

Teacher Views on Writing Feedback: Experience, Belief and Practice*

Ju-Youn Sim**
Hanshin University
Jae-Yeon Heo
Korea University

Sim, Ju-Youn & Heo, Jae-Yeon. (2018). Teacher views on writing feedback: experience, belief and practice. *Modern English Education, 19(1), 49-61.*

This study examined how Korean writing teachers view their writing feedback practice, focusing primarily on writing teachers' perceptions, experiences, and perceived difficulties regarding writing feedback process. The sixteen-week study employed a narrative case study involving writing teachers' in-depth interviews, their reflective journal diary, and students' writing drafts. Overall, the findings showed that teachers perceived their writing feedback process as interactive communication tools, which helped them have a clearer picture of students' needs, levels, and capabilities. In addition, writing feedback practice enabled teachers to gain pedagogical learning by reflecting their feedback process, and eventually leading to shaping further feedback practice. The interview data also pointed to teachers' concerns and difficulties arisen from their feedback process: (i) frustration with students' same errors; (ii) inactive participation of low-level students in feedback process; and (iii) dilemma between a feedback giver and a grader. This study suggested the need for further work in order to maximize reciprocal benefits to teachers and students through writing feedback process. To achieve this, representative samples and various data collection methods are recommended to listen to more teachers' voices and yield deeper insight into writing teachers' feedback process.

[English writing feedback/teacher feedback practice/teacher perception/
영어쓰기 피드백/교사 피드백 실행/교사 인식]

* This research was supported by Hanshin University Research Grant.

** First author: Ju-Youn Sim, Corresponding author: Jae-Yeon Heo

Received 15 December 2017
Revised 26 January 2018
Accepted 12 February 2018

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Ju-Youn Sim
Hanshin University
Hanshindaegil 137, Osan-si, Gyeonggi-do.
Tel: (031) 379-0674
Email: joan7475@gmail.com

Jae-Yeon Heo
Korea University
145, Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841
Tel: (02) 3290-1648
Email: jyheo71@naver.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing teacher feedback is an important pedagogical tool in terms of “offering commentary on the form and content of a text to encourage students to develop their writing and consolidate their learning” (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 206). However, teacher writing feedback plays not only an instructional role by identifying errors and assisting students to work out solutions by themselves, but also a conversational interaction between teacher and student (Weissberg, 2006). Moreover, that interactional teacher-student relationship built up through writing feedback process allows teachers to better understand their students’ intentions, strengths, and weaknesses in their writing (Leki, 1991; J. Y. Sim & J. Y. Heo, 2014), which enables teachers to shape further feedback practice. Teaching practice is often guided by teaching beliefs and teachers’ perception and belief influence teachers’ actual classroom practices (Borg, 2003; Burns, 1992; J. Y. Sim, 2015). This is because teachers “construct their own personal and workable theories of teaching” (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004, p. 244). Teachers’ beliefs and perceptions on writing feedback thus influence the focus of feedback types, and the relationship they seek to establish with students, and their involvement of themselves as co-constructors in students’ writing work.

In spite of reciprocal benefits to both teachers and students, many studies on writing feedback have emphasized the role of teacher feedback (J. Y. Sim & J. Y. Heo, 2015), feedback types (Y. Y. Park, 2015) and efficacy of error feedback from learners’ perspectives. (Eckstein, 2013; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Ferris, 2014; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Keh, 1990; Lee, 2003, 2005; Zamel, 1985). Writing teachers’ views on teacher feedback practice, and their beliefs and perception regarding their error feedback have received relatively little attention with some notable exceptions (e.g., S. K. Cho, 2015; Lee, Leong, & Song, 2016).

Given this fact, it is important to explore writing teacher views on feedback practice, and to understand the challenging issues teachers face while giving error feedback. The present study thus aims to investigate the teachers’ views on their own feedback practice as writing teachers. Within this, three sub-questions were formed:

- 1) How do writing teachers perceive their feedback practice?
- 2) What do writing teachers experience through writing feedback practice?
- 3) What are the practical constraints or difficulties in feedback practice?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Role of Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback in L2 writing plays the key role in helping students to learn about and enhance their writing skills (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Feedback has emphasized teacher’s instruction and response to students’ writing by giving information or correction (Keh, 1990; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). With a more expansive point of view, some researchers interpreted feedback as “the crucial interaction between teacher and student carried out for the purpose of furthering student learning” (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam, 2003, as cited in Hawe, Dixon, & Watson, 2008, p. 45). K. Hyland (2003) regarded writing as “a problem-solving activity” (p. 24) in the aspect of the process approach.

As one of the most important means, teacher feedback enables students to solve their writing problems. The writing teachers play essential roles in facilitating “the transition from feedback to self-monitoring” through the feedback process (Sadler, 1989, p. 122) and in creating an interactive audience or reader to lead students to get actively involved in the negotiation of meanings and suggestions with their teacher (Ivanic, 1998). More specifically, teachers can share learning goals with students and build up a collaborative relationship with students through their developmental feedback process. For example, written commentary or feedback helps students to revise their work and encourages them to achieve an appropriate level pertinent to individual differences and their approaches to writing (F. Hyland, 1998). In particular, teachers’ comments on written work may influence positively students’ motivation and confidence in themselves as writers (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Young, 2000). Ferris and Hedgcock (2004) mentioned that oral feedback is a powerful pedagogical tool due to its immediate interaction and potential for negotiation. J. Y. Sim and J. Y. Heo (2014) reported one-on-one writing conferences helped L2 Korean students enhance collaborative interaction with teachers, improve their writing performance and increase their motivation and confidence. Through the negotiation of meaning, teachers can ask students to clarify the problems and confirm oral comments, and help them to make a decision (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Keh, 1990). Teachers are able to find out the different levels of proper instruction for individual students through scaffolding with more productive feedback being provided than through written feedback.

