Winter 2019

Beyond Accuracy: Rethinking the Approach to Spanish Second Language Writing through a Tutoring Intervention

Lisa Kuriscak
Ball State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw

Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

RW

JOURNAL OF RESPONSE TO WRITING

Beyond Accuracy: Rethinking the Approach to Spanish Second Language Writing through a Tutoring Intervention

Lisa Kuriscak

Ball State University

This study reports on a pedagogical intervention in Spanish second language writing classes designed to shift learners' attention away from lower-order concerns (e.g., morphosyntax) and toward higher-order concerns (e.g., content, tone, organization of ideas) through the support of a Spanish writing fellow (tutor) who worked with the 300-level college participants. Those in the treatment group, but not those in the control group, were required to meet with the tutor. Multivariate analyses revealed that (a) learners in both groups improved in their writing from the graded rough drafts to the final versions, and (b) some gains were observed in the treatment group (suggesting some advantage), but, overall, learners still struggled to shift their attention away from lower-order concerns. These results are discussed in light of several write-to-learn and learn-to-write approaches to writing instruction, sociocultural theory, and research on anxiety in language learning.

Keywords: Spanish, second language writing, tutoring, writing fellow

Introduction

The idea for this study emerged from a workshop for instructors whose courses contained significant writing components. Many reported, dismayed, that students prioritized grammar and spelling over content, and several writing center directors reported that not only did clients try to steer tutoring sessions toward form but also some instructors reinforced this focus (e.g., not giving feedback until all or most surface errors were fixed). Many who taught English writing courses (mostly to native English speakers), argued for essentially writer-oriented and/or product-oriented approaches (K. Hyland, 2011)—emphasizing the writing process, cognitive factors, craftwork for specific audiences, and genre control. Such approaches tie into learn-to-write (LW) and write-to-learn-content (WLC) viewpoints. LW is often discipline-specific (learning to control first language [L1] or second language [L2] linguistic-rhetorical resources, especially voice, discourse, and genre); WLC falls more squarely in FL (foreign language) writing, placing emphasis on audience and converging with WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum; Ortega, 2011). These two lenses have not tended to be the norm in Spanish FL courses. Instead, a more traditional approach to writing-to-learn-language (WLL) has pervaded, whereby writing serves primarily as a vehicle for practicing grammar and vocabulary, with the rationale that students need practice for upper-level content courses. Although there is truth in this rationale, the result is that content and skills areas can get sidestepped. Ortega (2011) espouses a more nuanced approach to WLL to move beyond using writing to practice grammar and vocabulary and also advocates for bringing together the LW, WLC, and WLL lenses into a "triadic heuristic . . . that can both support instruction and enhance research interests" (p. 244). This can be operationalized for FL classes in multiple ways, including adding a WLC approach.

Emphasizing a WLC approach in the FL classroom can help students gain confidence, learn how to use sources well, engage in critical thinking, and develop greater control of discipline-specific content, but the picture of the role that writing plays for L2 learners' content development is still not straightforward (given the variability in results of existing studies and the need for more longitudinal studies, for example; see Hirvela, 2011, for

a summary). It is also conceivable that a WLC approach in the FL classroom could help learners to be more authentic in their expression and to better craft their writing for specific audiences (e.g., learning to tailor the content for different audiences). Attention to form and language development, however, should not be dismissed. Rather, extra effort should be made to direct students' attention to HOCs (higher-order concerns dealing with content/ideas, focus, organization, development; and sometimes referred to as global concerns), which are emphasized more in LW and WLC approaches. On the other end, LOCs (lower-order concerns dealing with mechanics, spelling, morphosyntax, etc.; and sometimes referred to as local concerns) have been typically emphasized in a more traditional WLL approach (e.g., Nakamaru, 2010). It should be noted that this binary distinction has been described (e.g., Severino & Cogie, 2016) as a false dichotomy. Severino and Cogie (2016) and others (e.g., Krest, 1987; Nakamaru, 2010; Severino & Deifell, 2011) have argued instead for an approach that carves out a category of middle-order concerns (MOCs) for the lexicon. Although the field is moving toward describing and analyzing this middle ground, there does not seem to be clear consensus yet regarding the operationalization of MOCs (e.g., Krest, 1988 [sentence structure]; Nakamaru, 2010 [lexicon]). For instructors who do not engage in research, the HOC/LOC distinction still remains salient. Akin to how this opposition is being nuanced by the examination of MOCs, so, too, is the write-to-learn/learn-to-write opposition being nuanced by the differentiation of WLC and WLL. In multiple chapters in Manchón's (2011b) edited volume, what stands out is that (a) aspects of writer-, product-, and reader-oriented approaches can be interwoven to create different emphases in the classroom, and (b) adopting only one approach could disadvantage students.

This reflection on approaches to writing serves as the backdrop for the present study, which reports on a pedagogical intervention in Spanish composition classes. In the first two sections below, the theoretical underpinnings are further explained and the participants and tutoring intervention are described. In the next sections, the quantitative results are shared (analyses of changes across essays), complemented by insights from participants' blog entries. Finally, concluding remarks, limitations, and suggestions for future research are offered.

