DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 272 FL 026 273

AUTHOR Chi, Feng-Ming
TITLE The Writer, the Teacher, and the Text: Examples From Taiwanese EFL College Students.
PUB DATE 1999-08-02
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics (12th, Tokyo, Japan, August 1-6, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; College Students; *English (Second Language); *Feedback; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Majors (Students); Questionnaires; *Revision (Written Composition); Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Teaching Methods; Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Taiwan

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the writing revision strategies employed by Taiwanese English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) college sophomores. Nine English majors participated in this study. Participants revised their second drafts based upon teacher feedback--both written and oral. Data were gathered from verbal self-reports, semi-structured oral interviews, and open-ended questionnaires. Analysis revealed three general ideas about written revisions emerging from the data: revising as submission, revising as meaning-negotiation, and revising as reposition. The data indicate that when students were able to take a critical stance to justify, negotiate, or even challenge teacher comments they were more likely to become critical thinkers, writers, and inquirers. This study strongly supports the idea that student revision with teacher feedback is a social-cognitive process, and that when students are given opportunities to revise their writing with responses that resonate with their own experiences, beliefs, and values, they will see revision as a tool for managing their original drafts comfortably and confidently. It is concluded that one of the most important tasks for the writing teacher is to transfer the power of revising to the student. Extensive scholarly references to published research are made throughout the paper. (Contains 23 references.) (KFT)

The 12th World Congress on Applied Linguistics

Tokyo, Japan

August 1-6, 1999

Feng-Ming Chi

The Writer, The Teacher, and The Text: Examples from Taiwanese EFL College Students

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
National Chung Cheng University
#160, San-hsiang, Ming-hsiung, Chia-yi (621),
Taiwan, ROC
TEL:8865-272-0411.ext.6367
FAX: 8865-272-0495
E-mail:folfmc@ccunix.ccu.edu.tw

Abstract

The purpose of this proposed paper is to investigate the revision strategies employed by Taiwanese EFL college students. Nine Taiwanese EFL college students participated in this proposed study and they were all sophomore English majors. Participants revised their second drafts based upon teacher feedback, one with written comments, and, the other, from the teacher-student conference. Data were gathered from three different dimensions: verbal self-reports, oral interviews, and open-ended questionnaires, whereas idea units and the thematic analysis were used to analyze and interpret the three types of data. As a result, three themes were generated: revising as submission, revising as meaning-negotiation, revising as re-position. The results indicate that when participants were able to take a critical stance to justify, negotiate or even challenge teacher comments, they would be able to become a critical thinker and writer as well as an inquirer. Some pedagogical implications are suggested for classroom practice.

1. Introduction

Responding to student writing is an integral aspect of composition instruction. Researchers have examined both teachers' written responses to student writing and one-on-one teacher-student writing conferences as important sources of teacher feedback and instruction for developing student writers. In fact, current research find mixed results about the effect of teacher comments on students' writings (Chaudron, 1984; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Goldstein & Conrad, 1996). Some studies suggest students appreciate genuine responses to their subject matter, though perhaps not on their ideas about it, while others suggest that students do not appreciate comments on the content of their writing. In all, three points can be reached based upon the previous studies with reference to the students' reactions to teacher comments. First, students do read and make use of teacher comments. Second, students are able to discriminate among different kinds of comments and find some more helpful than others. Third, students appreciate comments that reflect the teacher's involvement in what they say and engage them in an exchange about the writing (McCarthey, 1992; Silva, 1990).

In Taiwan, however, the majority of studies on Taiwanese students have been done on the composing process rather than on the revising process; little

research has been conducted on the revising process, much less focused on the revising processes with teacher feedback. Researchers have thus overlooked the complex process of how Taiwanese EFL college students revise their written compositions. Lacking such an investigation, educational professionals are missing valuable information that could help in designing English language programs to meet Taiwanese students' needs. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate how Taiwanese EFL college students employ two types of teacher feedback to revise their compositions.

