KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

L2 Writers' Engagement and Needs for Teacher Written Feedback: A Case of a Korean College English Composition Class*

JungEun Choi (Seoul National University)

JungEun Choi
Faculty of Liberal Education,
Seoul National University
choi7541@snu.ac.kr

* This article is a developed version of the author's master's thesis.

ABSTRACT

Choi, JungEun. 2021. L2 writers' engagement and needs for teacher written feedback: A case of a Korean college English composition class. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 21, 551-580.

As a relatively under-researched area, the present study focused on L2 writers' reactions to teacher written feedback in a comprehensive way. Specifically, multidimensional student engagement involving behavioral, affective, and cognitive reactions and student needs for teacher commentary were examined through a triangulation of data collection. As a case study, the present study examined a real-world practice of teacher feedback provided in an authentic English composition class in South Korea. One native English teacher and 13 Korean college students participated in this study. This paper first describes the types of teacher written comments according to the intent, linguistic features, text specificity, and the presence of hedges. Then, it examines the students' uptake in the subsequent revision by the feedback types, attitudinal responses and cognitive processing, and their wishes for the kind of teacher written feedback they would like to receive. The results revealed that content-related comments dominated in the teacher's end comments, whereas a majority of the marginal notes addressed linguistic features. However, in the students' revision process, the grammar-related marginal comments were often ignored due to changes in content by the teacher's end comments. In addition, characteristic patterns for emotional and cognitive engagement and students' actual needs were observed. Based on the results, pedagogical implications are suggested.

1. Introduction

Based on the process-oriented approach in teaching English writing, over the past several decades, the multiple-draft approach has led to a concern of many researchers and teachers on the effect of teacher written feedback on student writing. The presence of a more proficient partner providing comprehensible input and caring assistance is indispensable for learners in language acquisition (Blanton 2002). Despite the undeniably great importance of the teacher's role in the writing process, however, inconclusive evidence about the effectiveness of feedback has been reported in both L1 and L2 contexts (Bitchener and Ferris 2012, Connors and Lunsford 1993, Hillocks 1986, Knoblauch and Brannon 1981, 2006, Leki 1990, Sommers 1982, Zamel 1985). Especially for L2 writing, Truscott (1996, 1999) even strongly argued that error correction on students' drafts has so little benefit that teachers need to change student attitudes and expectations by adopting a 'correction-free approach' in the classroom. Sparked by this resistance to the practice of corrective feedback in writing instruction, growing interests among L2 writing researchers arose in the usefulness of teacher comments on intermediate student drafts. Accordingly, a number of extensive studies have been conducted with questions such as what constitutes a 'good' commentary on students' writing and its effects on the subsequent revisions (e.g., Bitchener and Knoch 2009, 2010, Chandler 2003, Ellis, Sheen, Murakami and Takashima 2008, Ferris 1997, 2006, Ferris, Pezone, Tade and Tinti 1997, F. Hyland and K. Hyland 2001, K. Hyland and F. Hyland 2006, Jang 2012, Shintani, Ellis and Suzuki 2014, van Beuningen, de Jong and Kuiken 2008, 2012).

On the other hand, in line with teacher response to student writing, student response to teacher feedback bears an important portion in feedback research. As much as teacher feedback has a vital role in the writing development of students, so does the consideration of student perception and processing of the feedback to ensure the effectiveness of teacher feedback. Yet, this consideration has received relatively less attention in the literature (Han and Hyland 2015, Storch and Wigglesworth 2010). In fact, the majority of the studies attempted so far have been mostly from the teachers' perspectives regarding the impact of different types of error correction and their contribution to students' accuracy in writing (Bitchener and Ferris 2012). However, while those scholarly efforts have yielded many helpful implications, before such consideration, the prerequisites for researchers and teachers should be to understand the process students undergo during the revision stages and identify their needs with teacher feedback. Then, finding ways students can use the feedback more effectively to improve their writing should come next. In this point, Ferris, Brown, Liu, and Stine (2011) also emphasized the need for writing instructors to understand the diverse needs of student writers and adapt their feedback to their needs. Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate this influential and still under-researched issue of student response to teacher written feedback.

The purpose of this study is, in more specific terms, to explore L2 student writers' engagement and needs for teacher written feedback from multidimensional perspectives. Adopting Ellis's (2010) framework for investigating written corrective feedback, students' responses and processing of teacher feedback were examined from behavioral, affective, and cognitive perspectives. In doing so, the relationship between teacher feedback and student revision was also examined. This attempt is significant in that the findings of the present study would provide more detailed information about what specific types of teacher feedback are taken and how students utilize them in the revision stage, and expand our understanding of student needs for teacher written feedback.

To fulfill this purpose, the present study employed a triangulated approach in data collection and analysis by examining teacher commentary, student reactions, and student revisions. Data were mainly from the collection of student texts, student think-aloud protocols, and retrospective in-depth interviews. This triangulation of data

collection was designed to address the methodological limitations of previous studies having been conducted until fairly recently; they have largely relied on surveys and interviews to describe what student writers think about teacher responses and how they use it in their revision (e.g., Cho 2011, Cohen 1987, Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990, Conrad and Goldstein 1999, Enginarlar 1993, Ferris 1995, Lee 2008, Liu and Lee 2014, Montgomery and Baker 2007). More recent studies have tried to include written text analyses, but they have still relied on retrospective interviews for the investigation of students' reactions (e.g., Han and Hyland 2015, Zhang and Hyland 2018). Moreover, there have been studies involving verbal protocols to investigate student writers' actual cognitive processing (e.g., Brice 1995, Chi 1999, Zheng and Yu 2018). However, the relationship between teacher feedback and student revision remains unclear since the studies have mostly had a narrow scope, focusing only on the students' behavior or attitudes toward their revisions. In addition to the triangulated approach in data collection, considering the necessity of the contextualization for the study in this area (Goldstein 2001, Lee 2014, 2020, Parr and Timperley 2010), the present study also situated the focus on the authentic natural context, targeting an intact L2 college composition class. Consequently, by employing these methods, it tried to provide more reliable and sufficient empirical evidence about how L2 writers consider teacher written comments or how they understand and handle them in the process of revision in a more comprehensive way.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teacher Written Feedback: Efficacy and Issues

In early L1 studies, researchers questioned the effectiveness of teacher written feedback (Hyland 1998, Knoblauch and Brannon 1981). Unlike the expectations we have now, early research findings were very discouraging; despite a great deal of consumption of energy and time, teacher feedback was mostly of poor quality and often ignored, misunderstood, or misinterpreted by students, and thus teacher comments had little impact on student writing. In addition, teacher appropriation of the student text by their commentary was often raised as an issue (Brannon and Knoblauch 1982, Hillocks 1986, Knoblauch and Brannon 1981, Sommers 1982). Amid discouraging effects of teacher comments in L1 composition, Zamel (1983) noted that "ESL writers who are ready to compose and express their ideas use strategies similar to those of native speakers of English" (p. 203). The assumptions and principles of the process approach in composition were soon pronounced and transferred into L2 composition studies (Silva 1990). The major early interest of L2 studies was also related to the efficacy of teacher comments and mostly revealed similar results to L1 studies (e.g., Robb, Ross and Shortreed 1986, Semke 1984, Zamel 1985). Little evidence was reported with respect to the fact that teacher comments contributed to improving students' drafts and helping them grow as writers (Leki 1990). As a reason to why teacher comments were not overwhelmingly positive in L2 writing, Cumming (1995) and Zamel (1985) pointed out that ESL writing teachers appeared to think of themselves as primarily language teachers, rather than composition instructors. They focused on superficial features like grammatical errors, and their comments were abstract and vague for students to understand and use in their next drafts. Adding to this view, Truscott (1996, 1999) persistently claimed that error correction is not effective and even has harmful effects on learning. This pessimistic view to corrective feedback sparked a long-held debate among L2 writing researchers and lasted until recently (Mohebbi 2021, Truscott 2016, Truscott and Hsu 2008).

In response to Truscott's challenge to corrective feedback, there have been extensive studies examining

various issues, trying to provide some positive evidence for it. These have included the examinations of the short- and longer-term effects of error correction (e.g., Bitchener and Knoch 2010, Chandler 2003, Ferris 1997, 2006, van Beuningen, de Jong and Kuiken 2008, 2012) and the impact of different foci and types of teacher feedback (e.g., Bitchener 2008, Bitchener and Knoch 2009, Bitchener, Young and Cameron 2005, Buckingham and Aktuğ-Ekinci 2017, Choi 2017, Ellis et al. 2008, Ferris et al. 1997, Ferris and Roberts 2001, F. Hyland and K. Hyland 2001, K. Hyland and F. Hyland 2006, Jang 2012, Rahimi 2019, Shintani, Ellis and Suzuki 2014). These studies have demonstrated that teacher corrective feedback has led to students' successful revision and a decrease in overall error rates over a considerable period of time (e.g., Chandler 2003, Ferris 2006). Additionally, different types of feedback have yielded different effects. For example, both direct and indirect feedback contribute to short-term effects, whereas direct feedback is effective long-term. Direct feedback is also effective in helping with grammatical accuracy, whereas indirect feedback is effective for non-grammar items (e.g., van Beuningen et al. 2008, 2012).

