

Are the Group-Specific Motives Working on the Peer-Reviewing Tasks of Writing Assignments?

Angel Hsieh

National Changhua University of Education, Changhua County, Taiwan

This study aimed to investigate and observe a correlation between the written corrective feedback and group-specific motives within four college students. In order to enhance the writing performances of these college students who have been regarded as unmotivated with the writing courses, the researcher designed a peer-reviewing task related to group-specific motives and observed the process of students' implementation, modification, and the relation with WCF. This study covered two weeks and contained two writing assignments based on the actual manipulation of group-specific motives. In each writing assignment, students were followed the four aspects related to the group dynamics: goal-orientedness, norm and reward system, group cohesion, and classroom goal structures. Additionally, students completed the peer-reviewing tasks in each aspect, such as keeping learning journals, making study plans, and the classroom discussions. This study demonstrates qualitative method to collect data. The qualitative data were collected through several techniques, such as observations, reflections, student interviews, and learning journals. From the findings, these group-specific motives influenced these students' WCF. These students performed better in writing learning than before. Both their writing performance and learning motivation were significantly enhanced. Moreover, they had positive attitude toward learning English and they apparently recognized the value of the writing training program. The results were shown in positive improvement in the WCF with group-specific motives. Furthermore, a peer relationship was built as one of the most precious fruits of the processes.

Keywords: L2 motivation, group-specific motivational components, WCF

Introduction

This chapter includes four sections. First, it introduces the background of the study. That is a brief introduction of motivational components. Second, it indicates the purpose of the study, which presents the discussion of the effect of group-specific motivational components. Third, we discuss the research questions in this study, which is the idea of the case study.

Background of the Study

After promoting English writing learning for so many years, few people consider that English writing skills in colleges has been a successful endeavor. Even though students are asked to write some English essays from a young age, officially in high schools or privately in cram schools, some students view English writing as difficult work. In most writing contexts, the importance of sentence sequencing and grammar correctness are

Angel Hsieh, Doctoral student, English Lecturer of NTUS, Department of English, National Changhua University of Education, Changhua County, Taiwan.

not presented with respect to the pragmatic use as in actual contexts. Rather, it is presented as a means to meeting requirements that are considered major motivational forces for students' English writing in further studies. Among the main troubles students are facing, most students cannot acquire the writing skills for the lack of the close connection with teachers' correctness. Therefore, if students can acquire the benefits from peer-reviewing, such as group-specific motives, they certainly can require the feedback more efficiently.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the present study aimed at investigating and implementing a relation of writing performance with group-specific motives within four college students. It was meant to explore the effect of the peer reviewing with group-specific motives on the students' writing learning and to examine the teacher's reflections. One objective of the study was to observe how the group-specific motives work out among these students' writing assignments. Then, by recording the reflections step by step to check if the group-specific motives really did work on these writing performances for the college students in their writing learning. In addition, this study also investigated how the students had changed in terms of their attitudes toward writing learning, their English performances, and their perceived achievements. The last objective was to examine what reflections the teacher as the researcher made on the teaching and on the implementation of the WCF method.

Research Questions

The research questions for this case study were as follows:

1. What are the group-specific motives for these college students in intermediate writing class?
2. How do the L2 motives roles show in the process of these significant effects on the involvement of the group-specific motives towards these students' writing performances change?

Literature Review

L2 Motivation

L2 motivation refers to students' motivation for learning a second/foreign language. The present study investigated the changes in the students' motivation for English learning. From the early 1990s, there are many researchers exploring the social psychological construct of L2 motivation. Although Robert Gardner and his associates (1985) stated most discussions about L2 motivation in this field, Oxford and Shearin (1994) also mentioned the source of motivation is very important to teachers who want to stimulate students' motivation. The explicit concern of these educational implications has brought a major trend in psychological and educational psychological theories of motivation, which might reflect in L2 motivation theories. Dörnyei (1994; 1998; 2003) discussed a clear framework of three aspects of the motivational construct, which are related to the L2 motivation structures. Among these discussions, Dörnyei mentioned the actual L2 motivation construct is closely associated with the motivation test battery, which is discussed by Gardner and MacIntyre (1993). This conceptualization of measurements in L2 motivation discussion reflects the self-report behavior measures which correlate with motivated behavior.

As we can see from the explicit elaboration of discussions from L2 motivation theories, there are some interesting factors influenced the application of L2 motivation. If these L2 motivation constituents really work on the learning path, there might be a main factor which stands for the basic and necessary component within the L2 motivation research. Gardner and Lambert's (1972) explored the main factor for the success in L2 learning. That is a function of the learner's attitudes towards the linguistic-cultural community of the target

language. Thus, the findings of this study added a social dimension to the study of motivation in learning a L2. That inspired the main discussion in the later motivational components which related to the L2 learning.

