

EFL Students' Beliefs and Processing Behaviors toward Writing and Teacher Response

Cheongsook Chin
(Inje University)

Chin, Cheongsook. (2007). EFL students' beliefs and processing behaviors toward writing and teacher response. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 13(4), 1-32.

This study took a cross-sectional, quantitative approach and profiled EFL students' awareness of the writing process and of teacher feedback. The subjects were 113 college students aged 19-26 years from non-English majors, who were enrolled in three sections of a required English course. According to the scores gained from the essay writing assignment, they were divided into two groups (proficient and less-proficient writers) and responded to an in-class survey. Major findings were that: (1) the vast majority of both groups did not find English writing enjoyable; (2) longer comments gave rise to substantial changes to the students' revisions; (3) the less-proficient writers were shown to benefit from revision significantly more than the proficient writers; (4) Both groups of writers utilized multiple strategies to process teacher feedback and preferred to receive teacher comments using complete sentences rather than phrases or single words; and (5) teacher's marks on grammar and vocabulary claimed to be most conducive to EFL writing development. Several important implications for EFL writing instruction and for future studies are suggested.

[EFLwriting/beliefs/teacher response]

I. INTRODUCTION

In L2 learning, writing is defined as an integrative skill which increases cognitive and metalinguistic knowledge. In order to deal with L2 writers successfully, teachers should be clearly aware of the unique nature of L2 writing. Superficially, L1 and L2 writing seem to be similar in that both L1 and L2 writers undergo a recursive composing process which includes planning, writing, and revising and employ the proper rhetorical and linguistic devices to express their ideas and thoughts. Empirical research findings, however, show

that L2 writing is different from and more challenging than L1 writing, but also exhibits less complex structures. Due to linguistic deficiency and lack of lexical control and cognitive strategies, L2 writers often struggle with producing and organizing text and are less able to revise it intuitively. L2 writers' texts generally reveal distinct patterns which are less fluent and less accurate (Chin, 2005; Khaldieh, 2000; Kim, 2005; Silva, 1993).

Teacher response and assessment are the main resources which allow EFL students to evaluate themselves as writers. They perceive teacher feedback as crucial to their writing development. Thus, it is essential to comprehend their views of teacher feedback, their attempts to process teachers' comments into their revisions, and the influence of these attempts on actual writing performance. Also, there is an obvious need to create the most helpful type of feedback that corresponds to various subject matters, diverse writing tasks, and differing proficiency levels. Giving useful feedback to EFL students' written work at the right phase has been of perennial concern to writing teachers. While there have been numerous studies on teacher response to student writing in both L1 and L2 contexts over the past several decades, little research has investigated the EFL students' perceptions regarding teacher feedback and their strategies toward teacher feedback incorporation. When writing teachers have a clearer understanding of what EFL students need from feedback and how they interact with it, they will be better able to provide usable and effective feedback which can deal with the areas of most concern to students (Enginarlar, 1993; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Hyland, 2003; Kepner, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988).

The present study, therefore, examines college EFL students' preferences and views, about writing and teacher feedback, and explores their processing behaviors. The specific research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. According to EFL students' beliefs, what are the characteristics of teacher feedback that contribute to their writing development?
 - 1) What are EFL students' perceptions about error corrections?
 - 2) What are EFL students' attitudes toward writing in English?
2. What kinds of strategies do EFL students use to process teacher feedback?
3. What are the differences between the proficient and the less-proficient EFL writers regarding the above questions?

II. A BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

While empirical studies on L1 and L2 writing have evolved over the past few decades and made many pedagogical changes, the writing teachers' critical roles in providing

feedback to their students' texts have still remained the same. Specifically, ESL writing teachers play multiple roles such as coach, judge, facilitator, evaluator, and interested reader in class. Regardless of teachers' attitudes in providing responses to their students' written work, teachers' feedback is considered to be important to students. In fact, previous research on ESL writing has shown that students value and pay close attention to their teachers' comments on their papers (Chin, 2005; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994). Then the remaining question is "Does teacher feedback actually help L2 students develop writing skills?" Previous L2 studies on teacher responses (Berger, 1991; Chaudron, 1983; Fathman & Whalley, 1990) have demonstrated that teacher feedback on preliminary drafts contributed to L2 writers' revising their writing more effectively than for feedback on final drafts. Especially, their revisions' overall quality and linguistic accuracy improved when teacher comments and/or corrections dealt with both the content and form of their texts.

Related to research on teacher reactions to student writing, L2 students' preferences about and responses to their teachers' feedback have been explored. Leki (1991) surveyed ESL students to obtain information on their perceptions regarding error correction in college-level writing classes. The results of the study showed that they believed that good writing in English refers to error-free writing and, therefore, that they prefer their writing teachers to mark all errors, major and minor, on their papers. More than half of the students claimed that they expected their teachers to identify where the error was and to provide a clue about how to correct it. The number of students who always read teachers' comments on the organization and content of their texts carefully outnumbered those who carefully considered more grammatical features of their texts.

Through questionnaires and interviews with ESL students, Radecki and Swales (1988) discovered that the students in general expressed a preference for extensive comments on grammar rather than content. The majority (87%) of them valued substantive responses and wanted their teacher to correct all their surface errors. The students who were not receptive toward revision perceived revision simply as the elimination of surface-level errors, and some even regarded it as punishment. Such a limited and negative stance toward revision could be detrimental to their L2 writing development. Therefore, Radecki and Swales suggested that teachers intervene to teach their students that revision is a generative process to reassess their ideas and restructure their text.

Moreover, teachers need to attempt to "facilitate revision by responding to writing as work in progress rather than judging it as a finished product" (Zamel, 1985, p. 79). One possible strategy to do this is to ask L2 students to submit two or three drafts of their papers. Thus, revising assistance could be provided before students' drafts are considered final. In doing so, teachers should make sure to respond to students' drafts in different ways. For instance, dealing with their early drafts, the teacher can focus on how the students can

revise their text, giving comments related to content and/or organization such as "Did your topic change here? You need to add a transition" (Gebhard, 2000, p. 239). On the later drafts, the teacher may comment on surface-level errors. That way, students will understand that they can get their ideas across to the audience through continuous clarification and exploration.

