

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
CENTRO DE COMUNICAÇÃO E EXPRESSÃO (CCE)
DEPARTAMENTO DE LÍNGUA E LITERATURA ESTRANGEIRA
(DLLE)

**Reacting to Feedback:
Students' Perception on Written Feedback**

Otávio A. B. Leal

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso
Orientadora: Prof. Dr. Maria Ester Wollstein Moritz

Florianópolis, SC - April, 2019

**Reacting to Feedback:
Students' Perception on Written Feedback**

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (TCC) para a disciplina LLE7462 do Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina como requisito para a obtenção do título de Bacharel em Letras – Inglês.

Orientadora: Maria Ester W. Moritz

Prof. Responsável pela disciplina: Hanna Emilia Kivisto de Souza

BANCA EXAMINADORA

Prof^ª. Dra. Maria Ester W. Moritz

Prof^ª. Dra. Raquel Carolina S. Ferraz D'ely

Prof^ª. Dra. Donesca Cristina Puntuel Xhafaj

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents José Carlos Marafiga Leal and Beatriz Barcella for all the emotional and financial support they have provided me during these 6,5 years, and much more for all the love and patience they have showed me during my entire life. I also want to thank my sister Camila and her husband Henrique for the funny weekends in which they helped me forgetting the pressure and the stress caused by grades and deadlines. And more specially I would like to thank my advisor Maria Ester who helped me when I had no idea of how to achieve the final demands of the Academy, if it was not for her assistance I would not have a subject to my TCC, and would not find courage to face a class of student that was one of the requirements to finish the course. When I entered the University I have convinced myself it would be easy, but I have soon realized that I was wrong. I had actually struggled while facing some challenges that made me consider several times the possibility of giving up, and these challenges were not severe dramas caused by physical or material limitations, just a persistent belief that I was not good enough. I thought I was not good enough, but these people made me believe differently, they had seen the best of me, and they showed me how to develop my potential so I dedicate this work to them.

Abstract

Reacting to Feedback: Students' Perception on Written Feedback

Otávio A. B. Leal

Universidade federal de Santa Catarina

2019

Prof. Dr. Maria Ester W. Moritz

The importance of written feedback has appeared in the 70s with the advent of the “process approach” (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). During the last 40 years this approach, that consists of teachers encouraging students to write through a multiple draft-system, has become extremely popular, and the relevance of written feedback that was provided all along this teaching approach has motivated uncountable studies in the area (Carless, 2006; Ferris, 1995; Lee, 2008; Seeker & Dincer, 2014; Truscott, 1996; etc). Having in mind the relevance that teachers’ written feedback has achieved in the context of the SLA field, this study aims at investigating how fourth year UFSC *Letras-Inglês* students react to the feedback provided by their professor in advanced Academic Writing classes. This study happened in the context of a Brazilian University in a course called *Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica*. The data collected were two versions of an Abstract produced by 3 female students in the last year of their major and a semi-structured interview conducted with them with the purpose of understanding: a) *What kinds of feedback they receive in their writing assignments* b) *What they change in the original version with the feedback received* and c) *What the students’ perceptions on the nature of received feedback are*. The results provide second language teachers with a notion of the singularities emerged from the way students deal with the written response given by professors in their textual productions, since it has become very clear according to our results that each student is unique in his/her reactions towards the feedback received.

Keywords: L2 Writing; Feedback in Writing; Teacher’s Feedback

Number of Words: 258

Resumo

Reacting to Feedback: Students' Perception on Written Feedback

Otávio A. B. Leal

Universidade federal de Santa Catarina

2019

Prof. Dr. Maria Ester W. Moritz

A importância do feedback escrito apareceu nos anos 70 com o advento da “process approach” (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Durante os últimos 40 anos essa abordagem que consiste no encorajamento dos alunos, por parte do professor, à produção de textos em um sistema que demanda a composição de várias versões desses mesmos textos se tornou bastante popular e o feedback escrito fornecido nesse tipo de abordagem de ensino motivou várias pesquisas na área (Carless, 2006; Ferris, 1995; Lee, 2008; Seeker & Dincer, 2014; Truscott, 1996; etc). Levando em consideração a relevância que o feedback escrito fornecido pelos professores alcançou no contexto do Ensino de Segunda Língua (ESL) esse trabalho busca saber como estudantes do quarto ano do curso de Letras-Inglês da UFSC lidam com o feedback recebido em aulas avançadas de Escrita Acadêmica. Esse estudo se passa numa Universidade Brasileira em um curso chamado *Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica*. Os dados coletados foram duas versões de um *Abstract* produzido por três estudantes no último ano de graduação em Letras e uma entrevista semiestruturada conduzida com cada uma delas com o objetivo de entender: a) Que tipo de feedback elas recebem em suas tarefas escritas, b) O que elas mudam em seus textos tendo como base esse feedback recebido e c) Como elas encaram esse feedback recebido. Os resultados dessa pesquisa trazem aos professores uma noção da complexidade da relação estudante/feedback, já que fica bastante claro em nossos resultados que cada estudante é único em sua maneira de lidar com o feedback recebido.

Palavras-chave: Escrita em Segunda Língua; Feedback Escrito; Feedback do Professor

Número de Palavras: 252

Table of Contents

1. Introduction1

2. Review of the Literature5

2.1. Feedback5

2.1.1. Peer feedback6

2.1.2. Conferences as feedback6

2.1.3. Teachers comments as feedback7

2.2. Student's reaction to teacher written feedback8

2.3. Students' Perception11

2.4. Types of feedback.12

3. Method..16

3.1. Context16

3.2. Participants18

3.3. Data Collection20

3.4. Interview21

4. Data Analysis: 24

4.1. Preliminary Accounts24

4.2. Written Feedback.25

4.2.1. Charlie25

4.2.2. Delta30

4.2.3. Ecco36

4.3. Student's Perception on the Written Feedback Received44

4.3.1. Charlie's Interview44

4.3.2. Delta's Interview47

4.3.3. Ecco's Interview50

4.4. Overview53

5. Final Remarks55

6. Limitations and Further Research61

6.1. Limitations:.61

6.2. Pedagogical Implications62

6.3. Future Research62

7. References: 64

8. Appendix: 67

8.1. Charlie's data:67

8.1. 1. Revised abstract67

8.1.2. Interview68

8.2. Delta's data:.72

8.2.1. Revised abstract.72

8.2.2. Interview73

8.3. Ecco's data:78

8.3.1. Revised Abstract78

8.3.2. Interview.78

Figures:

Figure 1-Charlie's Abstract27

Figure 2 - Delta's Abstract32

Figure 3 - Ecco's Abstract.38

Tables:

Table 1 Purposes of Revision, Moritz (1999)14

Table 2 Purposes of Revision – feedback on Charlie’s text28

Table 3 Purposes of Revision - feedback on Delta's text33

Table 4 Purposes of Revision - feedback on Ecco's text39

Reacting to Feedback: Student's Perception on Written Feedback

Chapter 1:

1. Introduction

The Cambridge Dictionary describes feedback as the “reaction to a process or activity, or the information obtained from such a reaction” (Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary, 2017). In second language teaching feedback is commonly used to define the multifaceted process of providing students with notions of how to improve several aspects related to the language they are engaged in learning. Written feedback is even more specific applying to all the comments, appraisal, suggestion and notes provided by the professor in students texts with the purpose of helping them to become better.

According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), the importance of written feedback appeared during the 1970s in North America with the advent of the “process approach” in L1 composition classes. Within these classes teachers were encouraged to support students to write through a multiple draft-system in which teachers provided feedback during the process of writing rather than at the end of it. More than 40 years have passed and this approach has become very popular, especially in the context of second language acquisition. According to Paulus (1999), the importance of this movement to a process approach on ESL classes resides in teaching students not only to edit their texts but also to develop strategies to generate ideas, compose multiple drafts, and revise their written work.

Hyland and Hyland (2006b, p. 206) state that as a pedagogical genre teacher written feedback carries a heavy informational load as it offers commentary on the form and content of a text encouraging students to develop their writing and consolidate their learning. The authors also mention that feedback prepares students to other texts they will write while assisting them to develop a text's potential by understanding the writing context, and providing a sense of audience with a comprehension of public expectation.

Due to the importance of written feedback within the context of English as a second language classroom, many studies have been carried out in order to identify how students react to the received feedback (Ferris, 1995; Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Lee, 2008; Seker & Dincer, 2014). Ferris (1995), for example, points out that in a classroom context in which students are supposed to rewrite their assignments they are more likely to pay attention to feedback. This has become evident considering the fact that in a multiple draft composition class students are assumed to pay more attention to the teacher's response on drafts rather than in the final version.

Despite this finding on students' interest on feedback and even the knowledge of student's preference for teachers' written feedback rather than the feedback received by their peers (Ferris, 1995; Ferris 2006; Hyland & Hyland 2006; Leki, 1991; Truscott 1996), the effectiveness of this kind of interaction is still questioned. Zamel (1985, p. 86) problematizes feedback by criticizing the nature of teacher response saying that "ESL writing teachers misread student texts, are inconsistent in their reactions, make arbitrary corrections, write contradictory comments, provide vague descriptions, impose abstract rules and standards (...)". And Truscott (1996) claims that grammar correction is a threat to students' learning, demotivating them.

The issues raised in the previous paragraph are very complex and we are not aiming at answering each one of them or giving a final answer to the problem involving the nature of written feedback and its implications. The aim here, as we acknowledge that both students and teachers recognize teacher feedback as an important part of the writing process (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Fatham & Whalley 1990; Ferris 1995), is to scrutinize students' perception on feedback they receive as a way to possibly understand if there are barriers which prevent teacher's feedback to actually operate a positive influence on student's learning. Therefore, this research seeks at investigating the students' perception of teacher's written feedback. In order to reach the general objective, a general question is posed:

How do fourth year UFSC Letras students react to the professor's written feedback received throughout an English Academic Writing course? As a means to answer the general question, a set of three specific questions is proposed.

- a) What kinds of feedback do the students receive in their writing assignments in this English Academic Writing Course?
- b) What do students change or not from feedback received? Why?
- c) What are the students' perceptions on the nature of received feedback?

Having these questions in mind, we move to chapter 2, where we discuss some of the literature in the field of second language writing that categorizes forms of providing feedback to students and some types of feedback recognized by the scholars on this area. After that, in chapter 3, we present the method of the current research. In chapter 4, all the data gathered is analyzed, which includes the students' texts, the professor's feedback, the

revised version of students' texts, and the interviews conducted with them. At the end, in the chapter 5 the results of the current research are discussed, taking into account some of the literature already produced in our field of research.

Chapter 2:

2. Review of the Literature

This chapter is divided in three main sections. In the first one we present Keh's (1990) division of feedback in three categories, which are different means of providing feedback to second language learners, a similar division can be spotted in Hyland & Hyland's (2006) article differing in the fact that they include a fourth feedback category that they call "Computer-Mediated-Feedback". In the second section we present some previous case studies produced in the area of Second Language Learning as a way to give us background to our research, by showing some factual knowledge regarding our area of research. In the third section we discuss briefly about students' reactions when receiving written feedback in their texts. Finally in the fourth section we present Ellis' (2007) framework, which will serve us to categorize the professor's main strategies when providing students with feedback in the course that is the focus of our analysis. We also present a table organized by Moritz (1999) that will serve us to organize the different marks made by teacher in the students' texts, according to purposes of revision.

2.1. Feedback

Keh (1990, p. 295) suggests that "through feedback, the writer learns where he or she has misled or confused the reader by not supplying enough information, illogical organization, and lack of development of ideas or something like inappropriate word-choice or tense". Keh (1990) mentions that there are three categories of feedback as means to promote text revision which are peer feedback, conferences as feedback, and teachers' comments as feedback.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) also mention computer-mediated feedback as a mean of promoting feedback; indeed computers can be used to facilitate communication in many ways, such as conferencing with teachers, and discussing feedback with colleagues. Furthermore, computer-mediated feedback can also be used to empower students because some programs can give students real time response – as showed by Hyland and Hyland (2006) – which allow the student to independently develop his/her potential with the help of these kinds of tutorial tools. So it seems like computer-mediated feedback exists in a kind of boundary between a fourth category of feedback and a total different teaching context, which is beyond the scope of this study.

2.1.1. Peer feedback

Peer feedback is a formative developmental process that gives the opportunity for writers to discuss their texts and understand the interpretation of others (Hyland & Hyland 2006).

Despite the fact that peer feedback is referred to using different terms such as peer response, peer critique, peer evaluation, among others, all these terms refer to the same construct and different names refer to different moments of the process in which peer feedback is utilized. Keh (1990) explains that while peer response is given in the beginning of the writing process by comments on content for example, peer editing takes place at the end of the continuum with a focus on grammar, spelling, punctuation among others.

2.1.2. Conferences as feedback

One of the most extensively employed modes of feedback which allows response and interaction among teacher and students are writing conferences that can be defined as

“an approach lauded by L1 researchers as a dialogue in which meaning and interpretation are constantly being negotiated by participants and as a method that provides both teaching and learning benefits” (Hyland & Hyland 2006a, p. 5).

There are some advantages and disadvantages in this area of feedback. As for advantages, Keh (1990) cites the interaction between student and teacher as a way to clarify doubts, help the writer with problems which emerged during the process, and assist the student to make decisions.

Nevertheless, some limitations of this kind of feedback must be considered. Hyland and Hyland (2006a, p. 6) observe that “some students may lack the experience, interactive abilities, or aural comprehension skills” to benefit from conferences and Powers (1993) considers that power relations between student and teacher may affect student’s participation and negotiation of meaning.

2.1.3. Teachers comments as feedback

Keh (1990) mentions three roles she occupies as a teacher when making comments on students writing. The first role is the reader responding to a writer, by appraising or criticizing specific points. The second role occurs still in the position of reader, but a reader worried with “points of confusion” and “breaks of logic”, asking when necessary for clarification. And finally she plays the role of grammarian; here she places herself in this position of a grammar authority in order to indicate where the grammar is inappropriate and explaining why it is inappropriate.