Theoretical Grounding and Contextualization of the Intervention

This study began as an experiment to expand the utilization of the writing center by offering tutoring services to those taking world languages courses (Spanish, in this case). Writing centers tend to serve students who write in (L1 or L2) English. Although there are examples of some multilingual U.S. Writing Centers (e.g., at Dickinson College [Lape, 2013], the Spanish writing center at University of Minnesota [Strong & Furth, 2001], and SPOT [Spanish and Portuguese Open Tutoring] at the University of Miami Ohio [Harper, Tabor, Klare, Borchers, & McCarty, 2014]; see also Hirsch & DeLuca, 2003), it is not the norm on U.S. campuses to find writing center tutors who can assist clients in languages other than English, despite the need.

This attempt to expand WAC efforts led to an experiment into the effect of tutoring on Spanish FL students' writing (by drawing their attention to HOCs) and is informed by several theoretical approaches, which highlight differences in how write-to-learn and learn-to-write approaches are operationalized and point to the importance of understanding these differences to avoid misalignments (Ortega, 2011) between teachers' and students' views of writing. Insights are also found in sociocultural theory and second language acquisition (SLA) literature, specifically the noticing hypothesis (e.g., Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012; Schmidt, 1990) and output hypothesis (Swain, 1993). The former hypothesis states that attention is crucial for SLA; without it, learners would not advance in their acquisition (for lack of noticing the gaps between their interlanguage and L2). The latter highlights the importance of pushing learners to make their output "more precise, more coherent, and more appropriate" (Manchón, 2011a, p. 47). Both dovetail with some of WAC's main tenets, for example: "writing enhances knowing: retrieving information, organizing it, and expressing it in writing seems to improve understanding and retention. . . . Writing focuses attention: those who know they are expected to write tend to be more attentive" (Soven, 1996, p. 1). Learners can be primed (via consciousness-raising functions) to notice details in the input, for example, through multiple forms of feedback. There are myriad ways to structure activities and scaffolding to help students notice details (and thus

process them more effectively) as well as to push their output, including written or verbal feedback. Although this type of consciousness-raising is typically associated with form-related (e.g., morphosyntactic) details, it seems logical that directing learners' attention to other aspects could be beneficial to their writing—for example, to content, context, and audience. Research has shown that attention paid to writing is task-dependent and that noticing is insufficient for taking learners to the next level; they need to engage in more in-depth processing while writing (Manchón, 2011a). As will be subsequently discussed, one way to do this is through feedback from instructors writing fellows.

The partnership between writing fellows and faculty members is more than a one-time workshop, implying instead the opportunity to address writing issues jointly in class and in tutoring sessions over the semester (Leahy, 1999). Being able to discuss their writing with a peer trained in writing center practices and with adequate L2 skills could open the door for collaboration and learning, which is a key tenet of another theory that informs the present study, namely Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mind for L2 learning and teaching (see Lantolf, 2000, for a comprehensive review, and Cumming, 2016). Sociocultural theory suggests that knowledge in any area is not acquired in a vacuum but rather results from a social process in which learning happens through interactions with individuals and is also influenced by more generalized cultural patterns (e.g., beliefs and attitudes). Numerous authors have pointed to the social nature of writing, including Manchón (2011a), who highlighted the importance of learning linguistic knowledge and relevance for collaborative problem-solving tasks, and Dufresne and Masny (2005, p. 376), who described L2 writing research as centering on "how to go about knowing about the social world." Furthermore, as summarized in Polio (2012), within a sociocultural approach, it is understood that scaffolding pushes learners' language development and that "explicit knowledge should be useable for certain learners" (p. 382), which can be stimulated by written feedback (from various sources, including instructors and tutors). As noted in the Introduction, depending on the approach, teachers, tutors, and students can adopt a more writer-, product-, or reader-oriented practice. The latter

two dovetail well with sociocultural theory (emphasizing relationships with readers) and with a WLC approach (emphasizing audience).

One of the benefits of an WLC approach is that it elevates writing beyond surface correctness, allowing for development in multiple areas (e.g., self-efficacy/self-fulfillment), with the goal of making the writing specifically relevant for students' professional and personal lives beyond the classroom (Soven, 1996). However, in an FL context, it is not uncommon for WLC to be reduced to a simplified version of WLL where the goal becomes improving students' accuracy in written Spanish so they can perform well in upper-level courses. That is, they write primarily to expand and polish their grammar and lexicon so that they can succeed in linguistics, literature, or culture courses. Overlapping concerns (e.g., curriculum demands, lack of training in writing pedagogies, and the perception that linguistic accuracy is the greatest challenge facing FL writers and the gateway to improving their language skills) can all lead instructors to place more emphasis on surface correctness than on utilizing writing to challenge learners in other ways. Furthermore, it is typically observed in programs that prepare high school FL teachers that students gravitate toward focus on form in both pre-service and in-service teaching. Shrum and Glisan (2016), citing Hyland (2003) and McMartin-Miller (2014), noted that this focus is real, although not always intentional: "Despite teachers' wishes to provide content-focused feedback, they often focus on grammatical accuracy and on form more than they realize" (p. 306). Thus, from both sides (i.e., what high school and college teachers emphasize as well as what students are most comfortable with), these patterns tend to repeat. Returning to the operationalization of WLL, it is important to note that, even within the WLL label, there are multiple interpretations—from a more traditional approach (just described) to a more innovative approach that aims to elevate L2 writing "from a convenient way to practice grammar and vocabulary to a site for language development" (Ortega, 2011, p. 240).

