“What do you mean I Wrote a C Paper?” Writing, Revision, and Self-Regulation

2015 CELT Vol. VIII
celt.uwindsor.ca
www.stlhe.ca

Mark Feltham
Fanshawe College

Colleen Sharen
Brescia University College

Students often express surprise at their grades on papers. This gap between expectation and achievement may stem in part from lack of facility with revision strategies. How, then, can teachers work with their students to foster more effective revisions? This question in teaching and learning has inspired an interdisciplinary collaboration: one of us is a management and leadership professor (Sharen), and the other is an English/communication professor (Feltham). In this essay, we describe a research study from winter 2013 in which we explored how a series of interventions improved students' mindsets about the process of drafting and revising reports for a second-year-university course entitled "Women and Leadership." After outlining key aspects of this study that we feel are of general interest, we then present a series of reflective suggestions about how to teach revision derived from both our experiences and a selective survey of the literature on both revision and self-regulation.

Introduction

Revision and its discontents

In May 2014, we conducted a workshop based on an early draft of this paper at the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) conference. During this workshop, we asked participants whether their students' inability to revise written work created gaps between student expectation and achievement. Most hands shot up. We then asked them whether they explicitly integrated revision into their teaching. Significantly fewer hands went up. These informal polls reflect a situation all too familiar to teachers: students do not always revise effectively, and teachers aren't always sure how (or whether) to address the problem. These gaps in student knowledge and pedagogy can create additional gaps between what teachers expect from the students and the actual results and also between the grades students expect and the ones that they actually receive. Our awareness of these problems has inspired a small-scale study, the aforementioned conference session, and now, this essay.

We think of our study and our ongoing conversations about it as inner and outer frames for this essay. The inner frame includes what we did, why we did it, and what we learned. Initially, we asked these research questions: to what degree do students view their writing skills as fixed or subject to growth, and does this mindset itself change as a result of classroom interventions involving revision? Would experiencing a mandatory, revision-friendly scaffold show students the benefits of revision and thus begin to nudge them from a fixed mindset towards a growth

mindset? Is seeing believing? The outer frame involves more general questions surrounding revision and its integration into courses of all sorts. Specifically, our initial study involved action research to address whether students viewed writing and revision in terms of a fixed mindset or a growth mindset. This narrower set of questions, however, leads outwards into broader questions about revision, how to adapt what we've learned to assignment design and assessment, and what we might do better next time. In what follows, we invite readers to share in these ongoing reflections, and we hope, to be inspired to "try this at home" with their students.

Visions of Revision

Uncertainties and opportunities

In light of this essay's reflective focus, we have not conducted the same level of literature review as we would have for a more conventional scholarly paper. Nevertheless, a brief overview of some important concepts in the literature will help establish a context for our reflections in the rest of this essay.

There are several patterns in the literature on revision that parallel the uncertainty about the subject that we experienced at the conference workshop that gave rise to this paper. Certainly there is a general scholarly consensus regarding the importance of revision in the writing process: as Barkaoui (2007) notes after citing numerous sources going back decades (Faigley & Witte, 1981; Sommers, 1980; Witte, 1985; Zamel, 1982), "good writers seem to revise at all stages of the writing process as they generate, reevaluate, reformulate, and refine their writing goals" (p. 81). Despite this widespread recognition of the importance of revision, considerable variation in (Whitney et al., 2008) and even ambiguity about (Witte, 2013) the teaching of revision remains.

Some of this variation and ambiguity likely stems from the complex nature of revision itself, which as Witte points out, is a "slow, arduous, laborious, and complex task in which one must reflect over time on a piece of writing and the changes that might be needed" and is thus "a difficult process to teach and model" (p. 34). Witte (2013), following Sommers (1980), offers this useful definition of revision: "a sequence of changes in a composition, in which ideas, words, and phrases are added, deleted, moved, or changed throughout the writing of the work" (p. 34). Why is such a seemingly straightforward process so fraught with problems?

Few processes work well when people dislike them, and students and non-students alike sometimes dislike revising. Witte (2013), discussing comments from a focus group of largely secondary-school teachers participating in her study of revision, goes so far as to refer to "revision aversion" (p. 42). She quotes one "high-school English teacher" who reported that when "I say 'revision' [. . .] they go 'ugh'"; this same teacher also describes students as "squeamish" about revision (p. 42). This aversion may, in turn, relate back to the definition of revision itself. Although Witte's working definition includes all features of a text, not just surface ones, some students and teachers conceive of revision exclusively in terms of form rather than content: "editing mechanics and grammar, as opposed to really rethinking a piece of writing or thinking about what that vision for that piece of writing is" (Witte, 2013, p. 42).

Self-regulation and feedback

Certainly we do not want to extrapolate from a single teacher's comments in a focus group to general statements about all students: as Witte (2013) herself notes, her study is limited because of "self-reported data that cannot be independently verified" (p. 49). Nevertheless, having also experienced this "ugh" factor, we were intrigued by a possible connection between student unwillingness/inability to revise and the concept of self-regulation. More specifically, we wondered whether student problems with revision were an instance of Linda Nilson's (2013) more general observation that "few of our students show signs of being intentional, independent, self-directed learners" (p.1). This question led us to consider

revision in relation to the concept of self-regulation.

Self-regulation involves behaviours and processes that learners adopt to attain their learning objectives more effectively (Oxford, 2011). Although IQ appears to influence post-secondary success, self-regulation plays a significantly greater role (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007): indeed, self-regulation increases students' depth of thinking, focus, professionalism, self-reflection, and overall academic performance (Nilson, 2013). Except as otherwise cited, the following list presents traits that Zimmerman (2002) ascribes to self-regulating learners. Such learners:

- tend to set explicit personal goals, usually approach goals ("I want to learn about insects") rather than avoidance goals ("I don't want to look stupid").
- tend to identify and use a variety of specific learning strategies to attain their goals and monitor their performance to ensure that they are attaining their goals: for instance, moving to the library because they know they become distracted in the cafeteria (Burnette, O'Boyle, VanEpps, Pollack, & Finkel, 2013).
- evaluate and reflect on the effectiveness of the methods and strategies adopted.
- adjust and experiment with methods and strategies to improve performance.

Like all processes involving self-regulation, composition/revision processes involve "forethought, performance, and self-reflection" (Zimmerman, 2002, p. 67). During each of these activities, an effective self-regulator sets goals, regulates attention, checks and corrects, activates reader awareness, monitors content, monitors organization, plans, and seeks help (Kaplan, Lichtinger, & Gorodetsky, 2009).

In light of these traits and behaviors, self-regulation would seem to be a prerequisite for effective revision. In theory, self-regulation would, one would reasonably expect, inspire students to seek feedback; such feedback would, one would also reasonably expect, inspire revision. Indeed, self-regulation and feedback would seem in theory to mutually reinforce each other: self-regulation can promote effective feedback and effective feedback can in turn promote more self-regulation. Feedback can also prompt learners to engage in self-evaluation and self-reflection and ultimately to adjust and experiment with strategies to improve performance (Butler & Winne, 1995). Formative, qualitative, and open-ended feedback tends to have a greater effect than does summative, closed-ended feedback (Topping, 1998). However, learners can experience discomfort with peer feedback, due to perceived unreliability or fear of social embarrassment (Topping, 2005).

