ESJ Humanities

Feedback as Scaffolded Instruction in the Assessment of L2 Writing Tasks

Zena Abu Shakra, EdD
The American University of Sharjah, The United Arab Emirates

Doi:10.19044/esj.2023.v19n29p57

Submitted: 23 May 2023
Accepted: 10 October 2023
Published: 31 October 2023

Cite As:
Shakra Z.A. (2023). *Feedback as Scaffolded Instruction in the Assessment of L2 Writing Tasks.* European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 19 (29), 57.
https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n29p57

Abstract

This study focuses on exploring the relationship between the concept of learner autonomy and foreign language writing feedback. A sample of 4 writing conferences were transcribed in order to carry out spoken discourse analysis based on the Burton (1981) model, which is directly derived from the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model. The aim was to linguistically ascertain the instructor's attempt to stimulate learner autonomy through scaffolding based on the three principles of Little (2000). It was important to also take into cognizance the concomitant discourse that accompanies such an attempt in an effort to compare the findings with those observed in the initial study done on conferences, which involved more holistic feedback on the whole essay. The design also made use of short retrospective self-reports where L2 writers recorded their thoughts and comments directly following the feedback they received in each conference. This study builds on a previous study which demonstrated how writing instructors often mistakenly presuppose that learners have reached their perspective on a writing revision. This happens at a point much earlier than expected when in fact, learners appear to be cognitively engaged at a point much later than when they claim understanding of the revision being made. The present study expands on the original by comparing the quality of discourse observed in the previous study, which involved more holistic feedback on writing, especially when feedback is more focused and limited to one section of writing. Findings suggest that minimizing feedback results in instructor discourse that is more superior as a scaffolding instrument, while learner discourse shows more

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

evidence of metacognitive activity and reflection. Paradoxically, curtailing feedback which facilitates learning and task acquisition during the assessment of writing actually renders it more scaffolded in nature, thus resulting in more positive outcomes for both the instructor and L2 learner. The theoretical and pedagogical implications of this are discussed extensively.

Keywords: Learner autonomy, scaffolding, metacognition, reflection

Introduction

1. Sociocultural Theory and Scaffolding

Sociocultural theory originated with Lev Vygotsky (1978) whose theory highlighted the social dimension of learning with knowledge being mediated through discourse in social interaction. His theory holds that sociocultural factors and cognition are interdependently tied together in a relationship that is semiotically mediated (Lantolf & Pavlenko 1995). According to Vygotsky (1978), all higher cognitive functions are the product of dialogic interaction in the zone of proximal development, which represents the difference between what the learner can carry out independently and what the learner can perform in the presence of an expert. It is through such discursive activity that the learner eventually develops self-regulation, whereby a task may be completed independently without guided assistance.

As far back as the 1990s, sociocultural theory has been recognized to be applicable in the field of Second Language acquisition (Schinke-Llano, 1993). In a review of the theory in the field of SLA, Abu Shakra (2008) demonstrates how sociocultural theory is particularly relevant and enriching to SLA because the acquisition and subsequent progress in language development is first and foremost a social activity. One of the concepts inherent in this theory is scaffolding, a term that originated with the work of Wood et al. (1976), which describes the interactive relationship inherent in the tutoring process on the development of competence in problem solving and the acquisition of certain skills. Scaffolding, as a form of semiotic mediation, leads to development within the zone of proximal development (DiCamilla & Anton 1997). Therefore, it has become a concept particularly inherent in L2 instruction. Thus, rather than providing the learner with explicit instruction on writing, the expert prompts the learner to arrive at an independent task completion by gradually reducing the level of scaffolding to an independently accomplished level. According to Swibel (2020), scaffolded instruction not only guides the learner but also regulates the learning process by providing the appropriate structure and tasks that allow social and cognitive skills to develop. One of the goals of scaffolded

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

instruction is learner autonomy. This is an interesting concept first coined by Henry Holec (1981, p.3), which refers to "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" with the decisions accompanying all aspects of that learning. Learner autonomy has been recognized as a key component of language learning. Mynard (2019) asserts that learner autonomy is one of the best ways for catering to the individual needs of learners by designing learning opportunities to meet the unique needs of each learner. Hyland and Hyland (2006) specifically stress the need for studies on the role which feedback plays in creating autonomous writers.

With learner autonomy as its goal, scaffolded writing instruction is executed through the writing process. This means that the learner completes a series of drafts which are assessed by the expert through feedback that is gradually scaffolded. Thus, the learner is able to complete the final draft independently and achieve writing competence. The whole writing process seems to work under the assumption that mastery of the writing task denotes internalization of learning and generalization of such competence to subsequent writing tasks in the future. In practice, however, this cannot be more far from the truth. In a previous study, Abu Shakra (2013) demonstrates how writing instructors mistakenly assume that learners have reached their perspective on a writing revision at a point much earlier than expected. Learner application of expert feedback on a writing task is a passive process that seldom involves active thinking. Based on expert feedback, a learner is capable of making amendments to a writing task at the initial stage. However, the learner may easily regress back to similar errors in successive writing tasks since the learning has not been fully internalized and the expert's perspective of the errors has not been achieved (Abu Shakra, 2013). Knoblauch and Brannon (1984) realized that when learners follow expert feedback on a writing task too meticulously, they are simply rewriting a work that closely reflects the instructor's thoughts with minimal cognitive development ensuing.

Although the conventional attempts at increasing learner autonomy and stimulating metacognitive activity during assessment through feedback on writing tasks are actively made through scaffolding, this is often not sufficient. This is where the innovative idea of minimizing feedback is ensued in an effort to make such feedback obtain a more instructional quality and foster more active learning. Paradoxically, it is intriguing to study how the reduction of feedback which facilitates learning and task acquisition during the assessment of writing tasks may result in assessment that is more instructional. However, this study works under the assumption that feedback on writing tasks is considered as a form of assessment. As such, it is more effective when it takes on an instructional focus. It would be interesting to study the learner discourse that accompanies reduced feedback to discover

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

whether such an approach plays a constructive role in the way the learner envisions metaknowledge about the quality of their learning.

2. Background

The following study was carried out at the Gulf University for Science and Technology, an institution that operates under a cooperation agreement with the University of Missouri at St. Louis. It involved 4 Arab first-year university students who were attending a 3 credit composition course, which introduces them to the fundamentals of writing through an emphasis on the writing process. The 4 students were chosen from the 10 students that took part in the initial research study. This study builds on the original research (Abu Shakra, 2013), which explored the effect of enacting learner autonomy, through feedback on writing tasks. Findings indicated that the attempt to generate autonomy during writing conferences results in learner composed goals, which suggests evidence of reflectivity and instances of metalearning. As such, instructor presupposition of the point at which the learner has truly internalized a writing error needs to be revised since learners seem to become cognitively engaged at a point much later than after they claim understanding of the revision being made.

The present study expands on the original research by delving deeper into autonomous learning through scaffolding by exploring how minimizing feedback during assessment affects learner discourse and learner visualization of the learning process. The study describes the discourse which characterizes scaffolded attempts to foster autonomy on writing tasks during conferences, especially when feedback is restricted to one specific section of the draft. It also explores how this compares with similar scaffolded writing conferences that involve more substantial feedback on writing that covers the whole draft. Therefore, the quality of scaffolded expert feedback which attempts to trigger more learner autonomy during writing conferences does not change. Nonetheless, the quantity or length of such feedback is reduced to one section of the draft based on the learner's choice, with the expectation that the learner would apply this learning to subsequent sections of the same draft. Before delving into a comparison between learner discourse during conferences of 2 types of feedback, it is important to establish the presence of this scaffolded feedback during the sessions. Thus, the study has 2 main objectives:

1. To linguistically demonstrate the attempt to scaffold feedback on writing tasks during conferences which are limited to one specific section of the writing task.
2. To compare learner discourse in writing conferences that focus on the revision of only one section of the writing task, with learner discourse

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

in conferences that involve more holistic revision of the entire writing piece.

