

**9.00-9.25 am**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **What renders feedback effective for novice L2 undergraduate writers' development of discipline-specific writing?**

Shari Dureshahwar Lughmani, The Hong Kong Polytechnic & Coventry University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

To be able to participate in construction of new knowledge, novice L2 writers need to build their understanding of the epistemology of the discipline that they are writing in and develop appropriate disciplinary perspectives. Novice L2 writers in the university, therefore, need to receive instruction, guidance and timely and dialogic feedback from both subject and language experts within the context of the discipline in which writing takes place. Disciplinary faculty tend to have acquired tacit understanding of writing within their discipline through “long exposure” (Nesi and Gardner 2012:261) and are often unaware of the need for training novice writers in their disciplines (Carter, 2007). This doctoral research aims to contribute towards an understanding of the processes of awareness of genres across the disciplines as experienced by novice writers through the interactive processes of assignment specific and genre-based feedback and revision. The context of my research is a writing support programme at my university developed in collaboration with the discipline teachers from across eight faculties representing broad disciplines of the arts and humanities, life sciences, social sciences, and physical sciences, using Nesi and Gardner’s framework (2012). The programme supports students through genre-based feedback on multiple drafts to raise among students an awareness of the ways of knowing and doing within a discipline as represented by discipline teacher’s expectations. This talk will present an analysis of successive drafts of the essay genre family from four subjects representing four broad disciplines and the feedback students received from language teachers with a view to finding out what specific feedback helped students revise according to faculty’s expectations as represented in the assignment guidelines developed as a result of collaboration between subject and language teachers.

### **Breakout Room 2**

#### **Benefits of L2 collaborative writing: How do Japanese EFL students share their L2 knowledge and construct new knowledge while writing together?**

Yusa Koizumi, Meiji Gakuin University

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

**Abstract:**

Research has shown benefits of collaborative writing in L2 learning. Writing together engages learners in discussion of L2 form (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016; Niu, 2009) and provides them with opportunities to resolve linguistic problems through collaboration (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016). It also promotes the use of

metalinguage, through which learners co-construct new L2 knowledge as well as utilize the knowledge they already possess (Fortune, 2015; Fortune & Thorp, 2001). This study explores this topic in the Japanese EFL context. Twenty-five pairs of university students in Tokyo completed a narrative writing task in pairs. During the 15-minute task, they produced a total of 393 language-related episodes (LREs), in which they discussed lexical, grammatical, or discourse features. They used metalinguage in 233 LREs, and in 35 LREs, they used metalinguage to verbalize their explicit knowledge of English. In the majority of these 35 episodes, the student who heard the verbalization signalled understanding or co-constructed new knowledge with the other student. In 25 of the 35 LREs, the two students successfully resolved the problem that triggered the episode and incorporated the form in their composition. These results show that L2 collaborative writing generates ample opportunities for form-focused discussion and interactive problem solving. They also indicate that such discussion can be a sphere where learners articulate their L2 knowledge using metalinguage and transfer it to their peers or put their knowledge together to construct new knowledge. The author will discuss the results with sample LREs and draw pedagogical implications.

**9.30-9.55 am**

## **Breakout Room 1**

### **Japanese L2 student writers' translingual practice in written peer feedback**

Sugene Kim, Nagoya University of Commerce and Business

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Incorporating peer review into an English as a second language (ESL) or a foreign language (EFL) writing curriculum is commonly practiced. While a line of research examining the effects of peer review claims that it generally affects student writers' performance in a positive way, there are studies suggesting that those from non-Western cultural backgrounds tend to exhibit difficulty in providing negative feedback for cultural reasons that value group consensus over verbal negotiations. Since these studies were conducted in an ESL setting (the USA) with a relatively small number of participants, this study set out to verify and extend the previous observations. Sixty-four Japanese EFL learners from four English writing classes participated in the study. Throughout the 14-week semester, they engaged in peer review in both face-to-face and anonymous conditions. Their perception toward peer review and preference for either review mode--if any--were explored by surveys administered at the outset and end of the experiment. After all peer-review sessions were completed, semi-structured interviews were additionally conducted to solicit in-depth responses about their experiences and perspectives. Analysis of the collected data did not support the previously held views that Asian students are predisposed to be reluctant peer reviewers. Rather, it was indicated that Japanese EFL students' preference for a certain peer-review mode interacts closely with various factors such as reviewer's English proficiency level, familiarity with the activity, and perceived value of peer review in the writing process. Pedagogical implications are discussed in relation to the findings, and suggestions for organizing peer-review sessions in ESL and EFL settings are made.

## **Breakout Room 2**

## **How do task repetition and pre-task focus on form instruction influence child EFL learners' collaborative dictogloss performance?**

Asier Calzada & María del Pilar García Mayo, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU)

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

### **Abstract:**

The language learning opportunities offered by face-to-face collaborative L2 writing tasks have been demonstrated to be moderated by a number of task-related factors, such as task type or group formation method (Zhang & Plonsky, 2020). However, task repetition (TR) and the provision of pre-task focus on form instruction (FFI) have been much less studied. Moreover, scant attention has been devoted to how child learners fare in these tasks, as they are presumed to be less equipped than adults for developing a metalinguistic explanation of grammar (Gorman & Ellis, 2019). In the present study, fifty-nine low proficiency EFL children (L1 Spanish, ages 11-12) carried out two dictoglosses with one-week interval in between in a counterbalanced order: one targeting the 3rd person singular -s (3S) and another targeting the 3rd person singular possessive determiners (POSS). In a quasi-experimental design, the learners were divided into two groups: a collaborative dictogloss (Collab, n = 28) and a Pre-task FFI + collaborative dictogloss group (FFI+Collab, n = 31). Dyads' oral interaction during task performance was recorded, transcribed and codified for Language Related Episodes (LREs), which were classified according to their focus, outcome, depth of engagement and L1 use. Besides, the task time and turns were also quantified. The results showed that TR did not have a significant influence on task time and focus on form, but FFI did. In fact, regardless of the dictogloss day, FFI+Collab spent more time on the task and generated significantly more LREs on 3S and lexis than Collab. Although both conditions were similar in their LRE resolution (with the majority being correctly resolved), FFI+Collab produced significantly more elaborate LREs than Collab. Finally, the former employed the L1 significantly more than the latter in their metalinguistic discussions. Based on these findings, some pedagogical and research conclusions will also be discussed.

**10.00-10.25 am**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **A classroom-based investigation of Korean EFL writers' feedback literacy: Implications for teaching and research**

Jill Boggs, Swansea University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

### **Abstract:**

While research tends to demonstrate a positive effect for corrective feedback (CF) on grammatical accuracy of language learners' writing, these studies often produce conflicting results about which type of CF is most effective. This has led to increased interest in learners' engagement with CF. Feedback literacy, or learners' conceptual understanding and use of feedback, has developed in the field of L1 writing research and is just beginning to appear in L2 writing literature. However, it is unclear how well current

models of feedback literacy apply to the various educational cultures in which English L2 writers learn. This paper considers feedback literacy within an instructed EFL setting with Korean L1 university learners (n=109), examining their understanding and use of CF. Participants produced in-class pen-and-paper academic writing (as part of their normal coursework) and were provided with a) one-to-one audio-recorded conferences, where participants were invited to engage with teachers about their CF; b) reflective worksheets, which prompted learners to engage in writing with their CF; or c) direct CF. Improvement was measured statistically (mixed ANOVA). The Birmingham method of classroom discourse analysis was used to analyse conference data. Reflective worksheet data were analysed with a coding scheme adapted from research. Results are informed by a background survey and semi-structured interviews. The statistically significant improvement found in the conference and reflective worksheet groups was equal to that of the comparison (direct CF) group, which was unexpected. Conference participants appeared to resist the opportunity provided by conferences to engage with their CF. The findings highlight the complexity of CF use, particularly in contexts where learners might be less accustomed to process writing. This suggests that current models of feedback literacy may be insufficient, as a successful model will need to account for educational context and cultural factors. Theoretical and pedagogical implications are explored.