2. Theoretical Framework

In school writing, the teacher usually initiates, designs, assigns and evaluates student writing. The teacher as a respondent is viewed as an expert as well as an authoritarian. In order to provide feedback, the teacher plays several different roles: judge, facilitator, evaluator, interested reader, even copy editor. Leki (1990) uses the metaphor of "coaching" to describe the teacher's activity, booing and cheering while pacing the margins of the student paper, shouting encouragement and tactical advice. The teacher inevitably offers writers more responses and more intervention than would an ordinary reader. However, recent research into teacher feedback to student writing has shown problematic results. Teacher responses sometimes fail to improve students'

writing products.

Straub (1997) set out to survey 142 college writing students to learn about their perceptions of teacher comments on a writing sample. His results indicated that these college students seemed equally as interested in getting responses on global matters of content, purpose, and organization as on local matters of sentence structure, wording, and correctness. They mostly preferred comments that provided advice, employed open questions, or included explanations that guided revision. On the other hand, Leki (1992) pointed out that sometimes students have a tendency to reject and/or ignore a teacher's written comments for a variety of reasons. Sometimes the teacher's handwriting is hard to read; sometimes the teacher comments seem inapplicable to the students. Much worse, writers may sometimes both understand and perceive the need for changes in their writing, yet not know how to go about making such changes. Sometimes students are not sure exactly which part of their text a teacher comment is addressing, and the gist of the comment itself may be unclear. As a consequence, such poor teacher commentary has little impact on student writing. Another problem in the use students make of teacher feedback lies in their perception of the teacher as a specialist in language. Many student writers, especially at the college level,

resist any alteration in the content of their writing, not only because they feel they have a natural right to hold any opinion they want and believe in the validity of their opinions, but also because they seem to perceive an English teacher as a qualified expert only on English grammar and usage but not qualified to comment on the content of their writing (Radecki & Swales, 1988).

Unlike teacher feedback by written comments, Zamel (1985; 1987) and Reid (1993) both highly recommend that teachers hold conferences with ESL students because "dynamic interchange and negotiation is most likely to take place when writers and readers work together face-to-face" (Zamel, 1985, p.97). In a typical conference, a student meets with the teacher for 15-30 minutes to discuss the writing progress being made by that student (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996). Student-teacher conferences allow students to express their opinions and needs, as well as to clarify teachers' comments when they are not understood. Such a face-to-face conversation between the teacher and the student, usually outside the boundaries of the classroom, should be seen as a negotiated teaching event, a chance for both parties to address the student's individual needs through dialogue (Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Reid, 1993; Sperling, 1990). The purpose of such meetings call for careful and detailed responses by the teacher in order to help the student test and apply suggestions

and comments before the final draft and the graded evaluation. Thus the teacher-student conference is veiwed as a two-way communiation, since it allows students to explain their opinions and needs, while clarifying the teacher's comments. As a result, conferences appear more effective than written comments in promoting students' revision processes (Satio, 1994). Leki (1992), on the other hand, also points out the fallacies of the student-teacher conference, in which student writers may be reluctant to ask for repetition or clarification. When the student writers are expected to accept teacher commentary, they must fully understand errors, writing problems, and the need for changes. Unfortunately, since a great deal of cognitive energy may be required for some student writers to negotiate orally, students are allowed to read and re-read written feedback but may find oral feedback slipping away from them, even if they fully understand it at the time it is given. It is not certain that they understand, even when they say they do, since they may be reluctant to ask for repetition or clarification. Another major disadvantage of the teacher-student conference, for the teacher, is that conferences exert much greater demands on time and the need to become skilled as an interactive negotiator (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996). Thus, while oral conferences are superior to written feedback in many respects, they must

also be handled with particular senstivity to make sure that ESL students understand and will be aided in remembering the exchanges made during the conference.