Since the focus of the current research is going to be the professor’s written feedback, this part is very relevant to us because we will be looking at all the course

professor's comments in the student's texts, together with the marks made by her. We must mention again these "three roles" occupied by the teacher when presenting Moritz (2009) framework, still in this Chapter.

2.2. Student's reaction to teacher written feedback

Several studies indicates that students' preference lies on teachers' written feedback rather than other kinds of feedback (Ferris 1995; Ferris, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Leki, 1991; Truscott 1996) and for this reason some research has been carried out in order to understand to which extent written feedback affects L2 students' progress and their attitude when receiving this kind of feedback. In the following paragraphs we present some findings on student's relation with teacher's written feedback. The purpose of presenting it is to give background to our research.

The first study refers to a very specific context. In a multiple case-study developed at a public University in USA, Ferris, Liu, Sinha and Senna (2013) found through interviews that some of their respondents (classified as "Generation 1.5", which means U.S. education children of first-generation immigrants), could not remember or even could not understand the grammar taught in secondary school. It is said by the researchers that what these students learned was, sometimes, partially learned or misapplied. Someone could say here that when students really have difficulty understanding the professor feedback, perhaps the problem is not the feedback itself, but the fact that students lack background knowledge in order to make a good use of the teachers' feedback. During the study, in which the students not just received feedback on their written productions, but were also stimulated to revise their texts, they all (a total amount of 10 students) highlighted positive aspects of the activities they were performing while participating in the research program

like, for example, the specific and clearly focused feedback on their errors, and the detailed information on their charts on how their error patterns changed from one task to the next one. So although the student's limited background consisted initially into a barrier to their learning, they were able to overcome it throughout the program in which they received clear and valuable feedback.

Another significant study was carried out by Hyland (1998) with six university students attending an English Proficiency Program in New Zealand. The data were collected through interviews, class observation, questionnaires and students written drafts, and what could be observed was that students vary in their preferences and their reactions regarding received feedback. Apparently, more skilled students were deeply worried with grammar accuracy while novices were worried with content, but, still, as showed by Hyland these preferences had a lot to do with student's personality. One of the participants in that study was Maho, and despite the fact that she asked for feedback on content, she ignored most of the feedback received and, according to Hyland (1998) there was a serious disagreement between her and the teacher regarding the function of a first draft; to Maho it was just a brainstorming stage, while to Joan, the teacher, it was a "semi-finished and shaped product" (p. 276). It is also important to mention how Samorn was emotionally affected by grammar correction. She believed that her grammar was good, and asked for this kind of feedback to become even better, but too much correction on her grammar without any positive comments on that topic broke her spirit, making her feel that she was not good at all. So while Maho possibly serves as an example that sometimes students are incompatible with their teachers' approach, Samorn's example could be used to reinforce Truscott (1996) view of grammar correction as being a threat to students, since the problem

here is not simply the fact that grammar correction by itself has demotivated Sammorn, but the fact that she was not able to transform this kind of feedback into progress.

Finally, in a more recent study designed by Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima (2008), they asked whether the professor's feedback helped Japanese students to become accurate in the use of the article "a/an" and the article "the" to express first and second mention. This study consisted of using 3 groups (one receiving focused feedback on article usage, another receiving unfocused feedback, and a control group which did not receive feedback at all), formed by an average of 10 students each, and most of the students were male below 20 years old. The researchers perceived that both groups which received feedback on grammar points, no matter if it was focused or not, were able to improve their accuracy to 90-100% while the group without grammar correction remained inaccurate, or with inconsistent results. It shows that feedback can actually help student's improvement on specific points, and, despite the fact that students receiving focused feedback have differed a little from those who received feedback on other points too, the fact demonstrated is that the feedback helped them, taking into account that the control group did not developed their article usage accuracy at all.

These three studies were selected in order to claim three points. First, students sometimes are unable to understand teachers' feedback for a number of reasons, varying from the quality of feedback received to their limited background knowledge. Second, each student is singular, sometimes the same approach is not effective with the whole class, and the student/teacher relation may become a threat to learning when they are in disagreement about some topic. Furthermore, feedback is essential to students understanding of specific structures.

The next subsection presents a very interesting study carried out in Hong Kong

2.3. Students' Perception

Carless (2006) reported on a qualitative research carried out in Hong Kong Universities. The corpus of this research consisted of selected items drawn from a large-scale questionnaire that assesses qualitative data focused mainly on feedback aspects, and the total of individuals that answered the research was 460 staff and 1740 students. Departing from (Higgins, Hartley and Skelton, 2001) notion that students are dissatisfied with feedback they receive, in terms of lacking specific advice to improve, one of the main questions raised by Carless (2006) was how the students perceive the feedback process.

It was observed that students don't perceive the feedback given by their teachers like their teachers do; actually, the feedback provided by the teachers is undervalued by students, and also students frequently blame teachers for the bad marks in their texts. Sometimes students even accuse their teachers or tutors of bias when the feedback provided did not meet their expectations.

Another interesting finding regards the emotional aspects affected by feedback. Below we cite some students' comments presented by Carless (2006, p. 21) within his article:

- “If the feedback is not so good, first I may feel depressed, but quite soon I may adjust myself to see how to do it better next time”
- “If I get a low mark, I like to try and forget about the assignment for some time because if I read it again it will make me unhappy”

- “When I check to see the mark [on the notice-board], I feel pressurized. If the grade is okay, the pressure is released”.

It is important to notice that the way the students deal with the feedback emotionally, might affect whether they are going to profit from this feedback or not.

Another relevant fact reported in Carless’ research is the importance of what he calls “general feedback”. Carless (2006) mentions that “a number of students commented that they could not improve much from lecturers’ comments because they (the comments) were specific to a particular assignment and so did not provide support to do better in another assignment in a different module”(p.13), and for this reason Carless highlights the importance of more generic feedback, feedback on points that are common to a variety of genres, and as an example he mentions feedback on citations, that is an example of feedback which helps students in the assignments they most do in the University.

2.4. Types of feedback

Having initially contextualized feedback, and then considered some research on the topic, we now proceed to an explanation of possible terms that appear within this field of research. We decided to use a typology organized by Ellis (2007) as, although the types of feedback listed by him were initially discussed by other researchers, he has compiled these types of feedback in a more didactic way. This typology includes: direct CF (corrective feedback), indirect CF (corrective feedback), metalinguistic CF, focused and unfocused CF, and reformulation.

In the case of direct CF the teacher provides the student with the correct grammar form. It is a very explicit form to correct students' mistakes and according to Ellis (2009, p. 99) it is desirable if the student does not already know what the correct form is.

Indirect CF is a method that consists of indicating to the student that he/she made a mistake (indicating or not where the error is) without giving the right form. Lalande (1982 as cited by Ellis, 2009, p. 100) argues that it caters to "guided learning and problem solving".

Metalinguistic corrective feedback is similar to Indirect corrective feedback differing on the fact that here the teacher must code the kind of error the student has made or/and explain the nature of the mistake.

Focused corrective feedback and Unfocused corrective feedback are strategies that can be applied to the three kinds of feedback mentioned in the last paragraphs. The question here is whether the teacher should 'focus' his/her correction on a specific group of errors (problems with verb tense, punctuation, for example) or correct all students' mistakes in an 'unfocused' manner.

Regarding reformulation, this strategy differs from all the others, since it consists of having the teacher reconstructing the students' text in a correct way and asking the student to study the two versions as a form to understand their mistakes and improve their accuracy in future texts.

While Ellis (2007) framework is useful to deal with professor's feedback in a general way, by identifying his/her main strategy when responding to a student's text, there is a need to organize the marks made by the professor as a way to systematize our feedback

analyses. Keeping this in mind, we decided to use a table organized by Moritz (1999), which is based on research conducted by Hall (1990) and Dellagnelo (1997). This table was originally used to categorize the changes made by students while revising their own texts and for this reason this table is called “Purposes of Revision table”.

Table 1 Purposes of Revision, Moritz (1999)

CONTENT	ORGANIZATION	WRITING CONVENTIONS
1. inappropriate title	1. lack of introduction	1. parallelism
2. unfulfilled expectations	2. lack of conclusion	2. vocabulary choice
3. undeveloped idea	3. lack of cohesive devices	3. word order
4. absence of important information	4. wrong use of cohesive devices	4. verb tense
5. irrelevant information	5. lack of transitions	5. verb form
6. ambiguity	6. different ideas	6. subject-verb agreement
7. repetition and redundancy	7. related ideas	7. number
8. incoherence		8. reference
9. non real information		9. conjunction
10. use of informal language		10. punctuation
11. unclear or incomprehensible idea		11. spelling
		12. pronoun
		13. preposition
		14. adjective
		15. adverb
		16. article
		17. subject
		18. absence or insertion of verb
		19. capitalization

Recalling what was said by Keh (1990) about the roles she played when responding to her student’s text, the first role is the role of a critic reader, appraising or criticizing specific points, the second role is the role of a reader worried with “points of confusion”

and “breaks of logic”, and the last role is the role of a grammarian. The “Content” category proposed by Moritz (1999) is concerned with the quality, clarity and sufficiency of content presented by the student, being adequate to represent aspects related to the second role played by the professor (the role of a reader worried with “points of confusion” and “breaks of logic”) when providing feedback as it comprises the subcategories: 1) unclear or incomprehensible idea, 8) incoherence, and 3) undeveloped idea, for example. The “Organization” category is less specific and is concerned with more general structural problems (like introduction, conclusion, and use of cohesive devices) being adequate to represent the first role mentioned by Keh (1990), the role of a critic reader, appraising or criticizing specific points. The last category “Writing Conventions” is very specific; the items listed there are mainly grammar related, with the exception of the subcategories: 1) Parallelisms, and 2) Word Choice. Still this category caters for the third role (grammarian), mentioned by Keh (1990).

After having presented the review of literature we are going to proceed to the next chapter that is the Method, where we talk about the participants involved in this research, the Data collecting procedures and the organization of this work.

Chapter 3:

3. Method

In order to investigate students' perception on teacher's written feedback, this qualitative study has analyzed a teacher's written feedback to students' written assignments produced in class, and the responses to a semi-structured individualized interview aiming at understanding how each student react to the way feedback was conducted by the teacher.

3.1.Context

The research was carried out in the context of *Letras-Inglês* program at Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), a federal university located in the south of Brazil, and the 3 participants were undergraduate students regularly enrolled in *Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica* which is a course focused on developing student's academic writing skills.

UFSC has a program called *Letras-Inglês* in which students enter with different purposes according to the possibilities offered by the program which is guided to the training of teachers of English as second/foreign language, but also provides a bachelor degree for the ones who want to specialize in English translation or Literary studies, for example.

The course *Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica* is mandatory to all the *Letras-Inglês*' students and has as its main focus the improvement of students' academic writing skills. The class is advanced, comprising students that are in the seventh semester, and/or have already accomplished the other twelve English courses from the program which are

half of them devoted to improving students' writing and reading skills, and the other half devoted to improving students' speaking and listening English skills.

In all the courses provided by UFSC professors are required to produce a course Syllabus called *Plano de Ensino*. This document is written in Portuguese and informs students about the purpose of the course, methodology, evaluation and the main bibliography. According to “Programa da Disciplina” *Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica* main purpose is:

Desenvolver as habilidades linguísticas, comunicativas e discursivas necessárias para a comunicação científica, através da compreensão e produção, em língua inglesa, de textos orais e/ou escritos necessários para a área de atuação do profissional em Letras.

Therefore the class attended by the students (*Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica*) was an advanced writing class with the purpose of preparing them to produce academic genres; the students were expected to plan and carry out a study and report that in an extended abstract including introduction, review of literature, method, data analysis, and conclusion, always taking into account the characteristics of the genres. The main objective of this course, according to “Programa da Disciplina” is helping students to develop their communicative, discursive, and linguistic skills in order to allow them to deal with the standards of scientific communication.

The course professor, that from now on will be called Alpha (as a way to protect her identity), mentioned that her course was idealized as a way to provide students with a notion of how an Academic event works. And having this in mind, the entire course revolves around students producing an academic research individually during the semester.

Hence the students worked individually all along the semester, and they had to produce an Abstract, after that they collected data, analyzed it, and presented orally an overview of their research results. At last, they were expected to produce a *Resumo Estendido*, which was a summary of their research, presenting its purpose, method and results. Our focus in this study was exclusively on their Abstracts and the feedback received in this activity.

In order to help students producing the first version of their Abstracts the professor prepared some classes in which she showed some examples of Abstracts, and explained the peculiarities of the genre. In the day that she asked students to start producing their Abstracts she gave them an “Outline”, that is, a table, where the students were expected to write separately each section of the Abstract in the following order: a)Title; b)Outline; c)Purpose; d)Method; e)Expected Results; f)Keywords.

After having received this first version from students, the professor corrected all of them digitally, using Microsoft Word, and asked students to revise their texts based on the comments and marks provided in the feedback as a way to produce a new and better version of it. For the present investigation, we looked at these two versions, the corrected one, and the student’s revised version, in order to develop the analyses of feedback and student’s reactions to it.

3.2. Participants

Since the main goal of this research is to analyze students’ attitude regarding teacher’s written response to their written tasks, the decision was to work with no more than three participants. This methodological decision does not allow generalizations, but it is adequate

for an in-depth analysis of student perception since the main objective here is to observe the singularities that emerge from the individual relation with the course and the kinds of feedback received in their written texts.

The three students participating in this research are all females, and so is the professor. There is no specific reason for the choice of three females, since they were the only who volunteered to take part in the research.

By means of protecting their identity they are going to be called within this paper as student Charlie, Delta, and Echo, the names were defined by the order the interviews were conducted, being Charlie the first, and Echo the last.

Before talking about our Instruments and Data Collection, it is essential to provide some information about each of our 3 participants and the professor:

Alpha is a 44 Years old University Professor, with 18 years of experience in teaching EFL, who had been working at UFSC for 4 years at the time of data collection. She works in the Applied Linguistics UFSC's department having a PhD in the field of L2 learning.