## Breakout Room 2

### **The development of collocation use in L2 learners' writing: Effects of pedagogic intervention**

Tanjun Liu, Hong Kong Baptist University

**Strand:** Analysis of written texts (TEXT)

#### **Abstract:**

The appropriate use of collocations, prefabricated multi-word combinations, is regarded as a prerequisite for L2 learners. Previous learner corpus studies have shown us that L2 learners tended to use a high proportion of deviant collocations of different types in writing (e.g., Laufer & Waldman, 2011; Siyanova & Schmitt, 2008). It is of importance to explore the potential of different pedagogical intervention in L2 collocation learning. This study, therefore, employed a quasi-experimental research design and used data from 100 Chinese students of English. While the experimental group (EG) used a data-driven learning (DDL) approach (i.e. direct use of corpora in language learning) (Johns, 1991), a learner dictionary was assigned to one comparison group (CG1) and the other comparison group (CG2) used any tools students preferred. During the intervention, students revised the writing that they produced one week before with different tools. After writing pieces were collected over a period of 15 weeks and compiled into learner corpora, collocations were extracted by using the corpus query language. The results indicated that in general learners in three groups demonstrated a tendency to use more collocations over time. In terms of the percentage of acceptable collocations produced, it has increased gradually for the EG, while the other two groups showed either a weak decline or a stable tendency. Moreover, when we look at the specific types of collocations, the EG, as well as the CG1, showed a significant increase in the use of adjective-noun

collocations over time, while the CG2 showed growth in their use of verb-noun collocations. The findings contribute to our understanding of the impact of pedagogical instructions on the development of collocations in L2 learners' writing.

**10.30-10.55 am**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **Instant messaging and the timing of written corrective feedback**

Bridget Murphy, Jessica Mackay & Elsa Tragant, Universitat de Barcelona

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Although under-researched in the SLA literature, the timing of feedback is worth exploring given the pedagogical implications that can be drawn from its study. The effectiveness of providing feedback during task performance (i.e., immediate corrective feedback, ICF) has not always proved to be more effective than providing feedback after task completion (i.e., delayed corrective feedback, DCF) (for a review see Quinn and Nakata, 2017). Furthermore, several teacher training manuals (i.e., Anderson, 2017;) discourage teachers from providing ICF for fear of disrupting oral communication. However, students seem to prefer ICF (Quinn, 2014) and some SLA theories (i.e., Interactional Hypothesis; Skill Acquisition Theory) are inclined to favour the ICF modality. The provision of written feedback in computer-mediated environments may be less disruptive than in face-to-face communication. Long (2017) also argues that it can be quite salient and a more permanent record. Two recent studies have investigated immediate feedback provision in computer-mediated communication (Andujar, 2020; Arroyo and Yilmaz, 2018) but did not explore students' perceptions, the goal of our study. The present study took place over five weeks during an online EFL course. Adult students (n=10) periodically received language learning activities via WhatsApp to complete by sending written messages outside class time. After an introductory task for familiarization purposes, students were sent DCF in weeks two and three and ICF in weeks four and five. Questionnaire and interview data show students did not find ICF to be disruptive and most had a strong preference for this more interactive type of feedback both for practical and cognitive-related reasons. There is also evidence of students spontaneously paying attention to their classmates' errors and repairs. These results confirm findings by Kim (2012) in the context of synchronous corrective teacher-initiated feedback in writing tasks and point to the potential of immediate feedback provision through instant messaging.

### **Breakout Room 2**

#### **Dutch young learners' development of English L2W in terms of complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis: Exploring the mediating impact of primary English and exposure to English outside the language classroom**

Cornee Ferreira-Van der Wind, University of Reading

**Strand:** Analysis of written texts (TEXT)

**Abstract:**

There is a paucity of research on L2W to inform educational policy and practice in the Netherlands. Though L2W is not a core aim in Dutch primary or lower secondary education, some English L2W ability is assumed by the age of fifteen. This study is aimed at gaining understanding in the L2W development (in CALF) among sixty Dutch YLs, while also investigating the possible mediating effects of English (writing) instruction in primary school and exposure to English outside of school. Data are gathered by using a questionnaire, a descriptive writing task, and a persuasive writing task at the beginning (time1), middle (time2) and end (time 3) of the YLs' first year in secondary education. The CALF measures include: The learners' ability to use subordination, their accurate use of verb tenses, the type-token ratio in their texts, the number of low frequency words used, and number of words written in 20 minutes. A MANOVA is used to explore the relationships between variables (time, exposure and previous education). The time1 data show that on average YLs who leave primary school are able to write at A2 level of the CEFR. Initial results show that a more complex task prompt the YLs to use more complex language structures, including subordination. The YLs report varied experiences of primary English and limited exposure to written English outside of school, but frequent exposure to spoken English via music, films, and gaming. Positive correlations are observed between exposure to spoken English and CALF scores.

**11.00-11.25 am**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **The effects of L2 error correction with corpus use in on-demand English writing classes**

Yoshiho Satake, Surugadai University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

#### **Abstract:**

Since the spread of the COVID-19 has forced teachers to teach remotely, various attempts have been made to obtain an educational effect similar to that is obtained in face-to-face classes. Regarding data-driven learning, corpus use in L2 learning in off-campus settings has not been studied enough, while the strengths of that in on-campus settings have been stated. Thus, this study explored the effects of L2 error correction with learners' indirect corpus use in on-demand English writing classes. The author focused on article- and preposition-omission errors and compared the results with those of the author's previous research, which investigated the effects of correcting these errors with learners' actual direct corpus use in an on-campus setting. The participants were thirteen Japanese university EFL students. They wrote essays in English before and after ten error correction sessions, in which the author highlighted all article- and preposition-omission errors in their essays and provided them with concordance feedback by using the corpus of contemporary American English. The concordance lines were related to the students' errors and the students were told to consult them for error correction. There was no learners' direct corpus access. The author examined whether fewer article- and preposition-omission errors were found in the post-session essays than in the pre-session ones. The results show that error correction with indirect corpus use contributed to more accurate correction of article-omission errors, while it did not promote more accurate correction of preposition-omission errors. Considering that the author's previous research shows that error correction with learners' direct corpus use contributed to more accurate

correction of both article- and preposition omission errors, the findings suggest that learners' indirect corpus use is less effective in L2 error correction than learners' direct corpus use. With indirect corpus use, exposure to fewer concordance lines would unfavourably affect correction of preposition-omission errors.

## Breakout Room 2

### **Are phraseological teddy bears discipline-specific? A corpus analysis of academic phraseology used by Romanian learners of English**

Andreea Dinca & Madalina Chitez, West University of Timisoara

**Strand:** Analysis of written texts (TEXT)

#### **Abstract:**

Studies investigating the academic writing produced by learners of English suggest that non-native speakers use a limited number of recurrent word combinations (Ädel and Erman, 2012). At the same time, learners exhibit a tendency to over-rely on certain phraseological expressions that they feel confident to use, i.e. “phraseological teddy bears”, (Hasselgård, 2019). Such linguistic behaviour could impact the quality of the texts written by L2 novice writers, since mastering the recurrent phraseological units typical of a “specific academic register and discipline” is fundamental (Ädel and Erman, 2012, p. 81). Additionally, previous research informs that lexical bundles vary significantly across disciplines (Hyland, 2008). Thus, the aim of the present study is to assess whether and how “phraseological teddy bears” differ across disciplines. We verify our hypotheses by analysing a corpus of English L2 texts written by the Romanian students. Our method involves the comparison of the most frequent 3 and 4-word lexical bundles in two different disciplines (Computer Science and Literary Studies) from two corpora that contain university student writing in English, namely the new Romanian Genre Corpus / ROGER (Bercuci & Chitez, 2019, p. 737) and the native-speaker academic writing corpus BAWE (Gardner and Nesi, 2013). We propose a double contrastive approach: first, we contrast the results from the two disciplines, Computer Science and Literary Studies, representing sub-sets of ROGER and second, the most frequent lexical bundles produced by learners are compared with the native speaker phrases extracted from the corresponding BAWE disciplinary sub-sets (e.g. Computer Science and English). We argue that this type of analysis can prove useful for identifying the restricted repertoire of L2 writers as opposed to native novice writers and it can be the starting point of a research-informed pedagogic intervention in L2 writing.

**11.45 am-12.10 pm**

## Breakout Room 1

### **Japanese L2 student writers' perceptions and experiences of face-to-face and anonymous peer review**

Sugene Kim, Nagoya University of Commerce and Business

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Incorporating peer review into an English as a second language (ESL) or a foreign language (EFL) writing curriculum is commonly practiced. While a line of research examining the effects of peer review claims that it generally affects student writers' performance in a positive way, there are studies suggesting that those from non-Western cultural backgrounds tend to exhibit difficulty in providing negative feedback for cultural reasons that value group consensus over verbal negotiations. Since these studies were conducted in an ESL setting (the USA) with a relatively small number of participants, this study set out to verify and extend the previous observations. Sixty-four Japanese EFL learners from four English writing classes participated in the study. Throughout the 14-week semester, they engaged in peer review in both face-to-face and anonymous conditions. Their perception toward peer review and preference for either review mode--if any--were explored by surveys administered at the outset and end of the experiment. After all peer-review sessions were completed, semi-structured interviews were additionally conducted to solicit in-depth responses about their experiences and perspectives. Analysis of the collected data did not support the previously held views that Asian students are predisposed to be reluctant peer reviewers. Rather, it was indicated that Japanese EFL students' preference for a certain peer-review mode interacts closely with various factors such as reviewer's English proficiency level, familiarity with the activity, and perceived value of peer review in the writing process. Pedagogical implications are discussed in relation to the findings, and suggestions for organizing peer-review sessions in ESL and EFL settings are made.

