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Research on written corrective feedback (WCF) in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) has been giving its feedback on this practice for more than 30 years now. The topic has been extensively researched and there is a better understanding of the issue than before; however, it continues to be debated (see Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Goldstein, 2005; Lee, 2004; Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Saito, 1994; Schulz, 1996). One of the main reasons for the controversial findings concerning feedback is the lack of attention to individual differences among learners (Zamel, 1985). Although the effects of written feedback have been investigated on students collectively, taking individual learner differences into account could help in developing a better understanding of the issue. While the relationship between feedback and individual learner differences remains underexplored, Hyland (1998) found that many of the teachers who participated in her qualitative work did, indeed, consider individual students when they gave their feedback. If many teachers give their students individual feedback on their papers, why not consider that in research?

One of the rarely studied individual differences in second language writing is language learning motivation. The current study is based on the assumption that learners’ different learning behaviors, including their perceptions of and reactions to feedback, could have roots in learners’ fundamental motivational characteristics (Papi & Teimouri, 2014). Although many scholars have attested to its importance, motivation has been ignored in research on corrective feedback. Hyland (1998) argued that motivation is an important factor in feedback because writing is so personal, stating that “writing is an intensely personal activity, and students’ motivation and confidence in themselves as writers may be adversely affected by the feedback they receive” (p. 279). Goldstein (2005) argued that lack of motivation is one reason students may not be paying attention to feedback. If motivation can play such a role in relation to corrective feedback, considering the motivational characteristics of learners in research in the area of corrective feedback can help us understand how feedback can be given more effectively. The present study, therefore, aims to take the initiative and research the topic of corrective feedback from the point of view of second language learners with different motivational orientations.
Individual Learner Differences in Relation to Corrective Feedback

There has been a substantial number of studies on students’ perceptions of and reactions to written feedback (e.g., Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Cohen, 1987; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Leki, 1991; Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994). These studies have been focusing on how students perceive written feedback. Over the course of time, these surveys evolved from just a two-item questionnaire (Cardelle & Corno, 1981) to multi-item surveys on both teacher and students’ perceptions (Montgomery & Baker, 2007). As these surveys became more in-depth along the way, they seem to have lost focus on individual learners.

One of the first surveys on students’ perception of feedback was administered by Cardelle and Corno (1981). They studied the effects of feedback framing on eleven homework assignments written by 80 beginning and intermediate Spanish students at Stanford University. The students were divided into four groups and given one of four types of feedback: one group was given praise (“You chose the right form of the verb for this kind of sentence”), a second group received criticism (“You chose the wrong form of the verb in this sentence. It should be…”), a third group was given both criticism plus praise (“You chose the right pronoun, but the form of the verb is wrong”), and the control group received no feedback. A pre-test was given to measure the students’ knowledge of Spanish vocabulary, grammar and structure, and translation. The students were then given a two-item survey. The first item asked the students to evaluate if the feedback they received increased their motivation to study, improved their performance, or both. The second item asked what type of feedback they preferred: praise, criticism, both, or grades only. The findings showed that 75% of the students felt the feedback improved both their motivation and final performance. Most of the students (88%) of the total sample of students preferred a combination of praise and criticism, and of the group that received only criticism, 13% preferred criticism only. Interestingly, some students felt that receiving no feedback was more motivating and improved their performance better than praise or criticism alone. The students were also categorized into high, middle and low performers according to their posttest scores. The researchers found that the higher performing students preferred feedback compared to the lower performers. Additionally, the higher performers liked both criticism and praise more than the lower performers. Overall, the authors confirmed that feedback can help improve students’ motivation and performance, but it is more effective when it contains not only praise, but some criticism on specific errors.