In Taiwan, researchers who advocate the process approach have called for serious attention to and consideration of the revising process as a crucial stage in process writing (Chen, 1997). Taiwanese students have taken teacher feedback for granted, focusing on how to implement the technique in the classroom and appraise the effects (Chi, 1996). More important, these studies have overlooked the complexity of the revising process with the teacher feedback, in that their analysis and interpretation only rely on student writers' evaluation or on those students' written products, completely ignoring the notion that revising is part of the process of writing and should be viewed as a process, too. Most important of all, none of these studies examine directly the revising strategies employed by Taiwanese EFL students. With this knowledge, researchers and teachers will be able to examine more closely Taiwanese EFL college students' revising processes.

3. About the Study

Research Setting and Participants

The research setting for this study was the National Chung Cheng

University (NCCU), a 6,000-student national university located in Ming-shiung, Chia-yi, Taiwan. In order to be accepted by this university, students are required to pass a competitive national joint entrance examination. Nine Taiwanese EFL college students from the NCCU participated in the study; all were sophomore students majoring in English. They were all taking Sophomore Composition as a required course with me when this study was conducted, and the class met three hours each week, sixteen weeks a semester. All participants were infomed of the reserach to be conducted before they formally registered for this course. In general, these participants had been exposed to at least six years of high school English, taught mainly by the grammar-translation method, plus one year of university-level English, also in Taiwan.

Data Collection Procedures

Nine out of twenty students in this class volunteered to participate in this study. These nine were requested to use the verbal self-report method in the process of revising their compositions, with two different types of teacher feedback. In addition, the semi-structured oral interview was used to evaluate the two different types of teacher feedback as writing activities in this class.

How each type of data was gathered is described in detail below.

(a) Verbal Self-Reports: In order to ensure that each participant understood and utilized the verbal self-report in an appropriate way, a training session was arranged to help participants become acquainted with it. After each participant was able to manage the verbal self-report method well enough to provide data, he/she was then given two ninety-minute audio-tapes for recording verbal self-report data. That is, each participant was requested to verbalize his/her thoughts aloud to the tape recorder in the process of revising two compositions with teacher feedback, one for revision with written comments (Composition #1) and the other for revision with oral comments in teacher-student oral conference. For Composition #1, participants were requested to write "My Life in 2200," whereas an argumentative essay, "Prostitution Should Be Legalized" was the topic for Composition #2.

(b) Semi-structured Oral Interviews: The semi-structured oral interview was used to provide more insight into how participants evaluated two types of teacher feedback as revising activities in class. Each participant was interviewed twice; usually the interview took place after the revised version was handed in. Each participant was allowed to select a suitable schedule at his/her convenience. Interview format was semi-structured: a list of questions

was prepared in advance, serving as a guideline in the interview process. Each interview generally lasted 20-30 minutes; participants were free to use either English or Chinese in their responses. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim by two research associates.

Data Analysis Procedures

Verbal self-reports and semi-structured oral interviews served as key resources for data analysis and interpretations. The topical unit was first used to analyze these two types of data. A topical unit is defined as one or several utterances with a complete idea unit. The following provides two examples with two different types of topical unit from one participant's verbal self-report data.

[Example: Data extracted from one participant's verbal self-reports]

> *'Be specific.' My teacher is right. I should provide more resource to support my idea why feminist disagreed with the profession of prostitution. What if I don't use the phrase 'from the feminist point of view.' I will rewrite this part, probably explain more reasons why most people disagree with the prostitution because ...* (1)
>
> ....
>
> *I think my teacher misunderstood my point. What I want to say is that many girls are willing to become prostitutes due to their desire to have a luxury life... Prostitution is a profession, and they choose it as a job. I like my idea. My teacher's idea is too traditional.* (2)

Then, the related utterances or topical units reflected a common perspective or revealed recurring topics and patterns as a theme. That is, all

of the relevant topical units were moved and grouped together as a theme. As a result, three themes were generated: peer revision as solution, as negotiation and as inquiry. The following section presents an in-depth discussion of these three themes.