## Breakout Room 2

**Examining the use of lexical bundles in Portuguese as a second language writing**

Marine Laísa Matte & Larissa Goulart, Univesidade do Rio Grande, Brasil

**Strand:** Analysis of written texts (TEXT)

**Abstract:**

Formulaic sequences are known to be an important resource in learners' language development (Adel & Erman, 2012; Chen & Baker, 2010). Studies investigating English as a Second Language have thoroughly addressed the use of formulaic sequences across learners' development level, suggesting that more advanced learners use more types of formulaic sequences, while lower level learners use more formulas overall. In Portuguese, however, few studies have investigated the use of formulaic sequences. The goal of this study is to investigate the use of lexical bundles across proficiency levels of Portuguese learners, providing an account of their structural classification and functional use in a learner corpus. In order to achieve this goal, this study examined the use of lexical bundles in texts written for Portuguese as a Second Language classes at five proficiency levels, from beginners (A1) to advanced (C1) as defined by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Sequences of three words were extracted from the corpus using Antconc. These sequences had to occur at a minimum dispersion of 5% in each subcorpora. For the study of function types, the corpus was divided into beginner (A1 and A2) and intermediate students (B1 and B2), while for the study of structure types the corpus was divided in the original five levels. The results show that beginner level learners prefer using bundles associated with concrete references and use more bundle tokens than bundle types. On the other hand, more advanced learners rely more on textual organization and stance bundles, and use clausal and adverb-based bundles more

frequently. This study can contribute to the description of written Portuguese at different levels of proficiency. Moreover, the results can inform pedagogical materials that combine both function and structure of lexical bundles.

12.15-12.40 pm

## Breakout Room 1

### **Asynchronous online peer feedback for Japanese students' lexical diversity development**

Naoya Shibata, Nagoya University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

#### **Abstract:**

Based on the sociocultural theory, asynchronous online peer feedback (AOPF) can provide learners with opportunities to scaffold their writing through online interactions across different time zones. Although the positive effects of AOPF on students' syntactic complexity were detected (Shang, 2017), the effectiveness of AOPF on other writing abilities, including lexical diversity (LD), is not revealed. Accordingly, the present study aims to investigate the effectiveness of students' AOPF on their LD in a Japanese tertiary educational context. This quasi-experimental case study model of mixed-methods research was conducted with 39 intermediate-level third-year university students (13 students in the no-peer-feedback (NPF) group, 13 students in the SOPF group, and the other 13 students in the AOPF group) for ten months, based on data collected through their online comments, and their genre-based essays and drafts. For this study, students wrote six genre-based essays: narrative, process, description, comparison, cause-and-effects, and argument. Students in the SOPF and the AOPF groups were told to provide feedback on their classmates' drafts and interact with them. No peer review rubrics were provided. All essays and drafts were analysed with the text inspector (2020), and the two-way repeated measures ANOVA tests were performed to compare their first drafts to their revisions and examine their LD development. Students' online comments were coded thematically. Findings revealed that, regardless of genres, while SOPF and the NPF groups had no statistically significant effect on students' LD, the AOPF group did. The qualitative data also illustrated that the AOPF group had more sociocultural scaffolding than the SOPF group. Since LD can assess learners' writing proficiency (Vo, 2019), the results of this study contribute to the second language writing field. While showing statistical data and some students' online feedback comments and writing samples, the presenter recommends the implementation of AOPF activities in online writing courses.

## Breakout Room 2

### **Writing processes in different languages**

Marije Roorda, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

**Abstract:**

English is omnipresent in the Netherlands and can be found in various contexts such as on television and in advertisement, all of which provide a lot of input. Because children already have some receptive knowledge of English before they enter school (Unsworth et al., 2014), English cannot entirely be considered a foreign language anymore (De Bot, 2014; Edwards, 2016). German however, can be seen as a foreign language as it is mostly learned as a third language through school, often in more explicit ways. This study aims to determine if and to what extent English and German are processed differently by Dutch students when writing. More specifically, pausing and revision behaviour of 19 participants are researched using keystroke logging and stimulated recall (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Participants were university students taking a German language course. They watched a video and after that, wrote one argumentative text in each language. Their writing processes were recorded using Inputlog (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013) and a screen recorder. After writing both texts, the participants reflected on their thoughts during writing using stimulated recall. Results revealed important differences between the languages. First, participants paused less, but longer in English. Second, there was a trend towards a relationship between pause length and German proficiency, with increased proficiency leading to relatively fewer small pauses (threshold 200ms) and more longer pauses (threshold 2000ms), whereas a higher proficiency in English was related to less pausing overall. Finally, the stimulated recall comments showed that the reasons for pausing and revising were mostly related to grammar and planning in German but of a more diverse nature in English. We discuss theoretical and pedagogical implications of our findings in light of earlier work into L2 writing processes.

12.45-1.15 pm

### Breakout Room 1

#### **The role of self-assessment and written corrective feedback in L2 writing development: A complex dynamic systems theory approach**

Attila Miklós Wind, Eötvös Loránd University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Self-assessment (SA) and written corrective feedback (WCF) has been found to promote second language (L2) writing development (Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). SA promotes self-regulatory processes (Butler, 2016; 2018) and has been positively associated with learners' performance (Butler & Lee, 2010). The main aim of WCF, apart from focusing on language errors, is to facilitate L2 writers develop their editing, revision and overall writing skills. From this perspective, WCF is associated with the learning-to-write dimension of L2 writing (Manchón, 2011). Previous studies found that L2 writing develops nonlinearly showing ebbs and flows (Verspoor, Lowie, & van Dijk, 2008). Therefore, this study adopted a Complex Dynamic Systems Theory approach to investigate the L2 writing development of 11 English as a foreign language (EFL) university students. The participants composed 10 argumentative essays while attending an Advanced Writing course at a university in Budapest. The participants were asked to self-assess the quality of their writing using a rubric, while the teacher provided WCF. The essays were analysed for linguistic complexity indices, while the essays were rated by two teachers. The accuracy of SA was calculated by correlating the students' and the

teachers' scores. This study found that the participants improved the accuracy of SA from the first to the last measurement points. However, the trajectories of SA accuracy showed peaks and dips between the first and the last measurement points. As far as linguistic complexity is concerned, the only statistically significant change was detected in the mean length of sentence index. The essays contained shorter sentences at the last than at the first measurement point. This study shows that the interaction of SA and WCF contributes to improvements in L2 writing especially in organization. This study also has pedagogical implications by demonstrating the usefulness of SA in L2 writing development.

## Breakout Room 2

### Exploring the efficacy of 'hope'-infused strategy instruction on English writing processes and products among Chinese EFL university students

Yuchen Zong & Karen Forbes, University of Cambridge

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

#### **Abstract:**

This presentation will explore the efficacy of an 8-week, hope-infused, English writing strategy instruction on Chinese EFL students' strategic writing processes and writing quality (e.g., lexical resource, grammatical range and accuracy). It seeks to investigate the nuanced interaction between one's hope in learning English writing, strategy use and writing performance. Cognitive perspectives on L2/FL writing invite us to view processes in one's mental 'black box' when s/he engages with tasks and internalises L2/FL linguistic structures. Empirical evidence has also proven that those processes are mediated by individual factors such as one's willpower. Yet, research that thoroughly investigates the influence of 'will' on L2/FL writing process and product, and that examines the pedagogical implications of bringing in additional 'will' construct(s), is still in its infancy. To fill this research gap, the present presentation will take on the lens of writing strategies, i.e., consciously selected mental processes, and propose to conceptualise the 'will' element as 'hope', which embraces agency thinking according to Snyder's Hope Theory. The project adopted a mixed-method, quasi-experimental approach. Data were collected before, during, and after an 8-week intervention among non-English-major students (experimental group: n=30, control group: n=42) at a public university in China. The intervention took the form of strategy instruction in the English Writing classroom and drew insights from hope intervention from positive psychology. Reflecting upon writing strategy task sheets, hope questionnaires, introspective journals, and stimulated recall interviews, this presentation will suggest differential levels of strategy development, alongside lexical variation and accuracy between groups. The influence of one's hope-scape on English writing strategy and quality is found to fluctuate with relevance to his/her recent and immediate learning demands especially in the pandemic era. The project also sheds light on how the teaching of EFL writing with more hopeful feelings amongst non-English-major students can be explicitly operated.

