Modern English Education, Vol. 11, No. 3, Winter 2010

Where All the Changes Come From: English Language Learners' Perceptions of Feedback

Sookyung Cho
Seoul National University

Cho, Sookyung. (2010). Where all the changes come from: English language learners' perceptions of feedback. *Modern English Education, 11*(3), 1-21.

This study aims to investigate how English language learner perceptions of feedback affect their actual writing. To date, studies on learner response to feedback are limited in that they have examined only what learners think of teacher or peer feedback, but have failed to relate these perceptions to actual learner paper drafts. To overcome this limitation, this study uses a case study methodology to examine the types of changes three Korean English as a foreign language students, Su-whan, Sol-ji, and Nam-hee make in revision based on feedback. While Su-hwan and Sol-ji approach feedback on a macro- level, Nam-hee views it in a more micro-level. These different perceptions of feedback and revision affect their revised drafts. This study implies that teachers of writing should first understand how students view and value feedback in order to make feedback more useful to students.

[feedback/writing/perceptions/피드백/작문/개념]

I. INTRODUCTION

The process of providing feedback to students, especially meaningful feedback, is both painstaking and time-consuming for writing instructors. Even as they partake in this difficult work, instructors wonder whether this feedback will really facilitate students' progress in writing. This study suggests that the effectiveness of feedback has a lot to do with how students think of feedback. Scholars on second language writing have investigated this issue by studying language learner response to feedback. These studies have usually examined how students react and respond toward teacher feedback (Brice, 1995; Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996). Several scholars,

however, have pointed out the limitations of the approach taken in these studies. For example, Ferris (2003) emphasizes that very few of these studies on student response to feedback link student observations or claims to actual teacher or peer feedback or to student revision. Lamenting that studies on feedback are usually text-oriented, Goldstein (2001) argues that "there are a good many factors that probably play an interactive role in how teachers comment, how students perceive and react to teacher commentary, and how students use such commentary when revising" (p. 77).

As recommended by Ferris and Goldstein, this study aims to broaden the scope of studies investigating student response to feedback by examining their general attitudes toward feedback instead of their acceptance of a particular type of feedback. It also examines student views and values about feedback in interaction with student texts. In other words, the focus of this study is on how students' general attitudes toward feedback are reflected in their revised drafts. This paper reports findings of two different types of analyses: analysis of participant texts and in-depth analysis of their values and attitudes toward feedback and revision. In the analysis of participant texts, close analysis of participants' first and revised drafts throughout the semester is presented, and the types of changes made and the extent of draft revision is discussed. The second section includes analysis of student perceptions as gleaned through interview and examines these perceptions in interaction with their revised drafts.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW: STUDENT RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

Early studies on student perceptions of feedback used survey methods (Cohen, 1987; Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994). By conducting a survey in a single-draft setting, Cohen found that students tried to reread their teachers' feedback and to attend to it. However, students did not have many strategies to approach written feedback, and oftentimes they even had difficulty understanding it, especially when instructors responded to their texts in single words or short phrases such as "not clear" or "confusing." Applying the same procedure as Cohen's procedure to multiple-draft setting, on the other hand, Ferris (1995) found more promising results than Cohen about student response to feedback. That is, she found that dealing with teacher feedback, students developed various strategies, including going to an outside source such as teacher, tutor, friends, grammar books, and dictionary, and mostly they thought teacher feedback is helpful to them.

On the other hand, some scholars used the same survery method in order to compare various groups of students. For example, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994, 1996) modified the survey method used in Cohen (1987) and Ferris (1995) and applied it to both English as a second language learners (ESL) and foreign language learners (FL) to see whether a difference exists between these two groups of participants in terms of student response to feedback. They found that ESL students are more concerned about content, rhetorical structure, and writing style than FL students. By conducting a survey on students' attitude towards "different types of comments, the marking and correcting of grammatical errors, the domain of teacher intervention, and revision (p. 357)," Radecki and Swales (1988) discovered three different types of learners: Receptors, Semi-resistors, and Resistors. While receptors mostly welcome teacher feedback and are willing to revise their writing if the teacher instructs them to do so, both semi-resistors and resistors are reluctant to revise their drafts, or sometimes consider revision as a punishment.

Saito (1994) used the form of questionnaire to see whether students' feedback preferences match teachers' feedback types, complementing the results with multiple sources of data such as student compositions, class observations, interviews with teachers, and students' think-aloud protocols. Saito discovered that students preferred teacher-feedback to non-teacher feedback (such as peer feedback and self-feedback), error-correction to other types of feedback, and prompt about Rule to the other prompts about Goal, Fit, and Word. Although Saito collected some students' first and revised drafts as samples, it is of note that she used them to analyze teacher feedback, not to view how students handled teacher feedback in revision.

