

The Identity Development of Writing Teachers: A Case Study in a Graduate Course on Writing Feedback*

Sookyung Cho

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

Cho, Sookyung. (2015). The identity development of writing teachers: A case study in a graduate course on writing feedback. *Modern English Education*, 16(3), 1-22.

This study investigates how three graduate students build and develop their identities as writing teachers through a graduate seminar focused on written feedback. Teacher feedback on writing has been extensively studied from the perspective of student writers, including its effectiveness (Ferris, 2003, 2006; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982; Lee, 1997) and their personal reactions (Ferris, 1995; Saito, 1994; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Enginarlar, 1993). However, teachers' reflections of their own feedback have rarely been studied. By analyzing three graduate students' reflections written monthly and their personal histories of learning and teaching writing, written at the end of the class, as well as their actual feedback they provide as a classroom practice, this study explores how their views on teacher feedback changed, how these views were reflected in their feedback, and how this process affected their identity development. The results indicate that the three different participants show how their identities as writing teachers developed depending on their own experiences both as a student and a teacher. These findings shed light on the importance of giving opportunities for teachers-in-training to build their identities as writing teachers along with training their feedback skills.

[identity/writing teachers/feedback/graduate course/
정체성/작문교사/피드백/대학원수업]

* This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2014.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the field of second language writing, feedback has been extensively studied from the perspective of the learner: how feedback affects their writing and how they perceive feedback. However, the role of feedback has not been deeply studied from the perspective of teachers, such as how they perceive their own feedback, and furthermore, how their views on feedback have developed and changed over time. This study investigates how three graduate students develop their identities as writing teachers, focusing on their participation in a graduate course on writing feedback.

In Korea, interest in teaching English writing has been continuously increasing due to several changes incorporated into the national curriculum driven by the Ministry of Education, but many English teachers are not prepared for teaching writing because of their lack of experience learning and teaching writing both in Korean and English. According to Y. Park's survey conducted on 56 middle school teachers (2007), 55% of teachers reported that writing is one of the most difficult areas to teach, and perhaps due to this difficulty, none of them (0%) seemed to place emphasis on teaching writing. E. Shim (2009) also asked 78 secondary English teachers about their current practices of teaching writing in their own classrooms and found that only one of them answered that writing is one of the most focused areas in the classroom. Shim's participants attributed this low interest in teaching writing to several obstacles such as "no urgent need to teach writing in the curriculum, relatively low confidence teaching English writing, and limited teacher training programs on writing instruction" (p. 114). Moreover, 77% of the teachers agreed that it is necessary to provide more training in writing instruction to teachers. S. Kim (2014) also pointed out that not only is there less emphasis on writing, compared to other English skills such as reading, listening, and speaking, in the current Korean educational system, but also lack of writing instruction for Korean teachers of English contributes to their lack of confidence in teaching writing. As these studies demonstrate, most Korean secondary school teachers of English do not feel well-prepared to teach writing in English to Korean students because of a lack of writing instruction as well as a lack of experience writing themselves.

This study focuses on three graduate students enrolled in a seminar on writing feedback, tracing their identity development as writing instructors through the course by exploring their views and perceptions of writing as well as their writing feedback itself. These three participants had various degrees of experience teaching writing: Jin-Su had no experience teaching English or writing; Min-Woo had been teaching English reading and grammar at a private institute for more than two years, but had no experience teaching writing; and Su-Young had been editing students' writing at a private reading academy for more than two years. None of the participants had ever taken a course focused on teaching writing,

meaning that this graduate course on writing feedback was their first exposure to major issues in providing writing feedback in a second language writing classroom. By focusing on these students' development as writing instructors for a semester, this study explores how their identity as writing instructors form and develop based on their reflections and changes in their actual feedback.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

To date, most studies on teacher feedback have approached feedback from the point of view of learners. Two main strands of research have examined how teacher feedback affects second language (L2) learners' grammatical accuracy and how L2 learners view teacher feedback.

