, “I think most of us can, can do that by ourselves,” an additional reference to his desire for autonomy.

At the end of the revision time, Amos appeared to lose interest in the task and whispered for several minutes to a classmate while pausing on his score summary screen. After I talked to him about possibilities for correcting several conjunctions and preposition errors which he had not yet fixed, Amos chose not make any additional
changes, displaying again his willingness to disregard feedback from the feedback givers, both *Criterion* and the teacher.

His revision behavior is markedly different in week 4, where he again had the Chinese feedback in addition to the English. This week, he checked the green feedback boxes over twenty times. In a couple of instances during his revision time, he would go back to the green box feedback for the error he was working on and check it repeatedly, a behavior which has not been previously observed. Admittedly, some of these checks were very brief, especially when he had already read the feedback for a particular kind of mistake, but the sheer number of times he went to them was interesting, almost as if he were hoping for more or new information to appear in the same box. After this, Amos continued to make changes based only on the blue highlights without seeking out written feedback of any kind, a behavior he has demonstrated and consistently reported preferring since week 1. As in previous weeks, a large number of repetition errors were marked (forty-five), but he did not spend time in this screen and made no attempt to change any of these words, very unlike Allan. In the interview, his perception of the difficulty of this category was discussed:

*S:* Repetition is the hard category.

*T:* That one is very hard. That has to do with vocabulary.

*S:* Yeah. That is about vocabulary...Even though I try learning vocabulary and I remember the vocabulary, but when you writing, you will forgot, you will forgot the spelling, and you will forgot to use this word. *You need to write lots of essays that you will know how to change that repetition word* (Amos, week 4 interview).
He offers a reason, then, for his neglect of this category--its difficulty. Though he feels like he knows vocabulary, in the midst of writing, he forgets it, giving a further example of the tremendous cognitive load (Sweller, 1988, 1994) these lower level students are under as they revise their essays. Allan also felt this pressure, but dealt with it in a different way; he chose to rise to the challenge, whereas Amos ignored it, possibly feeling defeated from the outset. One area where Amos did spend a large amount of the time was in adding to his conclusion, possibly due to the class discussion the week before about the functions that the conclusion should serve. This is a behavior Amos often demonstrated, spending more time revising his content and less time correcting marked errors. It is an important thing to remember: students are individuals and will react to the same challenge in very different ways.

Another area where they showed their individualism was the area of social adeptness. Overall, Amos seemed to be more social than Allan; several times over the study, Amos whispered to a neighbor, asking for her advice, a strategy that Allan did not appear to employ at all. This seemed to be in line with their personalities as well, with Allan often sitting away from others and not chatting before or after class; whereas, Amos always sat with friends and often talked to others. Displaying a similar strategy to Allan, he used iCIBA, a Chinese-English dictionary, on his phone to look up spelling errors explaining, “I just want to find the word different than the word I used before,” not unlike the behavior Allan displayed when changing his repeated words. Amos was also seen going against given feedback and/or ignoring feedback from Criterion and from the teacher during the study, some of these yielding good outcomes and some yielding poor
outcomes. Amos did check the feedback frequently this week, both L1 and English, but for far shorter periods of time than Allan.

Although overviews for the focus participants have just been mentioned, it may be helpful to now revisit a few of the interesting similarities and differences between these two students.

**Allan and Amos’ Revisions Summarized**

The focus participants, Allan and Amos, submitted their essays between 4 and 7 times, received 5s or 6s in their holistic scores, and wrote a little over 1,300 words, spending over an hour on each of their essays. While their outcomes were similar, several of their correction strategies differentiated them from one another in marked ways. Allan’s revision times seemed to be somewhat atypical in several ways. First, he frequently utilized outside sources, online dictionaries, for looking up synonyms and spelling. While his frequency of use was interesting, perhaps most interesting was that Allan would open the dictionary at the beginning of the revision time along with *Criterion*, as if planning ahead for its use, instead of opening it only when the need arose, as was typical in the class (personal observation). Secondly, he successfully and dramatically lowered the repetition comments each week, once to zero, which was not done by anyone else in this class. That Allan even attempted this drastic of a reduction is atypical. Admittedly, he did work on this category with encouragement from the teacher, but all students were encouraged to try to lower this category by five or ten words, a much lower goal than he seemed to set for himself. His work would suggest that he had intrinsic motivation to reduce these repetitions, especially to work through thirty marks, which he did with the help of L1 translations each week, utilizing Chinese translations
even on weeks where L1 feedback was not provided in *Criterion*. He does not seem to show the reluctance to use the translations like Storch & Wigglesworth (2012) found true with their subjects. Finally, Allan spent time looking for additional errors that *Criterion* had not marked, showing a certain motivational intensity, and perhaps demonstrating positive self-efficacy, one of the “most important determinants of learning effort and persistence in a given activity,” (Kormos, 2012, p. 399) characteristics he clearly demonstrated throughout the study. This is not to say that Allan regards himself as confident in his writing, rating his as only a 2 in the survey, but rather, knowing how to make use of the feedback and outside sources, usually with L1 translations, may have bolstered his motivation for correcting his errors. This may demonstrate a possible effect of utilizing the L1, having a better grasp of the task and better execution of it than they would have had alone, as Storch & Wigglesworth (2012) describe, “The use of the L1 may assist learners to ‘gain control of the task’ (Brooks & Donato, 1994, p. 271) and work with the task at a higher cognitive level than might have been possible had they been working individually” (p. 768).

Amos demonstrated some of these behaviors, but his strategies differed from Allan’s in several ways, though he finished with nearly the same outcomes. The comparison between the subjects can be seen in Table 12.
Table 12.

*Points of Comparison between the Focus Participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of comparison</th>
<th>Amos</th>
<th>Allan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous use</td>
<td>Seemed to be a focus of his comments, ignored Criterion’s and teacher’s advice on occasion.</td>
<td>Did comment on it, but did not speak of it as many times. He found extra helps to assist him in correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of feedback preference</td>
<td>Prefers the blue highlights, critiques the green and WH.</td>
<td>Prefers the blue highlights, critiques the green and WH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1/L2 dictionary</td>
<td>Uses iCIBA dictionary, occasionally and for spelling errors, as needed.</td>
<td>Uses iCIBA dictionary, opens at the beginning each week, extensively uses it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Writer’s Handbook</td>
<td>On weeks with L1, reads the Chinese and skips the English</td>
<td>Demonstrates the same use as Amos with the L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of revision time</td>
<td>His focus seemed to be on revising his essays through reworking sentences. Spent most of his time here.</td>
<td>His focus was on reducing his repetition of word errors. Spent most of his time here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amos showed a general willingness to work autonomously, going against *Criterion* and the teacher’s advice and not choosing to correct errors and/or to correct errors differently than was suggested. His comments about having the L1 in week 2, focused on the possibilities for autonomy, as did comments he made in the interviews; this seemed to be a theme for him throughout. Neither student ignored the feedback completely, and Amos used the same features that Allan did, sometimes identically, as in their use of the Chinese and neglect of the English in the Writer’s Handbook; however,
Amos did seem to use them less extensively overall. Amos attempted more extensive revision than Allan, often spending a majority of the revision time writing additional sentences, rather than spending the time correcting errors. When correcting errors, both preferred using the blue highlights over the green box feedback or the Writer’s Handbook. Additionally, Amos did not spend time in the style category, repetition of words, while Allan spent large quantities of his time there. Even though Amos used the same L1/L2 dictionary that Allan did for spelling errors, Amos did not carry this behavior over to his repetition errors, possibly not seeing the connection between his strategy for correcting his spelling errors and a workable strategy to reduce the repeated words, or perhaps, his motivation for correcting the different error types simply differed.

Even with these differences, their overall results were remarkably similar, as earlier shown earlier in Tables 1 and 2. Their regular use of the L1 was somewhat unexpected, since the pilot study for this investigation showed a general reluctance to use the L1, a phenomenon that other researchers have noted as well (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2012). Amos did struggle with the need for his L1, feeling he shouldn’t use it and looking to a time when it would no longer need it, saying in his first interview:

*I think if the system more, more higher technology, in the beginning step they will give some Chinese to make you to understand easily, and then when you better and better, the Chinese will be lesser and lesser so in the mean, mean time or something after that, all English and no Chinese.* (Amos, week 1 interview)
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

When the present study was being piloted, one of the focus participants made an impactful comment in an interview:

*Because for me, what my father also taught me, if you can do yourself, just do yourself. Because writing for the Internationals is difficult, so I can’t each time I write some paragraph to ask teacher, “Can you fix my paragraph?” you know? I think teacher is busy so…so sometimes, you need to do yourself, but you can’t yourself fix it, so Criterion is really, really good for me.”*

One would need to know Nick to understand the earnestness with which he explained these feelings, but he had never liked writing and considered himself a poor student. Through the pilot study, however, he came to feel an increased sense of his own ability to write and to create something that he was proud of. The realization of the need that Internationals feel to have the skill to autonomously correct their papers while at the same time struggling with their own inability to fix them is what pushed me to continue to investigate this area. While there have been frustrations expressed with AWE software by students and teachers, the promise it seemed to hold for my IEP students in giving them the feeling, perhaps for the first time, that they had some control over their writing and revision, made this investigation personally meaningful.

Through essays, surveys, interviews, and screen captures, this exploratory study aimed to be a first step in understanding the perceptions and use of L1 glosses in AWE
for IEP students. The main findings, pedagogical suggestions, and areas for future research will now be discussed.

**Main Findings from the Study**

A rationale for studying perceptions of the L1 has been offered by Storch & Wigglesworth (2003) who said that because their students “perceived the L1 to be useful, regardless of whether they actually made use of them, suggests that the topic warrants further investigation” (p. 768). This study asked two questions regarding the L1: first, what were the students’ perceptions of the L1 feedback, and second, what did they do with this feedback? Because of the limited number of students and the context, a level 3 IEP writing class, one should not assume all ESL classes, all IEP classes, or even all level 3 writing classes would have the same results, rather, this study is about these particular learners, at this point in time, performing this task. Three main findings seem to be that (1) the students felt the L1 glosses helped with understanding and autonomy, but (2) do not necessarily attribute this help to the quality of their overall product, and finally, (3) differing revision behaviors did not lead to differing outcomes.

1. **The L1 feedback seemed to aid learner understanding and autonomy.**

   The findings do not conclusively show that the students did better in L1 weeks, however, the class did receive higher holistic scores and wrote more words during these weeks overall. If a short-term goal for students is to be able to write and correct their essays, then understanding the feedback in order to make the correction seems to be imperative. Students, though desiring teachers’ feedback, do not feel free to ask teacher about each mistake, so feeling increased autonomy through AWE and the L1 translations may be very valuable to these students, which Allan described as “more freedom.”
Though focus participants differed in their desire for the L1, both found it helpful, especially when using certain text-heavy features (i.e. the Writer’s Handbook). Amos, in particular, felt reluctance to use the L1, as has been shown with learners in other studies (e.g. Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003), unless it was deemed necessary. Specifically, Amos felt that more practice and familiarity with Criterion would help him to understand the meaning of the feedback and eventually sees it reducing his need for the L1 and leading toward greater autonomy. As previously mentioned, the increased sense of autonomy in using the target language should not be dismissed as being a non-necessity for ESL students; it seems, rather, that it could be a pivotal factor in determining future motivation and even success in their language learning.

2. Quality of revisions was not attributed to the L1 feedback.

The students responding to the survey did not think the English was hard to understand, though they agreed in week 2 & 4 that they liked having the L1 feedback, and the class agreed (M=3.50, SD=0.97; week 4) that they could understand the feedback more fully with the L1. However, by the end of the study, somewhat disagreed (M=2.82, SD=1.08) that the overall quality of corrections were a result of L1 feedback. Allan, when questioned about this, did feel that the corrections he made with the L1 were “more” and “quicker,” which seemed to be important for not losing patience, as he often talked about. He went on to point out, “...sometimes even if I made a mistake because I can ask the teacher if I cannot understand...maybe the teacher can explain more well than the just the box...now I have a teacher, so I am not worry about that” (Allan, week 2 interview). It is possible, then, that the students did not want to attribute their corrections solely to the L1 translations because they also relied on other forms of
feedback, such as teacher and peer feedback, in their revisions. This combination of feedback sources, human and AWE, has been recommended (Burstein, et al., 2004; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Shermis & Burstein, 2003; Warschauer & Ware, 2006).

3. Revision behaviors differed, though outcomes did not.

Somewhat surprisingly, the differences in revision behavior and language strengths between the focus participants did not seem to make a difference in their outcomes. These differing revision behaviors they exhibited seemed to be based on differing strategies. Amos focused less on correction and more on content revision; whereas, Allan’s focus was on reducing as many errors as he possibly could, yet both attained very similar results. Recall that Amos submitted slightly less frequently and received slightly lower holistic overall scores, but wrote slightly more words, producing nearly identical results.

Amos was more focused on autonomy and felt a need for learning new strategies to lessen his need for the L1. This strategy training was requested by Amos when he was lamenting his need for the L1: “I cannot understand…the meaning…but we need to turn to that way, but I don’t know how to do that better, so I agree we don’t need to use (Chinese) for, but I don’t know…how can we do another ways to works better? (Amos, week 2 interview; parenthetical information, mine). It has been argued that CF in tandem with strategy training can lead to greater autonomy and success (Ferris, 1999).