Recently, however, scholars have started to point out the common limitations of these earlier studies. In her overview of research studying student views on response, Ferris (2003) argues that very few of the studies on student reaction to feedback link their observations or claims about feedback to either actual teacher or peer feedback or to student revision. While also emphasizing the necessity to examine the relationship between how students perceive feedback and how they actually revise, Goldstein (2001) asks scholars in this area these insightful questions: "What are students' underlying motivations for using or not using teacher-written commentary? How do individual students revise (as opposed to groups of students) in response to feedback? What is the relationship between students' attitudes and reactions to teacher commentary and how they actually revise? (p. 78)"

In answer to this call, a few studies have investigated how student perceptions of feedback influence and affect both their actual revision process and the revised product itself. For example, Goldstein (2006) interviewed two ESL learners, Trahn and Hisako, to

see how they interpreted teacher feedback. After examining how their views on feedback were reflected in their revision drafts, she found that the process of revision involved more than simply understanding teacher feedback; instead, it involved complex factors such as student motivation, time constraints, teacher grading policies, and class materials. In conclusion, Goldstein emphasizes the need to look at "the unique constellation and interaction of variables—contextual, teacher and student" in order to "truly understand what happens in the commentary and revision process and to understand what may or may not motivate students when they revise in reaction to this commentary" (p. 203).

Zhao (2010) discovered findings similar to Goldstein after comparing teacher and peer feedback. However, although the participants used more teacher feedback than peer feedback in revision, the interviews with the participants uncovered that they simply accepted teacher feedback without understanding it and that peer feedback provided a facilitative role in revision because students were able to communicate in their native language. Based on these findings, Zhao suggests that students' understanding of feedback is as important as their use of feedback in revision, and thus, that it should be taken into account in examining the usefulness of feedback.

While both Goldstein and Zhao did investigate the relationship between how students think of feedback and what they do in revision, they did not attempt to do a close analysis of student texts to see how students' perception of feedback is reflected in revised drafts. This study, therefore, fills this gap by examining how students' understanding of feedback makes a difference in their actual drafts, focusing on three Korean English as a foreign language students enrolled in an intermediate-level writing class. This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What types of changes and what amount of revision do participants make throughout the semester?
2. What are the participants' perceptions of feedback and revision in general?
3. How do the participants' perceptions and attitudes toward feedback and revision affect their revision process and revised products?

III. METHOD

This study adopts a case study method. In the area of student response to feedback, Goldstein (2006) emphasized the importance of case study approaches by stating that they help to "develop a sound understanding of the feedback and revision process and why as

teachers we need to look at each student and his or her context individually if we are to give optimal feedback to all students" (p. 203).

1. Participants

The three participants, Su-whan, Sol-ji, and Nam-hee were in my intermediate-level English writing class at one of the most prestigious universities in Korea. Students at this university with their proficiency level, higher than 700 in TEPS (Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University), are required to take either English speaking or English writing. The fact that these three participants chose writing instead of speaking is likely to indicate that they were relatively motivated to improve their writing skills in English. The students were asked to complete four major writing assignments: a one-paragraph text exhibiting logical division of ideas, a one-paragraph text explaining a process, a one-paragraph text of comparison and contrast, and an opinion essay. Students were required to turn in two drafts for each assignment on the assumption that this process-oriented writing practice is effective even in English as a foreign language context, as revealed in Minjong Song (2007). Between drafts, the students received both teacher and peer feedback.

As recommended by Jeongwan Lim (2007), a long-term perspective was taken to see how the students' perceptions of feedback are reflected in their multiple drafts throughout the semester. Out of the 19 students in the class, these particular three participants were selected for this study based on my interest in their improvements (or lack thereof) across drafts. I became interested in Su-whan and Sol-ji because they turned in remarkably improved revisions after the first drafts, revised to a much greater extent than I expected when giving feedback. On the other hand, Nam-hee was chosen for the opposite reason. Although she corrected her drafts according to my comments, she made minimal changes over the course of the semester. Nam-hee's writing was not inferior to other students, but it became worse across the drafts writing quality, which resulted in lower grades.

2. Procedure

In order to understand more deeply the differences between the writing of these three students, I collected the two drafts for each assignment, teacher feedback, and peer feedback. Teacher feedback was provided in two forms—annotated comments on the first draft and comments on a separate feedback sheet regarding the topic, elaboration, and grammar points (See Appendix A. Teacher Feedback). Based on these comments, I had a

five-minute teacher conference with each of the participants. Peer feedback was given in the format of answering questions from the textbook about each peer group member's draft (See Appendix B. Peer Feedback). Since the peer group members were rotated four times during the semester, it is difficult to assess whether or not any of the three participants received more helpful feedback from their peers than the other participants. In addition to these drafts and feedback, both teacher conference and interviews with the participants about their orientations toward feedback were tape-recorded. Although the medium of the instruction was solely English, both teacher conferences and interviews were conducted in our common L1, Korean, as students were able to communicate with me more freely (See Appendix C. Interview Protocol).