1.15-1.40 pm

## Breakout Room 1

### Reformulations vs. models in individual and collaborative writing by EFL primary school children

Ruth Milla & María del Pilar García Mayo, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU)

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

The present study analyses the effect of two types of written corrective feedback (WCF) on the output by primary school children working individually and collaboratively. A comparison was made of the effect of reformulations and models on learners' noticing of features and their subsequent incorporation in their revised drafts. Collaborative writing (Storch, 2013) has been found to lead to noticing of problematic linguistic features, operationalized as language related episodes (LREs). Moreover, written corrective feedback (WCF) also facilitates their noticing, which might subsequently lead to further L2 learning (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017). Models (Coyle & Roca de Larios, 2020) and reformulations (Yang & Zhang, 2010) appear to be useful at different linguistic levels. However, there is a clear gap in research regarding the comparison of these two types of WCF, specifically when used by primary school foreign language learners when they produce a text in collaboration as compared to individual writing. The aim of the present study was to compare the effects of models and reformulations on the written output produced by 39 6th year EFL Primary Education children (age 11-12), writing individually and collaboratively. The children's LREs and their written drafts were analysed to explore their noticing of problematic features at Time 1-before WCF- and their incorporation of those features at Time 2 -comparison with WCF- and Time 3- delayed post-test. Few statistically significant differences between the two WCF groups were found but, rather, tendencies in the following sense: models and reformulations led to noticing and incorporation of different types of features and pairs were found to notice and incorporate a greater number of features than individuals. The findings will be discussed in the light of the potential benefits of collaborative writing for young learners and pedagogical implications will be considered.

## Breakout Room 2

### **Writing in different languages: L1 Dutch and L2 English writing by secondary school pupils on the brink of university**

Penny Heisterkamp, Marije Michel & Anja Schüppert, University of Groningen

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

**Abstract:**

In the last decennia, English-taught programmes have gained substantial ground in Dutch tertiary education. In 2020, 47 per cent of the bachelor's programmes and 86 per cent of the master's programmes were entirely taught in English or had an English track (VSNU, 2020). Although English-taught programmes might have benefits for international students, it is unclear what the effects of teaching in a second language (L2) are on local students' academic performance. This study investigates Dutch and English text production by Dutch pupils in their final year of secondary education. Next year, most participants will start a Dutch- or English-taught university programme, for which they will write a variety of texts. It is important to measure the pupils' current writing skills to stay ahead of potential language-related issues in English-taught education. All

participants write an argumentative text in Dutch and English. Using keystroke logging (e.g., Leijten & Van Waes, 2013) and manual coding, product-based (complexity) and process-based (fluency, pauses and revision) features of the participants' writing are analysed to determine how writing in L2 English resembles or differs from writing in L1 Dutch. The writing data is complemented by data about the participants' language proficiency and typing skills. The results of this study contribute to ongoing discussions about the use of English as language of instruction in tertiary education.

**2.30-2.55 pm**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **Metalinguistic written corrective feedback and second versions: An exploration of feedback appropriation and students' perspectives**

Judith Borràs & Sonia López-Serrano, Universitat de Lleida/Universidad de Murcia & Universidad Complutense de Madrid

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

#### **Abstract:**

Providing students with written corrective feedback (WCF) and asking them to write a second version of their texts has become increasingly popular when teaching writing in a second language (L2) (Chandler, 2003). However, very few studies have investigated the outcomes of unfocused metalinguistic WCF, an approach to feedback that is widely employed in real language classrooms (Nicolás-Conesa, Manchón & Cerezo, 2019). Along the same lines, very little attention has been paid to learners' perceptions towards this type of WCF and having to write second versions (Chen, Nassaji, & Liu, 2016). In order to fill this gap, this study (i) investigates how an intact class of undergraduate students incorporated the WCF in the second versions of their texts throughout their first semester at university, and (ii) explores as the participants' opinions on this approach. Thirty Spanish EFL learners, majoring in Tourism, received direct and indirect metalinguistic feedback on five pieces of writing, which revolved around different topics related to the world of tourism. They were asked to take their teacher's feedback into account to write second versions of each text. After completing this process, they wrote a reflection on their views about second versions and WCF. Additionally, a subsample of learners completed a survey to further investigate their perspectives on the topic. The type of feedback provided was taken into consideration when examining which linguistic dimensions (lexis & grammar) the students were more inclined to change in their second versions. The analysis of their texts indicates that, whereas participants were likely to reduce their lexical and spelling mistakes, they found it challenging to incorporate the feedback on grammatical aspects into their second versions. In turn, initial analyses of the participants' reflections reveal their general positive feelings towards WCF and second versions, as WCF triggered their willingness to pay attention to their L2 mistakes.

### **Breakout Room 2**

#### **Writing across foreign languages: Same task, different processes?**

Elisa Guggenbichler & Benjamin Kremmel, University of Innsbruck

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

**Abstract:**

Recently, writing research has started to pay overdue attention to cognitive writing processes (e.g., Barkaoui, 2016, 2019; Michel et al., 2020; Révész et al., 2017, 2019). Despite the advances in the field, cognitive writing research is still mainly grounded in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts and corresponding models of writing (Kellogg, 1996; Field, 2004). Consequently, cognitive writing processes triggered in foreign languages other than English remain a hitherto unexplored field and lack validation by a cross-language study. The aim of this study was to extend cognitive writing research to learners of French as a foreign language. It set out to investigate to what extent writing processes elicited by the same task vary across foreign languages. Therefore, a sample of six B2-learners of French was recruited and assigned the same B2-level writing task (in translation) as an EFL control group of six participants (N = 12). The writing sessions were conducted in Inputlog 8.0. (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013), and the participants' writing behaviour was captured via a Tobii TX300 eye tracker. Keystroke-logging data and eye-tracking recordings then served as a basis for stimulated recall interviews. Based on a mixed-methods approach, this research project attempted to answer the following questions: (i) Does the same task trigger different writing behaviours across foreign languages? (ii) Are cognitive writing processes transferable from EFL to further foreign language settings, thereby validating existing cognitive writing models? (iii) Or, is there a need for language-specific, i.e. context-appropriate, writing models? This cross-language study provided new insights into writing processes across foreign languages. Findings indicate that writing processes are to a large extent comparable across languages, allowing to infer the cross-language validity of cognitive writing models. Nevertheless, language-specific tendencies and difficulties emerged from the qualitative analysis of stimulated recall interviews.

### Breakout Room 3

#### Recent developments in assessing writing motivation constructs

Muhammad M. M. Abdel Latif, Cairo University

**Strand:** Individual differences in writing (IDS)

**Abstract:**

The beginning of writing motivation research dates back to the mid-1970s. As a result of the growing research on writing motivation since that time, it has been represented in an increasing number of constructs. This paper reviews and discusses the historical developments in assessing the eight main writing motivation constructs researched so far. In highlighting the relevant assessment issues, the author depends on a framework in which these eight writing motivation constructs are grouped into four types: a) attitudinal/dispositional perceptions (writing apprehension, attitude towards writing, and the perceived value of writing); b) situational feelings and actions (writing anxiety, and the motivational regulation of writing); c) writing ability beliefs (writing self-efficacy and self-concept); and d) writing learning goals (i.e., writing achievement goal orientations). The author discusses the measures used for assessing each main writing motivation construct and the ones similar to it. The paper provides tables summarizing the scales of each construct, and highlights some pertinent issues, including the construct validity of the measures used, the terminological choice given to the construct, and the subtypes of

some constructs. The discussion of the writing motivation assessment issues covered in the paper indicates the need for building well-represented operationalizations of some constructs (writing apprehension/attitude, self-concept, and the perceived value of writing) and purer measures for others (writing anxiety and self-efficacy). Other implications for future writing motivation assessment research are also discussed.