However, despite the abundant body of literature in support of the effectiveness of error correction, its contribution to writing development is still inconclusive; students sometimes ignore, misuse, and misunderstand teacher comments, and thus they end up deleting the parts where the comments are noted (Bailey and Garner 2010, Ferris 1995, 1997, Conrad and Goldstein 1999, Lee 2004, Truscott 2007); gains from the error correction do not lead to longer retention where students can apply them into new pieces of writing (Polio, Fleck and Leder 1998, Truscott and Hsu 2008). Meanwhile, for this inconsistent efficacy of written corrective feedback, Truscott (2016) has pointed out that it has relevance to the vague notions of 'effects' or 'effectiveness' used in revision studies. In other words, some studies report the effectiveness of error correction, but do not actually have to do with learning (e.g., Ashwell 2000, Ferris and Roberts 2001). They often utilize a no-feedback control group for one-time treatment in generating findings for the effects. In this vein, Bitchener and Ferris (2012) addressed the methodological difficulties these studies often encounter. In other words, to show the 'real effects' that lead to learning, or long-term improvement in writing quality, the study needs to incorporate the control groups into the longitudinal and contextualized design, but in doing this, the ethical aspects of instruction cannot also be excluded at the same time.

Another issue is that feedback studies have been too decontextualized (Ferris 2003). They have only looked at the students' papers and teacher written commentary in isolation without considering the contextual factors that might play an important role in revisions (Ferris et al. 1997, Leki 1990, Reid 1994). Goldstein (2001), in the same line of this view, has insisted that "[b]ecause teacher commentary, student reactions to commentary and student revisions interact with each other, research needs to look at all three simultaneously" (p. 86). Thus, some studies examining teacher response to student writing began to involve triangulated or longitudinal research designs for more valuable and insightful results (Conrad and Goldstein 1999, Hyland 1998, Lee 2008, McGroarty and Zhu 1997, Polio, Fleck and Leder 1998).

As an extended discussion, Lee (2014, 2020) also brought up the issue of the appropriateness of feedback studies that are primarily experimental or quasi-experimental, not situated in a pedagogical context. Although they have tried to provide substantial evidence to some extent for the effectiveness of written feedback, she pointed out that most of them had been conducted in 'laboratory-like conditions,' focusing on certain target language forms, so that findings can hardly be interpreted as pedagogically relevant and ecologically valid (e.g., Bitchener 2008, van Beuningen et al. 2008, 2012). Considering the importance of the context in feedback studies (Goldstein 2001, Parr and Timperley 2010), she called for the research to be set out in naturalistic classroom contexts with the focus on the real needs of teachers and students. Therefore, based on this line of consideration, the present study focused on a real-world practice of teacher feedback provided in an intact college English

composition class. Also, it employed a triangulated approach, which involves teacher comments, student reactions, and student revisions through multiple data gathering instruments such as the collection of student drafts, student think-aloud protocols, and retrospective in-depth interviews to achieve a better understanding of the revision process of L2 student writers.

2.2 Student Engagement with Teacher Written Feedback

In the midst of a large body of research on teacher written feedback, in one important strand lies students' processing of the feedback. While the majority of researchers for decades placed their interests on whether written feedback is beneficial for students' writing development and what techniques could be better applied, students' views of such intervention have gained relatively less attention (see Bitchener and Ferris 2012 for a review). Indeed, although how learners actually process and engage with the feedback they receive can be an influencing factor for its effectiveness, it has been quite under-explored (Han and Hyland 2015, Storch and Wigglesworth 2010, Zhang and Hyland 2018). In recent years, growing efforts have been made, but still, there is a considerable need for research from the perspective of students.

To review the relevant literature, in earlier studies, students' preferences and perceptions about teacher written feedback, as well as their processing in the revision, were investigated generally by a survey design. They examined questions regarding the preferred type of written feedback, the focus or range the feedback should cover, or students' strategies in handling the feedback (e.g., Cohen 1987, Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990, Enginarlar 1993, Ferris 1995, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 1994, 1996, Lee 2008, Liu and Lee 2014, Montgomery and Baker 2007). Common findings were that students consistently acknowledge the value of teacher feedback, and that they generally prefer direct and comprehensive feedback on their errors. It was also found that students tend to be attentive to teacher feedback and sometimes have problems with the way teachers comment on their papers. However, due to the methodological limitations, such survey studies are often limited in providing a clear picture of students' reactions or actual behavior to the teacher feedback, although they demonstrate students' general attitudes toward it.

In addition, some studies have included verbal reports, mainly interviews, about how they use teacher feedback in their revision (e.g., Brice 1995, Chi 1999, Cho 2011, Cohen 1991, Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990, Conrad and Goldstein 1999, Han and Hyland 2015, Hyland 1998, 2003, Zhang and Hyland 2018, Zheng and Yu 2018). For example, Cho (2011) interviewed two L2 learners to investigate their internalization and utilization of teacher feedback in their revision in the perspective of sociocultural theory. The study indicated that the two subjects of different levels of English proficiency displayed different levels of internalization of feedback, and thus the author requested the consideration of ways to facilitate learners' understanding of feedback in the course of providing teacher feedback. On the other hand, Brice (1995), Chi (1999), and Zheng and Yu (2018) incorporated students' self-report protocols accompanied by interviews in their studies. They demonstrated more specific behavior and attitudes in responding to the teacher written comments (e.g., spending a considerable amount of time reading and understanding the comments, being frustrated with a certain correction system used by the teacher). However, while it is meaningful in a way that their studies have shown one aspect of students' actual processing of teacher feedback, the lack of consideration of the relationship between teacher comments and student revision remains. In other words, after classifying the teacher comment types, it is necessary to investigate in more detail how much and what specific types of feedback students uptake in their own revision and what motivates such behavior. To this end, we can have a more balanced view and clearer understanding of students' responses and their revising process with the given feedback.

555

Meanwhile, Ellis (2010) has defined the notion of engagement in reference to how learners respond to teacher feedback in an overarching sense. Within his framework of corrective feedback research, he has viewed engagement as playing a leading role in learning outcomes, which is also influenced by individual and contextual factors. By adopting the conceptualization of school engagement by Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004), he has embraced three subtypes of engagement into the framework: behavioral, affective, and cognitive engagement. This means that learners' engagement in feedback research can be examined from these three perspectives, separately or by combining a few or all of them. Behavioral engagement involves whether and how learners revise their written texts according to teacher feedback, whereas the affective perspective of engagement is concerned with how learners respond attitudinally to the feedback. On the other hand, cognitive engagement concerns how learners cognitively attend to the feedback. However, this notion of engagement is not particularly new. In fact, for feedback research to date, even though they have not manifested these three dimensions of learner engagement in responding to teacher feedback, the studies may have already reflected these to some extent. Nevertheless, Ellis's work is significant in that he has systematized the research approaches in this area by synthesizing the relevant prior studies. Inspired by his framework, several recent studies have shown that students' engagement with teacher feedback is multifaceted and takes place in three dimensions: behavioral, affective, and cognitive (Han and Hyland 2015, Zhang and Hyland 2018, Zheng and Yu 2018). Therefore, the present study also adopted Ellis's framework to comprehensively examine L2 writers' engagement with teacher written feedback.

The present study has built on recent efforts to examine student response to teacher written feedback, which is still under-explored in literature. In addressing the research gaps, the study has investigated L2 writers' engagement from multidimensional perspectives and needs for teacher feedback by employing data triangulation. In addition, it has followed a naturalistic case study approach targeting an authentic Korean college English composition class.

To pursue the purpose of the study, the following research questions were addressed:

(1) What types of teacher written feedback are provided in a college English composition class?
(2) How do students engage with teacher written feedback?
(3) What kinds of written feedback do students want the teacher to provide?

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The study was conducted in an advanced English composition course of one university located in Seoul, South Korea. The teacher who participated in this study was an experienced native instructor of English composition and conversation, who earned her master's degree in applied linguistics and TESL, majoring in teaching ESL writing in the US. She had experience in teaching English writing to college students for three years in South Korea and four years in the US. She adopted the process writing approach in her classes with prewriting exercises and peer-review sessions. She often required two or three drafts per essay. What she focused on in her feedback was, in general, content, language, and organization.

As for student participants, thirteen Korean college students were recruited from the teacher participant's three classes. They were largely advanced-level English learners, majoring and minoring in English language

556

education, and consisted of sophomores, juniors, and seniors at the same university. They were taking the course of Composition 2, an advanced English composition class, which was a required course for their majors. The student participants were from different classes taught by the same teacher and volunteered their time when the researcher recruited them in their classes. Regarding the students' experiences of taking English writing classes, most had taken Composition 1 before, which was the basic course of English writing for English majors, and two of them were taking both Composition 1 and Composition 2 at the same time when the present study was carried out. Therefore, almost all had a sense of writing multiple-paragraph English essays for a somewhat advanced level in terms of content, organization, and length. They also knew how to utilize the teacher feedback for their next writing assignment. Table 1 describes the details of the student information.