Motivational Components

As to the implications of discussion for applying motivation, some studies have extended the previous construct by mixing new components. For instance, there is the interface with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation by Brown (1994) as well as the attribution of motivational theories by Dörnyei (1990) and Skehan (1989). There are also some intrinsic interpretations of various motives related to learning situation-specific variables, such as classroom events and tasks, classroom climate and group cohesion, course content and teaching materials, teacher feedback, and grades and rewards (Dörnyei, 1994; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). In order to recognize the variables and processes involved at the learning situations level of L2 motivation, Dörnyei (1994) indicated three sets of motivational components: (1) course-specific motives, which relate to the syllabus, the teaching materials, the teaching method, and the learning tasks; (2) teacher-specific motives, which relate to the teacher's personality, teaching style, feedback, and relationship with students; and (3) group-specific motives, which relate to the dynamics of the learning group.

Group-Specific Motives

As to this specific domain of L2 motivation, four aspects of group-specific motives are: (1) goal-orientedness; (2) norm and reward system; (3) group cohesion; and (4) classroom goal structures (Dörnyei, 1994). With respect to the goal of a group of students, having fun is rather than to learn. Goal-orientedness refers to the extent to which the group is adjusted to pursuing its goal of L2 learning. Norm and reward system is the most salient classroom factor that affects learners' motivation. That means extrinsic regulations should be internalized as much as possible to trigger intrinsic motivation (Dörnyei, 1994). The group norms and rewards are standards that the majority of group members totally agree to and these become part of the group's value system. Hence, once a norm has been internalized and become a self-evident precondition for the group to act, the group is willing to deal with the derivations by putting pressure on members who violate the norm. The possible group behaviors might happen: to show active support teachers' efforts to observe the norms, to indirectly express disagreement with and dislike for some members, and openly to criticize them and put them in the stance of social quarantine.

As to the findings of Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1994), they confirmed the group cohesion is an important motivational component in a L2 learning context. Due to the fact that in a cohesive group, members are willing to achieve the group success and the group's goal-oriented norms indeed trigger a strong effect over the individual. With view to the discussion of classroom goal structures, it can be competitive, cooperative, or individualistic. The cooperative goal structure is the most powerful factor while promoting intrinsic motivation. It also can reach less anxiety, greater task involvement, and a more positive emotional tone. If the cooperative goals work, it triggers the positive attitudes towards the subject area, as well as a cohesive relationship with classmates and with the teachers (McGroarty, 2001). As to the core of this study, researcher wants to explore the possible relation within motives and written corrective feedback, especially in the peer-reviewing tasks. The explicit discussion of written corrective feedback and motives will be illustrated later.

Written Corrective Feedback

As in the traditional college writing instruction, that is assessment includes the assignment of a score or grade on a single draft, the lecturer's role as respondent on process-oriented instruction may be limited with

lecturers maintaining their status as authorities, experts, and dispensers of grammar and logic. Thus, they also act like evaluators in the writing training session (Chandrasegaran, 1986; Land & Whitley, 1989; Reid, 1994). Hardly can lecturers offer some authentic capacity and original ideas and information that writers are expected to show in their writings. Therefore, while lecturers begin to assess writers' writings, lecturers must view these texts as products, not as works in progress. As to many process writing components, facilitates successful revision in much more draft writing instruction program (Ferris, 1995; Hyland, 1990; Johns, 1993; Raimes, 1985). However, in the process of writing evaluation, the most common bias becomes especially apparent in the inconsistency and unevenness of these assigned evaluators (Freedman, 1979; Leki, 1995; Prior, 1995). While some evaluators focus principally on substance, rhetorical structure, and writing style, others regularly mention about mechanical concerns, such as sentence grammar, spelling, and punctuation (Gungle & Taylor, 1989).

In such complex situations in which revision is a major component of the writing program, writers may still be uncertain about how to deal with feedback and incorporate it into their own cognitive processes of revision (Ferris, 1995). Research has shown that the form and modality of lecturer response affects writers' receptivity to most kinds of instructor input (Kepner, 1991; Reid, 1994). Empirical researches also indicated that traditional, sentence-level correction, as well as more extensive forms of feedback, may result in fewer meaningful revisions by L2 writers (Cohen, 1987; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992). Among these famous WCF researches, Kepner (1991) also indicated that "the consistent use of L2 teachers' written error-corrections combined with explicit rule reminders as a primary medium of written feedback to periodic discourse-level L2 student writing is ineffective for promoting the development of writing proficiency in the L2". The intermediate level writers who received extensive content-focused feedback produced assignments that improved in terms of content and linguistic accuracy. Writers who received form-focused feedback did not improve the grammatical accuracy of their writing style as much as those who received only content-focused teacher comments (Kepner, 1991).