**3.00-3.25 pm**

## **Breakout Room 1**

### **Evolving doctoral writer identities through peer feedback**

Jim McKinley, Agata Mikolajewska, Josef Mueller, Lesley Price, Nathan Thomas, Dandan Zhu, UCL, London

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

#### **Abstract:**

This multiple case study investigates the experiences of two EdD and three PhD in Education students conducting peer analysis of English L2 doctoral writers with a particular focus on how the process of providing peer feedback shapes their own identities as doctoral writers. The peer analysis involves exploring the written language choices of English L2 doctoral candidates, specifically, how EdD and PhD students position themselves in relation to their arguments. Each of the five researchers in this study worked with 1-3 participants within their same programmes: EdD and PhD in Education students who use English as an additional language. Portions of a draft of their thesis were analysed for the language used to display different writer identities using an adapted Appraisal framework. As research indicates that PhD dissertations tend toward making and justifying further-reaching claims than EdD dissertations, that tend more toward practical claims in educational administration, these claims were explored in the investigation. The ten participants were interviewed before the analysis of their writing, and following the analysis, they were interviewed again to query their language choices, and to discuss what factors influenced changes to their writer identities. On a practical level, the study generated a bank of useful phrases and expressions for displaying clear and effective writer identities (which, although occasionally offered in doctoral writing guides, has not been supported with empirical evidence). The study contributes to theory concerning the importance and value of peer feedback at the doctoral level, and the inherent differences between the EdD and PhD thesis writing, in consideration of how and why different writer identities are displayed and may be more effective, depending on the arguments being made.

## **Breakout Room 2**

### **Pauses in syntactic complexity research**

Aysel Saricaoglu & Özkan Kilic, University of Ankara

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

#### **Abstract:**

For the majority of existing studies on syntactic complexity, the preferred method of investigation has been product-based, looking into different matters such the quality of

the produced texts, complexity development over time, or the effects of various factors. While this body of research has provided considerable insight, there is scope for process-based understandings of syntactic complexity. This exploratory study reports on a process approach to the investigation of syntactic complexity. It uses keystroke logging to examine students' pausing behaviour in relation to syntactic complexity features. Thirty-four high-intermediate level L2 learners of English participated in an argumentative writing task. Their real-time text production behaviour was logged using the keystroke logging program Inputlog (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013). Students' pausing behaviour was analysed using five pausing measures: pause time, number of pauses, number of within-word pauses, number of before-word pauses, and number of before-sentence pauses. Syntactic complexity of texts was analysed automatically via Lu's (2010) automated L2 syntactic complexity analyser using global, clausal, and phrasal measures. A regression analysis was performed to find out any potential relationship between students' pausing behaviour and syntactic complexity features of their argumentative texts. Findings showed that students' pausing behaviour significantly differed in four syntactic complexity features: mean length of clause, complex T-unit ratio, coordinate phrase per T-unit, and coordinate phrase per clause. There were also significant relationships between pausing location and syntactic complexity features. Students who wrote more coordinate phrases per clause had significantly more pauses within words. Students who wrote more coordinate phrases per T-unit had significantly more pauses before words. Those with a higher complex T-unit ratio had significantly more pauses before sentences. Thanks to employing the methodology of keystroke logging and the usefulness of real-time writing data, our study has potential to shed light on the cognitive processes associated with syntactic complexity features.

### Breakout Room 3

#### **On a complementary relationship between LAA (language analytic ability) and revision: Findings from two classroom-based studies**

Taichi Yamashita, Iowa State University

**Strand:** Individual differences in writing (IDS)

#### **Abstract:**

Written corrective feedback (WCF) studies have investigated language analytical ability (LAA) (Benson & DeKeyser, 2019; Sheen, 2007; Stefanou & Révész, 2015) and revision opportunity (Ekanayaka & Ellis, 2020; Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014). These studies suggest that learners with higher LAA benefit more from WCF and that learners with revision opportunity benefit more from WCF than those without. However, Shintani and Ellis (2015) indicated that high LAA learners may demonstrate larger gains when revision is not required, whereas low LAA learners may benefit from revision. Despite its potential to increase our understanding of learners' WCF processing, this complementary relationship remains underexplored. To fill this gap, two classroom-based experimental studies were conducted. Study 1 recruited 38 students in an English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) writing program at a U.S. university. They were assigned to either a direct group (n = 22) or indirect group (n = 16). These two groups were matched on LAA. Randomly paired up within the same group, they collaborated on two animation description tasks in Google Docs for 50 minutes on separate computers. As they collaborated, the direct group received the correct form for their errors on the referential articles from the instructor, whereas the indirect group had their article errors only

highlighted. They individually worked on animation description and error correction tests as pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test. Generalized linear mixed-effects model was performed to test if LAA and revision are associated with their changes from one testing point to another. Study 2 served as approximate replication of Study 1, recruiting another cohort of 38 students in the same ESL program. Results suggested the complementary relationship between LAA and revision in Study 1 and Study 2. The presentation will discuss these findings in relation to previous WCF studies and conclude with the importance of replication in WCF research.

3.30-3.55 pm

### Breakout Room 1

#### **Written corrective feedback information in a digital environment: Can corpus linguistic methods uncover patterns of differentiation by recipient ethnicity?**

Sian Alsop & Sheena Gardner, Coventry University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Attainment disparity between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) and White students is an ongoing concern within the higher education (HE) sector. Our work seeks to better understand institutional practices and policies that may contribute to ethnic attainment disparity, specifically in relation to written feedback given to students. We previously developed a new functional framework to investigate whether this feedback can be differentiated according to the variable of discipline (Alsop and Gardner 2019). Our framework is comprised of five functions ('advice', 'critique', 'observation', 'praise', 'query'). Each function is subdivided three times, firstly by focus (e.g. 'advice' splits into 'suggestion' and 'instruction'), then by orientation ('specific' or 'general'), and then by aspect ('future' or 'present'). We found that it was possible to differentiate feedback nature based on discipline. In this paper, we use this framework to investigate whether a relationship exists between students' ethnicity, grade attained, and language patterns within the written feedback they receive. To do so, we applied our framework to 50 texts written to students from different ethnic backgrounds within a single discipline in a post-92 HE institution in the UK. We will discuss findings from the analysis of this small dataset. Preliminary results indicate that little differentiation is evident in terms of the categorisation of feedback at the highest level of overall function in relation to binary self-identified ethnicity (BAME and White), but more granular investigation of function indicates some language differentiation. Overall, there is greater language differentiation at the level of particular functions within BAME populations than between White and BAME populations. We do not propose a direct causal relationship between the language of written feedback and student ethnicity, but rather suggest that feedback may constitute one means by which certain (already disadvantaged) groups of students are further, and cumulatively, disengaged by higher education practices.

## Breakout Room 2

### Exploiting screencasting and keylogging for L2 writing process instruction

Gaëtanelle Gilquin, Université Catholique de Louvain

**Strand:** Writing processes (WR PR)

**Abstract:**

Following up on studies like Lindgren & Sullivan (2003) or Ranalli et al. (2018), this paper describes a pedagogical intervention aimed at making L2 learners of English aware of their writing process, by showing them how they actually go about writing a text. First, the learners watch a screencast video recorded while they were writing a text in English. Then, they are presented with a report generated by Inputlog (Leijten & Van Waes 2013) from their keystroke logs, including statistics and graphs based on their writing process. These are compared to model writers' reports (a native writer and a highly proficient non-native writer). The learners also get to see video clips illustrating successful writing strategies adopted by other students. This material is explained by and discussed with the teacher during individual tutoring with five student volunteers. The aim of this paper is to evaluate the effectiveness of such a pedagogical intervention, based (i) on students' perceptions, as revealed through several questionnaires they had to fill in, and (ii) on the comparison of texts they wrote before and after the intervention. The results underline students' generally positive attitudes, as well as their increase in writing fluency, though not necessarily in accuracy.

## Breakout Room 3

### L2 writing teachers' use of Grammarly to complement their formative feedback

Svetlana Koltovskaia, Oklahoma State University

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Automated writing evaluation (AWE) systems have grown in popularity as a source of feedback that can complement teachers' response to L2 writing. The automated feedback's complementary nature is representative of a system's adept ability to provide feedback on sentence-level issues (Ranalli et al., 2017). Although it has been suggested that AWE can free up teacher's time to focus more on higher-level concerns (Koltovskaia, 2020), the impact of AWE on teachers' feedback practice is underexplored. Knowing this can contribute to the knowledge needed for the appropriate application of AWE systems for formative assessment in L2 writing classrooms. The aim of the study is two-fold: (1) to determine the error correction performance of Grammarly and (2) to understand how Grammarly impacts teachers' feedback provision when they use it to supplement their feedback and their perceptions of Grammarly. To achieve this aim, two studies were conducted. Study 1 was based on fifty-three argumentative essay drafts written by ESL university students. Grammarly feedback's accuracy was measured using precision and recall and compared to teacher feedback. In Study 2, novice and experienced teachers used Grammarly to supplement their feedback when evaluating essays from Study 1. Their feedback was analysed to understand Grammarly's impact on their feedback activity. The teachers then had a semi-structured interview aimed at exploring their perceptions of Grammarly. While findings of Study 1 revealed that Grammarly's

precision and recall rates were relatively high, findings of Study 2 showed that teachers gave more attention to higher-level concerns while Grammarly took care of lower-level concerns. However, such division of labour was not always clear cut. Teachers also focused on sentence-level issues, especially if Grammarly feedback was inaccurate. Overall, teachers were positive about Grammarly feedback. The presentation provides implications for how to use Grammarly meaningfully to complement teacher formative feedback in L2 writing classrooms.