Table 1. Background Information of Student Participants

Student ID	Age	Major	Grade	Prior Writing Class Experience	English Proficiency	Experience Abroad
S1	27	English Ed.	Senior	Composition 1	TEPS 800	None
S2	24	Education	Junior	Composition 1	TOEFL 105	None
S3	22	French Ed.	Junior	Composition 1	TEPS 698	USA, 8 months
S4	22	Education	Sophomore	Composition 1	TOEIC 920	USA, 1.5 years
S5	21	English Ed.	Junior	Composition 1	TOEIC 850	None
S6	21	English Ed.	Junior	Composition 1	TEPS 855	None
S7	24	English Ed.	Senior	Composition 1	TEPS 750	USA, 5 months
S8	22	French Ed.	Senior	Composition 1	TOEIC 870	None
S9	22	English Ed.	Junior	Private language institute class	TEPS 860	None
S10	23	English Ed.	Junior	Advanced English	TOEIC 890	None
S11	22	English Ed.	Junior	Composition 1	TEPS 780	None
S12	21	English Ed.	Junior	None	TEPS 770	None
S13	21	English Ed.	Sophomore	Composition 1	Officially none but advanced	Saipan, 15 years

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 The writing sample

With the permission of the teacher and students, the researcher collected the first drafts that contained the teacher's written comments and the revised second drafts of the thirteen student participants. The students wrote the first draft in class in the form of a pencil-and-paper test for one and a half hours. It was during the fifth week of the semester (consisting of 15 weeks) that they had this in-class writing assignment. They wrote a descriptive essay, so in writing, they had to utilize descriptive language, which they had learned in previous classes, such as adjectives, adverbs, metaphors, and similes. For this, they wrote a multiple-paragraph essay including an interesting introduction and conclusion. The mean length of the student writing was about 534 words, ranging from 410 to 614 words. They were not allowed to use any references such as dictionaries. This descriptive essay was one of the three major writing assignments required of them throughout the semester and involved the students writing two drafts for the essay. After receiving their first draft with the teacher's feedback, they wrote the second draft at home. They were given two weeks for the revision and used computers this time to write. The following is the prompt that was given to them in the class writing session.

> Describe a place that had left a strong impression on you in your childhood or more recently. For this first draft, determine the dominant impression you want to focus on and write about the details of the place that gave you that impression.

3.2.2 Student reactions

Data for student reactions to teacher feedback were collected through think-aloud protocols in the process of revision and retrospective semi-structured oral interviews. Think-aloud protocol data were for examining the three dimensions of student engagement—cognitive, affective, and behavioral—and oral interview data were for a deeper understanding of these aspects of engagement with the feedback.

For the think-aloud protocols, the students were requested to self-report on what they thought about the teacher's comments, what they decided, and how they revised their previous draft. They were also guided to say whatever came to their mind as they revised their writing. In order to ensure that each participant understood and properly utilized the protocol, a training session was arranged to help participants become acquainted with it before revising their writing. The researcher first demonstrated how to think aloud while writing with feedback. After each student was able to manage the verbal protocol well enough to provide data, they started to write their revised second drafts at home. Audio recordings of the verbal reports were conducted by the students themselves with their voice recorders. The mean duration of the recordings was about 63 minutes, ranging from about 32 to 125 minutes. They verbalized in Korean, the language that they felt more comfortable with compared to English.

The semi-structured oral interviews were held in order to obtain more insights into how the students utilized the teacher comments in their revisions. The general impression and their needs for teacher feedback were also gained. Each student was interviewed at his or her convenient time after all the think-aloud protocols were transcribed; it was the time when they received the second draft back with the final comments from the teacher. Some of the interview questions were derived from their think-aloud data, and others were common questions. The interview format was semi-structured; a list of questions was prepared in advance, serving as a guideline in the interview process. Interviews usually lasted 15 to 30 minutes in Korean and were audio-recorded. Details of the common interview questions can be found in Appendix B.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 Teacher written feedback

As the main purpose of the present study was to examine the students' engagement with teacher feedback, the analysis of teacher comments served as the foundation for this case study. It was conducted mostly by frequency tests in order to have a closer look at the details of feedback provided in an authentic writing classroom and the actual relationship between teacher feedback and student revision. The teacher comments were first classified according to types and analyzed in regard to what types were provided and adopted into the student revisions. For this, the framework developed in Ferris et al. (1997) was adapted in the present study. This analytic model was used as it systematically categorizes the teacher responses that are provided in the marginal areas of the text (marginal comments) and at the end of the text (end comments), according to the pragmatic aims or intent and the linguistic forms of the comments. Moreover, whether they were text-based and had hedges were also considered. This model was also useful in that it gives precise terms in specifically describing how the teacher responds. As for the modification from the original version, the present study separated the analysis of the text

specificity and the presence of hedges or softeners from that of the linguistic features. It was intended to distinguish them from the syntactic form of the comments. Also, the present model included the use of symbols in the form of comments as they frequently appear in the actual teacher commentary. The taxonomy of the comments used for analysis and their examples is provided in Appendix A. In addition, as in the original work, this study also looked at the marginal and end comments in separation as they have different characteristics in general. That is, the end comments tend to deal with the overall matter or characteristically important issues of the text, while the marginal comments are more locally related to specific details for each part of the text.

In the analysis of the teacher's responses, only verbal comments including question marks that indicate the need to give more specific meaning were included; some marks such as underlining words were excluded because the feedback intent was not clear. As she read through the students' marked first drafts, the researcher numbered each marginal and end comment on the paper and completed a form that made the categorical analyses possible. The frequencies for the comment types and linguistic forms of both marginal and end commentary were analyzed. The examination of the teacher interview conducted via e-mail was also included in the analysis for gaining more detailed information about the feedback.

Furthermore, whether or not the original teacher comments were taken in the process of student revisions was also marked for both marginal and end comments. This analysis would demonstrate the students' behavioral aspect of engagement as well as the final decisions about their revision consulting with the teacher comments. This relationship between teacher feedback and students' revision was analyzed by two-way frequency tables. In these analyses of the teacher comments, an additional independent rater also joined, and an interrater agreement was achieved with Chronbach's alpha 0.94, which was a mean of reliability statistics of all categories.

3.3.2 Student engagement

A qualitative analysis of transcriptions of verbal protocols and interviews was taken for the student reactions to the teacher written feedback. While students' revised texts would solely indicate the behavioral engagement, the verbal protocols and oral interview data could reveal multiple perspectives. In addition, the interview data would also show the students' needs for the teacher feedback. All of the students' verbal reports were transcribed verbatim first, and for the study, the parts that needed to be extracted were translated into English.[1] The topical unit was used to analyze both the think-aloud and interview data. A topical unit is defined as "one or several utterances with a complete idea unit" (Chi 1999, p. 10). Based on this, the related utterances or topical units reflecting a common perspective were regarded as one theme despite recurring topics or patterns. Thus, all of the relevant topical units were moved and grouped as one category.

More specifically, the researcher read the transcripts first, marked the idea units that provided insight or perspective to the research questions, and extracted a series of coding themes. Then, she reviewed them by reiteratively reading the transcripts to confirm and generate the dominant themes by combining, revising, and refining categories, guided by previous literature (e.g., Chi 1999, Han and Hyland 2015, Miles and Huberman 1994). The decision was made according to the relevance to the student engagement and needs for teacher written feedback. Finally, three dimensions of engagement were identified; behavioral reactions were identified in regards to the decision of revision made with the teacher comments. Affective and cognitive responses were examined by attitudinal reactions and the depth of cognitive process such as how well students understand and handle teacher written comments.

---

[1] Although the structure and subtle meanings may have been altered in the translation process due to differences in languages, it is assured that the original ideas underlying it, which are more important to the study, are preserved.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Teacher's Written Feedback

4.1.1 Comment types by intent

In order to examine student reactions, the first step was to analyze what types of teacher written comments were provided in a Korean college English composition class. The analysis was performed according to the adapted version of the framework used in Ferris et al. (1997), which categorizes the teacher marginal and end comments by types of intent, linguistic forms, text specificity, and hedges.

As for the comment type by intent, as shown in Table 2, many more instances of 'Request' and 'Giving Information' occurred in the end comments, 34 (75.5%) out of a total of 45 cases. That is, the end comments tended to be content-focused for guiding students to write properly for the given topic. The examples included the teacher's requests to use diverse literary devices for a descriptive essay ("Try to vary your simile expressions," Paper #13, End comment #1), to maintain the focus of writing ("In writing this essay, you need to focus on the place, not your feelings or the events," Paper #7, End comment #3), and to organize content properly ("Introduce incident with TA with transition & organize sentences there," Paper #11, End comment #1). The teacher's intent of giving information was also involved with the clarity of the writing ("It sounds more like a narrative than a descriptive essay," Paper #6, End comment #2; "The metaphors & descriptions don't seem to be unified at all," Paper #3, End comment #2). On the other hand, grammar-related comments hardly occurred in the end area. One exceptional case was found, but it was a summative note for one student who generated repeated grammar errors.