Cohen (1987) gave a survey to 217 English as a Second Language (ESL) and foreign language (FL) learners at New York State University at Binghamton, asking about their preferences for WCF. These were students who were receiving some type of written feedback in their classes. The ESL students were in basic and advanced writing courses. The FL students were studying French, German, or Hebrew. The one page questionnaire asked them to reflect on the last paper they received from their teachers. The survey asked the students if they read over a teacher’s comments, what type of feedback teachers were giving, what strategies students used for reading a teacher’s comments, and how much of the teachers’ comments they understood.
The students also had to self-rate what kind of learner they were. Nineteen percent of the students rated themselves as “excellent learners,” 70% as “good learners,” and 11% as “fair learners. None of the students rated themselves as poor learners. Based on the self-ratings, Cohen categorized his participants into better learners and poorer learners in order to analyze the data. He found that 81% of students looked over almost all of the comments given by their teachers. Most of the better-rated learners were more likely to read through a paper with feedback and pay attention to comments by their teachers on vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The students who rated themselves lower, on the other hand, were more likely to ignore their teacher’s comments and they paid less attention to comments on their grammar. Cohen found that students generally have few strategies for processing feedback, especially the poorer-rated learners. One of the most popular strategies was making a mental note of the feedback, which most better-rated learners did. Cohen speculated that this was because they were either good writers and they were learning from the mental notes they made, or they were already good writers who did not really need teachers’ comments in order to improve.

Radecki and Swales (1988) surveyed 59 learners in four ESL classes at the University of Michigan on their attitudes toward feedback. After they were surveyed, the researchers chose eight students to interview. The 18-item questionnaire focused on the students’ opinions of feedback and instruction, the usefulness of teachers’ comments, and responsibility for error correction. The students were classified into three categories according to their openness to feedback: Receptors (46%), semi-resisters (41%), and resistors (13%). The receptors and semi-resisters preferred comments on content and grammar whereas the resistors preferred short adjectives and a grade. Receptors saw the correction of errors as the responsibility of both the instructor and the students; resistors viewed it as just the teacher’s job only. Revision was welcomed by the receptors but seen as punishment by the resistors. Lastly, receptors and semi-resisters felt an obligation to use their teacher’s feedback while resistors did not care. Radecki and Swales suggested “typology of behaviors that characterizes student attitudes to teacher feedback” (p. 363) is one way of learning more about feedback.

Leki (1991) examined students’ opinions in a four-part survey on 100 ESL students in freshman composition classes at the University of Tennessee. In the first part of the survey, students were asked about the importance of accuracy, which they felt was important not only to them (91%) but for their English teachers as well (82%). As for English teachers pointing out grammar errors, 93% of students felt it was very important. Leki explained that it is easier for both students and teachers to attend to grammar errors compared to content; thus, when they correct these errors, they feel like they are able to master the language more concretely. In the second part of the survey, students were asked the types of errors they look at most frequently when a paper is returned to them. Although students said they wanted grammar corrections, only 53% of students said they looked carefully at comments on grammar. On the other hand, 74% and 65% claimed that they looked more carefully at comments on organization and ideas, respectfully. In the third part of the survey, 70% of students preferred that all errors, major and minor, be marked by a teacher; whereas 19% wanted only major errors to be marked. A large
majority of students (81%) reported that their current English teachers marked all the errors on their papers. Sixty-seven percent of students wanted their teachers to give clues about how to fix their errors, and a quarter of the students wanted the teacher to write the correct answers for them. Leki argued that students like to be given clues because it gives them some satisfaction, similar to solving a puzzle. In part three, peer review, 58% of students said that peer review was the least useful in helping them correct written errors. Leki reasoned that this could be due to the fact that many of the students were new arrivals in the U.S. and thus did not have much prior experience with peer feedback; or, perhaps, the peer reviewers were really unhelpful. The last section had the students rate seven different handwritten examples of grammar feedback in which they showed favor for clues for correction. Leki suggested that teachers spend some class time to discuss with their students their perceptions of feedback and current research. As a whole, 97% of students carefully read their teacher’s comments.

Students’ preferences for feedback were also investigated in another survey by Saito (1994) at a Canadian university. The study included 39 students from two ESL intensive courses and an ESL Engineering writing class; the students’ English proficiency ranged from intermediate to the advanced level. The questionnaire had students rate different types of feedback, students’ strategies for handling feedback, and their preferences for feedback. According to the students’ responses, most of the students preferred their teachers to focus on grammar errors. Students also liked to be given clues rather than explicit WCF to prompt them to correct and revise their papers. Although the students were willing to self-correct if they knew where the error was located, they preferred teacher feedback over peer review or self-correction. Saito pointed out that this may be due to students’ not being aware of the importance of peer or self-correction. If teachers explained their usefulness, Saito argued this would have benefited the students more. Many students did not see that value in revision and did not revise their writing even when it was a homework assignment. The findings on students’ preferences seemed to vary across different classes.