Chin (2007) reported the outcomes of the investigation of EFL writers' perceptions on English writing task and teacher feedback. Grammar and vocabulary were believed to be the main factors that determined good EFL writers. Regarding teacher feedback, the students paid the most attention to marks concerning grammar on their written work. Overall, the EFL writers appreciated their teachers' comments and error corrections and respected their advice. They pointed out that teacher feedback contributed to the improvement of their English writing skills because it helped them comprehend what to develop or avoid in the future, acquire better English usage, and correct their errors. The proficient EFL writers were more willing to correct errors on their own after being provided clues than the less-proficient EFL writers. Neither group of the writers, however, mentioned that teacher feedback helped them explore the content of their texts (e.g., clarify their ideas). Thus, in addition to raising L2 students' awareness of linguistic weaknesses in their texts, teacher commentary should give suggestions that are more concerned with content, which could lead to the revising process of recursive shaping of ideas (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996).

Unlike most previous ESL studies undertaken in single-draft contexts, Ferris (1995) carried out her study of ESL student reactions to teacher feedback in multiple-draft settings. The results showed that they tended to review their papers more often and give more attention to teacher feedback on earlier drafts than on final drafts. They appreciated teacher's encouraging remarks and pursued assistance from outside sources (e.g., peers, grammar book, or dictionary) to handle their teachers' advice and solve confusing points. While half of them indicated that they did not have difficulty interpreting their teacher's comments, others observed specific concerns about the teachers' feedback in terms of grammar (e.g., terminology and symbols), handwriting, and questions related to content. In order to deal with this problem, Ferris indicated that teachers should be more deliberate in stating their responses to L2 students' papers. To be more specific, they ought to "replace vague commentary and references to abstract rules and principles with text-specific strategies, directions, guidelines, and recommendations" (Zamel, 1985, p. 95).

As a subsequent research, Ferris (1997) assessed the direct effects of teacher feedback on ESL students' revisions and reported positive results. The students greatly attended to teacher commentary which led to concrete and effective revisions, although they sporadically disregarded the advice provided in their papers. In order to encourage students to incorporate teacher feedback into their revisions successfully, Ferris suggests

that teachers ask them to read it critically, explain how they have proceeded with the comments and justify why they may have avoided some of them. This method would motivate the students to reflect upon both feedback and revision yet enable them to have some freedom to determine what parts of the comments to apply or ignore. Marginal requests for information and summary comments on grammar were shown to influence student revision the most. Positive comments, however, failed to yield any tangible changes at all. Though comments of all lengths gave rise to positive changes in students' revisions, major changes which improved their overall quality were drawn from longer and text-specific comments more than shorter and general comments.

Cohen (1987) conducted a survey with L1, FL, and ESL students to examine how they incorporated teacher feedback into their subsequent drafts. The students claimed not only to pay great attention to teacher responses regarding mechanics and grammar but also to attend to marks related to vocabulary, organization, and content a lot. This study also disclosed that they used a limited set of strategies in processing teacher feedback. Whereas "making a mental note" was the most common strategy, "rewriting the paper" was limitedly used and more popular among those who evaluated themselves as poor writers. However, the students often had trouble interpreting teacher comments which were too abbreviated or too general, given in the form of single words or short phrases such as "confusing" or "needs transition."

In a similar vein, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) profiled the results of research on FL and ESL writers' beliefs about teacher feedback and revision. The writers identified writing and revising in L2 simply as grammar practice rather than as exploring their creative ideas. They believed that form should have priority over developing meaning or concepts in the process of composing and revising. Particularly, revising was regarded as the opportunity to eradicate ungrammaticality at the word and sentence levels, using their teacher's marks and comments, which corroborated the findings of Radecki and Swales (1988). Therefore, they expected teacher feedback just to have corrective input which emphasized grammar, orthography, mechanics, etc. In brief, unambiguous and continued surface-level feedback was shown to be the most preferred. Finally, they claimed to need more personalized and rhetorical feedback which is tailored to L2 writers' level of proficiency and state of readiness. They reported that whereas detailed feedback to an excessive degree may dissuade them from revising substantially, overly minimal feedback may lead to merely superficial changes.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

The subjects in this study were 113 students taking one of three class sections of a required English course at a university located in south Gyeongsang province. Nearly all of them were freshmen and the females outnumbered the males. They were from mixed majors (e.g., law, public health administration, early child education, etc.) and aged 19-26 years. In order to investigate the subjects' English language proficiency levels, the researcher implemented a multiple choice pretest in class. During the first week of the spring semester of 2007, the subjects took a 60 item English test which checked on vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension for an hour. The test was a shortened version of a TOEFL practice test from *Complete Guide to the TOEFL Test* (Rogers, 2001). The results revealed that the subjects had scored in a broad range of 18-52 correct items.

2. Data Collection

1) The writing Assignment

During the 9th week of the 15-week spring semester of 2007, the researcher gave the subjects an assignment to write an English essay on the topic of "What is your ultimate goal that you want to accomplish after graduation?" The subjects were informed of the writing assignment one week ahead of the deadline and directed to complete it as a homework. The length limit was approximately 300 words. Any kind of reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, grammar books, etc.) were allowed except for translation software. Revision assistance from native English speakers, however, was forbidden in order to assess the subjects' real English writing proficiency. The researcher asked the subjects to submit two copies of their written work because two native English speaking instructors were supposed to rate them separately (Chin, 2007).

2) Questionnaires

The subjects were surveyed in class during the 12th week of the semester, using the questionnaire written in English. The surveys composed of two parts. The major portion of Part I addressed error correction, whereas Part II dealt with writing task and teacher commentary. It is of importance to note that the subjects remained anonymous; however, they were directed to identify their major, age, and score of the writing assignment. The questionnaire was designed to analyze their sense of what characteristics of teacher

feedback contribute to EFL writing development and what kinds of strategies they utilize to process teacher feedback. The items on the questionnaire were derived from the findings of the previous studies (Chin, 2007; Cohen, 1987 ; Ferris, 1995 & 1997; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Leki, 1991). With regard to the procedure, the subjects were required to carefully read each item and select the best choice from among several by circling the number. Specifically, items 1-7 were provided in the form of multiple choice questions. On the other hand, responses of the items 8-38 were offered on a five-point Likert Scale: Strongly agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral/Undecided (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). Likewise, responses of items 39-40 were presented on a five-point Likert Scale: Always (5), Usually (4), Sometimes (3), Rarely (2), and Never (1).