Increasing training in using correction strategies may lead to greater independence in these writers, though whether it would affect their outcomes is unclear. Though this is only a small step toward investigating these issues, there are a few implications that may be taken from this study.
Pedagogical Implications with Regard to L1 Feedback and Strategy Training

Teachers should not outright dismiss using the L1 in classroom activities, especially for low and low-intermediate students when it has shown promise in moving tasks forward (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) and in providing scaffolding for students (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998). Recall the frustration that Allan shared with the L2 feedback and how it caused him to “really lose patience” (Allan, week 1 interview). He continued talking about losing patience in week 2, “I think maybe psychology problem, if you lost patient in one point, in one part, you will not want to do the whole part.” The L1, then, might be viewed as a “psychological tool” providing “additional cognitive support that allows them to analyse language and work at a higher level than would be possible were they restricted to sole use of their L2” (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003, p. 760). It seems that for some IEP students having the L1 glosses may also motivate them to work at this “higher level” by accessing the feedback more, as Amos did with the Writer’s Handbook, and to attempt greater error reduction, as Allan was able to do in the repetition category. Besides these things, the L1 seems to have had the effect of increasing learners’ confidence in their own writing autonomy, a consistently reported response in the study, which is really an end-goal in writing instruction.

Additionally, teachers need to understand that training in CALL activities and autonomy is imperative and should also not be overlooked (Hubbard, 2004). Hubbard (2004) explains, “We should not release our students into powerful learning environments unprepared: It is our responsibility as teachers to see that they are able to make informed decisions about how to use computer resources effectively to meet their
learning objectives” (p. 51). During training, teachers may want to consider framing activities in relation to students’ goals in order to increase student motivation. This suggestion harkens from Hubbard’s (2004) second training principle where he states that, “learners need to understand the importance of making a connection between a particular CALL activity and some desired learning outcome or progress toward it” (p. 53). In order to individualize this effectively, teachers may first need to determine what the goals the students have for writing. Perhaps asking about their goals in get-to know you activities at the beginning of the semester, followed by later class discussions, would help the teacher to informally make this assessment. As was done in the training period with this class, explaining pedagogical reasoning by tying the task to the learner outcomes may also be a motivation for some students. Granted, this particular tactic may have been more motivating for these students since the LOs were tied to end-of-semester tests in this IEP. Further, the students’ goal of passing the TOEFL was known to the teacher, so framing the task in the context of providing practice for this test by choosing TOEFL prompts, may have served as a motivation for the students and contributed to their overall positive perceptions about the experience. Training in general exploitation strategies (Hubbard’s fifth principle, 2004) may also be helpful for students like Amos. It is acknowledged that this class wrote for a narrowly defined writing purpose, but even other contexts, this idea of training and framing activities for one’s students is still crucial, because “there is every likelihood that their attitudes will affect their performance” (Levy & Stockwell, 2006, p. 174), so everything that teachers can do to ensure positive attitudes can only be beneficial to their outcomes.
Limitations of the Study

Because of the small number of participants, this study only begins the effort to understand how the students perceive, and ultimately, how they use L1 feedback in AWE. With the small class size, the best scenario would have been to have had an equal number of responses each week, but there was some variance. Further, it would have painted a fuller picture to have interviews and screen capturing with a greater number of students, both male and female, from varied language backgrounds.

In order to see whether proficiency level made a difference in the learners’ perceptions and in their revision behaviors, studying a higher-level class, such as a level 6 IEP class and/or a university ESL class would be desired as well. Folse (2004) called for researchers to determine “whether the value of L1 translations is as effective for higher-proficiency students as it is for lower-proficiency students” (p. 68), but because convenience sampling was used, the higher-level students were not available for this study.

Also, because AWE was new technology to these students, the positive responses may have been due to the possibility that “students often tend to react favorably to something new because it is a change and different from the norm; their responses to a survey given shortly after this new experience can easily reflect an overly positive image,” termed the novelty effect (Levy & Stockwell, 2006, p. 159). However, it has been found that exposure to the tool over time may counteract this effect and this brings timing and training to the forefront in study design (Levy & Stockwell, 2006). Minding this advice, training was conducted in this class for two weeks prior to the study, with
students writing and revising two essays in *Criterion*, although they did not use the L1 glosses at that time nor were told of their availability.

There is the further basic issue of asking students to rate their perspective on a scale. Levy and Stockwell (2006) point out that it is a difficult task to respond to a statement on a scale, since some students may be more modest than others and others may have an “eagerness to please the teacher” (p. 160). Additionally, these students were ESL students who did have occasional misunderstandings with survey statements, though they were explained, and these confusions could have had an effect on the responses. Researchers are called on to acknowledge this limitation and to combine survey research with other methods of data collection (Levy and Stockwell, 2006), which was done in the present study.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

One way to gain an understanding of the extent and consistency of reported perceptions and uses of AWE feedback would be to follow certain classes or certain students through the progression of the writing classes at the university, following a longitudinal design, as has been suggested (Bitchener 2005, 2008, 2009; Ellis 2006 2008; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Guénette, 2007; Sheen, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008). This would allow researchers to note changes in perception and strategies over time with a group of learners.

Further, using varied proficiency levels in the study would also be encouraged; for example, having participants from a lower level IEP class, an upper level IEP class, and a freshman ESL composition class may serve to make a clearer delineation between proficiency levels who feel they need this extra help and those who no longer feel the
need to use them. An additional benefit to this design is that it may be more manageable than the longitudinal design suggested above due to timing issues and participant retention concerns.

Finally, studying the effects of training, of motivation level, and of revision strategies would be helpful to further investigate students’ need for and/or perceived helpfulness of the L1 glosses. Specific training in the feedback vocabulary, for instance, may lessen their felt need for the L1; training in revision strategies could allow them to feel more confident, and less guilt in accessing the L1; motivation levels could be assessed to see if they have an effect on students’ use and reactions to the corrective feedback.

Although there are many more areas to study in greater depth in order to fully understand the implications, it seems that automated writing evaluation, through its various forms of feedback, including L1 feedback, may help IEP students to feel they are moving toward the goal of becoming independent L2 writers. Writing is a highly complex task, and for these lower proficiency learners who have not yet matriculated into the university, the L1 may indeed prove to be a helpful tool (Atkinson, 1993; Cook, 2002; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2012).
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APPENDIX A

CRITERION PROMPTS USED

Week 1: Learn from Mistakes: Persuasive TOEFL
Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? People always learn from their mistakes.
Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.

Week 2: Prepare for a Trip: Expository TOEFL
Imagine that you are preparing for a trip. You plan to be away from your home for a year. In addition to clothing and personal care items, you can take one additional thing. What would you take and why? Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.

Week 3: Experience or Books: Persuasive TOEFL
It has been said, "Not everything that is learned is contained in books." Compare and contrast knowledge gained from experience with knowledge gained from books. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?

Week 4: Preferred Teacher Style: Persuasive TOEFL
Some people learn best when a classroom lesson is presented in an entertaining, enjoyable way.
Other people learn best when a lesson is presented in a serious, formal way. Which of these two ways of learning do you prefer? Give reasons to support your answer.
APPENDIX B

SURVEYS

Week 1-4

F12. Week 1 Survey.

1. We have been using Criterion to score our writing in this class. Is this the first experience you have had with a computer offering you feedback about your writing? Please circle.

Yes
No

2. Totally satisfied Partially satisfied Partially unsatisfied Totally unsatisfied

I was satisfied with the feedback that Criterion gave me this week.

4 3 2 1

3. I used these parts of Criterion during my revision time this week:

☐ Writer’s Handbook
☐ Blue highlights
☐ Green feedback boxes

4. Which of those types of feedback did you use the most? Why?

__________________________________________________________________________

5. Agree Agree Disagree Disagree

Somewhat somewhat

The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.

4 3 2 1
6. If I could have feedback in my own (native) language, I think it would help me to understand the feedback more fully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The AMOUNT of feedback given was just about right. (not too much, not too little)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Even before this class, I felt confident correcting my essays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What kinds of mistakes do you think you make the most frequently?
### F12. Week 2 Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was satisfied with the feedback that Criterion gave me this week.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I used these parts of Criterion during my revision time this week: (You can check more than one.)

- [ ] Writer’s Handbook
- [ ] Blue highlights
- [ ] Green feedback boxes

3. Which of those types of feedback did you use the most? Why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. I liked having feedback in my own language (in addition to English) this week.

6. Because I had feedback in my own (native) language, it helped me to understand the feedback more fully.

7. I made more and better corrections to my paper because I had feedback in my native language.

8. The AMOUNT of feedback was just about right. (not too much, not too little).

9. Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.

10. Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most).

10. What kinds of mistakes do you think you make the most frequently?
F12. Week 3 Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I was satisfied with the feedback that Criterion gave me this week.

2. I used these parts of Criterion during my revision time this week: (You can check more than one.)
   - Writer’s Handbook
   - Blue highlights
   - Green feedback boxes

3. Which of those types of feedback did you use the most? Why?
   
   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I missed having feedback in my own language this week. I want to have it back!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The feedback was harder for me to understand this week because I only had English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The corrections I made to my paper were just as good and accurate as they were last time (even though I didn’t have native language feedback this week).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The AMOUNT of feedback was just about right. (not too much, not too little).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What kinds of mistakes do you think you make the most frequently?

F12. Week 4 Survey, Pt 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I was satisfied with the feedback that Criterion gave me this week.

2. The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.

3. I used these parts of Criterion during my revision time this week: (You can check more than one.)

- [ ] Writer’s Handbook
- [ ] Blue highlights
- [ ] Green feedback boxes

4. Which of those types of feedback did you use the most? Why?
Think about how helpful these types of feedback were this semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat unhelpful</th>
<th>Unhelpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The Writer’s Handbook</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Blue highlights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Green feedback boxes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>It was <strong>very helpful</strong> to have native language feedback with this type of feedback.</th>
<th>It was <strong>somewhat helpful</strong> to have native language feedback for this feedback.</th>
<th>Having native language feedback <strong>didn’t make a difference</strong> for this kind of feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writer’s Handbook</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blue highlights</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Green highlights</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer these questions thinking about your experience this past week:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The English words used in the feedback were easy for me to understand.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. I liked having feedback in my own language this week. I am glad to have it back!

13. The feedback was easier for me to understand this week because I had feedback in my native language.

14. The corrections I made to my paper were better and more accurate since I had feedback in my native language.

15. The AMOUNT of feedback was just about right. (not too much, not too little).

16. Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself.

17. Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I make frequently (most).

18. What kinds of mistakes do you think you make the most frequently?
Week 4 Survey, Pt 2.

Now, think about using Criterion this whole semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My feelings about writing in English have become more positive over the semester.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My feelings about Criterion have become more positive over the semester.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My writing has improved over the semester.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criterion helped my writing improve this semester.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other classes in the IEOP should have the opportunity to use Criterion as well.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Having feedback in my native language helped me to understand the feedback more fully</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(better).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. (Nyah) Having feedback in Arabic would have helped me to understand the feedback more fully (better).

Ask yourself: Who would benefit most from the feedback in Criterion?

8. What type(s) of students would most benefit from using a writing program like Criterion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High level students</th>
<th>Intermediate level students</th>
<th>Low level students</th>
<th>All levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. What type(s) of students would most benefit from having their native language feedback?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High level students</th>
<th>Intermediate level students</th>
<th>Low level students</th>
<th>All levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Think about what kinds of mistakes you still make the most frequently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Really need to improve!</th>
<th>Need some improvement</th>
<th>Don’t need much help</th>
<th>Do not need to improve. I’m already good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Usage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mechanics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Style</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Organization &amp; Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. You may have wanted to explain an opinion you shared more fully. Please feel free to write anything about your feelings about Criterion and the native language feedback in the space provided.
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS

Amos’ transcriptions

Amos week 1:

t: It's your first time. You have never done anything like this before?

s: First time.

t. Your first time using a computer…thing?

s. Ya.

t: What is your overall…impression? Do you know that word? Like that. Yeah, that is an impression when you put your thumb down it makes an impression. People can make an impression on you. Also experiences can make an impression on you. So like it is something you are interested in. Do you like it or “eh no, it's not for me.” Like what kind of impression do you have, just from starting to use it.

s. Like. Yeah I do.

t. Why? Can you think of a reason?

s. On these or?

t. Why do you think you like it? We’ve tried it for about 3 weeks.

s. Yeah, it can give us give me some information about what mistakes I always do and I think sometimes later I can remember and to correct, don't mistake in the future. Because I think…errors is more less than before, because I remember the first here, maybe it’s about um the grammar or the second and the...

t. Usage?
s. Yeah usage maybe about um…the beginning 6 or 8, but this time it’s a 5 or 6 and when I fix it, I think it’s better.

t. Ah, interesting that’s interesting. So you think that you are partially satisfied so pretty satisfied, so so…what, what would make it even better, do you think, if you could design it or if you could change something, what would make it from a 3 to a 4?

s. Um..I think I need to… I need to recognize/ I need to understand this system more deeply so just a like some button on the right or something else I will fit better. And that means more time. Um, yeah...

t. Yeah...go...if you have longer time….

s. I will...I can suit about this very good…ya.

t. Ya, I understand. So…you said you used the writer’s handbook, which is right here.

s. because some mistakes...when I put the... how do you say that?

t. Cursor?

s. cursors to the blue highlights they just say maybe I’m wrong, but they don't tell me, so I look the handbook

s. which is the green boxes?

t. so you felt the green, that's what I call the green, feedback boxes when you go over the blue, and um

s. oh this is green!

t. so when you run your curser over the blue and the green comes up and you said...
s. I think that is not useful because just something the answer or something the answer
comments comments, it take can tell me how to do but … but something like this... they
don't.. I cannot understand what's the meaning and how to fix it. It just says you need to
look at the Writer's handbook.