While Truscott vehemently criticized grammar correction, insisting on its ineffectiveness (1996, 1999), several scholars have found that certain kinds of teacher feedback improve student writing even in grammatical accuracy (Ferris, 2003, 2006; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982; Lee, 1997). Frantzen (1995) compared two Spanish content courses—a non-grammar group whose errors were indicated, but not corrected and a plus-grammar group, who received daily grammar review and error correction on their written work. Later, the two groups were tested on two different types of tests—the discrete-point grammar test consisting of items that had one correct answer and the integrative essay that required the students to pull together all aspects of the language to complete the essay. While both groups improved in grammatical accuracy, both in the grammar-focused test and the integrative essay, the plus-grammar group outperformed the non-grammar group in the grammar-focused test. Lalande (1982) also found that grammar correction, combined with activities that raise students' awareness of feedback, such as using an Error Correction Code or an Error Awareness Sheet, seem to reduce students' grammatical errors and orthographic errors. Similar to these scholars, through the analysis of 92 ESL student writing assignments and the feedback of three teachers, Ferris (2006) showed that teacher feedback helped students correct their own errors, but that the teachers varied their feedback depending on the error types: while indirect feedback, which indicated errors, but did not correct them, was preferred for treatable errors such as verb tense or form, subject-verb agreement, run-ons, fragments, noun endings, articles, pronouns, and spelling, direct feedback that corrected errors was favored in the case of untreatable errors, such as word choice, idioms, and sentence structure.

In the same vein, L2 learners seem to find teacher feedback helpful and desirable in improving their writing (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994). By conducting a survey of 155 English as a second language (ESL) learners, Ferris

(1995) found that most students believe teacher feedback is helpful for them in improving their writing by informing what to improve and avoid in the future; moreover, they seem to pay more attention to teacher feedback provided on preliminary drafts than on final drafts. Through a questionnaire of 39 ESL students in three ESL courses, Saito (1994) also obtained a similar finding: students preferred teacher feedback, including teacher correction, teacher correction with comments, error identification, commentary, and teacher-student conferencing, to non-teacher feedback like peer correction and self-correction, although their teachers used these approaches frequently in their classes. Radecki and Swales (1988) surveyed 59 ESL students and categorized them into three different groups—receptors, semi-receptors, and resisters—depending on their attitudes towards teacher feedback and revision. The results reveal that the majority (46% receptors and 41% semi-receptors) favored teacher feedback, while only 13% did not favor teacher feedback, but as their proficiency level increased, the participants seem to assign a limited role to teacher feedback. It has been also found that EFL students differ from their ESL counterparts in their preferences of teacher feedback (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996). According to Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), EFL students seem to prefer feedback on form, whereas ESL students appreciate content feedback as well as form feedback. They suspect that these differences are the result of different teaching practices in ESL and EFL writing contexts: while content and meaning has been emphasized in ESL writing classrooms, accuracy has been prioritized in EFL writing classrooms.

In contrast to these studies approaching teacher feedback from the point of view of students, Lee (2003, 2010, 2013) has viewed teacher feedback from the perspective of teachers. In order to explore writing instructors' beliefs and perceptions towards error feedback, Lee (2003) surveyed 206 secondary teachers in Hong Kong, finding that most of them corrected students' grammatical errors comprehensively, even though the literature and the local syllabus emphasized the effectiveness of selective error correction. Unfortunately, these teachers did not seem to believe that their efforts paid off, as they found little improvement in student revision or improvement in their writing in general across the semester. Lamenting the lack of research and attention given to writing instructors, Lee (2010) then examined how four EFL writing teachers developed their identities as writing instructors through in-service teacher education, arguing that teacher education can broaden their perspectives on teaching writing and contribute to their development as writing teachers. Lee (2013) also examined how their identities had been formed and what factors affect this identity formation, finding that their primary concern and focus changed from teaching language to teaching writing, and that they came to share responsibility with students instead of domineering the class. Their identities as teachers have been formed and influenced by the dynamics of multiple factors, such as teacher education, their reflective stance, that is, their ability and willingness to reflect on their

teaching practices, and their roles as teachers in the teaching context. Drawing on Lee's finding (2013) that writing teacher identity is dynamic and constantly changing due to the influence of various social and cultural factors, this study aims to examine how three Korean graduate students build their identities as writing instructors over the course of a semester in a graduate seminar focused on written feedback. In order to better understand how they build and negotiate their identities as writing instructors, this study traces the changes in their views on feedback and their actual writing feedback, and, as a result, addresses the following questions:

- 1) How do novice writing teachers' views on feedback change?
- 2) How does novice writing teachers' writing feedback change?
- 3) How does their identity as a writing instructor form and develop?

III. METHOD

1. Context and Participants

The participants are three graduate students—Su-Young, Min-Woo, and Jin-Su—who were studying in a MA program within the department of English language and linguistics at a university located in Seoul, Korea. All of them were enrolled in a graduate seminar on writing feedback, which I designed and taught. The course lasted 15 weeks (September to December), the first week introducing the course, the last two weeks dedicated to student preparation of final projects, and, making up the core of the course, five two- to three-week units on the following themes: 1) understanding teacher feedback, 2) understanding peer feedback, 3) computer-mediated feedback, 4) tutor feedback, and 5) genre and discipline in feedback. In reading various scholarly articles and discussing them with their classmates, students were exposed to multiple views and various topics on teacher feedback, including an overview of L2 writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a), the issue of teacher appropriation of student text (Reid, 1994; Tardy, 2006), controversy on the effects of error correction (Ferris, 2006; Truscott, 1996), and interpersonal aspects of teacher feedback such as mitigation strategies and interaction between teacher and student (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Hyland & Hyland, 2006b). At the end of the semester, the students submitted a study proposal describing a potential study on writing feedback.