2. Teacher Belief and Feedback Practice

Even though research on teachers’ practices has been conducted in various educational settings, there has been little research on the beliefs of writing teachers and their pedagogical choices which influence how they respond to students’ writing. Teaching practice is closely related to teaching beliefs, which can be “personalized theories [that] lie at the heart of teaching and learning” (Burns, 1992, p. 64). Teachers’ beliefs are rooted from their experience and knowledge, which affect their perception, judgment, and practice. Teachers’ professional experience and accumu-

lated knowledge can shape their teaching beliefs. Ferris (2014) explored the voice of writing teachers regarding beliefs about feedback practice, which indicated their practices were directed by a desire to enhance students' confidence and accountability. In M. K. Kim's study (2003), the interview data from Korean writing instructors revealed teacher feedback seemed mostly influenced by their beliefs on L2 writing and experience in teaching L2 writing. Mori (2011) reported that teachers placed the emphasis on improving their students' linguistic abilities and "instill[ing] values such as confidence, independence, and reasonable ability to communicate" (p. 464), which influenced the way they gave corrective feedback. S. K. Cho (2015) showed the changes and comparison of Korean teachers' views from initial to final feedback, indicating teachers began considering teacher feedback as "a way of interacting with the writer herself" (p. 52).

However, the results of some previous studies showed complex relationships and mismatches between writing teachers' practice and their beliefs or philosophies. For example, Lee (2009) found teachers believed good writing involved more than accuracy but their feedback mainly focused on language form or grammar correction. In a similar vein, teachers provided actual feedback on grammar or mechanics even though they overestimated global concerns like content and organization (M. K. Kim, 2003; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). M. K. Kim (2003) pointed out Korean writing instructors chose the way they would give comments on students' writing based on whether they found their feedback helpful in students' learning to write.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006, p. 205, as cited in Lee et al., 2016, pp. 60-61) identified seven aspects of good feedback practice as follows: "good feedback practice i) helps clarify what good performance is (goals, criteria, expected standards); ii) facilitates the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning; iii) delivers high-quality information to students about their learning; iv) encourages teacher and peer dialogue around learning; v) encourages positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem; vi) provides opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance; vii) provides information to teachers that can be used to help shape teaching". As a result, students are the main beneficiary from teacher feedback and teachers are also able to develop their writing practice, feedback process, and professional learning.

3. Constraints and Challenges

Despite a number of benefits of teacher feedback to students, the constraints and challenges teachers face in writing feedback have been reported as follows: i) a time-consuming process; ii) repetition of student errors; iii) students' weak proficiency; iv) ineffectiveness of existing error feedback practice; v) doubt about comprehensive marking (Lee, 2003, pp. 228-229). Writing teachers are often depicted as "composition slaves" (Lee, 2008, p. 13)

or "error hunters" (Hairston, 1986, p.122) because they invest lots of time and effort to give feedback. The contextual factors such as the number of students that teachers manage may either facilitate or inhibit the process of providing effective feedback (Goldstein, 2004). Writing teachers express their worries about the problem that their students may not interpret their feedback efficiently. Students tend to find it difficult to understand and interpret teachers' written comments which have the abstract forms, vague prescriptions and directives (Zamel, 1985). In particular, low-level students may not be able to recognize their errors or mistakes and correct them in response to teacher's written feedback (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Corpuz, 2011). It can cause miscommunication between teachers and students resulting from discrepancy between teachers' expectation and students' needs or intention in writing feedback process. In some cases, giving too much corrective feedback may not result in successful outcomes or results because of students' demotivation with their writing and excessive dependence on the teacher (J. Y. Heo & J. Y. Sim, 2015).

As for face to face conference, teachers have difficulties in producing timeslots and managing the one to one process individually. They also need adequate interaction skills in order to encourage students to participate in reciprocal communication through oral feedback. Lee and her fellows (2016) pointed out a tension between teachers' espoused beliefs about learning and their feedback practice. That is, even though teachers believed feedback could support learning, teachers tended to avoid disagreement or dissatisfaction from students related to their grades, resulting in changing the way teachers gave feedback. Consequently, teachers struggled with this tension between ideal and actual practices in the feedback process.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed a small-scale narrative case study which explored Korean writing teachers' perspectives and beliefs about writing feedback practice.¹ To respond to the given research questions, narrative interviews with writing teachers, teacher's written and oral feedback data (revision drafts and the audio recordings of conference discourse), and teachers' reflective journal diary were used as main research instrument.

1. Participants and Sampling

Although this research focused on looking mainly at two writing teachers' perspectives about writing feedback practice, in total, five teachers lecturing English writing at a university in Korea participated in this study. A mixed sampling approach was used in this study: 'homogeneous sampling' in the first and third interview sessions and 'convenience sampling' was adopted in the second stage

¹ Feedback in this study refers to both written and oral comments on students' written drafts.

of data collection. Dörnyei (2007) explained that homogeneous sampling is “selecting participants from a particular subgroup who share some important experience relevant to our study” (p. 127). Five participants had similar educational backgrounds and teaching experience (i.e., teaching writing for a tertiary level). This enables the researchers to obtain similar and common patterns of information about their teaching writing experiences (Dörnyei, 2007; Patton 1987). However, the three teachers declined to participate in the second stage of data collection due to time pressure; only two teachers agreed to take part in according to their availability and accessibility at that time: ‘convenience sampling’. The researchers intended to use maximum variation sampling (Dörnyei, 2007; Patton 1987). However, as mentioned, convenience sampling was inevitably used which brings to mind Patton (1987) commented that this sampling strategy is “neither purposeful nor strategic, but it is very practical” (p. 58).