Effective text revision includes the involvement and engagement of the writers. How to apply the feedback into these practices that guide the writers to an awareness of the informational, rhetorical, and linguistic expectations of the readers within a specific discourse community? (Blanton, 1987; Fish, 1980; Jones, 1985; Reid, 1994)

However, feedback must be interactive to be originally effective to the writers. Multi writing draft models of L2 writing instruction encourage and reward early attention to brainstorming, ideas developing process, clarity, and the logical coherence. These models are prior to the correction of sentence- and word- level grammatical accuracy (Sheppard, 1992). In such practice of models, teacher feedback should raise writers' awareness of the needs of the readers and should encourage problem-solving and critical thinking about the assignment completion (Leki & Carson, 1994). If the feedback of these models can come from the evaluators, not just from teachers, the writers might also get the similar WCF as the ones teachers gave. In this present study, the researcher wants to investigate the possible relation within each group-specific motives and the WCF.

Relation Between Motives and WCF

That is uncommon to see the discussion of the relation between group-specific motives and WCF in current English classes, especially in the writing courses. That is because the writing ability is the most difficult

English skill that learners' cannot achieve their learning efficacy with certain specific performance in motives. This study assumes there might be some possible connection between group-specific motives and WCF. Another possible factor to show the influence of group-specific motives is the idea of self-efficacy. As to the limitation of the methodology of this study, there cannot prove the influence on self-efficacy by qualitative study. Besides, if learners' receive a strong sense of self-efficacy, it can enhance their achievement behavior by helping them to approach threatening situations with confidence. That is an apparent result from the inference of the rationale of this study. Hence, during task-involvement training course, it is essential to maintain a task-diagnostic focus rather than self-diagnostic focus. While facing the failure, it is also important to heighten and sustain effort. Although the self-efficacy perceptions are not easy to measure in the teacher's reflection journal, it still can show some insights related to the cognitive aspects in the self-efficacy fields. Self-efficacy beliefs are related to actual competence and abilities indirectly while they are making the product of a complex process of self-persuasion based on cognitive processing of diverse sources. In the present study, self-efficacy refers to the students' perception about their confidence in their ability to perform in the following writing assignments. The strength of perceived self-efficacy was measured qualitatively. As to the qualitative data, it was collected from the teacher's observations, and the students' learning journals.

In terms of theoretical background, little research has been done on the influences of group-specific motives implemented in the writing classroom (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). While a great number of studies were reviewed, most of them were found to have been conducted in the field of academics (Schunk & Swartz, 1993), athletics, or business (Bandura, 1997). The results of previous studies were appealing to most teachers in the EFL learning mode. However, there is a dearth of empirical study about whether group-specific motives could effectively enhance students' WCF specifically toward writing training. There are certain discussions about improving students' self-efficacy with group-specific motives in the writing process would intensify motivation and lead to academic attainment and skillful performance (Schunk & Swartz, 1993). It is still little research mentioned about the relation between motives and WCF. As to the main ideas of this study, the researcher wants to figure out the interaction of group-specific motives and WCF. Although there are many motivational variables within full skills of English ability, this study aims to focus on the writing training in the intermediate level of college students.

Method

Rationale for the Choice of Research

This study provides the educational action research as the rationale of research method. Action research allows making modifications in progress and the same process may be run repeatedly until a better solution is found. The teachers can see the main learning problem through students' learning journal and teachers' observation in the real action research. In view of the flexibility and the recursion of action research, the nature of action research fits into the design of the study. According to Kemmis and McTaggart (1988), the complementary and dynamic process of action research goes through four steps, that is, planning, action, observation, and reflection. The fundamental steps of action research are in accordance with the design of the program.

Basically, the implementation of the program went through a cycle of design, implementation, reflection, and modification according to researcher's observation and the students' learning journals during the process, and then it repeated. The design of the program was flexible and adjustable for the purpose of helping the

students' learning from group-specific motives. Action research is chosen not only because the teacher serves as a researcher but also because the teacher has a chance to apply theoretically feasible methods to solve real problems in a natural educational context.

Another practical purpose for doing action research is to figure out solutions to the problems existing in the practical educational context. Altrichter, Posch, and Somekh (1993) indicated that action research provides the methods and strategies to investigate and improve practical teaching settings. Besides, Burns (1999) also indicated that action research is evaluative and reflective when it aims at exploring the main change and improvement in practice. The results of the research can be applied directly and immediately to the classroom to offer possible solutions to the existent problems. Action research helps to recognize and translate developing ideas into action.

Participants

The four participants in the study were chosen from the intermediate writing course of sophomore. They major in the department of applied English in a national university of technology, which is located in the center of Taiwan. These students all take the basic writing course for one year. They are going to finish one-year intermediate writing training course till June, 2016. Until now, they have participated in the intermediate courses for two months. These four participants all passed the midterm writing exam. One of the participants is in the middle level among the whole class; the others are all in the higher level. They are separated into two groups. Each group does the peer-review task of each other's writing. They record every step they used and keep the journals of feedback. The researcher keeps the observation report by each assignment.