Table 2. Types of End and Marginal Comments

Comment Types	N	Grammar/Mech.	Ask for Info.	Give Info.	Request	Positive
End Comments	45	1 (2.2%)	4 (8.9%)	11 (24.4%)	23 (51.1%)	6 (13.3%)
Marginal Comments	206	171 (83.0%)	8 (3.9%)	17 (8.3%)	10 (4.9%)	0 (0%)

On the other hand, in the marginal comments, the overwhelming majority (83%) were about 'Grammar or Mechanics,' while other content-related comments were relatively low in frequency. According to the teacher interview data, as for the grammar errors in the first draft, she marked the parts that were unclear because of the language, even though the idea or content was not set yet. This means that she tended to focus on the accuracy of the writing from the beginning of the feedback process. Overall, the marginal comments were likely to focus more on the grammatical aspects, while the end notes appeared to weigh the content or organization for a better essay and to have diverse forms of intent, or directives.

Another interesting aspect of the teacher comments was the lower occurrence rate of positive comments, with none appearing in the marginal area. Although she noted overall good points of the students' writing in the end area (6 out of 45 instances), she did not give any in the marginal area. This was somewhat different from the study of Ferris et al. (1997) that examined the responses of one experienced ESL writing instructor. The participant teacher's comments included a relatively greater percentage of positive comments (31.5% of the 111 first drafts) in the end notes and 17.8% in the marginal area (Ferris et al. 1997). Moreover, Hyland and Hyland (2001) also reported the frequent use of praise in written feedback provided by two participant ESL teachers.

4.1.2 Linguistic forms of the comments

As for the linguistic forms of the comments, the end written feedback mostly appeared to be statements and imperatives for requesting a better content organization of the essay. There were also slightly more instances of statement form, and this is probably because of the summative nature of the end notes (See Table 3).

Table 3. Linguistic Forms of End and Marginal Comments

Comment Types	N	Statement	Imperative	Question	Symbol
End Comments	45	23 (51.1%)	18 (40.0%)	4 (8.9%)	0 (0%)
Marginal Comments	206	20 (9.7%)	114 (55.3%)	11 (5.3%)	61 (29.6%)

The marginal comments showed more instances of imperatives and symbols. Among imperative comments, there were many direct teacher corrections (100 out of 114). According to her feedback policy, she gave direct corrections when she thought that the students would not know how to correct, when she did not expect them to know, or when it was a stylistic correction such as a better word choice. Symbols such as VT (verb tense) or WC (word choice) were used when the errors were basic enough that the students should know, and that she had taught in class. In other words, she tended to give direct corrections for better sentences as much as she let them look for the answers of problems marked with symbols.

4.1.3 Text specificity and hedges

Text specificity is one important aspect of written feedback. Earlier, Sommers (1982) and Zamel (1985) encouraged teachers to provide text-specific commentary rather than vague generalizations that exhibit little teacher involvement in students' papers. In the present study, most of the comments seemed to be text-based across the end and marginal comments as shown in Table 4. It was because, considering the features of the descriptive essay the students wrote, the comments mostly focused on the request for describing more dominant impressions that each student intended to show as directed in the writing prompt.

Table 4. Text Specificity of End and Marginal Comments

Comment Types	N	Text-Specific	Generic	Hedge/Softener
End Comments	45	29 (64.4%)	16 (35.6%)	6 (13.3%)
Marginal Comments	206	197 (95.6%)	9 (4.4%)	0 (0%)

As for the presence of hedges or softeners, the identification was made according to Crompton's (1997) taxonomy of hedges. As a result, despite rare cases, hedges like *seem* and *sounds* were found in the end comments. It reflected that the teacher tended to use direct comments rather than softening or toning down the comments. This result has brought a difference from the relevant previous studies that addressed the practice of a few ESL writing instructors. For example, although Ferris et al. (1997) reported still fewer occurrences of hedges in both marginal and end commentary of one experienced American ESL teacher (16.7% for the marginal and 20.4% for the end notes), Hyland and Hyland (2001) recognized more frequent features of hedges in teacher comments provided in university writing classes at a New Zealand university. For this difference, Hyland and Hyland (2001) addressed the possibility of cultural or individual differences in feedback practices.

4.2 Student Engagement in Revision

4.2.1 Revisions made by teacher feedback: Behavioral engagement

   Students' uptake of teacher written feedback provided at the end and marginal areas was examined to look at student behavioral engagement. This examination included only the comments related to the actual revision. First, as for the end comments, the results indicated that the students responded to almost all teacher comments except for a few rare instances, as presented in Table 5. Since the end comments were mostly about the overall content and points that the students should focus on in writing, the students seemed to accept the comments and tried to meet the teacher's expectations.

Table 5. Revisions Made by End Comments

Types of End Comments	N = 45	Revisions Made	Revisions Not Made
Request	23	21 (91.3%)	2 (8.7%)
Giving Information	11	11 (100%)	0 (0%)
Asking for Information	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)
Grammar/Mechanics	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)

   On the other hand, two 'Request' comments were not taken. One case was, according to the think-aloud protocol and interview data, because one student did not understand what the comment meant due to the teacher's handwriting, even though it was a tip for a better descriptive essay; thus, she ignored it. The other case was that one student did not want to revise their work according to what the teacher asked. The following excerpt shows why this student denied the revision request.

   Think-Aloud Excerpt 1 (S4)
   [On the teacher's end comment "Focus more on the second place."] I agree in part with the comment that if I focus on just one place, the description will be well organized. But it is the opposite of my intention. What I want to show is the contrast between the first and second places, so I'll keep writing about both places and show how they look different. I don't want to target only one place.

   This student was the only person who stuck to his intention, revealing autonomy in his writing. He gave the following reasons for not complying with the teacher's comment.

   Interview Excerpt 1 (S4)
   Although I think the grade is important, of course, that was my pride as a person studying how to write. That was pride in my own writing. I think I might have gotten a low grade because I didn't follow the teacher's instruction, but I didn't regret it at all.

   This student had strong feelings about his writing. Even though he thought that following the teacher's direction would get him a good grade, he persisted with his first intention by maintaining descriptions of the two places. This student's case can be in line with findings of other studies (e.g., Hyland 1998, Storch and Wigglesworth 2010) which demonstrate that uptake of teacher feedback may be affected by learners' attitudes, beliefs, and goals. Consequently, this suggests that while learners mostly tend to engage with the teacher

feedback when revising their drafts, the individual factors can play a role in the decision of uptake.

Next, the revisions made as suggested by the marginal comments were also examined. As presented in Table 6, a considerable number of the students' revisions were made with the teacher comments, at around 70 percent. Concerning the comment forms, a majority of the teacher's feedback was attempted in imperative and symbol forms (see Table 7). Since they were related to content and grammatical problems, many comments were found to have been reflected in the subsequent revision.

Table 6. Revisions Made by Marginal Comments

Types of Marginal Comments	N = 206	Revisions Made	Revisions Not Made
Grammar/Mechanics	171	130 (76.0%)	41 (24.0%)
Giving Information	17	13 (76.5%)	4 (23.5%)
Request	10	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)
Asking for Information	8	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)

Table 7. Revisions by Linguistic Forms of Marginal Comments

Linguistic Forms of Marginal Comments	N = 206	Revisions Made	Revisions Not Made
Imperative	114	88 (77.2%)	26 (22.8%)
Symbol	61	45 (73.8%)	16 (26.2%)
Statement	20	14 (70.0%)	6 (30.0%)
Question	11	8 (72.7%)	3 (27.3%)

However, while the students tried to use the written feedback as much as possible, there were cases that should not be ignored on the opposite side; that is, 24 percent of 'Grammar/Mechanics' comments were not used in the revision, as indicated in Table 6. This occurred in the process of changing much of their drafts according to the teacher's guide given in the end comments because the students were still in the process of building the ideas and content of the writing. The following verbal reports give evidence of this.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 2 (S11)
I want to focus on the teacher's comment where she wrote 'confusing.' [As an end comment, the teacher commented "It sounds confusing."] I agree with that because I described the way I was going to the place, not just the place itself. The description was so long that it could have made the teacher feel confused. What I want to describe here is the fresh feeling the department office always gives me. If I focus on this, the 'confusion' could be avoided in some way. Okay, then, the whole first introduction paragraph should be wiped out.

Interview Excerpt 2 (S12)
As the teacher said that the first part of the essay didn't have a dominant impression, I just took that part out [rather than revising it]. I also read what the teacher corrected in that part, but in the process of rewriting, I couldn't help but delete it all.

Interview Excerpt 3 (S5)
[Pointing at the part which contains the teacher's comments] Since the teacher said this part sounds like a repetition of the paragraph above, I made these two paragraphs into one. I tried to leave several sentences in,

but others had to be left out, even though they had the teacher's comments.