3. Data Analysis

When the students submitted their essays, the researcher designated two experienced native English speaking instructors (one American and one Canadian) to evaluate them on a 100-point scale. These instructors have been on the teaching staff at the subjects' university for over 5 years. For the purpose of objective judgements, however, they were not informed of the subjects' English language proficiency levels. The analytical scales of assessing the essays were rated based on five components: content (13-30), organization (7-20), vocabulary (7-20), language use (5-25), and mechanics (2-5) (Reid, 1993, p. 236). After the two instructors finished scoring the subjects' essays individually, the researcher added up each subject's two scores from both instructors and the mean was recorded as a final mark. The inter-rater reliability was .74. The data pool revealed that the range of the subjects' scores was from 47 to a maximum 100 points. According to the scores achieved from the essay assignment, the subjects were divided into two different groups. Subjects who attained a score of 80 points and above were distributed into a group of "proficient writers" (mean = 85.8), while those who attained a score of below 80 points were distributed into a group of "less-proficient writers" (mean = 68.8).

All the quantitative items on the questionnaire were tallied and summed. As a subsequent investigation, responses on all items between the proficient and less-proficient writers were separately tabulated and drew comparisons to explore similarities and differences. T-tests regarding items 8-40 were run afterwards to determine the statistical difference. It should be noted that for convenience of explanation, students' responses to items 8-38 were collapsed into three types: P (Positive: Strongly agree (5) & Agree (4)), U (Undecided/Neutral (3)), and N(Negative: Disagree (2) & Strongly disagree (1)). By the same token, students' responses to items 39-40 were combined into another three types: A/U (Always (5) & Usually (4)), S(Sometimes (3)), and R/N (Rarely (2) & Never (1)).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Part I of the questionnaire mainly explored EFL students' preferences and attitudes concerning error correction. The subjects were directed to select the best choice from among several. As shown in Tables 1 and 2 (see the Appendix), the first item asked the subjects how carefully they looked at the marks their teacher made on their written text. Not a large number of the students reported that they read every one carefully (proficient 39.3% vs. less-proficient 38.6%), whereas less than a third of both groups mostly focused on teacher's comments on the content of their texts (proficient 25% vs. less-proficient 28.1%). When they gave careful attention to some of the teacher's marks on their text (item 2), the majority of the proficient and less-proficient writers claimed to look at marks specifying errors in grammar most thoughtfully (80% vs. 68.4%), followed by vocabulary choice (18.2% vs. 29.8%). Likewise, in response to item 3, the majority of both groups wanted their teachers to pay the most attention to grammar on their text (73.2% vs. 66.7%), while vocabulary was, again, ranked second (14.3% vs. 15.8%) which was far lower. Thus the findings of this study revealed that regardless of L2 writing proficiency, students gave the most attention to grammar problems and expected their teachers to address them most carefully, a result which echoes that of previous studies of L2 students' perceptions about teacher feedback (Chin, 2007; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Radecki & Swales, 1988). Of the marks that teachers provided on student's texts (item 4), a large number of the respondents remembered marks specifying surface-level errors best (proficient 72.7% vs. less-proficient 84.2%). Only a few of each group claimed to remember those that dealt with ideas (i.e., content) (20% vs. 8.8%) or organization (7.3% vs. 7.0%) best.

In response to item 5, "rewriting an another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared" was the most popular strategy that the students used to avoid making the same errors again (proficient 57.1% vs. less-proficient 52.6%). This result refutes Leki's (1991) observations that "rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong" was indicated to be the most common among L2 writers. On the other hand, "rewriting the whole paper" was reported limitedly, and more prevalent among the less-proficient writers (19.3%) than the proficient writers (10.7%). On item 6, the students were asked where they would usually go for help if they made an error that they didn't know how to correct. They showed that they substantially depended on their peers as the best source of help (proficient 39.3% vs. less-proficient 42.9%); reference materials were second best (35.7% vs. 32.1%). It is unfortunate that less than 10% of each group claimed to seek assistance from their teachers and that no student chose a native speaker. Regarding teacher's comment types on item 7, more than half of each group primarily wanted their teachers to provide comments in the form of complete sentences (proficient 55.3% vs. less-

proficient 57.1%), and correction symbols were their second choice (26.8% vs. 23.2%). Only a few of the respondents preferred phrases or single words. A possible explanation for this outcome might be that single words or phrases were at times either ambiguous or confusing so that they could have difficulty understanding teacher's intentions about how to proceed with revision.

In Part II of the questionnaire, students were asked to describe their opinions and processing behaviors with regard to EFL writing and teacher feedback. In responses to items 8-10, only a small number of the respondents believed that they enjoy writing in English (proficient 17.9% vs. less-proficient 3.5%). Likewise, less than 10% of each group felt that they are skilled EFL writers, compared to their classmates. It is surprising that 71.9% of the less-proficient writers did not feel they were as skilled as their classmates. Again, a small number of the respondents felt that they are making progress toward English writing skills (proficient 26.8% vs. less-proficient 19.3%). Yet 55.4% of the proficient writers still remained undecided, whereas 43.9% of the less-proficient writers gave a negative answer to that statement. Regarding item 11, many of the respondents said that the length of teacher comments had effect on the degree to which changes were made (proficient 53.6% vs. less-proficient 54.4%). That is, longer comments were more likely to lead to substantive revisions than shorter comments, a result consistent with the finding of Ferris (1997). Items 12-19 assessed the students' perceptions of the influence of teacher comments involving specific areas. The majority of the proficient and less-proficient writers appeared to learn the most when teacher checked grammatical errors (91.1% vs. 89.5%) and vocabulary (75% vs. 82.5%). About half of both groups claimed that they learned a lot from teacher's comments on content (proficient 53.6% vs. less-proficient 54.4%) and organization (proficient 50% vs. less-proficient 49.1%). Less than 50% of each group, however, felt that they learned a lot when teacher commented on writing style or mechanics or used proofreading symbols. Furthermore, compared to their counterparts (50%), considerably more of the less-proficient writers (68.4%) indicated that they learned a lot when they were given the opportunity to revise their drafts after receiving teacher feedback (see Tables 3 and 4 in the Appendix).