Ferris (1995) surveyed 155 students at California State University in one of two levels of an ESL composition program. The purpose of this study was to see the students’ responses to feedback in multi-draft composition. The survey was an 11-item questionnaire that focused on multi-draft papers. There were also several open-ended questions with regards to strategies the students used for interpreting the feedback given. Overall, they found that most students (93.5%) thought that WCF was helpful for them to improve their writing. More relevant to the present study, they found that students remembered positive comments from their teachers for their ideas and organization. However, three students reported that “their teachers’ comments were all negative and that this fact depressed them and decreased their motivation and self-esteem” (p.46). Ferris asserted that teachers should offer not only constructive criticism, but comments with encouragement as well. On a positive note, Ferris suggested that students may indeed respect and appreciate the feedback their teachers gave.

Montgomery and Baker’s (2007) work at the English Language Center at Brigham Young University also surveyed of students’ and teachers’ perceptions of their teachers’
feedback. In addition, they examined the teachers’ actual written feedback. The teachers at the center were encouraged to give comments on global issues during the first drafts, and comments on local issues in later drafts. Thirteen teachers and 98 students filled out a questionnaire similar to the ones used by Cohen (1987) and Ferris (1995). Teacher feedback on the students’ compositions was also collected and coded with the frequency of feedback on: ideas and content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The drafts of the essays were categorized into first and later drafts; they were also divided into low pass, pass, and high pass depending on the grades they were given. Overall, students seemed to think that their teachers gave a sufficient amount of feedback; however, teachers thought that they were not giving enough. Additionally, teachers underestimated the amount of feedback they gave on local issues, but overestimated the amount of feedback on global issues. Although the teachers were trained to give comments on global issues, teachers gave more local feedback. The authors also found that teachers gave different amounts of feedback to different students, and this was not connected to the proficiency level of the students. For instance, one teacher gave a student 210 comments on grammar and no comments to another student, while both of these students received the same passing grade. The researchers could not account for the difference in the amount of feedback and called for more research to be done to see the effects that different types of comments (praise or criticism) have on individual students.

In most of these studies, students, in one way or another, seem to put some didactic value on receiving feedback. Many students indicated that they did look at a teachers’ feedback (Cohen, 1987; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994; Ferris, 1995) and one study showed that students were content with the amount of feedback given (i.e., Montgomery and Baker, 2007). Some students seem to prefer comments on grammar more than on content, organization, and ideas (Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994) while others found value in their teachers’ comments on global issues (Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988). In Leki’s (1991) study, the students said they valued comments on grammar, but then they said they looked at comments on organization and ideas more closely than the grammar comments. The types of feedback students prefer to receive also seem to differ greatly. Some students seem open to revising their essays (Cohen, 1987, Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Radecki & Swales, 1988) as long as they are challenged (Saito, 1994), while others saw it as punishment (Radecki & Swales, 1988). In three of the studies, students were in favor of implicit coding for marking errors (Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994) because it motivated them to revise and they view it as puzzle solving. As for peer revision, students seem to value their teachers’ comments more than their peers’ comments (Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994).

In order to account for the individual variations in terms of students’ openness and perceptions of feedback, some of the studies reviewed above have come up with labels such as resistors, receptors, better self-rated students, and the like. These attempts have highlighted the importance of individual differences in this area that are of great value and can reflect some underlying differences among learners. However, these differences may not be well understood if we limit the focus of our investigations to the perceptions and observed behaviors. The current
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study is based on the assumption that the differences in students’ perceptions of and reactions to feedback could have motivational reasons. Studying the learners reactions to feedback can be more revealing if we frame the study within a strong theoretical framework that highlight motivational differences among learners. The importance of this approach has been highlighted by Papi and Teimouri (2014), who called for research on how fundamental motivational differences result in different language learning behaviors. In order to take a step in this direction and account for motivational differences underlying learners’ different perceptions of and reaction to feedback, I will employ Dweck’s (2004) achievement goal theory and implicit theories of intelligence or mindsets.