In the first part of this study, a close analysis of student text—across all paper drafts of all four paper types—was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to see where any statistical and qualitative differences in types and amounts of changes exist among the participants. The second part of the study involves analysis of the participants' orientations and perceptions toward feedback and revision through in-depth interviews with them.

3. Data Analysis

In order to see the extent to which each assignment was revised from the first to the second (and final) draft, Cho and MacArthur's analysis (2010) was adopted but modified for this specific group of participants. Based on Faigley and Witte (1981) and Sommers (1980), Cho and MacArthur categorized changes made in revision into four different areas: surface change, micro-meaning change, macro-meaning change, and reference. Surface changes are simple repairs (e.g., adding '-ed' to a verb to form past tense); micro-meaning changes are complex repairs or extending content ideas (e.g., elaborating on an existing point); macro-meaning changes concern new content and organization (e.g., adding a new title); and reference refers to the addition, omission, or modification of supportive materials (e.g., adding tables or figures).

Because the participants in this study mostly wrote paragraphs and were not required to provide references even in the essay assignment, I used only the first three categories as in Table 1. I also divided the two categories micro-meaning and macro-meaning into more detailed categories, including meaning-preserving changes, micro-structure changes, and macro-structure changes in order to discern some subtle differences between the drafts. Surface changes, therefore, refer to mechanical changes in spelling or grammar including tense, number, modality, and punctuation. Meaning-preserving changes are defined as

sentence-level changes which do not result in meaning change, such as when contents are paraphrased or particular expressions are replaced with other ones. On the other hand, both micro-structure and macro-structure changes lead to changes in meaning. According to Faigley and Witte (1981), the major difference between micro- and macro-meaning changes is whether the changes affect the summary of a text. Micro-meaning changes affect the meaning within the context, but do not lead to change in the summary of the whole text; on the other hand, macro-changes do so.

In order to see the extent to which participants revised their final drafts, the total number of words involved in each type of change was calculated as in Cho and MacArthur (2010). Oftentimes, studies on revision count the frequencies (Hyland & Hyland, 2006) or percentage (Goldstein, 2004) of change from the first draft to the final draft. However, after counting the changes in this set of data, I realized that frequency was not a good indicator of the amount of change, since it varies depending on the length of the text. As the text becomes longer, each type of change becomes more frequent. Therefore, the number of words per each type of change was counted instead of tallying mere frequencies to regulate the differences in the length. For substitutions, a bigger number of words, whether in the original or in the revised, was counted, and for rearrangement of contents, the words moved were counted, as suggested in Cho and MacArthur (2010).

Table 1
Revision Codes

	Definition	Examples
Surface changes	Formal changes in spelling, tense, modality, and punctuation	Original: The other thing you have to remind is *attending* department meeting actively. Revised: The other thing is *to attend* department meeting actively.
Meaning-Preserving changes	Paraphrasing	Original: If it *adapts this water*, then make bubbles with shampoo. Revised: If the cat *gets accustomed with this water*, then make bubbles with shampoo.
Micro-Structure changes	Changes in meaning, but do not affect the summary of the text	Original: It is easy to find homosexuality in nature, so homosexuality is *not error against nature.* Revised: It is easy to find homosexuality in nature, so homosexuality is *not abnormal.*
Macro-Structure changes	Change the summary of the text	Original: *They think that homosexuality has many problems to your society, but it is not true.* Revised: *For these feelings, they are easy to have repulsion of homosexuality: abnormal, instable.*

For the analysis of the audio-taped conferences and interviews, I first transcribed the

audio-taped materials and reviewed them several times as recommended by Leki (2006) to figure out "particularly salient or interesting comments as potential themes or categories to be cued against transcripts" (p. 270). I then compared the transcripts rigorously with the interview responses, "with straightforward responses tabulated and elaborations examined for themes and potential analytic categories to be correlated with themes and categories noted in the oral recordings" (p.270). In addition, because this study compares three different participants, their transcripts were contrasted with one another so that I could analyze any differences in their attitude, motivations, and orientations toward feedback.