Growth or Fixed Mindset

What's the point of revising?

Self-regulation can be a necessary (but not sufficient) precondition for effective revision. The best feedback in the world won't promote effective revision if learners are unwilling or unable to engage in the revision process. A learner's ability to benefit from self-regulation and feedback, as Dweck (2006) has shown, may depend on whether he or she believes that intelligence is fixed or whether effort can improve intelligence and performance on academic tasks. Learners who have a fixed view of themselves as "smart," as Dweck (2006) further notes, often see evaluation as a threat to their identity and spend a great deal of effort defending their mindset, trapping themselves in a vicious circle in which their skills don't develop because they don't try. This circle, Dweck (2006) adds, also entraps other learners who have a fixed view of themselves as inadequate. Both types of learners tend to avoid revision, either because they see it as a threat to their sense of intelligence or because they see it as futile because of unchangeable inadequacy; both types of learners are likely to quit when faced with a challenge and less likely to work harder to succeed. In contrast, Dweck (2006) also describes how learners with a growth mindset are more likely to work hard, to persevere in the face of failure, and to self-regulate. In other words, students

who see their writing skills as fixed, with no further potential for growth, will understandably think, why bother revising at all?

Self-Regulated Revision

What we did and what we learned

Although the literature on revision tends not to address self-regulation and related concepts, these concepts speak directly to the "revision aversion" that Witte's study participants described. Our study and our subsequent discussion of it tentatively weave these diverse threads together.

Students' perception of the nature of writing talent as either fixed or subject to growth appears to influence their willingness to revise. Students with a fixed mindset have been shown to be more likely to believe achievement setbacks reflect personal ability while those with a growth mindset are more likely to believe the same setbacks reflect lack of mastery of a skill or strategy (Spinath, Spinath, Riemann, & Angleitner, 2003). Because students who view writing as an innate talent that effort won't improve would not see revision as a productive use of time, changing this mindset from a fixed to a growth perspective increases the likelihood that they will make productive efforts to revise.

Design

There were 17 participants in the study, all women taking a 13-week, second-year undergraduate course on "Women and Leadership" in winter 2013 at Brescia University College at Western University in Ontario. In this course, we developed an intervention designed to improve students' experience with feedback and revision. In a 2500-word report, students identified a gap between men and women in leadership positions and made specific recommendations about how to close this gap. To make the scenario more authentic, we asked students to imagine that they were writing this report for a senior executive in an actual organization. One of the authors (Sharen) has extensive experience as a senior executive in the private sector. As a result, we designed the assignment to mimic the process that organizations take when considering change to their human resources protocols. This design decision proceeds from the idea that the scenario should be as authentic as possible (Bean, 2011; Witte, 2013), with a specific implied audience (Witte, 2013).

Students received detailed assignment instructions and a grading rubric covering writing, information gathering and presentation, and quality of ideas. We designed this rubric to emphasize both writing and information collection to signal the importance of evidence for the assignment, which required substantial support for all recommendations. In keeping with a general emphasis on scaffolding running through the pedagogical literature, Witte (2013) notes the importance of scaffolding in relation to revision. We provided scaffolding for the assignment throughout the semester: students received six hours of classroom instruction on library research, critical thinking, writing, giving and receiving feedback, and revision strategies (see Appendices for sample materials from the study).

This instruction included:

- a one-hour workshop on library research discussing the selection of a topic, finding useful material, and assessment of the credibility of the sources.
- a second library workshop focused on information literacy, including correct approaches to citation. Our instructional librarian co-delivered these workshops.
- a one-hour workshop focused on critical thinking. Students were provided with a critical thinking primer, and then completed a critical thinking exercise, using an opinion piece, to identify common errors in critical thinking. The class then debriefed and discussed how critical thinking skills applied to the assignment.

- a workshop focused on the process of writing, discussing the ideas of purpose and audience and how these concepts influence the way in which a report is written. Students also discussed the concepts of coherence and cohesion.
- a classroom discussion about the nature of the writing process. Students were asked to develop a plan to approach this writing task and received feedback during a pair-and-share exercise.
- a one-hour feedback workshop, during which students
  - received a one-page guide to giving and receiving feedback.
  - practiced giving and receiving feedback by writing a brief one-paragraph summary of their report.
  - exchanged summaries and provided/received feedback.
  - discussed the exercise in class, focusing on appropriate and inappropriate ways to give and receive feedback.
  - received a feedback checklist to provide structure to their feedback. This checklist was reviewed in class.
- a workshop on revision strategies, including peer feedback, reading aloud, incubation, and self-questioning. We also discussed the nature of revision, placing emphasis on the idea that revision not only addresses grammar, punctuation and spelling errors, but also includes logical coherence and cohesiveness.
- information about sources of additional, one-on-one support, including the instructional librarian, the university Writing Centre, and the instructor.

Two weeks before the final due date, students exchanged drafts of their reports with two other students. Students also received a feedback checklist (see Appendices for sample checklist) to structure their suggestions. The next week, in class, students gave each other face-to-face formative feedback. Students then had one week to revise, edit, and proofread before submitting their final reports. The draft report, while not graded, was mandatory.

We chose to use a peer review rather than provide instructor formative feedback for three reasons. First, we wanted to expose students to the practice of giving and receiving feedback to build their repertoire of self-regulation strategies. Peer feedback, when supported with both in-class instruction with appropriate structure, can provide students with useful information about their work (Nilson, 2003). Second, given the length of these assignments (up to ten pages single spaced), the amount of time to provide a preliminary assessment by the instructor would have been prohibitive. Finally, we wanted to ensure that students felt safe submitting their first drafts for feedback. Although an initial formative assessment by an instructor could be valuable, we were concerned that many students would be likely to interpret a formative assessment as summative.

To determine whether students' attitudes, beliefs or behaviours changed due to this exercise, we asked students to complete a pre/post self-regulation of writing measure adapted from three existing instruments. The instrument assessed students' goals (mastery and approach goals), metacognitive strategy use, behavioural strategies, self-regulation strategies (Kaplan et al., 2009) and writing self-efficacy (Kaplan et al., 2009; Boekaerts & Rozendaal, 2007). In addition, we evaluated students' implicit beliefs about whether writing is fixed or subject to growth (Spinath et al., 2003). We administered this pre-test in the second week of classes and the post-test in the final week of classes.

To determine whether students' writing performance improved according to a more objective measure, two graders (Feltham and a graduate research assistant) graded each draft and final version using a standardized grading rubric. This rubric allocated 50 points to writing composition, 50 points to information gathering and presentation, and 70 points for the quality of ideas. Graders ensured consistency in coding by conducting training and using several papers as a pilot to ensure inter-coder reliability with the objective of attaining 90 percent grader agreement.

Where graders' evaluations differed, we used the mean score.

Results and Discussion

Students' implicit beliefs about whether writing is a fixed skill or one that can be improved with effort and practice (Spinath et al., 2003) changed significantly. Students indicated their agreement with the following statement, "How well you write depends mainly on your own effort" (1= strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree). In the pre-test students had a mean score of 2.69; in the post-test students had a mean score of 3.69, a statistically significant increase.[1] Thus, the assignment does appear to have increased students' belief in a growth mindset with respect to writing.