Putting the more traditional approach to writing instruction on its head, so to speak, and preferring an approach that infuses WLC into the FL classroom (where the "learning" is not interpreted as primarily learning the L2 better) means elevating the writing process and global (content-related)

aspects of the written product over local aspects (grammatical/lexical accuracy) and redirecting students' and instructors' attention more toward HOCs (McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001). Research on corrective feedback (e.g., Chandler, 2003; F. Hyland, 2011; Manchón, 2011b) has also tended to focus on grammatical, lexical, and orthographic corrections. Learners can become fixated on accuracy over content and (a) be less equipped to make their writing their own and (b) miss the empowering realization that their writing does not have to be entirely accurate to be impactful. By increasing their agency in their writing, dedicating more attention to HOCs, and viewing writing as personally and professionally relevant for their lives (during and after college), learners can launch themselves further forward in their language skills. If instructors can help shift learners' focus on writing in this direction, then HOCs could be used to accomplish LOCs (rather than letting LOCs eclipse HOCs). Research informed by Ferreira, Bailey, and Ferraro's (2002) good enough approach to language comprehension could bolster this prioritization of HOCs. For example, Ferreira et al. (2002, p. 13) reported on several studies that showed that participants used "knowledge of the world to figure out who is doing what to whom" more than they used syntactic algorithms to understand difficult passive constructions. This suggests that semantics and pragmatics (more aligned with HOCs) could constitute a more robust route toward comprehension than prioritization of syntactic rules (more aligned with LOCs).

In the final section of her chapter, Ortega (2011) asked how we can best operationalize a symbiotic relationship between LW, WLC, and WLL to support instruction and enhance research. LOCs predominate in a more traditional WLL approach (albeit not in the language-development-oriented approach espoused by Ortega), whereas HOCs tend to be emphasized more in WLC and LW approaches. The pedagogical intervention described here attempts to move in the latter direction. By not prioritizing LOCs, by emphasizing the writing process and audience (in class activities/discussion and rubrics), and by adding an extra layer of emphasis on HOCs (via tutoring), the aim is to

see if such an approach leads to positive learning outcomes. Therefore, the following research questions guided this study:

- Did learners' writing change from the graded rough draft to the final version (including Essays 1 and 2 in the analyses), either based on group assignment (treatment or control) or outcome examined (HOCs vs. LOCs)?
- Did learners' writing change from the graded rough draft to the final version, looking at higher-order versus lower-order changes within each essay individually?
- Within the treatment group, did the number of times that students met with the writing fellow have an effect?

Materials and Methods

This project arose from an experiment in shifting the emphasis in Spanish FL writing classes so that local/surface concerns would not eclipse global/content-based concerns, thus attempting to encourage learners to invest more in their ideas and the writing process. This can be a challenge for instructors (i.e., it is easy to focus on error correction [because LOCs are readily measurable] and thus pay less attention to rhetoric, genre, development, and organization) and for students (whose Spanish coursework may likely have been more geared toward LOCs). It was hoped that, by having a tutor (a Spanish writing fellow) work with students individually to reinforce the value of HOCs, they might begin to shift their attention. Additionally, being able to discuss their writing with a peer trained in writing center practices and who had Spanish skills (having completed a minor and studied abroad) opened the door for collaboration and learning (following a sociocultural approach).

Participants

Participants were enrolled in a 300-level Spanish composition course, required for the Spanish major and minor, at a large, public university. Data collection took two years (2013–2015) in two sections per semester (eight sections over four semesters total, with the same instructor). There

was a predominance of women (as is typical in FL classes), sophomores and juniors outnumbered freshmen and seniors (as some freshmen tested into the 300-level and others came up in the 100-/200-levels), and all were traditional-aged college students. A variety of majors were reported (i.e., Spanish as well as other majors who were minoring in Spanish).

Enrollment per section was capped at 25, but the number of participants ($n = 96$) is less than the total enrollment because, as per Institutional Review Board protocol, students could decide whether to have their data included in the research (i.e., everyone wrote essays and blogs and completed surveys as part of normal class activities, but they could withhold consent for their material to be used for research later). Furthermore, the essays analyzed for research were those in which students turned in two versions (i.e., a graded rough draft and a final version), and some data was lost with students who consented but then failed to turn in work. Similarly, blog data is not available for everyone: Students were given a variety of blog topics and responded to a subset of their choosing. Despite having a relatively small sample of posts to analyze on the topics of feedback and the writing process in English and Spanish ($n = 33$), their candid sharing offers insights that augment the statistical analyses (see the discussion section). They were assigned as a low-consequence way (as a small percentage of the course grade) to encourage students to write more and to try out complex structures without fixating on accuracy, and they also proved useful for understanding students' writing experiences.