IV. RESULTS

1. Text Analysis

1) Quantitative Analysis

In order to compare the average number of words per change across participants for each type of change, an ANOVA was conducted. With an alpha level of .05, no statistically significant differences were found in any of the categories, $F(2, 9) = .98$, $p = .41$ in macro-structure changes, $F(2, 9) = .72$, $p = .51$ in micro-structure changes, $F(2, 9) = 2.58$, $p = .13$ in meaning-preserving changes, and $F(2, 9) = .29$, $p = .75$ in surface changes. Although it seems that Su-whan and Sol-ji made more changes and a larger number of words were involved in these changes than Nam-hee, the average number of words for each type of change does not show any remarkable difference across participants as you see in Table 2, 3, and 4.

Table 2
Statistics for Su-whan

Draft	total # of words	Surface change			Meaning-preserving			Micro-structure			Macro-structure		
		Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.
1	328	2	3	**1.5**	7	17	**2.43**	2	5	**2.5**	8	128	**16**
2	279	4	4	**1**	14	41	**2.93**	4	44	**11**	0	0	**0**
3	266	4	4	**1**	10	36	**3.6**	7	53	**7.57**	0	0	**0**
4	500	5	5	**1**	14	33	**2.36**	11	155	**14.9**	3	51	**17**

Table 3
Statistics for Sol-ji

Draft	total # of words	Surface change			Meaning-preserving			Micro-structure			Macro-structure		
		Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.
1	297	4	4	**1**	9	51	**5.67**	18	137	**7.61**	3	57	**19**
2	384	9	14	**1.56**	27	101	**3.74**	11	74	**6.73**	6	83	**13.83**
3	331	0	0	**0**	7	78	**11.14**	2	11	**5.5**	12	196	**16.33**
4	881	7	10	**1.43**	33	143	**4.33**	12	150	**12.5**	24	308	**12.83**

Table 4
Statistics for Nam-hee

Draft	total # of words	Surface change			Meaning-preserving			Micro-structure			Macro-structure		
		Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.	Fre.	W	Ave.
1	295	6	11	**1.83**	8	52	**6.5**	0	0	**0**	2	23	**11.5**
2	308	1	1	**1**	7	29	**4.14**	7	99	**14.14**	0	0	**0**
3	246	9	11	**1.22**	8	28	**3.5**	1	5	**5**	2	30	**15**
4	334	8	8	**1**	6	27	**4.5**	0	0	**0**	2	37	**18.5**

2) In-Depth Text Analysis

A closer look at the actual changes made in their revised drafts, however, reveals a different story. While Nam-hee did not initiate any further changes than what I suggested to her, Sol-ji and Su-whan made more changes and greater changes in relation to the first drafts than I expected. I will introduce what each of them revised and how they revised in more detail through in-depth textual analysis, and I will also trace these differences back to their beliefs of feedback through an analysis of their interview data.

(1) Nam-hee

Although Nam-hee made many macro-structure changes in her final drafts, most of them were just simple omissions from the original or simple acceptance of teacher suggestions with no further elaborations. For example, in the first writing assignment, the text demonstrating the logical division of ideas, Nam-hee wrote about why teenagers use text message more than adults, and in her second supporting point, she argued as follows:

> Moreover, teenagers feel more comfortable in having a conversation in virtual space than face-to-face. It affects when they have conversation with their real friends or acquaintances. *They feel uncomfortable in face-to-face conversation, so they prefer text message*. (1st draft)

In this draft, I asked Nam-hee to provide evidence to support the italicized part, as it would be an easy claim for a skeptical reader to attack, as one may argue that there might be some students who prefer face-to-face conversation to text message. In the 2nd draft, Nam-hee accepted my suggestion and revised the italicized part, but she made very minimal changes as follows: "They tend to use text messaging than face-to-face conversation." Although she did change the whole sentence structure, she made no further elaborations on her claim. On the contrary, she did not change any other word, expression, or phrasing at all, but just toned down the specific sentence I had pointed-out to her. In her other cases of macrostructure change, she made as few changes as possible, often using the strategy of inserting one sentence without further elaboration. In particular, in her 4th and final assignment, which was to write an opinion essay, Nam-hee completed the assignment without an overall argument based on her opinion. Instead, Nam-hee simply described three different English tests: the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), and the Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University (TEPS). The following is her first paragraph in her first essay draft:

> English is the international official language. Many people who use English as a foreign language (EFL) study English to use it proficiently. Especially, there are more people dying to use English well in Korea. I think this phenomenon is caused by the situation that most companies regard English ability as important in recruiting employee. Employers judge appliers' English ability by using objective indicator such as test score. Thus, a lot of people who prepare to get a job study English to get a high score in English test. There are three representative English test in Korea—TOEIC, TOEFL, TEPS. (1st draft)

As you see here, the topic of having three representative English tests in Korea was not a suitable topic for an opinion essay. As Nam-hee claimed in her last sentence of the introduction, the body part simply listed several characteristics of each test including their full names, subject matters, and components.