Charlie is a 27 years old student; she has stopped the graduation for one year for personal reasons, and, then, went back to the University. She had experience with Academic Writing previous to the Course "Inglês VII: Produção Textual Acadêmica, because she attended the "Bolsa de Iniciação Científica Program" at UFSC (that is a program devoted to giving students an opportunity to develop their Academic Writing skills, while producing research in the *Letras-Inglês* field). Charlie had also traveled once to the U.S. on vacation.

Delta is 23 years old. She has studied English since her 5th grade of Elementary school, and had attended English classes at "Ways Escola de Idiomas" when she was 19. Her

experience with Academic Writing is limited to the mandatory courses from the *Letras-Inglês* program, and she has never had the opportunity to visit an English speaking country.

Ecco is 22 years old. She studied English in a language school called Microcamp when she was 14 to 15 years old. She restarted her English language studies just after she began studying in the University at the Letras-Inglês Program and never had the opportunity to travel to an English speaking country.

3.3 . Data Collection

Data comprised two versions of the Abstract produced by the students (that are the first version with professor's feedback and their revised final version), and the interview made with the 3 students after they rewrote their Abstracts following Alpha's feedback. The versions of students' Abstracts were sent to the researcher by the students themselves via e-mail, and all their work in the course "Inglês VII" was produced using Microsoft Word text editor, allowing the professor (Alpha) to give feedback to them with digital notes on their texts by using tools provided by the same text editor.

The interviews with the students were carried out in order to understand the students' perception on the feedback received and their decision making process when revising their own texts, and to clarify some research doubts that appeared throughout the analysis of the revised version of their Abstracts with the feedback received. It was important to understand, for example, if the student understood the feedback, not exclusively considering whether this feedback was clear or not, but also observing if the students had some comprehension difficulties, because depending on a student's attention or linguistic

background sometimes he/she can have difficulties with the feedback received as observed in Ferris et al (2013).

The interview was semi-structured, which gives to the researcher some freedom to clarify doubts that might be specific regarding each individual student assessed, and was conducted in Portuguese, which is the mother language of the participants. Each student was individually interviewed in different days of June 2018, and all the interviews were conducted in the footbridge that connects building A and B of CCE (Centro de Comunicação e Expressão - UFSC). In these interviews that were scheduled by email with the participants, the researcher talked with the students about their experience with academic writing, and the feedback received by them in their Abstracts.

The questions that constituted the basis format of the interview are displayed below, while the actual finished interviews appear in the Appendix of this paper divided by participant.

3.4.Interview

Informações Básicas (Background)

Idade, quando entrou no curso e há quanto tempo estuda Inglês?

Qual é o seu conhecimento sobre escrita acadêmica? Já trabalhaste com escrita Acadêmica antes?

Você acha importante receber feedback do professor nas suas produções escritas?

Quando você é corrigido em um trabalho acadêmico em inglês, quais tipos de comentário você gosta de receber? (correção de erros gramaticais, dicas para melhorar o texto, correção da organização do texto, pontuação, comentários sobre o conteúdo)?

Quais tipos de comentários a professora faz que você acredita que ajudam a melhorar o seu texto? Justifique?

E quais tipos de comentários você acha que não são válidos?

Produção Escrita (Abstract)

Você tinha alguma expectativa com relação ao feedback que você iria receber nesse seu Abstract? O que você pensou quando recebeu o feedback?

Você considera os comentários da professora claros?

Você acha que os comentários feitos ajudaram a reescrever seu texto? O que você não achou produtivo?

Eficácia do feedback

Qual o impacto dos comentários que você recebe? Você os leva em consideração em sua escrita em outros textos?

Você acha que vai lembrar-se desse feedback nas suas próximas tarefas? Você acha que o feedback da professora poderia ser melhor?

After having presented the method, we are going to move to our Data Analyses. There we look at the text produced by the students, the feedback received by them with

marks and comments made by the professor, the students' revision, and the interview conducted with them.

Chapter 4

4. Data Analysis:

This chapter explains in the first section the dynamics of the course and presents the framework chosen to analyze our data. The second section presents the feedback provided by the professor including her marks that are organized in a table, and comments that are not present in the table, being commented individually. In the third section we look at the changes made by students in their texts contrasting those with the interviews conducted with them, as a way to better understand students' rewriting process when dealing with the feedback they received.

4.1.Preliminary Accounts

In the first place it is important to clarify the dynamics of the course we collected our data from. In this course the students were guided to the production of an Academic Research Project, whose subject could be freely chosen by the students as long as it had some relation with the *Letras-Inglês* program, so the options ranged from Literary Studies to Translation, Linguistics, and Applied Linguistics. Along with the production of this study, that took the entire semester, there were three points in which the students were going to be evaluated. The first one was the production of the research Abstract, the second was the presentation of a lecture in an event in which they presented the results of their research, and the last, called "Resumo Estendido" was a summarized research report. Our current research focuses exclusively on the Abstract produced by the students.

In order to analyze the feedback provided by the professor to the students' Abstract – the first draft produced by students along with feedback provided by the professor – I used primarily Ellis' (2007) framework of types of feedback as a means of categorizing the feedback given by the course professor. Then I proceeded to the categorization of the feedback given by the professor in the student's text according to "Purposes of Revision" following a table produced by professor Moritz (1999). This table shows a framework based on research conducted by Hall (1990) and Dellagnelo (1997) and was originally used to categorize the changes made by students in the process of revising their own texts, but here we used these categories as a way to organize the marks made by the course professor in students' text. The table was already displayed on the chapter 2, in the "Types of feedback" section (p.14).

4.2. Written Feedback

This section presents an overview of the feedback provided by the professor on the first version of students' texts; the first corrected version of students "Abstract" is our focus. The texts observed here already received teacher's feedback and they include teachers' commentaries and marks.

As a mean of better systematizing results, findings are organized by participant.

4.2.1. Charlie

Charlie has stopped her major for one year for personal reasons, about two years ago, but it did not affect her proficiency. Actually, her English is very good, she is very

participative in classes, and her writing has some grammar mistakes, but her vocabulary and her organization are good, what justifies the few corrections made by professor Alpha in her Abstract.

Charlie's research is a review of the literature produced on the last decade in the field of Universal Grammar and its importance to the field of SLA studies.

Most of the teacher feedback given by Alpha to her texts is direct (Ellis 2007), and it ranges from word to sentence level. Basically, the teacher scribes students' mistakes and adds the correct form right after the original. The feedback is also unfocused (Ellis 2007), since all the mistakes are taken into account, and not just grammar mistakes, but also problems with organization, academic register and so far. Also, there are no comments provided by the teacher regarding grammar; all the grammar correction is direct and unfocused as already mentioned and all the comments are concerned with macro textual issues such as text organization, academic language, and quotation.

Below is a copy of her Abstract with the corrections made by Alpha:

Revisiting the debate on UG access in SLA:

a systematic review of literature.

Since the intrauterine environment, children are exposed to language. In the effort of explaining the phenomenon of how they go from recipients to producers of language, a few matters of investigation were depicted, such as (I) how can a child acquire such a complex meaning maker-making system in such a short time with no difficulty?, (II) how can a child produce an infinite number of sentences by using a finite number of elements?, (III) how can a child acquire any language despite the differences among them?, etc. In order to account for such questions, the Universal Grammar hypothesis emerged. Universal Grammar (UG) is the innate set of constraints that enable human beings to acquire language effortlessly and rapidly. In other words, UG is the initial state of a child's language acquisition. Ergo, is with access to the UG that children acquire their first language. Even though the UG theory is well accepted and investigated as a way to account for first language acquisition, the extent to which UG plays a role in second language acquisition (SLA) is yet to be determined. As a systematic review of literature, this paper aims at revisiting the empirical data collected about the issue of UG access in SLA. Our main concern will be asserting for which position had received more evidence has been documented: the No Access, the Partial Access, or the Full Access Positions. In pursuance of that, we will review research papers from the last decade that respect our inclusion criteria.

Keywords: Universal Grammar; Second Language Acquisition; Access; Minimalism

[1] Comentário: Present source on this.

[U2] Comentário: I guess if you look in the texts we used in SLA and also some in Est. Ling. II you'll easily find the references you need here.

[3] Comentário: Again, you need to present the source of this information. What author are you using? Etc.

[U4] Comentário: Published in English, right?

[U5] Comentário: I think if you mention that, you should tell us what these criteria are.

[6] Comentário: We are only going to work with three keywords here, so you'll have to choose. Still, great selection!

[U7] Comentário: I guess I would eliminate minimalism.

Figure 1-Charlie's Abstract

This student's "Abstract" has a total of 2,6 hundred words, and as a mean of organizing the information I used a table that organizes "purposes of revision" in three sub categories which are a)content, b)organization, and c) writing conventions. The table was based on Moritz (1999) as mentioned before and it uses a framework based on research conducted by Hall (1990) and Dellagnelo (1997).

The purpose of this table is to categorize the corrections made by the course professor (Alpha).

Table 2 Purposes of Revision – feedback on Charlie’s text

Content		Organization		Writing Conventions	
Inappropriate title	0%	Lack of introduction	0%	Parallelism	0%
Unfulfilled expectations	0%	Lack of conclusion	0%	Vocabulary choice	2=40%
Undeveloped idea	1=20%	Lack of cohesive devices	0%	Word Order	0%
Absence of important information	0%	Wrong use of cohesive devices	0%	Verb tense	1=20%
Irrelevant Information	1=20%	Lack of transitions	0%	Verb form	0%
Ambiguity	0%	Different ideas	0%	S-V Agreement	0%
Repetition and redundancy		Related ideas	0%	Number	
Incoherence	0%			Reference	0%
Non real information	0%			Conjunction	0%
Use of informal language	0%			Punctuation	0%
Unclear or incomprehensible idea	0%			Spelling	0%
				Pronoun	0%
				Preposition	0%
				Adjective	0%
				Adverb	0%
				Article	0%
				Subject	0%
				Absence or insertion of Verb	0%
				Capitalization	0%
TOTAL	2=40%		0		3=60%

As it can be seen, there are only few corrections in this text, Charlie’s “Abstract” received 5 corrections and 7 comments. From these 5 corrections, 1 regards verb tense (maker/making), 2 of them are inadequacies with vocabulary choice, and the other two are linked to commentaries; one is classified as undeveloped idea because in her comment the professor asked for clarification and the other is an unnecessary keyword present on the keyword section and for this reason I classified it as unnecessary information.

About the comments, as already stated, none of them is concerned with grammar. The first one asks for references to the introductory section of the text. The second suggests some possible sources to cite within the text and it is linked to the third commentary that asks for the source from which almost 50% of the student text was based. The fourth and the fifth commentaries ask for clarification (about the criteria used when selecting the papers to the research). And the last comments ask the student to eliminate one of her “keywords”, since three were already enough in the Abstract according to pre-defined parameters.

While the professor corrects mechanically the grammar mistakes made by the student, her comments make evident her real concern with what we call “Academic Writing”, which are the standards of tenor, formality, and correct use of quotations. So for Charlie, the major problem within her text is lack of references. There seems to have a noticeable preoccupation on informing the student that referencing is necessary, since 5 from the 7 comments address this point as exemplified below:

“**Comentário:** I guess if you look in the texts we used in SLA and also some in Est. Ling. II you’ll easily find the references you need here.

The next two comments also have to do with the references the student will use, but for a better understanding, we need to see the excerpt from student’s text that is being addressed:

Student text:

“In pursuance of that, we will review research papers from the last decade that respect our inclusion criteria.”

Professor's Comments:

research papers-“**Comentário:** Published in English, right?”

Inclusion criteria-“**Comentário:** I think if you mention that, you should tell us what these criteria are.”

This last comment is asking for clarification on what are the “inclusion criteria” concerning the previous research that are going to be the basis of the student’s research. This excerpt from the student’s text was classified as “Undeveloped idea” for means of revision.

Now we are going to move to the next student, but we will get back to Charlie to discuss her interview and the changes she has made in her text after receiving teachers “written feedback”.

4.2.2. Delta

Delta has a good level of English proficiency, and her research is a case study regarding classroom interaction. Her research consisted on observation of students (of English as Second Language) interaction with classmates and questionnaires in which the students should answer what they preferences when working in group were; if they preferred working with friends, and if the experience of working with different peers was productive, for example. Delta has delivered her first version of the Abstract in an outline

format, where the main steps were divided into sections; below we can see the corrected version of this:

title		<p style="text-align: center;">Are They Better Together?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">An overview of students' interaction in English classroom</p>	<p>Tabela formatada</p> <p>[1] Comentário: Don't forget to end your sentence with a period!</p>
Conference			
outlining/promoting/problematising the research field or topic		<p>According to Vygotsky's assumptions Sociocultural theory, the main role played by social interaction is the development of cognition (Vygotsky, 1978). The famous linguist-psychologist also argued that one's community plays a central role in the process of [making meaning.]</p> <p>In concerning relation to these ideas, Hatch wrote argued that it is through interaction students have in the classroom that students they can have the opportunity to apply develop linguistic and communicative competence which might be better developed in groups than alone (Hatch, 1978)</p>	<p>[2] Comentário: Unnecessary period.</p> <p>[3] Comentário: Elaborate on this. What is "making meaning"? Making meaning out of words?</p> <p>[U4] Comentário: Individually?</p> <p>[5] Comentário: Nice!</p> <p>Formatado: Fonte: Inglês (EUA)</p> <p>Formatado: Inglês (EUA)</p>
Purpose (Justifying this particular piece of research/study)		<p>Then, Taking into consideration the positive aspects the cooperative learning can bring for students, the present study focuses on the impact students' interaction can have in their development and engagement in the process of learning English.</p>	<p>[U6] Comentário: When I read that I imagine you'll measure learning and correlate it to the amount of interaction each of the participants engaged in while in class, but that's not what you're going to do. I would say your objective is to see in which way and how (according to the teacher and students) different types of interaction are perceived to benefit L2 learning.</p>
Method(s) – (procedural comments)		<p>The research conducted was conducted applied in Colégio de Aplicação with (number of students) teenagers students learners of English as an L2. The data collection of the research was obtained collected from 3 sources through three procedures methods: analyses of two English classes- one in which students worked together with the classmates they wanted to work with chose and another one in which they worked together with classmates the teacher had chosen chose for them; in addition, students and the analyses analysis of a will answer a questionnaire about their perceptions in relation to which they answered questions in which they could reflect about the two kinds of interaction they used.</p>	<p>[7] Comentário: Please specify that this is English as a Second Language.</p> <p>[8] Comentário: What Colégio de Aplicação? The one in Florianópolis/UFSC?</p> <p>[9] Comentário: Are these students in High School or Elementary School? In what grade are they?</p> <p>[U10] Comentário: Only students or you'll have a questionnaire for the teacher also?</p>
Signal results will be presented (you may advance expected results and the implications of that)		<p>The results obtained shown show students feel better in the English classroom working with their classmates than working alone. Students could declared to have realized they can learn more by interacting with others, because since interaction can provide an exchange of knowledges. On the other hand, most students generally didn't not enjoy working with different peers, because they feel more comfortable working with the classmates they are more habituated-used to work with.</p>	<p>[U11] Comentário: So far, you had only mentioned working with different peers, you hadn't told your reader you would also ask them about individual work. You need to advance that in the purpose of you study.</p> <p>[12] Comentário: They could, or they can?</p>
Keywords:		<p>students - interaction - cooperative learning- development - engagement - learning English</p>	<p>[13] Comentário: Source? Why do you feel that?</p>
			<p>[U14] Comentário: Have you really collected and analyzed data already? If you haven't, you can't write about your results, right?</p>
Criterion	Tantativa título - n 7	Your draft	n 7
<p>[15] Comentário: Choose only three.</p>			

Figure 2 - Delta's Abstract

Her “Abstract” has 2,6 hundred words, still there are some structural problems.