In addition, two steps were taken to ensure the credibility of the data analysis and interpretation: member checking and peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 1993). Six out of nine participants were given the transcripts and tape recordings of their own verbal self-reports and oral interviews. They were asked to check transcriptions by listening to their own words on the tape recordings. They were also asked to make any changes in the margins of the transcriptions when they recognized an inappropriate transcription. I discussed my data analysis with each participant. Any data that produced disagreement between us were dropped from the data pool. For peer debriefing, I first coded the transcripts, and then two EFL composition instructors independently coded them. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved. The final themes emerged through long conversations and negotiations. The inter-rater credibility we eventually reached was 81% and 84% between the two EFL instructors and me, with a rate of 83% between the two EFL instructors themselves.

Results and Discussion

Revising a text involves a reciprocally and mutually defining relationship between the reviser and the text to be revised; thus, teacher feedback should serve as a springboard, providing opportunities for revisers to re-visit their original text. In this study, however, participants often found themselves in an unbalanced relationship between themselves and their texts, swinging between their previous draft and their current draft, or dangling between teacher comments and their own ideas. In order to understand better the unbalanced relationship that arises out of the complexity of the revising process with two different types of teacher feedback, three themes are presented and discussed in detail below: revising as submission, as negotiation and as re-positioning. My discussion of the three themes in this section should not be construed as representing a series of necessarily separate entities. In fact, these themes can and should be viewed as recursively and simultaneously occurring in the revising process.

Theme 1: Revising as Submission

When the teacher reads and responds to students' written texts, his or her interpretations and experiences of the text are determined at least in part by the social stance the teacher takes toward students. Accordingly, teachers'

expectations for student writing and their habits in responding have a strong impact on students' attitudes toward their revision. For participants in this study, the teacher feedback, especially the written comments on Composition #1, had a complex effect on their attitudes toward revision. Such attitudes primarily evolved out of both respect for and fear of the teacher as an authoritarian. Conventionally, the role of a teacher in relation to students and their written texts has been assumed to be authoritarian. Such authority has allowed teachers to appropriate a student's text, to assume they know what it does/not mean, along with what it should mean; thus, revision with teacher comments easily becomes disorienting. As indicated in Examples 1A and 1B, participants attempted to make changes requested, but did not take the risk of changing anything not commented on, even if the participants sensed that other changes were needed.

[Example 1A: Extracted from Fanny's protocols on Composition #1]

'Construct a spaceship.' To me, 'construct' is all right. Why did the teacher change the word into 'build,' 'build the spaceship'? Well, 'construct' and 'build' should be both all right. I think I just used my teacher comment, [using the word 'build'].

[Example 1B: Extracted from Lea's protocols on Composition #1]

My teacher wanted me to explain more details about how a car can fly on the sky in 2200. Do I need to describe so many details here, since I have described how such cars are made in the last paragraph? My detailed explanation here looks redundant to me. ... In fact, I should write more about how this type of car can be used here. But, the teacher did not

suggest me to write this way. Forget it. Well, I just followed my teacher suggestions. I will just add some ideas to describe how a car can fly in sky in 2200.

Both participants' protocols gave some insight into the ways that they struggled with the vague comments provided by the teacher but chose to accept the teacher comments anyway. Likewise, Joanne, one of the best writers in this class, experienced a similar situation. When carefully examining Joanne's protocols on Composition #1 and her oral interview data, we find that these two types of data provided a consistent and comprehensive picture of how much Joanne is apt to think of authority figures as sources of truth when it comes to her writing. She equates receiving, accepting, retaining, and returning the words of authorities with revising. Joanne was lured into thinking that teachers are armed with absolute knowledge. She stated that she always accepted and attended to the teacher's comments, "almost every comment," since the teacher was an expert in writing. Even when her opinions differed from the teacher's, she was afraid of the "battle" between the teacher and herself; as a result, she became a submissive writer who tried her best to revise to satisfy the demands of, rather than attempting to negotiate with, the teacher.

[Example 1C: Extracted from Joanne's protocols on Composition #1]

'No connection.' I think these sentences did have connections. ... Maybe I should delete this sentence. ... But if this sentence is deleted, it won't make sense at all to me. Probably I should change the word 'iceberg' into 'ice pack.' Well, this is not what I meant, either. I wish the

teacher would say more as to how to make connections or why these sentences are not connected at all. I think I will just add 'the' in front of 'iceberg.'