All teachers work at a university as English writing teachers. They are all Koreans and teach general English classes named ‘Practical Reading and Writing’ (hereafter, PRW). The class consists of three hours per week spread over sixteen weeks and the average number of students in each class was 20. All students are beginning writers who did not have an essay-level writing experience before the class. Although the participant teachers have similarities in their educational background, gender, and age, there is an important difference in experience, ranging from six months of writing teaching experience to 15 years. Table 1 shows the background information of the five participant teachers in this study. Since confidentiality is a crucial concern in qualitative research (Dörnyei, 2007), personal information such as the name of their workplace was concealed and English pseudonyms were given.

TABLE 1

Background Information of Participating Teachers

Teacher	Gender /Age	Teaching English Experience	Teaching Writing Experience	Qualification
Danielle	F/45	14 years	6 years	PhD Candidate in TESOL
Olivia	F/46	10 years	8 years	PhD in English Language & Literature
Christine	F/46	15 years	3 years	EdD in Applied Linguistics
Lauren	F/44	13 years	6 months	PhD in ELT & Applied Linguistics
Ann	F/43	6 years	3 years	PhD in Applied Linguistics

2. Research Process

The broad research question that guided this study was: How do writing teachers view their writing feedback practice? To answer this question, this study was designed in three stages. The research started from in-depth narrative

interview with five teachers to explore their personal background, overall perspectives about teaching writing and writing feedback practice at the beginning of the semester (stage one). In the second stage, changes were made and a further series of longer, more detailed interviews of two teachers (stage two) were conducted (e.g., narratives of their actual feedback process with feedback data). The purpose of this was to gain more in-depth and thicker descriptions by examining how they actually give a feedback to students’ writing and how they perceived their writing process.

As for the last stage of research, the same five teachers who responded to the first interview participated in the third interview session after final exam. With the students’ permission, all the conferences were recorded and the teachers were able to collect copies of students’ writing draft (including the feedback given by email). Based on the data collected throughout sixteen weeks, the researchers hoped to listen to teachers’ self-reported voice about their writing feedback practice, beliefs and their problems regarding writing feedback. The Table 2 provides an overview of research procedures.

TABLE 2

Stages of Data Collection

Dates	Stages	Data	Subject
March 2014	1st phase	1st teacher interview	Five teachers
April 2014	2nd phase	2nd teacher interview;	Two teachers; 12 students
		1st student interview;	
		Teacher journal diary	
June 2014 July 2014	3rd phase	2nd students interview; Teacher journal diary	Five teachers; 12 students

1) Narrative Interviews With Teachers

The general concept of narratives is refined into the “view about personal and social stories” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2). However, narrative research is “not just a series of descriptions and stories, but requires researchers to make a critical evaluation of what lies behind them” (Iguchi, 2011, p. 100). In addition, teachers’ narratives embody emotions such as “frustration, fear, anger, and joy that permeate the activity of teaching” (Johnson & Golombek, 2002, p. 5). In this regard, narrative research is crucial to the present study in the following aspects: (i) to uncover EFL writing teachers’ writing feedback experiences, perspectives, and dilemmas arisen from writing feedback process; and (ii) to gain insights into their motivations, struggles, difficulties, and professional gains that guide their writing feedback repertoires.

Rather than focusing on students’ response to the teacher feedback, the researchers wished to listen to teachers’ voice about writing feedback experiences by recalling their feedback practice. Due to the fact that such teachers’ perceptions, belief, or attitudes elicited by questionnaire

surveys tend to be the surface expressions (Li & Barnard, 2011), in-depth narrative interviews for five teachers were conducted to represent deeper mental constructs. As some theorists have viewed that the aim of the narrative interview is to “elicit a less imposed and more valid rendering of the informant’s perspective” (Jovchelovitch & Bauer, 2000, p. 61), the researchers focused more on listening to their narratives rather than asking a series of predetermined questions. Although other qualitative interviews (i.e., structured interview or semi-structured interview) were planned for data collection by a researcher prior to undertaking the interviews, narrative interview encourages the participants to “let their stories unfold by asking for specific examples of life events” (Iguchi, 2011, p. 86). This allows the respondents to reveal “cultural and social patterns through the lens of individual experiences” (Patton, 2002, p. 155). Thus, narrative interviews in this study enabled the researchers to make a critical evaluation of participants’ underlying beliefs and experiences about their writing feedback process.

This study began with interviewing with five teachers at the beginning of semester, focusing on describing their general educational background, teaching writing experiences, and their perceptions about writing feedback practice. The second part of the interview held after mid-term exam asked to explain the process of writing feedback on which they had focused students’ writing draft (to probe feedback types they gave, the reasons why they chose the feedback types, see Appendix 1). In the final stage of the interview, participant teachers were asked to overview their entire revision process and ultimate goal of writing feedback, and reflect their writing feedback practice.