Of course, the other comment types were also found to have not been reflected in the students' revisions at a similar rate to those related to grammar. However, these cases stemmed from the fact that the students misunderstood the teacher's comments or had difficulties in handling them in the process of reconstructing the parts that were commented on. The following presents some students' voices.

Interview Excerpt 4 (S10)
[For the teacher's comment of "Need better transition."] Ah, does 'transition' mean the tool of showing the process in which something changes from one state to another, doing like a connection? I didn't know that word at all. I might have misunderstood the teacher's note. Yes, because I didn't know how to handle it, I just skipped that comment.

Interview Excerpt 5 (S8)
The teacher commented that "The meaning of this part is not clear." I could understand how she was confused with this because when I wrote this, it seemed a little awkward [to me as well]. But when I rewrote it, I still didn't know how to correct it. So, I just changed the whole sentence into a totally different one.

In revising drafts, learners often resort to the avoidance strategy when they have no clues about how to correct errors and respond to teacher comments, as seen in Interview Excerpt 5. In fact, the use of this strategy can typically be observed in less-motivated or less-successful English language learners (see Han and Hyland 2015, Zheng and Yu 2018). However, for the current case, it is necessary to look at the efficiency aspect in that comments on grammar are ignored in the process of revising the content of the text. This avoidance was not due to the learners' misunderstanding or lack of skills in handling the teacher comments, nor to the learners' beliefs or attitudes. It was inevitable in the process of revising part of the text according to the teacher's content-related comments. Hence, this may point to the necessity of considering a way to increase the efficiency of providing teacher feedback. This is to prioritize the focus of the feedback on content first and form second, as usually recommended within a process writing approach (Ferris 2003, Zamel 1985). In regard to this, there also exists an opposite view that separating content and form feedback does not make a difference for students (Ashwell 2000). Additionally, one might argue that learning from the teacher comments on language on the first draft is helpful as suggested in Fathman and Whalley (1990), even if they are not reflected in the subsequent revision. However, it seems to be necessary to consider this in terms of efficiency. In fact, many teachers report that responding to student writing is an energy and time-consuming part of the job (Ferris, Brown et al. 2011, Ferris, Pezone et al. 1997). Moreover, the research findings consistently suggest that the high level of uptake and retention of teacher feedback is influenced by learners' attitudes and goals to improve their linguistic accuracy in writing (Hyland 1998, 2003, Storch and Wigglesworth 2010). Taken all together, therefore, for a more efficient practice of teacher written feedback, it seems desirable to consider the pattern of 'content first and form second,' and the present findings of the case study can provide a piece of supporting evidence for this. In addition, further studies are also needed to provide more evidence to ensure the efficiency of teacher feedback practices.

4.2.2 Attitudes toward teacher written feedback: Affective engagement

For affective engagement with teacher written feedback, learners' affective responses were examined in terms of attitudes in making revisions and their emotions when receiving the feedback. Among responses in the "Revisions Made" presented above, attitudinal ways students took the teacher's comments were categorized: (1) revising to accomplish a good essay in their eyes, (2) revising for a learning experience, and (3) revising by reluctantly following the instructions.

(1) Revising to accomplish a good essay in their eyes

Almost all of the students who participated in the present study agreed with the teacher on the problems in their first drafts. It was in part because the first writing was done in class with a time limit and in a test format. The students felt that the first drafts were unsatisfactory for both the teacher and themselves. They revised the drafts not only to meet the teacher's comments but also to repair their defective writing to the best of their ability. This high level of positive engagement with teacher feedback was often observed in the findings of other studies (e.g., Han and Hyland 2015, Zhang and Hyland 2018, Zheng and Yu 2018).

Moreover, some students sometimes corrected their awkward expressions or sentences by themselves, while other students did not have the idea to revise the parts where the teacher did not mark. Think-Aloud Excerpt 3 is an example of the former, and Excerpt 4 is of the latter.

> Think-Aloud Excerpt 3 (S9)
> I used the word here 'electricity,' but changing it to 'a bolt of electricity' is much better to be more specific. And then, 'Affected by electric shock…,' it would be better if I start with 'Shocked by that dynamic high-voltage current.' It sounds more concrete and better now after I change it a little.

> Think-Aloud Excerpt 4 (S1)
> [Reading his text] "Nobody followed his word but just kept going what they were doing…until the wicked dressed-up man yelled." Ah... I can't figure out what should be added or revised [for a descriptive essay]. I think it's okay as it is, so then how can I rewrite this?

The two examples show the difference in the revising attitude between the students. Student 9 showed a very active and sincere attitude towards revising her draft in that she desired to organize what she first wanted to say in her writing. On the other hand, student 1 appeared a little passive to revise; he changed all the points where the teacher marked, but with other parts, he was not successful in making improvements. As he reported in the interview session, he just rewrote the parts where the teacher commented and tried to develop other parts as well, but was unable to. The reason for this had to do with his somewhat perfunctory manner. That is, although he could have looked for another way to revise that part, he just gave up, thinking this course would not be directly related to his career track. Thus, this kind of attitude blocked his further efforts to revise voluntarily. This concurred with the findings of Conrad and Goldstein (1999) that students' contextual factors, like their commitments to the course, play a role in the revision process.

(2) Revising for a learning experience

   As many previous studies revealed that teacher feedback on earlier drafts is helpful for both overall quality and linguistic accuracy (e.g., Chandler 2003, Fathman and Whalley 1990, Hyland 2003, Polio et al. 1998), all the student participants acknowledged the help from the teacher's comments. The part they felt most valuable was on native use of collocations and expressions. That is, when the teacher corrected the language written in a so-called Korean style, they felt they were learning appropriate language use in the right situation. Below are examples of this appreciation.

   Think-Aloud Excerpt 5 (S11)
   Here the teacher corrected my expression of 'university of Education' with 'college of Education.' Ah, it is the 'college of Education,' not 'university of Education,' because that's 'dangwadae' in Korean.

   Think-Aloud Excerpt 6 (S10)
   'Last summer?' Ah, here I shouldn't have used 'in the' in this case. [The teacher erased 'in the' before 'last summer' in the student's writing.] And '…scene "before?"' Ah, "I had never seen that big and spectacle scene 'before.'" [Teacher added 'before' at the end of the sentence.] This sentence needed 'before' at the end.

   For EFL learners who have not been exposed much to natural English usage, appropriate English use is a challenging matter. In addition, as the regular opportunity of getting knowledge and experience in this area is limited, the instruction could be crucial for them. By offering a good guide of language use, the teacher can enhance their language competence as well as their writing skills. Meanwhile, the students also showed trust in the teacher feedback.

   Interview Excerpt 6 (S13)
   While writing, I stopped at a certain point because I thought that's enough. But the teacher seemed to view it a different way and point out where something needs to be added or changed [so that I could revise them]. As she is the teacher, she knows far better than me, so I trust her.

   Interview Excerpt 7 (S1)
   I learned many things from the teacher comments, from selecting proper verbs to whether to insert prepositions or not in a sentence. As I said, when I was in the army [KATUSA for two years], the verb 'get' could be used for everything. [So, I could learn many different words in different cases from the teacher feedback.]

(3) Revising by reluctantly following the instructions

   As indicated earlier, most teacher comments were reflected in the students' revisions. All students reported they should rewrite the parts the teacher pointed out. It came from their beliefs that the teacher is the one who knows better than them, and that there must have been some reason for the comments to be made by the teacher. However, some students reluctantly revised their writing even though they did not fully agree with the teacher. When asked for the reason, students said that the teacher was the person who grades their writing. That is, to get

a good grade, they had to accept the teacher's request to revise. Similarly, Chi (1999) mentioned the social stance the teacher takes toward students, which has a strong impact on students' attitudes toward their revision. In the present study, the majority of the students also showed the attitude of following many of the teacher's instructions even though they were reluctant to revise their work. One example of the students' compliance with the teacher comments is provided below.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 7 (S4)
'How?' She seemed to mean that she didn't feel why this is very different here. I don't quite understand why she didn't feel this. As the contrast to the beginning part is described here, if she had read it through, then it could have been easily recognized. Anyway, now that she didn't, I can't help but add an explanation as to why it's different.

Earlier, this student showed a strong objection to the teacher's comment to focus more on the second place in the description, which can be a major framework for his writing. However, on other issues, even though he had negative feelings about the teacher's comment, he just accepted it and tried to revise the draft accordingly. Another example from a different student follows below.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 8 (S9)
[On the teacher's marginal comment of "Sounds too scientific. Doesn't match the rest of paragraph in style."] 'Scientific?' What I just wanted to show here was that the particles coming out of this house inspired me whenever I breathed. It was just like that when I go to exotic places, I feel that something exciting is coming into my body when I inhale…I wanted to express that kind of feeling. But the teacher regarded this nonsense as a scientific story. Anyway… [I'll just change it then].