4.00-4.25 pm

## Breakout Room 1

### **The role of individual differences on L2 learner's written corrective feedback processing**

Sophie McBride\*, M. Dolores Mellado\*, Olena Vasylets\*\* & Alberto Sánchez\*

\* Universidad de Murcia, \*\* Universitat de Barcelona

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

#### **Abstract:**

Studies focusing on written corrective feedback (WCF) have received ample attention in SLA-oriented research (as reviewed in Hyland & Hyland, 2018; Kang & Han, 2015), with the very act of processing WCF recently gaining momentum in the field. Researchers have focused on L2 learner's noticing and awareness in order to gain an insight into the cognitive processes of L2 learners when engaging with the feedback provided (e.g., Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Cerezo et al. 2019). Notwithstanding, very little research is available on how learner variables (IDs) may influence this engagement. The scarce research available has found that certain IDs were able to predict the levels of depth of processing (DoP) of WCF, with the analysis of introspective measures (think-aloud protocols) shedding further light on the interactions found. Thus, in order to contribute to this body of work, this exploratory study (as part of a wider research programme) set out to investigate the effects of (i) cognitive (working memory and language aptitude) and (ii) affective (writing anxiety, self-efficacy and L2 writing motivation) variables on the processing of WCF. We invited 18 high-intermediate English studies undergraduates to elaborate a text based on a problem-solving picture-based task. Participants were provided with direct WCF and were invited to reflect on the error corrections received (via think-aloud and written languaging tables). Additionally, participants completed a series of ID tests representative of the independent variables of the study. The WCF processing was analysed according to Leow's (2015) operationalization of DoP levels. Preliminary results confirmed initial predictions that learners who scored higher on cognitive ID tests demonstrated deeper levels of WCF processing, which, in turn, resulted in higher post-test accuracy scores. Affective variables (specifically, writing anxiety) were also found to play a role in inhibiting the potential of WCF processing.

## Breakout Room 2

## **Can productive vocabulary knowledge measures predict IELTS writing proficiency?**

Yajie Li Jon Clenton & Simon Fraser, Hiroshima University

**Strand:** Writing assessment (ASMT)

### **Abstract:**

Studies (e.g., Treffers-Daller, Parslow, & Williams, 2018; Jarvis, 2017) suggest that vocabulary knowledge measures might help to distinguish between learners of different language abilities. Treffers-Daller et al. (2018) show a significant relationship between vocabulary knowledge, lexical diversity (LD) measures, and different proficiency levels. The current paper extends this exploration by considering different productive vocabulary knowledge tasks in relation to L2 language learner general writing proficiency. Our aim, therefore, is to investigate potential relationships between different proficiency L2 learners, vocabulary knowledge, and LD measures, and the extent to which these relate to IELTS bands. We assess (n = 69) L1 Japanese undergraduate learners of (L2) English (CEFR B1) and (n = 35) L1 French undergraduate learners (CEFR B2). We adopt a multi-faceted approach to vocabulary measurements, using: Lex30, a task based on word association responses (Meara & Fitzpatrick, 2000); G\_Lex, a gap-fill task (Fitzpatrick & Clenton, 2017); and the Productive Vocabulary Levels Test (PVLТ), a sentence completion task (Laufer & Nation, 1999). Participants responded to two different IELTS writing questions. For writing processing, we followed recent research (Kyle, 2019) and lemmatized all writing samples. Our results show that the productive vocabulary task measures can, to some extent, predict both the LD scores and IELTS writing proficiency. We report significant relationships between Lex30, G-Lex and PVLТ scores, and a variety of LD measures and IELTS ratings. We report on PVLТ scores show the strongest and most significant correlations with our higher-level participants. As correlations range from weak to strong according to proficiency level, this suggests that a higher IELTS task score reflects a rich productive vocabulary knowledge. We discuss these findings in terms of vocabulary knowledge, with specific pedagogical implications for L2 writing.

## **Breakout Room 3**

### **LIDISELF: A project on the development of disciplinary literacies in English as a lingua franca at university**

Enric Llurda & Guzmán Mancho-Bares, Universitat de Lleida

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

### **Abstract:**

European universities provide numerous courses in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and/or English-medium-instruction (EMI) in order to compete in the global higher education area. Students therefore rely on these courses to put their disciplinary literacies in English into practice. Disciplinary literacies are the ways in which participants read, write, speak, think and reason in disciplinary contexts. They have been described as

communicative activities specific to each discipline, which require oral or written comprehension (Zhang and Chan, 2017) and enable participants to become active members of a particular discourse community (Swales, 1990) through the use of appropriate genres. Nevertheless, little is known about the process of (implicit or explicit) students' induction into disciplinary literacies by complementary ESP and EMI interventions. This paper presents the fundamental lines underlying a recently started project (LIDISELF) that aims to examine the guidance exerted by EMI and ESP instructors towards students' development of disciplinary literacies at two Catalan universities, with an emphasis on the use of written corrective feedback provided on student written genres. In this comprehensive study, multiple forms of data collection will be used (students' written production, feedback offered by instructors to students' productions, classroom observation, interviews and questionnaires with students and teachers). ESP classes, task instructions and tutors' feedback will be examined from a learning-to-write approach, which will be complemented with EMI instructors' data from a writing-to-learn-content perspective (Manchón & Matsuda, 2018). The results of LIDISELF are expected to shed light on feedback practices exercised by ESP and EMI instructors, and the extent they complement. Such a complimentary view to the two types of feedback will aim at designing integral training programmes to gradually develop students' writing disciplinary literacy.

4.45-5.10 pm

### Breakout Room 1

#### **Feedback processing via written languaging and its relationship with written accuracy: A comparative study between secondary and university EFL learners**

Joaquín Gris, Lourdes Cerezo & Flori Nicolás-Conesa, University of Murcia

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Learners' written explanations of their own L2 output (written languaging; WL) can assist them in noticing errors and understanding corrections since it may foster elaborate engagement (Leow, 1997) during feedback processing, which in turn may result in language development (Suzuki, 2012). Previous research has shown the positive relationship between deeper levels of feedback processing and the quality of rewritten texts (Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Suzuki, 2012, 2017). However, not much is known about the potential benefits of processing feedback through WL at lower education stages in EFL settings. The current study investigated the quality of WL produced by learners in two education stages (compulsory secondary education and higher education) as well as the possible correlation between the quality of their WL and the improvement of accuracy in texts rewritten in individual or collaborative conditions. Our participants (n=236) were asked to write a text in response to the complex version of the "Fire Chief" task (Gilbert, 2007), individually (n=108) or collaboratively (n=64 dyads). Half of the participants in the larger individual and collaborative writing groups were provided with direct error corrections and required to language on them, while the other half did not receive feedback and had to language on their self- or pair-identified errors. Subsequently, all the participants rewrote their texts, either individually or collaboratively. Data on L2 accuracy (number of errors per words; 4 dimensions) and WL were analysed by two

researchers using previous coding schemes (authors, 2019a, 2019b; Leow, 2015; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). Statistical analyses indicate that the participants in both education stages and writing conditions processed feedback at similar levels of depth of processing (DoP). No relationship was found between DoP levels and the accuracy of rewritten texts in any of the education stages. The implications of these findings are discussed.