On average, the quality of the writing improved: the draft reports received an average score of 54.3 from the two external raters, while the final reports received an average score of 67.3, a statistically significant difference.[2] This result suggests a substantial improvement in student performance, though how much can be attributed to the peer feedback and revision assignment is debatable. Because the draft version did not receive a grade, some students may have devoted less effort to it, possibly resulting in lower draft grades and, in turn, inflating the gains between the draft and final report.

No statistically significant change occurred from the pre-test to the post-test with regard to goal setting, metacognitive strategy use, behavioural strategies, self-regulation strategies (Kaplan et al., 2009) and writing self-efficacy (Kaplan et al., 2009; Boekaerts & Rozendaal, 2007). In retrospect, the assignment focused primarily on the development of feedback and revision skills. Goal setting and metacognitive strategy use received considerably less in-class instruction, and were not directly assessed, signaling low task significance to students. Because this was a single assignment over 13 weeks, it is not surprising that beliefs and behaviours, developed over thirteen-plus years of education, did not change.

Through qualitative survey questions and in-class debriefing of the assignment, we found that students experienced several benefits from this process. They reported less procrastination and stress because they were required to submit a first draft of the report two weeks prior to the final due date. The early draft requirement, combined with the in-class workshops, gave students a strong incentive to better plan their time, starting assignments early rather than the day before they were due. They felt less anxiety about the draft report because the instructor was not reviewing the draft—only their peers saw it. Additionally, the opportunity for formative (rather than summative) feedback appeared to encourage students to provide explicit and sometimes challenging feedback.

As peer reviewers and thus members of the reading audience, students also gained perspective on the importance of audience needs and increased their willingness to accept peer feedback. They also felt more confident about their final report because they had received feedback. Finally, they reported feeling an obligation to do a thorough analysis when providing feedback to their peers, in order to ensure reciprocity: one student stated that "I felt that I had to make a big effort to do a good job, if I was going to get helpful feedback from the other person" (anonymous, personal communication, March 2013).

Although our study results are interesting, because of methodological issues, including a very small sample size of all-female students in one course at one institution, we need to reproduce our results. This article, however, is less about our data and more about what we learned along the way. Indeed, we learned on several fronts: from dialogue between two teachers with very different academic backgrounds who had never worked together before, from seeing how our ideas relate to the literature, and from observing the actual revision behaviors of the

[1] ($p<0.0239$, $t=2.5131$, $df=15$, standard error of difference=0.0389).

[2] ($p<0.001$, $N= 17$, $t=6.4872$, $df=16$, standard error of difference=2.000).

students in the study. Along the way, we learned to revise some of our beliefs and practices as well.

Please Try This at Home

Some strategies for improving student revision

This final section merges our experiences with references to the literature on both revision and self-regulation to provide suggestions for helping students revise more effectively, thus avoiding variations on the question in our title.

Suggestion #1:
Talk your way out of your disciplinary circle

This entire project arose from a chance conversation in a coffee shop in downtown London, Ontario. We have both been regulars there for years, and, realizing we were both teachers, we began talking about pedagogy. Although one of us teaches management and leadership and is familiar with the literature on self-regulation (Sharen), the other (Feltham) teaches writing and is familiar with a separate-but-closely-connected thread: the literature on revision. Our different disciplinary backgrounds shaped our study, a conference presentation, and now this essay. Such dialogue—as Witte (2013) also emphasizes—illustrates the importance of seeking advice and ideas from others, especially those outside of your normal disciplinary circle. Yet another way to break out of this circle is to participate in the vibrant, cross-disciplinary world of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL), including participating in the annual STLHE conferences.

In this spirit, suggestions from our colleagues at the 2014 STLHE conference in Kingston, Ontario are worth sharing. Table 1 summarizes some of these suggestions, which participants wrote on Post-It notes and which we then discussed as a group. We have selected, lightly edited, and streamlined these suggestions to eliminate repetition. At the time, we asked workshop participants to provide suggestions for before, during, and after the writing process, and we have reproduced these categories in Table 1.

Suggestion #2:
Build a better bookshelf

Closely following on our first suggestion, we suggest that all teachers support their own practice-derived ideas with an extensive knowledge of the relevant pedagogical literature.

For teaching writing in general, John Bean's *Engaging Ideas* (2011) has been a powerful influence; one particular strength of this book is how it carefully supports its practical suggestions with extensive citations to the pedagogical literature. In addition, Linda Nilson's *Creating Self-regulated Learners: Strategies to Strengthen Students' Self-Awareness and Learning Skills* (2013) provides practical exercises to promote self-regulated learning. To Bean's and Nilson's own observations and references we have now added all the other sources in our reference list for this article. Whether a literal bookshelf, citation-management software like Zotero (https://www.zotero.org), or even a bundle of paper files, such a bookshelf provides an ongoing, expandable list of everyday inspirations for most problems in teaching and learning, including revision. Interestingly, we designed our study instruments in 2012, before we had read some of the sources cited here (such as Witte's article). In building a better bookshelf (metaphorical or not) of useful resources from the scholarship on teaching and learning (SOTL) community, all teachers take steps towards a more robust pedagogy.

Table 1

Suggestions Regarding the Writing Process

Before Writing	While Writing	After Writing
Essay proposal	Offer bonus marks for draft submission.	Quick feedback
Group writing: students write grant proposals as a group	Provide prompts in class: e.g., this week you should be thinking about your topic.	Peer feedback on drafts, done in pairs, in class, orally
In-class examples of revisions and samples of "A" papers	Gamified online writing course: badges and analytics - give students feedback about their progress.	e-portfolio: post completed assignment, write reflection on result, use to improve next writing assignment
In-class revision workshop	Offer to look over papers for APA if handed in 1 week early.	Explicitly tell me what you think the written feedback means or suggests.
Weekly writing (2 pages) students choose best and worst and submit with explanation why [they] think so.	[Be] available for 1-1 consultation at [the students'] initiative.	Demonstrate/show examples of before/after revision.
Students are required to submit proposal topic in advance to receive feedback before they start to write essays.	Peer reviews using Turnitin—give them examples of past "good" and "less good" papers.	Evaluate and grade their own piece, provide rationale for grade.
Class-time lecture on revision strategies		Students' second writing assignment is assigned marks for using the feedback from the first assignment=reward the students reading feedback.
Suggest students use the student resource center to get help with writing process.		
Provide a detailed rubric		
Writing portfolio mini-assignments (3) early in term		

Suggestion #3:
When In doubt, read and revise your own instructions

Assignment design is critical to a successful intervention. Clear instructions and learning outcomes, as well as check- in points, feedback, scaffolding and very specific rubrics all contributed to an effective learning experience. In particular, the rubric clearly communicated task significance to the students, as it was focused on composition, information gathering, and presentation.

Suggestion #4:
Break the surface

Our approach to revision focused on the organization and presentation of information to a specific audience, rather than on spelling, grammar, and punctuation. This approach changed students' level of engagement with the process. Rather than seeing the revision process as pedantic exercise in spelling, grammar, and punctuation, a danger that Witte (2013) discusses extensively, students were able to focus on effectively communicating their ideas to an audience. In so doing, we feel they became more likely to see the benefits of their efforts and thus, began to experience a change in mindset.