Out of the eleven students enrolled in the seminar, the three participants selected for this case study were chosen due to my familiarity with their academic interests and concerns, as I advised their master's theses. All of them are proficient English speakers: Su-Young, Min-Woo, and Jin-Su received 965, 840, and 920 in TOEIC (Test of English for

International Communication) respectively. Su-Young was 29 years old and was in the MA program for two semesters. She was teaching English reading and writing to primary and secondary Korean students and often commented on their book reviews. Min-Woo was 31 years old and was in the graduate program for four semesters. He was teaching English reading and grammar to middle school students at a private academy. Out of the three participants, Jin-Su was the youngest—he was 26 years old—was studying in the MA program for three semesters. He had had private tutoring but was not currently teaching. As none of the participants had ever taken a course focused on teaching writing, this graduate course on writing feedback was their first exposure to key issues in providing writing feedback in a second language writing classroom.

2. Data Collection

This study is based on the analysis of four different types of data: participant reflections on teacher feedback, their personal histories of learning and teaching writing, participant written feedback on texts, and field notes compiled through class observation. The participants submitted their reflections on teacher feedback four times during the semester, writing their thoughts and ideas concerning teacher feedback, such as what they think the purpose of teacher feedback is, what types of feedback they want to provide to their students, and why they would provide these types of feedback. In their personal histories, which were written at the end of the semester, the participants wrote their own personal history of learning and teaching in relation to English writing, focusing on 1) their own experiences with writing feedback both in Korean and English, 2) their views on writing feedback before the class, and 3) their current views on writing feedback, including what they have learned and how their views have changed through the class. In order to see whether their written feedback actually changed over the course of the seminar, I also collected their written feedback on the same sample writing both at the beginning and at the end of the semester. The participants were told to use either Korean or English in writing their reflections, personal histories, and written feedback, depending on whichever language they felt more comfortable with, but except for Su-Young's second reflections and Min-Woo's first and second reflections, all of their reflections, personal histories, and written feedback were completed in Korean. Lastly, during each class, I made field notes of what these students mentioned and what questions they raised about teacher feedback.

3. Data Analysis

The participants' reflections and personal histories were analyzed drawing on Leki (2006). They were closely read twice to obtain each participant's overall views and

thoughts on teacher feedback, and later coded line by line to figure out salient themes or patterns across participants. The field notes were also used at this point to corroborate the findings from the participants. In order to comprehensively analyze the participants' written feedback on the sample text, both Ferris (1997) and Conrad and Goldstein (1999) were adapted. The feedback was categorized depending on its length (1-5 words, 6-15 words, 16-25 words, and 26 or more words) and type based on Ferris (1997) as well as on its formal characteristics—use of hedges, text-specific (applicable to a particular paper) or non-text specific (applicable to any paper), and provision or non-provision of revision strategies—and the types of problems to be revised using Conrad and Goldstein (1999) (see Appendix I for details).

IV. RESULTS

The results of the analyses of their views on teacher feedback as well as their actual feedback will be presented as follows: first I will discuss each participant in turn, focusing on their views and feedback and then highlight major issues that arose across all the three participants.

1. Su-Young: How to Give Feedback

Through the seminar course, Su-Young developed her identity as a writing teacher from one who corrects grammar to one who is also concerned about students' emotions. In comparison with Min-Woo and Jin-Su, Su-Young had relatively more experiences of teaching writing to Korean students, as she had been working for a private reading academy. Although the main part of her job was to coordinate native English teachers, she did edit English book reviews written by Korean primary and secondary students. In her first reflections collected the very first class, Su-Young stated that the main purpose of writing feedback was to correct grammatical errors and awkward expressions and eventually to help students to write better. However, in the second reflection, collected after reading Truscott (1996) and Ferris (2006) and discussing the controversy over the effectiveness of error correction, Su-Young seemed conflicted between what she was supposed to do at the workplace and what she thought would be ideal as a writing instructor. Drawing on her own negative experiences as a student—too much emphasis on accuracy impeding the development of her writing fluency and making her afraid of writing—as well as what she learned in the seminar, Su-Young came to believe that students can learn to eliminate their own errors without teacher error correction:

Since student can develop their foreign language proficiency by learning four skills in a balanced way, I believe that they can gradually fix their own errors without teacher feedback, though it may take a long time. (Participant Reflection)

These negative attitudes toward form-focused teacher feedback notwithstanding, Su-Young does not believe that writing teachers should not give any feedback regarding accuracy:

Extremely speaking, form-focused feedback is a kind of necessary evil. In my case, I proofread the writing of primary and secondary students. If I don't give any feedback on their grammar, I'll get a lot of complaints from their parents. I can't avoid grammar correction because of students' needs as well as the prevalent prejudice that a writing teacher's job is error correction. In addition, I'm in a terrible situation where I have to proofread a student's writing within 5 minutes in front of him, so I can't help but give grammar correction. (Participant Reflection)

As seen here, the specific working environment where she was expected to give grammar correction within a very limited time is likely to constrain Su-Young from giving the kind of feedback she believes an ideal writing teacher could give: content-focused feedback.

In her third reflection, it is noticeable that Su-Young becomes interested in how to give feedback as well as what feedback to give. After being exposed to topics like mitigation strategies used by writing teachers in Hyland and Hyland (2006b) and the possibility of teachers appropriating student text through their feedback, dealt with in Tardy (2006), Su-Young now seems to be concerned about the writers' feelings by stating "I do not want to hurt a writer's feeling, so I try hard to mitigate the criticism and suggestions, which isn't easy for me." Su-Young's concern about the writer's emotions and feelings becomes more explicit in her final reflection as well as in her personal histories. In the final reflection, completed in the last class, Su-Young stated, "the purpose of teacher feedback is not only to help students improve their organization and use correct grammar, but also to encourage them to feel achievement." She also stated that she attempts to keep grammar correction to a minimum, instead giving advice on the structure of writing so that a writer can utilize the feedback in later writing and praising the writer for elements that were done well. Her personal history confirms that subtle changes started to occur in her identity as a writing teacher:

I used to think that the fewer grammar mistakes a text contains, the better it is, and I also instilled this belief in my students. Through this class, however, I began to think about the effectiveness of feedback again. There is no definite answer to what is the

most effective feedback, but I came to know that explicit grammar correction is not always good, and teachers should consider students' feelings and emotions. Although I'm not a confident writer myself, I hope to see my current and future students become confident and independent writers. (Personal History)

Here we can see a shift in her identity as a teacher: from someone who helps students improve their writing to someone who cares about students' feelings and emotions. In the final reflections and personal histories, Su-Young's goal of giving teacher feedback is not improving student writing any more as in her first reflections, but becomes building students' confidence and autonomy.

As Tables 1 to 4 show, Su-Young's actual writing feedback reflects this change in her identity as a writing teacher. The comparison of her first writing feedback—which was completed at the beginning of the semester—and the second one—completed at the end of the semester—shows that she gave more comments and that most of her comments became longer. Although most of her longer comments are in reference to grammar (from 14 to 24) and lexical choice (from 9 to 20), the formal characteristics of her feedback show that Su-Young became more concerned about how to give feedback along with what feedback to give. In her second feedback, Su-Young uses more hedges (from 21 to 27), makes more positive comments (from 0 to 2), and does not provide revision strategies more often (from 3 to 11). Regarding the use of hedges, in her first feedback, Su-Young used directives and imperatives, such as “Be careful when using vocabulary” and “Try to make it simple if you have trouble expressing your thoughts.” However, in the feedback given at the end of the semester, Su-Young uses hedges, including “I see” or “seem” as in the statement, “I see that you mix formal and informal expressions and some of your vocabulary do not seem appropriate.” Regarding positive comments, in her feedback at the end of the semester, Su-Young wrote “Well-written! You wrote it very well based on your own experiences.” This is a remarkable change considering that Su-Young did not leave any positive comment on the very same piece of writing in the first feedback. These positive comments and use of hedges reveal Su-Young's efforts to encourage students and build their confidence. On the other hand, the increased cases when Su-Young does not tell the students a revision strategy directly in the second feedback so that her students may correct their errors themselves confirms her intention to make her future students to become independent writers, which she mentioned in her personal history.