2) Teachers’ Journal Diary

In terms that narrative case study tries to “elicit participants’ own descriptions and interpretations of events and behaviors” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 157), participants’ diaries were beneficial for the current study in providing their feelings, thoughts, or interpretations of events that were hardly noticed (gained) through interview. As Clark and Peterson (1986) asserted, teaching is “substantially influenced and even determined by teachers’ underlying thinking” (p. 255). However, individuals’ thinking processes and belief systems are neither objectively measurable nor observable, but instead must be “inferred from what individuals say” (Li & Barnard, 2011, p. 139). In this sense, two teachers’ reflective diary was a suitable way to supplement interview data.

3. Data Analysis

As Patton (2002) stated that “qualitative analysis is typically inductive when figuring out possible categories, patterns, and themes” (p. 453), a data-driven inductive approach was used in this study to analyze the data.

Two themes emerged from teachers’ interview data and their journal diary² in this study: writing teachers’ perception and beliefs about writing feedback practice; and their dilemma (difficulties) arisen from the teachers’ interview data and journal diary. For the data-driven code, the researchers highlighted recurring concepts, themes, and categories from the data (pre-coding). Then those tentative data were undertaken to link and cluster together (open-coding). Since open coding refers to “the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing the data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 6, as cited in Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, p. 202), the researchers revisited the original transcript and coded them again so as to double check not to miss any significant data and also to reduce the amount of insignificant data. Finally, we made break them down into smaller sub-categories (coding). Since these themes were inductively emerged from the data rather than “being decided prior to data collection and analysis” (Patton, 1987, p. 150), analysis process in this study was based on ongoing and iterative process, not a linear logic.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings into two main parts: (i) general overview of the five teachers’ writing feedback; and (ii) two teachers’ perceptions, experiences, and difficulties in their writing feedback process.

1. General Overview of Feedback Experience

According to Clark and Peterson (1986, as cited in Li & Barnard, 2011, p. 139), “teaching is substantially influenced and even determined by teachers’ underlying thinking”. Likewise, the interview data of five teachers displayed a unique, distinct set of personal perceptions about writing feedback beliefs and practice.

In case of Olivia, her predominant perception of writing feedback centered on organizing coherent structure of students’ writing rather than grammar or punctuation since she believed that a logical flow is the most important in writing development. Stressing the need for students to express their ideas logically in their writing, Olivia said she looked primarily for conjunctive adverb, linkage, or supporting examples. She viewed herself as a reader rather than a feedback giver to “understand her students’ writing work as a reader”. Unlike Olivia, Ann gave very explicit and local feedback (e.g., grammar and punctuation). She said “my students, particularly low-level students, are frequently confused at even subject-verb agreement. So I wanted them to learn writing from very basic grammar rules”. Her main interest in writing was to make students equipped with linguistic forms and features. Interestingly, her main research area is related to corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, which shows a close correlation be-

² Teacher feedback data were not analyzed since writing feedback types or efficacy of error feedback were not main research questions in this study.

tween her situated belief and feedback practice.

Danielle put more importance on peer feedback than teacher feedback in her writing class. This pedagogical conception arose from her previous teaching experience. She said, “I used to give both written and oral feedback in the past, but I came to realize that it was ineffective and unproductive to improve students’ writing ability”. This negative experience led to a skeptical and passive attitude toward her feedback practice. This is consistent with Truscott’s argument (1996) mentioned earlier.

For Christine and Lauren, some similarities were found in their perception of teacher feedback: for example, the feedback style, the role of teachers in feedback process, and teaching writing instruction. This might be because they had some academic background in common such as completing PhD at the same university under the same supervisor. Even though Lauren was a novice writing teacher at a university, she had a very clear picture of writing feedback. She said, “Almost everyday I spend time sharing teaching writing with Christine, a more experienced and skillful writing teacher, and learned many things from her”. They gave electronic written feedback at least twice and conferences three times during the semester. Unlike the other teachers above, Christine and Lauren considered their roles as a co-structor or negotiator in writing class. Christine said, “Actually giving feedback is too much time and energy consuming. It is a painful process! However, I like to see my students’ improvement and particularly their getting motivation through my feedback. I willingly join their journey”. Christine’s second interview data revealed that her conceptual essence of feedback practice came from tutor modelling during her doctorate course. This will be dealt in more detail in the next section.

2. Two Writing Teachers’ Perception and Belief

This section describes two writing teachers’ perception on and concerns about feedback practice in the following three aspects: (i) interactive communication tool; (ii) learning from feedback practice; and (iii) major concerns and difficulties during writing feedback process.

1) Interactive Communication Tool

Some researchers (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Keh, 1990) stated that one of the distinctive advantages of teacher feedback is to enhance interaction between teachers and their students. In other words, teacher feedback has the potential to establish interpersonal relationship that can facilitate a student’s writing development (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In this aspect, both Christine and Lauren emphasized positive effects on constructive relationship with the students from their feedback process. Christine said that she was eager to create an opportunity of communication between the students and herself from brainstorming process to the final submission. She commented in her second interview:

I had conference sessions last week. I came to have a clearer picture of students’ needs, levels, capability, and intentions through writing feedback practice. This also enabled me to give more appropriate feedback on their needs to be offered. My primary concern for feedback practice is to guide students to think about their errors and to learn from teacher feedback; I don’t correct everything.