Suggestion #5:
Teach them how to teach each other and provide time to do it

Witte (2013) quotes one participant in her study who stated that "I revise very little, but if I do, it is from peer suggestion" (p. 41). Witte cites various specific techniques, including "incubation" and revision based on peer feedback. We devoted significant in-class time to each stage of the writing process and to an extensive debrief of the research showing that writing and revision processes improve the likelihood of student success. As Topping (2005) has suggested, the peer component provided social incentives to draft both early and deeply: the mere expectation by students of having to discuss their ideas in an in-class workshop increased the likelihood that students completed the work in advance. The structure of the assignment and accompanying scaffolding created a "forced" form of self-regulation. In fact, the in-class workshops modeled self-regulation strategies for students, pacing their work on the assignment throughout the semester. We addressed student concerns about the feedback process (Topping, 2005) by providing a workshop about giving and receiving feedback, providing a feedback rubric, and by ensuring that the feedback was formative.

Suggestion #6:
Design in (but don't bake in) authenticity, flexible peer review, and incentives

This suggestion acknowledges the importance of the audience: "[w]hen teachers can build an authentic audience into an assignment, even if the audience is just other classmates, students begin to see themselves as writers with an audience rather than students with teachers" (Witte, 2013, p. 48). Students particularly related to the idea that the report reflected a "real world" work assignment focused on the attempt to change the current under-representation of women in leadership roles. By identifying a specific audience (senior executives from different sectors), the assignment instructions led students to perceive the scenario as more authentic. In addition, through the peer-review process, students had a second "authentic" audience: their peers. This peer review helped them integrate the feedback they received: as one student noted, "If my peer who has studied this stuff doesn't get it, you can be sure that a senior executive, who may not be as engaged in the topic, wouldn't understand what I was trying to say" (anonymous, personal communication, March 2013). We would add one cautionary note: don't bake your design so deeply into your courses that approaches become inflexible and change becomes arduous.

Suggestion #7:
Look Back; Then Look Ahead

There usually will be something you missed. For example, when we were reviewing the final papers, we

observed students did not use headings, sub-headings, bolding, capitalization, or bullet points to provide direction to the audience. More specific instruction regarding these points and inclusion in the rubric (to signal their significance to students) is likely necessary. With respect to graphic presentation skills, we plan to include a short in-class workshop to address this gap.

Suggestion #8: Keep your own drafts and use them as models in your classes

In the spirit of our penultimate suggestion, our final one is something we have not yet tried but plan to try in the future. It follows directly on the title of Witte's essay, "Preaching What We Practice." Because many teachers, especially in post-secondary education, are likely to write on the same subjects that they're teaching, making their own composition and revision processes part of their courses provides an unmatched opportunity to simultaneously address relevant course content and integrate work on revision skills, thus, in Witte's words, preaching what they practice.

Conclusion

Living in a world of revision

"We live", as Witte (2013) puts it, "in a world of revision" (p. 33). Because it is a truth almost universally acknowledged that writing is a crucial skill, it stands to reason that revision, as a key component of writing, shares this importance: from architects to zoologists, virtually all professionals must write, and to write is to revise. Viewed against the larger backdrop of education itself, moreover, revision takes on even greater importance. As Dr. Eric Mazur states in the STLHE (2014) conference video, "the true hallmark of education is giving people the skills that are necessary to solve the unsolved problems, to answer the unanswered," and revision is one of these skills. As such, we see this essay as part of the larger ongoing conversation about how, as educators, we can best foster these skills. Seeing, in this sense, is believing: if we help students see their underlying potential for skills growth, we also help them believe in their ability, as Mazur puts it, to solve the unsolved and answer the unanswered.

References

Barkaoui, K. (2007). Revision in second language writing: what teachers need to know. *TESL Canada Journal*, *25*(1), 81–92. Retrieved from http://www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/view/109

Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boekaerts, M., & Rozendaal, J. S. (2007). New insights into the self-regulation of writing skills in secondary vocational education. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology*, *215*, 164–173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409.215.3.164

Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E. H., VanEpps, E. M., Pollack, J. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Mind-sets matter: A meta-analytic review of implicit theories and self-regulation. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*, 655. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029531

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 245-281. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 1087–

1101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: the new psychology of success* (1st ed.). New York: Random House.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 400-414. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/356602

Kaplan, A., Lichtinger, E., & Gorodetsky, M. (2009). Achievement goal orientations and self-regulation in writing: An integrative perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*, 51-69. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013200

Nilson, L. B. (2003). Improving student peer feedback. *College Teaching*, *51*, 34–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87567550309596408

Nilson, L. B. (2013). *Creating self-regulated learners: Strategies to strengthen students' self-awareness and learning skills*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Language learning strategies. (Applied Linguistics in Action)*. Harlow, England ; New York: Longman.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, *31*, 378-388. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/356588

STLHE, (2014). *STLHE 2014: Transforming our Learning Experiences*. [Video File]. Retrieved from http://www.queensu.ca/stlhe2014/stlhe2014

Spinath, B., Spinath, F. M., Riemann, R., & Angleitner, A. (2003). Implicit theories about personality and intelligence and their relationship to actual personality and intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*, 939–951. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00310-0

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*, 249–276. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543068003249

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational Psychology*, *25*, 631–645. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410500345172

Whitney, A., Blau, S., Bright, A., Cabe, R., Dewar, T., Levin, J., & Rogers, P. (2008). Beyond strategies: Teaching practice, writing process, and the influence of inquiry. *English Education*, *40*, 201–230.

Witte, S. (2013). Preaching what we practice: A study of revision. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *6*(2), 33–59. http://www.joci.ecu.edu/index.php/JoCI/article/view/214

Witte, S. P. (1985). Revising, composing theory, and research design. In S.W. Freedman (Ed.), *The acquisition of written language: Response and revision* (pp. 250-284). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16*, 195-209. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586792

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*, 64–70. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

Biographies

Mark Feltham holds a PhD in English from The University of Western Ontario. He has taught at Fanshawe College in London, Ontario, Canada since 2005.

Colleen Sharen is an Associate Professor of Management and Organizational Studies at Brescia University College in London, Ontario, Canada. Her research interests include teaching and learning in a post-secondary context and women's leadership.

Appendix A
Assignment Instructions

Closing the Gap Report

You will identify an issue that you believe causes a gap between women's and men's participation in leadership roles, preparing a report to the senior decision-makers in an organization, such as a CEO, Executive Director, or Cabinet Minister. Your report will recommend which approaches to closing the leadership gap are most effective.

You will

1. provide evidence that the gap exists.
2. discuss what approaches, if any, have been taken to close the gap by other people, communities or organizations.
3. assess the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.
4. draw conclusions with respect to the effectiveness of various approaches.
5. recommend the most effective approaches.

Objectives

Upon successful completion of this assignment students will be able to

1. identify a gap between men and women that reduces the likelihood that women will participate in leadership roles, using examples to illustrate the gap.
2. provide evidence that that gap exists.
3. explain why the gap exists.
4. identify and describe various approaches used to close this gap. If few approaches have been attempted, discuss the possible reasons for the absence of action.
5. evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the identified approaches.
6. recommend the most effective methods to close the gap, using SMART recommendations (specific, measurable, achievable, related and timely).
7. use library information effectively to support your claims.
8. practice providing performance feedback to others.
9. practice receiving performance feedback.