TABLE 1
Comment Length in Su-Young's Feedback

Feedback	Frequency	Short	Average	Long	Very Long
1 st	31	1.19	9.67	0	0
2 nd	33	1.38	0	20	28

TABLE 2
Comment Types in Su-Young's Feedback

Feedback	Ask for information (Q)	Make request (Q)	Make request (S)	Make request (I)	Give information (Q)	Give information (S)	Make positive comment	Make grammar comment
1 st	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	14
2 nd	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	24

TABLE 3
Formal Characteristics of Su-Young's Feedback

Feedback	Hedges Used		Text-Specific		Provision of Revision Strategy	
	Yes	No	Generic	Specific	Yes	No
1 st	21	0	5	16	18	3
2 nd	27	1	3	25	17	11

TABLE 4
Problems to Be Revised in Su-Young's Feedback

Feedback	Development through example	Development through explanation	Clarity of purpose	Coherence	Lexical Choice	Content	Paraphrasing	Expression
1 st	0	3	0	0	9	1	0	8
2 nd	1	1	0	0	20	1	0	7

2. Min-Woo: Selective Error Correction

As stated previously, in comparison with Su-Young, Min-Woo had relatively less experience teaching writing, although he had been teaching reading and grammar to secondary students at a private institute for a couple of years. From the beginning of the semester, Min-Woo seemed to have a firm belief that teacher feedback is equated with grammar correction. In the first reflection, he stated that the purpose of writing feedback is to improve student's writing skills, especially grammar, and that he gives grammar correction because it is the easiest element for teachers to give feedback on. In the second reflection, completed after reading and discussing the debate over the effectiveness of grammar correction between Ferris and Truscott, Min-Woo's belief in grammar correction seems more adamant despite the fact that it may not be effective:

Grammar correction should be provided even though students cannot benefit from it because too many grammatical mistakes make their writing incomprehensible. (Participant Reflection)

Notwithstanding his proclamation of his firm belief in grammar correction, by the third reflection, he seems to take into account writers' emotions, stating, "I try not to provide too much correction lest writers feel resistant to it when I give feedback." In his final reflection, Min-Woo is more flexible regarding grammar correction:

Of course, when I first read a student's writing, I check their grammar first to evaluate their writing ability. If there are no major grammatical errors, I can concentrate on expressions and coherence between sentences. In my opinion, I can focus on organization and expression if the writing is well written. (Participant Reflection)

Min-Woo's selective and conditioned approach—that is, giving different types of feedback other than grammar correction if students' writing is well written—toward the effectiveness of grammar correction can be found in his personal histories as well:

I cannot agree with Truscott's opinion that grammar correction should not be given to students at all, but I think grammar correction can also be helpful from a student's point of view. (Personal History)

His strong belief in grammar correction seen in the second reflection is loosened by acknowledging grammar correction as one type of teacher feedback, not the only type of feedback. Min-Woo explicitly states that other types of feedback can be as effective as grammar correction in his personal history as well:

I used to believe that writing feedback means grammar correction, but through this class, I came to know that grammar correction is not the only possible form of teacher feedback. (Personal History)

Table 5 shows that Min-Woo seems to provide more and longer feedback in the written feedback given at the end of the semester than in his feedback given at the start of the semester. Min-Woo's primary interest in grammar correction, noted in his reflections, is confirmed in his frequent use of grammar comments, as shown in Table 6. The formal characteristics of his end-of-semester feedback, as shown in Table 7, show that he uses more hedges and provides more revision strategies in the second feedback in comparison with the first feedback. That is, his feedback becomes less direct and takes on a kinder tone

to the writer by informing them how to fix the grammatical problems. Interestingly, however, his biggest change in written feedback can be found in Table 8, problems he asks the writer to revise: in the end-of-semester feedback, he points out more problems in relation to coherence and lexical choice, none of which were found in his beginning-of-semester feedback. This change reflects the change in his attitudes toward grammar correction: he realizes the possibility of providing various types of teacher feedback other than grammar correction.

TABLE 5
Comment Length in Min-Woo's Feedback

Feedback	Frequency	Short	Average	Long	Very Long
1 st	9	0.38	0	0	0
2 nd	13	0.88	8	0	0

TABLE 6
Comment Types in Min-Woo's Feedback

Feedback	Ask for information(Q)	Make request (Q)	Make request (S)	Make request (I)	Give information (Q)	Give information (S)	Make positive comment	Make grammar comment
1 st	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
2 nd	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	8

TABLE 7
Formal Characteristics of Min-Woo's Feedback

Feedback	Use of Hedges		Text-Specific		Provision of Revision Strategy	
	Yes	No	Generic	Specific	Yes	No
1 st	6	0	1	5	1	5
2 nd	12	0	6	6	9	2

TABLE 8
Problems to Be Revised in Min-Woo's Feedback

Feedback	Development through example	Development through explanation	Clarity of purpose	Coherence	Lexical Choice	Content	Para-phrasing	Expression
1 st	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
2 nd	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	5