This study is based on a couple of assumptions. First, this study in no way attempts to evaluate writing, but rather the focus is on describing learner discourse and visualization of metaknowledge as the quantity of feedback is reduced. Also, feedback in both studies is synonymous with assessment. Subsequently, even if feedback on a writing draft is not evaluated by the instructor through a grade, it is still nonetheless considered an evaluation of learner writing. Alongside the initial research, the instructor embedded her discourse with elements of scaffolding in an attempt to increase learner autonomy among learners. The concept of learner autonomy underlying such an attempt was borrowed from three pedagogical principles which Little (2000) uses to characterize learner autonomy. The first is the principle of learner empowerment, whereby learners take charge of their learning processes and feel responsible for their own learning. The second is the principle of reflectivity which necessitates that learners engage in reflection in order to monitor and plan their learning. The third is the principle of appropriate target language use which requires learners to use the target language in discursive interaction.

In line with the previous study, the two principles of learner empowerment and appropriate target language use formulate the vehicle which the instructor utilized to increase learner autonomy. These two principles entail that the instructor, rather than simply providing written comments on writing tasks, would provide oral feedback during a scheduled conference with each L2 learner to discuss feedback on their writing. This relates to the social-interactive dimension of learner autonomy as indicated by Little (2000). Each 30 minute conference involved joint exploration of the writing revision through a dialogic interactive process. These conferences were not only meant to empower the learner but also provided an opportunity for target language use. The principle of reflectivity, on the other hand, formulates the aim of this discursive interaction. The aim of the instructor during each writing conference was to encourage reflection among the learners so that they could monitor and assess their writing. These three principles work together in a process, which allows the instructor to interact with a learner in a conference, using the target language in order to make the student reflect on their learning to achieve greater learner autonomy. According to Little (2000), learner empowerment, reflectivity, and appropriate target language use are three principles which cannot be distinguished. This is because they work closely together and should therefore be viewed holistically. Learner autonomy in language represents a

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

dynamic relationship between teaching and learning where learners plan, implement, and evaluate their own learning (Little, 2020).

3. Method

The instructor attempted to provide feedback on one section of the writing previously selected by the learner. Thereafter, the learner was expected to carry out a similar revision for successive sections of the writing independently. The attempt to foster learner autonomy through the revision of a selected section of writing was informally observed in 10 conferences over a period of 2 weeks. However, for consistency purposes and to rule out extraneous variables, only the conferences which focused on the discussion of writing comparison and contrast essays, including the writing genre studied in the initial research, were chosen to be audio taped and transcribed for the analysis of spoken discourse. Thus, data analysis was carried out on selected sections of comparison and contrast essays in 4 conferences. The aim was to linguistically ascertain the instructor's attempt to stimulate learner autonomy through scaffolding. It was also important to take into cognizance the concomitant discourse that accompanies such an attempt in an effort to compare the findings with those observed in the initial research done on conferences, which involved more holistic feedback on the whole essay.

The analysis of the discourse in the conferences was based on the Burton (1981) model, which is directly derived from the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model. Although the Sinclair and Coulthard model (1975) is specifically tailored to the classroom context, the Burton model (1981) was opted for since the nature of the conferences differs from a classroom lesson. Subsequently, only the instructor and the learner were involved. Also, the conferences took place outside the classroom and focused specifically on the revision of a writing problem. Originally formulated to apply to casual conversation (Eggins & Slade 1997), the Burton model (1981) is flexible enough to apply to the discourse of these conferences. Most importantly, this model does not over-privilege the instructor's role in the discourse. In line with the Sinclair and Coulthard model (1975), the scheme set forth by Burton (1981) is essentially hierarchical and lessons formulate the largest units of discourse. Lessons are made up of transactions which embody exchanges related to particular topics covered in the discourse. Accordingly, exchanges consist of moves which formulate individual turns. The smallest units of discourse are the speech acts which comprise the moves. The Burton model (1981) expands on the original Sinclair and Coulthard model (1975) at the level of speech acts which includes a few modifications and at the level of moves. At this level, the original initiation, response, and feedback includes opening, challenging, supporting, bound-opening, re-opening,

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

framing, and focusing moves. Opening moves consist of topics which are considered new in relation to the discourse that precedes them. Challenging moves hold the progress of a topic, and supporting moves keep the interaction focused to facilitate the topic of discourse. While bound-opening moves reintroduce a topic after a supporting move, re-opening moves reintroduce a topic after a challenging move. Finally, focusing and framing moves serve to mark the boundaries of a transaction by appearing before a topic and capturing attention.

In addition to the transcription and analysis of the discourse during the writing conferences, the L2 learners who took part in each conference were also asked to record their thoughts and comments on how the conference took place in a short retrospective self-report, which they filled out directly after the writing conference. The reports did not place a limit on student responses but simply provided some general guiding points related to the conference as an instructional method, which the students were asked to comment on open-endedly. The points the students were asked to comment on included instructional aspects they liked about the conference, aspects they disliked, and an evaluation of their learning of the writing revision. There were three main rationales behind these self-reports. First, the inequality in terms of power distribution present among the instructor and student in these conferences entailed that fewer turns would be taken by the student in comparison to the instructor. According to Muncie (2000), the fact that the instructor gives feedback and later evaluates the writing gives learners less chance to be critical about the feedback received. Hence, having them record their thoughts on these conferences gives students more voice in the process. Another justification for using self-reports is related to the fact that conferences geared at fostering learner autonomy were somewhat new to these L2 learners. As a result, it was important to allow them to further reflect on not only their writing, but also this new pedagogical practice and joint exploration instruction which is more student centered. Although self-reports were part of the methodology in this study, they were also chosen to serve a pedagogical function. By encouraging evaluation and raising awareness of learning strategies, they may also be considered as a means of fostering learner autonomy.

4. Data analysis

The analysis of spoken discourse linguistically demonstrated how scaffolding was used to foster learner autonomy. This was based on Little's (2000) three principles of learner autonomy during conferences which provided feedback on a selected section of the writing piece. The selection of the writing to be revised was wholly made by the learner. Thereafter, the data analysis compared this oral discourse to ensure that the instructor

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

feedback during a conference holistically covers the entire writing piece. Furthermore, excerpts from the transcript of one of the 4 conferences involved selected revisions as well as retrospective self-reports, which students filled out directly. Subsequently, two of the writing conferences will be used to discuss how data analysis took place. In this study, the conference will be referred to as Conference C in order to differentiate it from Conferences A and B, which involved more holistic feedback on writing in the previous study. It should be noted that transcripts in this conference are relatively shorter in length in comparison to the 2 conferences of the previous study. This is due to the brevity of the feedback given in a selected section. A complete transcript from Conference C, which is coded according to the Burton (1981) model of spoken discourse, is provided in Appendix 2 along with the notes on the coding scheme (Appendix 1).

This particular conference was chosen not only because it falls under the genre of comparison and contrast writing, but also because it was found to be the most illuminating of the four conferences. It involved a learner who, after being asked to select one section of his comparison and contrast essay for revision, requested help on the introduction of the draft. The instructor attempted to prompt him into understanding that there needs to be a particular purpose in the thesis statement of his introduction. The conference included three transactions that were geared towards a particular aspect of writing revision. The instructor first started with *problem analysis and exploration of a solution* which allowed the instructor to analyze the difficulty and explore a solution with the learner. This was followed by *relation to previous learning* which basically involved relating the writing difficulty to concepts discussed in class. Finally, the instructor proceeded with *pinpointing the problem*, which allowed the learner to specifically pinpoint the writing problem during the last stage.