t. It's not necessarily the words that you don't understand, its' that the information…
s. I understand the information, but when I saw that... I still don't know how to fix.

t. And so that pushes you to go to the writer's handbook.

s. Yeah.

t. Ok. So here when you said which one you the most you use the blue highlights
because that is these “because that is the most easy to do.”

s. It's the obvious things to do.

t. So do you think just by highlighting it can… you just look at the blue highlight and
then go down and fix it, usually?

s. Yeah, because when I see some blue highlights in the writing before I will think
something wrong so I will think how to fix it if I don't know, I will look the green and
look in the writer’s handbook.

t. Ok, so we have seen some green boxes coming up as we are watching so you did used
the green boxes, didn’t you? But you didn't find it as helpful as maybe these two.

s. yeah, yeah… just not as helpful as these 2. I just don't know the green this is before
yeah this is

t. You didn't understand what that meant, now you do?

s. Ya, now I understand, ya. I didn't understand … now I understand.

t. Ok, the English words were easy to understand?
s. Yeah, probably.

t. Were there some you didn't understand?

s. Some ac...academic words like something in the grammar that’s like these things I understand, but some, some examples in the writer’s handbook I can’t understand.

t. Oh, got it. So that makes it more clear. Some of these words are confusing ok so I wonder if we should go over them sometime, might be helpful.

s. Just like grammar class Some, some academic grammars phrase like blah, blah, blah phrase something... I don't know but... but totally I know that it in Chinese, but just don't know in English so...

t. So once you see it or see an example then you are like, “I know that.”

s. Yeah, when you see that example.

t. Yeah, and it’s just the words.

t. If I could have feedback in my own native language, did you understand that... that's like Chinese, I think that it would help me understand more fully... you disagree somewhat I am interested in that.

s. Just I think if the system more more higher technology in the beginning step, they will give some Chinese to make you to understand easily and then when you better and better the Chinese will be less lesser and lesser so in the mean, meantime or something after that all English and no Chinese. Then because some people in the beginning it was something, they also need to some helps by their native language, but if someone the English skills not very better that use this as the beginning maybe some, a lot of things they can understand, so I just....
t. So when they are using the program for the first time, do you think it would be very helpful until they get used to it?

s. But I chose this because they are most English is better so, but I am still don't disagree but also agree something.
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t. Ya, no, that’s totally fine. I’m interested in that, but do you think also: is it just about the computer program or is it about the student’s level?

s. Student’s level, student’s level, maybe.

t. Maybe. That’ll be interesting to keep thinking about as we’re using it. So the Amount of feedback was just right … not too much or too little and you agreed.

s. because I don't know I understand clearly about... amount of feedback.

t. You should have asked me, I said ask me if you don't know. (laughing) The amount means how much feedback they give you do you feel like I have had some students maybe want more feedback and some students maybe say that I don't read the writer’s handbook because it is too much…they get overwhelmed. How do you feel about it? Do have enough feedback? Like you said maybe the green boxes-- you didn't feel like maybe they told you enough, so you went to the writer’s handbook, or like, over all there's enough feedback for you or do you think you would like more or less?

s. I think this is ok, it’s ok, not more or less.

t. Ok, so you somewhat agree with that. “Even before this class, I felt confident correcting my essays” so even before this class, you felt pretty good at taking your essays and fixing your mistakes?
s. yeah, I just I don’t choose 4 because I just have problems in some academic words and some and some and some sentence I’m still Chinglish English is not very,...

t. That’s funny. I haven’t heard that before. That’s hilarious.

s. So just a 3.

t. Yeah, yeah. Criterion helps correct essays by myself you felt that you agree.

s. But I don't know, we only can write essays that you give me this can fix them but we cannot write anything else in that.

t. So I made a demo assignment in your, on your list of assignments, there should be one, no it's named text editor.... text editor and I made that for you guys so you can practice that one for you so you can practice for whatever you want. You can keep re-using it but that one you can answer any question you want to and it will grade it. It won't give you a score from 1-6 but it will help you...so look at it and tell me if you can find it and let me know.

s. And I think also can write under each line just like this week and last week but I can't write something different its ok because the system fix it not depend on the question.

t. It won't score you or give you a 1-6 if it's a different question. Since using Criterion, I have noticed which errors I use quite frequently… do you feel like yeah that has helped you notice that?

s. Yeah, I think most people would feel.


t. I think I would probably would too I was thinking I should type in it and see if there’s some patterns that come up.
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t. What mistake did you say do you make more frequently?
s. Some words like this.. I don't know how do you say these words...

t. Articles

s. Ya articles. Yeah I remember articles.

t. so in the green boxes something about articles

s. maybe something I write ..wrote quickly I forget them something a or not

t. so hard for chinese people especially

s. But some student can do that very well. I need to say “good” or “very well”? We also well for body good is for starting?

t. That would be a good thing for us to talk about we should talk about those words – good or well.....if you think of anything else like that tell me and maybe we could do one day of talking about those kinds of words. Ok, and then run-on sentences (looking at the paper).

s. Run-on sentences. Run-on sentences because sometimes I write some sentences too long or maybe something wrong. Run-on sentence means something is wrong?

t. It means it goes way too long lalallalalla without a period. Well, so good that is great. Is there anything else can think of that you want to mention about using this program. There doesn't need to be anything else but if there is anything else you wanted to say or.....

s. I don't understand to the left clearly um the last part- (pointing)

t. Organization and development?

s. It’s just give you some it just give you some topic, the body, something for essay do they have any other ....?
t. Function? Mostly it’s pointing out that you have these parts to your essay… cause and it highlights it so supposedly it highlights something and is says we think this is your thesis and you are like, this is not my thesis or that's not a good thesis, then you can fix it but they don't, yeah, they don't point out yeah you don't have a score here.. it's just for information, I think.

Turned off video

Amos week 2

t. Ok, so let’s look at your survey. Ok, so you said that you were satisfied with the… reason I ask the questions every week because maybe it changes. Maybe you are like I hate it now or maybe I like it now but you still agreed that you liked it.

s. Yeah

t. And you used all the parts of…

s. Because always some question can't find the answer in the blue highlights or only green feedback you need to come back to the writer’s handbook.

t. So you have used the writer’s handbook. How do you feel about that is it too much information do you think it’s about the right amount? do they give the example?

s. Yeah, just I can see examples I can understand example in the handbook but on something like used on, off, at those words I also cannot find that in the handbook, just like, I am remembering which essay…

t. So you would like maybe a little more information almost on some things?

s. No, just something like that.
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t. On specific?

s. Specific?

t. On how to use those kinds of words?

s. Yeah some words you use that together is wrong but…

t. Yeah that's very difficult that would be good for us to go over. It’s hard for us to go
over all the examples in the world but maybe if we have a general idea it might help.
Which of these types of feed back do you use the most... still the blue highlights the most,
ok… just because it’s…

s. Yeah, because that is the easy way to find and to correct, yeah.

t. So most of the time when you see the blue highlights, let’s see if you have any
mistakes… do you have any mistakes at all left? Let's check (looks at Camtasia) ok well
let’s pretend that these are mistakes. That’s repetition of words, but you see that it is
spelled wrong, let's pretend. Um you could just see that and go (Snap) oh ok?

s. And and find something wrong in my essay.


t. And the English words were easy to understand, still, for you?

s. Yeah


t. Ok


t. Were there any that you can think of? Specific ones that you didn't understand?

s. Umm I can't remember.

t. Yeah that’s hard to remember there are so many. like when they say fragment you
understand that?

s. Fragment.
When they say this sentence might be a fragment?

no

What about run-on?

run-on I know.

You know run-on? Fragment is the opposite of run-on. Um ok, so none stick out to you that you had no idea?

So… but this time it's the Chinese, so I can understand fragment (smiling) ya.

Yeah, yeah, yeah that really helps doesn't it? Um so “I liked having feedback in my own language,” #5. You agree somewhat, so tell me why you chose 3.

um because because um I look at 4 because I give 3 this time, because it is the first time, so maybe in my own language have some others not not good for you, just but it’s also ok its very good.

#6 because I had feedback in my own language it helped me to understand the feedback more fully.

(interrupting) Yeah, it’s, yeah.

So like things like maybe you can't remember a specific, but when you saw it, do you remember what you thought when saw it pop up? What were you thinking?

I thinking can know I can know what is my wrong. I can, in the first time, I can correct the answer.

I made more and better corrects to my paper because I had feedback in my native language. And you agreed somewhat with that; too.
s. Because I remember last week and before I also can I also can use the feedback not in my native language to correct my paper, so I just give 3, but I think have own language is is helpful more helpful yeah.

t. You agreed that the amount of feedback was just about right again so you didn't feel like it was like…would you like, can you think of any changes that you would like, like the green boxes do you think they give you enough, or you said they don't give you enough? so you go to the writer’s handbook yeah, but you can't really read a huge thing either like, what do you think?

s. um I think that that ways that way is the orig, original to way people to understand these something that that because only can go to writer’s handbook you can know why and the why that something need to be used in that way not only in high, highlight or green.

t. And again, and I think you put this last week, that you think Criterion helps you to correct your essays by yourself. Since using Criterion I have notice which errors I use most frequently and you said yes.

s. Yes.

t. And run-on sentences.

s. yeah

t. Ok how do you connect your sentences, do you just keep going without any punctuation, or do you put commas in between independent clauses or what do you think?
s. Some sentences I don't know how to fix sentence I just, I cannot put comma, I just per…?

t. Period?

s. Period, because I put comma, it’s still run-on sentence, so I just need… I can't shorten into shortened into short sentence but in that way that is not the meaning I want to say, but I don't maybe next week I have something ask how fix sentence.

7.06

t. oh, that would be really good to ask me when you run into those, um I wonder if it’s… do you see any on here that maybe that would be hard to find....here there..(Camtasia) there's less color on there. I wonder if it’s the transition, or the conjunction kind of words. That may be instead of putting just a comma if you had a comma…word… then joining 2 sentences together and…

s. comma words only all of comma word like, but, and

8.04

t. and, or, for, so, yet

s. and so words, and the comma before and?

t. Yes, comma ,and comma ,or comma ,for comma ,so comma ,yet.

s.Ok.

t. Yeah.

t. Complete sentence and then one of those comma, word, and then another complete sentence makes a big long sentence but its ok it’s correct because it is joined by a comma and a conjunction.
s. maybe that maybe it has another, another wrong in that sentence just like yeah don’t have some verb or some others is wrong.

s. right you might be trying to join might like have 2 dependent clauses or you might have a dependent and an independent which is correct but you join them incorrectly. Let’s see I am trying to see if you have a dependent ok I am trying to find an example here. You fixed almost everything here and that’s great. Yeah, I don't see an example of what I was thinking of.

9.42

s. …in the future.

t. Yeah in the future we can work on it. Do you have an opinion do you think yet of who the L1 maybe would be helpful for? Do you think it would be helpful for everybody in our class? Do you think some people it would be more helpful for, or like… some teachers don't allow students to use their cell phones to look in their Chinese cell phones. Do you think everybody should be able to use it do you think a teacher should decide if you could use it and you can't what do you think about that?

10.22

s. I think I agree that because, because we should not used my cell phone in the Chinese to search the English words, but if I want to do that I think we need to… but some just like me English to English dictionary. I cannot understand the directorily, no the directorily, the meaning yes but we need to turn to that way, but I don't know how to do that better, so I agree we don't need to use that for, but I don’t know we don't do that how can we do another ways to works better?
t. So in Criterion I, with the language, do you think I should let the whole class have their language, Chinese, Korean or or do you think it would help some people more or less? Should that a teacher's decision? What do you think? Who gets the language or who doesn't? Does somebody need it more?
s. I think the next can the next can this can use your own language, and another next week, didn't use maybe can find something different between that’s two times and can compare maybe they’ll know have own language is better or didn't have own language was better.
t. That’s great. Thank you so much!

Amos week 3

t. Alright, well here’s your survey and…let me just look at this really quick…Alright, so…um we are going to focus really on the back page, so I’m just gonna go through this part really fast. You said you agreed that you were satisfied with the feedback?

s. Yes.
t. …even though it didn't have…. The, the, the, uh..

s. question.
t. Chinese.

s. yeah.
t. it was still ok?

s. yeah.
t. okay. And you said you used all of them and you did um I looked through your thing and there you are using the writers handbook you only used it a couple of times you know kind of briefly and I think was… I think they were both for reasons for verbs… verb issues. Are those the ones you normally have trouble with? Why, what prompted you, what made you decide to look at the Writer’s Handbook for those? Do you remember?

s. (looking at Camtasia) …mmmm I need to look…(pointing)

t. Oh see what was before you did it?

s. What’s that?

t. Um…You may be using the wrong preposition. And… it said ‘wrong by their own experiences’ and so “by” was highlighted so you were looking for preposition information and they don't list it there do they?

s. Yes.

t. What were you thinking when you saw that? When they didn't list it?

s. Just close it and change another word.

t. Ok, I looked at that one too and I thought that was interesting that they had flagged this word but then when you went to the Writer’s handbook they didn't show you information about that… so did you use the Writer’s handbook again or was it just once?

s. Just once.

t. Yeah, I think maybe. Oh, I put you down for twice, so maybe you looked at it another time too.