Assessment

This assignment is worth 30% of your course grade.

Grading Rubric

In general the final report grading will consider the quality of

Your ideas	70 marks
Your information gathering & presentation	50 marks
Your writing	50 marks

Your report should include a minimum of ten credible sources of information, at least three of which are peer-reviewed sources. You should use evidence and examples to support your claims. Your recommendations should be specific, measurable, achievable, related and timely (SMART).

A detailed explanation of the expectations for the report is available in the assignment rubric on OWL. I strongly recommend that you read the rubric carefully before you begin your assignment.

Process

Students will submit first drafts of their reports two week before the final due date. Students will exchange reports, reading them and providing suggestions for improvement the following week in class, and will provide the other students with a brief written summary of their feedback, along with feedback from your instructor. Students will then have one week to revise, edit and proofread their reports, prior to submitting their final report. The draft report, while not graded, is mandatory. Your final report will not be graded unless the draft report is submitted.

Resources

The Brescia Writing Centre
Joan Ellsworth
Phone: (519) 432-8353 ext 28044
Email: jellswo3@uwo.ca
Brescia Writing Centre
Room 40, St. James Building
(Take the down stairs beside McCann Student Life Centre)

The Brescia Library
Heather Campbell
Phone: (519) 432-8353 ext 28010
Email: heather.campbell@uwo.ca

APA Style Blog. (n.d.).APA Style Blog. Retrieved September 3, 2012, from http://blog.apastyle.org/

Purdue OWL. (n.d.).Purdue OWL Online Writing Lab. Retrieved September 3, 2012, from http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/

The Clever Researcher. (n.d.). *The Clever Researcher*. Retrieved September 3, 2012, from http://beryliveylibrary.wordpress.com/

Report Requirements

Ensure that your report

- is between 3500 and 5000 words, excluding title page, table of contents, exhibits and references
- is single spaced
- has been submitted with two hard copies of both draft and final versions
- has been submitted to Turnitin (final version only)
- uses 12 point Times or Times New Roman font
- uses one inch margins
- has page numbers

- has a title page with your name, student number and project title
- is stapled, do not use plastic report covers
- uses APA 6th ed citation format (check BUC library for info sheet, or online)

All academic integrity policies of Brescia University College apply to this assignment.

Deadlines

	Due Date	Submission Format	Grading
Draft Report	March 27/13 at the beginning of class	2 hard copies	Feedback only
Written Feedback Summary	April 3/13 at the beginning of class	2 hard copies	None; providing feedback to your peers using feedback checklist available on OWL
Final Report	April 10/13 at the beginning of class	2 hard copies; Turnitin	See Grading Rubric on OWL

Important information:

- You are required to submit an identical copy of the assignment to Turnitin.com before the beginning of class the day that the paper is due.
- Failure to submit to Turnitin before the beginning of class on the day the paper is due will result in a "0" for the assignment.
- No extensions will be granted, unless a student obtains an academic accommodation from their home faculty.
- Late submissions will not be accepted and will result in a "0" for the assignment, unless the student has an academic accommodation from their home faculty.

Appendix B

Giving and Receiving Feedback Handout for In-Class Exercise

Ground Rules for Giving and Receiving Feedback

- Read a draft all the way through **before** you begin to comment on it.
- Give yourself **enough time** to read and respond.
- If something on the feedback form is unclear, **ask the instructor**.
- Point out the **strengths** of the draft.
- When discussing areas that need improvement, be nice. Offer **appropriate, constructive comments** from a reader's point of view.
- Make comments **text-specific**, referring specifically to the writer's draft (NO "rubber stamps" such as "awkward" or "unclear" or "vague," which are too general to be helpful).
- **Don't overwhelm the writer** with too much commentary. Stick to the major issues on the feedback form that are problematic.
- Make sure your suggestions are **reasonable** (i.e., don't suggest that they totally rewrite the paper because you didn't agree with the author's point of view or didn't like the topic).
- If something appears too complicated to write in the commentary, just mention that you have something that you would like to talk to the writer about when you discuss the draft afterwards.
- Before giving your written comments to the author, **reread your comments to make sure they are clear and make sense**.

"As a peer reviewer, your job is not to provide answers. You raise questions; the writer makes the choices. You act as a mirror, showing the writer how the draft looks to you and pointing our areas which need attention." - Sharon Williams

APPROPRIATE, CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS

- **Be respectful and considerate** of the writer's feelings.
- **Use "I" statements**.
- **Offer suggestions, not commands.**
- **Raise questions** from a reader's point of view, points that may not have occurred to the writer.
- Phrase comments **clearly and carefully** so that the writer can easily understand what needs to be improved.
- Make sure comments are **constructive and specific** (not "This paper is confusing. It keeps saying the same things over and over again" but rather "It sounds like paragraph five makes the same point as paragraphs 2 and 3.").
- Avoid turning the writer's paper into YOUR paper.

Final tip: Although it might not be on the feedback form, you can always ask the writer if there is something he or she wants you to comment specifically on in the paper. (This is related to developing writing awareness and self-assessment - see Writing Matters #5 for more information on this topic).

Source: Manoa Writing Program, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/mwp/faculty/teaching-tips/syllabus-design/writing-activities/peer-review#facilitate (sourced on March 27, 2013)

Appendix C
Best Practices Pair and Share: Getting Feedback on Your Ideas

Best Practices Sharing Exercise: Writing Your Report

Instructions:

Get into pairs - preferably with someone that you do not know well.

Each of you will have 7 minutes to discuss your research project. Your partner will interview you about your project and you will interview her/him about their project. The interviewer's job is to keep you on task, focused on your project. The questions below are for the interviewer to guide the conversation if you get stuck.

After you have been interviewed, you might ask for help, or for feedback on your idea.

Don't look at your drafts or notes, just share in a conversation what topic and research question you are going to address.

Questions:

1. What gap is your paper going to address?
2. Why is this gap controversial or otherwise problematic? Why is it significant? Show me what makes this a good gap to address.
3. What is your solution to close this gap? (If the writer doesn't have a good thesis statement yet, go on to the next question and then come back to this one. Perhaps you can help the writer figure out a thesis.)
4. Talk me through your whole argument or at least explain your ideas so far. (As you interview your writer, get her to do most of the talking; however, you can respond to the writer by offering suggestions, bringing up additional ideas, playing devil's advocate, and so forth.)

Source: Adapted from Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix D
Exercise: What is Critical Thinking?

Source: Dyer, Linda. (2006). *Critical thinking for business students*. Captus Press.

Critical thinking is a process we use to evaluate beliefs, arguments and ideas. The process consists of five parts:

- Central Claims
- Quality of evidence
- Underlying assumptions and values
- Causal claims
- Persuasive techniques

Central claims

The main conclusion that an author is persuading you to accept. There are two types of claims.

Uncontested claims are those claims that we have actually experienced or that are based on clear and shared facts, agreement between experts, or technical or mathematical proofs.

Contestable claims are all other claims, which require tests of their validity using critical thinking.