5. Discussion

Findings of this study will be discussed according to each focus separately. The first focus will explore findings related to the scaffolded feedback, which is provided by the instructor during the writing conference. The second focus will outline how the discourse is observed in the previous study, whereby feedback is provided holistically on a writing task in comparison to when feedback is limited to one section of a writing task.

5.1 First focus

Turning to the first focus, data from the four writing conferences revealed that the instructor relied on scaffolding in order to make the learner arrive at the targeted perspective of the task, which in turn promotes self-reflection. This transfer of increased responsibility from the instructor to the

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

learner based on the learner's readiness involved several successive attempts. According to Kunschak (2007), this is required to foster learner autonomy. Analysis of the discourse in the writing conferences revealed several scaffolding functions. In line with the previous study and for the sake of consistency, 2 of these major scaffolding functions will be discussed here. The first relates to the instructor's feedback which was not similar to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) traditional IRF exchange. This is considered as a well-defined exchange in a typical lesson because of its 3 moves involving initiation by the instructor, response on the part of the student, and feedback from the instructor to evaluate the response. The analysis of discourse in these writing conferences was instead found to closely resemble what Mercer (1998) refers to as spiral IRF exchanges. These exchanges retain the traditional initiation, response, and feedback sequence. During the feedback stage, the instructor replaces the assessment of student response with probing questions to find out how the student arrived at such response. This helps, the student explore other possible ways of approaching the topic at hand. Thus, the instructor feedback is regarded as a method of exploration than an evaluation of student learning during each conference. Excerpt 1 from writing conference C demonstrates how spiral IRF exchanges characterized the instructor's discourse at the level of speech acts.

EXCERPT 1

Column 1 represents the speech turns.

Column 2 represents the speakers involved in the discussion.

Column 3 represents the Moves.

Column 4 represents the Speech Acts.

1.	T	FOO	ms s el	Let's start with a question./ My question is/ when were you asked to find similarities and differences between two things?
2.	A	C	rep	When?
3.	T	S	i	Anytime.
4.	A	S	rep	On Wednesday last week.
5.	T	S	acct p	Last week/ What for?

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

6.	A	S	rep i	In Science for my assignment./ I had to compare two organisms.	
7.	T	BO	el	To find similarities and differences?	
8.	A	S	rep	Yeah both.	
9.	A	S	rep	Last month also I was working on finding similarities and differences.	
10.		T	C	i	In?
11.		A	S	rep	History class.
12.		T C	S i	acct	OK./ I didn't understand what you said (A mumbles something which can't be heard).
13.		A	S	rep	It was 2 famous figures in the French revolution.
14.		T BO	S m s el	ack	OK./ Now/ when you compared the two figures/ did you find similarities or differences?
15.		A	S	rep	It was both.
16.		T	S	acct	Both, OK.
17.		A	S	rep	I also had to compare 2 phones with my friend.
18.		T	S	acct	Alright.
19.		A	S	i	To see which one I am going to buy.
20.		T BO	S el	ack	OK./ What is comparing two things called?
21.		A	C	rep	I don't get it.
22.		T	RO	p	What do you call it when you find differences?
23.	A	S	rep	Contrast.	
24.	T	S	acct p	Contrast./ and when you find similarities?	
25.	A	S	rep	(mumbling; not clear.)	
26.		T	C	p	What did you say?

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

27.	A	S	rep	Comparison.
28.	T	S	acct	Comparison?

In this excerpt, the instructor commences the writing conference with the first transaction which is an analysis of the writing issue. The instructor's initial elicitation at 1 is meant to get the student to arrive at a general understanding of comparison and contrast. Therefore, she engages in a series of elicits to request linguistic response and prompts in order to reinforce previous elicits (Burton, 1981). These 2 speech acts appeared in more turns at 5, 7, 14, 20, 22, 24, and 26 respectively than informatives and comments. According to Burton (1981), the only function is to show compliance to a previous reply. Thus, the instructor's turns seemed to involve more prompting and mentoring than assessment and evaluation in order to get the student to reach a closer understanding of comparison and contrast. According to Li (2017), when instructor feedback in an IRF exchange comes in the form of questioning, a spiral IRF is created. This results to a new learning cycle, which enriches student involvement in the learning process. Such dialogue not only encourages reflection among learners but also helps raise awareness of values inherent in student learning (Greenbank & Penketh 2009). According to Gama (2004), this may lead to the enhancement of student learning. On the downside, it also speaks of the apparent conflicting roles of an instructor during a writing conference as a feedback provider and the ultimate evaluator of the same writing (Hyland, 2000).

Cued elicitation (Edwards & Mercer 1987) is another scaffolding function that is evident in the discourse of the writing conference. Closely related to spiral IRF exchanges, cued elicitation involves prompting learners through questions embedded with clues to help them arrive at the instructor's perspective of the task (Edwards & Mercer 1987). This is clearly evident in Excerpt 2 of the writing conference which shows how cued elicitation occurred in the instructor's discourse at the level of speech acts.

EXCERPT 2

Column 1 represents the speech turns.

Column 2 represents the speakers involved in the discussion.

Column 3 represents the Moves.

Column 4 represents the Speech Acts.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

52.	T	S	m	Well/
		i	that's related to the first point./	
		ms	I'll write all this down./	
		s	You can have three purposes. The first would be which is better./	
		m	OK/	
		el	What would the second one be?	
53.	A	S	rep	Which one is worse.
54.	T S	I	Same thing, which is better or worse./	
		p	What else?	
55.	A	S	rep	You're choosing.
56.	T	S	I	Same thing./
		com	You're making a choice; deciding which is better or worse./	
		p	What else can you do?	
		sum	Adam/	
		p	you just said it.	
57.	A	C	rep	I did?
58.	T	S	acct	Yes.
59.	A	S	rep	Um, find the differences; how they are different.
60.	T	S	acct	Alright./
		p	You can find the differences but….	
61.	A	S	rep	They're the same.

This excerpt is taken from the last transaction in which the instructor attempts to make the learner pinpoint the specific problem of having a thesis statement that lacks a significant aim in comparison and contrast writing. Therefore, she relies on cued elicitation. In reply to the instructor's initial elicitation in turn 52, the student responds with replies in turns 53 and 54, which attempt to address the elicitation. When the instructor realizes that the student is not able to arrive at her perspective of the task, she is quick to follow her first prompt in turn 56, with a second prompt that provides a cue to remind the learner of something that she previously mentioned during the conference. Subsequently, when the student requests further clarification in her elicit in turn 57, the instructor resists the temptation to reply with a speech act such as an informative, which directly gives out information. While responding with accept in turns 58 and 60, the instructor is quick to add a clue in the form of a prompt, which allows the student to finally realize something in turn 61. Apparently, two concepts, though divergent, may be

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

shown to be similar. The instructor seemed to make use of these cues to jointly explore the solution to the writing problem with the learner rather than directly transmitting the information to the learner. As part of scaffolded instruction, cued elicitation aids learning within the zone of proximal development and encourages learner autonomy. Murphy and Jacobs (2000) assert that such guided cooperative learning processes create more autonomous learners. Embedding the prompting process with such cues also allows learners to actually reflect on their queries, thus encouraging self-evaluation and stimulating metacognitive activity. Edwards and Mercer (1987) further highlighted how such paraphrasic interpretations of student response, which involves reconstruction to make it more explicit, may be considered a metalearning strategy since they allow learners to become more cognizant of their own thinking. However, Moore (2012) asserts that although cued elicitation is effective, it should be used sparingly since its overuse may become a strategy for the instructor to control the actual lesson.