Student 9 in this case wanted to express a kind of exotic feeling she got when she traveled to Firenze. However, even though the teacher seemed to have misinterpreted this, she just revised her sentences so that her teacher could understand what she intended them to mean. In the interview session, when asked why she did not go and talk with the teacher about this misinterpretation, she said that she was not willing to go and ask the teacher because of the teacher's tight schedule right after class. Furthermore, even though there were chances to ask about something in class, this student hardly ever took advantage of that. This was because her question might be irrelevant to the class, and she did not want to interrupt in the middle. Furthermore, she said that the text itself should be comprehensible to its readers, not by other means such as explaining the details of the intention in person. This was why she revised her work when given comments, even though she thought she was sometimes correct in the first place. In this sense, this student can be viewed as finding it a bit easier to motivate herself to convert non-positive feelings she initially received from the teacher's feedback into a revision. This kind of attitude can also be found in a highly motivated Chinese student participant reported in Han and Hyland (2015). Depending on their expectations and self-efficacy beliefs, learners sometimes have negative emotions toward teacher comments but tend to regulate and convert them into motivation for revision.

4.2.3 Revision as a guessing game: Cognitive engagement

As for cognitive engagement, the present study focused on students' cognitive processing to understand and handle teacher written feedback. As a result, the most difficult part of the feedback for the students to deal with

occurred with the teacher's abstract comments without any specific descriptions or examples. Almost all students expressed troubles with the teacher's abstract notes in revising their drafts. Despite such difficulties, they tried to do their best to meet the teacher's comments. However, what is more was that they were not sure whether their rewriting was correct or not, and that they did not know what the teacher exactly intended in the comments. The following are a few examples of this represented in the students' reports.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 9 (S2)

The teacher noted [in the marginal area] to "Be more specific." 'Be more specific?' And 'Meaning not clear?' Why? And where? It would be more helpful for the teacher to indicate which word is not specific and to give some specific word choices than just to say, 'be more specific.' I can study by myself using dictionaries and grammar books, but I still don't know whether my correction is right or not.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 10 (S1)

"'Unforgettable' place sounds awkward"… ah… how should I change this? How?... Should I change it to 'impressive' [place]? Yes, I'll just change it into 'unforgettable and impressive' [place]… Just, just… because the two words have a similar meaning, [it'll work]. But I'm not sure if it's enough to just add a word. Will it be okay? Do I still need to be more specific? Ah, I can't be sure. If that place is unforgettable, I guess I need to specify the reason for it. Do I need still more?... Let's just skip it now.

Interview Excerpt 8 (S13)

As I didn't know exactly what she [the teacher] wanted me to rewrite in this part, I simply deleted the part like I usually do.

As seen in the examples, most of the students had no clues for revising their writing when the teacher comments were not clear, and so they sometimes ended up deleting the sentences on which the comments were made. They felt they should correct the marked problems, but they were not given any specific guide, except for very rare cases. Moreover, even if they tried to change some words or sentences, they were still left dangling between their revision and the teacher's comments. This lack of specificity in teacher written commentary has long been raised as an issue since feedback studies started (Chi 1999, Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990, Ferris 1997, Han and Hyland 2015, Liu and Lee 2014, Sommers 1982, Zamel 1985, Zheng and Yu 2018). The students' common reactions to this type of teacher comment were to just remove the marked sentences or leave them unrevised (Chi 1999, Han and Hyland 2015, Liu and Lee 2014, Zheng and Yu 2018). Of course, it is the students themselves who need to find errors and look for ways to solve the problems. Furthermore, this would not be an issue if they had understood the purpose of the writing correctly (e.g., a descriptive essay); then, they would have soon been able to figure out what the teacher comments intended. Nevertheless, it still seems necessary and desirable to include more specific information about what the problems are, where they are, and explain further about why they are problems in the teacher written comments.

On the other hand, one student below showed a successful revision from guessing what the teacher comment meant.

Think-Aloud Excerpt 11 (S6)

[On the teacher comment of "I can't sense the dominant impression."] Ah, for dominant impression…I want to have two impressions here, but should I only address one? Um...I'm not sure. I think it's okay to

emphasize two different impressions… [A little later] As I just read my text again, the teacher seems right. Although I tried to describe the dominant impression then [in the class writing session], ...um…now…it looks so faint that she could not have recognized it. Okay. As she pointed out, I'll just delete the irrelevant part, and describe that I felt peacefulness [as the dominant impression].

This student was confused at first with the teacher comment; she contemplated if it meant to focus on only one dominant impression among several or to make it clear to show 'the dominant impression.' After reading her text several times, she captured the teacher's intention and willingly revised it to make the dominant impression clear as commented.

4.3 Students' Wishes for Teacher Written Feedback

The last research question considered the students' needs for teacher written comments. The results were mostly from the interview data showing their wishes for feedback. There were diverse opinions, summarized as follows: (1) specific directions with concrete indications or examples, (2) positive and soft comments (3) focusing on native-like expressions rather than on grammar, (4) focusing on features at the sentence level, (5) grammar feedback with a whole class approach, (6) as many comments as possible, (7) an overall improvement check by writing components, (8) second feedback on the revision, (9) good handwriting, and (10) using a separate feedback paper sheet. Among these, the first four major issues are discussed in detail below.

(1) Specific directions with concrete indications or examples

What almost all students voiced regarding the teacher written feedback was the need for text-specific comments. As mentioned above, they wanted the comments to be pointing to the specific, relevant parts of their drafts. For example, if the note "be more specific" was given, the indication of which part, in particular, in a paragraph or sentence, plus why she (the teacher) thinks that way should be mentioned as well. Some students reported the following.

Interview Excerpt 9 (S13)
It would be more helpful if she included more specific examples in the comments so that they could be guides as I revise my draft.

Interview Excerpt 10 (S11)
I felt uneasy and unsure with one single sentence of the comment and no further or more specific directions, which only says to correct it.

When they have difficulty understanding the teacher's comments, bringing them to the teacher can be one solution for the students to know the clear meaning of the comments. However, some students addressed that it is not easy to ask the teacher about their writing personally, although the teacher welcomes inquiries about her comments. The transcripts below show how they feel reluctant to ask for help.

Interview Excerpt 11 (S8)
I feel sorry to ask the teacher, so I hardly visit her at any time. It is because she has lots of students who are

taking this writing class, so I think it's hard for her to answer all questions from many students. I don't want to bother her in any way.

Interview Excerpt 12 (S11)
I can't visit the teacher for questions because I would feel a little bit ashamed. The reason is that although the grade is given to my writing rather than to me, if I go and ask a question that I made repeatedly in my writing, I might fear becoming quite self-conscious about my writing ability. In addition, if she were a Korean, then I could ask a quick question about the comments without bothering her that much. But in English, it seems hard for me to deliver my question 100% in a quick moment. The teacher will probably be busy because she has to go to her next class.

Likewise, some students feel reluctant to ask the teacher about their writing. Of course, these students' dispositions may reflect the cultural influences of Korea. In this situation, more effective delivery of the feedback can be achieved through teacher-student one-on-one conferences or verbal feedback sessions. However, the major channel in which they could communicate with the teacher may be the paper itself. Therefore, providing feedback that is as specific as possible would be of great help for students, not to leave room for possible troubles.

(2) Positive and soft comments

Unlike other studies (Ferris et al. 1997, Hyland and Hyland 2001), as indicated earlier, the result of this case study showed very few instances of positive teacher comments. Some students, thus, raised their voices that they want some compliments for things which they did well, even on small points. Several of these are presented below.

Interview Excerpt 13 (S9)
I think positive comments are lacking in the teacher's notes. Some expressions in my writing were the result of my deep thinking and my struggle to produce. Without any apparent positive comments, I cannot be sure whether it was good or not.

Interview Excerpt 14 (S8)
I like the compliments the most even such as 'good choice.' When I get that kind of comment, I can be very certain that I am doing well.

In addition, another characteristic of the teacher's comments in this case study was that there were fewer hedges or softeners. Actually, this lack of softeners in the comments caused a problem with one student. While the other students did not show much discomfort, this student looked quite uncomfortable with the teacher's direct tone of commentary. His opinion is recorded below.

Interview Excerpt 15 (S4)
I am unhappy with the very imperative comments. 'You'd better do that' makes me far more agreeable than 'You must do that,' which drives me to be reluctant to revise my writing. If she had commented like 'I think it's better to…,' then it would have been much better…

Regarding reasons for this student's somewhat different stance on the teacher's comments, he said that he had once studied English abroad before. Thus, he felt himself a bit more advanced than other students in English writing. Moreover, on the tone of the teacher's comments, as he could sense the subtle meaning differences according to the language, he seemed rather sensitive about this.

On the other hand, most of the other students did not show unpleasant feelings with regard to the direct comments. One student ascribed this to the difference in perception between EFL learners and natives as noted below.

Interview Excerpt 16 (S11)

Since we read and listen to English as a foreign language, the direct imperative comments don't make me feel as upset as native speakers do. It is just like how 'stand up' and 'stand up please' sometimes don't make a difference to me.