Participants were subdivided into two groups: one section each semester was randomly assigned as the control group and the other as the treatment group, differing in whether they had to meet with the writing fellow. Pretest/posttest surveys were distributed to gather background (demographic) data, and Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for both groups.

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 5(1), 75–101.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics by Group

Variable	Treatment group[a] (*n* = 52)	Control group[a] (*n* = 44)	Total (*n* = 96)
Gender	38 women	36 women	74 women
	14 men	8 men	22 men
Class standing	9 freshmen	4 freshmen	13 freshmen
	19 sophomores	16 sophomores	35 sophomores
	12 juniors	17 juniors	29 juniors
	9 seniors	6 seniors	15 seniors
	3 other		3 (other or missing)
Age	*M* = 19.8	*M* = 20	range: 18–23
Times tutored	0 = 0	0 = 44	0 = 44
	1 = 12	1 = 0	1 = 12
	2 = 38	2 = 0	2 = 38
	3 = 2	3 = 0	3 = 2

Note. The n per semester was as follows: 24 in Fall 2013, 29 in Spring 2014, 17 in Fall 2014, and 26 in Spring 2015.

Procedures and Instrumentation

Students wrote multiple essays over the semester, two of which required a graded rough draft and a final version. The prompts varied slightly within the same genres: narrative and reflective pieces. The narrative piece (Essay 1) was written at the end of the first month and came

from one of three prompts (depending on the semester): tell a story of (a) a personal event that accompanies a photo, (b) a special person in your life, and (c) a significant moment in your life. The reflective piece (Essay 2) was written in the last month of the semester and was the culmination of an extended project in which students explored situations (of their choosing) on campus or in the community where they were the minority (in race, gender, physical ability, ideology, age, social class, religion, language, sexual orientation, lifestyle, etc.). They wrote in Spanish about their experiences and reflections, focusing on what it takes to leave their comfort zone and connect with others.

Everyone first received written instructor feedback on their drafts and final versions (indicating LOC and HOC areas to improve, though HOCs to a lesser extent because of the writing fellow's attention to HOCs; e.g., McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001). Students were not required to edit the final versions but were told to use the feedback to inform their future writing. Each category received about equal weight in the grade; the importance of both was explained to students along with the need to dedicate more time to HOCs rather than expecting their L1 writing experience to carry them through. Regardless of whether students consented to let their data be used for research, meeting with the writing fellow was a normal class requirement for the treatment group; students knew that participation points would be reduced for missing sessions. It was hoped that the tutoring would help the treatment group to engage in another layer of in-depth, elaborate (content-related) processing that went beyond form-related features. Those in the control group were only encouraged to meet with the writing tutor; none utilized her services. The treatment group's one-on-one, 30-minute sessions were HOC-focused (primarily on content, organization, transitions, paragraphing, and development/substantiation of ideas, and also sometimes the instructor's comments). That said, the writing fellow and students were not always on the same page; the writing fellow answered a few LOCs where she felt she best could but tried to focus the discussion on HOCs. Students were told to incorporate the writing fellow's (and instructor's) suggestions into their final versions. In sum,

in terms of input received, both groups received (written) feedback from their instructor, and the treatment group also received (verbal, in-person, individual) feedback from the writing fellow in the writing center, with more emphasis overall on HOCs.

Coding and Analyses

Before deciding on a coding system, a survey of the literature was done to review the range of approaches to coding writing. Most studies that examined changes in learners' writing over time coded primarily for LOCs (see Polio, 1997, for a summary). The coding system utilized in the present study takes some of its inspiration from Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) for the LOCs, and to that was added the HOCs, inspired by and adapted from Storch (2005). See Table 2, showing the total number of points that each essay could receive (10 [HO] + 10 [LO] = 20) along with the descriptions for each rating. (Note that grades were removed from the essays before coding, which happened after the semester ended.) As Table 2 shows, lexical choice was considered within LOCs. Although some scholars advocate for placing the lexicon in its own middle-order category, for the purposes of the present study, morphosyntax and lexicon were included together because the goal was to attempt to shift learners' attention toward more global (HO) concerns, regardless of whether middle- and lower-order-concerns constituted one or separate categories. The essays were coded by two trained raters (the author and a research assistant); the first rater coded all essays and the second coded 10% to gain a measure of interrater reliability, which resulted in 94% alignment.