Lauren also thought it was important to provide students with the opportunity to express their own ideas and opinions clearly and work together to make a better essay as a team. In fact, she found her students had more positive responses to individual conferences than her expectation as they were able to communicate with a teacher through a personal meeting. Some researchers (Jean & Simard, 2011; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005) reported that the majority of students preferred oral corrective feedback and were willing to have their errors corrected regarding students’ perspectives on and preferences for feedback. As Nicole (2010) stated that “feedback cannot be a monologue, but should be a dialogical and contingent two-way process that involves coordinated teacher-student [...] as well as active learner engagement” (p. 503), teacher feedback process allowed Christine and Lauren to build a better rapport and interactive relationships with their students. Christine indicated that she was not always concerned about the quantity and types of feedback when giving feedback to her students, but tried to have interactive relationship using more indirect and global feedback than prompt one. In addition, she used praises and positive feedback as an important means of engaging with student-writers and of building their confidence in their writing and revision process. She reflected her stance as an “expert guide” (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 210) or “co-structor” (J. Y. Sim & J. Y. Heo, 2014, p. 175) rather than an error-corrector or feedback giver, ultimately leading her to identify what her students hope to learn. She commented as follows:

Gradually I was able to notice students’ strengths and weaknesses of their writing ability. Even I could see their career interests, worries, and concerns of English through feedback practice. This is a good way to know my students’ individual differences, which can shape my feedback types and styles. For example, for some students, I need to give more critical feedback, but for others, more positive and encouraging comments are needed. One thing that I am sure is that positive feedback or praises increase students’ confidence and motivation. Without feedback practice, I was not able to have a chance to know students’ individual learning differences.

It appears that Christine’s belief about feedback practice is in accordance with students’ response to writing feedback which is a negotiating process to promote teacher-student interactive communication. As J. Y. Sim and J. Y. Heo (2014) pointed out, “the conference sessions provided a rich mentoring relationship between students and their teacher and also students could benefit from scaffolding

and negotiation with their teacher in the writing process” (p. 162). They went on to say that most of the interviewee students responded that individual teacher feedback on their writing draft provided a sense of security and motivated them to actively engage in their writing process with their teacher.

Laruen reflected on her first tutorial with a few low-level students who had lack of confidence and motivation. They seemed to avoid face to face oral feedback with unwillingness to talk about their essays. As they considered interaction with a teacher as another pressure or stressful work, Lauren intended to give emotional support to low level or demotivated students by sharing her similar experience as a learner and emphasizing each student’s strengths with positive comments. As presented in the following comment, her students became less stressed or less afraid of meeting a teacher in the feedback process.

From the second meeting, I felt they gradually changed their attitudes toward my feedback and became more serious to pay attention to the class. I know, it will be quite challenging or to some extent impossible to rapidly improve their writing skills within several weeks or even during the semester but I believe they would recognize I am a kind of supporter to them. In fact, the most important step is to sympathize with students’ anxiety or challenges, in particular low-level students. Without conferences, students might not have any opportunity to contact or meet me personally and I might miss lots of things about them. I could deepen my understanding of their learning process, difficulties, and expectations in my class and build a closer relationship with them.

Similar to her comment above, T. S. Yang (2010) argued that “receiving ongoing feedback from the professor gave students more confidence in writing [...] and less anxious in their writing process” (p. 178). Lauren valued affective support to students more than correction, saying the most important role of feedback is to make them encouraged, motivated, and interested in writing. From her experience and belief, Lauren expressed emotional support was essential to some students in a mixed level class through “a dialogical and contingent two-way process” (Lee et al., 2016, p. 67) with them. In addition, Christine pointed out this interactive relationship with her students helped them facilitate the development of autonomous learning. She mentioned as follows:

I observed that although positive comments did not always lead to successful results in students’ writing performance, my students appreciated receiving praise from me and it improved their confidence and motivation as writers. They worked harder and harder to produce better work after getting positive comments on their writing. Correspondingly, they got actively involved in their writing process.

Christine thought that cooperative relationship with a teacher encouraged students to be more responsible for their learning and naturally this responsibility promoted learner autonomy. It shows that teacher feedback gives the possible interpersonal impact on students’ learning (Hyland

& Hyland, 2006).

2) Teacher Learning Through Feedback Practice

Teacher learning is “a highly complex process that involves a number of dimensions, including readiness and vision, willingness and motivation, understanding, practice, reflection, and community” (Shulman & Shulman, 2004, as cited in Lee, 2010, p. 144). Researchers argued that teachers learn from experience through their reflection on the nature and meaning of teaching experiences (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Christine and Lauren expressed what they learned through their teaching writing experiences and feedback practice in their reflection.

As for the primary role of writing feedback, Christine put the emphasis on the correction of errors and lexical choices before teaching essay-level writing and found most of her colleagues at her school corrected only grammar errors on students’ writing. After the experience of teaching essay-level writing, however, she became aware of other problems in her students’ writing. She said:

I discovered improvement in my students’ writing when they learned logical and critical thinking. At first, I thought that the problems of students’ writing lied in their English ability. However, I realized that there were many factors to make students feel ‘English writing is difficult’ such as the different rhetoric between L1 and L2, individual differences, background knowledge and so on.