5.2 Second focus

Turning to the second focus, it is important to note that as with the initial research, this study acknowledges the positive effect of dialogic interaction on L2 learners. However, it does not attempt to measure the reflectivity and metalearning observed or investigate the value of such discourse on the attainment of self-regulation. Therefore, this study compares the quality of discourse observed in the previous study where feedback is provided holistically on the entire writing piece in comparison to limited feedback in one section of writing. Interestingly, findings reveal that the quality of interaction when scaffolded instructor feedback occurs during a writing conference is limited to one section of writing. However, this is surprisingly quite superior to when instructor feedback attempts to cover the entire writing piece as commonly practiced during a conference. It is thus quite intriguing how limiting instructor feedback during a writing conference may actually result in more gains, thus allowing second language learners to take charge of the academic writing process. This will be discussed in the 2 main findings of the previous study.

In comparing the discourse that ensues in the conference at hand with that of the previous study, it is integral to differentiate between instructor discourse and learner discourse. In terms of the instructor, the first observation revealed that prompting extended throughout the conference. As can be seen in Table 1 below, elicits and prompts have a much higher incidence. This formulates 14% and 13% of the total speech acts used by the instructor in the conference than informatives and comments, which accounts for 9% and 1% of the speech acts used by the instructor.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

TABLE 1. OVERALL DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH ACTS IN CONFERENCE C

SPEECH ACT	*TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTS*	*% OF TOTAL SPEECH ACTS*
^		
Accn		
Ex		
Pr		
M	*12*	*7%*
Sum	*1*	*0.6%*
S	*7*	*4%*
Ms	*6*	*3.5%*
I	*15*	*9%*
El	*24*	*14%*
D	*2*	*1%*
Rea	*2*	*1%*
Con	*5*	*3%*
Ack	*4*	*4%*
P	*21*	*13%*
Acct	*24*	*14%*
Rep	*45*	*27%*
Com	*2*	*1%*
TOTAL	***169***	

Surprisingly, the conference in the previous study also had a high incidence of prompting. Table 2 below shows the overall distribution of speech acts in Conference A and reveals that the distribution of the 4 speech acts was evenly distributed throughout the conference. Elicits and prompts formulate 14% and 11% of the total speech acts used by the instructor, while informatives and comments similarly account for 10% and 8% of the speech acts used by the instructor in the conference.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

TABLE 2. OVERALL DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH ACTS IN CONFERENCE A

SPEECH ACT	TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTS	% OF TOTAL SPEECH ACTS
M	2	2%
Sum		
S	4	4%
Ms	3	3%
I	10	10%
El	14	14%
D		
Rea		
Con	3	3%
Ack	2	2%
P	13	11%
Acct	7	7%
Rep	29	28%
Com	8	8%
^	4	4%
Ex		
Accn		
Pr		
TOTAL	**104**	

The higher incidence of informatives and comments in Conference A may be attributed to the fact that the pressure for time to revise an extended piece of writing during a 30 minute conference impedes the instructor from engaging in as much prompting as originally desired. This may result in the instructor's desire to simply proceed by covering the entire writing piece as thoroughly as possible while showcasing expertise without exceeding the designated time frame, thus engaging in less prompting than originally desired. This may on the surface appear to be similar to what Bloome (1986) referred to as procedural display. This allows the instructor to interact with the learner through discourse that is appropriate for the conference without addressing the academic bulk of the conference or realizing the value of the interaction during the conference. On the surface, what may appear to be scaffolded feedback is actually prompting in a superficial sense. Although engaged in discourse during the conference, the instructor and learners may in such cases not achieve a shared understanding of the writing problem. According to Bloome et al. (2014), procedural display should be differentiated from the acquisition of academic content and skills.

In addition, feedback on shorter segments of writing within a given time frame is less arduous for the instructor who is required to delve into this process for at least 25 students in an average writing class. This may allot more time to comment on a learner's successful attempts at writing and not just delve into areas of error, thus highlighting areas of mastery which might

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

otherwise go unnoticed. Referring back to Tables 1 and 2, the acknowledge speech which indicates that an informative has been understood appears to be slightly more frequently used by the instructor at 4% in the present study than it was in the previous conference where it only appears at 2%. The same applies to the accept speech act which consents to a previous utterance. In the present conference, it appears at 14%. However, in the previous study, it was used by the instructor at 7%. Both speech acts may be considered as support for learners since they provide encouragement by accepting the learner's informatives through non-evaluative word choice. Therefore, the learner is aware that the conference is not an evaluation or assessment of their writing. In other words, it is a discursive activity which results in thinking through the writing problem together in order to achieve a shared understanding of the task at hand. Subsequently, the learner becomes aware not only of areas of difficulty but also positive aspects of their writing that they may build upon in successive pieces of writing.

In terms of learner discourse, comparison between the learner discourse that ensues in the conference at hand with that of the previous study reveals several observations. In the previous study, the primary observation centered on the importance of writing goals generated by the learner towards the end of the conference. Nonetheless, these writing goals were not only an expression of reflectivity, but it also revealed instances of metacognitive activity. Therefore, the end result of discursive exploration during writing conferences was seen as added learner autonomy. The present study observes that such metacognitive activity gains more momentum as instructor feedback is reduced. On the other hand, metacognitive activity and reflection were previously revealed solely through the writing goals learners formulated towards the end of the conferences. Instances of metacognition in the present conferences are not just confined to writing goals at the end but are extensively spread out throughout the conference. Tables 3 and 4 below compare the frequency distribution of speech acts between the teacher and student, and the 3 transactions of each conference will be used to demonstrate this.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

TABLE 3. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH ACTS AMONG TEACHER AND STUDENT FOR EACH TRANSACTION OF CONFERENCE A.

	TRANSACTION 1			TRANSACTION 2			TRANSACTION 3		
	S	**T**	**TOTAL**	**S**	**T**	**TOTAL**	**S**	**T**	**TOTAL**
m					1	1		1	1
sum									
s									
ms	1		1	1		1		1	1
I	5		5	2		2	3		3
el		8	8		5	5	1	5	5
d									
rea									
con					1	1	1	1	2
ack				1		1		2	2
p		4	4		8	8		1	1
acct		7	7		2	2		4	4
rep	12		12	11		11	6		6
com		2	2						
^				4		4			
ex									
accn									
pr									
TOTAL	**18**	**23**	**41**	**19**	**18**	**37**	**11**	**15**	**25**

TABLE 4. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH ACTS AMONG TEACHER AND STUDENT FOR EACH TRANSACTION OF CONFERENCE C

	TRANSACTION 1			TRANSACTION 2			TRANSACTION 3		
	S	**T**	**TOTAL**	**S**	**T**	**TOTAL**	**S**	**T**	**TOTAL**
m		1	1		3	3		2	2
sum									
s		2	2		1	1		1	1
ms		1	1					4	4
I	2	3	5				1	4	5
el		4	4	2	3	3	3	6	8
d								2	2
rea							2		2
con								1	1
ack		2	2					1	1
p		3	3		4	4		1	1
acct		6	6		6	6			
rep	13		13	6		6	2	2	4
com									
^									
ex									
accn									
pr									
TOTAL	**15**	**22**	**37**	**8**	**17**	**23**	**8**	**24**	**31**

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

A comparison between the 2 tables above shows that while elicits on the part of the student are used once in Conference A, they are used 5 times in the last 2 transactions of Conference C. The learner thus appears to be directing more questions about the feedback presented by the expert. When feedback is limited to a selected section of writing, learners may feel more obliged to inquire about a writing error rather than blindly following the expert's feedback. This is because they know that they will need to continue with this revision independently for the latter sections of the draft. Furthermore, a glance at the nature of inquiries addressed by the learner in both conferences reveals a startling finding. Although the elicit in Conference A was limited to simple repetition of the teacher's comment used during feedback, learner queries in Conference C seem to be more developed and extensive. Excerpt 3 demonstrates how student queries in Conference C were relatively more developed.