Table 2

Coding System

Higher-order concerns	Lower-order concerns
An Excellent essay would have these characteristics and thus be coded as a 9–10: This is a very well written text: well structured; interesting and relevant hook; a clear and complete topic statement of what the essay is about. The ideas are clearly organized and flow logically. Connections between ideas, sentences, and paragraphs are present and effective via linking words/phrases. There are concrete details that support the topic. There is an effective closing paragraph.	An Excellent essay would have these characteristics and thus be coded as a 9–10: The grammatical accuracy of this text is very good to excellent, demonstrating complex structures, relatively few errors in agreement, tense/mood/aspect, or spelling/accentuation. The lexical choices are very good to excellent, demonstrating knowledge of the topic, variety in word choice, and use of some appropriate idioms (e.g., very few literal translations from English).
A Good essay will have similar traits but not to the same level and thus be coded as a 7–8.	A Good essay will have similar traits but not to the same level and thus be coded as a 7–8.
A Satisfactory essay will be one step lower than the Good essay and thus be coded as a 5–6.	A Satisfactory essay will be one step lower than the Good essay and thus be coded as a 5–6.
An Adequate essay will only meet minimal standards and be difficult to follow, thus coded as a 3–4.	An Adequate essay will only meet minimal standards and be difficult to follow, thus coded as a 3–4.
A Poor essay will be significantly lacking even in minimal standards and very difficult to follow and be coded as a 1–2.	A Poor essay will be significantly lacking even in minimal standards and very difficult to follow and be coded as a 1–2.

In the statistical analyses (ANOVAs), students' writing was evaluated for the effects of group (tutored or not) and number of hours (within the treatment group of tutees) on their writing. As noted in the instrumentation and procedures section, students received two types of feedback/input: LOCs (grammar, lexicon, spelling, etc.) and HOCs (quality of introduction and conclusion, sequencing of ideas,

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing*, *5*(1), 75–101.

descriptive details, etc.). The main results come from comparisons of patterns in students' development from their graded rough drafts to the final versions (i.e., change from the first to the second essay) and from the beginning to the end of the semester. Furthermore, the blogs provide insights into some of the patterns in the quantitative essay data.

Results

Research Question 1

Three-way ANOVAs were run with two within-subject factors: Version (graded rough draft vs. final version) and Essay (Essay 1 written at the beginning of the semester vs. Essay 2 written toward the end of the semester). There was one between-subject factor of Group (treatment vs. control group). The analyses were run several ways to test for changes in learners' writing, comparing rough drafts and final versions for (a) overall change (HO and LOCs together), (b) change in HOCs only, and (c) change in LOCs only. The multivariate tests revealed, across the board, one persistent and significant main effect—namely, the final versions had higher average scores (i.e., were more improved) than rough drafts (for both Essay 1 and Essay 2). This held true for the analyses of overall change, HOCs only, and LOCs only (see Table 3).

Table 3

Research Question 1

Outcomes	F	p	Means: Rough drafts	Means: Final versions	$\eta2$
Overall change	$F(1, 49) = 222.89$	$< .001$	11.80	13.21	.395
Higher-order only	$F(1, 49) = 165.55$	$< .001$	5.76	6.43	.6065
Lower-order only	$F(1, 49) = 167.99$	$< .001$	6.05	6.81	.7742

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 5(1), 75–101.

This was expected overall, though it was hoped that there might be more of a difference in the treatment and control groups. However, Group did not produce significant findings: The final versions of students' essays had higher estimated marginal means than the graded rough drafts, regardless of Group. Interestingly, there was one three-way interaction involving Group that approached but did not reach significance—namely, comparing change in HOCs across Essay and Version, with Group as the between-subject factor: $F(1, 49) = 3.45$, $\eta2 = .0141$, $p < .069$. In other words, looking at just HOCs from rough draft to final version for both essays, the treatment group had higher estimated marginal means (although the differences were not large at the final version). As will be explained subsequently, additional analyses were done to examine changes only within Essay 1 and then others only within Essay 2 to see if this tendency would come into focus with greater explanatory power.

Research Question 2

Looking at Essay 1, the outcomes of these analyses echo those of research question 1: The final versions were better than the graded rough drafts, and HOCs had significantly lower averages across the rough drafts and final versions than LOCs (see Tables 4 and 5). As will be described, there was an interaction effect that approached significance for Essay 2, but, interestingly, it did not reach or approach significance for Essay 1. However, there was still a significant interaction effect found—between Version and higher-order versus lower-order in Essay 1: $F(1, 57) = 4.13$, $\eta2 = .004$, $p = .047$. This finding highlighted more spread between the HO and LO scores in the final versions: The HO means were lower than the LO means in both the rough drafts and the final versions, and the split was a bit more noticeable in the final versions (Rough drafts: HOM = 5.78; LOM = 6.09 ; Final versions: HOM = 6.36; LOM = 6.88).

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing, 5*(1), 75–101.