By the same token, items 20-27 examined the students' evaluations concerning teacher comment types. As shown in Tables 5 and 6 (see the Appendix), in general, the students' judgments of the usefulness of each comment type were positive. In more detail, a large number of both groups showed that teacher's positive remarks in the form of statement or exclamation (e.g., "good use of an introduction!" or "Your organization was excellent!") were most helpful (proficient 76.8% vs. less-proficient 63.2%). On the other hand, giving information related to content in the form of statement (e.g., "It is crucial to find a job that fits your personality") appeared to be the least helpful among the proficient writers (35.8%), whereas asking for information in the form of question (e.g., "Did you solve this problem

with your advisor?) was said to be the least helpful among the less-proficient writers (42.1%). Notably, items 21-23 revealed that the students responded to the three different forms (i.e., question, statement, and imperative), which teacher used when asking for revision, almost equally. That is, more than 50% of both groups had positive answers referring to each individual form. In short, request form did not seem to make a substantial difference in their revising process.

Items 28-38 asked the students to report in what ways teacher feedback contributed to their EFL writing development (see Tables 7 and 8 in the Appendix). Overall, the responses to these items were affirmative. It is overwhelming that more than 70% of the proficient and less-proficient writers claimed that teacher feedback allowed them to discover their weaknesses so that they could figure out what to avoid/improve next time; teacher's error corrections helped them develop vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics; positive remarks (e.g., praise) encouraged them to work hard; critical comments specifying their problems helped them improve their writing skills; and teacher's commentary assessed their writing abilities. Around 60% of both groups also confirmed that teacher feedback could be used as reference to other writing assignments and instructed them to acquire better expressions and structures. Meanwhile, more or less 30% of them said that teacher feedback encouraged them to try out challenging things such as complex sentences, enabled them to be better able to clarify the content, and organize their written text. A possible explanation for this finding could be that teacher feedback failed to give careful attention to content and organization in students' papers.

Items 39 and 40 asked the students to report their strategies for addressing their teacher's feedback. A summary of their responses is provided in Tables 9-12 in the Appendix. Many of the proficient and less-proficient writers said that after they read teacher feedback, they always or usually make corrections on their own (60.7% vs. 56.2%), ask peers or family for help (57.2% vs. 45.6%), consult reference materials (71.4% vs. 66.7%), and make a mental note of their common errors (64.3% vs. 64.9%). Notably, only a few of them claimed that they always or usually ask teachers for help (8.9% vs. 10.5%); however, a considerable number of the students reported always or usually writing down teacher's main points (30.4% vs. 42.1%). It is a relief that the majority of the students claimed to rarely or never do anything (71.4% vs. 77.2%). Dealing with teacher's comments or corrections that they do not understand, both groups, on the whole, appeared to utilize a variety of strategies. In fact, only two people in each group said that they always or usually give up. A large number of both groups mentioned that they always or usually consult reference materials to clarify them (67.9% vs. 59.7%), ask peers or family to explain them (62.5% vs. 56.1%), try to fix them by themselves (71.4% vs. 50.9%), or search on the Internet (71.4% vs. 66.7%). More or less 30% of the proficient and less-proficient writers said that they always or usually ask their teacher to explain them, while more than 80% of

them rarely or never seek assistance from a native speaker. A possible explanation for this finding might be that the students still perceive their writing teacher as an authority figure rather than an interested reader or a source of help so that they are reluctant to approach him/her. There is little doubt that asking a native speaker for clarification could be even more challenging while they have a low self-confidence and feel insecure as an EFL writer.

Finally, *t*-test results between the proficient and less-proficient writers revealed that significant differences were found in responses to items 8, 9, 10, 19, 31, and 40.4 ($t = -3.28$, $p < .01$, $t = -2.96$, $p < .01$, $t = -2.73$, $p < .01$, $t = 2.49$, $p < .05$, $t = -2.34$, $p < .05$, and $t = -2.48$, $p < .05$, respectively) (see Tables 13, 15, and 17 in the Appendix). That is, the proficient writers perceived that they enjoy writing in English, are skilled EFL writers compared to their classmates, are making progress toward English writing skills, positive remarks such as praise encourage them to work hard, and when they do not understand teacher's comments or corrections, they try to fix them by themselves more than their counterparts. Meanwhile, a significantly larger number of the less-proficient writers claimed that they learn a lot when they are allowed to revise their papers after receiving teacher feedback, in comparison with the proficient writers. Thus, these results suggest that students' positive attitudes and interests toward L2 writing lead to writing development and that revising has more influence on the less-proficient writers than the proficient writers.

V. CONCLUSION

With regard to the characteristics of teacher commentary that are conducive to EFL students' writing improvement, positive comments in the form of statements or exclamations were most influential. Less influential were giving information in the form of statements and asking for information in the form of questions. The students preferred that their teacher gave comments using complete sentences rather than phrases or single words. Longer comments gave rise to substantial changes on students' revisions. Overall, the students did not seem to care much about the forms that their teacher utilized in asking for revision. Yet the less-proficient writers were shown to benefit from the revision task more than the proficient writers. Regardless of writing proficiency, the vast majority of the students did not find EFL writing enjoyable. Moreover, only a few rated themselves as skilled EFL writers and reported making progress toward English writing skills. These responses indicated that many students still had great anxiety about their writing in English which could be detrimental to performing writing tasks to the best of their ability.

In understanding or responding to teacher feedback, the proficient and less-proficient writers evenly engaged in a repertoire of strategies. Many of them, however, appeared to avoid directly consulting their teacher or a native speaker when they were in need of

help. Rather, they relied on outside sources (e.g., reference materials, Internet, peers, etc.). When clarifying points of confusion, the proficient writers were more likely to find solutions on their own than the less-proficient writers, which could possibly lead them to becoming successful writers. Both groups paid the most attention to teacher's remarks on grammar and vocabulary and claimed to find those most conducive to their learning, although comments concerning content were not neglected. Thus, the conclusion can be drawn that students' primary concerns were more associated with accuracy in form than with meaning. Finally, the students' responses in this survey disclosed that they valued not only teachers' positive remarks but also their constructive criticism.