Evidence

Evidence is a collection of facts that help us evaluate the validity of an argument. We need to evaluate the quality of evidence using the following factors:

1. Accuracy - use proxies for accuracy - e.g. grammar, spelling, precision, etc.
2. Precision - Over or under-precision detracts from credibility of evidence.
3. Sufficiency - is there enough data or a large enough sample to justify the claim?
4. Representativeness - is the information representative of the situation. How was the information gathered?
5. Authority - does the information come from experts?
6. Clarity of expression - is the significance of the data clearly stated? Is it misrepresented? How is the information interpreted?

Underlying assumptions

Found in the gap between claims and evidence. Usually these assumptions are implicit, that is, they are assumed and unconscious.

An example of an underlying assumption is that capitalism or for profit businesses are always more efficient than government. In other words, they are a set of beliefs about reality (often shared beliefs in a culture).

To identify an underlying assumption, ask, What might be true if this claim is to follow from the evidence? Could someone believe this evidence and still disagree with the claim?

e.g. Evidence: only 20% of members of parliament are female.
Claim: Therefore women are disadvantaged in electoral leadership.

You can believe the evidence, yet if you hold an underlying assumption that women don't run for office because they don't aspire to political leadership, you can refute the claim.

Reality assumptions: beliefs about what has taken place, what exists or how the world works. To challenge reality assumptions, need to present information showing the error in the assumption using evidence or facts.

Value assumptions are ideals about how things should be. To challenge these assumptions, need to challenge the authors belief that their values are universal.

Causal Claims

Causal claims argue that certain factors cause certain outcomes. (Cause and effect). They explain why something happens. However, causal explanations are often inferred when they aren't merited. Just because two things happen at the same time, doesn't mean that one causes the other. (e.g. more profitable firms do more training and development - does this mean that T&D make you more successful? Or does it mean that because you are more profitable, you have more money for T&D?

Explanations after the fact - assumes that after something is introduced, that the change must be because of the introduction, not some other intervening factor.

Persuasion techniques

1. Anticipate and counter argue readers' objections
2. Anticipate suggestions of a rival cause to explain the outcomes
3. Present negative evidence
4. Provide evidence for your debatable assumptions
5. Limit your claims when you have no rebuttal

Read the article "Are women better leaders for modern organizations" and answer the following questions:

1. What is the central claim of the article?
2. Evaluate the quality of the claims made in the article.
3. Identify any underlying assumptions and the impact they have on the claims.
4. Identify any causal claims that are inappropriately applied.
5. Identify any persuasive techniques used

Appendix E

DOL 2233 Women In Leadership
Closing the Leadership Gap Assignment Fall 2013

Student Name: Report Title:

	Writing											Weight	Total
Organization of Ideas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1.5	
	Ideas are not in a logical order; sections are not consistent with the overall intent of the report				Ideas are generally presented in a logical order; sections are generally consistent with the overall intent of the report						Ideas are always presented in a logical order; sections are always consistent with the overall intent of the report		
Expression of Ideas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1.5	
	Ideas are expressed simplistically and/or inappropriately for the audience, and/or with little variety, using wordy or awkward phrasing and sophisticated phrasing				Ideas are generally expressed clearly, and/or appropriately for the audience, often using a variety of sentence structures, often using concise						Ideas are expressed clearly, and appropriately for the audience, using variety of sentence structures, and concise and sophisticated phrasing		
Effectiveness of Paragraphing	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Paragraphing is absent				Paragraphing is present, generally effective						Paragraphing is consistently highly effective		
Correctness of Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation (technical writing skills)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Writing is error filled				Writing has occasional serious errors or several minor errors						Writing is free of both serious and minor errors		
Writing Total													/50

	Information Gathering & Presentation											**Weight**	**Total**
Information gathered is comprehensive and relevant	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Fewer than minimum number of required sources, no peer-reviewed sources and/or sources are not relevant to the research question and/or audience				Minimum number of sources, including some peer-reviewed sources, that are relevant to the research question and audience						Exceeds minimum number of sources, including a significant number of peer-reviewed sources, that are relevant to the research question and audience		
Ideas are summarized or paraphrased properly and effectively	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0.5	
	Uses the exact words of the original, or makes minimal changes to the original				Rephrases the idea into a new form shortening it somewhat (paraphrasing) or significantly (summarizing). Idea reflects the original, and is usually clear and correct						Rephrases the idea into a new form shortening it somewhat (paraphrasing) or significantly (summarizing). Idea reflects original and is always clear and correct		
Direct quotes are used correctly and sparingly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0.5	
	Direct quotes are incorrectly presented and/or are over-used				Direct quotes are correctly presented, but are over-used						Direct quotes are correctly presented and used sparingly		
Ideas are correctly cited, using APA 6th ed format	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Missing citations, and/or citations are consistently incomplete and/or incorrect, having a significant number of significant errors				All ideas from other sources are cited. Citations are usually complete and correct, with only minor errors						All ideas from other sources are cited. Citations are all complete and correct		
Use of credible sources	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Uses sources that are out of date, not peer reviewed, weak evidence, poorly collected evidence, author has little credibility sources				Generally appropriate use of sources, which are recent, peer-reviewed, strong evidence that is correctly collected, author has credibility						Consistent and appropriate use of credible sources, explanation of absence of sources or weak sources. Uses peer-reviewed		
Use of evidence and examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Rarely, if ever, appropriately uses examples or evidence to support a claim				Generally appropriate use of examples or evidence to support a claim						Consistent and appropriate use of relevant examples and or evidence to support a claim		
Information Gathering & Presentation Total													/50

	Ideas			Weight	Score
Identify a leadership gap, showing evidence that the gap exists	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10			1	
	Does not identify a gap and/or show evidence that the gap exists	Identifies a gap and provides some evidence that the gap exists	Identifies a gap and provides substantial high quality evidence that the gap exists		
Explain why the gap exists	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10			2	
	Does not explain why the gap exists	Provides an adequate explanation for the gap, with supporting evidence	Provides a thorough explanation for the gap with high quality supporting evidence		
Identify various approaches used to close this gap	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10			2	
	Does not identify approaches used to close the gap and/or discuss why attempts have not been made	Identifies and describes 3 – 5 approaches used to close the gap and/or discusses why attempts have not been made	Identifies and clearly describes 3 – 5 approaches used to close the gap, and/or discusses why attempts have not been made		
Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of approaches used to close this gap	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10			2	
	Does not evaluate strengths and/or weaknesses of the approaches used to close this gap	Adequate evaluates strengths and weaknesses of each approach.	Thoroughly evaluates strengths and weaknesses of each approach. Draws conclusions as to the most effective approaches		
Idea Total					/70