Achievement Goal Theory and Mindsets

According to Dweck, there are two types of goals with underlying implicit theories about intelligence. In her achievement goal theory and based on the approach-avoidance perspective towards motivation, Dweck (1988) proposed that there are two different types of goals among students: learning and performance goals. “A performance goal is the goal of validating one’s ability through one’s performance, that is, the goal of looking smart and not dumb. In contrast a learning goal is the goal of increasing one’s ability, that is, the goal of getting smarter” (p. 42). Various studies (e.g. Dweck & Sorich, 1999; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Farrell & Dweck, 1985; Grant & Dweck, 2003; Henderson & Dweck, 1990; Mueller & Dweck, 1998) have shown that students with learning versus performance goals show different learning behaviors. Farrell and Dweck (1985), for instance, studied junior high students who were taught a challenging new unit. The students with learning goals were more likely to search for and find strategies compared with those with performance goals who were concerned with validating their ability. Grant and Dweck (2003) found that students with learning goals were more likely to be engaged with the course material, which was predictive of higher grades.

Dweck (1988) stipulated that a learner’s development of learning or performance goals has roots in what she calls the learner’s dominant implicit theory of intelligence, or their mindsets. Learning goals are held by individuals who have an incremental theory about their abilities. Individuals with an incremental theory of intelligence (or a growth mindset) see their intelligence as something that is dynamic and can be developed through effort and experience. Individuals with performance goals, on the other hand, have an entity theory (or fixed mindset) about their abilities; they believe their intelligence is fixed and unchangeable. The students who have an incremental theory of intelligence may think that they received a low test score because they did not study hard. Yet, students who hold an entity theory about their intelligence think that they failed the test because they are not smart enough (Dweck et al., 1995). According to Dweck (2004), these theories of intelligence greatly impact students’ learning behaviors:

When students believe that their intelligence is a fixed trait (an entity theory of intelligence), it becomes critical to for them to validate their fixed ability through their performance. In contrast, when students believe that their intellectual skills are something that they can increase through their efforts (an incremental theory of intelligence), they become less concerned with how their abilities might be evaluated now, and more
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contcerned with cultivating their abilities in the longer term (p.42).

Many studies have examined Dweck’s theories of intelligence and found strong evidence for their relevance to students’ learning and achievement (e.g. Dweck & Sorich, 1999; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Farrell & Dweck, 1985; Grant & Dweck, 2003; Henderson & Dweck, 1990; Mueller & Dweck, 1998). Dweck and Sorich (1999) found that students over the course of their seventh and eighth grades who held an incremental theory earned higher grades in math while students with an entity theory had decreasing grades, even though all the students started with equivalent math scores. In Aronson and Good (2002), students at Stanford University who were trained in incremental theory at the beginning of the semester reported a greater enjoyment in their classes and a higher grade point average at the end of the semester. More relevant to the purpose of the present study, there have been other studies linking learners’ interest in and reaction to feedback and goal orientations (e.g. Butterfield & Mangels, 2003; VandeWalle, 1997; VandeWalle & Cummings, 1997). Butterfield and Mangels (2003), for instance, studied students’ reactions to feedback with an electroencephalography (EEG) device. The participants were asked general information questions and they were given two types of feedback: red or green lights indicating if they were correct or incorrect (performance oriented) and the correct answers to the questions (learning oriented). They found that with the learning-relevant feedback, there was more activity in the brains of the participants with an incremental theory of intelligence. Those with the fixed mindset, on the other hand, did not have any brain activity for the learning-relevant feedback, suggesting they were less motivated by the feedback. A student’s theory of intelligence could thus be an indicator of how open they are to written feedback. The present study intends to examine students’ perceptions towards WCF by looking at these motivational orientations. By examining learners’ feedback preferences through the lens of motivation, this study can also further our understanding of why corrective feedback has resulted in inconsistent findings in the literature and open new avenues of research on how we can make feedback more motivating and effective.

Research Questions:

Based on the discussion above, the following research questions have been formulated:

1. What are the relationships between English learners’ mindsets and their openness to corrective feedback on their L2 written productions?
2. What are the relationships between English learners’ mindsets and their reactions to corrective feedback on their L2 written productions?
3. What are the relationships between English learners’ mindsets and their writing motivation?