All in all, the value of this research may be realized by providing classroom teachers with a glimpse of students' perceptions toward EFL writing and teacher feedback. Nonetheless, limitations should be acknowledged for future explorations. First, in assessing student writers' reactions to teacher feedback, this questionnaire did not make a distinction between preliminary and final drafts. Consequently, it is not clear whether students thought that the texts referred to in the questionnaire were to be regarded as rough drafts or final graded drafts. A follow-up questionnaire dealing with a multiple-draft writing approach might have to be implemented in order to see if student reactions to teacher comments and corrections are correlated with the nature of their drafts. Second, this questionnaire is made less effective since it simply analyzed students' responses concerning one type of writing (i.e., essay). Thus, conclusions drawn from this study may not be relevant to other EFL writing practices (e.g., journals, letters, reports, etc.). An additional extension of this research would be to relate the preferences and processing behaviors of EFL students with regard to teacher feedback to each writing task. Third, the participants were mostly females so that the results may be inappropriate as a representation of typical EFL classroom settings. Accordingly, the questionnaire should be replicated with a balanced ratio of males and females. The findings of such studies might allow writing teachers to understand EFL students' beliefs of their wants and their sense of what contributes to their writing progress in a systematic way.

VI. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study suggest the following pedagogical implications for EFL writing teachers. In order to help students enhance self-confidence and become risk takers, it is essential that teacher feedback should provide encouraging comments as well as negative or critical remarks. Especially, less-proficient writers might need more praise than criticism. Due to lack of writing skills, students might find writing not pleasant but stressful as yet. As one viable option to ease pressure, teachers might invite them to implement writing

tasks in a non-threatening classroom setting where collaboration has a place and their written texts are not always to be graded. To start off, complicated and formidable writing activities may lead to breakdowns or setbacks. Thus, dealing with interesting or familiar topics might be another prerequisite to take into account. In addition, it would be worthwhile to train students to review peers' papers based on guidelines and give out opinions. In doing so, they may learn to be aware of the audience and discover their own strengths and weaknesses as writers. Through reading English texts extensively, they can also reinforce their linguistic knowledge and control (Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996).

Students seemed to be scared to seek assistance from their teachers. Teachers should make efforts to present themselves as consultants and facilitators rather than authorities. In order to have a collaborative relationship with students, individualized conferences may be employed as an alternative to written feedback. One-on-one conferences could allow students to explain the underlying meaning and intention of their incoherent text so that teachers can suggest concrete solutions about how to reshape, modify, and transform the text. In responding to students' drafts, however, teachers need to set up priorities in that certain problems should be treated before others. Students showed that grammatical accuracy and correction were of primary concern. Through challenging, asking questions, and identifying ambiguities, teachers can help them comprehend that meaning-level features ought to be addressed first (Zamel, 1985).

REFERENCES

- Berger, V. (1991). The effects of peer and self feedback. *CATESOL Journal*, 3, 21-35.
- Chaudron, C. (1983, March). *Evaluating writing: Effects of feedback on revision*. Revised version of a paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 706).
- Chin, C. (2005). Perceptions, language proficiency, and learning strategies of college EFL writers. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 101-125.
- Chin, C. (2007). EFL learners' perceptions on English writing tasks and teacher feedback. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 13(1), 1-26.
- Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21(2), 193-204.
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Gebhard, J. (2000). *Teaching English as a foreign or second language: A teacher self-development and methodology guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity, to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141-163.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(3), 287-308.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-312.
- Khaldieh, S. (2000). Learning strategies and writing processes of proficient vs. less-proficient learners of Arabic. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 522-534.
- Kim, Y. (2005). Toward a conceptual clarification of foreign language anxiety. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 11(4), 1-20.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- Radecki, P., & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16(3), 355-365.
- Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Rogers, B. (2001). *Complete guide to the TOEFL test*. MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 657-677.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
Proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Items (1-7)

(data in percentages; n = 56)

Item	Content
1.	How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your text? -read everything carefully: 22(39.3%) -look at some marks more carefully than at others: 20(35.7%) -mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas I described: 14(25%)
2.	If you look carefully at some of the marks your teacher makes on your text, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully? -marks specifying errors in grammar: 44(80%) -marks specifying errors in vocabulary choice: 10 (18.2%) -marks specifying errors in mechanics: 1(1.8%)
3.	What do you want your teacher to focus on the most in response to your paper? -content: 2(3.57%) -organization: 5(8.93%) -mechanics: 0(0%) -grammar: 41(73.2%) -vocabulary: 8(14.3%)
4.	Of the marks that your teacher makes on your text, which ones do you remember best? -comments on my ideas: 11(20%) -comments on the organization: 4(7.3%) -marks specifying surface-level errors: 40(72.7%)
5.	What is the best way to help you avoid making the same errors again? -rewriting the whole paper: 6 (10.7%) -rewriting on another piece of paper the sentence in which an error appeared: 32(57.1%) -rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong: 15(26.8%) -just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything: 3(5.4%)
6.	If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help? -to my teacher: 5(8.9%) -to a native speaker: 0(0%) -to reference materials (e.g., grammar book, dictionary): 20(35.7%)

- to my peers: 22(39.3%)
 - to the Internet: 9(16.1%)
7. which one do you want your teacher to use when making comments on your paper?
- single words: 3(5.4%)
 - phrases: 7(12.5%)
 - correction symbols: 15(26.8%)
 - complete sentences: 31(55.3%)

TABLE 2**Less-proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Items (1-7)**

(data in percentages; n = 57)

Item	Content
1.	How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your text? -read everything carefully: 22 (38.6%) -look at some marks more carefully than at others: 19(33.3%) -mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas I described: 16(28.1%)
2.	If you look carefully at some of the marks your teacher makes on your text, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully? -marks specifying errors in grammar: 39(68.4%) -marks specifying errors in vocabulary choice: 17(29.8%) -marks specifying errors in mechanics: 1 (1.8%)
3.	What do you want your teacher to focus on the most in response to your paper? -content: 5(8.8%) -organization: 4(7.0%) -mechanics: 1(1.7%) -grammar: 38(66.7%) -vocabulary: 9(15.8%)
4.	Of the marks that your teacher makes on your text, which ones do you remember best? -comments on my ideas: 5(8.8%) -comments on the organization: 4(7.0%) -marks specifying surface-level errors: 48(84.2%)
5.	What is the best way to help you avoid making the same errors again? -rewriting the whole paper: 11(19.3%) -rewriting on another piece of paper the sentence in which an error appeared: 30(52.6%)

- rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong: 12(21%)
 -just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything: 3(5.3%)
6. If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?
 -to my teacher: 5(8.9%)
 -to a native speaker: 0(0%)
 -to reference materials (e.g., grammar book, dictionary): 18(32.1%)
 -to my peers: 24(42.9%)
 -to the Internet: 9(16.1%)
7. which one do you want your teacher to use when making comments on your paper?
 -single words: 6(10.7%)
 -phrases: 5(8.9%)
 -correction symbols: 13(23.2%)
 -complete sentences: 32(57.1%)

TABLE 3
Proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Items (8-19)

Item	Content	frequency/% of responses (N=56)			
		Mean SD	P %	U %	N %
8	I enjoy writing in English.	2.48	10	12	34
		0.95	17.9	21.4	60.7
9	Compared to my classmates, I am a skilled writer.	2.61	4	32	20
		0.85	7.1	57.1	35.8
10	I am making progress toward English writing skills.	3.09	15	31	10
		0.75	26.8	55.4	17.8
11	The length of teacher comments has effect on the degree to which changes are made.	3.46	30	16	10
		0.97	53.6	28.6	17.8
12	I learn a lot when T comments on content.	3.64	30	22	4
		0.86	53.6	39.3	7.1

18		Chin Cheongsook			
13	I learn a lot when T comments on organization.	3.57	28	26	2
		0.74	50.0	46.4	3.6
14	I learn a lot when T comments on writing style.	3.36	18	34	4
		0.77	32.2	60.7	7.1
15	I learn a lot when T checks vocabulary.	3.89	42	12	2
		0.73	75.0	21.4	3.6
16	I learn a lot when T checks grammatical errors.	4.30	51	5	0
		0.63	91.1	8.9	0
17	I learn a lot when T checks mechanical errors.	3.50	27	24	5
		0.81	48.2	42.9	8.9
18	I learn a lot when T uses proofreading symbols.	3.48	27	23	6
		0.83	48.2	41.1	10.7
19	I learn a lot when T allows me to revise my paper after receiving feedback.	3.52	28	21	7
		0.89	50.0	37.5	12.5

P: Positive responses (Strongly agree (5) & Agree (4))

U: Undecided/Neutral (3)

N: Negative responses (Disagree (2) & Strongly disagree (1))

TABLE 4
Less-proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Items (8-19)

Item	Content	Mean	frequency/ % of Responses (N=57)		
			SD	P	U
			%	%	%
8	I enjoy writing in English.	1.96	2	7	48
		0.71	3.5	12.3	84.2
9	Compared to my classmates, I am a skilled EFL writer.	2.14	4	12	41
		0.83	7.0	21.1	71.9

EFL Students' Beliefs and Processing Behaviors

19

10	I am making progress toward English writing skills.	2.67 0.89	11 19.3	21 36.8	25 43.9
11	The length of teacher comments has effect on the degree to which changes are made.	3.40 0.96	31 54.4	17 29.8	9 15.8
12	I learn a lot when T comments on content.	3.56 0.76	31 54.4	22 38.6	4 7.0
13	I learn a lot when T comments on organization.	3.47 0.76	28 49.1	24 42.1	5 8.8
14	I learn a lot when T comments on writing style.	3.11 0.82	19 33.3	25 43.9	13 22.8
15	I learn a lot when T checks vocabulary.	3.96 0.68	47 82.5	8 14.0	2 3.5
16	I learn a lot when T checks grammatical errors.	4.33 0.66	51 89.5	6 10.5	0 0
17	I learn a lot when T checks mechanical errors.	3.40 0.82	27 47.5	22 38.5	8 14.0
18	I learn a lot when T uses proof reading symbols.	3.37 1.03	26 45.6	20 35.1	11 19.3
19	I learn a lot when T allows me to revise my paper after receiving feedback.	3.91 0.79	39 68.4	17 29.8	1 1.8

TABLE 5
Proficient Writers' Responses to Teacher Comment Types

Item	Content	frequency/ % of responses (N=56)			
		Mean SD	P %	U %	N %
20.	It is helpful when T asks for information in the form of question.	3.14 1.05	21 37.5	18 32.1	17 30.4
21.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of question.	3.57 0.99	34 60.8	11 19.6	11 19.6
22.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of statement.	3.55 0.99	31 55.3	15 26.8	10 17.9
23.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of imperative.	3.50 1.19	31 55.4	12 21.4	13 23.2
24.	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of question.	3.23 1.01	24 42.9	18 32.1	14 25.0
25.	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of statement.	3.25 0.88	20 35.8	25 44.6	11 19.6
26.	It is helpful when T makes positive comments in the form of statement or exclamation.	4.02 0.80	43 76.8	11 19.6	2 3.6
27.	It is helpful when T makes grammar/vocabulary/mechanics comments in the form of question, statement, or imperative.	3.52 1.13	29 51.8	16 28.6	11 19.6

TABLE 6
Less-proficient Writers' Responses to Teacher Comment Types

Item	Content	frequency/% of responses (N=57)			
		Mean SD	P %	U %	N %
20.	It is helpful when T asks for information in the form of question.	3.21 0.92	24 42.1	19 33.3	14 24.6
21.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of question.	3.53 0.91	32 56.1	16 28.1	9 15.8
22.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of statement.	3.54 0.78	32 56.2	21 36.8	4 7.0
23.	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of imperative.	3.70 1.07	32 56.1	16 28.1	9 15.8
24.	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of question.	3.40 0.92	28 49.1	18 31.6	11 19.3
25.	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of statement.	3.44 0.96	30 52.6	18 31.6	9 15.8
26.	It is helpful when T makes positive comments in the form of statement or exclamation.	3.77 0.91	36 63.2	16 28.0	5 8.8
27.	It is helpful when T makes grammar/vocabulary/mechanics comments in the form of question, statement, or imperative.	3.66 0.96	33 57.9	17 29.8	7 12.3