So um, you used all of them though. Um, you still like the blue highlights best.

s. Yes.
t. Yeah, why?

s. Because that is the first thing I can see.

t. MMM. Mhm. Do you feel like you can usually just see the blue highlight and go down here and correct it without looking at anything else or….
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s. Some, some, mistake just like this one, can and not, can yeah not look green feedbacks.

t. Are there some mistakes that you feel you need to look at the green feedback boxes for?

s. Yes.

t. What types of mistakes can you…er maybe grammar usage… again is there like any grouping of mistakes that you usually think that you maybe either just use the blue or do you always look at the green

s. The grammar, but this time the grammar mistake is the… most less.

t. The smallest? Oh nice, congratulations.

s. This is the first time I get 6 out of 6.

t. I saw that! Congratulations that that (motions with yeah)

s. But I don't know but actually but actually this this essay I think is not. I think it I do not pay more much attention don't know why

t. That's interesting… so that when you get the highest score on this one it’s kind of like, “ohhh!”
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s. But I don't know.

t. Yeah. How they decide? Maybe you were more clear…
s. Maybe yeah yeah more clear.

t. In some areas even if your ideas weren't as deep?

s. because I saw here the last one. This maybe ideas more clearly.

 t. Your structure there that they are showing is really solid, isn’t it? Um, ok, and you said the English was easy to understand.

 s. yeah

 t. Ok, so these are the ones that I am really interested in this time.

 s. They changed.

    t. Yeah, they changed.

    t. So ‘I missed having feedback in my own language this week. I want to have it back.’

    s. First choice I choose, first time I choose that.

 t. Oh, ya I see that, you erased #3, and moved it to 2 tell me why.

 s. Because I saw Dragon (another student’s). He's one, so….

 t. That's funny. Don't do that… I want to know what you think!

 s. Ya, I also think…oh, so I’m disagree so I can't choose agree somewhat maybe choose disagree somewhat.

 t. Ok ok so why do you think you didn't miss it, so much? You missed it a little, but not maybe, maybe you don't really miss it… is what it is kind of saying.'I missed having feedback’ and you disagreed with that, but you really didn't miss it.

 s. Uh huh.

 t. Yeah, why?
s. Because maybe some mistakes I also need some clearer clearly explained but but, but I think we can only use the English to know to understand what it says.

t. So you think that the English is enough for you to understand?

s. No.

t. No?

s. Enough to understand?

t. Understand your mistake?

s. Yeah, its ok.

t. It’s ok.

s. yeah.

t. Okay. ‘The feedback was harder for me to understand this week because I only had English’ and so you disagreed again.. so you said it wasn't really harder.
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s. It's not very hard.

t. Yeah.

t. Do you think that’s because you understand English so well? Do you think it’s because you are a good reader and you think that maybe people that aren’t as good readers would feel differently or what do you think?

s. Yeah, I think maybe we use Criterion reading more times then we know much much the academic that word so cannot...oh, we CAN understand easily than before.

t. Oh ok so maybe it’s a function of getting really, really used to what they’re saying and so maybe you don't rely on ah huh ok…Um ‘the corrections I made to my paper were just as good and accurate as they were last time even though I didn't have my native language
feedback.’ And you agreed totally with that so you feel that your corrections weren't, weren’t hurt because of the Chinese. Ok, does that make sss… now you are looking confused.

s. Yeah, ok.

t. Sometimes you when read these you have to read them a couple of times, but you are just saying this week you fixed it just as well as you did last week when you had Chinese even though you didn't have it this week, it was still fine.

s. Yes, still fine.

t. Yeah, um do you think there was a different, you only used the Writer’s handbook a couple of times this week one or two times. Do you think you used it more when you had the Chinese translation?

s. I think that is true… if I if we have Chinese translation, maybe we will use more Writer’s handbook.

t. Ok why?

s. because because because some academic words in Writer’s handbook we cannot understand in English very easily but in Chinese we can know what it say and we can find which one we need to search which one we need to look.

t. ok ok how did…

s. Oh! yeah so… maybe maybe the blue highlight and green maybe the blue highlight and green how do you say

t. boxes…

s. Boxes do not need to use Chinese, but yeah, Writer’s handbook maybe have Chinese very helpful.
t. Ok, you think it would encourage you to use the Writer’s handbook more if it had
the…you think?

s. yes.

t. Ok, and do you think that would be the case for… So IEOP, for instance, has 6 levels
1,2,3,4,5,6, we are in level 3, um if all 6 levels used Criterion, um…
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s. Yeah I know some another writing class they don't… high level… they do not use the
Criterion.

t. It's just our class.

s. Oh, ok.

t. I got you in.

s. …but many freshman use this.

t. Yes yes…the other…when you get to the university, the classes use this.

s. Yeah because, because one day we were talking about our writing essay, the freshman
friend said they use, but another writing class say they don't know what’s this.

t. and you are like ‘yeah!’ so really, because you already know you will be ahead when
you get there so it will be nice.

s. It’s very useful.

t. It will be nice I am hoping that will be the case um but so do you think… so pretend
IEOP, all the writing classes got to use this and um the teachers could decide whether
they gave their students Chinese or not. What do you think about that? All of ‘em
should. All of ‘em shouldn’t?
s. The lower level give more Chinese in their... the higher level I think do not need Chinese to explain.

t. so they don't need to but, do you think they should...do you think they should have the choice or do you think the teacher should make the choice for them? 

s. I think the first time the teacher will make choice for them but if something wrong with something not very good can change.

 t. So like a level 6 person the teacher should decide whether they get English or Chinese? 

s. Yeah.

 t. ...is what you are saying. And then what if...what would happen? You said something might happen?

s. Yeah. If all if they can do that very good so do not need to change but if something bad just change it later.

 t. Oh, like so if a student isn't doing very well, then give them...

s. another...

 t. the extra help?

s. (nods) Ok, so only our class uses this now?

 t. Yeah

s. Ok. We are so lucky.

11.04

 t. Yeah cuz I am studying Criterion with a research group and we are all looking at different things and so I said my students need to have this, so they bought your seats. The university paid for them so that is great. So now you’ll probably have to retrain when you go to the university but at least you’ll already know and that’ll be nice. You’ll feel be
more, more secure. Um…and ‘You felt the amount of feedback’… so the amount of things that are written in the green boxes, you think that's a good amount or you think it should be more or less?

s. I think it’s good.

t. Good amount?

s. …not to more or too less.

t. And in the Writer’s handbook, do you feel that’s too much information or…

s. I think if we if we can, but yep, I think the writer’s handbook maybe just like our book can if that can create and the readers like to read story to learn the main idea in that can be more useful to put that on there after writing to find mistake on it.

t. ok.

s. …or find the answer, find the answer.

t. So, so more so so you talked about the book so more things like the books says, in there (pointing).

s. Yeah, but I think most of main ideas in the writer’s handbook we know much but still if if the most we don't know I think can take off and start in the class, after class, just like the Monday we go to lab, right (t. yes) to do essays (t. yes) and just like you can tell us to learn one thing or two things we always make mistake in the writers which one and told us not only finish our essay also we need to look that and you will give some little little one or two sentence to yeah.
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t. Like a little lesson you were talking about before?

s. yes, yes.
t. …and then focus on that while you are writing. That's a good idea that's a good idea for a use in the classroom, yeah, I like that. Do you think by yourself, correcting an essay at home, um would be… this will be my last question… would be just as, you could do it with Criterion and just yourself, or would you prefer do you prefer correcting in class to be able to do it and ask questions of the teacher or another student. Do you like correcting in class or would you rather correct just at home by yourself.

s. I think oh ok…

t. Do you understand the question?

s. Yeah, I understand I think.

t. Cuz this one says “Criterion helps me correct my essays by myself and you agree” I am just asking about… do your preference completely by yourself or do you like it with Criterion and the teacher or how do you…

s. I think we can short our time seeing that just like the Monday we begin do that and we need to finish until Wednesday, but I think we can… you can said we can finish end finish the Criterion before Wednesday and the Wednesday can talk some most mistake or something else or something important and that (t. ok) yeah I think most of us can can do that by ourselves.

t. Ok, good.

s. other people choose the 4 so I didn't know

t. Ya, a lot of people agree with that one, ya.

s. because just because just something because maybe you finish that maybe 1 or 2 error we can know how to change that at that time we can talk about together in the class and we will know that we can learn together.
t. ok ok good…and then you notice you make run-on sentences and that is the one that you went to the writers handbook for, I am pretty sure. What’s the error in your run-on sentences that you normally make? Do you, do you just put comma-- stick 2 independent clauses together-- do you forget the word or what do you think the problem is? Do you forget a period?

s. no the, the problem…

t. for you…

s. and, and I asked you, you also didn't know. You said that is the right sentence but that still mark as a run-on sentence. (note: Criterion mistake, check Camtasia if needed)

t. Oh ok now I remember that. I will have to look at that again but you had 2 run-on sentences. Right and one really was, wasn't it? One really was a run-on sentence and you fixed it and then you asked me about the 2nd one?

s. Yep because the first one, yeah.

t. Maybe. So you think you do make that was a wrong correction from Criterion, right, they made a mistake but you think you do make a lot of mistakes, real mistakes, on run-ons.

s. About the time, is more or less than before.

t. Good, good, that's great. Do you think you would recognize that you made a run-on if you didn't have Criterion… like if you were reading a paper and I said there were 2 run-on sentences, do you think you could find them?

s. I think that is a good way to improve our English, but yeah I think we could do that. Just like yeah that's a good way but need to do that before the class just like mm yeah

t. Oh ok… before you write.
s. Yeah just like the homework.

t. Yes.

s. You tell us we need to find some run-ons we need to find that and do our best to fix that and that the next day we talk about.

t. Ok, ok that's great. Fantastic.

s. Yeah, maybe more efficiency.

s. More efficient.

t. Ok, Good suggestions. Good suggestions.

t. Thank you so much.

s. No problem.

Amos week 4

t. Ok, you were agreed somewhat that you were somewhat satisfied…would it be the same reason as you said before how to move it up to agree?

s. …because this week we have some Chinese, so yeah.

t. So you liked the Chinese or you didn’t?

s. Um…I think the Chinese in the writer’s handbook would be better than in the green feedback.

t. Oh, ok!

s. Because in the green feedback, the first sentence, I can understand the meaning very what it said but in the writer’s handbook I can, I can see the Chinese at first and look at example, and something maybe easy for student to understand what they said.
t. Ok, so when you said the green feedback boxes, the first sentence was easy to understand you were saying the English is easy to understand in the green or are you saying the Chinese?

s. I think in the feedbacks both the English and Chinese **both not very easy for the student to understand** because they have something many academic and something that word in that, but in the writer’s handbook they have many examples and many something to tell you.

t. Ok, understand.

s. Ok.

t. and you liked the green one…or the blue ones again?

s. Ya the blue ones.

t. Ya, um why?

s. The same reason.

t. Ya?

s. Convenient.

t. Convenience, ya, okay! (Writing…asks) Are you doing ok?

s. Ya...I feel long time, no see.

t. Ya, it has been. Um ok so…right here is says how helpful were these types this semester and you said you really liked the blue and the green and you thought the writer’s handbook was somewhat helpful.

s. Because the writer’s handbook is the…how do you say…this one the more less one I used.

t. Ya.
s. How to say?

t. Um... you used it the least frequently.

s. Oh, yes. Least frequently.

t. Uh huh, or the least often.

s. ...so for this reason I choose somewhat helpful.

t. Ok, got it, ya.

s. This is not scientist, just my (pointing to self)

t. This is the whole thing, this is just your opinion, the whole thing, so it's totally, it.

doesn't need to be scientific ya.so...here it was very helpful to have native language

feedback with this type of feedback so...you made two different kinds of marks--what are

these sideways marks? What do they mean? And then you have checks. Remember?

s. Oh, oh, yes, just choose, I remember, just choose this one is not very helpful,
somewhat helpful because it had some Chinese.


t. Ok, so... so having Chinese was somewhat helpful for the green boxes...you're saying

it was somewhat helpful for the green boxes?

s. No, I just think it is not very helpful so I just choose the second one...I think that this is

the most, then this is the second.


t. Oh ok, so you thought the blue highlights, it was somewhat helpful to have the

Chinese?

s. No.


t. No?

s. The blue highlights don’t have Chinese, right, just (motions) the blue highlight.


t. Nodding...right, so maybe it didn’t make a difference.
s. I don’t understand what this box is.

t. Oh, ok! Well, then if you want to change any of them, you can. The writer’s handbook do you think the Chinese is very helpful for people in the writer’s handbook, or just somewhat helpful, to have Chinese, their own language, or do you think it didn’t make a difference for you?... in the writer’s handbook?

s. I think maybe in the writer’s handbook maybe it’s very helpful but I didn’t…

t. Understand the question?

s. No no no I didn’t open the handbook to see and in the Chinese and English so I don’t know whether or not.

t. Um…you DID use it the writer’s handbook a couple of times this week. I looked on your Camtasia interview and you did use it a few times, but maybe you might not remember (laughing)! So, you would think that the Chinese would be very helpful, though, for people in the writer’s handbook?
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s. Ya, in the writer’s handbook. So, just choose one…

 t. Ok.

s. Just choose this one second.

 t. and then the green highlights, the second one, it’s somewhat helpful…

s. (nods)

 t. is that what you’re saying? and then the blue highlights, which one would you say?

s. points to “doesn’t make a difference.”

 t. ok.
s. the green highlights have some native language maybe for some lower level students maybe. Useful, ya.

t. ok..(writing) useful for lower level (to have native language). Um okay, you agree that the English is easy to understand and you weren’t really glad to have the Chinese back, why?

s. I think English more useful, this here, because only in this way, we can change the idea…don’t …the thinking style…because in Chinese I think…is not good for you change your thinking style…I do not know how you say that word, I think so…do you understand?

t. I think I do…ya…I think I do. You want to start thinking in English.

s. English, English, no, not translating into Chinese then come back.