Table 3 Purposes of Revision - feedback on Delta's text

Content		Organization		Writing Conventions	
Inappropriate title	0%	Lack of introduction	0%	Parallelism	0%
Unfulfilled expectations	1=2,38%	Lack of conclusion	0%	Vocabulary choice	12=28,57%
Undeveloped idea	1=2,38%	Lack of cohesive devices	0%	Word Order	1=2,38%
Absence of important information	6=14,28%	Wrong use of cohesive devices	1=2,38%	Verb tense	3=7,14%
Irrelevant Information	0%	Lack of transitions	0%	Verb form	2=4,76%
Ambiguity	0%	Different ideas	0%	S-V Agreement	0%
Repetition and redundancy	1=2,38%	Related ideas	0%	Number	1=2,38%
Incoherence	0%			Reference	0%
Non real information	0%			Conjunction	1=2,38%
Use of informal language	1=2,38%			Punctuation	2=4,76%
Unclear or incomprehensible idea	1=2,38%			Spelling	0%
				Pronoun	
				Preposition	5=11,6%
				Adjective	0%
				Adverb	1=2,38%
				Article	1=2,38%
				Subject	1=2,38%
				Absence or insertion of Verb	0%
				Capitalization	0%
TOTAL	11=26,19%		1=2,38%		30=71,42%

As it can be noticed, 42 items were observed in this student text, most of them concern inappropriate word choice (12), like in the examples below, where there are two words that have been substituted by the professor:

“In ~~concerning~~ relation to these ideas, Hatch ~~wrote~~ argued that is through interaction students have...”

It is possible to identify the professor direct CF, since we have the inappropriate word scratched and the word suggested by her underlined.

There is one case in which the student idea has been categorized as “unclear/incomprehensible” that is:

“The data ~~collection of the research~~ was ~~obtained~~ collected from 3 sources ~~through three~~
~~procedures methods:~~

As can be seen in the example the scratched parts are from the original and they are being substituted by the underlined parts which are from professor’s authorship and by knowing this, there we got the original and the corrected version, or what it should look like:

Original: “The data collection of the research was obtained through three procedures methods:”

Corrected: “The data was collected from 3 sources:”

This mistake corrected by the professor has been categorized as “unclear/incomprehensible”, because even though it is possible to identify the meaning conveyed by the student, the sentence is not very clear. In this example the teacher works through “reformulating” the student’s writing, which is why it is being considered as one single marked category, although there are many words marked. This part is being addressed here because if we observe the student’s and the professor’s version, it is possible to notice that the professor is not exclusively changing specific grammar mistakes, but actually pointing out to a better way to convey the same idea; this we call

reformulation. As defined by Ellis (2007), this strategy consists of having a teacher reconstructing students' text in a correct way.

We are not going to talk about every mark made by the professor, since there are 42, so we must skip to the comments made by her. There are a total of 15 comments, what means that about one third of the corrections we were able to count have been commented on. It is important to reinforce that the comments do not go in the table, and this happens basically for two reasons. The first reason is, some comments are addressing marks on the students' texts that already have been categorized, and the second reason is that the professor's appraisal, or suggestion, does not fit in any "Purpose of revision".

From the 15 comments, two of them are concerned with the wrong use of a period ("."). It is very interesting because there are at least 18 grammar problems in the text, but just two of them are related to punctuation and both of them are linked to a comment while there is not one comment concerned with verb tense (3 mistakes), preposition (5 mistakes) or Verb Form (2). In one of the cases the student had forgotten to use the period after the title of the text, and in the other correction the student was oriented not to separate the indirect citation from the author name with a period like:

"According to Vigotsky assumptions the main role played by social interaction is the development of cognition (period) (Vygotsky,1978)."

Going back to the fifteen comments made by the professor, there is one comment explaining that just 3 items are necessary in the "keyword" section (what is very relevant information to the purpose of the course), there is still one comment praising one paragraph written by the student and two comments about vocabulary choices made by the student.

The nine comments left are all content related, and the kind of feedback more frequent in the teacher comments regards the lack of important information in sections written by the student explaining the research format, as in the cases where the student does not make clear where exactly the research would be conducted and who were the students observed; in our table these cases were marked as “Absence of Important Information”, and most of them are commented as follows:

“**Comentário:** Please specify that this is English as a Second Language.”

“**Comentário:** What Colégio de Aplicação? The one in Florianópolis/UFSC?”

“**Comentário:** Are these students in High School or Elementary School? In what grade are they?”

By the professor’s comments it is possible to notice a clear and major preoccupation with content and clarity. As an advanced writing course idealized having as its target audience advanced English students, the professor seems to try to orient the student to expose her ideas in the clearest possible way, in a well-organized manner, and without missing any relevant information.

4.2.3. Ecco

Ecco is the third participant of this study, and the last one to be interviewed, what poses some distance (about one month) in time between her finishing writing her revised version of her Abstract and the moment she was addressed through this interview. The reason why it was hard to find time to schedule an interview with her is because at the moment she was burdened with many classes and other commitments related to her *Letras-Inglês* course.

According to Ecco, her: Abstract was written “under some pressure because of time constraints”, and she “knew there would be many mistakes on her text, because it was written in a hurry”.

Ecco’s research addressed the English as second language student’s attitude towards oral activities in the language classroom. Just like Delta, she has done the first version of her Abstract in a table provided by the professor. Below we have a copy of her Abstract, which originally has two pages:

title	[The challenges of oral production in for 2 ESL learners.]	<p>[WU1] Comentário: You're only focusing on English as Second Language learners, right?</p> <p>[WU2] Comentário: Try to be more specific on your title. Don't forget to add that you are working with 7th grade South Brazilian ESL students/learners.</p>
Conference		
outlining/promoting/problematising the research field or topic	[This study consists in of exploring the challenges, fears and beliefs about the oral production activities of English language students.]	<p>[WU3] Comentário: Try to elaborate more on the reason why this topic worth researching. For example, why are we focused so much on speaking another language and not reading or writing, for example? Why is speaking so challenging than listening? Does ca can give you materials on that.</p>
Purpose (Justifying this particular piece of research/study)	Based on research done in the area of oral production, the objective of this study is to compare the difficulties and facilities of to assess the challenges faced by each student in the 7th year of elementary school in English classes they attend in the 7th year of a public elementary school in the south of Brazil .	<p>[WU4] Comentário: Reference?</p> <p>[WU5] Comentário: Facility is a term used for institutions or industries. Besides, your work focuses on accessing the challenges of the students, so that should be present in your purpose.</p> <p>Formatado: Sobrescrito</p>
Method(s) – (procedural comments)	[The 15 students and their behaviours The attitude of 15 ESL learners will be observed by the researcher in during their English class while they perform oral activities. In addition, each student will answer a questionnaire (with 10 questions) about oral production activities. After collecting this data With this data, will be made a comparison a comparison will be made between with the written replies in the questionnaire and their the participant's behaviors while taking part in oral activities in the ESL classroom.	<p>[WU6] Comentário: Also do not forget to point why it is importante to analyze the student's beliefs and challenges, as said beliefs and challenges impact learning.</p> <p>[WU7] Comentário: The term attitude is more suitable to what you will observe than behavior.</p> <p>[WU8] Comentário: How many?</p> <p>[WU9] Comentário: I still have to look at the questionnaire</p> <p>[WU10] Comentário: Like this.</p>
Signal results will be presented (you may advance expected results and the implications of that)	Based on the data collection- analysis and the comparison of the behavior of the students in the classroom , the expected results have- might to- show indicate what is the main cause of the challenges some of the main cause for the challenges and demotivation these participants of the 7th grade face when attempting to speak a second language of the students of the 7th grade . Moreover, as a consequence, the research results will- might show- indicate the reasons possible	<p>Formatado: Sobrescrito</p> <p>[WU11] Comentário: We do not know if they are demotivated</p> <p>[WU12] Comentário: Maybe you should look for the main causes and not just one. There are a number of factors that may cause demotivation on ESL students.</p>
	ways for motivation of these to motivate students to engage in the oral production who have more proficiency in the oral production of the English language.	
Keywords:	English language ESL; oral activities and; student's behaviour beliefs.	<p>[WU13] Comentário: The way the students observe the challenges are related to the beliefs they have.</p>

Figure 3 - Ecco's Abstract

Ecco's Abstract has 1,7 hundred words, and as a means of organizing the feedback provided by the professor in terms of "purposes of revision", our "Purposes of Revision" table is displayed below:

Table 4 Purposes of Revision - feedback on Ecco's text

<i>CONTENT</i>		<i>ORGANIZATION</i>		<i>WRITING CONVENTIONS</i>	
Inappropriate title	0%	Lack of introduction	1=4,16%	Parallelism	0%
Unfulfilled expectations	0%	Lack of conclusion	0%	Vocabulary choice	8=33,33%
Undeveloped idea	1=4,16%	Lack of cohesive devices	0%	Word Order	1=4,16%
Absence of important information	5=20,83%	Wrong use of cohesive devices	2=8,33%	Verb tense	0%
Irrelevant Information	0%	Lack of transitions	0%	Verb form	0%
Ambiguity	0%	Different ideas	0%	S-V Agreement	0%
Repetition and redundancy	0%	Related ideas	0%	Number	0%
Incoherence	0%			Reference	0%
Non real information	0%			Conjunction	0%
Use of informal language	0%			Punctuation	0%
Unclear or incomprehensible idea	3=12,5%			Spelling	0%
				Pronoun	1=4,16%
				Preposition	2=8,33%
				Adjective	0%
				Adverb	0%
				Article	0%
				Subject	0%
				Absence or insertion of Verb	0%
				Capitalization	0%
TOTAL	9=37,5%		3=12,5%		12=50%

There are 24 corrections made by Alpha in Ecco's text, but there are two cases that have been classified as "Unclear/ Uncomprehensible idea" that have drawn our attention and are going to be closely discussed.

Most of the professor's feedback is direct and unfocused. There are also many words marked in the student's text, but some of the corrections are unspecific, what means that they are not concerned specifically with some word or expression written by the student. What happens in these cases is that when looking at the marks made by the professor, what we observed is a totally reformulated paragraph. In the following example this kind of professor's influence in student's text is noticeable; almost the entire paragraph was altered by her as follows:

Ecco's text with feedback:

"Based on the data ~~collection~~ analysis ~~and the comparison of the behavior of the students in the classroom,~~ the expected results ~~have~~ might to show indicate ~~what is the main cause of the challenges~~ some of the main causes for the challenges ~~and demotivation~~ these participants of the 7th grade face when attempting to speak a second language ~~of the students of the 7th grade.~~ Moreover, as As a consequence, the ~~research~~ results ~~will~~ might show indicate ~~the reasons~~ possible ways for motivation of those to motivate students to engage in the oral production ~~who have more proficiency in the oral production of the English language."~~

This is a depiction of how the correction looks like in the original, and in order to understand we must take into account that the unmarked parts are the original content preserved by the teacher, the scratched parts are the deletions made by the teacher, and the underlined parts are her additions. So the next two examples show respectively the original version and the teacher version as they must be read.

Ecco's text:

“Based on the data collection and the comparison of the behavior of the students in the classroom, the expected results have to show what is the main cause of the challenges and demotivation of the students of the 7th grade. Moreover, as a consequence, the research will show the reasons for motivation of those students who have more proficiency in the oral production of the English language.”

Professor's reformulated version:

“Based on the data analysis, the expected results might indicate some of the main causes for the challenges these participants of the 7th grade face when attempting to speak a second language. As a consequence, the results might indicate possible ways to motivate students to engage in the oral production of the English language”.

It was just said that the professor corrects the students' text in a direct and unfocused way, what means that all students mistakes are corrected (that is unfocused CF according to Ellis, 2007) and the wrong form is substituted by the more appropriated one (what comprises direct CF); this is true for most of her feedback in all the students' texts, but in this case there are so many changes in the original version that it can be assumed as a reformulation. The reformulation is a valid corrective feedback strategy, but apparently the modifications made by the teacher alter the purpose presented by the student taking into account that: although many inadequacies can be found within the student's text, it is possible to understand that the student's intention is to observe the difference between the motivated and unmotivated students while trying to understand what the factors are that

affect they motivation or lack of this, while in the professor's version she points out that the research results might point a "way to motivate students", something that was not mentioned by the original author, although it is a real possibility. The point is that students are **individually** motivated by different aspects, and the purpose of the research mentioned in the text is to find out what these aspects are, it doesn't necessarily implies that there is this "way of motivating students" as a **group**.