As for another reason, most students attributed this tendency to the teacher's characteristics. That is, the teacher is usually kind, so even if the comments themselves are not soft, they are not likely to offend the students. The interview excerpt below shows this.

Interview Excerpt 17 (S6)

[On the direct imperative comments] That's… [okay to me] because of her nature. I like her very much because she makes us feel comfortable. She is open-minded. Thus, even if we were to say something wrong, she would still accept the majority of our opinions. I, and probably most of us, know that she is a very kind person, so I don't care that much.

Overall, it is clear that teacher comments are crucial in correcting errors in student texts and guiding them to the direction of improving; thus, they often mainly focus on errors. Nevertheless, it can be seen that positive teacher comments play an important role in acknowledging students' efforts and making them aware that they are going in the right direction. Moreover, although the teacher can use rather direct expressions in the comments when pointing out what needs to be corrected, it also seems important for students to recognize and learn the subtle differences in meaning conveyed by the tone of the language, especially from the standpoint of students learning English. Therefore, even if the sensitivity to this aspect is somewhat low depending on the classroom culture, it seems ultimately desirable that soft comments are provided as much as possible.

(3) Native-like expressions over grammar

One interesting result of the present case study lies in this point. The majority of the students showed great interest in learning native-like expressions rather than grammar from their teacher's comments. This contrasts with Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) who found that EFL students were more concerned with grammar than ESL students. However, in the present findings, what the students felt they learned and what they wanted to receive from the teacher's comments were the appropriate use of expressions from the native speaker's perspective.

Interview Excerpt 18 (S12)

I like the comments focusing on the expressions. We write English essays, so the language use and the

expressions should be appropriate for natives' understanding. For example, if I wrote a sentence in the passive voice which should be in the active for native speakers to understand better, then it might be problematic. So, I want the teacher to focus on that kind of thing.

Interview Excerpt 19 (S1)
Since we are not natives, I want the teacher to be concerned with language use such as collocations. As for grammar, in the process of rechecking my writing, I can correct it myself. But whether expressions or sentences are appropriate or not can only be judged by a native speaker's sense, I think.

The reason why these students were concerned more about appropriate language usage might be that they thought of themselves to be already at an advanced level of writing ability, being qualified in grammar and basic writing knowledge. They think grammar problems are matters for self-correction and are nothing new in the teacher's comments. Nevertheless, a few voices reaffirmed the importance of grammar and the balance of grammar, content or organization, and the expressions in the comments.

Interview Excerpt 20 (S2)
When I took Composition 1, I learned quite a lot about English grammar even though most of them were things I had known already. Although I felt that I knew all of the grammar needed for writing, I realized that it's valuable.

Interview Excerpt 21 (S7)
Although I'm interested in native-like expressions, when the teacher gives comments, I think it would be better if she makes a balance among grammar, expressions, and content of the writing.

(4) Focusing on features at the sentence level

Another interesting result was that one student showed great concern for sentence-level features, which he thought the teacher should focus on. He believed that after completing a matter on a sentence level first, he could then stretch out to the logical meaning of the whole writing. In this sense, he thought the teacher seemed to ignore such basic matters as verb tense or modals which can hinder subtle meaning differences in a sentence. In fact, in this class, overall grammar-related feedback at the sentence level was provided much in the marginal area as indicated earlier. However, this student thought it was not enough; actually, he was not satisfied with the amount of such feedback because he received very little. Below is a statement from the student.

Interview Excerpt 22 (S4)
I think she should focus on whether a sentence or an organization [within a paragraph] is natural or not. Although in my eyes, there are weird sentences which she should have corrected, she tended to ignore them but rather focused on the overall logic of the writing. I wish, as a writing teacher, she would also point out something related to the sentence or vocabulary.

It seemed that this student might have misunderstood the teacher's writing instruction approach. The teacher reported that she pursued the process writing approach which emphasizes the content, idea, and logical connection first within the whole writing assignment. This student, however, insisted that the teacher comment

on local problems in a sentence, regardless of the teacher's teaching approach. Conversely, it appeared that the misunderstanding came from the lack of communication about the feedback policy between the teacher and the student. It might be right for the student to follow the teacher's instruction, but the teaching policy also needs to be fully delivered in advance. When asked if he had heard of the process approach in teaching writing, he answered no. Thus, lest this kind of possible miscommunication occurs in writing classrooms, explicit notification of the teacher's feedback policy or the teaching approach should be made at the beginning of the course.

5. Conclusion

The present case study aimed to explore L2 student writers' engagement and needs for teacher written feedback in a comprehensive way, focusing on an authentic college English composition class in South Korea. For the purpose of the study, it first attempted to describe what types of teacher comments are given in a natural setting. The students' multifaceted engagement—behavioral, affective, and cognitive—with teacher feedback was examined through a data triangulation approach including teacher comments, student revisions, and student responses by text analyses, think-aloud protocols, and retrospective in-depth interviews. In examining the student reactions to the teacher feedback, unlike other relevant studies, the present study tried to include the relationship between teacher feedback and student revision by looking at the students' specific uptake of the given feedback. In addition, it attempted a topical classification for the way students react to teacher feedback and the students' actual needs.

As for the type of teacher written feedback, the findings indicated that while content-related comments prevailed in the teacher's end notes, grammar-related comments were the overwhelming majority in the marginal area. Concerning linguistic forms of the comments, statements and imperatives predominated in the end comments, whereas correction symbols and imperative forms for direct corrections abounded in the marginal notes. In addition, few positive comments and hedges were found in the end and marginal areas. Concerning the students' behavioral reactions, almost all students reflected the teacher's comments in their revisions. One interesting finding, however, was that grammar-related marginal comments were often ignored due to redrafting according to the content-related end comments. In addition, the students showed attitudinal patterns for emotional engagement such as expressing their appreciation and active involvement with the comments to accomplish good writing results and to learn proper native expressions. On the other hand, there was also an attitude of reluctantly following the teacher's instructions. Cognitively, the students showed difficulty in understanding and handling the teacher written comments due to the lack of specific suggestions, and thus they were almost playing a guessing game with the comments. As to the students' needs for teacher written feedback, students wished to be provided comments that are text-specific, positive and soft, and native-like expression focused, among others.

Based on the findings, pedagogical implications are suggested for English composition classes. First, if the teacher takes a multiple-draft approach, the comments on grammar and mechanics would be suggested to be delayed to a later stage. As the content matter changes in the subsequent revisions, it is possible that the grammar-focused comments can be easily ignored. Second, very specific comments which indicate concrete problems or include related examples are necessary. For better communication between the teacher and students, the best way would be to have one-on-one conference sessions. In reality, however, the classroom context is sometimes not an easy place to allot conference time in the syllabi because of the tight curriculum and large class

size. Then, it seems that the best and most realistic way to communicate between the teacher and students is mostly via written comments, specific written feedback being of most help for students. Third, the teacher's explicit feedback policy should be clearly addressed at the beginning of the course. The understanding between the teacher and students is a prerequisite for learning any subject. A maximum learning effect can be expected from this mutual understanding. Last, providing as many positive comments, even on minor details, as possible could greatly motivate students. Although they do not feel the commentary is harsh, acknowledgment from the teacher not only drives them to enhance their good habits in writing but also to feel confident in English writing.

There are several limitations of the present study. First, the findings for teacher comment types from this study are not generalizable to all patterns in Korean contexts. This study is a case study that investigated only one teacher's classes, and hence it cannot be expected that all composition teachers provide the same feedback types in their classes. Second, the teacher's feedback investigated in this study was only provided at one intermediate stage. Although the results of the present study had little difference on this, future research could consider multiple-stage feedback approaches depending on the purpose of the study. Last, the present study considered students of only one English proficiency level: a rather high level of English proficiency, which is also not generalizable to a wider student population. The student response to teacher feedback could be different with different levels of proficiency. In addition, the responses could also change as the teacher feedback changes in a multiple-draft process. Thus, future research could include a wider range of proficiency levels and a process of multiple revisions for this topic. Despite these limitations, however, the present study has a significance in that it examined students' multifaceted engagement and diverse needs for teacher written feedback under a close lens and in a more comprehensive way. This was achieved through a data triangulation approach in an authentic learning environment.

References

Ashwell, T. 2000. Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9(3), 227-257.

Bailey, R. and M. Garner. 2010. Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education* 15(2), 187-198.

Bitchener, J. 2008. Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(2), 102-118.

Bitchener, J. and D. R. Ferris. 2012. *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing.* New York: Routledge.

Bitchener, J. and U. Knoch. 2009. The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System* 37(2), 322-329.

Bitchener, J. and U. Knoch. 2010. The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics* 31, 193-214.

Bitchener, J., S. Young and D. Cameron. 2005. The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14(3), 191-205.

Blanton, L. L. 2002. Seeing the invisible: Situating L2 literacy acquisition in child-teacher interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11, 295-310.

Brannon, L. and C. H. Knoblauch. 1982. On students' rights to their own texts: A model of teacher response.