	Recommendations											Weight	Score
Concise, clear, correct	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Wordy, confusing, poor writing, and/or contain errors				Most recommendations are concise, clear, well written and contain no errors				All recommendations are concise, clear, well written and contain no errors				
Provides cost/benefit analysis	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Does not provide cost/benefit analysis				Cost/benefit analysis is incomplete and/ or inaccurate				Cost benefit analysis is thorough and accurate				
Analyzes opportunity cost	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Does not analyze opportunity cost				Analysis is incomplete and/or inaccurate				Analysis is thorough and accurate				
Specific: States the method for implementing your recommendations	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	
	Most or all recommendations are vague or incomplete				Some recommendations are vague				All recommendations are specific				
Measurable: Provides quantifiable measurement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	
	It is not possible to determine whether many or all recommendation has a successful result because there are no measurable criteria				It is possible to determine whether most recommendations have had a successful result, because there are measurable criteria				It is possible to determine whether all recommendations have had a successful result, because there are measurable criteria				
Achievable: Realistically achievable with available resources	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Does not access resources required to deliver recommendations				Assesses required resources for some recommendations; or a partial assessment				Assesses required resources thoroughly for all recommendations				
Results Oriented: the potential outcomes solve the problem in question	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	No clear linkage between recommended actions and problem in all recommendations				Weak linkage or some recommendations are missing linkage				All recos have strong linkage between recommended actions and problem				
Timely: Specific, realistic deadlines for implementation of recommendations	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	
	Deadlines not indicated				Deadlines not specific or realistic or, some missing				All recommendations have deadlines that are specific and realistic				
Recommendations total												/100	

Assignment Grade Summary		
Writing Total		/50
Information Gathering & Presentation Total		/50
Ideas Total		/70
Recommendations Total		/100
Assignment Total		/270
Penalties (if any)	No submission or late submission to turn it in, plagiarism, academic dishonesty, late submission of paper (due to academic accommodation only), other penalties as specified in comments.	
Final Assignment Total		/270

Comments/Feedback:

Appendix F

Reviewer Checklist

Author Name: Paper Title: Reviewer Name:

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Has the writer...
Organization of Ideas				checked to make sure that her ideas are logically organized?
				answered all questions in the instructions fully, in the required order?
				established the context for the paper in the introduction before moving on to the additional sections? (context includes the general issue, key terms and so on; considers the type of audience).
				included a clear roadmap in the introduction that explains the overall structure of the paper to the reader at the beginning?
				ensured that the order of topics corresponds to this roadmap?
				ensured that each section is consistent with the overall intent of this report?
				defined all terms as they are introduced?
Expression of Ideas				used a variety of sentence structures?
				ensured that these sentence structures enhance what she is trying to say?
				avoided awkward sentences and expressions?
				used clear, action verbs when possible?
				avoided wordy expressions?
				avoided unclear expressions?
				avoided cliches?
				avoided over-generalizations?
				considered the intended audience (language level, degree of expected formality, knowledge of the topic, current position on the issue)?

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Has the writer...
Effectiveness of Paragraphing				ensured paragraphs are unified? (each paragraph deals with a topic fully, but does not switch topics, mix together two topics that should be in separate paragraphs, etc.)
				begun each paragraph with a clear topic sentence? (A topic sentence should set up the argument for the entire paragraph, not just part of it. It should also state what YOU plan to say about a topic, not just what someone else has said about that topic.)
				incorporated effective transitions between both sentences and paragraphs?
				avoided very short, awkward paragraphs?
				avoided overly long paragraphs?
Correctness of Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation				checked that all words are spelled correctly?
				checked that all words are correct for the context?
				checked all punctuation marks for correctness? commas? colons? semi- colons? dashes? hyphen
				checked that all sentences are grammatically complete?
				checked that all verbs agree with their subjects?
				checked that all pronouns agree with their referents?

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Has the writer...
Information gathering				used the minimum number of resources?
				used the minimum number of peer-reviewed resources?
				used a variety of types of resources?
				used resources relevant to the topic?
				used credible resources?
Information presentation				checked for correct paraphrasing and summation?
				used direct quotes sparingly?
				used direct quotes correctly?
				checked to make sure that all references are correctly cited?
				used evidence and examples to support any claims or arguments?
Ideas				identified a gap?
				explained why the gap exists, providing evidence?
				identified approaches used to close the gap
				evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of each approach?
				ensured that each recommendation is specific, measurable, achievable, related and timely?

Q1. What is the one thing you found most effective in this report? (Please be as specific as possible. Give concrete examples.)

Q2. What is the one thing you found most confusing in this report? (Please be as specific as possible. Give concrete examples.)

Q3. What is the one thing that you would recommend to the author that, in your opinion, would make the greatest improvement in this report? (Please be as specific as possible. Give concrete examples.)

Appendix G

Writing Survey

The objective of this study is to learn more about how students approach the task of writing, in order to improve writing instruction. Your honest answers to this survey will help us design better courses and help students learn to write more effectively. Writing is an important skill in the workplace. According to the American Association of Colleges and Universities (2010), 89% of employers want more emphasis placed on written and oral communication skills.

This survey[1] is not a test. This survey will not be used to calculate your course grades. Your professor will not see the results of the survey until after final grades have been submitted. The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet by a third party until grades are submitted. Your participation is entirely voluntary. Thank you for helping us with this important research.

	Think about a recent assignment that required a significant amount of writing. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements with respect to the process of writing that assignment, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.						
	QID		**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	MAP1	It was important to me that I learn as much as I could from the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
2	MAP2	In writing the assignment, it was important to me that I improve my skills and knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
3	MAP3	One of my goals when I did the writing assignment was to learn as much as I could.	1	2	3	4	5
4	MAP4	It was important to me to really understand what there was to learn from the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
5	MAP5	One of my goals when I did the writing assignment was to develop deep understanding of what we were learning.	1	2	3	4	5
6	MAV1	I was worried that I won't learn all there is to learn from the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
7	MAV2	I was afraid that I might not learn all that I could from the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
8	MAV3	I was concerned that I might not learn as deeply as I could from the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
9	PAP1	When I did the writing assignment, it was important to me to look smart in comparison to the other students in my class.	1	2	3	4	5

[1] Adopted from Kaplan et al., 2009; Boekaerts & Rozendaal, 2007; Spinath et al., 2003.

	Think about a recent assignment that required a significant amount of writing. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements with respect to the process of writing that assignment, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.						
	QID		**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
10	PAP2	When I did the writing assignment, one of my goals was to look smart compared to others in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
11	PAP3	One of my goals in writing was to show others that this assignment was easy for me.	1	2	3	4	5
12	PAP4	When I was writing, it was important to me that other students in my class think I am good at it.	1	2	3	4	5
13	PAP5	One of my goals in doing the writing assignment was to show others that I'm good at this work.	1	2	3	4	5
14	PAV1	It was important to me that I didn't look stupid when I did the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
15	PAV2	When I did the writing assignment, it was important to me that my teacher didn't think that I know less than others in class.	1	2	3	4	5
16	PAV3	One of my goals in the writing assignment was to keep others from thinking I'm not smart.	1	2	3	4	5
17	PAV4	One of my goals in the writing assignment was to avoid looking like I have trouble doing the work.	1	2	3	4	5
18	e1	I was certain I could do well in the writing task.	1	2	3	4	5
19	e2	I can do even the hardest writing assignments if I try.	1	2	3	4	5
20	e3	If I had enough time, I could have done a good job on the writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
21	e4	Even if the writing assignment was hard, I could have done it.	1	2	3	4	5
22	e5	If I don't give up, I can do well on the most difficult writing assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
23	AR1	While writing, I focused on the page so that I wouldn't be distracted by other things.	1	2	3	4	5
24	AR2	During writing, I made sure to concentrate on the work and not to think about other things.	1	2	3	4	5
25	AR3	During writing, I didn't really make sure to focus on the work and not think about other things.	1	2	3	4	5
26	AR4	While writing, I told myself that I need to focus on the work and not to think about other things.	1	2	3	4	5