T. Y. Kim (2008) claimed that even proficient L2 writers who possess the adequate grammar and vocabulary knowledge have difficulties in writing well-organized essays. It is evident that “L2 writing is a complex process” which is influenced by “many motivational, cognitive, cultural, and social factors” and L2 writers may perceive the various difficulties (J. Y. Heo & J. Y. Sim, 2015, p.162). After understanding the problems the students experienced, Christine started to change her feedback style. Her new feedback practice was influenced by her prior learning experience, and therefore, her own practice was based on “apprenticeship of observation” (Borg, 2004, p. 274). She reflected on her experience as a learner as follows:

When studying my doctoral course, I got feedback from my supervisor in both ways: electronic written and oral conference feedback. Looking back on the feedback process, I was able to have a chance to rethink my problems and refine the writing draft through electronic written feedback. On the other hand, when my supervisor and I had a conference session, I could get more immediate feedback and it was really helpful to solve some questions of my writing more effectively.

Similarly, Lauren mentioned the feedback experience she had received from her supervisor and interaction with her senior colleague at her school had a great impact on her feedback practice. Even though she was a novice lecturer with one semester teaching experience, she said, “I

learned lots of practical things from my colleague, Christine and mostly I agreed with her ideas. It significantly affected my teaching writing and feedback practice.” Good feedback practice facilitates the development of self-assessment in learning. Self-assessment or reflection helps teachers improve their performance by recognizing their strengths and needs (Darling & Gallagher, 2003; Hilger, Hussey, & Stitt-Bergh, 2000, as cited in Montgomery & Baker, 2007) and increase teachers’ awareness of “reflective backdrop for understanding teaching direction” (Wold, 2003, p. 55). Lauren mentioned she was able to learn lots of things from the reflection on her feedback practice during the semester. She thought teaching writing was not only teaching practice but also a learning process as a writing teacher while teaching and interacting with students.

While teaching students, I felt I needed to be a more advanced and experienced writer myself. If I do not develop my writing skills and expand content knowledge, how could I meet different levels of individual students’ needs fully? These days my students are exposed to a rapidly changing environment, so I need to keep up with this change through a wide range of contents, resources and media. Writing is not a simple language skill but a complex of content knowledge, logic and critical thinking. I think I need to be a teacher and learner as well.

Christine had a better understanding of her students as follows:

I learned a lot from students through my feedback practice. The best learning during feedback process was about students. For example, I learned students’ needs and concerns, and factors to demotivate students. Actually, I learned this kind of theory in my Master or PhD course, but actual experience obtained from real classroom was more meaningful in my teaching life.

The reflection can be “the process of critical examination of experiences” through such procedures as self-monitoring and observation (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 7). Teachers need to become more reflective of their own practice, which allows them to tailor their feedback pertinent to “what is needed, rather than what they assume is needed” (Lee et al., 2016, p. 64). Despite a time and energy consuming process, Christine and Lauren had a strong commitment to giving feedback. As the majority of their colleagues seldom, if ever, provided oral feedback to their students, they felt much more convinced of and satisfied with their feedback process and students’ outcomes as a professional writing teacher.

3) Difficulties and Concerns

The difficulties and concerns Christine and Lauren faced can be summarized in three aspects: (i) frustration with repeated students’ errors; (ii) students’ passive atti-

tude toward teacher feedback; and (iii) dilemma between a feedback giver and a grader.

(1) Frustration With Students’ Same Errors

The large number of students tended to make the same errors repeatedly even though clear explanation of their errors was given in class or individually. Christine expressed frustration with failure to observe immediate improvements in her students’ writing. This frustration appears to have stemmed from students’ passive attitudes and feeble efforts, resulting in making the same errors. For example, Christine wrote in her diary:

It’s not an easy job to give feedback on students’ writing drafts; sometimes I felt demotivated and frustrated with their lack of determination. Some students showed me really poor and hopeless drafts. Even though the students and I have been spending lots of time discussing their main problems with writing drafts, their writing does not seem to have improved. I became somewhat disappointed and frustrated when I felt my effort was nothing.

Christine seemed to expect her students not to make the same mistakes since she spent a great amount of time discussing errors with students through written and oral feedback. Christine might have an unrealistic goal, which eventually caused her frustration. However, Christine found the students started to think more logically to support their ideas with cohesiveness although they still repeated the same errors. She thought it was significant improvement particularly in general structure and organization.

Like Christine, Lauren had similar frustrated experience but questioned her feedback type and frequency. She said, “I might spoil my students by giving too many comments whenever they requested. I think they were over-reliant on me. It caused their repeated mistakes and carelessness.” As J. Y. Sim and J. Y. Heo (2014) claimed, students could be passive recipients of information who were too much exposed to teacher feedback. This might deprive students of the opportunity for self-correction.

(2) Students’ Passive Attitude Toward Teacher Feedback

Christine pointed out one of constrains was the students’ inactive responses to teacher feedback. In feedback practice, Christine focused more on enhancing students’ higher-order thinking ability to analyze, evaluate, and create their own writing draft rather than simply giving comments to be followed. However, she found that there was a big discrepancy between her situated belief and reality. She said,

I hoped the students could rethink their weak points and have their own voice through my feedback. However, many students just followed my comments rather than voiced their opinions or argument since students were so concerned about their grades. In many cases, students tended to immediately accept my com-

ments without enough negotiation or a rethinking process. I hope my comments would be just a guideline or a tool for students to rethink and edit their writing.