3. Jin-Su: Feedback as Encouragement

Out of the three participants in this study, Jin-Su is not only the youngest, but also the least experienced teacher. In his first reflection, he shows uncertainty as a writing teacher, a

role he was required to play for the first time in this particular class:

I'm not sure if my feedback is correct or not. I give feedback as my teachers gave when I went to a private English academy. This type of feedback was helpful for me to use correct English expressions, so I will give these types of feedback when I teach my students. (Participant Reflection)

These remarks show that Jin-Su has not developed his identity as a writing teacher yet. He feels more comfortable with himself as a student, and thus he will give the same kind of feedback he believed was helpful when he was as a student. In his second reflection, Jin-Su states that he will give feedback on organization and logical flow because he experienced these types of feedback as a student and he found them the most helpful. From the third reflection, however, Jin-Su's identity as a teacher seems to emerge. He starts to take into account the writer's ability and proficiency level in his written feedback, not his own experiences anymore:

If a student writing lacks coherence and logic, I will directly point it out so that the student writer can write clearly and in a more focused way. (Participant Reflection)

This emerging identity as a teacher can be witnessed in his final reflection as well. Now he believes the purpose of feedback is to help the writer figure out the main focus. Instead of struggling with conflicting roles as teacher and student, he now seems to be more concerned about his identity as a non-native teacher:

Because of a lack of natively-like intuition, I do not feel confident about my feedback on grammar and expression since they can be wrong.

In his personal history, he goes back to his own experiences as a student and emphasizes the importance of receiving compliments in written feedback by describing how happy he was when he received positive comments from his teachers.

This lack of confidence in Jin-Su's emerging identity as a non-native teacher seems to be reflected in his written feedback. Unlike Su-Young and Min-Woo, both of whom gave more feedback on the end-of-semester text than the beginning-of-semester text, the number of Jin-Su's comments decreased from 15 to 10, although the length of the comments increased a bit from 1.89 to 2.75 words. However, Table 10 shows remarkable differences in the types of comments: while most of his comments on the beginning-of-semester text focused on grammar, those on the end-of-semester text contain more giving information in statement like "this argument is not clear" or making positive comments. For example,

while his beginning-of-semester feedback contains no overall comments or positive comments, his end-of-semester feedback reads, “Very good organization and transition and interesting topic.” This positive comment reflects his emphasis on the importance of compliments. Both Table 11 and 12 show that Jin-Su notifies the writer of fewer revision strategies, but points out more problems in the purpose of the text and coherence, which is quite different from his beginning-of-semester feedback focused on lexical choice and expression. This change in his focus on revision problems may represent his lack of confidence as a non-native teacher, as he stated that lack of nativelike intuition makes him reluctant to point out problems in lexical choice and expression.

TABLE 9
Comment Length in Jin-Su’s Feedback

Feedback	Frequency	Short	Average	Long	Very Long
1 st	15	1.89	8	0	0
2 nd	10	2.75	10	0	0

TABLE 10
Comment Types in Jin-Su’s Feedback

Feedback	Ask for information (Q)	Make request (Q)	Make request (S)	Make request (I)	Give information (Q)	Give information (S)	Make a positive comment	Make a grammar comment
1 st	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
2 nd	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0

TABLE 11
Formal Characteristics of Jin-Su’s Feedback

Feedback	Use of Hedges		Text-Specific		Provision of Revision Strategy	
	Yes	No	Generic	Specific	Yes	No
1 st	12	0	0	12	10	2
2 nd	8	0	5	3	0	8

TABLE 12
Problems to Be Revised in Jin-Su’s Feedback

Feedback	Development through example	Development through explanation	Clarity of purpose	Coherence	Lexical Choice	Content	Paraphrasing	Expression
1 st	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	5
2 nd	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	0

V. DISCUSSION

The analysis of participant reflections and personal histories shows various degrees of concern about grammar correction: Su-Young first struggled with the writing teacher's role as an editor or a content reviewer, but throughout the semester, her interest gradually moved to the role of writing teachers as concerned about the emotions of student writers; Min-Woo initially showed a strong belief in grammar correction, but towards the end of the semester, adopted a more lenient attitude toward students' grammar mistakes by realizing that different types of feedback exist in addition to grammar correction; finally, Jin-Su was more accustomed to using his identity as a student to consider issues of writing, showing a lack of confidence in his role as a teacher, but as the semester went on, his new identity as a writing teacher developed, and also exhibited struggles between his writing teacher identity and his identity as a non-native speaker of English.