The second case of the professor's reformulation is displayed below:

Ecco's text:

After collecting this data, will be made a comparison with the written replies and their behaviors in the classroom.

Professor's reformulated version:

With this data, a comparison will be made between replies in the questionnaire and the participants' behaviors while taking part in activities in the ESL classroom.

In this case, professor' reformulation maintains the original meaning, while it improves the student's text by making it more clear by changing, for example, "written replies" by "replies in the questionnaire", and specifying the circumstance in which students behavior is being accounted, that is "while taking part in oral activities...".

Now, looking at professor comments in general:

There is a total amount of 13 comments made by the professor on Ecco's text. The first two comments address the student title, but these are not cases of "inappropriate title", they have been classified as "lack of important information", because Ecco does not make clear that the students accessed are second language learners and also is not specific,

forgetting to tell where are they from and in which school year they are, for example. There is one single comment asking Ecco to elaborate more her intro that has been classified as “lack of introduction”, because the student does not outline nor problematizes her field of research at all. There is one case where the professor asks for reference, and 3 comments regarding “vocabulary choice”, these 3 are exemplified below:

“**Comentário:** Facility is a term used for institutions or industries. Besides, your work focuses on accessing the challenges of the students, so that should be present in your purpose.

“**Comentário:** The term attitude is more suitable to what you will observe than behavior.

“**Comentário:** The way the students observe the challenges are related to the beliefs they have

This last comment is present on the student’s keyword section, because she used the word “student behaviors” that was changed for “students’ beliefs” by the professor. There is one more comment made by the professor asking “How many” classes would be observed by the researcher that is a case of “lack of important information”, and one comment asking the student to develop on “the importance to analyze students’ beliefs and challenges, as said that beliefs and challenges impact learning”.

There are still 4 comments left that are not related to any marked mistake. In one of these cases the Professor appraises the correct use of the word behavior, in another comment the professor mentions that she wants to see Ecco’s questionnaire. There are still one criticism and one suggestion. The professor criticizes the fact that the student implies on her writing that students are demotivated, and suggests that if they are demotivated then Ecco must look for the main causes of that and not just one.

Now that we have presented the first version of student's Abstracts and the corrections made by the professor, we shift our attention to the revision made by the students based on feedback received. We also look closely at the interviews conducted with them as a way to have a better understanding of their relation with the professor, the feedback received, and the changes made by them in their texts.

4.3. Student's Perception on the Written Feedback Received

In this section we discuss the interviews in which the participants have talked about how they value the written feedback received while producing their Abstract, their relation with the course professor, and their previous experiences along the Letras-Ingês Program. The purpose of this section is to answer the research questions: "What are the students' perceptions on the nature of feedback received?" and "What do students change or not from feedback received? Why?"

Differently from the previous section in which we fully displayed the students' text, here we are just going to show specific parts from the student's revised versions. The complete versions can be found in the Appendix, together with the interviews in Portuguese.

4.3.1. Charlie's Interview

Charlie is 27 years old and she has studied English before entering the University in an English School called "Cultura Inglesa" from the age of 9 until she was 13 years old. She also has traveled once to the U.S. on vacation. When asked about her past experience with Academic Writing she answered that she has already written an article that was in

process of being published under V.E.'s professor supervision in PIBIC ("Bolsa de Iniciação Científica"). She seems to have good linguistic background knowledge, what justifies her good proficiency in English and few grammatical mistakes observed on her writing, and it was interesting to observe that she was the most critical student when commenting the marks made on her text showing a lot of confidence and knowledge of Academic Writing.

When asked about the importance of the feedback, she pointed out that, although it is important, the feedback provided by English teachers is most of times unclear or nonspecific. However, she mentioned that "it was not the case of Alpha's" who is usually clear and "she was one of the best professors" she had. Charlie also stated that feedback on grammar is pretty rare at "this level of UFSC Letras-Inglês program". According to her, students don't receive a focused feedback regarding what she calls "little mistakes".

During the interview I showed the student both versions of her Abstract, the corrected one and the new version written by her and her first comment was: "a lot has changed, huh!", "that is because she (Alpha) has not commented on nearly anything, and I thought it was not at my level (of skill)". In fact, the revised version is very different from the first draft, but while the student followed some comments written by Alpha concerning in-text citation, and one comment in which Alpha asked her to clarify what the inclusion criteria mentioned by her in the Abstract was, the student had simply ignored the few grammar corrections made by the professor.

For now let us give a quick overview on the student revised text. We are going to compare the two versions of student's abstract intro.

ORIGINAL: Since the intrauterine environment, children are exposed to language. In the effort of explaining the phenomenon of how they go from recipients to producers of language a few matters of investigation ~~were depicted~~ arose, such as (I) how can a child acquire such a complex meaning ~~maker~~ making system in such a short time with no difficulty?, (II) how can a child produce an infinite number of sentences by using a finite number of elements?, (III) how can a child acquire any language despite the differences among them?, etc.

REVISION: Since the intrauterine environment, children are exposed to language (Moon, Lagercrantz and Kuhl, 2013). In the effort of explaining the phenomenon of how they go from recipients to producers of language a mismatch was found between the input, the language to which a child is exposed, and the output, the grammar knowledge to which the child will arrive (Baker and McCarthy, 1981; Pinker, 1979, 1989; White, 2003). Such mismatch came to be known as the logical problem of language acquisition, or the poverty of stimulus problem. Such research topic yields the necessity for a biological built-in system to account for language acquisition (Pinker, 2004).

As we may see, there are two corrections in the original text that did not have space in the new version since the text was modified. Also there were two comments from the teacher in the original version; one of these comments addressed the first clause asking for the source of what was being said, while the other comment suggested some research material to improve the rest of the text. We could notice that the first teacher comment was attended, while the second comment triggered an extensive process of revision. By comparing the two versions it is possible to observe that the second one is more elaborated and purpose specific than the first one. The first version presented three very wide questions regarding first language acquisition, while the second version clearly outlines the field of research while presenting the problem that is going to be the matter of

investigation. According to Charlie, this revision is part of her “process”; still, it has been influenced by teachers’ comments.

Also, by talking with the students I found out that after they received the feedback, all of the students had the option of scheduling a conference with the course’ professor (Alpha) in order to clarify doubts or ask for suggestions. This conference was not mandatory in the Syllabus, but it was an opportunity given to the students to talk with the course professor and discuss the feedback received.

Charlie went to one of these conferences, but she mentioned she did not modified her text exclusively because of this conference or the feedback received on her text. Specifically, she said that everything counts: “all the feedbacks” she receive together with the questions she has sent by e-mail to the professor, that according to her were many. The point is that she does not accept passively the suggestions given by the professor, using everything as material to make her own changes.

4.3.2. Delta’s Interview

Delta is 23, and just like Charlie and most of the students from the Letras-Ingês program she has studied English before University, but according to her it has not helped her very much. About her previous experience with Academic writing, she has had some because of previous courses in the University, but she does not have a “Bolsa de Iniciação Científica” for example, that could give her a boost of experience and confidence to deal with Academic writing in an advanced class. Delta said she was a “bit worried” with this course, since the purpose of it was to conduct a study to present in a conference, but after

finishing her Abstract she was a bit more confident since she was not “distant from Academic standards”.

Initially I asked her about her preferences regarding written feedback. To her, written feedback is important because it helps “improving your text and exposing your ideas”. She also mentioned that it is not useful when the professor tells her to change everything or made her feel that what she has written is “just crap”.

Her biggest preoccupation while producing this Abstract seemed to be form, she mentioned that her biggest difficulty writing was her vocabulary, and she also “thinks in Portuguese” and has some trouble to organize her ideas in English, because it is “very different”. Despite some problems with grammar and her assumed vocabulary limitations, when asked whether the professor should focus more their classes or corrections on grammar, she said it would not be good, because grammar classes are quite annoying. Instead, she suggests that professors should work more with this approach in which students are supposed to review and rewrite their texts, because as she said: “there was a semester where I had to write one text per week and I never had a feedback on my mistakes, and if I had it was not clear”.

Now going to her revision, Delta did not make many revisions on the content of her draft, and she accepted most of the corrections suggested by the professor. The section that we observe is the “methods section” from her abstract. This part has many marks made by the teacher so we are going to look, at the original, the teacher’s reformulation and the final version.

ORIGINAL: The research conducted was applied in Colégio de Aplicação with [number of students] teenagers students. The data collection of the research was obtained through three procedures methods: analyses of two classes- one which students worked together the classmates they wanted work with, another one which they worked together the classmates the teacher had chosen for them and analyses of a questionnaire which they answered questions which they could reflect about the two kind of interactions they had.

CORRECTION: The research was conducted in Colégio de Aplicação with [number of students] teenagers learners of English as an L2. The data was collected from three sources: analyses of two English classes – one in which students worked with the classmates they choose and one in which they worked together with classmates the teacher choose for them; in addition, students will answer a questionnaire about their perceptions in relation to the two kinds of interaction they had.

REVISION: The research was conducted in Colégio de Aplicação (UFSC) with 13 teenagers students from the first year of the High school. The data was collected from three sources: analyses of two classes- one in which students worked with the classmates they chose and one in which they worked together with classmates the teacher chose for them; In addition, students answered a questionnaire about their reading, listening, oral and writing activities and the way which they prefer work with them (individually or in groups) and their perceptions in relation to the two kinds of interactions they had.

In the revised version the student followed the professor's feedback; we could observe that the organization of the information is similar to the corrected version, for example. And the student has also expanded it adding more information about the research questionnaire. There are some differences when comparing this final version with the correction, but it cannot be said that the student ignored the correction. As an example we have the part "learners of English as an L2", that has been changed into "students from the first year of the high School", this difference exist because of a comment made by the

professor asking the student to specify the school grade of the students she was working with. Delta has also specified where Colégio de Aplicação is in response to another comment made by the teacher. Delta therefore diverges from Charlie in the sense that Charlie is very autonomous when revising her texts, having teacher comments just as a reference, while Delta is more dependent on teacher's written feedback.

4.3.3. Ecco's Interview

Ecco is 22 and she studied English in a private language school during high school for 2 years. After that she did not study English anymore until University. Her experience with academic writing is limited to what she has learned in the cycle of the Letras-Inglês program she attended.

When asked about her preferences and perceptions regarding the feedback she usually receives in English classes, Ecco has said that the most important to her is to check her performance; she said, for example, that sometimes she does not know exactly what the teacher expectations are, and then the professor "tells me what I might say, or asks me what I intend to say so I can improve my writing". According to Ecco, the kind of comment that helps her the most are those in which the professor gives her a more adequate or formal variation of what she was implying. In other words Ecco seems to approve the reformulation strategy.

Regarding grammar, Ecco affirmed that English professors are very demanding when dealing with grammar accuracy, but "there is not much input for this, there is not a "good grammar approach". Ecco assumedly has some issues with her grammar, but she does not know "whether the problem is with me or if it is the way teachers teach grammar, or if they

(professors) neglect this part”. Ecco seemed very worried about her English skills, so we did not enter further on this subject. Still, she was optimistic about working with professor Alpha, who helped her a lot, although, as stated by Ecco, it was not the written feedback that has helped her mostly.

Indeed, Alpha’s written feedback was not sufficiently satisfactory for this specific student. All along the interview Ecco reinforced how important was the conference she had with the professor because it was a way to discuss her text allowing her to better understand the written feedback received.

I asked Ecco if there was something that the professor could improve in her written feedback that would make the feedback more clear, reducing the importance of conferencing and Ecco answered that “it would not be easy”. To Ecco, conferencing with the professor is essential to her process, and it would not be easy to her improving her writing just with the written feedback, without meeting with Alpha

Regarding Ecco’s text, many things have changed in her final version of the Abstract, and when she was asked about this the answer was: “it was because of the conference I had (with Alpha)”. In the first version of the Abstract the student had just presented the methodology of her research and what was her research purpose, but she did not address the relevance of the research, neither presented a scientific background for it. Therefore we might look at the first section of her Original text and compare it to the extended version.

ORIGINAL VERSION: This study consists ~~in~~ of exploring the challenges, fears and beliefs about the oral production activities of English language students.

FINAL VERSION: In the mandatory internship course in the English program at UFSC the undergraduates must observe English classes of elementary school or high school. In these

observations, the fact that some students avoid speaking in public or are nervous when they are exposed to L2 drew attention. According to Swain (1993) this occurrence happens due to the fact that students speaking in English note that they have difficulties between what they want to say and what they can to say. **Thus, this study consists of exploring the perceptions of teenagers learners of English as an L2 in relation to their use of English when producing speech.**

The section represented here is the outline section of the Abstract where the researcher is supposed to problematize the research topic in order to highlight its research relevance.

The part in bold is the part that was derived from the original, while all the rest is totally new. We could say that this new part is an answer to the following comment made by teacher in the student's text:

Comentário: Try to elaborate more on the reason why this topic worth researching. For example, why are we focused so much on speaking another language and not reading or writing, for example? Why is speaking so challenging than listening?

Since the student has clearly stated that she would have “struggled to revise the text if there was not a moment such as the conference with the professor”, it is not possible to exclusively attribute the changes made by the student to any comment, because the student insisted that the changes made by her were due to things she discussed with the professor during the meeting. The student said that during the meeting the professor went little by little, asking her what she meant, according to her research, and so she helped her.

As explained by the student, when I asked her the reason why the second version was so different from the original:

“It was because of the meeting I have had with her. There is not a ‘WHY’, actually we went by parts, and she asked what I meant to say, according to my research, and so she helped

me. I can't tell you 'WHY', it was because of the meeting and not because of the written feedback..."

4.4. Overview

After speaking with each student and looking at their work it was possible to notice some singularities. Charlie is very autonomous, she is confident of her self-revision skills and, although she values the professor feedback, she does not use this feedback in a passive manner. Charlie sees written feedback, conferences, and self-revision as valid tools to improve her writing without relying in one above the others; as she has said "everything counts".