## **Breakout Room 2**

### **Validating an L2 integrated writing assessment: Linking process, product and scoring data**

Sonja Zimmermann, TestDaF-Institut

**Strand:** Writing assessment (ASMT)

#### **Abstract:**

Integrated writing tasks are commonly used in language assessment for academic purposes. Yet, it is often an issue of debate which factors account for the performance, i.e. to what extent writing ability, reading skills, or an integrated reading-writing-factor contribute to the test results. In recent years, many studies in the context of EFL have tried to shed light on this issue. They investigated the underlying construct of integrated writing tasks from different perspectives, either focusing on the cognitive processes during writing (e.g. Plakans 2008; 2009), the use of source material (Plakans & Gebril 2013) and paraphrasing in the written products (Shi 2004) or the evaluation and scoring of written performances (e.g. Shin & Ewert 2014). The present paper reports on a validation study in the context of the newly developed digital Test of German as a foreign language (Test Deutsch als Fremdsprache; TestDaF), a university entrance language test for international students who want to enter HE in Germany. The study uses a mixed methods design to link process data to the written products, using a combination of eye-tracking, stimulated recalls and text analysis. Eye-movements of 19 international university applicants were recorded while writing a summary from written and graphical input. Recordings were then used as a stimulus for retrospective interviews. The analysis of process data focused on viewing behaviour in relation to different Areas of Interest (AOIs) on the screen. The written products were analysed linguistically, building on Keck's (2006) approach of "attempted paraphrase", and with respect to content. Results show that process data can explain to some extent the quality of the written summaries. The paper finally discusses a possible linking with the scoring of the written products, to see if differences in processing are evident in the scores.

## **Breakout Room 3**

### **Examining learners' affective engagement and interaction mindsets as mediating factors in computer-supported collaborative L2 writing**

Laura Stiefenhöfer, Lancaster University

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

#### **Abstract:**

Collaborative writing research has highlighted the potential impact of L2 learners' affective states on their interactional behaviours, examining mediating factors such as

learners' perception of partners and interaction (Storch, 2004; Watanabe, 2008). The influence of learners' affective engagement on interaction has also been shown in the context of online learning settings (Baralt, Gurzynski-Weiss, & Kim, 2016). Recent research on the role of affective states in L2 learning has identified learners' interaction mindsets as potential predictors of collaborative interaction (Sato, 2017). The present study explores how learners' affective engagement and interaction mindsets mediate learners' interaction and writing products in the context of computer-supported collaborative writing, extending the research on collaborative writing in digital environments. Eight advanced EFL learners participated in the study. All participants first completed a questionnaire on their views on peer interaction and peer feedback. Participants then completed two collaborative academic writing tasks working in dyads, with a duration of 30 minutes. Both tasks required participants to write a joint statement on a topic, based on provided research data in the form of graphs and figures. Participants completed the tasks sitting in separate rooms, using Google Docs for writing and communicating via text-chat. For each task, participants worked with a different partner. After the second task, interviews were conducted with all participants, targeting learners' perceptions of the collaboration, their interaction, as well as their roles during the collaborative writing process. Chat logs of both tasks were analysed for contribution and affective engagement. Revision behaviour in both tasks was compared using DocuViz (Wang, 2016). The writing products of both tasks were analysed using CAF measures. Findings will be discussed in light of the role of affective engagement in computer-supported collaborative L2 writing. Pedagogical implications for facilitating collaborative writing activities conducive to L2 development in digital context will be highlighted.

5.15-5.40 pm

### Breakout Room 1

#### **Written corrective feedback strategies and their effects on EFL students' accuracy: A longitudinal small-scale study**

Natalia Muguero & Damiana Lobos, National University of La Pampa

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

A rich debate about the value and usefulness of written corrective feedback (WCF) has been prominent in recent years, thus placing WCF as the subject of many studies in the field of second language (L2) writing. In order to contribute to such growing body of empirical research, this small-scale exploratory study aims at finding out the extent to which error feedback helps students to improve their accuracy in the short-term as well as in the long-term processes. Furthermore, the effect of different feedback strategies has been explored. Data for this longitudinal study was collected along three months from an EFL course (n=15; L1=Spanish) according to a three-stage design: 1) Pre-tests; 2) Treatment (provision of WCF); and 3) Post-tests. A corpus of 270 texts (45,008 words) was built from sets of letters, stories, and essays that students were required to write at each stage. Three different strategies have been applied along each stage (direct feedback, indirect coded feedback with error location, and indirect coded feedback without error location) over a series of selected error categories. Findings indicate that the provision of WCF helps students to improve accuracy in the short-term process as well as in the long

run, which goes in line with previous research. However, it has been found that there is not a linear upward pattern of improvement in the transition process from stages 1 to 3. The most effective strategy was direct feedback, as it has been shown in previous studies. In addition, while coded feedback with error location was more effective than non-located feedback, this difference decreased with the passing of the time. Underpinned by Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories, results are discussed in relation to the degree of cognitive difficulty of the writing task and the importance of error location issues for the long-term acquisition process.

## Breakout Room 2

### **Refining an analytic rubric to support second language writing development in online tasks**

Kristin Rock, University of Hawaii at Manoa

**Strand:** Writing assessment (ASMT)

#### **Abstract:**

Recently, educational stakeholders have seen an accelerated move to online learning, within which the ability to correspond effectively depends on good writing skills. Language learners are increasingly being asked to navigate new digital genres, such as blogs and discussion boards, without access to empirically-based guidelines for composing successful blog or discussion board posts. Furthermore, researchers have utilized multiple methods for assessing writing within this genre, ranging from full credit for completion to rubrics based on complexity, accuracy, and fluency. In this study, I tested the validity of a rubric designed specifically for academic blog posts. The new analytic rubric assessed five categories, including (a) genre specific features (i.e., use of emojis and hyperlinks), (b) task fulfilment and relevancy, (c) content (i.e., depth and development), (d) organization and balance, and (e) language use. Each category was assessed on a 1- to 6-point scale. Six raters used the rubric to score the posts written by 163 university English language learners in response to a prompt on the pros and cons of using technology for language learning. Subsequently, I investigated the raters' utilization of each of the rubric's cells via Rasch analysis. Results showed that the raters did not use the entire scale and that a 4-point scale would cover learner performance levels sufficiently. In the second phase of this research, 40 of the original 163 learners were invited to compose another blog post. To clarify writing expectations, half of the 40 participants received the revised rubric in advance of their second post. This presentation discusses the performance outcomes of both groups, highlighting the higher scores and syntactic sophistication of posts from learners who had access to the rubric. The results of this study will guide teachers and researchers concerned with students' online writing and the formative assessment of their performance.

## Breakout Room 3

### **Writing collaboratively in Google docs: Effects in subsequent individual compositions**

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

**Abstract:**

This study analyses whether writing collaboratively in Google docs results in improved performance, which transfers to subsequent individually written texts. Following a pre-post-test design, collaboratively vs individually written texts and students' perceptions were compared. Results indicated the former were better but subsequent individually written texts were not. Collaborative writing has been praised for offering increased learning opportunities and better texts (Villarreal & Gil-Sarratea, 2020; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009), especially regarding accuracy (Lee, 2010; McDonough & García Fuentes, 2015), however, scarce research exists regarding whether those better results transfer to subsequent individual texts (Chen, 2019), especially in secondary school contexts working online. This study analyses whether writing collaborative in Google docs results in improved performance over individually written texts and whether any improvement which occurs remains in subsequent individually written texts. Following a pre-post-test design, a control (n=23) and an experimental group (N=23) wrote individually and collaboratively, respectively, using Google docs. Three weeks later, both groups wrote individual texts and completed a questionnaire to indicate their preferences. The initial (pre-test) and final (post-test) texts were analysed using CAF measures and a holistic rubric scoring content. Results indicated that although students writing collaboratively enjoyed the writing tasks more and perceived it as more useful and the collaborative written online texts were better than individually written in all CAF measures and holistically, the superiority of their performance was not reflected in the post-tests. Both groups improved from the pre to the post-test showing that writing online is beneficial, and the EG's individually written texts were similar to the CG's or worse in fluency, number of errors and holistic ratings. Our study illustrates the benefits of writing online and the enjoyment collaborative writing tasks bring to secondary school students, encouraging teachers to use that approach but combining it with some individually written work.

5.45-6.10 pm

### Breakout Room 1

**The effectiveness of instruction and pragmatic corrective feedback to improve students' writing of appropriate email requests**

Esther Usó & Alicia Martínez Flor, Universitat Jaume I

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

Research examining email requests during academic consultation has shown that, in general, second/foreign language (L2) students place greater emphasis on their own needs and employ insufficient mitigation, running the risk of, unintentionally, being impolite (Codina and Salazar 2019; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011; Tseng 2015, among others). Consequently, these studies have suggested the need for teaching how to compose email

requests that are appropriate in relation to the recipient (i.e., professor) and the specific request being formulated (i.e., the request imposition). Surprisingly, only a few studies have been conducted to address this need (e.g., Nguyen and colleagues, 2015, 2018, 2019), so more research is required to inform teaching practices that are optimal for appropriate email communication in an academic context. In an effort to expand this line of research, this study investigates whether the combined effects of pragmatic teaching plus pragmatic corrective feedback could be effective in developing students' use of email request modifiers, not only immediately after participating in the instructional sessions, but also in the long-term. The study included twenty-five Spanish university students with an intermediate proficiency level in English who were enrolled in a mandatory writing course. The pedagogical intervention was designed to help students understand the form-function-context relationship of email requests in the academic context. Students' pragmatic performance was measured by means of a pre-test, immediate and delayed post-tests, which consisted of writing two request emails. Results of the study revealed that students made a significant progress in their use of request modifiers as evidenced in the delayed post-test administered two months later. The findings, however, also indicated that some types of request modifiers were more amenable to instruction than others. These results are discussed and suggestions for future investigations that examine the effects of different types of written corrective feedback to foster L2 pragmatic knowledge are presented.