Method

Participants

The participants of this research will be recruited from a Midwestern university in the United States. The students will be international students learning English as a second language at different proficiency levels at the university. The students’ native languages typically include
Chinese, Arabic, or Portuguese. The researcher anticipates 100+ learner participants.

**Instruments**

There are three questionnaires being used in this research study with a total of 73 items concerning learners’ motivation, written feedback, and background information. The motivation questionnaire (Appendix A) includes 32 items measuring participants’ goal orientations (Elliot and McGregor, 2001), theories of general intelligence (Dweck et al., 2004), theories of writing ability, and L2 writing motivation. Items that measure goal orientations include both learning goals (“My aim is to completely master the material presented in this class”) and performance goals (“My goal is to perform better than the other students”). Theories of general intelligence include items for both incremental and entity mindsets (e.g., “You have a certain amount of intelligence, and you can’t really do much to change it”). It also includes a measure of learners’ implicit theory of English writing ability, which I developed based on Dweck’s measures (e.g., “With enough practice you will be able to write like a native speaker of English”). Five items measure the incremental and entity mindset of students and another five items measure the writing mindsets (Dweck et al., 2004).

The second part (Appendix B) contains 33 items measuring learners’ openness and reaction towards written corrective feedback. This part of the questionnaire has been developed using items used in previous WCF studies (e.g., Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Cohen, 1987; Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Goldstein, 2005; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994; Radecki & Swales, 1988) and some items that were specifically developed for the purpose of the present study. The items have been categorized into four classes: openness to feedback, framing of feedback, reaction to feedback, and writing motivation. Openness to feedback refers to how open students are to feedback (e.g., “Written feedback from my teacher helps me to be a better writer” or “I don’t care about receiving feedback on my papers”). Framing is the way that teachers frame their feedback (e.g., “I like when my teacher comments only on my writing strengths” or “I like when my teacher comments only on my writing weaknesses”). Reaction is the students’ reaction after they receive feedback from their teachers (e.g., “When I get my papers back, I read all of the comments carefully” or “When I do not understand my teacher’s comments, I ignore them”). Writing motivation items, which were adapted from Taguchi, Magid, and Papi (2009), include students’ intended efforts, desire, and motivational intensity for writing (“I enjoy writing in English” or “I would like to spend lots of time learning to write in English”).

For these two parts, a six-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (this doesn’t apply to me) to 6 (always) is used for each item. They have been translated and back-translated into Chinese, Arabic and Portuguese by graduate students (native speakers of the languages) in order to make the items easily understandable for students at all levels of proficiency. The last part of the questionnaire includes background information questions with regards to the students’ age, gender, native language, length of time in the U.S., length of studying English, year in college, major of study, and proficiency (Appendix C).
Procedure

The data collection for this study will take a few weeks. After securing IRB approval, teachers who are currently teaching English as a Second Language classes at the ELC will be emailed with details of the research and asked for their voluntary participation. The researcher will go to each individual class and ask students to fill out the surveys, during break time or after the class. The three parts of the survey will only take about 10-15 minutes to complete. The surveys will be anonymous.

Data Analysis

After establishing the reliability of the scales through Cronbach’s alpha analysis, the correlation analyses will be run between students’ implicit theories of intelligence and their openness and reaction to written feedback as well as their motivation for writing.

Anticipated Discussion

The study could provide preliminary evidence for the motivational underpinnings of how learners perceive and act upon teacher’s feedback. This could be a good initial attempt to open new avenues of research on how to increase students’ desire for and attention to corrective feedback through changing their detrimental but chronic mindsets, thereby improving the quality of language teaching. The study would link the motivation research to the actual processes of language learning. The introduction of the concept of the implicit theories of intelligence to the field of second language acquisition could also contribute to our understanding of lack of motivation on the part of many language learners and encourage investigation in how we can increase learner’s motivation through changing their beliefs about intelligence and setting helpful learning goals that motivate learners to put in sufficient efforts to learn a second language.
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Appendix A

Language Learner Questionnaire (Part 1)