Instruments

The research is also the lecturer in this writing class. Each student had a notebook to keep their journals on the revising process. They wrote down every idea and discussion into this notebook. Then after finishing the task, they all handed the journals to the researcher. They also used the cellphone and online dictionary to check the grammar and correctness of the usage.

Procedures

The researcher sets two requirements of the grammar checking components. One is the number agreement, such as personal pronouns and antecedents. The other is the tense checking. Every participant reviews his/her mate's writing with these two grammar checking components, then writes down the problems and suggestions. After exchanging each reviewed writing assignments, they should record their process of revision. At the same time, the researcher interviews each participant about the feedback of this peer review project. Every participant should review two writing assignments, and receive his/her own revision. The participants should keep learning journals which included two parts: as a reviewer and as a writer. They should set a goal of their reviewing tasks in the beginning, then before starting the checking process, the researcher informs the norm they should follow and the reward they will receive after completing the whole peer-reviewing tasks. The participants have to record every detail of actual difficulties they faced. If the difficulties solve later, they should also record the solutions clearly. If they cannot solve the difficulties happened during the reviewing process, they also need to record the difficulties precisely and clearly in their learning journals. The data were collected, analyzed by the paper-written journals. Students need to record their feedback of group-specific motives for all the procedures related to the peer-reviewing steps.

After completing the reviewing process of the first assignment, each participant has to write down their feedback of this task. Then, they start the second task: to review the other writing assignment with the same procedures of the first checking process. They also need to keep their learning journals with every detail happened within the reviewing process as well as record every difficulty they meet.

After these students finished the task, the researcher interviewed each student for 10 minutes and asked these students for three questions: 1. What do you think about revising others' writings? 2. How to solve the difficulties in the process? 3. Before you start the second assignment, is the first revised one helpful to your second writing? The raw Chinese versions of answers were shown in Appendix 2. The detailed procedures would present in the next part, data collection and analysis.

Data Collection and Analysis

All the data collection was obtained from the teacher reflections (teacher is also the researcher), student interviews, and the student learning journals of these four sophomores. Student interviews were conducted individually. As to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), using the interview method to collect data on learning strategy can help to gain deep information and inspire the participants to respond more utterances.

The four sophomore participants attended individual face-to-face interviews. Each interview lasted about 10 minutes and was written-recorded. The questions concerned the difficulties while processing the peer-reviewing task and their reflections of finishing the tasks (See Appendix 2 for the student interview questions in raw data). The interviews were conducted in Mandarin Chinese, the students' mother tongue. Before starting the interviews, the participants were informed that all the discussions of the interviews would be kept confidential and have no bearing on their writing grades.

All data collected from the students' journals, students' interviews, and teacher's reflections went through three main coding stages: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Moghaddam, 2006). At the open coding stage, the data were split into units of meanings, incidents were put together as labels, and categorized concepts united into some clusters related to a certain theme. At the axial coding stage, the labels were reducing in the process of establishing the relationships among the possible codes. The process keeps relating sub-categories to a main category and adding the density of the categories by examining detailed variations. Finally, a core category was developed at the end of this stage. At the selective coding stage, core categories and their relationships to each other were investigated to picture a general idea of the results. When the researcher met difficulties in analyzing the data, she would trace back to the raw data and examine it from an alternative perspective through consideration of the study context. These core categories developed from the three coding stages were repeatedly examined to ensure the validity of the findings.

Findings

Teacher Reflections

The researcher marks one of the participants in Group 1 as "G1a", then the other is "G1b". The participants in Group 2 are marked as "G2a" and "G2b". In the first meeting, participants were excited about their peer-reviewing tasks. Only G2b concerned about the uncertainty of grammar checking. She doubted that how did she know the correctness of her own revision. The researcher just said: "try to find the correct information about the grammar, use dictionary, or consult others". Then, the researcher gave them the norm of grammar checking and asked them to write down every step while they were revising each other's work.

In the second meeting, these participants revised each other's first assignment and exchange their writing for self-checking. Then, they all need to start writing the second assignment and hand in the second draft to each other for the second revision process. The research observed the Group 1 showed a steady state while in the discussion. They just checked their own revised version and discussed peacefully and quietly. The researcher thought that would be related to the gender issue (G1a is a girl, and G1b is a boy). However, there was totally different situation in the discussion session of Group 2. These two girls of Group 2 were having a fierce discussion. G2a complained the late work about G2b. G2b complained the difficulties of revising G2a's first assignment. After some harsh conversations, they did meet the same conclusion: They have to hand the 2nd draft to each other in three days.

Student Interviews

The researcher interviewed each student for 10 minutes and asked these students for three questions (see Appendix 2). According to the student interviews, the researcher observed that Group 1 had a pleasant and cooperative correspondence within the peer review processes. Although they did not gain much benefit from the 1st revision, they all took some insights and reflections from the peer-review processes. Group 2 had a more active interaction within the peer-review processes. They both spent lots time and energy to find the correct information of grammar checking. G2a made a brief and detailed record for G2b's writings and she did check dictionaries many times while revising G2b's writings.