EXCERPT 3

Column 1 represents the speech turns.
Column 2 represents the speakers involved in the discussion.
Column 3 represents the Moves.
Column 4 represents the Speech Acts.

44.	T	S	acct	Make a choice./
		m		Alright/
		con		choose which is better/
	BO	el		or why else would we do this?/
		p		Think about it: if you're showing that two things have similarities, how is that important?/
		p		Why would that be something necessary?
45.	A	S	rep	To see which is better.
46.	T	S	acct	To see which is better.
47.	A	S	rep	To also see how they differ.
		el		Do does that mean I have to do both?
48.	T	S	acct	Yes./
		s		Two things that everybody thinks are similar, you may show are actually different./
…….				
	O	el		What else could we do then?/
		p		You can find which is better or….?

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

49.	A		S	rep	How they are different.
50.	T		C	p	So what? In that case…you are proving that ….?
51.	A		S	rep	What are the disadvantages.
52.T		S	m	Well/	
			i	that's related to the first point./	
			ms	I'll write all this down./	
			s	You can have three purposes. The first would be which is better./	
			m	OK/	
			el	What would the second one be?	
53.	A		S	rep	Which one is worse.
			el	Is that the same as comparing and contrasting?	
54.	T	S	I	Same thing, which is better or worse./	
			p	What else?	
55.	A	S	rep	You're choosing.	
56.	T		S	I	Same thing./
			com	You're making a choice; deciding which is better or worse./	
			p	What else can you do?	
			sum	Adam/	
			p	you just said it.	
57.	A		C	rep	I did?
58.	T		S	acct	Yes.
59.	A		S	rep	Um, find the differences; how they are different.
60.	T		S	acct	Alright./
			p	You can find the differences but….	
61.	A		S	rep	They're the same.
62.	T		S	acct	They're similar./
			con	So, if you have two things that are similar you try to show that they're different./	
			el	Take two iphones for example.	
63.	A		S	rep	They're the same.
64.	T		S	acct	OK. They're the same./
		C	p	But…	

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

65.	A	S	rep	They have similarities but they can also have differences.
66.	T	S	acct	They're also different./
	BO	el		So, what would #3 be?/
		p		If #2 is we are choosing two things that are similar and we are trying to find differences, what would #3 be?/
67.	A	S	rep	The same.
68.	T	C	p	Two things that appear different….
69.	A	S	rep	Find out how they are the same.
70.	T	S	el	Can you give me an example?
71.	A	S	rep	Friends.
72.	T	C	i	No./
		p		Give me an example of two writing topics that everybody thinks are different and you prove are similar.
73.	A	S	rep	A Samsung and an iphone.
74.	T	S	acct	Samsungs and iphones OK./
		con		Everybody thinks they're different phones and you will try to prove that they're similar./
		m		So/
		el		What is the conclusion we are reaching here?
75.	A	S	rep	You have to make a statement.
		el		So how can I add this to my writing later?
76.	T	S	acct	You have to have a point to prove./
		el		So comparison and contrast in itself is?
		i		If we're just comparing and contrasting, its pointless so we would have to do something./
		com		Either make a choice or else prove that 2 things thought similar are different or 2 things thought different are similar./
	FO	con		Otherwise, you are going to run into a problem and the reader wouldn't know./
		el		Do you get the aim behind all this/

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

In this excerpt, the student in line 47 inquires whether comparison and contrast need to be completed in the essay. Similarly, in line 53, the student inquires whether making a choice is similar to compare and contrast. This is a far cry from the simple question addressed to the teacher in Conference A. Even the learner goals generated at the end of Conference A, which could arguably be considered quite developed, were prompted by the instructor and initiated based on a direct request by the instructor.

The fact that the learner in Conference C restates some of the previous feedback provides evidence that the learner seems to have internalized the instructor feedback and is now reflecting on it by attempting to plan the application of the learning. Later on in the same excerpt, the student in line 75 attempts to rephrase the instructor's comment and further probes into how this may be applied in another section of their writing. This is important in two respects. First, this recapitulation of learning provides evidence that the learner has gotten closer to achieving the instructor's perspective of the writing revision, thus hastening the internalization of learning. Certainly, the previous study showed how learners arrive at the instructor's perspective and become cognitively engaged at a point much later than after they claim understanding during a conference. It is therefore over-simplistic to assume that learning becomes internalized after it has been pointed out through feedback (Hyland & Hyland 2006). When internalization is limited, learners will fail to generalize feedback on their writing. This causes errors to reappear in subsequent writing tasks. According to Vincent (2019), students are often not capable of absorbing all the feedback given to them by ESL instructors when it is extensive. However, such revision is done out of altruism on the part of instructors. On the part of the learner, recapitulation of learning is insightful and relates to the planning element inherent in the learner's queries. Student questions clearly show evidence of plans to apply this write application elsewhere. More developed and extensive queries such as the ones in the excerpt above reveal how the learner has taken charge of the writing process and feels more accountable for their writing. According to Thanasoulas (2000), self-monitoring which involves performance check is one of several metacognitive strategies that require learners to ponder on their thoughts. Schraff et al. (2017) reveal how metacognition aids in the transfer of learning as learners are likely to apply learning strategies when they get the chance to reflect on their learning processes. This is also related to learner autonomy and the generation of more independent learners. According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), learners need to develop metacognition to achieve the ultimate goal of instructor feedback. This entails the creation of autonomous learners who are capable of critically assessing their own writing. The benefits of learner autonomy have been recognized in the field of L2. Marantika (2021)

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

highlights how the development of metacognition and autonomy in learning allows learners to be more aware of the learning process and the techniques needed to succeed in language learning. According to Benaissi (2015), learner autonomy is not only bound by cultural constraints but is also a concept that is not innate. Therefore, it requires an innovative perspective towards learning on the part of learners and instructor. Subsequently, when feedback provided to the learner is reduced to a particular section of writing, there is less need to prompt the learner to plan their writing. This allows the learner to take more initiative to independently revise alternative sections of their writing. Certainly, feedback on a piece of writing tends to reduce revision to a mechanical process, which allows the learner to make necessary changes to meet the demands of the assignment and receive a grade with less internalization of learning and less metacognitive activity of the ensuant learning. Comments recorded by students in their self-reports following the 4 writing conferences mirrors this observation. Table 4 lists a few of these comments.

TABLE 4. COMMENTS FROM STUDENT SELF-REPORTS FOLLOWING WRITING COFERENCES

Student	Comment 1	Comment 2
Adam (Conference C)	'I prefer the in-person conference where we worked on one part of the essay only because I will directly understand the point you want me to edit and you could give me examples of how to fix it. This will help me plan for other parts of my essay. I get to think about how to fix the other parts.'	'I liked how we focused on one problem while in the first essay she briefly went through it. The second one was more effective than the first one in my opinion. I was able to understand the importance of the thesis statement in a comparison and contrast essay in a better way.'
Maya (Conference D)	'I found it to be more helpful than the short conference we had on the previous essay. I felt like the conference was a "one question" to "one-answer" meeting and we couldn't get to the details of the essay and our mistakes. This gave me more power because I got to choose what I needed help with, so I came prepared.'	'I preferred the correction of the second essay since the first essay was very brief and chaotic.'
George (Conference E)	'The fact that it was easier to grasp made this better than when comments are just written and instead of having a meeting about everything, we can talk to you about it giving us an advantage over just talking about everything, more to memorize, less organized when it's about everything.	'The writing conferences were better because I got to look at the essay criteria more than when you personally corrected our essays in writing: Interaction is important.'