During the individual conference with Nam-hee, I explained that her argument was not

clear in her draft, and I asked her to revise her draft by making clear her own opinion or purpose of comparing these three different English tests. In her revised draft, Nam-hee made her argument relatively clear, although I cannot say that she was successful in constructing an opinion-based argument. Her argument was that she was going to compare and contrast the three different English proficiency tests lest people should be confused which test they have to take:

> English is internationally an official language. Many people study English to use it proficiently. Especially, there are more people dying to speak English well in Korea. I think this phenomenon is caused by the situation that most companies regard English ability as important in recruiting employee. Employers judge applicants' English ability by using objective indicators such as test scores. Thus, a lot of people who prepare to get a job study English to get a high score in English test. *However, there are many kinds of English tests, so people are confused which test they will take. Thus, I'm going to explain* the characters of the three representative English test in Korea—TOEIC, TOEFL, and TEPS. (2nd draft)

Although Nam-hee only added one sentence (the italicized one) and modified as little as possible while recycling the original phrases and sentences she used in her first draft, it is clearer in her revision why she wanted to compare and contrast the three different tests, namely that the number of English tests available to people is so great that people may be confused as to what test they have to take. The purpose of teaching the readers the differences between the three major tests is still not an appropriate argument for an opinion essay, but her opinion is more present here than in the revised draft. Once I read the whole essay, however, I was quite disappointed to find that no other changes had been made in her body paragraphs, which were expected to be made in accordance with her revised purpose. She made only two or three changes in grammar, changes I had pointed out on the margins of her first draft.

(2) Sol-ji & Su-whan

On the other hand, Su-whan's and Sol-ji's macrostructure changes are much more profound than Nam-hee's. Actually, they were the two students who made the biggest changes in their revised drafts compared with the other 17 students. They were given similar kinds of feedback as Nam-hee was; no important difference in peer feedback was ascertained in comparison with the peer feedback Nam-hee received from her peer. I also

responded with equal detail to each of them. Similarities in the contents of feedback notwithstanding, Su-whan and Sol-ji actually initiated more changes in their revisions than either the instructor or their peer suggested. Sol-ji's first writing assignment (i.e., the logical division of ideas) is about her own ways of relieving stress. She provides three different ways of relieving stress: chatting with friends, sleeping, and watching TV shows. Here is one of her supporting points:

> The first way that I relieve stress is I chat away with friends. When I got stressed because of worry, chattering with my friends has positive effects. Because when I talk with my friends about my worry, they become outlet for stress. So, I can feel relieved. (1st draft)

As can be seen, Sol-ji's explanations about the effect of chatting with friends are not persuasive since the same idea (that chatting with friends relieves stress) was repeated and no further detail was given. During the teacher conference, I pointed out this problem to her by saying that her supporting point needs more explanations. For example, I asked Sol-ji to think about the positive effects of chatting with friends and how talking with friends can be an outlet for stress. I only provided Sol-ji with these guiding questions; I did not advise her as to what kinds of details she could use in her revised drafts.

To my surprise, Sol-ji's 2nd draft consisted of many changes, as follows:

> First, I chat away with my close friends. Researchers say that a heart-to-heart talk is the best way of relieving stress. This is psychologically called 'ventilation'. For example, if we are worried about cares by ourselves, these will be stuck in our body and build up stress. But, if we talk with our bosom friends about anxiety, we will find our outlet. When we have same or similar concern and share sympathetic understanding each other by conversation, we can remove stress. (2nd draft)

In this revised draft, almost everything has been changed and none of the original phrases have survived, which is quite a contrast with Nam-hee, who changed her text very little. In the revised draft, Sol-ji quoted researchers' findings about the effect of a heart-to-heart talk in relieving stress (though it is of note that because we had not yet discussed how to quote findings appropriately in class, she did not give complete citations here). Also, Sol-ji explained the process of 'ventilation,' that is, how this kind of talk relieves stress, in detail.

Like Sol-ji, Su-whan not only initiated his own changes in addition to what was

recommended by the instructor, but he also made changes beyond my suggestions. For example, in his first draft of the first assignment (i.e., the logical division of ideas), Su-whan wrote about two tips to get along with your seniors at a university: first, greet them with smile and get close to them at the first meeting, and second, participate in department meetings actively. Here is Su-whan's first supporting point in his first draft:

> First, greet with smile and get close to them at the first meeting. It is very important to make a positive first impression. If you appeal them to have a good impression, you can have a fine relationship with them more easily. Greeting with a tender smile is not only the simplest thing but also definite thing, so say hello to them more gladly. (1st draft)

Regarding this supporting point, I suggested to Su-whan that while he only provided explanations, it would be better to provide concrete examples, such as using his own or his friends' experiences or episodes related to the topic.