[Example 1D: Extracted from Joanne's protocols on Composition #1]

I think my teacher did not understand what I meant to say here. Should I make any change here? (Reading her writing twice). ...Probably I should skip her comments. N...n... (thinking) If she, as a teacher, does not understand my writing, it means that I did not make my ideas clear to readers. Well, what can I do? Maybe she is right since, she is the teacher. I will just change my idea based upon her comments. But I did not completely know my teacher's intention. Well, I will just rewrite this part completely. That will be easier than to revise.

[Example 1E: Extracted from Joanne's semi-structured oral interview]

Basically, I read my teacher's comments very carefully and revised completely based upon her suggestions. I think she is an expert in writing and definitely knows how to use words and ideas more powerfully. ... It is true sometimes I felt confused with her comments and did not know what she expected me to revise, but I still tried different ways to change everything as requested. I didn't worry about my grade at all; I just wanted to make my writing better. ...

Joanne's attitudes toward revision with teacher feedback are very similar to those of what Sperling and Freedman (1987) called "good girls." Being a good student, a "good girl" assumes that any requests or suggestions her teacher makes must be accommodated, even when she does not understand what the comments mean and why the teacher made them. As shown in Examples 1D and 1E, Joanne surrendered authority over her text, assuming that the teacher always knew better than she did. For Joanne, the teacher's comments present as representations of what she should have done on her

writing, rather than as suggestions, through which she is allowed to project her subjective voice and stance.

As seen from Joanne's case, participants' trust in the teacher's authority could also suggest that teacher feedback was more favorable and acceptable. My findings complied with Maley's (1990) and Song's (1995) finding. Song even points out that because of the Confucian learning system's strong influence on East Asian students, "A teacher's word is like an imperial edict, carrying absolute power" (p.35). Thus, revising for my participants as EFL students may make them feel unsure about their English writing abilities. Another explanation may be due to the fact that Taiwanese EFL college students have received schooling with traditional values, which stress the authority and excellence of academic performance. In order to achieve academic excellence, it is understandable and reasonable that participants in this study, be they more or less proficient linguistically in writing competence, are inclined to "surrender" their critical stance to the teacher's authoritarian power.

Theme 2: Revising as Negotiation

Revision with teacher feedback is not only a process for improving the original text, but also a process of meaning-negotiation between the reviser and

the respondent, during which the former takes an active role in making sense of comments made by the latter. Participants are assumed to play the role of communicators who intend to converse with their imagined audience, which in this case is their teacher. Thus, any response, no matter how superficial or profound, served as "an overpass" for a reviser to re-enter his or her original text; in turn, all responses were weighed, negotiated or justified before revising was undertaken. Such processes of revising functioned as a threshold for participants' continual meaning re-construction and re-creation in the process of writing and rewriting. The interrelationship between participants and their feedback or responses was like the pendulum of a clock, swinging back and forth, from one side of understanding or changing to the other at the moment when participants entered into their written texts to be revised. The relationship was seldom balanced between writers and their responses. The following examples present how Lynn and Linda negotiated with the teacher feedback in the process of revising their compositions.

[Example 2A: Extracted from Lynn's protocols on Composition #4]

Now I am going to revise the conclusion. After discussion with my teacher about the "weak conclusion" of my composition, I think she is right. I simply summarized the pros and cons for prostitution to be legalized. It is true I just copied some sentences from previous paragraphs. ... So, I should come up with two or three solutions for how to regulate legal prostitutes, such as ...

[Example 2B: Extracted from Linda's protocols on Composition #1]

'?' 'A question mark.' I don't understand what the question mark here refers to. The teacher did not write clearly what it meant. Well, I just have to make a guess. (Reading her writing) Maybe I did not make my ideas understood to her or my writing is Chinese-English style. Anyway, I probably just have to write one example. Examples always make ideas easily understood.