7:00

t. Do you think students themselves should be able to choose if they get the Chinese or not? Or do you think that should be the job of a teacher choosing which students get it? Or just low-level or high-level?

s. Ya. I think just a low-level or high-level different.

t. Ok, so you didn’t like it, but you did think it was easier to understand.

s. hmmm…that is true, ya.

t. Corrections, I made were better and more accurate, since or because, I had feedback in my native language.

s. Oh, of course.

t. (nodding) Ya, because you understand the English well, so maybe it doesn’t make a difference for you.
s. And something because, oh, a way is many difficult words I can’t understand, we can ask you and many friends to understand, so I don’t think the native language…ya…

t. Made a difference. Ok! And these are three from the other weeks too, so you still like the amount and you feel like it does help you correct them by yourself?

s. nods.

t. Ya? Do you feel more confident in correcting them when you’re working in Criterion?

s. ya.

t. Than just on paper?

s. On paper?

t. If you were just correcting an essay on paper, or would you rather correct it in Criterion or just on paper?

s. (no response)

t. …like if I gave you an essay to fix, would you rather fix it with Criterion’s help or just with yourself.

s. Oh no! Need Criterion. (laughs)

t. oh, I figured so..(reads) since using Criterion, I have (trails off) which you did so (turns page), what errors do you think you make most frequently? It’s just the same one as last time. Which ones…which kind do you think?

s. Um, wrong sentence and article.

t. ok I did see you make some article errors this time, ya.

s. Sometimes I forget to put ‘a’ or ‘the’

t. Ya, ya I saw that, but when they highlighted them you fixed ‘em really quickly.

s. nods
t. Ya. So this is part 2. My feelings about writing in English have become more positive, I have become more positive about Criterion, and your writing you feel like, has improved?

s. Ya. I can. More words than before.

t. Oh, your word count’s higher! (check this) oh, great! Criterion and its feedback helped my writing improve this semester and you agreed with that.

s. Ya, because it let me know what errors I always do. Fix that.

t. Ya ya. Visually sometimes, that helps people. Um…the writing class and teacher helped my writing improve this semester and you thought so.

s. ya…of course! (laughing)

t. You didn’t have to say that! (laughing) But if we have time we’ll come back to that, but um…don’t wanna get you late for class.

s. No, class is just in Ross.

t. Oh, perfect. Oh, ok, great. I would like to continue using Criterion after this class ends. Did that question make sense? I was hoping it did, like do you want to keep using Criterion for your other classes or keep your seat so you can always use it, that’s, that was my question. And you agreed…that you would like to continue using Criterion after our writing class ends and you agreed. How would you use it?

s. I just think, if I in the class, didn’t finish, I can today finish, don’t…is different meaning.

t. OH! Ya.

s. So when you said that I was surprise there was another meaning. I just think if I…yeah.

t. Oh very interesting. Ya.
s. I think many students in the writing class think like me, just think in the writing class, after class we also use this to fix our writing essays.

t. Oh ok, I might have to ask this again….that’s the question. Ok, so when our class ends in December, would you like to continue using Criterion. That’s the question. What’s your answer, it can be different. What would you use it for?

s. Ya. For in the future, we have many essays we need to give to the professor, so we can use that to make our essays more, no more, just better.

t. yay a ya, that’s correct!

s. Always more and better together!

t. I know…more better! Little kids do that all the time, so (laughs) it’s not uncommon.

11:37

s. I’m agree, but just a little lucky, so I put somewhat. (laughing)

t. Ya, somebody last semester put disagree! (laughing) It was kinda funny. Having feedback in my native language helped me to understand the feedback more fully or better and you somewhat agree with that.

s. Native language is harmful for us to learn English but is...effect is some useful things. Just in the writer’s handbook can give you more information for you to understand what they said.

t. hmmm…hmmmm…What did you think about the Chinese itself, did you feel that it was easily understandable words or did you think that the words that the Chinese used were hard words or…
s. The Chinese words is not hard words, but the meaning is very…complex.

t. Oh.

s. Is is very…the words is easy, but the sentence meaning is also don’t, not easy to understand, so in the green feedback is not very useful, but I think in the writer’s handbook, that Chinese word maybe easy to understand and to know what they said.

t. Ok, so the words of the Chinese are easy, but the meaning is a little…iffy little hard.

s. Ya.

t. Okay. So what kind of student would most benefit? You thought intermediate students would most benefit. Um…why wouldn’t low level students benefit? I’m just trying to get to um…this is not a wrong answer, I just want to know what your thinking was…you figured intermediate students would be best at Criterion or

s. Oh, I think another meaning this, and this time I will think only this. What type of student would most benefit…

 t. …would most benefit from using a program like Criterion: high, kind of middle, low, or all levels.

s. Ya, because I think the high level, in the high level, so they don’t need use this much than the median and the lower. And these two, this the basic is more better than…oh, is better than low level students, so I think this is the most.


s. It also benefit all levels, but I just see this question have the most, so I just only choosed one.
t. That’s great. That’s totally fine and I kind wanted people to choose one, but it’s okay if they chose more. What type of students would benefit from having the Chinese feedback and you thought intermediate and low.

s. ya.

t. Ya. Again, is it the same reason that you feel that the high level shouldn’t have it?

s. Ya. Because high-level is already the high level, so they don’t need to understand.

t. Just don’t need it. Ok. You though grammar is goin’ well….these kind of errors…for you, a little bit usage on the prepositions, maybe? Maybe in the articles?

s. yay a ya.

t. That’s what I saw.

s. I always saw the four parts of usage have more though, have the most errors.

t. Errors in yours, ok. Mechanics, the spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, you thought those are good for you.

s. nods

t. Um…need some improvement with style… mostly this one? Repetition?

s. Many the similar words.

t. Hmmm…that’ll improve with vocabulary.

s. Ya, vocabulary, yes.

t. Ya. And uh just the organization like you felt you’re, you get it , you understand the structure…

s. Ya, but …understand the structure

t. Ok, Criterion is a good tool for learners to improve their writing skills but it also needs to be more full. What do you mean by full?
s. Just like some word in this part and this part (pointing to parts of the survey paper) if this system right is better than two…just like in style the repetition of words,…it gives errors, but it cannot give me something help…just if it can give one or two more that word, maybe can ya, more better. This part is not very good.

t. Like synonyms or something that you could use.

s. Ya. due…Or, I said Chinese word!

t. Ya…oh, did you! I was like, I’m not sure what he said but he said.

s. Because due means yes.

Allan’s Interviews
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11.25 start at…

t. Ok, this is the first time you've used a computer to score your writing and you felt satisfied

s. yeah

t. ok

s. yeah I feel satisfied because um it is a new things and I usually can work out somethings is very obsessive program...

t. obvious?
s. yeah obvious program of mine (t. ok) I think teacher something he read essay careful
careful careful because teacher writing teacher so you need be careful you need to fix our
program even if its not obvious one
t. obvious
s. during the tougher example in in other people to see very quickly
t. yes
s. they were in lots of a
t. yes, problems
s. not obvious problem but they can always see obvious problem, that that’s problem
have already ask us and and just like um I don't know the wrong word
t. the repetition of words, spelling…
s. yeah repetition, yes, the spelling this would be obvious, so I feel this would be a great
things, so I choose observer. (means obvious here)
t. Ok, and you said you used the green feedback boxes, so that’s when you go over the
blue ones and then that green box appears and you used those. Did you, did you use the
writer’s workbook at all or not? The writer’s handbook?
s. writer’s handbook?
t. That one where you click and a box comes… you didn't use that one.

13.29

s. No used that one

t. Ok and the blue highlights.. that’s these… so did you, did you…
s. Actually I don't understand where we are during. actually he grants both I think maybe
I will if I choose not not choose the green one, choose the blue one
t. You can use as much as you want so

s. I choose the blue one

t. So ‘these parts’ means that you can choose more than one

s. I choose the blue highlights

t. …and you used the blue highlight too, so sometimes you just looked at the blue and fixed it?

s. Ya, because because I have already learned lots of grammar you know my country more than 10 years, so some suggest he (Criterion) put out and I will understand why I am wrong and also also the green feedback box sometimes difficult for me to understand.

t. Ok, why?

s. Because he put some academic words and some and if the green box very long, I will lose my patient to see. Ya, I will REALLY lose patient to have a look at that because I have because I always try to find the easy way to figure out the program, and I learn lots of grammar and notes, so I'll never choose to see how long and difficult to understands green box. Just instead, I figure out the problem by my knowledge and by myself so….

t. Well that’s very interesting to me and I think that that's really good points that you make, but I think it’s interesting because here (on survey) you say you use the green feedback boxes because they’re easy to understand!!

s. I don't know. I just missed the feedback is the…

t. You meant the blue?! (on the survey)

s. blue

t. So here you actually meant the blue, oh!
s. It’s the blue its the blue yeah, because you pulled out blue you can see how many mistakes you make and and just will show you can really easy to understand why you’re you’re…

t. So here, where you checked green, you actually meant, check blue?

s. Yeah check blue.

t. Ok great. And you already told me the English words you already used were easy to understand-- you agreed with that.

s. Easy words feedback-- you mean in the green?

t. Just in the green in over here all the English words you had to read to fix your mistake and here you said there “it was sometimes difficult and sometimes used academic word”

s. maybe maybe agree somewhat the most I used is you tell us about which books has something functional to figure to fix fix our essays. I just reading the certain one you tell us, so maybe I have little time to watch, to reveal, all the function of the software. I think that also lots of the Chinese student who do that he will not to of the information of the facilitator always follow the teacher, always use the usually use the one, and even to know which one the meaning, but he know the function to fix this to how to fix the essays

17.48

t. Ok, that’s very interesting. If you could have, you (pointing), if you could have feedback in your own native language-- so in Chinese-- I think it would help me to understand the feedback more fully and you agreed somewhat.

s. Yeah, because we learning English so use my native language is still not very well, but instead Chinese, I think the more useful… is the simple words that I don't know how to
understand the meaning if you cannot do that then better have a teacher to teach us… to
tell us the function of the word and to show us yeah maybe you tell us we cannot
understand because for me…
t. words…
s. during the the class is maybe you also then also been identified, but we cannot
concentrate on all the things so the best thing to figure out this program is to show us how
to do that to use the computer what’s there and to understand and we will understand very
quickly.
t. I see, I see. Yes, that’s good.   The amount of feedback was just about right not too
much and not too little… (reading from survey) that means how much feedback they give
you. You told me over here that maybe it was too long too much and you lost patience in
the green boxes, here you said that you agree that it was about right… that's ok, it’s ok!
s. Maybe maybe, maybe the I choose this for I don't understand very well.
t. That’s okay! Which one would you choose if you understand it now? Not too much,
not too little, it was just a right amount.
s. Yeah it is difficult to choose because I see some green boxes with short and some with
long so…
t. Ok, so (writing) some green, short and some… too long?
s. too long, yeah.
t. Ok! Ok. Um, before this class you felt confident correcting your essays and you said
yes
s. yes I read it because I saw the ETS I think ETS is real is really straightforward and after I use this after I know the function of this software I feel I can it will help me to figure out lots of problem that I usually make
t. but even before you used this like not not using Criterion, just you and your paper do you feel confident you can correct your essays in English on paper
s. without the software
t. without the software
s. actually I try to figure my essays in high school. I write lots of essays and also I try to figure out I 3-4 times even I go to my teacher still he know lots of mistake in essays so I think…
t. so maybe just by yourself… not so much?
s. just by myself just by myself maybe I can look at something obvious mistake but I still need a teacher to help
t. ok ok. So if you were gonna answer this question today, understanding what this means, which one do you think you would pick? Oops, oops, this one, “before this class I felt confident in correcting my essays”
s. Maybe I will give that 2 points maybe a 2 because the 3-4, I still need teacher to help me
t. 3-4 times, uh huh.
s. Even still 3 or 4 times I know where we are so I still so if the teacher just help me out once that mean my essays really improve a lot.
t. Yeah that makes sense!... So “Criterion helps me to correct my essays by myself”… do you feel like this software can help you correct it by yourself, more than you alone with your paper?

s. I just will choose, I will choose 3 point.

t. ok.

s. As I said, it can put our sense in of obvious things the he cannot pick the logic and supporting so that is something can something a person cannot do that’s why I pick 3 point.

s. ok and then “since using Criterion I have noticed which errors I make more frequently” or most and you said yeah that you started to notice.

s. mmmm

t. maybe?

s. yeah.

s. here you said the mistakes you make are grammar and words and spelling.

s. Yeah that is the obvious put out I always made the mistake, so but still I always make mistake that I cannot see-- my logic and supporting are not…

t. …so those are what you feel is lacking, but maybe since using Criterion you’ve noticed you make these errors a lot?

s. Yeah.

t. Ok that's great.
Allan week 2

T. Alright, so here's your survey for week 2. Same question as last week you were satisfied with the feedback and you agreed.

s. yeah.

t. So you’re happy with what criterion tells you?

s. yeah.

t. ok.

s. I feel that is very good.

t. Ok, and it says you used the blue highlights so these…

s. Yeah.

t. …and then the green boxes too.

s. Yeah because I can really in my native country language…

t. Oh yeah? What did you think of that when you saw Chinese pop up, what did you think?

s. Just a just a just a more quickly can understand so I will not lost my patience to a watch a lot of the words

t. So you didn't lose your patience so you read the whole thing?

s. Yeah because I just use the green and watch for a 2 the first.

t. Ok.

s. Yes, I think I use the green feedback boxes feel more and more yes I feel this week helpful.

t. Ok good you didn't use writers handbook this week you didn’t go up here this week no?

ok. That has Chinese also did you know that?
s. Yeah, that is that has Chinese off by something it’s not very difficult and I cannot figure out in my knowledge. I have already missed maybe I can maybe I will to see writer’s handbook but if I can figure out I think I will not spend time doing that.

t. So maybe it’s a time thing cause it takes a lot of time?

s. Also if you watch that and maybe a little complicate, because if you not it unnecessary to watch what they say the knowledge again, if these things I don't know watch and learn again.