Table 4

Research Question 2

Outcomes	F	p	Means: Rough drafts	Means: Final versions	η²
Essay 1: Overall change	F(1, 57) = 142.41	< .001	5.90	6.62	.3868
Essay 2: Overall change	F(1, 49) = 102.15	< .001	5.87	6.63	.4169

Table 5

Research Question 2

Outcomes	F	p	Means: HOCs	Means: LOCs	η²
Essay 1: HOCs & LOCs compared	F(1, 57) = 34.36	< .001	6.04	6.48	.146
Essay 2: HOCs & LOCs compared	F(1, 49) = 11.22	< .002	6.11	6.39	.0584

The outcomes for Essay 2 are consistent with those of Essay 1: Final versions were better than the rough drafts, and HOCs had significantly lower averages across the rough draft and final version than the LOCs (see Tables 4 and 5). Finally, there was an interaction effect for Essay 2 between Version and Group that approached but did not reach significance and that could support less solidified patterns in the data: $F(1, 49) = 3.66$, $η2 = .0149$, $p = .062$. The means for this finding point to the similarity in the control and treatment groups at the beginning (*M*

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 5(1), 75–101.

= 5.89 control group; *M* = 5.86 treatment group) as well as their divergence at the final version, with the treatment group surpassing the control group for change in HOCs and LOCs in Essay 2 (*M* = 6.50 control group; *M* = 6.75 treatment group).

Regarding Essay 2, in the rough draft, the treatment and control groups were similar, but in the final version they diverged more notably, showing that the treatment group did better. This could give support to the hypothesis that the intervention impacted this group's learning trajectory (i.e., drafts were about the same, but after the tutoring sessions and more time in the semester had passed, they had higher HO scores, which was the emphasis of the tutoring sessions). Interestingly, this same interaction did not approach significance for Essay 1 but instead another interaction was significant (Version x HO/LO), which compared the HO/LO change from rough draft to final version. With a larger subject pool, perhaps this would have reached statistical significance and we could speak with greater confidence about this finding. As is, the data is suggestive that the intervention could lead to positive gains. The pattern showing HO means that are lower than LO means will be further commented on in the discussion section.

Research Question 3

Most students (*n* = 23) in the treatment group met with the writing fellow two or three times. A few (*n* = 5) only worked with her one time (having missed an appointment). The multivariate test for this question was run to see if any benefit might have been produced by meeting with the writing fellow more than once. Given the lack of symmetry across the *n*'s, the results should be taken with a grain of salt. That said, it is important to note that, like the results for research question 1, in terms of overall change, the rough drafts had lower marginal means (12.45) than the final versions (13.85), regardless of the number of tutoring sessions: $F(1, 26) = 78.06$, $\eta2 = .2497$, $p < .001$.

In sum, the most persistent main effect is that students' writing improved from rough draft to final version over the semester. They also made more gains in LOCs than HOCs, which at first seems unexpected, but, as will be subsequently discussed, the qualitative data gleaned from

the blogs suggests that it could be related to their affective response to language learning.

Discussion

The main effects and the interactions that reached significance (and those that approached significance, though with more caution) contribute to this picture: (a) There was significant improvement from graded rough draft to final version (for Essays 1 and 2) when looking at overall change, HOCs only, and LOCs only; (b) more LO (than HO) gains were made; (c) there appears to be a slight advantage for the treatment group (at least in terms of HOCs from rough draft to final version for both essays, where the treatment group had higher means on the final version); and (d) meeting with the tutor two or three times versus one time did not produce measurable benefit. Although it is not unexpected that their writing improved from the rough draft to the final version, it is somewhat surprising, if not disappointing, that adding an extra layer of emphasis on HOCs (through tutoring) didn't yield more robust results (i.e., students made more gains in LO than HO and tried to steer the tutoring sessions in that direction). The writing fellow also worked in the writing center and reported having this same struggle with clients whose papers were in English; this is not to imply that LOCs should be absent from tutoring sessions, but rather that the general approach of our writing center in any tutoring context was for tutors to give more attention to HOCs. The findings of the present study leave room for continued pedagogical attention and experimentation to find ways to shift students' orientation, as will be suggested in the final section. But first, there are insights to be learned from the blog entries as well as studies in educational studies that provide possible ways to understand these patterns as more than isolated phenomena of FL writing in Spanish.

Approximately halfway through the semester, students were given this blog prompt to encourage reflection on the writing process:

> Please reflect on the process of writing (in English and Spanish), what you get from writing and what it requires of you, your approach, and your reaction to

the process. For example: What is your process of writing like in Spanish? Has it changed since the beginning of the semester, and if so, how? What do you most like about writing? What is different about writing in English vs. Spanish for you? What are your challenges and accomplishments in writing?

Many perceived their English writing process as effortless compared to writing in Spanish, which is "una bestia totalmente diferente" [a totally different beast], as described by one student. Although a few expressed a dislike for writing in general, many stated that they enjoyed writing in English but did not have the same reaction to writing in Spanish, for example: "Escribir en español es difícil porque tiene que pensar en un millones cosas en seguida. Con escribir en ingles, haces las mismas cosas pero no tiene que pensar en las." [Writing in Spanish is hard because you have to think about a million things at once. With writing in English, you do the same things but you don't have to think about them.] Their comments about the stages of the writing process continued to highlight differences in their processes; they remarked on pre-writing/planning and drafting but made few comments on editing/revision. Although some reported engaging in planning before writing (e.g., brainstorming, reflecting, outlining, translating words for later), many indicated they spent less time on pre-writing in Spanish (than English), which could be at least partially responsible for their reduced attention to HOCs. When drafting, some recognized trying to think and write in Spanish but others stated that they think and write in English and then translate to Spanish (running contrary to the instructor's and tutor's suggestions and best practices in the field).

Finally, their affective response to writing in Spanish stood out in the blog data. Overall, they described writing in Spanish as an arduous, slow process with inherent lexical and syntactic challenges. The quotes below reflect this discomfort with writing in Spanish and suggest connections with identity or self-image issues:

"En inglés aparezo como una persona creativa y complicada. En español, aparezo como una persona aburrida y llana." [In English I seem like a creative, complex person. In Spanish I seem like a boring, flat person.]

"Me siento inteligente cuando escriba en español sin un diccionario."
[I feel intelligent when I write in Spanish without a dictionary.]

Perhaps in part for this reason, students reduced their involvement in other stages of the writing process. For example, because of how laborious they found the process, they may have run out of time before the due date to meet with the writing fellow (who would've guided them toward revisions and offered encouragement) or didn't budget time or energy for editing on their own. Or perhaps, depending on the effect that their evaluation of their own skills had on their self-image, they felt more (or less) inspired to spend time on all stages of the process. They also identified their Spanish writing process with nervousness at making mistakes and a lack of confidence. When commenting on their nervousness at making mistakes, they generally linked it to LOCs: They felt that, if they could the get the grammar and form in good shape, they would be more confident and less nervous, whereas content-related aspects were barely mentioned (suggesting it is less on their radar).

Although there do not appear to be any studies directly linking anxiousness to L2 writing outcomes, Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) did find such a correlation in their study of L2 oral performance (with L1 Spanish speakers from Chile who were learning English as an L2). Referring to work by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), they described L2 anxiety as comprising three subtypes of anxiety: communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety (all of which could also exist in daily life with L1 use). When individuals feel anxious, they may withdraw, shut down, or use avoidance behaviors, which can happen when using an L2 because: "the inability to express oneself fully or to understand what another person says can easily lead to frustration and apprehension given that the apprehensive communicator is aware that complete communication is not possible and may be troubled by this prospect" (p. 562). It's possible that this could hold true for L2 writing, and if so, then for the present study this could be one reason that students avoided giving more attention to HOCs. That is, they may have considered the resolution of LOCs to be a more effective path to relieving their anxiety, as noted above; if they felt apprehensive about HOCs but didn't consider them as important as LOCs (despite the message communicated by their instructor and

tutor), they may have avoided giving HOCs more attention. The current generation has also been described as lacking confidence; for example, see McAllum (2016) who states that many have symptoms of imposter syndrome or a deep-seated insecurity that one is not sufficiently capable of carrying out the task at hand, often masking their anxiety of being exposed as intellectual frauds through what Pedler (2011) calls "over-compensating" or "fronting it out" (p. 90). Millennials either study too hard to prove their ability to themselves and others or become paralyzed by inadequacy, refusing to take risks (p. 364).

In language learning, this is particularly counterproductive, as it is important that learners make errors and take risks. As educators, it could be argued that we are faced with figuring out how to adapt in order to help students also adapt. For example, students' affective response to writing is very powerful and could suggest that they would benefit from receiving more positive comments on their writing to encourage them to keep writing and focusing on HOCs. There are also problems with over-adaptation, as McAllum (2016) notes: "Through our constant availability to clarify criteria, explain instructions, provide microlevel feedback and offer words of encouragement, we nourish millennials' craving for continuous external affirmations of success and reduce their resilience in the face of challenges or failure" (p. 364). It seems that we are still early on in determining how much support to give and in what form, but what stands out is the importance of understanding the connection between students' affective responses and their attention to various aspects of their writing and the writing process.

Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Directions

The aim of the present study was to implement an intervention in which a Spanish writing fellow worked with students in the treatment group (but not control group) on their essays to draw their attention to HOCs in their writing, giving greater priority to that aspect of their writing. Although students' writing improved (overall, for HOC only, and for LOC only), students still fixated on the LOCs. The writing fellow's work, however, was not ineffective in that there was some evidence that the

treatment group performed better. Supplemental data from blog entries suggest that students' affective response to L2 writing (i.e., they see it as slow and arduous, focus on lexical and syntactic challenges, and are nervous about making lower-order-type mistakes). What drives this affective response could potentially be larger than just the L2 writing context, perhaps connected to L2 anxiety (as explored in the previous section).

Future studies could make several modifications to yield more generalizable results. For example, had the sample size been larger, the results may have shed further light on the variables. Including individual difference variables could also be useful, as could modifying the coding systems by, for example, experimenting with coding systems that isolate middle-order concerns (to separate out more the role of morphosyntax and lexical choice in communicating content and to capture with greater granularity the effect of writing-fellow tutoring on students' writing). Future studies could also increase the number of drafts that students wrote (before the final version) or the length and number of the tutoring sessions. Even with these limitations, the present study lays groundwork for future work with different treatment/control parameters, for example: Rewrites with no feedback from the instructor and only from a tutor; no feedback from a tutor and only from the instructor; and no feedback from a tutor or the instructor. In the latter case, it would be interesting to see if the findings here would hold (i.e., significant improvement from rough draft to final version—overall, for HOC only, for LOC only); separating out these three parameters could help disambiguate whether instructor feedback and tutor feedback have a cumulative effect (as opposed to the effect of each one alone). Furthermore, it could be useful to have learners complete the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz et al., 1986) and correlate the findings (for the writing outcomes) with the participants' scores on this metric.

From the standpoint of pedagogical implications, instructors who do not have an L2 writing fellow could have their students work with a classmate as a graded task for additional accountability and structure during pre-writing or editing (and also thus distinguish the distinct phases of the writing process so that learners do not gloss over them). Reading an essay aloud to a classmate who then gives feedback (using a worksheet) could

further nudge students toward focusing more on HOCs, as would dedicating time in class to peer-feedback activities and utilizing a worksheet to retain the focus on HO elements. For those who would like to start a writing fellow program, avenues to investigate could include tapping into language honor societies and partnering with other centers or departments (e.g., campus learning center that provides tutoring, a writing center, or honors college).

Kuriscak, L. (2019). Beyond accuracy: Rethinking the approach to Spanish second language writing through a tutoring intervention. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 5(1), 75–101.

References

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 267–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Cumming, A. (2016). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. In R. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 65–90). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dufresne, T., & Masny, D. (2005). Different and differing views on conceptualizing writing system research and education. In V. Cook & B. Bassetti (Eds.), *Second language writing systems* (pp. 375–397). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2005.

Ferreira, F., Bailey, K. G. D., & Ferraro, V. (2002). Good-enough representations in language comprehension. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11*(1), 11–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00158

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(4), 562–570. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00161

Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 332–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.008

Harper, H., Tabor, L., Klare, S., Borchers, A., & McCarty, C. (2014, March). See SPOT Write: The development, current progress, & future of Miami University's Department of Spanish--Portuguese Spanish language writing center. Paper presented at the ECWCA conference Oxford, OH.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 255–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(92)90006-B

Hirsch, L., & DeLuca, C. (2003). WAC in an urban and bilingual setting: Writing-to-learn in English y en español. *Language & Learning Across the Disciplines, 6*(3), 61–73.

Hirvela, A. (2011). Writing to learn in content areas. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 37–59). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, *31*, 217–230.

Hyland, F. (2011). The language learning potential of form-focused feedback on writing: Students' and teachers' perceptions. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 159–179). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.

Hyland, K. (2011). Learning to write: Issues in theory, research, and pedagogy. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 17–35). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.

Krest, M. (1987). Time on my hands: Handling the paper load. *The English Journal, 76*(8), 37–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/819412

Krest, M. (1988). Monitoring student writing: How not to avoid the draft. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 7*(1), 27–39.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lape, N. (2013). Going global, becoming translingual: The development of a multilingual writing center. *Writing Lab Newsletter, 38*(3–4), 1–6.

Leahy, R. (1999). When a writing center undertakes a writing fellows program. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blummer (Eds.), *Writing centers and writing across the curriculum programs* (pp. 71–88). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Manchón, R. M. (2011a). The language learning potential of writing in foreign language contexts: Lessons from research. In T. Cimasko & M. Reichelt (Eds.), *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices* (pp. 44–64). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2011b). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.

McAllum, K. (2016). Managing imposter syndrome among the "Trophy Kids": Creating teaching practices that develop independence in millennial students. *Communication Education, 65*(3), 363–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1177848

McAndrew, D. A., & Reigstad, T. J. (2001). *Tutoring writing: A practical guide for conferences.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

McMartin-Miller, C. (2014). How much feedback is enough? Instructor practices and student attitudes toward treatment in second language writing. *Assessing Writing, 19*, 24–35.

Nakamaru, S. (2010). Lexical issues in writing center tutorials with international and US-educated multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(2), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.01.001

Ortega, L. (2011). Reflections on the learning-to-write and writing-to-learn dimensions of second language writing. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 237–250). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.

Polio, C. G. (1997). Measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning, 47*(1), 101–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.31997003

Polio, C. G. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 375–389. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.004

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Severino, C., & Cogie, J. (2016). Writing centers and second and foreign language writers. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 453–472). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Severino, C., & Deifell, E. (2011). Empowering L2 tutoring: A case study of a second language writer's vocabulary learning. *The Writing Center Journal, 31*(1), 25–54.

Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2016). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Soven, M. (1996). *Write to learn: A guide to writing across the curriculum.* Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002

Strong, R. M., & Furth, J. K. (2001). The Spanish writing center at the University of Minnesota. *ADFL Bulletin, 32*(2), 33–36. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.32.2.33

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*(1), 158–164. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.50.1.158