Major Findings

As to the participants' learning journals and the researcher reflection, there are some discussions via these four criteria related to the group-specific motives:

(1) Goal-orientedness: G1a set an easy goal for this task (see Appendix 3), and then G1b made a complex goal (see Appendix 4). G1b wants to make the revision without any logical sequence problems and make readers easy to understand the context. It is hard to define the logical sequence and set the checking components. However, G2a and G2b met a consistent goal for their peer-reviewing task. They all follow the rules of correct spelling and coherence in sentences.

(2) Norm and reward system: The researcher described the revised norm of these tasks and the reward would be some gifts cost under 500 NTD. G1a made a quick review of G1b's assignment 1, and then she marked some problems, and made the suggestions. However, after checking the grammar part, G1b found some errors in agreements, and he did some revision of grammar part and made some suggestions towards the transitions. However, G2a followed the revised norm, but G2b did not know how to revise the G2a's assignments. G2b thought G2a's assignments were good enough.

(3) Group cohesion: The participants in Group 1 show a close cohesion within the group discussion part. Although they did not discuss in a furious way like Group 2, they still met some necessary conclusion of their revision work. They all felt nervous about this task, which might take them lots time and energy to complete the task. Maybe their different genders made them feel shy while in the discussion session. They all fully participate in the discussion sessions and writing their own assignments. Group 2 had a fierce conversation about the difficulties of each other's writing. G2a also complained the late work of G2b's first writing. Therefore, they made an agreement that both had to hand in the second one within three days.

(4) Classroom goal structures: Group 1 showed their each individual goal separately while completing the reviewing tasks. They did not make each individual goal to meet the cooperative goals. However, they showed

the competitive goals during the discussion session. Group 2 set individual goals related to the whole classroom goals. Their active discussion during the discussion session is a perspective of the competitive goal structure. As to the consistent goal setting in the beginning, they also met the cooperative classroom goal structure.

Discussions

As to the findings of these two groups, the processes of peer-reviewing influenced the setting of group-specific motives. These motives were also affecting the receiving of WCF. That is, students did achieve better writing skills and more confidence after the peer-reviewing processes. Among these factors of group-specific motives, the group cohesion and classroom goal structures of these participants were the most significant influencing factors while writing the following assignments. Although the researcher keeps striving for finding some theoretical supports to show the interaction between group-specific motives and WCF, there seems to be no relevant references. In terms of theoretical background, little research has been done on the influences of group-specific motives implemented in the writing classroom (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). If the findings of this study can indicate some possible insight of the correlations between the groups-specific motives and the receiving of WCF, that might be few contributions to the future studies. Future studies may also focus on investigating the significant relations between the group-specific motives and the performance of WCF.

Conclusion

More peer interaction and response for revising classmates' writing assignments may heighten awareness of one's own strengths and weaknesses (Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992, 1996). As to the findings of these groups, students show higher intense of the willingness of receiving the specific task. However, they did learn something from the process of completing the peer-reviewing task. The learning path of peer-reviewing certainly indicates the relation within the group-specific motives, which triggers better self-regulatory learning strategies. After observing these correlations between the motives and WCF in peer-reviewing methods, this study proposed some insights of the influences of group-specific motives. The present findings further suggest that a qualitative observation might offer an original idea for inspiring further L2 writing research.

References

- Altrichter, H., Posch, P., & Somekh, B. (1993). *Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to the methods of action research*. London: Routledge.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The existence of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Blanton, L. (1987). Reshaping ESL students' perspectives of writing. *ELT Journal*, 41(2), 112-118.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teacher*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandrasegaran, A. (1986). An exploratory study of EL2 students' revision and self-correction skills. *RELC Journal*, 17(2), 26-40.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 417-418.
- Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40(1), 45-78.

The dimension of instrumental motivational subsystem involves a number of extrinsic motives including the desire to integrate into a new community. The results of this study presented that instrumental motives significantly affect the motivation in FLL contexts. These motives are organized by the individual's long-term career striving, resulting in a fairly homogeneous subsystem. The results also indicate that to conceptualize an integrative motivational subsystem in FLL contexts is possible. In addition to these two subsystems, there is another component called need for achievement, which is regarded as a typical motivational component in FLL contexts. The last factor shown in the results is attributions about past failures, which means learning failure is very common in FLL contexts. The conclusion shows that learners with a high level of instrumental motivation and need for achievement are more possible to gain an intermediate level of proficiency in the target language. That is, in order to go beyond this "really learn" level, learners should be integratively motivated.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 515-523.