Despite these varying degrees of concern and interest regarding grammar correction, by the end of the semester all three participants do have in common the consideration of the writer as a human, not simply the writing as text. As seen above, in demonstrated by their first reflections and their beginning-of-semester written feedback, all three participants believed that teacher feedback should be focused on grammar correction. However, throughout their consecutive reflections and personal histories, Su-Young became interested in how to give feedback, not just what feedback to give, by taking into account the possible impact of teacher feedback on the writer's emotions and feelings; Min-Woo varies the amount of grammar correction depending on the individual writer's writing ability; and Jin-Su tries to give feedback after considering what the student writer wants. That is, all three participants began to approach writing being conscious of the fact that this piece of writing was written by an individual human writer. This evidence can be found in their written feedback: they leave longer comments addressing the writer and use more hedges and statements instead of directives, noun phrases, and incomplete sentences. Additionally, Su-Young and Jin-Su give positive comment and compliments in their end-of-semester feedback to encourage the writer, unlike in their beginning-of-semester feedback. From their third and fourth reflections and personal history, in describing the purpose of teacher feedback, all three participants use the words 'autonomy,' 'independence,' or 'confidence,' which were not found in their first and second reflections. Considering all these changes both in their written feedback and reflections, it is apparent that all three participants seem to move their attention from writing itself to the writer as an individual in dealing with a student writing.

VI. CONCLUSION

As seen above, the analysis of their reflections, personal histories, and actual feedback reveals that the three participants in this study went through different kinds of changes in their identities as writing teachers through the graduate course. Through the course, they were not only exposed to various issues regarding teacher feedback, such as effectiveness of error correction and importance of interpersonal relationship between teacher and student, but the very experiences of recording their own reflections and personal histories on a regular basis also seem to provide them with the chances to relate what they have learned in class to their own experiences as both teacher and student. This finding is in line with several educators who have emphasized the importance of training in teacher learning (Borko, 2004; Freeman, 1993). In a case study of a group of foreign language teachers, Freeman (1993) found that teacher education enabled the four foreign language teachers to rename their experiences and reconstruct their classroom practices. Highlighting a close relationship between teachers' understanding and their practice, he argued that without a change in their understanding, teachers' classroom practice does not change. Drawing on the situative perspective, that is, the belief that "the contexts and activities in which people learn become a fundamental part of what they learn (p. 7), Borko (2004) also suggested that what teachers learn provides powerful contexts for their learning. Lee (2010) witnessed development in her four EFL writing teachers' understanding of writing through teacher training, based on their overall experiences.

Like the four participants in Lee (2013)—Cindy, Betty, Iris, and Alice—all three participants in this study show dynamic patterns of identity development depending on their own status as a writing teacher and their own personal experiences. On the other hand, while Cindy, Betty, Iris, and Alice had five to 15 years of experience teaching writing, all three participants in this study are relatively inexperienced in teaching writing, and Jin-Su has almost no experience teaching English. Because of this lack of experience teaching writing, in comparison with Lee's four participants, these three participants show how the identity of a writing teacher is developed from the beginning. While Lee's participants showed how they restructured their identity from a language teacher to writing teacher and from more teacher-centered to sharing responsibility with their students, my participants show different patterns of identity development. Su-Young, who had often edited student writing, became more interested in how to give feedback—how not to hurt the feelings of student writers as well as how to build their confidence and autonomy as writers, through her struggles about what feedback to give, grammar-focused or content-focused. This change in her identity is reflected in her feedback in more frequent use of hedges and compliments. According to Hyland and Hyland (2001, 2006b), hedges and compliments are often used by writing instructors as interpersonal strategies to mitigate their criticisms

and enhance relationship with their students. On the other hand, Min-Woo, who had experience teaching only English grammar and reading, used to equate written feedback with grammar correction, and firmly believed in the necessity of grammar correction no matter whether it is academically proven to be effective or not; however, as the semester went on, he became more open-minded to other types of feedback such as coherence and lexical choice, realized in his end-of-semester feedback, in which he commented on the student writer's coherence and lexical choice. Lastly, while taking the graduate seminar on written feedback, Jin-Su shows a transition from a student who received feedback to a teacher who has to give feedback: in developing his teacher identity, he also develops a lack of confidence as a non-native teacher. This lack of confidence is demonstrated in a decreased number of comments overall as well as a decrease in the number of grammar-focused comments in the end-of-semester feedback. Because of his relatively weak teaching experiences in comparison with the other two participants, Jin-Su's identity as writing instructor has just emerged and still has large room for further development and investigation.