2.38

t. Ok and you said you used the blue highlights because they were easy for you to check out your problems?

s. Yeah I I I just I knew the essay I knew the blue boxes and know which one which mistake I have a made and I can I can fix my mistake.

2.38

t. Yeah.

s. Were easy. Just can read it first. Solve all problem in me, so in me.

2.38

t. So, ones like spelling when the blue boxes on them, maybe they are easy? There would be some… maybe that would be hard with just the blue and not green maybe? I don’t know, some grammar mistakes?

s. Yeah.

2.38

t. You would need to look at the green.

2.38

s. I think lots of things the spelling maybe cannot be in program because you can check it out dictionary. The grammar, need a green box.

3.39

t. Yeah a little bit of extra help!
s. Ya, also we can sometimes we can see all the why we are wrong, but if we watch the
green box just a second then we ask.

t. Look at you… looking at the writers handbook! (Camtasia)

s. That’s you telling me to write down.

t. Oh is that me telling you to? Ok, that's funny, that’s funny, so you didn't go back there.

That’s awesome.

s. Yeah and a little confused about repetition. I want to watch a little. I watch, watch the
information about that I want to know how much repity words can bear.

t. Like a number?

s. Like can use, so I want to know that so I watch that.

t. Did it answer your question or not really? Did you find out the answer or not?

s. After watch that, I yeah I I can understand something, but I still not find how many
words that.

t. You want a number, yeah, and it didn't tell you.

s. So I have asked, so I have asked you, in my memory.

t. Yeah you did you did ask me! So, ok interesting. The English words were easy to
understand and you agree somewhat with that.

s. Yeah the feedback that the green ones because I have Chinese I can understand the
mistake but but I still can once I still not see my words after watch green boxes, so maybe
I can understand something wrong, but I don’t know where it is wrong because it just just
give us the blue ones and if it just a grammar they maybe the sentence, the whole
sentence, maybe have something problem not just a word so leave me a little confused.
t. Ok, and so here… yeah I remember, you were looking for synonyms, weren't you? Other words to use? (dictionary in Camtasia) Good idea. Good idea. Ok this one—“I liked having feedback in my own language in addition to English this week” yeah you agreed with that.

s. Yeah, really agree.

t. Yeah, really agree why?

s. Kind of is easy to understand and not waste lot of time on green boxes and have more time to fix essays and will not made me lost my… patient (Ah ok) because I loss I loss I loss the green boxes make me hurry and and loss my patient, even that will affect me to fix my essays.

t. Interesting, interesting points, interesting points.

s. I think maybe psychology problem, if you lost patient in on point, in 1 part, you will not want to do the whole part.

t. Sometimes on tests you feel like that probably…maybe?

s. Yeah maybe, my teacher in school want us to get over this problem and I try even during in the test maybe I have some problem, very difficult and maybe not at end just in beginning or the middle if you spend lots of time to work out that problem, you will not want to do….

t. Yeah, yeah, yeah…the other ones “because I had feedback in my own language it helped me to understand more” and you said you agreed.

s. Yeah I understand more…. that is the sure.

t. …and you said that it helped you do it quicker too, ya more and quicker.

s. Yeah.
t. Um…”I made more and better corrections to my paper because I had feedback in Chinese.” So, because you had Chinese, Maybe you had more and better corrections?
s. Yeah I really help me to make fix lots of problem and repetition, plus the make a mistake, I try to… because sometimes maybe I know what the problem is but don’t know how to figure out.
t. So you said you agree somewhat cause maybe because maybe you would make some corrections in English?
s. Yeah because I don’t know how to figure out maybe maybe if another box that you give me example and put all main point in that box in the sentence maybe I can understand well about it just little, a really little time to use them because I cannot figure out the problems by just 1 or 2
t. Ok yeah.
s. It doesn’t matter doesn’t fix a lot.
t. Ok, so just somewhat… kind of here.
s. Yeah sometimes even if I made a mistake because I can ask the a teacher if I cannot understand ask the teacher maybe the teacher can explain more well than the just the box.
t. Ok yeah that’s true so if you didn’t have a teacher, maybe then the Chinese would be more important?
s. Yeah but now I have a teacher… so I am not worry about that.
t. Yeah.
s. Even also I can figure out problem when I try out more tense
~ Talk about tenses here....~

10.42
t. Try, try again! Ok and you said the amount of feedback you somewhat agree the
amount of feedback was just about right, not too much, not too little? Do you think in
general, do you think it’s a little too much or a little bit too small?
s. When I watch the green box in my native language, I just catch 1 or 2 words and I
understand what the problem is, so usually I don't watch whole sentence a whole
paragraph to understand really well, so maybe I thought still with lots of time, I maybe
loss my patient and in addition, if I do that very carefully, that will make my brain narrow
become narrow and even can lose thought.
t. So you picked 3, but maybe if you had to pick it maybe it’s a little too much? I mean
cause you didn't say you completely agree so maybe just a little?
s. Maybe you can you can… you can get off more detail in green box but I just if you
could pull out the important ones…capital…not capital…
t. Boldface, or…italics, when the
s. Just like when the capital more bigger.
t. Ok, uh huh.
s. So just watch you can understand and if I cannot understand, I can watch carefully
t. So almost kind of like have levels of feedback, where you can see something very
quickly and then..
s. So we can choose and if can have already some image in my brain so we watch same
words and we can understand immediately and we can remember, but something we have
never learned you just put all that which you cannot understand about, so you need to
spend more…
t. Right….fully.
s. Fully, more fully.

13.14

t. Right now they sorta have that, don't they, with the green boxes and then the writer’s handbook? But you don't like the writers hand book, so you just want it all in the green boxes?

s. Maybe it’s a simple problem because I cannot concentrate my English is not as good others I cannot concentrate on writing lots of times so for me I will want to just concentrate use my energy concentrate on…on the point I need I need to figure out the most useful point and then…

t. I understand. Makes sense. That’s okay.

s. Can lead me to one more better and can help me to 1 less mistake, maybe I lose my concentrate

t. That’s funny…we should give you some candy bars! Criterion helps me correct my essays by myself and you said you agree some. What would you do to move it up to a 4? You have it at 3 which is good, it’s fine.

s. The same problem sometimes I cannot figure it out by myself. I need to ask my teacher they will help me.

t. Great ok.

s. If not teacher…

t. Then you are stuck.

s. Maybe motive but I wish I would not do it.

t. You don't want to do it… you just want to ask. Asking is easier than reading writer’s handbook?
s. Yeah even, even, even I would rather ask my classmates than to watch a long, long sentence or paragraph and try to understand myself.

t. Ok, so you would like getting information by… verbally than… instead of written?

15.12

s. Ok maybe it is not a good habit, I know because if I watch the lots of information I can understand more well. I need to overcome this problem (t. Ok, ok) but I just want to let you know the most of I think most Chinese student have same situation as me because you watch the whole sentence and understand where we are at and spend lots of time, it is not easy to adjust to.

t. Ok ok that's good to know. That’s good to know, ya, and you said that you do think you...that you’ve noticed which errors you make and you said grammar and spelling.

s. Yes still, it is the most obvious.

t. Ok.

s. Also I can't understand, I cannot figure out very easily the capital letter and the, and the period.

(t. And the and the and the and the (pointing to examples) yeah yeah yeah… so those are easy to see from just from the blue maybe from the blue highlights and you can correct them but you think those are the ones you make a lot of mistakes on those?)

s. Yeah maybe I not write all the mistake.

(t. Yeah, yeah, yeah, you can't write all of them.

s. but it is one of the easy one obvious one I can figure it out and always make that mistake, I think you already know the mistake we are.

(t. Ya, no, that's great, that's fantastic, ok!
Allan week 3

t. The thing that was different this week is that you did not… you just had English!
s. There was just English. I just can feel, I want to ask you about it.
t. You didn’t ask me, though, did you notice it?
s. Yeah I know that I want to ask you but feel maybe it is the computer… maybe it is different with lab so…maybe with the computer program, so I not ask you why is not the Chinese.
t. ok very fun. Um maybe we will start with that today since that is what we are talking about anyway today so #5 says I missed having feedback I want to have it back and you agreed. yeah what part did you miss what made you miss it? What was better?
s. The green one green one, green box
t. Ok why? Can you think why?
s. …because the blue one just says one mistake of you but green one try to what the mistake always the green ones can tell you how fix is the problem and what is the problem, so if I can understand the green box very well it is good for me to solve the problem.
t. Yeah, so the Chinese being in the green boxes was good for you.
s. Yeah, because the English maybe not understand.
t. Ok, ok, ok that makes sense. I went through your Camtasia, and you used the green boxes a lot this week still. I can't remember though if you clicked on the writer’s handbook at all. Did you click on it this week?
s. Yeah a couple times.
t. Yeah once. Just one time, and it was all in English so then you went away.
s. Yeah it went away.

t. When you clicked on it and saw that it was all in English, did you spend some time reading or did you just… did you use it when you saw it was all English, or when you saw no Chinese, did you leave?

s. I spend a little time, not understand very well, so I try to solve problem by myself.

t. …so you said you gave up.

s. I thought maybe I will ask the teacher.

t. That makes sense that makes sense that’s a good reason. So the feedback was harder this week because I only had English, so you said basically you said yes, it was harder, just not completely harder, but kind of harder.

s. Yeah I still can't understand something can't completely understand what green boxes say that.


t. Do you remember at all I am looking at these: grammar, usage, mechanics, style, do you remember if there’s any of those groups that the feedback is easier to for you to understand in English, or maybe the English is harder, like when you go to the at one or one is always easier or you can't tell the difference?

s. We talking about this one? Maybe grammar is most difficult ones and the usage and another thing not as difficult as the grammar.


t. So the grammar feedback box the green box is difficult….Maybe?

s. Maybe. Because the grammar is about a lot of things and if the usage maybe something the remove which one that which one that would be easy and the style one is just repeat (repetition) so you don't need you understand even don't watch green box on that and the what is that?
t. Mechanics.

s. Mechanics. I think that’s like capital, punctuation, some of those kind of things.

t. Yeah let’s do the easy one. So #7 was also about this and it said, “The corrections I made to my paper were just as good and accurate as they were last time even though I didn't have my native language this week,” so even though I didn't have the Chinese, I fixed my paper just as well is basically what that’s saying and you agreed with that somewhat.

s. Yes why I agree somewhat because I may a problem I try to fix, but I don't what’s the thought of that so I change that whole sentence, and I see the green box but don't understand really well just like this one (looking at Camtasia 6:00) maybe the are run-on sentence but I don't know where I made mistake I don't know where so I just change the whole sentence.

t. So when you saw the green box that you didn't understand you’re saying that one of your strategies is that you change the whole sentence cause you’re not sure exactly what to do?

s. Yeah. Yes, so I change the familiar ones.

t. …but that's not very specific is it (pointing)?

s. so I change familiar sentence to make. Maybe can understand better if I if the Chinese I could not change whole sentence I try figure out, figure out what sentence is wrong and try to figure out. Make sure that it was right, so also a way to solve the problem.

t. Do you think last week, if you can remember last time, cause it was 2 weeks ago, when you were doing it with Chinese on say the run-on sentences ones, did you did you the
same thing… you just changed the whole sentence cause you didn't understand, or did you understand better so you did a different change?

Check answer

7.33

t. Do you have any feelings about…well in IEOP we have 6 levels of students, do you think it makes a difference, do you think the green boxes with your language would be helpful for level 1,2,3,4,5,6 all the levels? What do you think about that kind of question?

s. I don't think so because of which level because… if you want to know you want try the dictionary to understand the green boxes, yes you can understand, but most the problem is you don't want to do that because it's too complicate, so even the 6th level also not want to see the green boxes.

t. Oh.

s. It depends on person.

t. Ok it depends on the person. What do you think about having the Chinese? Let’s pretend all the students are Chinese, do you think all levels could use the Chinese or what do you think about that?

s. If the yeah, yeah, the low level use maybe the Chinese, they can understand more well and even the high level they see the green boxes with Chinese they can understand also very well and very quickly, the lose patient of the… to see the green boxes… because we always watch the green boxes. What we want to do is to click at that and click something important words and you understand quickly, but if you also with Chinese you watch you
reading the green box real quickly, but you can not catch important thing, so maybe you don't want to reading, read carefully.

t. Ok so on the green boxes, you feel all the students would like to grab some information very quickly from them and not to do that, so how does the Chinese help with that, so does Chinese help with that just grabbing info quickly or does it make a difference, what do you think?

Would it help you grab information quicker if you had the Chinese?

s. Yeah.

t. Is that what you are saying?

10.55

s. Yeah ok actually, if just the English if someone learned the language maybe it’s really useful for them because they can understand lots of this area of the words of the sentence, but because we not the learn the language, we maybe learn the business, the agriculture, the electronics, the physics, all of that maybe someone will think, “Oh maybe a lot of these words are hard, maybe I can’t understand, I will waste lots of time and nothing will benefit for my future, so I wouldn’t to try lot, to spend lots of time to watch that.” Also depends on their future, on their benefit on their develop.

t. Develop?

s. Ya, development.

t. When you think of the writer’s handbook, you said you only used it once this week.