The purpose of this article is to achieve the unique opportunity to regain some new insights in L2 motivation research in the exploration of other foremost researchers. At the same time, the article also highlights and investigates some controversial areas of L2 learning that may help trigger some different approaches to go further. The researcher of this article proposed the discussion of three aspects of the integrative motivation construct based on Gardner's theory (1985). Terminology is the first one that the researcher mentioned. The relation between "motivation" and "integrative motive" is confused by some insufficient discussions. Second is the measurement issue. A motivation test includes such predictive capacity of since self-report behavioral measures are likely to correlate with motivated behavior. Thus, the actual items of the AMTB concern a combination of intended and actual L2 learning behavioral measures as well as general ideas of L2 learning. The third one is conceptual issues which mostly concern the relationship between "motivation" and "orientation". Yet, orientations and motivation are sometimes interchangeable in the L2 literature. That is why a crucial task of L2 motivation research has to be conceptualized alternatively or modified motivational constructs in concrete terms.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284.

This paper intended to make L2 motivation research become more popular in educational discussion. That is, integration with the concept of L2 motivation makes the teachers convinced in the critical success in second language acquisition. Using an expectancy-value motivational framework, as well as on important findings in general and education psychology, researchers made an attempt to express a comprehensive motivational construct relevant to the L2 classroom motivation. This mentioned construct is shown in three levels: the language level, the learner level, and the learning situation level. Besides, these levels correspond to the three basic constituents in the L2 learning process, that is, L2, L2 learner, and L2 learning environment. These constituents also reflect three important dimensions of language learning: the social dimension, the personal dimension, and the educational subject matter dimension. This model based on the components of a number of practical motivational strategies. These may trigger language teachers to gain a better recognition of what motivates the learners in the L2 classroom.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117-135.

A brief but general assumption of this article is to believe that L2 motivation is a complex, multifaceted construct, and the diverse approaches focus various aspects of this complexity. Therefore, they do enrich the understanding from a theoretical and practical idea while being properly integrated. The conceptualizations of motivation are also occupied in some positions in the mainstream of psychological research: expectancy-value theories, goal theories, and self-determination theory. As to the extended framework of foreign language learning in L2 motivation, the researcher proposed some components under three levels. In the language level, there are two subsystem of integrative and instrumental motivation. In the learner level, there are two aspects of the need for achievement and self-confidence, which also refers to language use anxiety, perceived L2 competence, causal attributions, and self-efficacy. In the learning situation level, there are three domains of motivational components: course-specific, teacher-specific, and group-specific. Among the last motivational components, there include the ideas of goal-orientedness, the norm and reward system, and classroom goal structure (competitive, cooperative, or individualistic).

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(S1), 3-32.

There are two implications of L2 motivation field discussed in this article. First, it provides a series of recent advances in research on motivation to learn a foreign or second language. For example, motivational orientations and self-determination theory, L2 motivation and attribution theory, goal theories, willingness to communicate, and the relation between motivation and learning strategy use were all discussed precisely in the article. Then, the article mainly focuses on a process-oriented approach to L2 motivation research. It proposed three stages of different motivational types. At the preactional stage, the choice motivation type contains three functions: setting goals, forming intentions, and launching action. This choice influences various goal properties, values related to the learning process itself as well as to its outcomes and consequences, attitudes towards the L2 and its speakers, expectancy of success and perceived coping potential, learner beliefs and strategies, and environmental support or hindrance. At the actional stage, the executive motivation type contains three functions: generating subtasks, ongoing appraisal of one's achievement, and self-regulation. This executive motivation influences quality of the learning experience, sense of autonomy, teacher's and parents' influence, classroom reward and goal structure, influence of the learner group, and knowledge and use of self-regulatory strategies. At the postactional stage, there are three functions of motivational retrospection: forming causal attributions, elaborating standards and strategies, and dismissing intention and further planning. The main effects are on attributional factors, self-concept beliefs and received feedback, praise, and grades. This article also provides a framework of motivational teaching practice consisting of four dimensions: creating the basic motivational conditions, generating initial student motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation.

- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Freeman, S. W. (1979). How characteristics of student essays influence teachers' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(3), 328-338.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Newbury House: Rowley, MA.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43(2), 157-194.
- Gungle, B., & Taylor, V. (1989). Writing apprehension and second language writers. In D. Johnson and D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 235-248). New York: Longman.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 255-276.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(3), 287-308.
- Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 279-285.
- Johns, A. (1986). The ESL student and the revision process: Some insights from schema theory. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5(2), 70-80.
- Johns, A. (1993). Reading and writing tasks in English for academic purposes classes: Products, processes, and resources. In J. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 274-289). Boston: Heinle.
- Jones, S. (1985). Problems with monitor use in second language composing. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing process problems* (pp. 96-118). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- Land, R., & Whitley, C. (1989). Evaluating second language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U.S. rhetoric. In D. Johnson and D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 284-293). New York: Longman.
- Leki, I. (1995). Good writing: I know it when I see it. In D. Belcher and G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 23-46). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 81-101.