Based on this simple and general feedback that did not explain specifically what Su-whan needed to add to his revised version exactly, he made the following changes:

> First, I recommend you to remember your senior's personal information. When I was freshman, I tried to remember one thing about my seniors. When I met them first time, they introduced themselves such as their hometown, their birthday, and interest. I remembered these insignificant things and talked about it later, for example, I asked my senior who had lived in Jin-Hae about a date of cherry blossoms festival (Jin-Hae is famous for beautiful cherry blossoms). Then he talked lots of story about cherry blossoms festival to me, and I could be on intimate terms with him. People like to receive attention from others, so if you give more concern to your senior's information, they can talk easily, and they will like you. (2nd draft)

As you can see in his revised supporting point, Su-whan changed almost everything. First, he modified the focus of the first supporting point from 'greeting with smile and getting close to seniors' to 'remembering a senior's personal information.' Furthermore, he included his own example of remembering one of his senior's personal information and what the consequences of that action were, which is very effective in supporting this new supporting point. Comparing Su-whan with Nam-hee in the same macrostructure changes, we can easily notice that Su-whan's changes are more profound. These are the changes that could not be accounted for by the mere count of frequencies and the number of words changed.

2. Perceptions of Feedback and Revision

In order to understand more deeply the differences between the three participants, I interviewed them at the end of this semester. As examining teacher and peer feedback did not suffice in explaining the notable differences between their revisions, my questions concerned the particular revisions they made and their general understanding about revision and feedback. The interviews revealed that while Nam-hee understands revision on a very local level (as conjectured from analyzing her revised texts), Sol-ji and Su-whan perceive revision on a more global level.

Nam-hee returned my question about what she did in her revision with her own question: “You mean correction after seeing [teacher’s comments]? I tried to read everything, but I rather concentrated on the contents. I fixed the grammar mistakes, but I did not pay attention to why I was wrong. Instead, I simply fixed the problems. I fixed everything unconsciously.” It seems that Nam-hee simply accepted my suggestions without any second thoughts—the term “unconsciously” here seems key. Not only did Nam-hee correct all the mistakes pointed out in her first draft ‘unconsciously,’ but she also has a very limited view of revision itself. When asked whether she tends to revise a lot or not, Nam-hee answered, "I'm not sure, but I tried to fix everything the instructor pinpointed. About peer feedback, I did fix what I could fix, but didn’t fix if it is hard to do it."

On the other hand, Sol-ji and Su-whan have quite a different approach to feedback and revision from Nam-hee. With regard to her first assignment, discussed previously, Sol-ji said, “Since the contents were too limited, I tried to elaborate on them. In my first draft, I am just writing as I think without thoughts on coherence.” Asked whether she is afraid of revision, Sol-ji answered, "I wrote a so-called rough draft at first. I revised a lot the first assignment and the third one. I mean I usually write as I want to write, and, after receiving feedback, I revised it. I think revision is necessary."

Su-whan’s answers for the same questions uncover more remarkable differences between Nam-hee and him. When asked how he came up with those notable changes, he said, “with the thought that the instructor provided a general outline of changes I have to make, I added on a couple of my own episodes and then speculated on any other changes I could make.” Also, his general understanding of revision in general is similar to Sol-ji’s. Like Sol-ji, Su-whan states, “I write my first draft as I think although I am not sure if some points look okay or not, with the thought that later I will decide what to do with them [keep them or change them] after receiving feedback. To me, a first draft is a first draft as the

name indicates. My style of writing is to write quickly at first without changes, but to make other changes I have thought of in addition to the changes pointed by the instructor."

While Nam-hee views comments at face-value, both Sol-ji and Su-whan take on more responsibility in revision, in that they view comments as starting points off of which to expand their ideas. In addition to these different views of feedback, their process of writing and revision differs, as we saw in the interview data. To Nam-hee, revision means correction, and she does not necessarily contemplate on why she has to correct a certain mistake. Revision is a kind of mechanical process of cleaning up her draft. On the other hand, to Sol-ji and Su-whan, the process of revision requires refinement in ideas, structures, and language, since they wrote their first drafts as rough drafts. Although all three participants incorporated my feedback into their revision, they differed in the extent to which they revised, as we noticed before. Sol-ji's and Su-whan's views of feedback as suggestions off of which it is their responsibility, as students, to build their ideas may explain why they made those profound and great changes, as examined before.