## Breakout Room 2

### **Exploring the cognitive validity of a computerized writing test using eye-tracking, keystroke logging and stimulated recalls**

Benjamin Kremmel, Kathrin Eberharter & Elisa Guggenbichler, Universität Innsbruck

**Strand:** Writing assessment (ASMT)

#### **Abstract:**

This paper presents a study that investigates the cognitive validity of the new computer-based Linguaskill Writing test in relation to test taker characteristics. It explores the cognitive processes engaged by a mixed-proficiency (CEFR A2-C1) sample of EFL learners (N=30) when responding to two writing tasks, and in how far they elicit a full model of L2 writing processes (Barkaoui, 2019; Révész, Michel, & Lee, 2017; Shaw and Weir, 2007). In addition, it aims to uncover the links between computer writing behaviour (i.e., fluency, pausing and revision behaviours of candidates) and the cognitive processes involved in L2 writing at different levels of test taker ability. For this, the study triangulates data from eye-tracking, keystroke logging, performance ratings, and text analyses of the written output of candidates using measures of text complexity, as well as stimulated recalls of 16 participants. Participants took a typing test as a baseline measure and a standalone receptive proficiency test in addition to responding to both parts of the Linguaskill Writing test. During the writing test, their eye movements and writing behaviour were recorded with a Tobii TX300 eye tracker and Inputlog 8.0. 16 of the participants produced stimulated recalls after each writing task, prompted by a replay of their eye movements together with the recording of their typing. The replays generated rich verbal recalls, which were transcribed and coded for evidence of cognitive processing as described in the literature. Selected metrics from the keystroke logging (pause duration and frequency) as well as eye tracking (fixation duration and number of visits) were used to explore relationships between task, test taker proficiency and writing outcome. The

findings provide valuable information regarding test validation and task design in terms of the two prompts being successful in eliciting a substantial sample of cognitive processes and writing behaviours across proficiency levels.

### **Breakout Room 3**

#### **EFL learners' beliefs towards online collaborative writing amid a pandemic**

Agurtzane Azkarai Garai, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU)

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

#### **Abstract:**

The Covid-19 pandemic has forced many EFL teachers to change their methodology to a full online or bimodal (face-to-face and online) approach. Unlike most L2 learners, EFL learners do not have as many opportunities to practice their target language outside the classroom, which is the setting that allows for its practice and development (García Mayo & García Lecumberri, 2003). Thus, if EFL learners do not attend classes, these opportunities could decrease because of the impossibility to work together with other classmates, and interact with them, a practice that has been shown to be beneficial for L2 learning (Long, 1996; Mackey, 2020). This study presents a preliminary analysis of the beliefs of 30 Spanish EFL university students (age=19) towards online EFL collaborative writing. The data were collected from October to December 2020 in the same English course. They completed a Likert-type questionnaire twice, before and after carrying out three essays in three different modes: face-to-face, online using only a chat to exchange ideas, and online using their microphones to interact. The questionnaire focused on their thoughts about EFL writing, collaborative work, L1 use in the EFL classroom, corrective feedback, and online learning. The comparison of the questionnaire replies before and after doing the essays indicated that: they showed a neutral attitude towards collaborative work and online learning; their beliefs towards corrective feedback and EFL writing were high, and increased significantly after doing the essays; and that they were reluctant to use the L1 in the EFL classroom, but after they did the essays, their responses indicated that they were more open to its use in EFL classrooms. These findings aim to provide EFL teachers with more insight about the impact of the pandemic in EFL collaborative writing activities, and will be discussed considering the importance of collaborative work in EFL development.

**6.15-6.40 pm**

### **Breakout Room 1**

#### **Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in a French as a foreign language classroom**

Maria-Lourdes Lira-Gonzales, Hossein Nassaji & Kuok Wa Chao, Université du Québec

**Strand:** Written corrective feedback (WCF)

**Abstract:**

This paper reports on an exploratory multiple-case study conducted to examine six French as a foreign language (FFL) learners' affective, behavioural, and cognitive engagements with teacher written corrective feedback (WCF) at a university in Costa Rica. Data were collected through students' writings (drafts and revisions), semi-structured interviews, and stimulated recall interviews. The students' writings were used to examine students' behavioural engagement, whereas the semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews aimed to determine how students cognitively and affectively engaged with WCF. Findings revealed that although most participants initially reported mixed feelings and at times negative emotions upon the receipt of WCF, they overcame such feelings and became more positively engaged. All participants were able to detect the teacher's WCF intention. However, only half of them reported using certain cognitive or meta-cognitive strategies when processing feedback. Even if their behavioural engagement was relatively high overall, it differed across students and varied depending on their degree of affective and cognitive engagement.

## Breakout Room 2

**Cohesion in L2 writing: Contrasting human rating with automated assessment**

Carola Strobl, University of Antwerp

**Strand:** Writing assessment (ASMT)

**Abstract:**

Writing a cohesive text is an important ability for foreign language (L2) learners. Cohesive features are therefore included in instruments that measure L2 writing quality. One example is the rating tool of Functional Adequacy (FA) developed by Kuiken and Vedder (2017) for the rubric-based rating of L2 writing quality, which includes the dimension Cohesion and Coherence. Another example are automated L2 text assessment tools like CTAP (Chen & Meurers, 2016) that include counts of specific cohesive devices. This project contrasts results of both methods to analyse cohesion in L2 writing, human rubric-based rating and automated analyses of cohesive density. To this aim, data of a study that explored the impact of study abroad (SA) on the written production of university students in L2 German were used. The participants wrote three narrative texts related to their SA experiences: the first just before their SA, the second immediately after their return, and the third after a short post-SA intervention. Eighteen texts produced by six randomly selected participants were assessed by three expert raters using the FA rubrics for cohesion and coherence. The same texts were also analysed automatically for argument overlap, pronoun use and connectives using the German version of CTAP. The results uncovered discrepancies between the human rubric-based assessment and the automated assessment. Changes in cohesive quality according to human rubric-based rating were not reflected in the automatically retrieved cohesive density counts. This suggests that the raters based their assessment on other features than the ones included in the automated analysis. Based on an additional analysis of the texts, we hypothesize that these features include a ratio between text length, number of paragraphs and number of propositions. The findings will be discussed in the light of L2 writing quality assessment and potential implications for writing pedagogy.

## Breakout Room 3

## **Effects of collaborative writing on young learners' texts: L2 vs. FL**

Izaskun Villarreal, Universidad Pública de Navarra

**Strand:** Collaborative writing (CW)

### **Abstract:**

Collaborative writing (CW) seems to develop learners' written performance in second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) contexts alike. Recently, more studies have taken up to examine how learner-related variables interact with task conditions and shape the outcomes of learners' performance. Patterns of interaction, the engagement level, learners' dispositions, or context have been recognized to mediate students' outcomes. Studies dealing with the effects of the context or teaching/learning environment are multisite, and to date, no study has addressed how the social status of the language students write and engage in interplays with students' performance. The present classroom-based study, therefore, explores the effects of CW on the L2 and EFL of 11-12-year-old primary education students from a school in northern Spain. Participants wrote three compositions per language: the first and the third were written individually, but the second (the experimental task) was written individually by the control group (CG) (n = 17) and in pairs by the experimental group (EG) (n = 10 pairs). Texts were examined quantitatively for fluency and accuracy measures as well as qualitatively by means of an analytic rubric. The analysis revealed that, all students wrote fewer words in each task and language. Similarly, global qualitative scores also did not vary much and no differences were attested across tasks or languages. Accuracy effects were only attested for the collaborating pairs. Collaboration seemed to bring about enduring effects, as the accuracy effects were also observable in the post-test. When differences by language were examined, the CG was shown to behave differently depending on whether they wrote in their L2, Basque, or FL, English, while no language-dependent differences emerged for the EG. Collaborative writing seems to counterbalance students' attention to form and therefore it seems to be an expedient tool to increase students' attention to language.