In fact, participants in this study often responded to exhortations like "provide examples" or "be specific," and it is not unusual to see a label like this stamped in the margin of a paper at a spot where it is difficult to imagine what an example might be or how an example might clarify an assertion. Ambiguity, confusion, uncertainty and perceived differences were viewed as the seeds of learning and as potential sources for my participants' growth if they framed these moments as essential elements naturally existing in the process of revising. Such a shift represented a change in revisers' orientations and a shift in understanding that the role of language in the learning process is not like-mindedness, but difference, as presented on Examples 2Aand 2B above. For Lynn and Linda, the change of attitude toward responses in turn assisted them to revise more comfortably and confidently.

Revising and responding sometimes come in hand in hand, functioning simultaneously as inquiry processes. Ada and Jim both learned how to extend and elaborate their original texts in the process of the teacher-student oral conference. The following examples, one from Ada's protocols and the other

Jim's oral interview data, illustrate revising as negotiation process.

[Example 2C: Extracted from Ada's protocols on Compositions #4]

My teacher requested me to explain more why feminists are opposed to the legalized prostitutes. Yea, I did not state the reasons why they disagreed. N... In fact, some agreed and some didn't. Maybe I should present both sides of the points and then present my own opinions. If so, I think my points will be more important than those of the feminists, and this will be more persuasive to my teacher.

[Example 2D: Extracted from Jim's oral interview data]

After talking to the teacher, I better understood my weaknesses and knew how to improve them (compositions). In addition, the teacher always focused on my questions, so I know how to revise my writing with concrete suggestions. In fact, through the conferencing, I have become more able to link the sentence and paragraph relationships in a more meaningful way.

As long as participants continued to pursue an idea with further thinking, investigating, reading, and re-thinking, the revision process could only build up knowledge. Changes resulted in knowledge acquisition, language acquisition and a new self. In order to make sense of a respondent's response, revisers have to make sense of the responses actively. To use a Buddhist concept, responses should be metaphorically used as a boat useful for ferrying the passengers (revisers), but probably should be thrown away or left behind at a later stage, when self (the reviser) should replace the responses in order for knowledge to be derived from the revision process. That is, revisers use the self to doubt, vacillate, search, verify, exemplify and discover.

Theme 3: Revising as Re-positioning

Revision as re-positioning in this study involved my participants making judgmental statements about the teacher's responses or weighing critical opinions made by their teacher. In fact, a certain number of protocols moved away from direct response to the revised text but remained linked with the content or integrated a participant's personal voice, stance or justifications with the revised text. Revising as re-positioning allows the revision to focus not on the text per se, but on the conversation between the writer and the reader. In order to make their writing understandable and acceptable, participants mingled their own perspectives of their writing with the teacher's comments by re-framing, re-organizing and re-constructing their own original written texts. In this sense, revising as re-positioning has become a dialogue between the teller (the participant) and the imagined audience (the teacher in this study), and thus revising became a social act, causing the revisers to step out of the physical text, in a sense, and simultaneously to step into the physical world—from the inside "me" to the outside "us." Thus, revising as repositioning provided opportunities for participants to justify the responses by exploration or illumination if they thought the responses were more appropriate.

[Example 3A: Extracted from Amy's protocols on Composition 4]

(Reading the teacher feedback) The teacher did not agree my idea that prostitution should be a job free for girls to choose. But, many girls worked as prostitutes not because they were forced to take this job or they

were poor, but because they were willing to own this job. Maybe my teacher is traditional so she did not agree with what I said. ...Probably I should use some examples or resources to make my ideas clear or even acceptable to my teacher.

[Example 3B: Extracted from Linda's oral interviews]

Both types of comments are all right with me. The teacher-teacher oral conference helped me broaden my aspect [ideas] of writing, and I know how to revise my writing with concrete suggestions. In fact, I have become more able to link the sentence and paragraph relationships in a more meaningful way.