Delta relies on the professor's written feedback. This can be said, because the final version of her abstract preserves most of the corrections made by the professor, and even the parts that apparently differed from those suggested by the professor in the text still can be related to teacher comments. Delta observed that her Portuguese (L1) influences her writing because she thinks in Portuguese; she also mentioned struggling with vocabulary. Yet, according to her, the feedback received in the course has helped her, making her feel that she was not "distant from academic standards".

Ecco had a good relation with the course professor, she even mentioned to have good expectations regarding the feedback she would receive in the course when she found out that Alpha would be the lecturer. When asked whether the comments made by Alpha on her Abstract helped her improving her text she said "yes", but when asked specifically whether some changes made by her in specific parts of her revision were due to some of the professor's comments she insisted that it was due to the conference with the professor. The impression I had when talking with the student was that she felt insecure, and that she looks forward for the conference as a way of feeling more

confident about how to improve her text. According to her, during the conference Alpha has guided her all along her text “part by part”; asking her what was her purpose and giving her advice on how to improve.

After we have looked at the students’ productions, the feedback received by them, their interviews and their revision process we now move to chapter 5 where our aim is to address the 3 research questions proposed in the beginning of this work.

Chapter 5:

5. Final Remarks

This research work has been designed with the purpose of answering the following question: How do fourth year UFSC Letras students react to the professor's written feedback received throughout the English Academic Writing Course? Having this main question in mind, three specific questions have been proposed, that we are going to address now.

What kinds of feedback do the students receive in their writing assignments in this English Academic Writing Course?

We have observed that the majority of feedback provided by professor Alpha in student's texts was direct, what means that she marked their mistakes, while providing them with the correct form. Her feedback was also unfocused, what means that she was worried with many aspects of student's texts, like coherence, organization, grammar, not limiting her corrections to specific issues. It was also possible to notice the recursive use of reformulation as a way to deal with the more complex mistakes committed by the students, it happened precisely on the cases where the mistakes were categorized as "Unclear/Incomprehensible idea". In our table with the purposes of revision we divided the corrections made by the professor in three major categories which are a) Content; b) Organization and c) Writing Conventions. The subcategory "Unclear/Incomprehensible idea" belongs to the Content category what seemed to be the more relevant category considered in the professors feedback, since this category assembles most of professor

comments; as an example we might mention the subcategory “lack of important information”, that have all been very commented.

The Organization category did not receive important attention from comments, because few mistakes have been made by the students in this aspect, a total amount of 4, being 3 cases of wrong use of cohesive devices and one case of lack of introduction (this one has been already commented).

Concerning the category writing conventions, there is a total amount of 45 items classified in this category, from these, 22 (almost 50%) are vocabulary choices. Some of these choices have been commented. And there was a pattern on the comments regarding vocabulary choice. Basically, the professor commented the inappropriate vocabulary choices on student’s abstracts keyword section, and she has also commented the cases in which the vocabulary choices altered a student’s research purpose, like in the case where Ecco uses the term behavior instead of attitude to refer to the students’ attitudes toward oral activities in the classroom.

The second specific question addressed was: What do students change or not from feedback received? Why?

We realized that students actually value the professor’s written feedback, although they do not always agree with that feedback. Student Delta, for example, mentioned that she could not understand when the professor asked her to elaborate more on what she conveyed with “making meaning” in a section of her text in which she mentioned that “community plays a role in the process of ‘making meaning’”. She thought that “making meaning” was “self-explanatory” on this context, but, still, according to her, she tried to

elaborate more on that since the professor asked. The three students followed most of the written feedback provided by the professor, but they differed in the way they did.

When I talked to Charlie about her first version of her abstract and the last one, she observed that she has made many changes, and mentioned that this is part of her creative process. I asked her “so these changes were not because of professor comments”, and she answered “but she has not commented on nearly anything”. In fact, there was little correction on Charlie’s text, because it was good in general, most of the professor’s comments were concerned with in text citation, and even though the student improved her text by her own will, she attended all the professor comments. While the student searched for scientific background in order to justify her research (attending to the professor’s comments), she also found material to improve her text, what is apparent when we compare the first version (displayed in the chapter 4 of this work) and the last one (that can be found in the Appendix). So, while she followed the few comments made by her professor, this effort triggered a whole revision process.

Delta has followed all the teacher’s comments, most of these comments concerning clarity; the professor asked the student, for example, to specify from which school the students participating on her research were, she also asked Delta to make it clear if the students were high school, or elementary school students and to mention that they were learning English as L2. Delta followed all the guidelines provided by the professor, and as mentioned previously, even the professor comment that Delta did not agree with (about making meaning) has been taking into account. This finding shows that the student relies in the professor’s judgment, even when it goes against her own perception.

When looking at Ecco's revised abstract we can initially conclude that she has also followed the comments made by the professor, but, according to her, the changes made on her text are due to the conference with the professor. According to Ecco, in this conference the professor guided her throughout her text, asking her what her purpose in each section was, and giving her suggestions to improve. So what we can assume is that Ecco values her professor's feedback, but she feels insecure to follow the written feedback without meeting with the professor to clarify her doubts.

Our last question was: What are the student's perceptions on the nature of received feedback?

The main answer is it differs according to the student and the feedback received. We are going to exemplify that, by looking at each student individually.

Charlie has appraised Alpha criteria regarding the grades, because Alpha specifies, before evaluating the students, how much each of text aspects will count to the final grade. This way the students are able to know beforehand how much citation, organization, grammar, and other aspects will weight on professor evaluation. Still, there was a situation that has made Charlie feel disappointed, which is the fact that in her second version of the Abstract all her references section was scratched, with the comment "no references for abstract". Charlie reported that it was a problem on the explanation. Charlie also commented that she did not know that the criteria would be the same for the first and the final version of her text. Hyland (1998) has reported a case of disagreement between student and professor about the function of a draft, the example is present in our Review of Literature (chapter 2), in that case Maho reported to see a draft as a brain-storming stage,

while Johan considered it as a semi-finished and shape product. Apparently, in Charlie's case, the biggest issue is that the professor might have not made clear enough the importance that this first version would have.

Delta was asked about the kind of feedback she received on classes in the University, she mentioned that "the way professors address the students has been changing", she observed that there were some comments she received from professors in the fourth semester that she did not enjoy. Regarding this course, Delta has improved her text by following the 15 comments made by the professor and still managed to keep the original format. Delta has appreciated Alpha's feedback, she even compared Alpha to another professor she had. According to Delta this other professor has once made her change her entire research by saying that it was all wrong. Delta mentioned that Alpha was different in the sense that she respected the student space: "she guided me, according to the research I had, my idea".

As already mentioned, Ecco relied mostly in the conference she had with the professor than the written feedback received. She reported a bad experience she had with a professor in another course where she has been rudely criticized on her English; this case is not present in the interview, because it was mentioned right after it. Ecco has showed signals of lack of confidence during the interview, by stating some times that she has great difficulty with the English language, and also by the fact that she did not trust her own judgment when reading the professor's written feedback; she insisted that it would not be possible to her to improve her text without meeting the professor. And I am inclined to think that her past experience with that other professor has affected her self-esteem. Ecco had highlighted how Alpha is accessible and how she carefully helped her in her research

during the conference, but her relation with written feedback is not good, as according to Ecco “just written feedback is not sufficient”.

Chapter 6:

6. Limitations and Further Research

6.1. Limitations:

One of the limitations of this study was the number of participants. As already stated it was the researchers' choice to work with a small number of participants in order to have an in-depth analysis of each individual characteristic. The major constraint of working with few participants is being unable to build a statistical data basis, therefore precluding generalizations.

Another limitation was not have interviewed the professor to have a better understanding of her strategies, even though it was not the focus of our analysis, it could have been useful when I organized the data so I would be able to explain the purpose of the types of feedback provided by her.

Still, the biggest "problem" observed when collecting the data was not being able to attend the individual conferences scheduled by the students with the professor. This happened basically for two reasons: In the first place the presence of the researcher would constitute an external influence, possibly making the student uncomfortable. In the second place the existence of these conferences has come into light only during the interview with the students (when the conferences had already happened basically) and still that was not our focus, since the purpose of this study was working with written feedback exclusively.

6.2. Pedagogical Implications

The most relevant aspect highlighted throughout this research was the uniqueness of each student reality. It is important for second language professors to keep in mind that the way they address one student might not be equally effective with all of them, and that there are many aspects that can potentially have influence in the way students interact with the feedback they receive. The main example of aspect that motivates student's different reactions to professor written feedback that appeared in the cases we observed was self-confidence; while Charlie's higher confidence led her to underestimate professor's feedback impact on her revision, for example, Ecco's apparent low self-esteem made her unable to interpret teacher comments without help.

6.3. Future Research

The research in the field of second language devises three categories of feedback in order to provide text revision Keh (1990) or even four if we consider Hyland and Hyland's (2006) division. Therefore, after this year working with these three students and hearing their perceptions it seems more coherent to look at feedback not as a tool that can be applied in three or four different ways, but as a complex process in each every type of feedback (peer feedback, conference as feedback, etc...) has an essential and irreplaceable function in the learning process.

Instead of looking at some specific "type of feedback", the suggestion for further research is to look at feedback approaches. As an example, we can mention Alpha's approach that consisted primarily of written response and conferences. In an online course, for example, the approach would be entirely computer mediated, maybe including some conferences. In a multimedia classroom, all the 4 types of feedback might be present.

Looking at different “feedback approaches” might make it possible to observe the impact of different approaches, possibly giving professors an insight better ways of providing feedback in different situations.

7. References:

- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in higher education, 2006*, v. 31 n. 2, p. 219-233.
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M.C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and students verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dellagnelo, A.C.K. (1997). Writing and revision; the effect of individual revision, peer revision and teacher's written feedback in foreign language production. *Unpublished master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.*
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *English Language Teaching Journal, 63*, 97-107.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y. Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36* (2008), 353-371
- feedback. 2019. In *Dictionary.Cambridge.org*. Retrieved April 4, 2019, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/pt/dicionario/ingles/feedback>
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reaction to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 33-53.

- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long term effects of written error correction. *Feedback on second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-102). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22 (2013), 307-329
- Fathman, A. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (3), 255-286
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10 (3), 185-212.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. *Feedback on second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. *Feedback on second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 206-223). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44 (4), 294-305.

- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17 (2013), 69-85
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues on written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. (pp. 57-68).
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24 (3), 203-218.
- Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8, 265-289.
- Powers, J. (1993). Rethinking writing centered conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *Writing Center Journal*, 13, 39-47.
- Seeker, M., & Dincer, A. (2014). An insight to students' Perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching*, 7 (2), 73-83
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-102.

8. Appendix:

I think it is important to make the information available in an organized manner. So, as promised, here the reader can find the final version of student's abstracts, and the interview conducted with them. The information is organized by participant, therefore we disposed the info in the following order: 1) Charlie's abstract final version and interview. 2) Delta's final version abstract and interview. 3) Ecco's final version abstract and interview.

8.1. Charlie's data:

8.1.1. Revised abstract

REVISITING THE DEBATE ON UG ACCESS IN SLA: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF LITERATURE.

CHARLIE

¹ *Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina*

Since the intrauterine environment, children are exposed to language (Moon, Lagercrantz and Kuhl, 2013). In the effort of explaining the phenomenon of how they go from recipients to producers of language a mismatch was found between the input, the language to which a child is exposed, and the output, the grammar knowledge to which the child will arrive (Baker and McCarthy 1981; Pinker, 1979, 1989; White, 2003). Such mismatch came to be known as the *logical problem of language acquisition*, or the *poverty of stimulus* problem. Such research topic yields the necessity for a biological built-in system to account for language acquisition (Pinker, 2004). In order to rationalize that, the Universal Grammar hypothesis emerged (Chomsky, 1965). Universal Grammar (UG) is the innate set of constrains that enable human beings to acquire language effortlessly and rapidly. In other words, UG is the initial state of a child's language acquisition (White, 2003). The issue of what the initial state would constitute of for a second language learner is a matter of investigation since the early 1980's. In other words, the extent to which second language acquisition (SLA) is also UG constrained is still debatable. As a systematic review of literature, this paper aims at revisiting the empirical data collected about the issue of UG access in SLA. Our main concern will be asserting which position

has received more evidence in the past two years: the No Access (Epstein, Flynn, and Martohardjono, 1996), the Partial Access (Hawkins and Chan, 1997) or the Full Access (Schwartz and Sprouse, 1996). In pursuance of that, we will review research papers written in English from 2016 to 2018 that had produced evidences for such positions. Considering how the *poverty of stimulus* problem could also be extended to SLA we predict that the positions that argue in favor of UG access, the Partial Access or the Full Access, should be the ones that will receive more favorable evidence.

Keywords: Universal Grammar; Second Language Acquisition; Access

REFERENCES

1. Baker, C. L. & McCarthy, J. (eds) (1981). *The logical problem of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
2. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
3. Epstein, S., Flynn, S. and Martohardjono, G. (1996). Second language acquisition: Theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19(04), pp.677-714.
4. Hawkins, R. and Chan, C. (1997). The partial availability of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition: the ‘failed functional features hypothesis’. *Second Language Research*, 13(3), pp.187-226.
5. Moon, C., Lagercrantz, H. and Kuhl, P. (2013). Language experienced in utero affects vowel perception after birth: a two-country study. *Acta Paediatrica*, 102(2), pp.156-160.
6. Pinker, S. (1979). Formal models of language learning. *Cognition* 7, 217–83.
7. Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition: the acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
8. Pinker, S. (2004). Clarifying the logical problem of language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 31(4), pp.949-953.
9. Schwartz, B. and Sprouse, R. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the Full Transfer/Full Access model. *Second Language Research*, 12(1), pp.40-72.
10. White, L. (2003). *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press.

8.1.2. Interview

08 de Junho de 2018

Entrevista com Charlie.

Entrevistador: Oi Charlie, algumas informações básicas. Idade?

Charlie: 27

E: Quando você entrou no curso?

C: 2014.1.

E: Há quanto tempo você estuda Inglês?

C: Formalmente desde os 9 no “Cultura Inglesa”.

E: Fez o curso inteiro, quanto tempo?