- McGroarty, M. (2001). Situating second language motivation. In Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language learning* (pp. 69-90). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Moghaddam, A. (2006). Coding issues in grounded theory. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(1), 52-66.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
- Prior, P. (1995). Redefining the task: An ethnographic examination of writing and response in graduate seminars. In D. Belcher and G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 47-82). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 229-258.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 273-292.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: internal structure and external connections. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: pathways to the new century* (pp. 14-87). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawaii.
- Schunk, D. H., & Swartz, C. W. (1993). Goals and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and writing achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 18(3), 337-354.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 103-110.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix 1 Teacher Reflections

In the first meeting, participants were excited about their tasks for peer-reviewing. Only G2b concerned about the uncertainty of grammar checking. She doubted that how did she know the correctness of her own revision. I just said: "try to find the correct information about the grammar, use dictionary, or consult others". Then, I gave them the norm of grammar checking and asked them to write down every step while they were revising each other's work.

In the second meeting, these participants revised each other's first assignment and exchange their writing for self-checking. Then they all need to start writing the second assignment and hand in the second draft to each other for the second revision process. Group 1 members fully focused on double checking their own revision. Group 2 members complained each other's late work. They just complain the difficulties they encountered during the revision process. After some harsh conversations, they did meet the same conclusion: they have to hand the 2nd draft to each other in three days. If there is any one did not meet the agreement, she should buy another a cup of tea.

According to the student interviews, the researcher observed that Group 1 had a pleasant and cooperative correspondence within the peer review processes. Although they did not gain much benefit from the 1st revision, they all took some insights and reflections from the peer-review processes. Group 2 had a more active interaction within the peer-review process. They both spent lots time and energy to find the correct information of grammar checking. G2a made a specific record for G2b's writings and she did check dictionaries many times while revising G2b's writings. G2a's writing skills are the best in all participants. She also kept the richest reflection and feedback for peer-reviewing task.

Appendix 2 Student Interviews

Teacher:

1. 幫同學改作文的感覺是甚麼？
2. 過程中碰到困難時如何解決？
3. 在你開始寫第二篇作文前，看到同學幫你修改的前作文，是否有幫助？

G1a

Q1: 幫同學改作文的感覺是甚麼？

A1: 很新鮮的體驗，滿酷的

Q2: 過程中碰到的困難時如何解決？

A2: 遇到不懂的就嘗試從上下文判斷，不行的話就直接照自己的意思來

Q3: 在你開始寫第二篇作文前，看到同學幫你修改前的作文是否有幫助？

A3: 可以避免重複犯一樣的錯，強迫自己思考別的東西

G1b

A1: 覺得是讓自己作文進步的一個方式

A2: 遇到不會的就會上網查，或是查字典

A3: 有，可以避免之前錯的東西

G2a

A1: 有點內疚，因為有時候不確定自己想的是對的還是錯的，或是我太嚴格嗎

A2: 查字典或是先想一下

A3: 多少有點幫助，但我先確認對方寫的是否正確，或是我還是會堅持我的寫法

G2b

A1: 還滿新奇的，之前沒有幫同學改過作文，剛好可以練練自己的英文

A2: 困難大概就是不知道那句對不對，然後會懷疑要不要照自己得方式改，然後就上網找句子的用法才決定

A3: 多少有，看同學怎麼改考卷就可以看看自己改的方法對不對，看文法時態也可以當作一種學習

Appendix 3 Learning Journal Sheet 1—G1a (Chinese Version)

Reviewing the 1st assignment:

Goal: 學會使用分詞構句，合併句子，使文章看起來清楚明瞭

Norm: 1. 第三人稱單數動詞變化; 2. 五個轉折語

Feedback: 1. 沒有topic; 2. 沒有五個轉折語; 3. 句子開頭多為“T”開頭; 4. 一句有兩個動詞; 5. 缺少一些能表達情緒的形容詞

Reviewing the 2nd assignment:

Goal: 寫出較長的句子，善用連接詞，轉折語等。

Norm: 1. 第三人稱單數動詞變化; 2. 五個轉折語

Feedback: 1. Every child gets a day off. 2. Instead of going to school or cram school, we can stay at home and do whatever we want, such as playing video games and watching movies. 3. Undoubtedly, every child loves Children's Day. 4. Has a good time. 5. On. 6. Children. 7. After they become adults, they will not forget the happy time in their childhood, which makes them keep going! 8. 看不懂

Appendix 4 Learning Journal Sheet 1—G1b (Chinese Version)

Goal: 希望對方的文章能夠更通順，沒有出現文法錯誤，拼音錯誤或是句意不順，時態正不正確之類的，然後能讓讀者一讀就懂文章的概要，起承轉合都有做到。

Norm: 1. 第三人稱單數動詞變化; 2. 五個轉折語

Feedback for assignment 1: 這篇文章大致沒甚麼問題，句意也很通順，我認為有些地方也可以用不同的句型寫或加入一些連接詞。

My teacher who named George is a principled person.

that I have ever seen before.

Figure out 前面已經出現過，可用“work out”取代: work out the problems

可以改寫成 Due to his ways of teaching

I really appreciated about everything he did for me.