The comments in Table 4 clearly display signs of metacognitive activity. Evidently, the learners seem to be more cognizant of the learning process that took place by reflecting on the feedback given during the conference. George's first comment and Maya's second comment clearly attest to the superior quality of the feedback obtained during conferences which focuses on one area of writing. This means that both learners reiterate

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

how much more organized and substantial feedback is. Adam's first comment not only reveals his preference for conferences that are limited in focus to one area of an essay but is also a step forward with planning for other parts of the writing piece. This certainly confirms the move towards more autonomous learning, which is the ability to metacognitively and critically make decisions as learners take charge of their own learning. Thanasoulas (2000) affirms that the concept of learner autonomy entails that the learner assumes increased responsibility for learning, thus shifting the balance of authority between students and instructor in traditional learning settings. It represents the capacity for learners to recognize that they are responsible for their learning and therefore take an active role in all aspects of the learning process (Little, 1991). Such autonomy is also evident in Maya's first comment which sheds light on how limiting instructor feedback during the conference and the accompanying request for her to make a choice on what to be revised rather than assuming the whole draft would be in the hands of the instructor, made her feel more accountable and in charge of the writing conference and learning in general. Even before the whole revision process of the conference ensues, the learner is already being held accountable and has to decide which part of the draft they want revised. This is in contrast to the previous traditional conferences where such pre-conference decision-making and preparation are not necessary since the instructor simply revises the whole draft. According to Sercu (2002), the view of learning whereby knowledge is passed to learners in a structured way should be discarded. Therefore, developing learner autonomy requires an emphasis on cognitive skills and deeper levels of processing.

More significant and noteworthy, however, are the statements issued by learners with regard to the grading rubric of their writing assignment. In Adam and George's second comments, there is direct reference to criteria included in the rubric, which is used to assess their writing. This indicates metacognitive activity whereby the learner has not only internalized feedback and is using it to plan ahead, but is also able to view learning from a wider perspective by linking it to the original criteria for writing assessment established in class. This is quite remarkable given the fact that writing rubrics presented by the instructor are often ignored by learners as they complete writing tasks. Often times, such criteria become a tool used solely by the instructor to evaluate writing. According to the radical suggestion of Wilson (2018), the writing piece should be suggestive of its own evaluative criteria. This is integral for subsequent learning tasks. As learners perceive the justification or value of the criteria used to evaluate their writing, they eventually provide more input in formulating such criteria with the instructor to obtain an expanded role in the writing process. Such learner involvement should be added to the criteria of assessment literacy for

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

educators. Popham (2018) holds that assessment literacy should be exclusive to the fundamental concepts and techniques that impact learners the most. Over time, learner involvement may result in long term changes on the affective side. This may eventually project negative attitude among learners towards writing. Writing tasks would become less of an enigma and rubrics would no longer be viewed as vague criteria that are more meaningful to the instructor than the learner.

A brief summary of the findings is outlined below in relation to each focus of the study.

The first focus linguistically examined scaffolded feedback on one specific section of the writing task during the conferences. It revealed 2 major scaffolding functions on the part of the instructor:

- Spiral IRF exchanges
- Cued elicitation

The second focus compared the quality of discourse between the present conference and the previous study. Based on the comparison, the following details were revealed:

- In terms of instructor discourse, there was prompting and extensive comments on the writers' successful attempts and not just errors.
- In terms of learner discourse, findings showed instances of metacognitive activity, questions related to instructor feedback, developed queries, attempts at the recapitulation of learning, and learner autonomy in general.

Conclusion

In line with the previous study, it is not within the breadth of this paper to place learners on a continuum to measure the autonomy achieved or the metacognition instigated. Apart from highlighting the fact that writing instruction in the field of 2nd language acquisition should revisit instructional methodology, which creates autonomous learners, a broader conceptualization of feedback on learner production is required. This study has shown that the use of feedback to assess L2 writing takes on a more instructional quality as it is reduced and focused on a selected section. Proper assessment includes feedback that supports learning with a clear instruction in mind. Ironically, curtailing feedback for L2 learners leads to positive outcomes for the learner and instructor.

In retrospect, several questions remain for consideration. For the purpose of this study, feedback on writing was presented orally in a conference. This was carried out not only for the sake of consistency with the previous study but also because discussing writing orally allowed learner input, which is needed to get more insight into metacognitive processes and

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

optimize understanding of learner autonomy. It would be interesting, however, to study how the reduction of feedback affects the L2 learner as spoken feedback is replaced by written feedback on the part of the instructor. Perhaps this should be the ultimate goal of writing instruction. This is seen as a reduction not only in the amount of feedback per se, but also a move from instructor feedback that is less spoken to one that is more written. Certainly, it seems that feedback is closely akin to models of good writing for the learner. Although such models are often effective as an introduction to a writing type, they may become a limitation when overused. Similarly, if instructor feedback is not gradually reduced for the learner, it may become less of an asset and more of a limitation.

Furthermore, this study works under the assumption that the L2 learner has been previously acquainted with the criteria used to create the rubric, which assesses the respective piece of writing. This allows for more optimal efficacy of feedback during writing conferences. Such scaffolded feedback may not work efficiently without prior exposure to the writing criteria. Instructor feedback on student writing and the rubric, with the criteria used to evaluate the writing, should optimally complement each other. This is achieved by working together to collectively create an all-encompassing paradigmatic definition of assessment. This means that one is ineffective without the other. Andrade (2005) postulates that rubrics alone can neither explain writing nor replace good instruction. Similarly, without specific reference to rubrics, feedback would not be sufficient to clarify writing criteria, raise awareness of what is expected in writing, or create benchmarks to measure and document progress in writing. The end objective of assessment should be learning and not the other way round because assessment is a social conversation that gets internalized and results in learning.

In light of all this, the following pedagogical recommendations may be put forth. Firstly, L2 instructors may need to reassess instructional methodology which encourages learner autonomy. Thus, minimizing feedback on academic writing by limiting it to a particular section of writing may lead to favorable outcomes. According to the hypothesis formulated by Evans et al. (2010), L2 writing competence is enhanced when instructor feedback takes on the qualities of being manageable, valuable, prompt, and constant. In addition, L2 instructors need to adopt a broader conceptualization of feedback and assessment. Therefore, any feedback which accompanies assessment needs to be instructional and formulate a learning experience for students. This denotes that the end of any assessment should be instruction and not just evaluation. According to Daflizar, Sulistiyo, and Kamil (2022), L2 instructors are facilitators of learning who provide assistance and guide the learning process rather than

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

being the dominant authority who controls the process of learning academic writing skills.

In terms of L2 research, one of the implications of this study reveals that the field of learner autonomy is still a relatively virgin area that requires further investigation. Mikwitz and Suajala (2020) offer several reasons why more research is needed in the field of learner autonomy. These include factors related to the effect of different pedagogical settings on academic writing competence as well as the need to learn more about how learners develop autonomy, self-efficacy beliefs, and self-regulatory strategies throughout the process of learning academic writing skills. To them, such research would not only fill a gap in the present literature but also provide a better understanding of academic writing processes for college students.

Finally, there is the need to allocate time for L2 learners to reflect, which is a vital part of learning academic writing skills. According to Ping Wang (2011, p.275), "It is much more important to let the students know about their own learning style if they are to take responsibility of their learning process". This highlights the strong bond between reflection as a metacognitive activity and learner autonomy. In addition, L2 learners of academic writing need to be well versed and acquainted with the criteria used to assess their writing. In the absence of this awareness, all feedback provided by the instructor would be less effective and productive. Becker (2016) demonstrates this in his study which revealed that asking L2 learners to develop and apply a rubric to their writing has a constructive effect on the writing performance.