In fact, the function of revising as repositioning is not only to value or even to challenge readers' viewpoints, but also to make judgmental statements about ideas or opinions recommended by the readers. While evaluating the responses, participants were naturally led to jump outside the textual framework, creating their own frames of writing. The following examples present such situations.

[Example 3C: Extracted from Penny's oral interviews]

...As for the oral conference with my teacher, It was really a challenge to me, but I liked it, too. After talking with my teacher, face-to-face, I not only better understand how to revise my text, but also challenge how I asked questions of teachers. At that moment I had to ask and I did. I think it is a challenge for myself.

[Example 3D: Extracted from Kim's oral interview data]

After talking to the teacher, I better understood my weaknesses and knew how to improve them [the compositions]. In addition, the teacher always focused on my questions, so I learned more and better.

In the above examples, the evaluation concept enabled participants to re-formulate themselves as writers, thinkers, and learners. Since the process of

shaping and acting on comments is not a simple matter, with evaluation, participants discovered new aspects of the comments and deepened or willingly changed their initial understanding of those comments. In essence, repositioning encouraged participants to think for themselves as critical writers, and ultimately to take responsibility for themselves. Revising definitely has its tough moments when difficulties prevail or ambiguities mount. This can be, and usually is, a messy or even a thorny process. Under such circumstances, participants felt they were forced to accept, reserve or even reject the comments.

As Halliday and Hasan (1985) propose, writing creates a world of things, whereas talking creates a world of happening. That is, the reciprocal exchange of oral comments in revising processes involved unfolding, tentative responses, responses that encouraged student writers to express opinions and challenge one another's perspective. More importantly, revising should be viewed as an inquiry process, a process of asking questions of a text, a process in which to inquire and to seek alternative ways of rewriting after discussion—in a sense, to struggle into and out of chaos. These methods are inherent in authentic learning situations and must be supported by roles that teachers play.

Conclusion and Implications

Results from this study confirm those of the previous research which indicates that revisers' orientations, beliefs, attitudes and stances play a crucial role in the process of revising. In order to respect the teacher's authority and to avoid the danger of confrontation, students must accept the teacher feedback without any critical evaluation, or at least pretend to accept suggestions. However, students benefited more genuinely from teacher feedback if they have some investment, or sense of ownership, in their own revising, as well as in the ideas generated from teacher feedback. In all, the results from this study strongly support the complexity of revising with teacher feedback as a social-cognitive process, through which students are able to employ more extensive and powerful revision strategies to battle with revising difficulties. Moreover, when students are given opportunities to revise a text with responses, they simultaneously and spontaneously mingle their experiences, beliefs, and values with the texts being revised. Allowing students such opportunities will help them ultimately to see revision as a tool for managing their original drafts comfortably and confidently.

This study has implications both for further research and for pedagogical practice. As with all qualitative research, the three themes delineated in this

paper must be researched in future studies, conducted with further investigation with larger numbers of students and also students of different language proficiency levels. However, some pedagogical implications surfaced at the early stage.

First, revising with teacher feedback, as a natural consequence of writing, should be further researched. Such responses can serve as observable behaviors that allow teachers to re-investigate and re-evaluate student writers' lived experiences of their own written text and to reflect upon their students' problems with writing and revising. As presented in this study, responses by teacher feedback provided participants with opportunities to engage in a natural meaning-negotiation process, a natural part of the generative process that participants use to arrive at the final product of writing. Responses also further embodied the potential to engage and stimulate their revising motivation and in turn to promote their critical thinking. Thus, the teacher should help students expand the range of revision strategies used, by sharing and discussing revising and responding experiences with students, as well as by increasing the number of sources from which students can learn. Revising should be a source of inquiry and a path of self-discovery.