V. DISCUSSION

We can conclude, then, that the views and perceptions of feedback and revision of these three participants affected their revision process and, as a result, their final written products. The analysis on the types of changes, that is, whether students made surface, meaning-preserving, microstructure, and macrostructure changes, did not show any statistically significant differences across the changes made by participants. Although Sol-ji and Su-whan made more microstructure and macrostructure changes, these differences were not significant when frequency of changes was taken into account. The qualitative analysis of the actual changes made by each participant shows a different story. In particular, the micro-structure and macro-structure changes, which usually involve a bigger number of words changed, are considered more global than surface and meaning-preserving changes. On the one hand, Sol-ji and Su-whan made additional changes prompted by teacher feedback in addition to what was pointed out by the teacher. On the other hand, Nam-hee's revision looks very passive in that she simply accepted the teacher's suggestions and did not attempt further changes at all. Her minimal revisions involved simply dropping problematic expressions, replacing them with new ones, or adding one or more words or sentence; she never made changes over the sentence-level.

The interviews with each of the participants confirm that these differences in revision styles are in accordance with their views and perceptions of the writing process, feedback,

and revision itself. While Sol-ji and Su-whan view feedback as starting points off of which to make further changes and revision on a global level, Nam-hee regards revision as correction of mistakes and as acceptance of teacher's recommendations. Furthermore, Nam-hee was even selective in accepting peer feedback: she only changed what she was able to change and ignores what she considers difficult to fix. This fundamental difference in their views of feedback and revision comes from their different view of writing process. Sol-ji and Su-whan tended to write their first drafts relatively easily but put more effort in their revision, contemplating on how to improve the first draft. Since Nam-hee did not tell me how much effort she put in her first draft, it is not plausible to compare her with the other participants in this aspect. However, it is clear that her revision process—simple acceptance of all the suggestions and mere ignorance of difficult revision—looks much simpler than Sol-ji's and Su-whan's.

VI. CONCLUSION

The previous discussion points to the fact that how learners think of feedback, revision, and their writing process affects their actual revisions. The quantitative analysis of four different types of changes does not reveal any statistically significant differences across the participants. The close investigation of the changes made by each participant across their assignments and drafts, however, demonstrates that Su-whan and Sol-ji made more global changes than Nam-hee and that Su-whan and Sol-ji initiated changes other than what the instructor pointed out. These self-initiated changes were not traceable at all in Nam-hee's revised drafts. She fixed only what the instructor problematized, and even as she fixed the problems, she attempted to minimize the number of words changed by simply omitting problematic words, phrases, or sentences, and adding one word or one sentence. Her revision did not go above sentence-level corrections.

How the participants think of feedback and revision clearly affects the differences in their approaches to revision. Both Su-whan and Sol-ji believe that feedback is necessary to their writing, whether it comes from a teacher or peer, and these views on feedback are reflected in their writing processes themselves. They are likely to have less difficulty in writing their first drafts since they write them freely without second thoughts, but place more effort in revising after receiving feedback. On the other hand, the process is reversed in the case of Nam-hee, who considers revision as the correction of mistakes. Although I do not know exactly how much effort she put in her original draft, at least I can tell that Nam-hee put more effort in the original draft than in the revisions. During the interview,

when I asked her how long it took her to write the first draft of the last writing assignment, she said "a lot". Surprisingly, in comparison with the effort she put in the first draft, her revision looks relatively unchanged, allowing us to assume that it did not take much time and effort.

These findings actually satisfy the speculations of many scholars who have studied learners' perceptions of feedback in the area of second language writing. Goldstein (2001) emphasized the necessity of examining sources in addition to student reactions to feedback, such as teacher commentary and student revisions, arguing that all these interact to affect a revision. In this way, she argues, "They [scholars] can see their mutual influences and come to understand why teachers comment the ways that they do, why students perceive comments in the ways that they do, and why students use comments in the different ways that they do" (p. 86). Zhao (2010) also suggests that students' understanding of feedback is as important as their use of feedback in the revisions, and thus, that it should be taken into account in examining how useful feedback is. As they implied, this study uncovers how students' understanding of feedback and revision is reflected in their actual revision.

Since this study only focuses on three participants, the close relationship between student response to feedback and revision cannot be generalizable to other contexts or to other learners of English. To date, however, most studies on student reaction to feedback are usually conducted on a larger scale, which makes it almost impossible to look at the relationship between student views on feedback and their actual revisions. Thus, we may be in a greater need of more focused research on individual or small groups of language learners and their entire processes of writing in detail. As Goldstein (2006) implies, in this way, we can "develop a sound understanding of the feedback and revision process and why as teachers we need to look at each student and his or her context individually if we are to give optimal feedback to all students" (p. 203).