These varying degrees and different patterns of identity development notwithstanding, Su-Young, Min-Woo, and Jin-Su show a common tendency through the seminar: they seem to be more aware of the fact that they are dealing with a writer and not simply a written text while providing written feedback. In their first and second reflections, they used general terms like 'student' or inanimate terms like 'writing' or 'grammar,' but in their later reflections and personal histories, I often come across the words 'independence,' 'confidence,' or 'autonomy,' which show their concerns and considerations about an individual writer. This change is also realized in their written feedback: their beginning-of-semester feedback took the form of directives and incomplete sentences like noun phrases, but their end-of-semester feedback included more hedges and compliments as well as complete sentences and statements. In the same line with Lee (2010), who argues that in-service education broadened the perspectives of her pre-service writing teachers and contributed to their identity development as writing teachers, this study implies that a course can make a difference in students' attitudes and perceptions on writing feedback by enhancing their awareness of teacher feedback. Writing instructors should not only learn how to teach writing to learners, but also have time to reflect on what they learned in class, relate it to their own learning and teaching experiences, and eventually build and restructure their own identities as writing teachers.

Because this study is based on only a small number of participants, it is limited in its scope, and thus its results are not generalizable into other contexts. Also, this study does not trace how these newly-emerging identities as writing instructors affect the participants' actual teaching. In the Korean context, where writing has rarely been taught in the curriculum, Korean teachers of English writing may experience conflicts between what

they think writing instruction should be and how writing is currently taught in the reality. In this situation, it is quite apparent that teaching realities as well as writing education will be influential in shaping their identities as writing instructor. And thus, further studies are needed to see how Korean teachers of English writing develop their own identities as writing instructors through training as well as in relation to other people, including students, colleagues, or administrators, in their own teaching contexts.

REFERENCES

- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3–15.
- 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.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21(2), 193–204.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315–339.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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.
- Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(3), 329-344.
- Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 485–497.
- Guerrero, M. C. M. de, & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 51-67.
- 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 expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(3),

287-308.

- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 185-212.
- 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.
- Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2014). Korean secondary English teacher's competence in English writing and writing instruction. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 14*(1), 1-24.
- Lalande, J. F., Jr. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal, 66*, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing. *System, 25*(4), 465-477.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices, and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing 8*, 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*, 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.
- Park, Yu-ra. (2007). Current state of teaching English writing and suggested lesson plans. *The British & English Language and Literature, 23*(1), 51-81.
- Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System, 16*(3), 355-365.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 273-292.
- 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.
- Shim, Eunsook. (2009). An investigation of secondary English teachers' perceptions of

- writing instruction. *Modern English Education*, 10(1), 114-130.
- 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, 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.

APPENDIX A

Analysis Categories of Teacher Feedback

Major Categories	Sub-categories	Example
Comment Length	Short (1-5 words)	"Informal"
	Average (6-15 words)	"It doesn't have any relationship."
	Long (16-25 words)	"Be careful! Whenever you finish a piece of writing, make sure that you read it again."
	Very long (26 or more words)	"Well-written! You wrote it very well based on your own experiences. Next time why don't you choose a topic and try to write a counterargument against it?"
Comment Types	Ask for information (Question)	"Why actually?"
	Make a request (Question)	"Which group?"
	Make a request (Statement)	"Your thesis is not clear here."
	Make a request (Imperative)	"Clarify your thesis."
	Give information (Question)	"Do you mean a group of people?"
	Give information (Statement)	"You'd better use <i>stick to</i> than <i>follow</i> ."
Formal Characteristics	Make a positive comment	"Very good organization and transition and interesting topic."
	Make a grammar comment	"Minor grammar mistakes in subject-verb agreement."
Formal Characteristics	Use of Hedges (Yes or No)	Hedge included "I see that you mix formal and informal expressions and some of your vocabulary do not seem appropriate."
	Text-Specific or Generic	Text-specific "Why did you use <i>both</i> here?"

	Whether to provide a revision strategy or not	Revision provided “unforgettable moments of my life”
Problems to Be Revised	Development through examples	“Use specific examples.”
	Development through explanation	“Give what the advantages and disadvantages are at the beginning of the paragraph.”
	Clarity of purpose	“Clarify your thesis.”
	Coherence/Cohesion	“Sudden break in thought”
	Lexical Choice	“Ambiguous pronoun”
	Content	“What are the differences?”
	Paraphrasing	“Simple structure”
	Expression	“Awkward”

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 accompanies. 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.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Secondary/Tertiary

Sookyung Cho
Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-Ro, Dongdaemun-Gu, Seoul 130-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2173-3194
Email: Sookyungcho@hufs.ac.kr

Received 15 June 2015

Revised 5 August 2015

Accepted 17 August 2015