Moreover, the view of teacher feedback as an aid to a student's writing has

been oversimplified and even overlooked by previous researchers on revision. As teachers, we certainly do not want students to see teacher feedback as an authority to be deferred, or as a wrong authority to be rejected; rather, we would prefer students to see us as individuals, representing a culture and a discipline, with whom they can talk and negotiate. Ultimately, students must become their own evaluators, and the responsibility for making judgments about responses must become the students' work. They are the ones who must feel the rightness and wrongness of their statements because they are responsible for what they write. If teacher feedback fails to encourage that responsibility, if the teacher's markings are pronouncements from on high, then students instead take on an attitude of submission, appropriate perhaps for "a typesetter, but not for a writer," as Probst warns (1989). Thus, what is important in the teaching of writing is to transfer the power of revising to the student.

References Cited

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, 15, 1-14.

Chen, Yun-mei. (1997). An investigation of EFL students' perceptions of revision in English composition. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China* (pp.273-292). Taipei: Crane.

Chi, F. M. (1996). Making reading/writing connection as an intertextual process in EFL: A comparative study of six Taiwanese college students. Paper presented at the 16th World Congress, International Reading Association, Czech Republic, Prague (July 9-13).

Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In Barbara Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1996). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. In B. Leed (Ed.), *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research* (pp.173-189). N.Y.: Longman.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, B. (1996). Responding to writing and writing assessment. In W.Grabe & R.B. Kaplan, *Theory & Practice of Writing* (pp.377-421). N.Y.: Longman.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written responses. In Barbara Kroll's (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp.57-87). N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

--------. (1992). Responding to ESL writing. In L. Leki (Ed.), *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers* (pp.122-141). Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinmann.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Maley, A. (1990). XANADU "A miracle of rare device": The teaching of English in China. In J.M.Valdes (Eds.), *Culture bond: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (pp.102-111). Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthey, S. J. (1992). The teacher, the author, and the text: Variations in the form and content of writing conference. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 24(1), 51-82.

Patthey-Chavez, G.G., & Ferris, D. R. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, (1), 51-90.

Probst, R. E. (1989). Transactional theory and response to student writing. In Chris M. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research* (pp.68-79). Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Reid, J. (1993). Responding to student writing. In Joy M. Reid (Ed.), *Teaching ESL writing*(pp.205-224). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

--------. (1996). A learning styles unit for the intermediate ESL/EFL writing classroom. *TESOL Journal* (6), 42-47.

Rodby, J. (1992). Great expectations: Reading and responding to ESL student writing. In Judith Rodby (Ed.), *Approaching literacy* (pp.110-132). Heniemann, Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

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

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction.* Thousands, California: SAGE.

Silva, T. (1990). ESL composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions. In Barbara Kroll's (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp.11-23). Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.

Sperling, M. (1990). I want to talk to each of you: Collaboration and the teacher-student writing conference. *Research in the teaching of English*, 24(3), 279-321.

----------., & Freedman, S. W. (1987). A good girl writes like a good girl. *Written Communication*, 4, 343-369.

Straub, R. (1997). Students' reactions to teacher comments: An Exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31(1), 91-119.

Zamel, V. (1985). What unskilled ESL student do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-258.

----------. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 697-715.

----------. (1991). Acquiring language, literacy, and academic discourse: Entering new conversations. *College ESL*, 1(1). 10-18.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The writer, the teacher, and the text: Example from Taiwanese EFL College Students

Author(s): Feng-mTng Chi

Corporate Source: Paper presented at the 12th World Congress on Applied Linguistics

Publication Date: August 2, '99

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is g to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottor the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED I

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, perm reproduction and dissemination in micr only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees anc system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here please

Signature: [signature]

Printed Name/Position/Title: Feng-mTng Chi, Associate Professor

Organization/Address: National Chung Cheng University
#168, Tren Hsiang st., N. District, Taichung, Taiwan. ROC (404)

Telephone: 04)272-0411 ext. 6367

FAX: 8865-22-0495

E-Mail Address: folfmc@ccunix.ccu.edu.tw

Date: April 11, 2000

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly avail and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent documents that cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price Per Copy:
Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant a reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and addres

Name:
Address:

V.WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, which will forward your materials to appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse.

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguisitics
4646 40th Street NW
Washington, DC 20016-1859

(800) 276-9834/ (202) 362-0700
e-mail: eric@cal.org