Conflict of Interest: The author reported no conflict of interest.

Data Availability: All of the data are included in the content of the paper.

Funding Statement: The author did not obtain any funding for this research.

References:

1. Abu Shakra, Z. (2008). 'A review of sociocultural theory in the field of second language acquisition', Language Acquisition, Vol. 9.
2. Abu Shakra, Z. (2013). 'Towards greater autonomy in feedback on writing tasks,' European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 30 May 2013.
3. Andrade, H. G. (2005). Teaching with Rubrics: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. College Teaching, 53 (1), 27-30.
4. Becker, A. (2016). 'Student-generated scoring rubrics: Examining their formative value for improving ESL students' writing performance,' Assessing Writing Volume 29, July 2016, Pages 15-24

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

5. Benaissi, F. (2016). 'Autonomy in foreign language learning and teaching: A culture bound concept', Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), Vol. 6, No. 1, P. 409-414
6. Bloome, D. & Puro, P. (2014). 'Procedural display and classroom lessons' 15 December http://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1989.11075331
7. Bloome, D. (1986). Building Literacy and the Classroom Community. Theory into Practice, Vol.25, p.71-76.
8. Burton, D. (1981). Analysing Spoken Discourse, in R. Coulthard and M. Montgomery, (eds.) Studies in Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, p. 61-81.
9. Daflizar Sulistiyo, U. & Kamil, D. (2022). Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students. LEARN Journal: Language
10. Education and Acquisition Research Network, 15(1), 257-281.
11. DiCamilla, F. & Anton, M. (1997). 'Repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners: A Vygotskian perspective.' Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol.53, No.4, p.609-33.
12. Edwards, D. & Mercer, N. (1987). Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom. London: Routledge.
13. Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). Analysing Casual Conversation. London: Cassell.
14. Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R., & Wofersberger, M. (2010). "Contextualizing Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing Pedagogy." Language Teaching Research, 14, 445–463.
15. Gama, C. (2004). 'Integrating metacognition instruction in interactive learning environments'. Thesis submitted for the Degree of D. Phil at the University of Sussex, December 2004.
16. Greenback, P. & Penketh, C. (2009). 'Student autonomy and reflections on researching and writing the undergraduate dissertation.' Journal of Further and Higher Education. Vol. 33, No. 4:463-472.
17. Holec, H. (1981). 'Autonomy and foreign language learning.' Open Journal of Modern Linguistics. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press.
18. Hyland, F. (2000). 'ESL writers and feedback: giving more autonomy to students.' Language Teaching Research. 4, 1: 33-54
19. Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). 'Feedback on second language students' writing.' Language Teaching, Vol. 39:83-101.
20. Knoblauch, C.H. & Brannon, L. (1984). Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

21. Kunschak, C. (2007). 'Forms of feedback in the writing classroom: steps toward autonomy.' Paper presented at Independent Learning Association 2007 Japan Conference: Exploring theory, enhancing practice. Kanda University of International Studies. Chiba, Japan, October 2007.
22. Lantolf, J.P. & Pavlenko, A. (1995). 'Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition.' Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol.15, p.108-24.
23. Li, L. (2017). Social Interaction and Teacher Cognition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
24. Little, D. (2020). 'Language learner autonomy: Rethinking language teaching', Cambridge Core, Cambridge University Press 2020.
25. Little, D. (2004). 'Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy and the European Language Portfolio,' UNTELE, Universite de Compiegne, 17-20 March 2004.
26. Little, D. (1991). Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues, and Problems. Dublin: Authentik.
27. Marantika, J. (2021). 'Metacognitive ability and autonomous learning strategy in improving learning outcomes,' Journal of Education and Learning (Edulearn), v15 n1, February 2021.
28. Mercer, N. (1998). 'Development through dialogue: a socio-cultural perspective on the process of being educated'. In A.C. Quelhas and F. Pereira (eds) Cognition and Context, Lisboa, Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada.
29. Mickwitz, A. & Suojala, M. (2020) "Learner autonomy, self-regulation skills and self-efficacy beliefs - how can students' academic writing skills be supported?" Language Learning in Higher Education, Vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 381–402, 2020.
30. Moore, A. (2012). Teaching and Learning: Pedagogy, Curriculum and Culture. UK: Routledge.
31. Muncie, J. (2000). 'Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes,' ELT Journal, Volume 54, Issue 1, January 2000, Pages 47–53.
32. Murphy, T. & Jacobs, G. (2000). 'Encouraging critical collaborative autonomy', JALT Journal 22 (2) 228-244.
33. Mynard, Jo. (2019). 'Learner autonomy: Research and practice, humanizing language teaching by pilgrims,' Year 21, Issue 2, ISSN 1755-9715., Instill Education Limited, Oxford, UK.
34. Popham, J. (2018). Assessment Literacy: The What, the Why, and the How. Alexandria,Virginia: ASCD

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

35. Schinke-Llano, L. (1993). 'On the value of a Vygotskian framework for SLA theory and research'. Language Learning, Vol.43, No.1, p.121-129.
36. Scharff, L., Daeger, J., Verpoorten, D., Devin, H., Dvorakova, L.S., Lodge, J.H., et al. (2017). 'Exploring metacognition as support for learning transfer.' Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 5(1), 1-14
37. Sercu, L. (2002). 'Autonomous learning and the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence'. Language, Culture, and Curriculum 15/1:61-74.
38. Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R. (1975). Towards an Analysis of Discourse. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
39. Swibel, D. (2020). 'Instructional scaffolding in online education: What is it and how to do it right?' https://frp.newrow.com/instructional-scaffolding-in-online-education/ , Newrow, Kaltura, Inc. Retrieved August 2020.
40. Thanasoulas, D. (2000). 'What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered?'. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.VI, No. 11, November.
41. Vincent, B. & Preshous, A. (2019). 'Talking Heads: exploring the impact of feedback on writing using screencasts' Conference: BALEAP Conference: Innovation, Exploration and Transformation. At University of Leeds.
42. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
43. Wang, P. (2011). 'Constructivism and Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: To what Extent does Theory Inform Practice?' Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1(3), pp. 273-277. 10.4304/TPLS.1.3.273-277
44. Wilson, M. (2018). Rethinking Rubrics in Writing Assessment. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
45. Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). 'The role of tutoring in problem solving'. Journal of Child Psychology, Vol.17, p.89-100.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

APPENIX 2: NOTES ON CODING SCHEME

1. Column 1 represents the speech turns.
2. Column 2 represents the speakers involved in the discussion.
3. Column 3 represents the Moves using the following labels*:

FR	**Framing**	**S**	**Supporting**	**BO**	**Bound-opening**
FO	**Focusing**	**RO**	**Re-opening**		
O	**Opening**	**C**	**Challenging**		

*The above labels are taken directly from Burton (1981:69-72).

4. Column 4 represents the Speech Acts using the following labels*:

m	**marker**	**con**	**conclusion**
sum	**summons**	**accn**	**accusation**
^	**silent stress**	**ack**	**acknowledge**
s	**starter**	**ex**	**excuse**
ms	**metastatement**	**pr**	**preface**
i	**informative**	**p**	**prompt**
el	**elicitation**	**acct**	**accept**
d	**directive**	**rep**	**reply**
rea	**react**	**com**	**comment**

*The above labels are taken directly from Burton (1981:76-78).