Did you use it more, do you remember last time when you had the Chinese, or does it, or is it too much information no matter if there?

s. Maybe 3 or 5 times.
t. So more times you used it, you think, why?

s. I still don't understand very well because handbook even difficult than the green boxes there are lots of words… lots of words, and if Chinese is hard to understand very well

t. The Chinese in the hand book is hard to understand?

s. Yes it is very hard to understand.

t. Why?

s. Because the academic words, the thesis and the example, and something and just lots of things.

t. So you are saying the actual Chinese words that they used were hard, because they are academic?

s. Yes, also they hard because the Chinese especially is so different from the American words, so maybe something important the Chinese, one important maybe you want to catch the important information before the head of the sentence, and the American maybe just … hobby is different and and…

t. Are you talking about the structure?

s. The structure and yeah the structure is different. So it is also a very difficult, a factor when no understand writing very well…especially it’s about the language and explain a lot of things even difficult.

t. That makes sense that makes sense. I think every time you’ve said that you like the blue highlights, I’m back on the front page talking about the ones I think we’ve already talked about, but I think you've probably answered this every week, too, that it’s, you understand the feedback pretty well, so, so pretty well understand that looks the same. Ok the amount of feedback was just about right not too, much not too little?
s. I don't understand very well of this quest ions these sentences.

t. By amount, I mean, do you want the green boxes to be bigger and have more words, or do you want them to have less words? Or the writer’s hand book, do you want to have more words or less words, or is it about right. Are the green boxes about right, the writer’s handbook, about right?

s. No I thought maybe the green boxes the example can be very long word with lots of words, but definition can use a little word

T. What is the difference between the definition and the example?

S. Because then if the definition

T. By definition you mean saying you repeated the words like them telling you what error you made?

S. Ya, just like the green box, they explain what’s wrong of them if you give too much and we don't want to read it, but the example is maybe a habit plus the example can more help me to understand it more easily than just the definition because we do lots of grammar and lots of practice and we familiar with the example because we do a lots of questions we are familiar with that, so if you pour some example we see, we can understand more quickly more clearly, and then just the definition because we just have acknowledge (t. already in your mind) of that part so we watch the example and we thought we thought and we understand. If we just watch the definition, we need to change the meaning into our familiar structure and understand understand that really well and try to connect with our knowledge it’s a lot of process.

T. Ya, so this would be the definition (pointing to the green) and then you would like them to add an example.
s. yeah an example

t. yeah and the definition is not need to as long as this one

t. ok so ad an example and make definition shorter.

s. shorter yeah

t. Criterion helps me correct my essays by myself, you agreed somewhat with that.

s. Sure, Criterion helps me correct my essays I don't know how to. But as I said…

s. Yeah.

t. „„Fand because when you see so many blue how do you feel?

s. terrible. That mean a lot of mistake, who want to make by his one essay? No one wants.

s. Yeah, so when you see the line so very tall, or see so many blue, I can imagine, ya. That makes you feel bad. Do you feel like feedback on this repetition is helpful or not really.

s. The feedback.

s. This the repetition page?

s. Not very help. Didn't watch much of that.

s. Did you go to the writer’s handbook for that?
s. Yeah I have ever go there.

t. I thought you had.

s. Also for this one, I try to you know, you tell me to I think. I don't know which classes I ask this question, and you help me to the hand writer’s handbook to understand, but the question is that they don’t put up because you understand, you want, you need to change the words…

t. …but they don't give you choices.

s. They don't give you choices, that is the question.

t. I saw that you went to the dictionary several times, is that what you were looking for?

s. Yeah, because it can't dictionary can help me to write the sentences the vocabulary of so many, can help me.

t. Did it help you?

s. Uh-huh.

t. Did the dictionary work?

s. Yeah, the dictionary work but the green boxes and the handbook cannot, so I know they can't help me with this problem so why I waste time to watch that. I would rather go to…spend more time in the dictionary because they can maybe help me work out this problem.

t. Ok, you said you have noticed which errors you make most now and you think it’s probably spelling and grammar.

s. Yes, spelling after writing, I checking the spelling to have something maybe, have several mistake other when I writing, I still can't… I still use computer to solve that problem to use that dictionary to check out the words and put on the computer, but when
we in the TOEFL exam we cannot use the dictionary so spelling still a big problem for me.

t. That makes sense so at 18 min 10 seconds (Camtasia) you have highlights on “thousands of years” and I remember we talked about this answer, or this problem, when you read the green boxes, did you not understand their meaning, and then you called me over, is that why… cause you didn't understand what they were saying?

s. Yeah, cause I didn't understand.

21.27

**Week 4, pt 1 Allan**

t. You didn’t use the writer’s handbook at all this week, you said.

s. (Negative head shake)

t. You just didn’t feel like it?

s. I don’t use the handbook.

t. Ok! And so you still like the blue highlights because they “show where you make mistakes.” (reading)Number 5,6,7 were kind of, a little bit different questions …so the writer’s handbook you said was not very helpful, somewhat unhelpful?

s. No.

t. Hmm…Hmm…and you said the blue highlights were very helpful which matches what you said here (first page). And the green boxes were somewhat helpful. What would change the green feedback boxes to a 4?

s. To give them an example a way how you do that.
t. You said that last week, more examples, more specific.

s. Ya, more specific.

t. These are asking about the same three things, but when you had your native language. So when you had Chinese. You said the writer’s handbook was somewhat helpful to have Chinese. Can you tell me about that?

s. Because the handbook is most difficult to understand in that part, and if you have a Chinese language maybe you can understand the grammar and other things. And if you have the grammar you can have a look and you will catch the grammar very quickly. For me, the handbook maybe could be just learning the grammar. And after that you fix your essays with the knowledge you have learned.

t. Ok. Ok.

s. But essay ….that mistake is not absolutely not …because sometimes you still can learn some information about the handbook. Just for instance, if you learning in the drug test speech and maybe that will help you, but if that is just for a usage, for long running sentence, that will not specif… it’s not very special. Not very special for the sentence you write so.

3:39

t. Ok, not specialized for your sentence?

s. Uh huh. So that may be so not very helpful.

t. Ok, so, that’s why you picked the middle one, ok. You said the blue highlights didn’t make a difference. Why?

s. Because they don’t explain anything, they just blue line and show you what is your mistake…
t. It’s just visual.

s. Ya.

t. Ya. And the green boxes, you thought it was very helpful to have them.

s. Ya, because um….when you saw your…mistake, the first one you maybe…If you can understand what mistake you made, so you maybe you cannot even see the green lines. But actually, if you want to save time, if you want work more effectively, you want to read the green lines and see what’s wrong with your sentence that you will have idea to fix this then. And the green lines, if you have your native language, then you will understand what’s wrong with your language, what’s wrong with your mistake and actually, if you were familiar with the English, maybe the native is not as simple as now I think.

5:22

s. But, I never. I don’t very familiar with the language and I don’t very familiar with the name of the mistake…what called, so maybe need the native language to help me to understand more well.

t. Ok. Good.

s. Maybe if you’re familiar, it doesn’t matter.

t. Um hum, ya. So you said the English words were easy for you to understand, you agreed with that, the English words. Is that true? What do you think?

s. Somewhat easy, somewhat still cannot understand. That is not the…it is not gran best, it is for the international student, because they don’t familiar with that part, they have some challenge words and some difficult words it is normal things.
t. The words in the green boxes are difficult, so they should have the glosses, or they should have the native, that’s helpful, the native feedback, is that what you’re saying?
s. Yeah.

t. Ok, I liked having feedback in my own language this week, I’m glad to have it back and you said you agree.
s. Yeah.

t. And here, the feedback was easier for me to understand because I had feedback in my native language.
s. True.

t. You felt like that was true?
s. Yeah.

t. Can you think of a specific example that was easier for you to understand?
s. Feedback, just like the green box, and have the run-on sentence (looking at Camtasia run on).

t. That’s hard to read, isn’t it? This one says “this verb may be incorrect, proofread to make sure you have chosen the correct form of the verb”….but when they were talking about run-on sentences.
s. Just the run-on sentence, if I see the green box for the run-on sentence.

t. (tries to find) Oh, you didn’t make any mistakes in run-ons this week. That’s good!
s. So I can understand, the run-on sentence. So now I’m familiar with the run-on sentence so now if I see the green box I can understand that what’s the mistake I make.

t. So do you think that over time then, it’s less necessary to have the Chinese because you’re becoming familiar?
s. Yeah.

t. Is that what you’re saying?

s. Yeah familiar. After familiar, it is not needed, the Chinese anymore.

t. Ok!

s. …but not still (laughing)

t. …not yet? No, not yet. I’m not taking it away from you.

s. Yeah.

 t. Reading: the corrections I made to my paper were better and more accurate since I had feedback in my native language. Can you think of…it’s hard to probably remember, but can you think of a fix that once you read it it was like, oh ok, and then you were able to fix it better this week?

 t. You were looking here at the writer’s handbook

 9:37

s. I just ah…try.

t. you just try?

s. but when I saw…I just wanna try, but when I saw the handbook not very…special…not very…special…so I give up.

 t. ok.

s. Maybe if I don’t understand the grammar, I will see the handbook, but….

t. Ok so…even though it was in Chinese this week, it still wasn’t helpful… because of the content. You understood the words, but…

s. The content is very, very broad. Just like in our country, they give him a very thick book want you to read it, want you to find any mistake you make, and want you to finish
a the mistakes through this book, lots of students won’t want to do that because if you
want to fix the mistake you made, maybe want to read it, need to read it, a chapter of the
whole grammar of that things and after that, you even cannot make sure you made right
fixes.

t. I understand, I understand. That makes sense. Again, I think you answered this way
other times, too, that the amount of feedback was just about right. You somewhat agree
with that? When do you think it’s too much? This, the writer’s handbook is too much?
s. Yeah.
t. Okay.
s. Um…I think the writer’s handbook had better give us…have more example, will be
good
t. Okay, more examples..
s. More examples and need a special example, no a broad, very broad, and if they’re
broad it is hard to understand, it’s hard to find the mistake in the wrong place or so.
11:48
t. Ok, Criterion ‘helps me correct my essays by myself.’ You agree somewhat on that.
s. Yeah, something I can do that, but somethings maybe just like that (pointing to
Camtasia) they tell me I’m wrong, and I don’t know how to fix it.
t. Ok!
s. Some ones, I still cannot understand.
t. Ok.
s. but maybe it be better to…ask teacher! (laughing)
t. Ok! Ok! Ok!
s. …after that we can understand more deeply.

t. Ok! Um…you’ve noticed which errors you make and on the back you said spelling, grammar, and repetition,

s. Yeah. Repetition is the hard category.

t. That one is very hard! Everybody has trouble with that one. It’s okay. That one is very hard. That has to do with vocabulary.

S. Yeah, that is about vocabulary.

t. That’s a vocabulary issue, right?

s. Even though I try learning vocabulary and I remember the vocabulary, but when you writing, you will forgot, you will forgot the spelling and you will forgot to use this…this word…I really I… this word, this word, you need to write lots of essays that you will know how to change that repetition word.

t. That’s right.

**Allan, week 4, part 2**

t. Your feelings about writing in English, you feel, you agree that they have become more positive? In what way is it positive? Less scary, easier…what kind of feeling?

s. Just you, a it’s really uh, writing practice of this writing and you fix this writing almost always you will know what mistake you learned so in exam or whatever, you will try to avoid that mistake, although you are familiar with a new sentence and can be able to write very fluently and can maybe save the time, even though you will get lots of point through your writing...so maybe you can have lots of exam you will have exam from the
writing, you will very familiar with that so maybe the next time you writing the similar article, you can use the point, you can use the exam.

t. Ok, um, my feelings about Criterion have become more positive over the semester and you agree that you feel like the program, you feel positive?

s. Ya. I feeling more positive.

t. Ok. This one is asking when people are asking you to write in English, you feel good and this one is asking, this program, how are you feeling about it?

s. This program can show me my mistake, can show me, can teach me how to fixes that, and can give me my source, can let me know which level I am, so…

t. You said you agree.

s. Ya, because your writing, you fix the essays, there may be somethings, maybe the ability of the students will be improved, just like the grammar the fluent, fluent sentence, maybe your supporting is more suitable for the topic, so…

t. …a little more suitable for the topic, ya. Ok. Good. And then this one says ‘Criterion and its feedback helped my writing improve this semester’ and you somewhat agree with that.

s. Ya. I improve something, but still because Criterion cannot explanation, explain is not very special. not very special, not very special, so something I cannot fix it by myself, I need to ask the teacher for help.

 t. Ok. Ok. That’s fine. So, the writing class and the teacher helped my writing improve this semester and you agreed with that.

s. Ya.

t. OK.
s. I think that teacher’s feedback is more special than just they give us. The green line give us.

t. This one says, I would like to continue using Criterion by myself after this class ends. And you somewhat agree.

s. Ya. Maybe I will use, but it depends if I wanted to improve my language until pass the TOEFL, maybe I will use this article, but when I study my regular classes, maybe I will not use this Criterion.

t. Ok.

s. Criterion.

s. Criterion.

t. Criterion.

s. Because maybe busy, maybe the report is different from the TOEFL essays…

r. There is, I’ll show you sometime, or remind everyone in class, but there is a one called text editor, one of your assignments, and you can put anything in there. It doesn’t have to answer one of Criterion’s questions, so you could put a report for another class in there

s. Ok.

r. And get get feedback. Ok? Alright. Other classes in the IEOP should have the opportunity to use Criterion and you agreed.

s. Um, ya because Criterion can make us to write the essays more independently and because if we just writing by myself and ask the teacher they will waste lots of time and maybe you can’t find the teacher sometimes and Criterion is more freedom.

r. Freedom?

s. Ya, freedom and also he can tell you the popular mistake, the mistake you always make and can help you to fix some mistake that is very ob, ob,
t. Obvious?


t. Having feedback in my native language, so Chinese, helped me to understand the feedback more fully.


t. Ya. That’s kind of a question that I’ve asked several times, so sorry. Ok. So who would benefit most from, thinking about who would benefit most from having the feedback in Criterion. And so I asked it kind of here again, what type of students would benefit most from having a writing program like Criterion and you thought high level students would.