College Composition and Communication 33(2), 157-166.

Brice, C. 1995. *ESL writers' reactions to teacher commentary: A case study.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of TESOL, Long Beach, CA. ERIC Document 394 312.

Buckingham, L. and D. Aktuğ-Ekinci. 2017. Interpreting coded feedback on writing: Turkish EFL students' approaches to revision. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 26, 1-16.

Chandler, J. 2003. The efficacy of various kinds of error correction for improvement of the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12(3), 267-296.

Chi, F.-M. 1999. *The writer, the teacher, and the text: Examples from Taiwanese EFL college students*. Paper presented at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan.

Cho, S. 2011. Internalization of feedback. *English Teaching* 66(3), 3-22.

Choi, J. 2017. Effects of different types of written corrective feedback on Korean high school students' writing. *Foreign Language Education Research* 21, 21-40.

Cohen, A. 1987. Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wenden and J. Rubin, eds., *Learner Strategies in Language Learning,* 57-69. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cohen, A. D. 1991. Feedback on writing: The use of verbal report. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13(2), 133-159.

Cohen, A. D. and M. C. Cavalcanti. 1990. Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll, ed., *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, 155-177. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Connors, R. and A. Lunsford. 1993. Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication* 44, 200-223.

Conrad, S. M., and L. M. Goldstein. 1999. ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8(2), 147-179.

Crompton, P. 1997. Hedging in academic writing: Some theoretical problems. *English for Specific Purposes* 16(4), 271-287.

Cumming, A. 1995. Fostering writing expertise in ESL composition instruction: Modeling and evaluation. In D. Belcher and G. Braine, eds., *Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays on Research and Pedagogy,* 375-397. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ellis, R. 2010. A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 335-349.

Ellis, R., Y. Sheen, M. Murakami, and H. Takashima. 2008. The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System* 36(3), 353-371.

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

Fathman, A. K. and E. Whalley. 1990. Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll, ed., *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, 178-190. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. 1995. Teaching ESL composition students to become independent self-editors. *TESOL Journal* 4(4), 18-22.

Ferris, D. R. 1997. The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(2), 315-339.

Ferris, D. R. 2003. Responding to writing. In B. Kroll, ed., *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, 119-140. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. 2006. Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland, eds., *Feedback in Second Language Writing:*

Contexts and Issues, 81–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R., J. Brown, H. Liu and M. E. A. Stine. 2011. Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly* 45(2), 207-234.

Ferris, D. R., S. Pezone, C. R. Tade and S. Tinti. 1997. Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6(2), 155-182.

Ferris, D. R. and B. Roberts. 2001. Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10(3), 161-184.

Fredricks, J. A., P. C. Blumenfeld and A. H. Paris. 2004. School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research* 74(1), 59-109.

Goldstein, L. 2001. For Kyla: What does the research say about responding to student writers. In T. Silva and P. K. Matsuda, eds., *On second language writing,* 73-89. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Han, Y. and F. Hyland. 2015. Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 30(1), 31-44.

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

Hedgcock, J. and N. Lefkowitz. 1996. Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal* 80(3), 287-308.

Hillocks, G. J. 1986. *Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, National Conference on Research in English.

Hyland, F. 1998. The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7(3), 255-286.

Hyland, F. 2003. Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System* 31(2), 217-230.

Hyland, F. and K. Hyland. 2001. Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10(3), 185-212.

Hyland, K. and F. Hyland. 2006. Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland, eds., *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, 206-224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jang, S.-S. 2012. Types of information in written corrective feedback and its efficacy on L2 acquisition. *English Teaching* 67(3), 3-25.

Knoblauch, C. H. and L. Brannon. 1981. Teacher commentary on student writing: The state of the art. *Freshman English News* 10, 1-4.

Knoblauch, C. and L. Brannon. 2006. Introduction: The emperor (still) has no clothes—Revisiting the myth of improvement. In R. Straub, ed., *Key Works on Teacher Response*, 1-16. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Lee, I. 2004. Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(4), 285-312.

Lee, I. 2008. Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(3), 144-164.

Lee, I. 2014. Feedback in writing: Issues and challenges. *Assessing Writing* 19, 1-5.

Lee, I. 2020. Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 49, 100734. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734

Leki, I. 1990. Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll, ed., *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom,* 57-68. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Liu, X. and J.-W. Lee. 2014. EFL college students' reactions to their writing teachers' corrective feedback. *English Teaching* 69(3), 81-103.

McGroarty, M. E. and W. Zhu. 1997. Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning* 47(1), 1-43.

Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Mohebbi, H. 2021. 25 years on, the written error correction debate continues: An interview with John Truscott. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* 6, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-021-00110-9

Montgomery, J. and W. Baker. 2007. Teacher-written feedback: Student perception, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16(2), 82-99.

Parr, J. M. and H. S. Timperley. 2010. Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching, and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing* 15, 68–85.

Polio, C., C. Fleck and N. Leder. 1998. "If only I had more time": ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7(1), 43-68.

Rahimi, M. 2019. A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. *Language Teaching Research.* https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819879182. Advance online publication.

Reid. 1994. Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 273-292.

Robb, T., S. Ross and I. Shortreed. 1986. Salience of feedback on error and its effect of EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly* 20(1), 83-95.

Semke, H. D. 1984. The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals* 17, 195-202.

Silva, T. 1990. Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll, ed., *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom,* 11-23. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sommers, N. 1982. Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication* 33, 148-156.

Shintani, N., R. Ellis and W. Suzuki. 2014. Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning* 64(1), 103–131.

Storch, N. and G. Wigglesworth. 2010. Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 303-334.

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.

Truscott, J. 2007. The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16(4), 255-272.

Truscott, J. 2016. The effectiveness of error correction: Why do meta-analytic reviews produce such different answers? In Y. Leung, ed., *Epoch Making in English Teaching and Learning: A Special Monograph for Celebration of ETA-ROC's 25th Anniversary*, 129-141. Taipei: Crane.

Truscott, J. and A. Y. Hsu. 2008. Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(4), 292-305.

van Beuningen, C. G., N. H. de Jong and F. Kuiken. 2008. The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 156, 279-296.

van Beuningen, C. G., N. H. de Jong and F. Kuiken. 2012. Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning* 62(1), 1-41.

Zamel, V. 1983. The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case-studies. *TESOL Quarterly* 17(2), 165-187.

Zamel, V. 1985. Responding to writing. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(1), 79-101.

Zhang, Z. and K. Hyland. 2018. Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing* 36, 90-102.

Zheng, Y. and S. Yu. 2018. Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing* 37, 13-24.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Appendix A

Teacher Written Feedback Taxonomy (Adapted from Ferris et al. (1997))

A.   Aim or Intent of the Comment:
    1.   Directives:
        a.   Asking for information: asking for information that is not clear and unknown to the teacher/reader with the purpose of expanding the student writers' idea
            Example: *What's the dominant impression-spooky? Dirty?*
            Example: *Does it remind you of traditional Korea?*
        b.   Making a suggestion/ Request
            Example: *Make introduction & thesis more specific.*
        c.   Giving information
            Example: *It sounds too general: "unforgettable place."*
            Example: *Sounds like repetition of paragraph above this one.*
    2.   Grammar/ Mechanics
        Example: *VT* [Verb Tense]
        Example: *passive* [voice]
    3.   Positive Comments
        Example: Good choice of details to describe.

B.   Linguistic Features of the Comment:
    1.   Syntactic Form:
        a.   Statement
        b.   Question
        c.   Imperative
        d.   Exclamation
        e.   Symbol

C.   Text Specificity
    1.   Text-Specific : only written on this particular essay
        Example: *Make a stronger contrast of mood from the lonely outside & the inside.*
    2.   Generic : can appear on any paper; vague & general comments
        Example: *Make introduction & thesis more specific.*
        Example: *Try to vary your vocabulary.*
    3.   Presence of Hedges/Softeners
        Example: *It sounds more like a narrative than a descriptive essay.*

Appendix B

Interview Questions for Students

<PART 1: General aspects of feedback>

1. What do you like best and the least about the teacher comments?
2. How much do you think you take the teacher comments?
3. Do you think the amount of teacher feedback is proper for you?
   If not, how much do you think it should be?
4. What do you want from the teacher comments, for example about the content or the grammar?
5. Do you think the teacher feedback is of help for you?
   If not, what's the reason?
6. Do you understand all the feedback from the teacher well enough?
7. What kind of the comments can you understand the best or the worst?

<PART 2: Specific features of comments>

1. What do you think about the direct imperative comments?
2. What do you think about the direct correction of the teacher?
   When you use her direct correction in your revision, did you think and study why it should be?
   Do you agree with the teacher's correction?
3. When given the symbols, it is intended for the students to look for the answer by themselves. How do you think about that? Are you comfortable with the symbol solving while rewriting?
4. When you don't understand what the comments mean, do you try to go and ask the teacher about them?
5. How was your attitude while revising your first draft? Did you try to rewrite with sincere attitude for a better writing, or did you revise roughly? What's the reason?