TABLE 7
Proficient Writers' Beliefs about the Effects of Teacher Feedback

Item	Content	Mean SD	frequency/% of responses (N=56)		
			P %	U %	N %
28.	I know my weaknesses so that I can figure out what to avoid/improve next time.	4.04 0.79	48 85.8	4 7.1	4 7.1
29.	Error corrections help me develop vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.	4.11 0.71	47 83.9	8 14.3	1 1.8
30.	It can be used as reference to other writing assignments.	3.59 1.06	33 59.0	11 19.6	12 21.4
31.	Positive remarks encourage me to work hard.	4.36 0.77	48 85.7	7 12.5	1 1.8
32.	Critical comments help me improve my writing skills.	4.05 0.86	45 80.4	7 12.5	4 7.1
33.	It keeps me from making the same errors.	3.63 0.86	34 60.7	17 30.3	5 8.9
34.	It teaches me to acquire better expressions and structures.	3.59 0.78	33 58.9	18 32.2	5 8.9
35.	It assesses my writing abilities.	4.20 0.80	45 80.3	10 17.9	1 1.8
36.	It encourages me to try out challenging things.	3.21 0.89	22 39.3	22 39.3	12 21.4
37.	It enables me to be better to clarify the content.	3.27 0.70	19 33.9	31 55.4	6 10.7

38.	It enables me to be better to organize the text.	3.11	16	29	11
		0.73	28.6	51.8	19.6

TABLE 8
Less-proficient Writers' Beliefs about the Effects of Teacher feedback

Item	Content	frequency/% of responses (N=57)			
		Mean SD	P %	U %	N %
28.	I know my weaknesses so that I can figure out what to avoid/improve next time.	4.05 0.64	49 86.0	7 12.2	1 1.8
29.	Error corrections help me develop vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.	4.21 0.56	56 93.0	4 7.0	0 0
30.	It can be used as reference to other writing assignments.	3.65 0.90	36 63.2	15 26.3	6 10.5
31.	Positive remarks encourage me to work hard.	3.96 1.00	43 75.4	8 14.1	6 10.5
32.	Critical comments help me improve my writing skills.	3.82 0.87	42 73.7	9 15.8	6 10.5
33.	It keeps me from making the same errors.	3.77 0.71	41 71.9	13 22.8	3 5.3
34.	It teaches me to acquire better expressions and structures.	3.54 0.95	36 63.2	11 19.3	10 17.5
35.	It assesses my writing abilities.	4.09 0.74	48 84.2	7 12.3	2 3.5
36.	It encourages me to try out challenging things.	3.16 0.82	19 33.3	27 47.4	11 19.3

37.	It enables me to be better to clarify the content.	3.26 0.84	21 36.8	26 45.6	10 17.6
38.	It enables me to be better to organize the text.	3.30 0.87	20 35.1	28 49.1	9 15.8

TABLE 9
Proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Item 39

Item	What do you do after you read teacher's comments and corrections?	frequency/% of responses (N=56)			
		Mean SD	A/U %	S %	R/N %
39.1	I ask teacher for help.	2.59 0.78	5 8.9	25 44.7	26 46.4
39.2	I make corrections on my own.	3.57 0.95	34 60.7	12 21.4	10 17.9
39.3	I ask peers or family for help.	3.45 1.04	32 57.2	12 21.4	12 21.4
39.4	I consult reference materials (e.g., grammar book, dictionary).	3.86 1.05	40 71.4	8 14.3	8 14.3
39.5	I make a mental note of my common errors.	3.75 0.88	36 64.3	15 26.8	5 8.9
39.6	I write down teacher's main points.	3.05 0.96	17 30.4	23 41.1	16 28.5
39.7	I do nothing.	2.02 0.94	3 5.4	13 23.2	40 71.4

A/U: Always/Usually S: Sometimes R/N: Rarely/Never

TABLE 10
Less-proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Item 39

Item	What do you do after you read teacher' comments and corrections?	frequency/ % of responses (N=57)			
		Mean SD	A/U %	S %	R/N %
39.1	I ask teacher for help.	2.65 0.72	6 10.5	27 47.4	24 42.1
39.2	I make corrections on my own.	3.44 0.91	32 56.2	15 26.3	10 17.5
39.3	I ask peers or family for help.	3.19 1.03	26 45.6	14 24.6	17 29.8
39.4	I consult reference materials (e.g., grammar book, dictionary).	3.75 1.04	38 66.7	12 21.0	7 12.3
39.5	I make a mental note of my common errors.	3.74 0.84	37 64.9	17 29.8	3 5.3
39.6	I write down teacher's main points.	3.16 1.03	24 42.1	14 24.6	19 33.3
39.7	I do nothing.	2.00 0.89	3 5.3	10 17.5	44 77.2

TABLE 11
Proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Item 40

Item	What do you do about the comments or corrections that you don't understand?	frequency/% of responses (N=56)			
		Mean SD	A/U %	S %	R/N %
40.1	I ask teacher to explain them.	2.98 0.98	16 28.6	21 37.5	19 33.9

40.2	I consult reference materials to clarify them.	3.80 0.80	38 67.9	15 26.8	3 5.4
40.3	I ask peers or family to explain them.	3.54 0.87	35 62.5	13 23.2	8 14.3
40.4	I try to fix them by myself.	3.84 0.87	40 71.4	11 19.6	5 8.9
40.5	I ask a native speaker to explain them.	1.98 0.80	3 5.4	8 14.3	45 80.4
40.6	I search on the Internet.	3.68 0.99	40 71.4	9 16.1	7 12.5
40.7	I just give up, doing nothing.	1.88 0.85	2 3.6	11 19.6	43 76.8

TABLE 12
Less-proficient Writers' Responses to Structured-Response Item 40

Item	What do you do about the comments or corrections that you don't understand?	frequency/% of responses (N=57)			
		Mean SD	A/U %	S %	R/N %
40.1	I ask teacher to explain them.	3.12 0.96	20 35.1	22 38.6	15 26.3
40.2	I consult reference materials to clarify them.	3.65 0.86	34 59.7	19 33.3	4 7.0
40.3	I ask peers or family to explain them.	3.54 1.04	32 56.1	16 28.1	9 15.8
40.4	I try to fix them by myself.	3.42 0.92	29 50.9	17 29.8	11 19.3