By understanding student writing processes in relation to their perspectives on feedback more deeply, writing teachers are likely to provide help that can be considered useful from the student perceptive. More importantly, this study suggests that teachers should tap into how students think of feedback and revision at the same time that they teach them how to write in English. Without these types of efforts, no matter how good and useful teacher feedback is, it will not leave positive marks or traces in student development of literacy skills in English.

REFERENCES

Brice, C. (1995). ESL writers' reactions to teacher commentary: A case study. (Eric document reproduction service No. 394 312).

Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction, 20*, 328-338.

Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, *21*(2), 193-204.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* 400-414.

Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multi-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 33-53.

Ferris, D. (2003). Student views on response. In D. Ferris (Ed.), *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students* (pp. 92-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goldstein, L. (2001). For Kyla: What does the research say about responding to ESL writers? In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 73-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goldstein, L. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(1), 63-80.

Goldstein, L. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.) *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 185-205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(2), 141-163.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expect feedback in L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal, 80*, 237-308.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.) *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 206-224). Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Leki, I. (2006). "You cannot ignore": L2 graduate students' response to discipline-based written feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.) *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 266-285). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lim, Jeongwan. (2007). Responding to students writing: Peer and teacher feedback. *Modern English Education, 8*(2), 59-74.

Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System, 16* (3), 355-365.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 11*(2), 46-70.

Song, Minjong. (2007). A promising practice for improving writing quality and decreasing writing apprehension of Korean students. *Modern English Education, 8*(2), 113-135.

Sommers, N. I. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*, 378-387.

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15*, 3-17.

APPENDIX A

Teacher Feedback
(Su-whan, 1st assignment)

Dear Su-Whan,

Your topic will look very interesting to a freshman. The following are my comments that may be helpful for you to revise your draft.

Topic
Your topic is clearly stated, and your supporting points are well-explained. But you may need to think about who these tips are for. These tips may look interesting to a high school graduate who is about to go to college, but these may not be that interesting to college students who have already experienced the college life. Depending on whom you target this paragraph at, you may need to refocus your paragraph.

Elaboration

Under each supporting point, you provide nice explanations, but personally I believe that a concrete example is more powerful than a lot of nice explanations. For example, your own episode showing your point or a friend of yours will be more efficient to support your topic than an explanation.

Grammar

No major mistakes, but some of your word choices do not look appropriate in the context. For example, “bored,” “fine,” and “remind.” See my comments.

APPENDIX B

Peer Feedback

(Sol-ji’s Feedback to Su-whan’s 1st Assignment)

Peer-Editing Worksheet

Logical Division of Ideas

Peer Editor: Sol-ji

1. Is the paragraph interesting? Yes
   Write a comment about a part that is especially interesting to you.
   Greet with smile and get close to them at the first meeting. It is very important to make a positive first impression.
   When I meet people the first time, I make awkward expression because of little shyness. So that sentence is interesting.
2. Do you understand everything? Mostly
   Circle or underline any part that you do not understand, and write a comment about it.
3. Copy the topic sentence here, and circle the topic and underline the controlling idea.
   There are two tips to get on with your seniors in university.
4. How many supporting points are there in the paragraph? Two
   Is each point introduced by a transition signal? Yes
   Is there at least one example for every supporting point? Yes
5. Would you like more information about anything? Yes
   If your answer is yes, write down what you would like to know more about.
   When we drink alcohol only, can we take with seniors actively?
   I want you to explain by giving specific examples.

6. How many transition signals can you find? Six
   Are there too many or just about right number of transition signals?
   I think that 'the other thing' makes a pair with 'one,' so it is awkward after 'first.'
   'For this reason, even you don't drink at all, you can talk with your seniors and have a intimacy with them. Drinking help you to talk easily.'
   I think that the flow of these sentences are unnatural.
7. In your opinion, what is the best feature of this paragraph? That is, what is this writer's best writing skill?
   He explains concretely each subsection given examples. He doesn't use concluding signals, but he concluded paragraph.

APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol

1. Which of the drafts do you think you revised the most? Which of the drafts did you put the most effort into for revision?
2. What kinds of things did you try to focus on when you revised the draft?
3. What kinds of changes did you make in revision?
4. What kinds of comments were the most helpful to you both in peer and teacher feedback?
5. Did you usually read the feedback carefully?
6. Are you willing to make changes in your revision? Do you mind making changes on a large scale?
7. What do you think of revision? Do you think it is necessary?

Sookyung Cho
College English, Seoul National University
599 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu,
Seoul ,151-742, Korea
Tel: (02) 880-4010/H.P.:010-3506-0197
Email: sookyungcho@snu.ac.kr

Received 30 September 2010
Reviewed 13 November 2010
Revised version received 7 December, 2010