C: Não, não. Eu fiz dos 9 até os 13 por aí.

E: Já viajou alguma vez pra fora, pra algum país de língua inglesa?

C: Já, pros Estados Unidos.

E: Quanto tempo?

C: Que eu fiquei lá? Foram férias, não foi intercâmbio, só alguns dias.

E: Você já escreveu algum artigo, ele foi publicado?

C: Sim, na iniciação científica e já estou publicando. Em “Análise crítica do Discurso: Gramática Visual”. É sobre a representação da mulher no livro de literatura infantil.

E: Tem alguém te orientando nisso?

C: A “V. E.” (nome da orientadora do PIBIC) É o artigo da minha PIBIC entendeu?

E: O que você pensa do feedback do professor? A importância dele nas produções escritas? (essa pergunta não é específica ao professor da disciplina, mas sim geral)

C: É muito importante né e falta muito um feedback específico, objetivo, eu acho muito importante. E acho que falta muito. Não é o caso de Alpha ela é o melhor que eu tive. Tu viu como ela faz bem todos os critérios dela tudo direitinho?

E: Vi e achei bem interessante. Assim, você acha suficiente o feedback escrito, ele dá conta ou você sente falta de falar com o professor e de uma reunião.

C: Eu sempre vou atrás, então eu sempre tenho isso. A quantidade de e-mail que eu já mandei pra ela (risos), coitada.

E: Então tá. Quando você é corrigida num trabalho acadêmico em inglês que tipo de comentário que você procura mais? Gramática, dicas pra melhorar o texto?

C: Eu nunca recebo nenhum comentário específico na gramática, Não é que eu seja muito boa nisso não, acho que falta. Os professores em geral não dão tanto um feedback específico de corrigir errinho nesse nível. O que eu procuro é hummm 10. (risos) acho que não tenho uma prioridade assim. Ah se eu tenho alguma dúvida *a priori* eu vou procurar em relação a isso né, faz sentido? Se eu já estava insegura em algum aspecto, se eu vou entregar um trabalho sabendo que tem alguma parte que talvez não esteja ali, aí você vai atrás disso.

E: Ah, mas daí você depende mais da tua consulta à professora, não tanto do que ela passa escrito, ou você aproveita bastante isso que você recebe?

C: Não, eu aproveito bastante, mas daí eu aproveito igualmente, vou ver todos os feedbacks. Mas assim é mais com relação à forma do que conteúdo, porque eu estou lembrando a correção dos slides e teve uma coisa que ela me sugeriu que aí eu conversei com ela e eu não fiz porque era conteúdo e eu estava certa.

E: E quando você recebe essas correções e se às vezes você vê que tem alguns comentários que não são válidos que você acha talvez desnecessários ou exagerados?

C: Não. Nunca me aconteceu isso. Exagerado como assim?

E: Assim, de você sentir que o professor tá interferindo no teu processo?

N: A eu pensei nisso, mas no sentido de que é chata a questão do “words lenght” tem que ser 300, então elas tem que ser cortadas entendeu?

E: Ah, mas é que no Abstract isso é uma coisa que realmente existe né.

C: Mas uma coisa que ela sugeriu que foi correção de “L2 learning” aqui(aponta para o texto corrigido), é mas tem que pensar que não é tudo ela que corrige, aqui (aponta para o texto corrigido) eu ignorei eu achei idiota sabe, mas não foi ela(apontando pra correção onde foi pedido que a sigla UG fosse substituída por “Universal grammar”). Quando eu olhei eu pensei tá, mas não é assim ninguém fala assim, aí eu a tá OK(viu que o comentário era do estagiário). Entendeu.

E: Aqui (mexe na pasta com os trabalhos dela) eu tenho a versão primeira e a versão segunda.

C: Aí mudou muito né, mas eu vou dizer que a maioria do que mudou foi porque EU refiz entendeu?

E: Não foi por causa de comentário dela então?

C: Mas é que ela não tinha comentado quase nada entendeu? Mas eu quis mudar porque não estava no meu nível. Nível (risos) quem ouve pensa que eu sou a pessoa mais arrogante do mundo.

E: Aqui as partes marcadas em verde são as referências nas partes que ficou evidente que você acrescentou por causa do retorno dela.

C: Tá é que nesse ela acrescentou “No reference for abstracts”, mas eu entendo aqui era o corpo de texto, mas olha isso desnecessário...

E: (risos) tudo riscado. (a questão aqui é que a aluna não sabia se devia colocar referências no Abstract, como a professora pediu as referências do corpo do texto a aluna também adicionou a lista no fim).

C: Porque assim eu acho que isso foi talvez uma falha na explicação. Eu achei; eu e algumas pessoas; que a primeira versão do Abstract não ia ser corrigida com os mesmos critérios do final. Porque eu entendo bastante de escrita acadêmica, então eu nunca mandaria sem essas referências (de corpo de texto).

E: Aqui as partes em laranja é conteúdo totalmente novo.

C: É que eu me inspirei.

E: E eu percebi assim, que tu não só acrescentou conteúdo, mas tu cortou muita coisa.

C: Eu cortei bastante justamente porque é o movimento que eu faço na escrita, eu não tenho por hábito fazer “outline”, “guideline”, eu sento e escrevo. Depois de uns dias eu releio, então os meus textos tem muitas mudanças.

E: Uma coisa que ela (a professora da disciplina) comentou quando eu falei com ela é que muitos alunos pegaram o “outline” e preencheram ele, você foi justamente um das exceções que foram os alunos que fizeram inteiro.

C: É que eu não trabalho bem assim entendeu. É uma questão minha, do meu processo criativo.

E: Você tinha alguma expectativa em relação ao feedback dela pra esse trabalho?

C: Tinha sempre tem né.

E: Mas assim tinha alguma coisa que você olhou e você pensou “não era o que eu queria”, “não ficou bem claro”?

C: Minha única questão foi essa em relação às referências, entendeu, do critério de avaliação. Porque hoje quando eu ouço rascunho parece uma coisa mais “raw” entendeu. Então eu fiquei um pouco chateada.

E: Você conseguiu entender tudo o que ela comentou?

C: Sim.

E: Todos os comentários foram positivos? Não teve nada que te deixou triste?

C: Não, só aqui onde ela deu a nota da gramática eu ganhei 1,3, valia 1,5 e eu ganhei 1,3, e eu queria saber onde é que tá esse 0,2.

E: Em geral qual o impacto dos comentários que você recebe? Você leva pra outros textos? Você consegue lembrar de tudo? Ou passa batido?

C: Depende, eu acho que quando a coisa é negativa fica marcado. Quando é elogio é legal mas...

E: Mas daí você presta mais atenção pra aqueles comentários pra forma, você pensa “olha esse vocabulário aqui é interessante e eu vou acrescentar nos próximos textos” ou quando ela critica organização textual, o que te chama mais atenção?

C: Mas eu acho que assim a correção é muito mais focada em estrutura do que gramática então como não é muito corrigido a gramática não tem como lembrar ou não lembrar.

E: E você acha que eles deviam focar um pouco mais na gramática?

C: Mas daí ia dar mais trabalho. Eu acho que não deveria tirar nota, mas devia marcar sabe. Uma coisa que eu tinha era esse “mismatch” da questão do “aspect” do “had been”, pra mim sempre foi uma dificuldade. Só que assim eu errei bastante isso daí fui fora, fui em outros lugares e aprendi.

8.2. Delta's data:

8.2.1. Revised abstract

Are They Better Together?

An Overview of Students' Interaction in English Classroom.

Delta

According to Vygotsky, the main role played by social interaction is the development of cognition (Vygotsky,1978). The psychologist also argued that community plays a central role in the process of "making meaning" that is the way a person can construct an understanding about a subject. In relation to these ideas, Hatch argued that it is through interaction students have in classroom that they can have the opportunity to develop linguistic and communicative competence which might be better developed in groups than individually (Hatch,1978). Taking into consideration the positive aspects the cooperative learning can bring for students, the present study focuses on different types of students' interaction to analyse the benefits they can obtain in the learning process of English as L2. The research was conducted in Colégio de Aplicação (UFSC) with 13 teenagers students from the first year of the High school. The data was collected from three sources: analyses of two classes- one in which students worked with the classmates they chose and one in which they worked together with classmates the teacher chose for them; In addition, students answered a questionnaire about their reading, listening, oral and writing activities and the way which they prefer work with them (individually or in groups) and their perceptions in relation to the two kinds of interactions they had. Applied the questionnaires, the results obtained show students feel better in English classroom working together with their classmates, mainly when it involves oral activities. On the other hand, the majority part of students highlighted they generally do not enjoy work with classmates they usually do not work with, but they perceive that different interactions can provide exchange of knowledges that may help they develop their L2 skills.

keywords: students- interaction- cooperative learning.

8.2.2. Interview

12 de Junho de 2018

Entrevista com Delta

Entrevistador: Idade?

Delta: tenho 23 anos.

E: Quando você entrou no curso de Letras Inglês e há quanto tempo estuda inglês?

D: Eu entrei no curso com 19, foi em 2015. E há quanto tempo eu estudo Inglês, bem, na escola mesmo desde a quinta série e também fiz cursinho, mas eu achei que o cursinho não ajudou tanto, e não foi por tanto tempo assim.

E: Qual era o nome do curso?

D: Era “Way”, “Ways” alguma coisa assim.

E: Sobre escrita acadêmica, vocês trabalham com artigos (acadêmicos), essas coisas nas aulas?

D: Sim, bastante, desde a quinta fase eu acho que a gente estava tendo assim alguma coisa mais focada pro meio acadêmico. Antes a gente estava tendo, mas não tanto, era mais criação de textos que não envolviam tanto a linguagem acadêmica. A gente não usava tanto referências, “according to”, “de acordo com” fulano, etc.

E: Sobre o feedback do professor nas produções escritas, qual a importância dele?

D: Eu acho que ajuda ou a tu querer melhorar o que tu fez. Porque tem professores que sabem dar um feedback que tu pensa assim “tem que melhorar, mas meu trabalho está quase lá”. E tem aqueles também que te desmotivam, assim que tu pensa: “nossa, meu trabalho está, então, uma porcaria”.

E: E o que o professor falam assim que geralmente te desmotiva?

D: Geralmente que eles dizem?

E: É.

D: Olha, ultimamente eu estou tendo experiências boas, me parece que os professores estão mudando o jeito que eles falam com a gente. Teve, por exemplo, acho que na quarta fase, ou um pouco antes eu tive alguns feedbacks que eu não gostei muito, que eu pensei assim “não precisava ter sido dessa forma”.

E: E quando tu recibes esse retorno do professor tu tem alguma expectativa? Tu espera receber correção gramatical, dica pra melhorar o texto, organização?

D: Eu sempre espero muito em relação à correção gramatical, porque eu nunca tive, por exemplo, experiência fora, eu acho que isso me ajudaria muito, e eu vejo que muitos colegas meus tem muito mais facilidade que eu de formular uma frase. Por exemplo, até falando eu acho que eu tenho mais dificuldade. E eu sempre acabo colocando algum errinho gramatical sem querer e eu vou ver bem depois, então se um professor diz isso eu vou ficar mais ligada pra próxima vez.

E: Mas esses erros acontecem mais, geralmente porque tu não prestou atenção, ou realmente depois tu percebe “nossa isso aqui eu não sabia”?

D: Alguns eu não sabia, mas alguns realmente eu não prestei atenção. Por exemplo: tu tens lá um trabalho para fazer e tu começa a digitar e a fazer e parece que a ideia tá fluindo, só que aí o teu português também começa a influenciar no inglês, e aí vai.

E: Quais comentários que você acha mais válidos e que te ajudam mais?

D: Eu acho que comentários que venham agregar, não que venha mudar todo o teu estudo. Por exemplo, eu fiz uma pesquisa pra professora, e ela não falou assim “Ah, tu tem que mudar, a tua pesquisa não tá certa”. Ela não, ela foi me guiando conforme a pesquisa que eu tinha, a ideia que eu queria, não foi uma coisa assim “não tu tem que fazer uma coisa totalmente diferente”.

E: Quando você entregou esse trabalho (O Abstract que os estudantes da disciplina estão produzindo), você tinha alguma expectativa em relação ao feedback que você iria receber?

D: Eu fiquei bastante preocupada porque ele é para um evento né, daí eu pensei que talvez ela (professora da disciplina) fosse ser muito mais rigorosa do que eu esperava. Só que eu também acho que de acordo com o texto (Abstract) que eu escrevi, não estava tão fora do padrão acadêmico. Aí eu tentei cuidar disso, porque é um evento acadêmico, então tem que escrever de uma forma acadêmica.

E: Quando você começou a fazer essa pesquisa, vocês começaram a desenvolver esse Abstract, tu já tinha uma boa noção do que você ia fazer ou foi meio assim de susto?

D: Eu não tinha noção, eu fiquei pensando “nossa sobre o que eu vou escrever”, aí eu estava muito envolvida com meu estágio (estágio supervisionado obrigatório para obtenção do diploma de Licenciatura), e daí eu queria ver coisas relacionadas ao estágio. Aí eu pensei o que mais me chama a atenção porque eu estava na época de “observação” é a interação dos alunos.

E: Agora sobre o teu texto, quando você recebeu esse retorno aqui, qual foi a tua primeira reação? O que te chamou mais a atenção dos comentários da professora? Eu tenho aqui a cópia.

D: Eu gostei da forma que ela falou que eu estava basicamente no caminho, né, não que estava assim “nossa perfeito”, mas ela falou que estava quase lá, faltava melhorar. E assim eu gostei também da nota porque eu pensei que talvez a nota fosse ser mais baixa, mas eu até gostei da nota.

E: E você acha que ela foi clara nos comentários dela?

D: Sim porque, muita parte ela diz que ... eu não sei se você tem aí.

E: **Tenho, tenho a correção e a última versão.**

D: Só pra eu lembrar.

(aqui o entrevistador rapidamente explica o significado das legendas feitas por ele no trabalho)

D: Às vezes as nossas ideias meio que conflitam, tipo, você pensa em português, e em português você pensa uma coisa e em inglês é outra daí tu não está sendo tão claro.