I wouldn't have “become” a better person today.

不用加 “one”

P.S. 結尾寫得很好

Feedback for assignment 2: 這篇文章還蠻易了解的，只是我覺得喜歡的理由有點太少，反而介紹書有點太多了，感覺會變成這本書的大綱或是讀後心得。

Respectively named, Twilight, New Moon, Eclipse, and Breaking Dawn.

可以加“very”來強調他們的相遇: the “very” first meet...

How they meet and fall for each other is the main part of this book.

可以再加些喜歡的原因在裏頭，像書中哪段讓你印象深刻或是故事很新奇甚麼書介紹的部分可以少一點，結尾也可以留點神祕感會想讓讀者想去看的衝動。

Appendix 5 Learning Journal Sheet 1—G2a (Chinese Version)

Goal: 文法拼字正確, 語意要通順

Norm: 1. 第三人稱單數動詞變化; 2. 五個轉折語

Feedback for assignment 1:

1. Stopped work: 我覺得這個用法不太對, 但是不確定怎麼改正, 所以上網查了“停駛”的英文, 接著看到一篇頁面寫了許多有關鐵道英文的用法, 就順利的找到相關用法了。

2. railway carriage: 一開始不確定這個是不是正確的, 所以有查了一下

3. everyone was standing...: 加了一些字想讓語意更完整

4. blown by the wind: 覺得有點台式英文所以幫她修正了一些字

看完這篇作文, 覺得一個比較大的問題是很多句子都語意不太完整, 我想是因為作者寫的時候都用中文的思考方式, 因此寫出來的句字用英文的邏輯不太能理解。後來, 我試著用中文直翻就大概了解句子想表達的意思了。

Ex. The trees outside were brown by the strong wind and bent a lot.

這個句子就很明顯是用中文邏輯寫的, 所以後來我有幫她修正。還有一個就是很多句子裡面少了連接詞, 造成一個句子裡面出現主詞混亂……

最後是我一開始拿到文章後就發現文章並沒有分段……因為自己從以前寫作文都有分段習慣所以覺得奇怪。

Assignment 2:

Revision:

1. There are certain kinds of movies are my favorite.

2. 去 “…”, 用斜體 *about time*

3. The general idea of About Time is that all of us should cherish every moment we have.

4. the action one, Inception definitely comes to the first.

5. the series of Fast & Furious is another great movie on my “Favorite list”.

6. there are many thrilling plots which make my heartbeat races.

7. I like watching movies because I think that movies teach me a lot of things.

8. watching movie is just like watching many different people’s life.

Feedback: 這一篇感覺比上一篇難改, 因為少了許多轉折語, 讓這篇文章好像有種想到甚麼就說甚麼的感覺。有些單字放在句子裡面讓我看不太懂意思。Ex. Heroine. 這個字是女英雄的意思, 可是寫的同學可能直接查了意思, 但沒有發現其實語意上有出入。除了剛剛那個單字之外, 還有像 *ingredient*, *gist* 這兩個字, 我都認為用法不妥, 所以把 *ingredient* 改成 *material*; *gist* 改為常用的 *general idea*。在二, 三段的開頭, 都沒有轉折語, 會覺得整段來的蠻突然的。還有在第三段的地方一次舉了兩個例子但也沒做一些相關性來連結。所以覺得有點難改……細節的地方就是有一些主詞跟動詞的搭配有小失誤, 除了這些以外, 就是我有針對一些單字跟動詞用法查了一下字典。

Appendix 6 Learning Journal Sheet 1—G2b (Chinese Version)

Goal: 文法拼字正確, 語意要通順

Norm: 1. 第三人稱單數動詞變化; 2. 五個轉折語

Feedback for assignment 1:

1. Hooked on 改成 fascinated with

2. which 改成 that 因為後面是完整子句

3. obsessed 改成 obsessed

Feedback for assignment 2:

1. I have watched her raise me and my brother up... 改成 I have watched that she raised me and my brother up... 我覺得 her 後面不應該直接接 raise 這個動詞。這樣句子的動詞就會有衝突，所以改成 that 子句

2. 這個句子我看了很多遍，句子的意思應該是想表達“我不知道跟家人相隔這麼遠的距離是甚麼感覺”。好像沒錯但我又覺得有點怪

3. 這裡適合加上 “in my eyes”

4. give 改成 gives 前面 S 是 she

5. thus 改成 in the end 我覺得更好

Difficulty: 在改的過程，我看這篇文章不只看一次。第一次是看這篇是在寫甚麼，第二遍是看哪裡有錯，或是我覺得不順的地方，第三遍是看我改完後有沒有順，或是其他之類的。在幫別人改的過程，我認為需要更細心去檢查，而且在遇到我不懂的部分，我會借用電腦，課本，或是其他工具來查證我想的或是文章寫的對錯。從中可以讓我更加深某些文法或是詞性的用法。