Please read each of the following statements. Circle the answer that best describes what you think. Do not leave any blank answers. Answer each one as honestly as you can. The results will not be shown to your teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>This doesn’t apply to me</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My goal is to perform better than the other students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>When I see an opportunity for something I like, I get excited right away.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>You have a certain amount of intelligence, and you can’t really do much to change it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am striving to avoid performing worse than others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my “ideal self”—to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>As an English learner, you have a limited amount of talent for developing your English writing skills, and you can’t really do much to change it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My goal is to completely master the material presented in this class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don’t perform as well as I would ideally like to do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am striving to understand the content of this course as thoroughly as possible.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Your intelligence is something about you that you can’t change very much.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am striving to avoid an incomplete understanding of the course material.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>With enough practice you will be able to write like a native speaker of English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My goal is to learn as much as possible.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I usually obeyed rules and regulations that were established by my parents.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I am striving to do well compared to other students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I worry about making mistakes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>You can always greatly change how intelligent you are.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My goal is to avoid performing poorly compared to others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I “ought” to be—fulfill my duties, responsibilities and obligations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>No matter who you are, you can always learn to write as well as native speakers of English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My goal is to perform well relative to other students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>You can learn new things, but you can’t really change your basic intelligence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My goal is to avoid learning less than I possibly could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>No matter how hard you try, as an English language learner you can never write like a native speaker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>No matter how much intelligence you have, you can always change it a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My goal is to avoid learning less than it is possible to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>You can improve your English writing skills, but you can’t really change your writing talent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>My goal is to avoid doing worse than other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

**Written Feedback Questionnaire (Part 2)**

Please read each of the following statements. Circle the answer that best describes what you think. Do not leave any blank answers. Answer each one as honestly as you can. The results will not be shown to your teacher.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This doesn’t apply to me</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I enjoy writing in English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I like to have many opportunities to revise my writing for a grade. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I like when my teacher comments on only my writing strengths. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I like when my teacher only writes a grade and not comments on my paper. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. When I do not understand my teacher’s comments, I talk to him/her. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I like to get comments on my writing like “Good job! You did it right.” 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I like when my teacher corrects all of my mistakes (grammar, content, organization, spelling, punctuation). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I am making progress toward become a stronger writer in English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. When I do not understand my teacher’s comments, I ignore them. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I like to get comments on my writing like “Good job! You did not make any mistakes.” 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I like when my teacher uses correction symbols to show me my mistakes. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. When I get my papers back, I read all of the comments carefully. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. I like to receive feedback on my writing from my classmates (peer review). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. I really try to learn how to write English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. After peer review, I never look at my classmate’s comments. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I would like to be told only what I did wrong in my paper. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Written feedback from my teacher helps me to be a better writer. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. I always look forward to my writing classes in English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. I like to receive feedback only on my organization and development of my ideas in my writing. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. I like when my teacher comments only on my writing weaknesses. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Writing in English is very important to me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. I revise and save my papers, even if it is not for a grade. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. I like to get comments on my writing like “You need to work on…” 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. I like to receive feedback only on grammar, spelling, and vocabulary errors in my writing. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. When I get my papers back, I only look at the grade. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. I would like to be told only what I did right in my paper. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. I remember the mistakes my teacher points out to me and I try not to make them again. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. I would like to spend lots of time learning to write in English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. I like to receive feedback only on my ideas and content in my writing. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. I actively think about what I have learned in my English writing class. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. I like when my teacher writes questions on my paper to make me think about my writing and does not give me the answer.  

32. I would like to concentrate on learning to write in English more than any other topic.  

33. I don’t care about receiving feedback on my papers.
Appendix C

Background Information (Part 3)

1. Age: ______________________

2. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female

3. What is your native language? ______________________

4. How long have you been in the U.S.? Years ______ Months ______

5. How long have you been studying English? Years ______ Months ______

6. Year in college:  □ Freshman  □ Sophomore  □ Junior  □ Senior  □ MA/Ph.D.

7. Major field of study: ______________________

8. Please rate on a scale of 1-6 your current ability in English writing (circle the number below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= beginner</th>
<th>2= pre-intermediate</th>
<th>3= intermediate</th>
<th>4= upper-intermediate</th>
<th>5= advanced</th>
<th>6= native-like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please add any additional comments you may have.