	Think about a recent assignment that required a significant amount of writing. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements with respect to the process of writing that assignment, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.						
	QID		**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
27	PBW1	Before I wrote, I planned an outline of what I'd be writing about.	1	2	3	4	5
28	PBW2	Before I wrote, I decided what would be the main idea I'd write about.	1	2	3	4	5
29	PBW3	Before I wrote, I made a plan of what I'd do during the writing.	1	2	3	4	5
30	CM1	While writing, I checked to see whether what I wrote was correct.	1	2	3	4	5
31	CM2	During writing, I checked to see if what I was writing fit with what I wrote before.	1	2	3	4	5
32	CM3	During writing, I went back to the instructions to see if what I wrote was related to the topic.	1	2	3	4	5
33	ORG1	I wrote an ending that summarized the topics I wrote about.	1	2	3	4	5
34	ORG2	I wrote the main idea and later I elaborated on it.	1	2	3	4	5
35	ORG3	I wrote an introduction in which I presented the topic.	1	2	3	4	5
36	CHK1	After I finished writing a section, I read to see whether what I had written was good.	1	2	3	4	5
37	CHK2	At the end of writing, I didn't really go back to see whether everything was OK.	1	2	3	4	5
38	CHK3	After I finished writing a section, I didn't really go back to fix what was not good.	1	2	3	4	5
39	CHK4	At the end of writing a section, I went back and read the section to make sure it was OK.	1	2	3	4	5
40	CHK5	After I finished writing a section, I went back to fix what I didn't think was good.	1	2	3	4	5
41	PDW1	During writing, I stopped to think how to phrase what I was going to write.	1	2	3	4	5
42	PDW2	While writing, I thought about what I was going to write next.	1	2	3	4	5
43	PDW3	During writing, I thought about how to connect one topic to the next.	1	2	3	4	5
44	EVAL1	After I finished writing a section or part of it, I thought about whether what I had written was correct.	1	2	3	4	5

	Think about a recent assignment that required a significant amount of writing. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements with respect to the process of writing that assignment, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.						
	QID		**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
45	EVAL2	After I finished writing a section or part of it, I thought about whether what I had written was good.	1	2	3	4	5
46	SUCC1	While writing, I reminded myself that if I work correctly, I'll succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
47	SUCC2	During writing, I told myself that I could succeed in this task.	1	2	3	4	5
48	VALU1	When I was writing, I was reminding myself that I have to do this task.	1	2	3	4	5
49	VALU2	When I was writing, I was reminding myself that this task is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
50	VALU3	When I was writing, I told myself that I need to invest effort in this task.	1	2	3	4	5
51	VALU4	When I was writing, I said to myself that it is important to me to get a good grade.	1	2	3	4	5
52	PRAI1	When I felt that I succeeded, I said to myself that I was good.	1	2	3	4	5
53	PRAI2	When I felt that I succeeded, I gave myself a reward.	1	2	3	4	5
54	HELP1	When I was writing and didn't know enough about the subject, I asked for help from my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
55	HELP2	When I didn't know how to write, I talked about it with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
56	HELP3	When I didn't know enough about the subject, I asked for help from my teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
57	HELP4	When I was writing and didn't know how to write, I asked my teacher for help.	1	2	3	4	5
58	RA1	When I was writing, I thought about who was going to read this, and it affected my writing.	1	2	3	4	5
59	RA2	When I was writing, I imagined who was going to read this.	1	2	3	4	5
60	RA3	When I was writing, I didn't think about who was going to read this.	1	2	3	4	5
61	RA4	When I was writing, I thought about where the text was going to be, and it affected my writing.	1	2	3	4	5
62	RA5	When I was writing, I was trying to persuade my readers.	1	2	3	4	5

	Think about a recent assignment that required a significant amount of writing. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements with respect to the process of writing that assignment, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.						
	QID		**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
63	SAY1	When I was writing, I told myself out loud the words I was going to write.	1	2	3	4	5
64	SAY2	When I was writing, I read to myself out loud parts of the instructions or of the text I already wrote.	1	2	3	4	5
65	CON1	When I was writing, I imagined pictures of what I was writing about.	1	2	3	4	5

	Think about writing in general. What do you believe about writing?						
			Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree Nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
66	e6	I am good at writing.	1	2	3	4	5
67	e7	I can express my ideas so that others can understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
68	e8	I can place my ideas in a logical sequence so that the text is coherent.	1	2	3	4	5
69	e9	I can do this easily.	1	2	3	4	5
70	e10	I can do it without spelling and grammatical errors.	1	2	3	4	5
71	IT1	How well you write is hardly or not at all changeable by yourself.	1	2	3	4	5
72	IT2	How well you write depends mainly on your own effort.	1	2	3	4	5
73	IT3	How well you write cannot be influenced by yourself.	1	2	3	4	5
74	IT4	If someone is not very good at writing as a child, her or she cannot be very good at writing as an adult either, even if he or she tries to.	1	2	3	4	5

75. Over the past twelve months, how many writing assignments at least five pages (single spaced) or 10 pages (double spaced) have you completed for any academic course?	
None	
1 - 2	
3 - 5	
6 or more	

76. What type of academic writing instruction (such as essays and reports) have you received? (select all that apply)	
Senior high school English course (Ontario U or C level)	
Senior high school English course (outside of Ontario)	
Adult Basic Education course	
Introductory University Writing Course, such as Writing 1000F/G or Writing 1020F/G	
Upper-year University writing course, such as Writing 2101F/G	
Other college or university academic writing course	
Other college or university communication course	
Writing instruction within a college or university non-writing course (e.g. writing instruction in introductory history)	
Library instruction within a college or university non-writing course (e.g. using the library to research an essay)	
Library instruction in a voluntary workshop outside of class time	
Writing instruction in a voluntary workshop outside of class time	

77. What year were you born in? _____

78. How many languages do you speak? _____

79. Please list the languages you speak. In what order did you learn these languages?

Please list the languages you speak	Please indicate the order you learned these languages

80. What year of university are you currently in? (Choose one)	
1st (completed less than 5.0 credits)	
2nd (completed 5.0 credits, but less than 10.0 credits)	
3rd (completed 10.0 credits but less than 15.0 credits)	
4th (completed 15.0 credits)	
Graduate school	

82. What program are you currently enrolled in?	
Health Sciences (including Food & Nutrition)	
Math & Science (excluding Health Sciences ; Food & Nutrition)	
Dimensions of Leadership	
Sociology & Family Studies	
Social Sciences (Geography, History, Political Science, Economics, Psychology, Global Studies)	
Management & Organizational Studies	
Humanities (English, French, Modern Languages, Philosophy)	
Other (please specify)	

Thinking about writing project that you will undertake for this course, what aspects of the writing assignment are you confident about? What aspects of the writing assignment are you worried about?

(Post Test only question)

Thinking about your experience with doing the assignment, will you do anything differently when completing future writing assignments? If so, please describe some of the things that you anticipate doing differently?

Is there anything else about your writing experience in this course that you would like to share?