5. Speech Acts are separated by slashes.
5. Dotted lines mark exchange boundaries.
6. Double bold lines mark transaction boundaries.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

APPENIX 2: NOTES ON CODING SCHEME

1. Column 1 represents the speech turns.

2. Column 2 represents the speakers involved in the discussion.

3. Column 3 represents the moves using the following labels*:

FR	**Framing**	**S**	**Supporting**	**BO**	**Bound-opening**
FO	**Focusing**	**RO**	**Re-opening**		
O	**Opening**	**C**	**Challenging**		

*The above labels are taken directly from Burton (1981, p.69-72).

4. Column 4 represents the speech acts using the following labels*:

m	**marker**	**con**	**conclusion**
sum	**summons**	**accn**	**accusation**
^	**silent stress**	**ack**	**acknowledge**
s	**starter**	**ex**	**excuse**
ms	**metastatement**	**pr**	**preface**
i	**informative**	**p**	**prompt**
el	**elicitation**	**acct**	**accept**
d	**directive**	**rep**	**reply**
rea	**react**	**com**	**comment**

*The above labels are taken directly from Burton (1981, p.76-78).

5. Speech acts are separated by slashes.

6. Dotted lines mark exchange boundaries.

7. Double bold lines mark transaction boundaries.

APPENIX 2: TRANSCRIPT FOR CONFERENCE C

Conference C: Revision of Introduction for Comparison and Contrast Essay

T: Teacher

A: Adam (student)

I. PROBLEM ANALYSIS AND EXPLORATION OF SOLUTION

1.	T	FO O	ms s el	Let's start with a question./ My question is/ when were you asked to find similarities and differences between two things?
2.	A	C	rep	When?
3.	T	S	i	Anytime.
4.	A	S	rep	On Wednesday last week.
5.	T	S	acct p	Last week/ What for?
6.	A	S	rep i	In Science for my assignment./ I had to compare two organisms.
7.	T	BO	el	To find similarities and differences?
8.	A	S	rep	Yeah both.
9.	A	S	rep	Last month also I was working on finding similarities and differences.
10.	T	C	i	In?
11.	A	S	rep	History class.
12.	T	S C	acct i	OK./ I didn't understand what you said (A mumbles something which can't be heard).
13.	A	S	rep	It was 2 famous figures in the French revolution.
14.	T	S	ack	OK./

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

		m	Now/
	BO	s	when you compared the two figures/
		el	did you find similarities or differences?
15. A	S	rep	It was both.
16. T	S	acct	Both, OK.
17. A	S	rep	I also had to compare 2 phones with my friend.
18. T	S	acct	Alright.
19. A	S	i	To see which one I am going to buy.
20. T	S	ack	OK./
	BO	el	What is comparing two things called?
21. A	C	rep	I don't get it.
22. T	RO	p	What do you call it when you find differences?
23.A	S	rep	Contrast.
24. T	S	acct	Contrast./
		p	and when you find similarities?
25.A	S	rep	(mumbling; not clear.)
26. T	C	p	What did you say?
27. A	S	rep	Comparison.
28. T	S	acct	Comparison?

II. RELATION TO PREVIOUS LEARNING

……

	O	m	Now./
		s	we do these two things all the time whether we realize it or are aware of this or not./
		el	but when it comes to writing, if you were asked to make a comparison or a contrast between two courses, for example, how would you do that?
29. A	S	rep	You find similarities and differences.
		el	Is that what your mean?
30. T	S	acct	Yes./

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

		p	but what if you take any topic; take the topic you had last week which was comparing….
31. A	S	rep	Two figures in the French revolution.
32. T	S	acct	The 2 figures./
		m	OK./
	BO	el	If you had to find similarities and differences between those two, what was the point you were trying to make in your essay?
33. A	S	rep	Which one played a bigger role in the French revolution.
34. T	S	acct	Alright./
		el	How about the 2 phones?/
		p	If you were writing an essay about that, how would you start?
35. A	S	rep	The storage space in each phone.
36. T	S	acct	OK./
	C	p	but what would be the aim of all this?
37. A	S	rep	To choose one.
		el	Is it to see which one is better?
38. T	S	acct	To see which is better./
		m	OK/
		p	so what is the point of all this?
39. A	S	rep	Deciding which is better.
40. T	S	acct	Deciding which is better./

……

III. PINPOINTING THE PROBLEM

	O	m	Now/
		s	one reason we compare and contrast in writing is to choose which thing is better./
		el	Is there another reason for comparing and contrasting?
41. A	S	rep	To make (unclear).
42. T	C	p	Make decisions?
43. A	S	rep	Make a choice.
44. T	S	acct	Make a choice./

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

		m	Alright/
		con	choose which is better/
	BO	el	or why else would we do this?/
		p	Think about it: if you're showing that two things have similarities, how is that important?/
		p	Why would that be something necessary?
45. A	S	rep	To see which is better.
46. T	S	acct	To see which is better.
47. A	S	rep	To also see how they differ.
		el	Does that mean I have to do both?
48. T	S	acct	Yes./
		s	Two things that everybody thinks are similar, you may show are actually different./

……

	O	el	What else could we do then?/
		p	You can find which is better or….?
49. A	S	rep	How they are different.
50. T	C	p	So what? In that case…you are proving that ….?
51. A	S	rep	What are the disadvantages.
52.T	S	m	Well/
		i	that's related to the first point./
		ms	I'll write all this down./
		s	You can have three purposes. The first would be which is better./
		m	OK/
		el	What would the second one be?
52. A	S	rep	Which one is worse.
		el	Is that the same as comparing and contrasting?
54. T	S	I	Same thing, which is better or worse./
		p	What else?
55. A	S	rep	You're choosing.
55. T	S	I	Same thing./
		com	You're making a choice; deciding which is better or worse./
		p	What else can you do?
		sum	Adam/
		p	you just said it.

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

56. A	C	rep	I did?
57. T	S	acct	Yes.
58. A	S	rep	Um, find the differences; how they are different.
59. T	S	acct	Alright./
		p	You can find the differences but….
61. A	S	rep	They're the same.
62. T	S	acct	They're similar./
		con	So, if you have two things that are similar you try to show that they're different./
		el	Take two iphones for example.
63. A	S	rep	They're the same.
64. T	S	acct	OK. They're the same./
	C	p	But…
65. A	S	rep	They have similarities but they can also have differences.
66. T	S	acct	They're also different./
	BO	el	So, what would #3 be?/
		p	If #2 is we are choosing two things that are similar and we are trying to find differences, what would #3 be?/
67. A	S	rep	The same.
68. T	C	p	Two things that appear different….
69. A	S	rep	Find out how they are the same.
70. T	S	el	Can you give me an example?
71. A	S	rep	Friends.
72. T	C	i	No./
		p	Give me an example of two writing topics that everybody thinks are different and you prove are similar.
73. A	S	rep	A Samsung and an iphone.
74. T	S	acct	Samsungs and iphones OK./

 ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431

		con	Everybody thinks they're different phones and you will try to prove that they're similar./
		m	So/
		el	What is the conclusion we are reaching here?
75. A	S	rep	You have to make a statement.
		el	So how can I add this to my writing later?
76. T	S	acct	You have to have a point to prove./
		el	So comparison and contrast in itself is?
		i	If we're just comparing and contrasting, its pointless so we would have to do something./
		com	Either make a choice or else prove that 2 things thought similar are different or 2 things thought different are similar./
	FO	con	Otherwise, you are going to run into a problem and the reader wouldn't know./
		el	Do you get the aim behind all this/
77. A	S	rep	Yeah.

……

78. T	O	m	Now/
		el	Where can you put that purpose in your essay?
79. A	S	rep	In the introduction
80. T	S	acct	OK/
		el	Where in the introduction?
81. A	S	rep	In the thesis statement.
82. T	S	acct	Alright/
		i	You would have one focused purpose there./