40.5	I ask a native speaker to explain them.	1.84 0.82	4 7.0	3 5.3	50 87.7
40.6	I search on the Internet.	3.77 0.89	38 66.7	15 26.3	4 7.0
40.7	I just give up, doing nothing.	1.89 0.84	2 3.5	11 19.3	44 77.2

TABLE 13
T-test Results for Proficient and Less-proficient Writers' Responses
to Structured-Response Items (8-19)

Item	Content	Less-proficient (N=57)		Proficient (N=56)		t-test P
		M	SD	M	SD	
8	I enjoy writing in English.	1.96	0.71	2.48	0.95	0.0015*
9	Compared to my classmates, I am a skilled writer.	2.14	0.83	2.61	0.85	0.0038*
10	I am making progress toward English writing skills.	2.67	0.89	3.09	0.75	0.0073*
11	The length of teacher comments has effect on the degree to which changes are made.	3.40	0.96	3.46	0.97	0.7388
12	I learn a lot when T comments on content.	3.56	0.76	3.64	0.86	0.5947
13	I learn a lot when T comments on organization.	3.47	0.76	3.57	0.74	0.4881
14	I learn a lot when T comments on writing style.	3.11	0.82	3.36	0.77	0.0950
15	I learn a lot when T checks vocabulary.	3.96	0.68	3.89	0.73	0.5887
16	I learn a lot when T checks grammatical errors.	4.33	0.66	4.30	0.63	0.8073

17	I learn a lot when T checks mechanical errors.	3.40	1.03	3.50	0.81	0.5304
18	I learn a lot when T uses proofreading symbols.	3.37	1.03	3.48	0.83	0.5190
19	I learn a lot when T allows me to revise my paper after receiving feedback.	3.91	0.79	3.52	0.89	0.0143**

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .05$

TABLE 14
T-test Results for Proficient and Less-proficient Writers' Responses
to Teacher Comment Types

Item	Content	Less-proficient (N=57)		Proficient (N=56)		t-test P
		M	SD	M	SD	
20	It is helpful when T asks for information in the form of question.	3.21	0.92	3.14	1.05	0.7168
21	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of question.	3.53	0.91	3.57	0.99	0.8011
22	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of statement.	3.54	0.78	3.55	0.99	0.9540
23	It is helpful when T asks for revision in the form of imperative.	3.70	1.07	3.50	1.19	0.3450
24	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of question.	3.40	0.92	3.23	1.01	0.3481
25	It is helpful when T gives information related to content in the form of statement.	3.44	0.96	3.25	0.88	0.2794
26	It is helpful when T makes positive comments in the form of statement or exclamation.	3.77	0.91	4.02	0.80	0.1260

27	It is helpful when T makes grammar/vocabulary/mechanics comments in the form of question, statement, or imperative.	3.66	0.96	3.52	1.13	0.4718
----	---	------	------	------	------	--------

TABLE 15
T-test Results for Proficient and Less-proficient Writers' Beliefs about the Effects of Teacher Feedback

Item	Content	Less-proficient (N=57)		Proficient (N=56)		t-test
		M	SD	M	SD	P
28	I know my weaknesses so that I can figure out what to avoid/improve next time.	4.05	0.64	4.04	0.79	0.9004
29	Error corrections help me develop vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.	4.21	0.56	4.11	0.71	0.3902
30	It can be used as reference to other writing assignments.	3.65	0.90	3.59	1.06	0.7465
31	Positive remarks encourage me to work hard.	3.96	1.00	4.36	0.77	0.0214**
32	Critical comments help me improve my writing skills.	3.82	0.87	4.05	0.86	0.1622
33	It keeps me from making the same errors.	3.77	0.71	3.63	0.86	0.3256
34	It teaches me to acquire better expressions and structures.	3.54	0.95	3.59	0.78	0.7812
35	It assesses my writing abilities.	4.09	0.74	4.20	0.80	0.4535
36	It encourages me to try out challenging things.	3.16	0.82	3.21	0.89	0.7266

37	It enables me to be better to clarify the content.	3.26	0.84	3.27	0.70	0.9742
38	It enables me to be better to organize the text.	3.30	0.87	3.11	0.73	0.2070

** $p < .05$

TABLE 16
T-test Results for Proficient and Less-proficient Writers' Responses
to Structured-Response Item 39

Item	What do you do after you read teacher's comments and corrections?	Less-proficient (N=57)		Proficient (N=56)		t-test P
		M	SD	M	SD	
39.1	I ask teacher for help.	2.65	0.72	2.59	0.78	0.6728
39.2	I make corrections on my own.	3.44	0.91	3.57	0.95	0.4490
39.3	I ask peers or family for help.	3.19	1.03	3.45	1.04	0.1955
39.4	I consult reference materials (e.g., grammar book, dictionary).	3.75	1.04	3.86	1.05	0.6026
39.5	I make a mental note of my common errors.	3.74	0.84	3.75	0.88	0.9352
39.6	I write down teacher's main points.	3.16	1.03	3.05	0.96	0.5791
39.7	I do nothing.	2.00	0.89	2.02	0.94	0.9176

TABLE 17
T-test Results for Proficient and Less-proficient Writers' Responses
to Structured-Response Item 40

Item	What do you do about the comments or corrections that you don't understand?	Less-proficient (N=57)		Proficient (N=56)		t-test
		M	SD	M	SD	P
40.1	I ask teacher to explain them.	3.12	0.96	2.98	0.98	0.4441
40.2	I consult reference materials to clarify them.	3.65	0.86	3.80	0.80	0.3228
40.3	I ask peers or family to explain them.	3.54	1.04	3.54	0.87	0.9640
40.4	I try to fix them by myself.	3.42	0.92	3.84	0.87	0.0147**
40.5	I ask a native speaker to explain them.	1.84	0.82	1.98	0.80	0.3592
40.6	I search on the Internet.	3.77	0.89	3.68	0.99	0.5994
40.7	I just give up, doing nothing.	1.89	0.84	1.88	0.85	0.9016

** $p < .05$

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: College

Cheongsook Chin
 Institute of Foreign Language Education
 Inje University
 607 Obangdong, Kimhae
 621-749, South Korea
 Phone: 055-320-3530
 Fax: 055-333-8231
 Email: chincs9@hotmail.com

Received in Oct., 2007

Reviewed in Nov., 2007

Revised version received in Dec., 2007