7:50

s. Ya, if the high level student, maybe their grammar learning really well, maybe they understand more well of the handbook, of the green lines so maybe can more easy to use this, and they maybe more interested in Criterion.

t. And then when I asked which type of students would benefit from having their native language feedback, you said low level.

s. Ya, I think that low level is most need. Is need native language most. Because maybe they can’t understand that, Even master grammar very well, so they need their native language help them to understand, help them to learn the grammar again. But intermediate level…also need, but not as much as low level student, I think.

t. Do you think high level students should have the option of using their native language. Who should choose who gets it? The student or the teacher? Or do you think there should be….You know you can turn it off and on. Who should choose? Should the
teacher say, “You’re low level, you get it, or you’re high level, you don’t get it. Or should the student say, I want it, or I don’t want it.”

s. Maybe I think the teacher can make this decisions. Why? Because I think the student always lazy. I think if they have an easy way to understand, they will choose the easy way. Even the high level student, if there is easy way to fix their mistake, I think they will choose to use the native language to help them understand more well. But for them, they have a case, maybe they can learn more from the green box, find the English words, and can maybe improve their language more well, improve their writing more well, also can provide an opportunity of practice. So….

t. So maybe the teacher should decide?

s. Ya.

t. for the student?

s. but the low-level student, someone maybe they not understand. They will, almost they will choose the native language.

t. Ok. Ok. Ok. So this section is talking about the kinds of mistakes that you think you still make the most frequently and so I gave some examples there, but the grammar, you really need to improve on that.

s. Ya, the grammar, is the because it’s very bore.

t. Boring?

s. Ya. Is very boring. And I always make some mistake, always do, make some mistake and kind of seriously, consciously. And…even something cannot understand, even grammar, cannot use, because I think my grammar is very limited, just use several knowledge of the grammar, not lots of.
t. Ok, not lots of different kinds. On usage, like articles, and prepositions, and word forms, you thought you need some improvement still, you usually don’t get too many mistakes in this one?

s. Um…usage because usage is always the er and ya because that is not as…as the grammar. I think I not always made these mistakes.

t. ok.

s. And also easier to fix it this mistake, so…

t. Ok. Ok. Mechanics are things like spelling, punctuation, capitalization, so you thought you really need help on that…

s. Ya the Spelling.

t. Spelling? Ok.

s. I always made rough spelling, if not, checking the spelling.

t. I know, it’s so hard, so hard. On style, things like repetition of words, inappropriate words, passive voice, blah blah blah, really need to improve you said.

s. Ya, repetition word that may, ya, I think I need to improve because they will make my article more colorful. Just not always use several words to explain the explanation, and the teacher say that maybe just know this one and just very limited very very severe limited.

t. Well, the good thing about this is that it’s hard for everybody.

s. And other things you…you…about vocabulary also you how to use the vocabulary, how to use the words, and not only you change the sentence the different words but the same meaning, but you need to know how to use that. That also is very hard. I need to improve.
t. Ok. Organization and development like things about your thesis statement like they say it’s missing or they say it’s not complete or these kind of things and you said that you don’t need much help on that. You feel that’s strong?

s. Ya, because I always, I think my structure, structure is almost the same. And the TOEFL exam, when we write these essays maybe it is the same

t. You’re pretty good at that?

s. You will not always to change the structure and if you always change the structure, that will make you confused sometimes can be the supporting is not special, maybe your supporting is not good enough just like the structure is very…ah…memememem…is very messy.

t. Ok.

s. Messy if you…

t. Ok. I understand what you’re saying.

s. Always change the criteria, so if you just use the same, the typical, the several, if you just always use the structure, you just very familiar with that so it can make your logics very clearly may the people, may the teacher can understand more well.

t. Ok! That’s great. And then you wrote this and you said, “I think Criterion can help students to write and fix their essays independently.”

s. Ya.

t. Ya. How does that, how does that make a difference for you. You’ve talked about that a couple of times, that the independent or the freedom, you said earlier in the interview, so how does that make you feel or how does that help you as a student?
s. I think they can tell you to fix the simple mistake that you make but … if you fix all the simple mistake that you make, I think your essay improve a lot, and also the spelling, they tell, teach you the spelling what’s wrong of your spelling you fixes that, so in your essays you won’t see the wrong spelling that also is very good. And when you’re writing by yourself, not use the Criterion, you write lots of, make lots of spelling, but you don’t know where it is and maybe the next time, you will you made this wrong spelling again, again, again, and in the TOEFL exam you may, “Oh, what the word is?” and the teacher, because the teacher, they can’t catch the wrong spelling with very quickly so they will give you a low grade.

t. Ok, interesting. So thinking about Criterion, would you like to um um in your future writing classes, would you also like to use a program like Criterion or do you think you um would rather just take a writing class, with no Criterion or do you like the writing class when they have class plus Criterion?

s. Class plus, um I think the Criterion always can be used for homework.

t. Ok.

s. And um if you always do it in the class is not, enough. Cannot have enough time for the teacher to teach how to writing the article and that is a good software for practice and if you practice and save the essays for the teacher and teacher can help you to fix the problem, can give you some comments to improve your essays that can do in the after class and also student can have the ability to do that.

t. On their own.

s. Ya, on their own.

t. Ok, great! That’s wonderful.
These are the codes and explanations, followed by a few lines from the transcription. You can just label the responses with one of the codes using the comment feature. If you notice they don’t make sense or don’t fit well, just make a note. Then, I will make any changes necessary before sending you a transcription to code. Sometimes, I (t) read what the students said on a survey so those can be coded as well.

**Codes:**

- **Preferences:** These include comments about preferences for different types of feedback (blue/green, writer’s handbook), amount of feedback (too much, too little)

- **Beliefs about language (L1, L2):** These comments deal with student beliefs dealing with what language should be used or not used, the levels of students which should/should not use them, teacher use of the language feedback

- **Changes/growth:** These comments deal with changes (positive/negative) in perspective/behavior with writing and/or Criterion in general.

- **Autonomy:** These comments deal with the learner talking about their ability (or lack of) to write, revise, and understand on their own. This can be in the past or now.

- **Noticing:** These comments deal with learners noticing errors, noticing parts of the system (Criterion), noticing misunderstandings during the interview.
APPENDIX E

CAMTASIA TRANSCRIPTS, SAMPLES

Amos Camtasia, week 1

Learn from mistakes

3 minutes to get in

Grammar first

Run-on sentences

Writers handbook 3-4 seconds

Green boxes briefly several times

Then, begins to revise

4:50

Save and keep writing button at

5:30

Goes on to next error (SV)

He succeed correcting without looking at boxes, saved

Ill-formed verbs

6:00

Writer’s handbook --about 3 seconds

Will has a feeling to It will gives a feeling on him.

To possessive errors

7:27

Save and keep writing on to usage: 2 wrong article, 7 missing or extra article, 1

preposition error
Wrong article fixes w/o boxes and saves

MA EA: writer’s handbook, 8 seconds

Fixes without boxes

9:39 Instead of adding an article ‘find correct way’ to ‘find correctly way’ also did “truly follower”…’sciences field’ later went back to the red underlines and added articles-the and a ,

Made one plural ‘mistakes’ instead of ‘a mistake’.

Changed one prep from for 2 to. …understand article error or just chose to fix differently?

11:18

Saved and moved on to mechanics.

1 spelling error, 2 missing commas, 2 compound words

Didn’t fix spelling, went on to missing commas

“I am firmly convinced that every individual could learn a lot from they mistakes.”

Didn’t fix it…rightly so, but then made green box appear. Says—you may need to place a comma after this word. Fixed they 2 their.

Went on to compound words, read green box and fixed

Saved and moved on to style.

29 repetition of words

13:19

Looks at screen for long time…without doing anything

16:44 he saves and keep writing button
On mechanics hyphen error green boxes and writer’s handbook and adds a hyphen between million time mistakes 2 million-time mistakes.

22:19

Submits: 0 grammar errors, 3 usage errors, 1 mechanics error, 21 style comments

Score 5/6

Goes to usage

Wrong article a million-time mistakes, deletes, next

Preposition, on it to with it. “who is the best example on it” to “who is the best example with it” should be ‘of’…doesn’t consult any helps here.on to mechanics 1 spelling..ignores b/c it’s a name

24:00

Submits 1 usage (PREP)

1 mechanics (spelling)

Back to sentence above erases with looks at green box…just says”you may be using the wrong preposition.

Goes to writer’s handbook scrolls…turns off…changes to of

Submits

25:00 END

All errors fixed except the name and the repetition
Allan Camtasia week 3

319 words, 21 sentences, 15.4 words per sentence.

Brings up criterion and iciba (dictionary) right from start

Grammar frag/MC reads green…no Chinese reads several times says, “Hmmm?” Starts to read the sentence to himself. Adds a therefore in front of If they want to…but doesn’t add a comma, so it will probably still be flagged.

He then deletes a sentence in from of the problem sentence

Run on, checks green long enough to read it.

6:15

SV 3 errors doesn’t check green. Makes the changes.

Proof read this stays on green for 841 to 910=30 seconds… then adds “of” for thousands of years in both.

1003 goes to writer’s handbook to proofread this reads it cursor moves through whole thing

closes at 10:44

Goes to usage

wrong article, green 7 seconds

Changes “these” to “the”

next one green 3 seconds

next prep error. checks green. Changes “at” to “in”

now to missing or extra article 5 errors

12:27
Changes and checks green, back to wrong article and on to spelling in mechanics.

He has phrase, “Everything…so it isn’t a spelling error, it is really a spacing comma error. Checks the green at 14:14

Goes on to types, 60 repetition

Green indirect feedback stays on it from 14:57 until 15:29 still pauses

Looks quickly at another word’s green…same…goes off it.

Changes one learn to acquire (I wonder if he’s using the dictionary on another computer.)

Save and keep writing.

Shows me the proofread…oh, thousands years…take the S off. 10 thousand years. The number makes it plural and the word is not.

Changes learn the knowledge to gained the knowledge

2010

Missing extra article looks at green in three errors before fixing

Changes for instant to for instance, deletes an article and checks the green and adds an s at the end of book.

Goes to repetition of words in 23:00

Books, experience, knowledge

Submits 24.42

6/6

53 repetition errors

Continues revising in grammar section though there are no errors showing here.

44 repetition after
Goes to organization/dev. At the end of 26:00 Goes through each of the categories back to repetition “How to fix this problem?” laughing he says to himself.

Goes to Chinese/English dictionary

At 29:38

Then to dictionary.com

Book…tries to find syn. But can’t. goes to knowledge. Scrolls quickly.

Goes back to Criterion. To style.

33:00

Allan Camtasia week 4

At 10:25, he gets in to his essay. Not may.

Ill formed verbs reads green boxes with L1 reads it aloud in Chinese.

Goes to writer’s handbook 11:14

View’s question again

Makes a few changes

Goes to proofread this green reads and makes a form change.

Wrong article and reads the green , looks at the green again and makes a change

Goes to spelling glances at green and changes…spacing between quote…needs a comma still.

Cruises through a bunch

Settles on wrong article in 15:20

Adds words to sentences and adding sentences. Revising rather than editing. One example: “Activities are more interested and easy, thus students would like to join in the
group and pay their attention in learning. (As a result, students will study more effective) and learn more knowledge.”

23:06 Added transition

Finally, added to “it is easy to know their personality which can let teachers make a good plan to teach their students”…to “finally, it is easy for teachers to know their students’s personalities (which can let teachers make a good plan to teach their students).

Long pause nothing at 32:05

goes to writer’s handbook with the Chinese reading slowly fast through English down to each Chinese part click through quickly goes to grammar usage mechanics style just the heading quickly and goes back to usage and wrong article in essay.

35 pause again.

Asks me why he can’t use a conclusion and needs the conclusion. You are actually saying a specific conclusion, so you need ‘the.’

Goes to performance summary spent 1 hour 26 minutes 45 seconds on essay 6/6 1 error in grammar, usage, mechanics, and 9 in style.

Works on usage errors.

Checks green in prepetition briefly.

Now 0 errors on all and 6/6 40:00 done
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE TRANSLATION CHECK

Criterion Category: Grammar
Error type feedback: Run-on sentences

Verbatim feedback:

This sentence may be a run-on sentence. Proofread it to see if you need to add punctuation, add conjunctions, or create separate sentences. Look at the "Writer's Handbook" to find out how to correct run-on sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency/flow</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(with 5 being very fluent and 1 being not fluent.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(with 5 being very correct and 1 being many errors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(consider the DIFFICULTY of words, with 5 being very easy for an IEP student to understand and 1 being very difficult for them to understand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(correct WORD CHOICES compared to English feedback -- with 5 being very accurate and 1 showing very frequent errors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(with 5 meaning very accurate mechanics and 1 being many errors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use this space to give any specific examples that you think I should consider: