

Writing Teacher Views on Teacher Feedback: A Shift from Grammar Corrector to Motivator

Sookyung Cho

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea

This study aims to examine how Korean writing teacher views on teacher feedback change during the course of a graduate class focused on the role of feedback in second language writing classrooms. Although the content of teacher feedback, such as focus and form as well as feedback's effects on students, has been extensively studied (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997, 2001), the act of giving feedback from the teacher's perspective has not been investigated. This study traces the changes in eight writing teachers' reflections on the role of feedback as well as their actual feedback practices over one semester. The data include 1) participants' written reflections during the semester, 2) samples of their written feedback collected at the beginning and end of the semester, and 3) their personal histories regarding feedback. Data analysis reveals that teacher feedback changed from focusing on the written text to focusing on the student writer. This finding was confirmed in the written feedback, as the end-of-semester feedback showed a greater emphasis on teacher concern for the writer. It demonstrated through use of hedges, compliments and honorifics (i.e., expressions of esteem and respect when addressing a person). Suggestions for writing teacher training and future research are provided.

Keywords: writing teachers, feedback, second language writing

Introduction

To date, studies on teacher feedback have been primarily concerned with feedback itself, such as its focus, form, and effects on student writing. In the 1980s, most teacher feedback remained at the sentence level and was likely to be form-focused (Zamel, 1987), but in the 1990s, when the process approach was widely adopted in the American context, the focus of teacher feedback was broadened to include composition issues such as idea development, organization, and content, in addition to grammar (Caulk, 1994; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997; Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997; Saito, 1994). Another strand of research has examined the relationship between the form of teacher feedback and its effects on student revision. That is, certain forms of teacher feedback, such as information questions and imperatives rather than questions challenging students' thinking and ideas, have been found to lead to a higher rate of incorporation into student revision (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997; Ferris, et al, 1997). In addition to the various forms of teacher feedback, other research has examined the different types of problems teacher feedback highlights and how these different types of feedback affect student revision (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 2001). It has been shown that identifying issues related to use of examples, amount of detail, lack of coherence, and need for paraphrasing seem to lead to more successful revision than issues involving a need for explanation, explicitness, or analysis (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999).

While this large volume of research on teacher feedback has improved our understanding of the role feedback plays in student revision, little research has examined teacher understanding of its role. Few studies have examined, for example, why teachers give certain kinds of feedback, how much professional knowledge they have of writing feedback, and what they consider to be the purpose and effect of their own feedback on students. Among the few studies examining the perspective of writing teachers, Lee (2003) found that the majority of surveyed writing teachers working in Hong Kong spent the majority of their time and energy correcting all grammar errors, even though

they believed their time and effort would not have long-term effects on student writing. The mismatch between teacher perception of error correction and actual practice demonstrates the need to pay more attention to the views of writing teachers on their own feedback practices. Lee (2013) also states, “a study that focuses on the development of writing teachers’ identity is able to add knowledge to our hitherto limited understanding of how EFL teachers develop as teachers of writing, and it is an area of work that merits research” (p. 331). The emphasis on the EFL context in particular is warranted because it is a context with a relatively young history in teaching writing. By tracing the struggles and development of EFL writing instructors for a semester in a graduate course, this study aims to examine how teachers’ views on feedback develop.

Literature Review

In the area of second language writing, studies on teacher feedback have focused on the feedback itself: the focus of teacher feedback, the form feedback takes, and whether feedback is effective. In the 1980s, Zamel (1987) lamented that most teacher feedback failed to deal with student essays as a whole, remaining at the sentence level and focusing on error correction. In the 1990s, however, several studies found that teacher feedback had begun to cover a wider range of issues, including content and organization (Caulk, 1994; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997; Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997; Saito, 1994). Through a longitudinal study of an experienced ESL writing instructor, Ferris et al. (1997) discovered that only 15% of the feedback given by this instructor focused on grammar and mechanics, while the other 85% focused on students’ ideas and rhetorical development. Conrad and Goldstein (1999) found that their three ESL students – Trinh, Marigrace, and Zohre – received many kinds of teacher feedback on a variety of areas ranging from coherence/cohesion, lexical choice, and paraphrasing to content development through examples, facts, or explanations.

In addition to examining the focus of feedback, scholars have also examined the forms feedback has taken. Based on 1,600 written teacher comments on 47 ESL student papers, Ferris (1997) and Ferris et al. (1997) found that certain forms of teacher feedback, such as information questions, imperatives, and comments on mechanics, were incorporated in student revision, while questions challenging students' ideas and thoughts did not lead to successful revision. Ferris and Ferris et al. interpreted this result as meaning that students may be confused by these challenging questions. Similarly but more comprehensively, Conrad and Goldstein (1999) examined the effects of teacher comments, focusing on formal characteristics – syntactic form, semantic content, directness of comments, presence of hedges, provision of revision strategies – and the type of revision problems whereby they discovered that out of these characteristics, feedback connected to the type of problem leads to more successful revision; that is, when teachers pinpointed a specific problem of lack of examples, details, coherence, or paraphrasing, the students were more likely to incorporate feedback into their revision than other types of problems, such as insufficient explanation, lack of explicitness, or need for in-depth analysis.

Lastly, the effectiveness of teacher feedback, which has often been indirectly studied in the format of students' integration of teacher feedback into their revision, has been demonstrated (Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hyland, 2003). For example, Fathman and Whalley (1990) compared 72 ESL college students' first and second drafts, finding statistically significant improvement in grammatical accuracy whether they received grammar-only feedback or both grammar and content feedback together. They attributed this positive effect of teacher feedback to identification of the location of grammatical errors, which helped students correct errors. After comparing three different groups – Group 1 who received error corrections marked with codes, Group 2 whose errors were just underlined without codes or labels, and Group 3 who did not receive any feedback at all – Ferris and Roberts (2001) also found positive effects of teacher feedback on student writing, that is, both Group 1 and Group 2, who received explicit teacher feedback and less explicit

teacher feedback respectively, outperformed no-feedback group, Group 3. Similarly, the six participants in Hyland's (2003) case study actively engaged with teacher feedback in order to incorporate it into their revision, but the percentage of feedback incorporation varied depending on the individual's personal beliefs and preferences towards teacher feedback.

Despite the extensive amount of research conducted on the type of teacher feedback given and the incorporation of this feedback by students in their revisions, less attention has been paid to teachers' thought processes and consideration of their feedback practices. The study of teachers' perceptions on their own feedback is useful for both practical and theoretical reasons, particularly, in EFL contexts where writing instruction is not common in either the L1 or L2. Pinpointing the problem as a lack of research on EFL teacher perceptions of their own feedback practices, Lee (2003) emphasized the necessity of examining their views. She suggested that EFL writing instructors should be trained to "give error feedback and to do so, effectively and efficiently – e.g., to experiment with a wider range of feedback techniques" (p. 231).

Lee (2010) and Casanave (2009) have emphasized the importance of training writing instructors in EFL contexts. After tracing the development of writing teacher identity among her four EFL writing teachers over the course of their teacher training, Lee (2010) found that writing teacher education contributes to teacher learning in the following six ways: 1) problematizing conventional approaches; 2) enabling application of what was learned in teacher education to real classrooms; 3) providing research literature as a valuable learning resource; 4) exposing teachers to a greater variety of writing experiences; 5) helping teachers to develop new writing teacher identities; and finally 6) making teachers blend idealism and realism. While Lee sees the potential of writing teacher education, Casanave (2009) pinpoints limitations of Western methods of teacher education in EFL contexts, such as communicative and process-oriented writing instruction, as writing instruction is rarely provided and English education is test-oriented. Most of Casanave's graduate students felt constraints in applying this idealistic approach to teaching writing in their

classrooms, and thus Casanave recommends that writing teacher education in EFL contexts should prepare pre-service and in-service teachers to deal with these constraints, which demands more research on teaching and writing in EFL settings.

In line with these scholars, this study aims to examine how Korean teachers of English writing develop their views on teacher feedback over the course of a semester-length graduate course focused on the role of feedback in second language writing classrooms. Furthermore, in order to see how the changes in their views on teacher feedback led to changes in their feedback behavior, their feedback practices were also investigated. By exploring the changes in novice teachers' views of teacher feedback as well as the changes in their actual editing practices, this study tries to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What were novice teachers' initial views of teacher feedback?
- 2) How have these views changed through the semester?
- 3) Has their feedback changed over the course of the semester? If so, how has the feedback changed?

Writing and Writing Teacher Education in Korea

As Lee (2003, 2010, 2013) has shown, writing is tested rather than taught in most Asian countries, including her context of Hong Kong and the context of Korea. Since the introduction of a new college entrance exam in 1994, the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT), many universities in Korea have administered essay tests on their own in addition to taking into account students' scores on CSAT during their admission process (Cho, 2010). Because the Korean national curriculum is geared towards the college entrance exam, which does not test students' writing ability, writing is rarely taught at school. According to Ryu's (2010) survey conducted on 94 secondary teachers (52 middle school and 42 high school teachers), more than half of the teachers (58.5%) rarely or never taught writing in English to their students. They

frequently attributed this lack of English writing instruction to the paucity of writing activities in textbooks (28.8%) and their own difficulty in evaluating student writing (21.3%). Perhaps more importantly, the teachers did not feel they had adequate knowledge and ability to teach English writing (90%). Most mentioned that they were first exposed to English writing or writing instruction at undergraduate or graduate levels, if at all. As the results of Ryu's (2010) study demonstrate, most Korean secondary school teachers of English do not feel well-prepared to teach writing in English to Korean students at school because of their lack of writing instruction and writing experience.

Method

Context and Participants

This study took place during a 15-week graduate course focusing on the role of feedback in second language writing. I designed and taught the class, covering the following topics: 1) understanding teacher feedback; 2) understanding peer feedback; 3) computer-mediated feedback; 4) tutor feedback; and 5) genre and discipline in feedback. During the semester, the students participated in discussions of multiple views and various topics regarding teacher feedback, including an overview of L2 writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). They also discussed the issue of teacher appropriation of student text (Reid, 1994; Tardy, 2006), controversy over the effects of error correction (Ferris, 2006; Truscott, 1996), and interpersonal aspects of teacher feedback (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Hyland & Hyland, 2006b).

Eight students (three doctoral students and five master's students; five males and three females) were included in this study. Like the teachers in Ryu's survey mentioned above, all participants are similar in that they did not receive writing instruction at school until they entered university, with the exception of Student 1. He emigrated to the United States when he was an elementary student, completed his master's degree in engineering, returned to Korea, and

had taught English writing to Korean students for more than ten years in the private sector. Similar to Student 1, several participants were involved in teaching English or English writing at various institutions: Student 2 had been working for a private English reading academy where she worked as a coordinator for foreign teachers and often commented on student book reviews; Student 3 taught English to middle school students at a private academy; Student 5 taught English to adult learners at a private academy; and Student 7 taught writing classes at a university during summer or winter breaks. While Students 4, 6, and 8 had no experience teaching English, Student 4 used to develop test preparation materials and was involved in translating English textbooks. Surprisingly, however, none of the participants had ever taken a course focused on teaching writing. This graduate course on writing feedback was their first exposure to major issues regarding writing feedback in a second language writing classroom.

Data Collection

Three types of data were collected: their written reflections discussing their personal views of feedback, their written feedback on a sample text, and their personal history of English learning and teaching. Three times during the semester – at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end – the participants were given 30 minutes of class time to write reflections discussing their views of teacher feedback, concerning the following three questions: 1) What is the purpose of providing feedback on student writing? 2) What kinds of feedback would you provide to students? and 3) Why would you give these kinds of feedback? At the beginning and at the end of the semester, along with reflections, they were also involved in the process of giving feedback for an additional 15 minutes. Each time, they were provided the same sample student writing and were asked to provide their own feedback as if they were the instructor. In the last class, all participants were also asked to compose a personal history of learning and teaching experiences involving English writing, including 1) their own English and Korean writing experiences, especially

focusing on feedback they received; 2) their own views on writing feedback before this class; and 3) their current views on writing feedback after this class, focusing on what they learned through the class. All of their reflections and feedback were written in either Korean or English, depending on whatever language they felt more comfortable with.¹ In addition, the field notes I made after each class were taken into account in order to corroborate the findings from the participants.

Data Analysis

All the reflections and personal histories written by the participants were analyzed in the two ways used by Leki (2006). They were first read twice to obtain an overall understanding of the thoughts and orientations of each participant towards teacher feedback. Second, all written documents were coded line by line for the purpose of identifying salient themes or patterns, and the coded data were read against the research questions until potential common themes were arrived at across participants. My field notes were also taken into account at this stage. For the analysis of written teacher feedback, the methods of Ferris (1997) and Conrad and Goldstein (1999) were modified in order to produce a comprehensive picture of feedback patterns provided by each participant. Participant feedback was analyzed according to five categories: comment length, comment types, use of hedges, text-specific or non-text-specific, and the inclusion or absence of revision strategies. The first four categories were adopted from Ferris (1997), with the final category coming from Conrad and Goldstein (1999) (see Appendix A for details).

¹ I translated the reflections and feedback originally provided in Korean into English for this study.

Results

Perceptions of Teaching Feedback

The analysis of participant reflections reveals that their views on teacher feedback gradually changed from the beginning to the end of the semester. While participants initially focused on the writing itself, detaching themselves from the writer, by the end of the semester their focus shifted from the writing to the writer, and they began viewing the student as an individual with emotions and feelings like themselves.

Focus on writing: Grammar correction

In the first class, most participants expressed the view that the purpose of feedback was to correct errors in student writing. In the first reflections, six out of eight participants associated the purpose of feedback with grammar correction or improvement of grammatical accuracy (emphasis added):

[The purpose of teacher feedback is to] correct *grammatical* errors and awkward expressions. (Student 2)

Teacher feedback was to improve students' writing skills, especially on *grammar* and writing composition. (Student 3)

Because students have difficulties in using appropriate expressions such as sentence conjunctions and *grammar*, they need teacher feedback. (Student 4)

I focused on *grammar* and expressions [when providing feedback]. I replaced an ambiguous sentence with a better-sounding one. (Student 6)

However, after reading Truscott (1996) and Ferris (2006) and discussing the controversy over grammar correction, some students began questioning this

practice. For instance, in her second reflection, Student 4 wrote that she used to take for granted the hierarchical relationship of the teacher and student regarding feedback – that teachers give feedback and students receive it – but she began to question this assumption once she read Truscott and Ferris.

I think error correction is necessary, but teachers should be more careful when correcting errors with some guidelines in their mind, by thinking about what a writer can do. I want to see and judge myself what these guidelines should be through this class. (Student 4)

While Student 4 was beginning to pay attention to the writer in addition to the writing, Student 2 was struggling with the reality that she had to correct grammar in student writing, even though she personally believed that teacher feedback should focus on fluency and complexity rather than on accuracy.

I do not think we should stop providing feedback on accuracy because it is a kind of “necessary evil.” If I did not correct errors in a book report written by middle and high school students at my private academy, I would receive a lot of complaints from the parents. Because of my students’ needs and the prejudice that grammar correction is a writing teacher’s job, I cannot stop correcting grammar. (Student 2)

Unlike Student 2 and Student 4, who wrestled with what they used to believe about teacher feedback, what they were asked to do in reality, and what they had just read for class, Student 3 seemed to adhere to his belief in the necessity of error correction. In his second reflection, Student 3 wrote the following:

What makes you hesitate to correct [grammatical mistakes]? Even if grammar correction is not the main source many students can use to improve their writing, teachers should correct what is wrong, explain why they are wrong, and clarify how they can be right. I think grammar can’t be the only way to show how well you can write skillfully. However, too many grammatical errors make your writing rubbish. (Student 3)

Although it seems that Student 3 acknowledged that grammar is not the only measure of good writing, he insisted on the importance of grammar correction, referring to grammatically-inaccurate writing as “rubbish,” a strongly negative term.

Focus on the writer: Individual feedback

By the end of the semester, however, the participants seemed to have expanded their view of teacher feedback. Moving away from a focus on grammar correction, most participants began to pay more attention to the writer. While none of the participants used terms such as confidence, emotion, or motivation in discussing the purpose of teacher feedback in their first reflections, in their third reflections, five of the eight reported that they took into account students’ emotions and that their feedback was designed to boost students’ self-confidence as well as to motivate them. Even the three participants who did not use these terms in their final reflections explicitly expressed their changed views on error correction in their personal histories.

Before this class, I used to correct all the errors in student writing, but now I realized that my approach was wrong. Now I think that a teacher’s role is to motivate students and to enable them to identify their problems and correct them so that they can be better writers. (Student 5)

As her remarks show, after taking the class, Student 5 came to have a broader perspective on teacher feedback, including motivating students as well as assisting them to be independent learners. A more remarkable difference can be found in Student 3’s personal history.

Although I cannot completely agree with Truscott’s argument that error correction should not be provided to students, through this class, I realized that there are types of feedback a teacher can provide to students other than grammar correction. (Student 3)

In line with the other participants, Student 4 also felt that many issues should be considered when providing feedback, such as student motivation and self-confidence.

In considering the writer's emotions and confidence, the participants attempted to tailor their feedback to each individual writer's needs. This customized feedback is based on the participants' understanding of what the student writer is able to do independently. In her third reflection, Student 4 reported that she would only give feedback on the content, based on her judgment that the student writer has the ability to correct her own grammatical errors. Arriving at a similar conclusion, Student 2 reported that she would minimize error correction and instead focus her feedback on organization and idea development. With the hope that the student would become independent, Student 1 also mentioned that he would give indirect feedback so that the student would be able to correct the errors on her own. Student 3, who continued to have a firm belief in grammar correction even in his second reflection, seems to base his feedback on the evaluation of the writer's ability as well.

When I first read the writing, I judged the writer's writing ability by looking at how correct her grammar is. In the case of this particular student, I did not see any major grammatical mistakes, so I focused on expression and coherence in my feedback. (Student 3)

Given that the first and third reflections are based on the same student writing, the change in the focus of the feedback provided by the novice instructors in this study becomes more revealing. While in the first reflection the participants considered the main purpose of feedback correcting grammar, in the last reflection, their focus is no longer on grammar correction.

This change in their views of teacher feedback is confirmed in their personal histories. Except for Student 7, who mentioned that though he learned a lot about feedback, his views had not changed, seven students stated that the course had prompted them to change their views. As in their reflections, the

main change in their perceptions was prompted by their new focus on the writer rather than the writing.

I used to think that feedback should make the writing better, but now I realize that there are a lot of things to be considered in giving feedback. Because writing is a sort of communication, feedback should be tailored to each individual student and his/her context. Most of all, it is very important to motivate students and not to discourage them. (Student 4)

I think a teacher should ask ‘what do you think of this?’ before telling them ‘this should be this.’ Also, there are a lot of things to consider depending on the individual student. For example, we need to have interest in students’ cultural differences or language abilities. (Student 8)

According to the personal histories of these two participants, before the course their primary focus was on student writing, but through the course, they become more interested in the student writer: Student 4 is concerned about student motivation and his ability to help students build their autonomy in learning; Student 8 is interested in students’ thoughts and ideas, emphasizing the importance of considering that every student is different in their motivation and language proficiency.

Teacher Feedback

The change in participants’ views on teacher feedback – the shift of focus from writing to writer – is also reflected in their feedback. Although no remarkable differences are noticeable in comment types, some differences are found in comment length and in the types of problems the instructors encourage the student to examine in revision. The most remarkable change, however, occurred in the use of hedges and revision strategies. Table 1 compares the participants’ first and second feedback in terms of the total number of feedback items and the frequency of each comment length (short, average, long, and very long). Half of the participants (Student 1, Student 2,

Student 3, and Student 8) provided more feedback the second time, whereas the other four (Student 4, Student 5, Student 6, and Student 7) provided less feedback. Although the participants made short comments most frequently in both the first and second attempts, interestingly all participants seemed to make longer comments in their second attempt. Student 1, Student 3, and Student 7, who made only short comments in the first attempt, made comments of average length or long comments. Similarly, Student 2, Student 4, Student 5, Student 6, and Student 8, who used average-length or long comments in the first attempt, used longer or even very long comments in the second attempt. The tendency of their comments to be longer in the second attempt can be associated with change in other areas.

TABLE 1
Comment Length

Student	Feedback	Frequency	Short	Average	Long	Very Long
Student 1	1 st	9	9	0	0	0
	2 nd	43	42	1	0	0
Student 2	1 st	31	28	3	0	0
	2 nd	33	31	0	1	1
Student 3	1 st	9	9	0	0	0
	2 nd	13	12	1	0	0
Student 4	1 st	9	8	1	0	0
	2 nd	2	0	1	1	0
Student 5	1 st	11	8	3	0	0
	2 nd	7	6	0	1	0
Student 6	1 st	15	14	1	0	0
	2 nd	10	7	3	0	0
Student 7	1 st	15	15	0	0	0
	2 nd	4	2	1	1	0
Student 8	1 st	32	30	1	1	0
	2 nd	37	33	2	0	2

Despite the minimal changes found in comment types between the first and second attempts, Table 2 does show a slight increase in giving information in the form of statements and positive comments. Close examination of the feedback provided by the participants reveals that in the second attempt, most participants wrote comments in full sentences, unlike the first attempt, when they preferred noun phrases or imperatives as follows:

Differentiate advantages from disadvantages clearly.

Express your theme clearly.

(Student 4's end comments in the first feedback)

You are very good at summarizing the previous contents in the conclusion. Although there are a few grammatical errors, you wrote about your own traveling experiences and feelings relatively well.

(Student 4's end comments in the second feedback)

Moreover, three participants, including Student 4, gave compliments to the writer in the second attempt, which did not appear in the first attempt. Student 4, for example, praises the student's writing ability, especially her ability to summarize the body section. In the second attempt, Student 2 also left the final comment "well-written" in the margin and then explained her rationale: "you wrote this piece very well based on your own experiences." Likewise, Student 6 complimented the organization and transitions of the writing as well as the topic.

TABLE 2
Comment Types

ID	Feed back	Ask for Info. (Q)	Make Request (Q)	Make Request (S)	Make Request (I)	Give Info. (Q)	Give Info. (S)	Make a Positive Comment	Make a Grammar Comment
1	1 st	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	5
	2 nd	2	4	0	4	1	10	0	24
2	1 st	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	14
	2 nd	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	24
3	1 st	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	2 nd	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	8
4	1 st	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	2
	2 nd	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
5	1 st	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1
	2 nd	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0
6	1 st	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
	2 nd	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0
7	1 st	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	1
	2 nd	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
8	1 st	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	30
	2 nd	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	29

Along with the increased use of statements and positive comments, another difference between the first and second feedback attempts is found in the use of hedges and suggested revision strategies. Even though more cases exist in which the participants did not use hedges, more than half of the participants (Student 2, Student 4, Student 5, Student 7, and Student 8) used hedges in their second attempt, which were not found in the first attempt. For example, Student 7 did not leave any end comments in his first attempt, but he wrote final comments on the bottom of the student writing in his second attempt and used several hedges:

I think it would be better if you focused on the advantages of travel, even though you listed both the advantages and disadvantages of travelling alone and travelling in a group. (Student 7's second feedback)

Student 8 left the longest end comments (78 words), as seen in Table 1, and although she used hedges in her first attempt, her second attempt contains even more hedges:

It would be better to distinguish "the" and "a" and to use the tense correctly. (Student 8's first feedback)

One thing I would like to suggest is to give the advantages and disadvantages at the beginning of the paragraph. In that way, we can expect what you will be writing about. (Student 8's second feedback)

Interestingly, except for Student 8, who switched from Korean in the first attempt to English in the second attempt, the other four participants who used hedges in their second feedback used Korean, and three of the four used honorifics, which are words or endings used in Korean in addressing seniors, those of higher status, or those unfamiliar to the speaker. Finally, except for three cases (Student 3, Student 5, and Student 7), most participants used more comments that do not inform the writer of the revision strategy directly.

In comparison with their first attempt, all the evidence from the second attempt – in which the participants began using full statements, used more positive comments, hedges, and honorifics, and left comments without providing revision strategies – clearly aligns with the change in their views on teacher feedback noted in their reflections. This shows that the Korean writing teachers are beginning to use feedback as a way to interact with writers and not the writing. In other words, their major concern has changed from what to correct in student writing to how to give their feedback in a way that will be received well by a particular student. Furthermore, the increased number of cases where no revision strategy was provided, which is most obvious in

Student 1's second attempt, shows that the participants respect students' potential to self-correct errors once they are identified by the instructor, with the hope that the writer will be an independent and better writer.

TABLE 3
Hedges, Text-Specific, and Revision Strategy

Student	Feedback	Hedges		Text-specific		Revision Strategy Provided	
		No	Yes	Generic	Specific	Yes	No
1	1 st	8	0	7	0	1	7
	2 nd	42	0	36	6	1	39
2	1 st	21	0	5	16	18	3
	2 nd	27	1	3	25	17	11
3	1 st	6	0	1	5	1	5
	2 nd	12	0	6	6	9	2
4	1 st	6	0	1	5	4	2
	2 nd	1	1	1	1	0	2
5	1 st	6	0	1	5	5	1
	2 nd	4	1	0	5	1	0
6	1 st	12	0	0	12	10	2
	2 nd	8	0	5	3	0	8
7	1 st	14	0	13	1	0	8
	2 nd	2	2	2	2	2	0
8	1 st	30	0	3	29	29	3
	2 nd	36	1	8	29	29	6

Discussion and Conclusion

The results reveal that in the very beginning of the semester, most participants of this study – six out of eight – considered teacher feedback as a tool to correct grammatical errors and improve grammatical accuracy in

student writing. Over the course of the semester, in which they were exposed to a variety of views on teacher feedback (e.g., the controversies over error correction, teacher appropriation of student text, interpersonal aspects of teacher feedback, and alternative types of feedback), their views on teacher feedback changed. By the end of the semester, the participants began considering the student writer's emotions, motivation, and self-confidence; their purpose in giving teacher feedback was no longer merely to correct errors, but to motivate and encourage the student writer as well as to boost self-confidence. Additionally, the participants began to base their feedback on what the student writer could do and to assist them in eventually becoming independent writers.

The comparison of the participants' initial and final feedback on the sample student text demonstrates some changes in their views towards written feedback. That is, some participants started writing longer comments, using statements instead of phrases, giving positive comments, using hedges, and using honorifics. This evidence indicates that the participants became aware of the existence of the writer while responding to their writing. As these devices, particularly, hedges and honorifics, show respect to conversational partners, the participants began treating teacher feedback as a way of interacting with the writer herself. Giving positive comments serves the function of encouraging the writer. Also, the increase in the cases where a revision strategy is not provided confirms the changed purpose of teacher feedback: teacher feedback is to assist students in becoming independent learners, not in solving all their problems for them.

Drawing on the analysis of participant reflections and feedback practices, I argue that through the graduate course, the participants' feedback has been 'enlivened,' meaning that the teachers came to acknowledge the presence of the writer and to target their feedback towards the writer rather than the writing. The findings of this study verify the positive effects of teacher training and emphasize the necessity of writing teacher training. As argued by Lee (2010) and Casanave (2009), through training, the participants of this study changed their views and understandings of teacher feedback, and these changed views

were also reflected in their actual feedback. In particular, this study implies that writing teacher training is more needed in the EFL context, where writing has not been taught as systematically as in the American context, as Lee (2003, 2010, 2013) suggests. Most participants in this study had not only never learned how to teach English writing to EFL learners, but they had also never received writing instruction as learners themselves in elementary, middle, or high school, receiving their first instruction only after entering university. There is a widely-accepted adage that states that teachers tend to teach as they learned, but in the case of the participants in this study, who never learned how to write in English or how to teach writing, the ramifications of the adage are even more dire.

This study is limited in that it is based on only a small number of participants and does not examine how the participants use their gained knowledge in their teaching as writing instructors. Future studies must investigate the needs and perspectives of writing teachers as well as their application of teacher training in the classroom. As the participants in this study came to pay more attention to individual writers by acknowledging that an individual exists behind the writing, writing scholars need to pay more attention to individual writing instructors by acknowledging that an individual exists behind their feedback. Studies that explore how writing teachers make sense of their feedback and how their views change as they develop as writing instructors will increase our understanding of writing instructors and in turn contribute to the improvement of teaching methods. Longitudinal studies that follow the teachers into the classrooms after teacher training will be also very revealing, revealing how they actually comment once they are in their “native habitat” and what obstacles and conflicts they may be faced with in actual teaching contexts.

The Author

Sookyung Cho is a professor in the Dept. of English Linguistics of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Seoul. Sookyung Cho has a strong interest in

second language writing, in particular, English language learners' and teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards feedback. Her recent publications include a study on effects of scoring in formative assessment in a second language writing classroom with C. Park (2014) and a study on the role of L1 translation in writing center conferences with S. Kim (2014).

Department of English Linguistics
College of English
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, 130-791, Korea
Tel: +82 221733194
Mobile: + 82 1035060197
Email: sookyuncho@hufs.ac.kr

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2015.

References

- Casanave, C. P. (2009). Training for writing or training for reality? Challenges facing EFL writing teachers and students in language teacher education programs. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 256-277). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 181-188.
- Cho, S. (2010). Academic biliteracy challenges: Korean scholars in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(2), 82-94.
- Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1990). Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second*

- language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher written-comments: Texts, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 147-179.
- de Guerrero, M. C. M. & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 51-67.
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Ferris, D. R. (2001). Teaching writing for academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 298-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error correction help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & H. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 155-182.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006a). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & H. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006b). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. In K. Hyland & H. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 206-224). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices, and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 216-237.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 143-157.
- Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 330-345.
- Leki, I. (2006). "You cannot ignore": L2 graduate students' response to discipline-based written feedback. In K. Hyland & H. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 266-285). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 273-292.
- Ryu, H. (2010). What's the problem in teaching English writing in secondary level? *Journal of the English Language and Literature*, 52(3), 173-197.
- Saito, H. (1994). Teacher's practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 46-70.
- Tardy, C. (2006). Appropriation, ownership, and agency: Negotiating teacher feedback in academic settings. In K. Hyland & H. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 60-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 697-715.

Appendix A

Analysis Categories of Teacher Feedback

Major Categories	Sub-categories
Comment Length	Short (1-5 words)
	Average (6-15 words)
	Long (16-25 words)
	Very long (26 or more words)
Comment Types	Ask for information (Question)
	Make a request (Question)
	Make a request (Statement)
	Make a request (Imperative)
	Give information (Question)
	Give information (Statement)
	Make a positive comment
Make a grammar comment	
Use of Hedges	Yes or No
Text -specific	Specific or General
Revision Strategy Provided	Whether to provide a revision strategy or not

Appendix B

Sample Student Writing

Traveling in group vs. Traveling alone

Since I entered the university school, I have traveled here and there, from domestic regions to Europe continents. In my first summer vacation in college, I traveled around Korea riding bike with my friends. The trip lasted four weeks and 11 members joined the trip including me. Two years later after the trip, I have been to Europe alone for about 40 days. I enjoyed both trips and they were unforgettable moment in my life but there are some differences between them.

When I traveled with group, my daily routine was scheduled and fixed. All of members should follow the plan and there were little chance to be changed. I had to wake up until 7 am and ate breakfast which was distributed equally for everyone. Moreover, all of personal activities were rarely allowed because it is likely to lead to an accident. We were usually conscious of safety which could occur in the group. It was somehow uncomfortable and annoying sometimes, but I could learn how to be considerate of other's feeling and to persist in the hard situation. Actually, it was too harsh to travel by bike so during the trip, I regretted millions of time hitting the road by bicycle and I determined not to do again. At the same time, I enjoyed taking tons of photos with friends and beautiful scenery of our nation. We could share the feelings of the trip, which made us closer. Since we went through hard time and enjoyable time together, we get to know each other well and become much closer than before. Until now, we gather and recollect those time telling lots of episodes which will be unforgettable to all of us.

On the contrary, when I was in Europe, I didn't have to be tied on the schedule. I could wake up whenever I wanted, eat whatever I wanted and itinerary was flexible depending on my convenience. Especially in Europe, I could adapt to unfamiliar place shortly and I could enjoy the classical

atmosphere of Europe without any bother from companions. Also I made some foreign friends who were traveling alone like me. However, as time goes by, I started to feel lonely. I became tired of begging other tourists for taking photos and there were no one to share the feeling of that time. Particularly, when I got some troubles, I wished there had been someone to overcome together. Due to the experience being alone, I gained confidence through the trip. I had to handle all of troublesome works such as booking accommodation or flight and finding the way to tourist attractions. Sometimes I encountered to sudden incidents. Experiencing those events, I became more confident and self-dependent.

As I wrote in the first paragraph, there are some differences between two types of trip, traveling with group and traveling alone. The former type of trip is not liberal, but it's much fun to hang out with group and all of members get friendly after the trip. Meanwhile traveling alone may be solitary, but I don't have to consider other's feeling and I have a lot of time to arrange my thought. Both have their own strengths and shorts, so I can't tell which type is better. I think it varies depending on personal preference or purpose of the trip.