E: **Eu percebi que ela fez mais correções de vocabulário mesmo.**

D: Isso, que é a parte que eu acho que eu mais sinto alguma dificuldade.

E: **E ela fez algumas “críticas”, alguma coisa em relação à pesquisa, pra ser mais clara pra explicar alguns termos, por exemplo aqui “making meaning”.**

D: Então, eu achei que ia ficar claro se eu deixasse assim, só que ela colocou ali pra eu especificar. A minha preocupação também era passar o limite de palavras que era 300. Aí eu fiquei perguntando pra ela se tinha que contar junto com o título e ela falou que não precisava.

E: **Então algumas partes que você tirou foram por causa da contagem no caso?**

D: Foi.

E: **Porque eu notei que essa seção aqui você cortou inteira.**

D: É teve parte aqui que eu mudei, e aqui, por exemplo, eu tirei, aqui: “The famous English psychologist”, porque eu pensei “ah isso daqui é só pra dar ênfase de quão importante ele é nesse meio” sabe. Aí eu pensei “ah, o pessoal das Letras, o pessoal que vai ver o evento, eles sabem de quem eu estou falando”, então eu não achei tão primordial.

E: **E sobre esse modo dela avaliar, de já dar a nota no “draft” pra você ter uma noção dos critérios dela.**

D: Eu achei bom porque daí deu pra ver, realmente, cada tópico, o que estava bom, porque realmente a gramática que é onde eu tenho mais problema foi aonde eu tirei a nota menor do total; o total era 1,5 e eu tirei 0,7 e o resto assim, eu mais ou menos tinha noção de que talvez eu estivesse “quase lá”. E o propósito eu não sei se estava muito de acordo, bom que ela foi dando algumas dicas que deu pra melhorar bastante nessa parte.

E: **No caso de orientar o caminho da pesquisa?**

D: É porque eu também tinha ficado confusa assim “ah será que tem um problema na minha pesquisa?”.

E: Qual o comentário dela que te ajudou mais?

D: Eu acho que foi de especificar aqui o objetivo, porque eu mudei bastante a ideia do objetivo, e hoje quando eu apresentei pra ela, ela falou que realmente estava melhor. Daí conforme o objetivo eu tentei adequar esse método também, a explicação do método.

E: A pesquisa tu quer trabalhar com essa coisa do trabalho em grupo né, pelo que eu entendi?

D: A primeira experiência foi em uma aula em que os alunos estavam trabalhando em pares e esses pares eram geralmente com colegas que eles estavam acostumados a trabalhar. Nada novo; era novo pra mim porque eu nunca tinha visto o grupo; só que eles estavam com colegas que eles costumam trabalhar, amigos, até tinha um menino com a namorada e tal e em outro eles estavam com grupos de diferentes níveis de proficiência, por exemplo tinham alunos com muito problema em inglês e uns que já tinham morado fora, que já tinham um nível bem bom de inglês sabe. E assim, uns acharam que essa experiência foi válida só pra socializar e outros acharam que realmente conseguiram aprender um pouco com o colega.

E: E daí teve o questionário, tu conseguiu todos os dados? O que a professora achou da tua pesquisa?

D: Ela gostou bastante.

E: Agora voltando para o draft, teve algum comentário que tu achou irrelevante, desnecessário?

D: Não desnecessário, mas eu achei que “make meaning”, ali quando ela comentou pra eu elaborar mais nisso, eu achei que, na minha ideia, parece que “make meaning” já se explica pelo próprio termo aí eu pensei “será que realmente precisa elaborar essa parte?”, mas aí como ela pediu daí eu pensei “enfim, vou tentar o mais concisa possível para achar uma frase que explique isso”. Tanto é que eu expliquei com poucos termos.

E: Sobre a correção gramatical, que tu mencionou no começo que tu busca um pouco isso, tu acha que falta, que os professores deveriam focar um pouco mais nisso, trabalhar um pouco mais a questão da gramática?

D: Não sei se o problema é tanto de os professores não focarem isso, até porque a aula totalmente gramatical é chata, mas de repente em algumas escritas anteriores das outras matérias eles, ao invés de pedir tanto texto diferente, de diferentes assuntos, eles focassem em menos quantidade de trabalho e maior foco nesses textos com feedback igual esse que ela está fazendo aqui(draft e revisão). Porque teve um semestre que eu fazia um texto por

semana de um assunto diferente e eu não tinha muito retorno do que realmente estava errado, ou, se tinha um retorno não tinha a explicação do porque que isso está errado sabe, só estava errado.

E: É isso só obrigado.

8.3. Ecco's data:

8.3.1. Revised Abstract

The challenges of Oral Production for Brazilian ESL learners

In the mandatory internship course in the English program at UFSC the undergraduates must observe English classes of elementary school or high school. In these observations, the fact that some students avoid speaking in public or are nervous when they are exposed to L2 drew attention. According to Swain (1993) this occurrence happens due to the fact that students speaking in English note that they have difficulties between what they want to say and what they can to say. Thus, this study consists of exploring the perceptions of teenagers learners of English as an L2 in relation to their use of English when producing speech. This research focuses on observing the feelings towards L2 speaking, challenges that the learners find in the process, how much they engage in this practice, how students react to corrections in relation to pronunciation, why they feel this way and how the learners feel correcting their classmates' pronunciation. Among the difficulties in oral production, were found: Foreign language anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p. 284), Lack of motivation (Wei, 2013), Introversión, shyness and apprehension (Ortega, 2009). Based on these researches, the objective of this study is to compare the difficulties of each student in the 7th year of elementary school in English classes and their relationship to error correction. The 13 students and their behaviors will be observed throughout 25 English classes. In addition, each student will answer a questionnaire with 10 questions about their perceptions in relation to oral production and correction activities. After collecting this data, a comparison will be made with the written replies and students' behaviors in the classroom; the expected results may change in relation to challenges in L2 speech production by teenagers, and how they react to correction.

Keywords: L2 learners' perception, L2 speech production, classroom behavior

8.3.2. Interview

20/06/2018 Quarta-feira

Entrevista Ecco.

Entrevistador: Idade

Ecco: 22

E: Quando você entrou no curso?

Ecco: 2015.1

E: Há quanto tempo você estuda inglês?

Ecco: Eu fiz um cursinho quando eu tinha uns 14 ou 15 anos, mas aí desde então eu larguei e só aqui na graduação mesmo, então desde 2015.

E: Quanto tempo fez o curso (o cursinho)?

Ecco: 2 anos.

E: Qual era o curso?

Ecco: Era da Microcamp, era inicial. Mas, é, quando eu tinha 14, 15, né foram os dois anos.

E: E sobre escrita acadêmica, qual a tua experiência com escrita acadêmica até agora?

Ecco: Acho que só aqui na graduação mesmo né. Acho que há dois anos, desde a sexta fase... 1 ano e meio.

E: E qual que é a importância do feedback do professor nas tuas produções?

Ecco: Ah eu gosto de ter um feedback pra saber se a minha ideia estava certa, do que o professor queria, e também pra ajudar até na minha... sei lá no meu desenvolvimento. Às vezes eu não consigo escrever o que o professor quer e aí geralmente eles dão... a Alpha né, dá um feedback dizendo o que eu poderia dizer ou então perguntando o que eu realmente queria dizer pra melhorar na próxima escrita. Eu acho que é bem importante o feedback também pra...ah sei lá não consigo pensar em muita coisa.

E: Você acha importante a correção gramatical?

Ecco: Sim.

E: E vocês têm muito disso no curso, ou como é que funciona essa parte?

Ecco: Correção gramatical... os professores são bem exigentes nisso, mas eu acredito que insumo pra isso, tipo, uma abordagem maior da gramática eu acho que não tem tanto assim.

E: Você acha que não é muito claro, por exemplo, quando eles (professores) corrigem teu texto, por exemplo: problemas com pontuação, problemas talvez com vocabulário.

Você acha que eles poderiam, talvez, ser mais específicos, tipo apontar o que exatamente dá pra melhorar?

Ecco: Sim. Acho que sim.

E: Que tipo de comentários que geralmente você acha que ajudam no teu texto?

Ecco: Dando uma opção pra aquilo que eu quis dizer, quando ele (professor) entende o que eu quero dizer e eu não falei do jeito certo, aí dá uma opção, ou então às vezes até uma opção em português do que eu queria dizer pra eu traduzir melhor, ou então dão uma opção mais acadêmica, mais formal daquilo.

E: Tem algum tipo de comentário, de correção que é costume dos professores fazerem que você acha desnecessário?

Ecco: Acho que em sala de aula, quando tu quer falar alguma coisa e eles te falam NÃO, e interrompem tua fala, e falam o que é o certo até mesmo antes de tu terminar o que tu queria falar.

E: Agora sobre a produção escrita que você fez. Tu tinha alguma expectativa em relação o retorno que você ia ter?

Ecco: Sim. Porque era a Alpha. Eu já tive outras aulas com ela e eu sei como é que é o feedback dela sabe, geralmente é bem positivo, ela dá bastante ajuda. E também eu fiz a primeira versão ali muito rápida né, então eu imaginei que ia ter bastante coisa pra corrigir mesmo, e, tanto que eu marquei um encontro com ela depois que ela me deu o feedback.

E: E como que foi essa experiência específica?

B: Do encontro?

E: Não. Desse trabalho como um todo, até essa parte? (mostro pra ela as correções do Abstract) Numa palavra como você define?

Ecco: Acho que foi bom. Se eu não tivesse tido o feedback que ela me deu, se eu não tivesse encontrado ela pra ter uma reunião sobre o Abstract, eu acho que teria continuado ruim.

E: Mas, tirando a reunião. Pelos comentários, eles te ajudaram?

Ecco: Sim.

E: Aqui eu tenho alguns comentários dela (professora da disciplina). Por exemplo, ela pediu pra você elaborar mais na primeira parte. Uma coisa ela corrigiu sobre o vocabulário, sobre “facility”. Ela também pediu que você apontasse a importância da análise.

Ecco: Mas eu acho que se não eu tivesse encontrado ela, só isso (o feedback escrito) não teria sido suficiente. Eu acho que eu tenho bastante dificuldade.

E: **E você acha que tem como o professor melhorar esse feedback? É claro que sempre vai ser importante o encontro com o professor, mas você acha que seria possível ela melhorar (esse feedback) que talvez não fosse tão essencial o encontro?**

Ecco: Eu acho que ia ser difícil.

E: **Você acha que faz parte esse encontro com o professor?**

Ecco: Eu acho que sim. Pelo menos pra mim né que tenho bastante dificuldade, mas talvez pra outra pessoa já fosse o suficiente.

E: **Eu notei que você fez muitas mudanças do draft pra versão final. Geralmente os textos eu marco aquelas partes... por exemplo, alguma parte que o professor corrigiu e que foi mantida, alguma parte que você manteve do texto original. Mas aqui eu percebi que o texto é quase 100% novo. Você manteve a ideia (projeto), mas você mudou todo o texto. Por que isso?**

Ecco: Foi por causa do encontro que eu tive com ela. Não tem um porquê assim, na verdade a gente foi parte por parte e ela foi me perguntando o que eu queria dizer, ou, de acordo com a minha pesquisa, e foi me ajudando. Não sei te dizer um porquê, assim foi por causa do encontro não foi por causa do feedback (escrito). É que ela foi parte por partezinha, e aí de cada parte ela me perguntava: “Essa parte aqui, de acordo com a tua pesquisa...”, mesmo em português ela foi me ajudando.

E: **Na verdade nesses casos eu achei importante falar em português já que é pra clarificar o que está acontecendo. Bom, voltando aos comentários dela... Tá então se não fosse esse encontro com ela, não teria ajudado muito isso (feedback escrito).**

Ecco: É acho que não teria ajudado tanto assim.

E: **Tem algum comentário que você achou negativo?**

Ecco: Não.

E: **Não mesmo?**

Ecco: Acho que não.

E: **O que você acha dessa versão final em relação ao draft? Você acha que ficou muito melhor?**

Ecco: Ah, sim. Com certeza. Essa primeira eu não gostei.

E: O que você aprende das correções que você recebe, de um modo geral, você geralmente lembra de tudo pras próximas tarefas?

Ecco: De tudo não, mas geralmente o que... por exemplo, um erro que eu às vezes deixo passar e que ela (professora) repete de novo: “Ecco isso... pode mudar pra aquela maneira que eu já te falei antes”. Geralmente os erros repetidos eu já não repito mais.

E: E você anota essas coisas ou você lembra de tudo de cabeça?

Ecco: Tem coisa que eu anoto tipo, como iniciar frase, sabe, às vezes eu não sabia como trocar os sinônimos das palavras por alguma palavra mais formal. Essas coisas eu tenho anotado, as outras coisas eu tento lembrar.

E: E uma pergunta geral do curso. Sobre essa parte gramatical, trabalho com gramática, é bom? É ruim? Você acha que você sente falta.

Ecco: Eu na verdade tenho bastante dificuldade no Inglês. Eu não sei se foi por uma falta dessa parte né –Agora eu vejo essa dificuldade – ou talvez se não foi... talvez a minha dificuldade tenha passado despercebida pelos professores e aí eles me passaram de fase e eu deveria ter ficado em alguma fase pra trabalhar mais essa parte da gramática. Então eu não sei ao certo se o problema é eu ou se é a forma como eles ensinam ou deixam de ensinar.

E: E o que é que você acha desse sistema de você pegar um texto que você já fez e trabalhar mais nele em relação àquelas disciplinas em que você simplesmente faz um texto por aula?

Ecco: Ah, eu acho bem melhor do que fazer um texto só por aula. Tipo, tu diz refazer o teu texto? Essa reconstrução?

E: Isso, essa coisa de você refazer, observar o que você já fez e tentar melhorar.

Ecco: Ah, eu acho bem importante. Eu até prefiro a gente trabalhar um texto só nosso por mais tempo e melhorar ele muito mais do que ficar trabalhando vários textos aleatórios e uma versão só, sabe.

E: Isso é tudo, obrigado.