Christine raised the issue that students tended to rely heavily on her comments and perceived her feedback as an obliged rule to follow. Lauren had a similar difficulty in encouraging low-level or demotivated students to get actively involved in writing classes and feedback process. As Lee (2003) emphasized, teachers need to encourage students to promote a strong sense of ownership and become more active learners rather than passive feedback receivers through a two-way conversation with students. Even though some students with poor motivation changed their attitudes positively through interaction in the feedback process (J. Y. Sim & J. Y. Heo, 2014), Lauren was overwhelmed by a sense of defeat and guilt with a few students still left behind in class. Moreover, the whole feedback process led her to examine the feedback types and deliver the appropriate ways to balance between the principles and flexibility when giving feedback to individual students. In her diary, she described her difficulty as follows:

While giving feedback, I kept questioning whether the feedback or comments were suitable for each one. I could not make all the students satisfied with my feedback. Sometimes I needed to compromise between ideal feedback practice and real one when I was swamped with lots of feedback work.

(3) Dilemma Between Feedback Giver and Grader

The most challenging issue Lauren experienced was that a few students disagreed with her comments and suggestions in relation to logical thinking and structure in their essays. She felt frustrated and exhausted when she failed to find out solutions or reach the agreement between the students and herself.

One of my students majoring in philosophy was smart but quite stubborn and self-assertive. Even though I tried to make him understand the problematic points such as lack of coherence, he did not accept my advice and kept insisting his argument. When it seemed unable to find common ground on the issue of logical sequence in the essay, I really wanted to let him do it. But the problem was that I had to grade his final draft. Eventually, he did not follow my comments and his essay was not enough to meet the assessment criteria given. He might be unhappy with his grade in that semester.

As described above, she faced the conflict and disagreement with the student, failed to make him understand problematic points and later graded his essay. Carless (2006) stated “asymmetrical power relations inherent in the assessment process” (p. 229) which may be an obstacle to learning from feedback. He reported teachers had the emotional burdens of assessment on themselves and their students as well. When Lauren was in trouble as a writing teacher, she often asked advice and possible solutions from more experienced colleagues. As discussed in

the second part, Christine raised the similar issue related to dilemma between a grader and a feedback provider.

I hoped the students could rethink their weak points and have their own voice through my feedback. However, many students just followed my comments rather than voiced their opinions or argument since students were so concerned about their grades. In many cases, students tended to immediately accept my comments without enough negotiation or a rethinking process.

Christine indicated teacher’s evaluation regarding students’ writing and grades caused one of possible reasons for their passive attitude. After all, the difficulties and concerns discussed in this session were closely intertwined with one another and similar to the constraints writing teachers experienced in the previous studies. However, even though Christine and Lauren regarded feedback process as an interactive communication tool with students and learned a lot from feedback practice, their feedback practice and process led them to confront more challenges emotionally and practically than one-off written feedback or correction.

V. CONCLUSION

This study has shown that how writing teachers perceived their feedback practice, what they learned, and what their practical difficulties were during feedback process. Using narrative interview and journal diary data, the findings revealed that teacher feedback helped teachers increase student-teacher interaction and reflect their own feedback practice, eventually leading to shaping better instruction for teaching writing. Teachers reported frustration with students’ same errors; students’ passive responses to the teacher feedback; and lack of low-level students’ participation as the main difficulties and challenges they faced.

As for practical implications and suggestions for writing teachers, feedback can encourage and develop students with a focus on “growth rather than grading” (Sadler, 1983, p. 60). Writing feedback process should also be an opportunity to encourage teachers to reflect themselves as writing teachers, which can shape their feedback practice and classroom instruction. Considering the important role of teacher feedback, it is necessary to provide training programs and mentoring systems to support writing teachers, reflect their instruction, and promote developmental continuity as a competent writer and writing teacher. Both individual teachers and groups of teachers working together need to build up a “communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991) which facilitates their learning by sharing their knowledge, experience, and difficulties because learning is a social practice. Like Lauren, novice writing teachers may not have enough assurance about how their feedback fits students’ needs and levels and will be able to learn from more experienced colleagues.

The research methods used in this study have their own limitations in two ways: sample size and data collection method. First, there should be a reasonably representative sample to listen to more teachers' voices in various educational settings. Claims derived from a narrow focus on two participants cannot be generalized to the wider population because a reasonably representative sample was not taken.

Second, when considering teachers' narrative interview and journal diary data, they probe deep insight into teacher thinking about their practices and difficulties. However, other methods such as stimulated recall interviews would be adopted. As stimulated recall can be used to "prompt participants to recall thoughts they had while performing a task" (Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 17), it would enable teachers to trace their thinking and feedback process by revisiting and interpreting their own feedback practice through conference recorded. This would contribute to delving deeply into writing teachers' feedback practice.

REFERENCES

- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243-272.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205.
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 274-276.
- Burns, A. (1992). Teacher beliefs and their influence on classroom practice. *Prospect*, 7(3), 56-66.
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 219-233.
- Cho, Soo-Kyung. (2015). Writing teacher views on teacher feedback: A shift from grammar corrector to motivator. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(3), 33-59.
- Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *American Educational Research Association*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Corpuz, V. F. (2011). *Error correction in second language writing: Teachers' beliefs, practices and students' preferences*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- Darling, S., & Gallagher, P. (2003). Using self-assessment in early intervention training. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 25(3), 219-227.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckstein, G. (2013). Implementing and evaluating a writing conference program for international L2 writers across language proficiency levels. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 231-239.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19(1), 6-23.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2004). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). NY: Taylor & Francis, Inc.
- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 307-329.
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 443-460.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996) *Theory and practice of writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Hairston, M. (1986). On not being a composition slave. In C. W. Bridges (Ed.), *Training the new teacher of college composition* (pp. 117-124). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Hawe, E., Dixon, H., & Watson, E. (2008). Oral feedback in the context of written language. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 31(1), 43-58.
- Heo, Jae-Yeon, & Sim, Ju-Youn. (2015). Korean students' perspectives on L2 writing difficulty, needs, and challenges. *Studies in English Education*, 20(2), 161-188.
- Hilgers, T. L., Hussey, E. L., & Stitt-Bergh, M. (2000). The case for prompted self assessment in the writing classroom. In J. B. Smith & K. B. Yancey (Eds.), *Self-assessment and development in writing: A collaborative inquiry* (pp. 1-24). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286.

- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 17-29.
- 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.
- Iguchi, M. (2011). *Integration, identity and beyond: A narrative case study of two Japanese women living in Britain*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Warwick University, Coventry.
- Ivanic, R. (1998) *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: Students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(4), 465-492.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2002). Inquiry into experience. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Teachers' narrative inquiry as professional development* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jovchelovitch, S., & Bauer, M. (2000). Narrative interviewing. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gakell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: A practical handbook* (pp. 57-74). London: Sage.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
- Kim, Mi-Kyung. (2003). Lesson learned from twelve Korean teachers of college-level EFL writing. *Korean journal of English language and linguistics*, 3(2), 181-210.
- Kim, Tae-Young. (2008). Korean L2 writers' previous writing experience: L1 literacy development in school. *Second Language Studies*, 27(1), 103-154.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2005). Error correction: Students' vs. teachers' perceptions. *Language awareness*, 14(2), 112-127.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 216-237.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 1-16.
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69-85.
- Lee, I. (2009). A new look at an old problem: How teachers can liberate themselves from the drudgery of marking student writing. *Prospect: An Australian Journal of Teaching/Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)*, 24(2), 34-41.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 143-157.
- Lee, H. H., Leong, A. P., & Song, G. (2016). Investigating teacher perceptions of feedback. *ELT Journal*, 71(1), 60-68.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- Li, J., & Barnard, R. (2011). Academic tutors' beliefs about and practices of giving feedback on students' written assignments: A New Zealand case study. *Assessing Writing*, 16(2), 137-148.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.
- Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, 39(4), 451-467.
- Murry, G. (2009). Ethics and trustworthiness. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 45-65). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nicole, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501-517.
- Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- Park, Young-Ye. (2015). An analysis of types and characteristics of feedback in elementary school English teachers' talk. *Modern English Education*, 16(1), 153-173.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadler, D. R. (1983). Evaluation and the improvement of academic learning. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54(1), 60-79.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- Shulman, L. S., & Shulman, J. H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2), 257-271.
- Sim, Ju-Youn. (2015). The continuing professional development of Korean English teachers: An in-depth

- look at longer-term impact. *English Language Teaching*, 27(1), 69-90.
- Sim, Ju-Youn, & Heo, Jae-Yeon. (2014). Writing feedback: The benefits of conferences. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 20(3), 165-189.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basic of qualitative research: Ground theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Weissberg, R. (2006). Scaffolded feedback: Tutorial conversations with advanced L2 writers. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 246-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wold, L. S. (2003). An examination of teachers' "learning to act on reflection". *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 42(3), 52-74.
- Zamel, V. (1985) Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.
- Yang, Tae-Sun. (2010). Effects of ongoing feedback on students' attitudes towards writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 16(1), 171-189.
- Young, P. (2000). 'I might as well give up': Self-esteem and mature students' feelings about feedback on assignments. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 24(3), 409-418.

APPNEDIX 1
Christine Feedback Process

Time	Data Collected
Week 1	Teaching how to write an essay
Week 2	Overview of how to write an essay
Week3	Brainstorming for the introduction section
Week 4	Pre-course survey questionnaire for students
Week 5	Students' electronic draft for introduction (1st)
Week 6	Teachers' written feedback, revision task
Week 7	Conference with students' revised draft (2nd),
Week 8	Mid-term examination (3rd draft)
Week 9	1st in-depth interview
Week 12	Brainstorming for body section
Week 13	Students' electronic draft for body paragraphs
Week 14	Teachers' written feedback, revision task
Week 15	Conference with students' revised draft, revision task
Week 15	Post-course survey questionnaire for students
Week 16	Final examination (final draft)
Week 16	2nd in-depth interview

APPNEDIX 2
Samples of Interview Questions

Procedures	Interview Questions
1st interview	<p>1) Background interview questions: age, educational background, teaching (writing) experience</p> <p>2) Teaching writing practice questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are aims of your class? Do you have any experience of teaching writing? - What do you expect students to learn from your writing class? - What do you think is the most challenging issue on teaching writing?
2nd interview	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How many times do you give feedback to your students? 2) What types of feedback do you usually use? Why? 3) Do you have any preferred types of writing feedback in your context? Why? 4) What value do you believe feedback has in learning? 5) Do you believe your feedback could be influential in students' writing (improvement or development)? 6) When providing feedback, do you have a specific focus or an aim about it? 7) Do you think there are other influential factors to affect students' writing improvement (except for teacher's feedback)? 8) What do you think about yourself as a writer and writing teacher? 9) Do you have any concerns regarding writing feedback? 10) To what extent are you satisfied with your feedback practice?
3rd interview	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What did you learn from the feedback process? 2) How would you describe writing feedback process in your class? 3) How would you describe the significance of teacher writing feedback for both students and teachers? 4) Was there any discrepancy between your existed belief about writing feedback and actual feedback process? 5) Were there any concerns/difficulties regarding writing feedback?