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The issue of text appropriation is rarely explored in EFL classrooms where the teachers are native speakers of English. In this study we highlight how the ideology of NESTs influences students’ feedback practices. Two Korean EFL students seemingly welcomed teacher comments into their texts to make their revision process more manageable. By relinquishing their control, they welcome the appropriative behavior the teacher brings as the native English speaker. They believe that appropriating the behavior of the native English-speaking teacher is not only beneficial, but necessary in shaping their English discourse. Nonetheless, the students struggled in the feedback and revision cycles to negotiate between their hegemonic beliefs and the expectations of their native English-speaking teacher. In this sense, EFL students’ writing is always in foreclosure from the native English-speaking teachers, as EFL students are overshadowed by the ideology of NESTs.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Providing feedback on students’ written text is a complex process. Most writing teachers and students acknowledge the need or benefit of teacher feedback, as it can contribute to improving students’ writing ability through helpful comments and the revision process. However, the process of giving feedback and utilizing this feedback has extensively been thought of as a linear one that involves teacher and the student only (Goldstein, 2001; 2005). This view of the process overlooks the contextual forces operating on the teacher and student alike and assumes that the student paper and written teacher comments are made in isolation (Goldstein, 2005). In reality, this is not the case.

In fact, teachers and students work within complex contexts as they write, comment, and revise. This context is a unique combination of factors that both teachers and students bring to the process within which the writing, commenting, and revising takes place, as Goldstein (2001) rightly points out. In Korea, for example, students bring their beliefs that native English-speaking teachers are superior to non-native English-speaking teachers (Jeon, 2009). In such EFL contexts, “the ideology of native English-speaking teachers (NESTs)” (Wang & Lin, 2013) is present in every corner of the language classroom.

The dominant and deeply established ideology of NESTs (Braine, 1999; Brutt-Griffler & Samin, 1999; Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 2003; Holliday, 2005; Phillipson, 1992) “is essentially linked to the process of sustaining asymmetrical relations of power – that is, to the process of maintaining domination” (Thompson, 1984, p. 4). Again, NESTs may be inadvertently and unwittingly involved in what Cummins (2000) calls “coercive relations of power” by their superiority in the ability to use English spontaneously in diverse communicative situations (Liu, 2010; Medgyes, 2001; Moussu, 2006).

Under such circumstances, the ideology of NESTs may directly influence pedagogical spaces of teacher feedback within EFL classrooms: Native English-speaking teachers intervene in students’ texts by being too authoritative and direct in their feedback. Because of the hierarchical nature of the NS-NNS relationship, EFL students feel obligated to follow the NEST’s comments (Hyland, 2000). EFL students unquestionably “foreclose” their text to the hand of the NESTs and accept whatever response the NESTs provide them in responding to their texts. In time, such attitudes inextricably link with Canagarajah’s (2004) “ideological subjectivity” of non-native speakers.

Reid (1994) spoke out strongly against what she called the “myths of appropriation,” arguing that writing teachers discard fear of text appropriation and instead provide abundant linguistic and cultural information through feedback. Reid went on to point out that because “[ESL writers’] linguistic, content, contextual, and rhetorical schemata differ, they often have problems with the identification and fulfillment of U.S. audience expectations” (p. 282). Therefore, “[t]hese ESL students have extraordinary needs” (ibid.).
However, although many researchers, like Reid (1994), exaggerate the influence of social context, they often overlook “the EFL context” where “native speaker norms” (Kirkpatrick, 2006) are promoted and the ideology of native speakers as ideal English teachers is adopted.

In light of the ideology of NESTs and ideological subjectivity, we now need to investigate the question of text appropriation. Accordingly, we will investigate how a native English-speaking teacher gets into a Korean EFL student’s texts and injects his/her own meaning into them during the feedback process. We will also investigate which ideological subjectivity Korean EFL students choose in an EFL writing class and consequently what type of strategies they use for handling teacher feedback in their revisions. We have chosen to focus on two students with the understanding that a case study allows for in-depth understanding of particular individuals in particular contexts (Hood, 2009).

2. THE IDEOLOGY OF NESTS IN EFL TEXT APPROPRIATION

Responding to student writing has always been central to teaching writing. Historically, the first major set of research studies and reviews on response to student writing appeared during the 1980s. In the research-based papers of Sommers (1982) and Brannon and Knoblauch (1982), and the state-of-the-art article published by Knoblauch and Brannon (1981), the authors’ assessment of the entire endeavor of teacher commentary on student writing, including the marking of student errors, was quite negative. Sommers (1982) criticized the teacher commentary as “arbitrary and idiosyncratic” and “hostile and meanspirited...” (p. 149). These authors were among the first to raise the issue of text appropriation when teachers provide written comments to students’ writing.

Brannon and Knoblauch (1982) alerted writing teachers to the dangers of responding to students’ writings based on “Ideal Text” (p. 159) and not fully considering the students’ intent. They also challenged the notion of the “Ideal Text,” arguing that teachers disempower and demotivate students by using their commentary to lead students into producing the type of text teachers want to see rather than the meaning that student writers intended to convey. Indeed, one of the major ways that teachers appropriate their students’ texts is by reading them without knowing for what purpose the student is writing the text. Sommers (1982) succinctly pointed out the problem as follows:

The teacher appropriates the text from the student by confusing the student’s purpose in writing the text with her own purpose in commenting. Students make the changes the teacher wants rather than those that the student perceives are necessary, since the
teachers’ concerns imposed on the text create the reasons for the subsequent changes. (pp. 149-150)

A number of second language (L2) researchers also have debated on whether text appropriation is an issue which should be considered in teacher’s feedback to student writing. However, L2 researchers have claimed that L2 writers are significantly different from native speakers in their linguistic, rhetorical and cultural knowledge (see Silva, 1993). Leki (1990) points out that the notion of appropriation may not be relevant in L2 contexts because “L2 students have a smaller backlog of experience with English grammatical or rhetorical structure to fall back on, not having had the same exposure to those structures as native speakers have had” (p. 59). She further explains that such a “peculiar situation of L2 writers makes adoption of [nonprescriptive interventions] somewhat more problematic for the L2 writing teacher” (ibid.).

Ferris (1997, 2003) also refers to the “unique status” of L2 students. This “unique status” means the success experienced in L1 settings may not be replicated in L2 classrooms and the notion of appropriation may be irrelevant. Furthermore, Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) have warned that “in empowering students to retain ownership of their writing, we force them into roles for which they are not prepared” (p. 142). Reid (1994) has been an even stronger critic of what she refers to as the myth of appropriation, claiming that teachers are failing to provide useful feedback out of fear of being appropriative. In Tardy’s (2006) words, “Reid at least partially neutralized the fear of appropriation by arguing that feedback provides important scaffolding for learning to write for an academic community, by giving students a sense of how the community might respond to their texts” (p. 62).

Although text appropriation has been a pressing issue (Goldstein, 2004; Hall, 1995; Reid, 1994; Tardy, 2006), the issues of text appropriation in L2 contexts “are generally given a nod but are not studied in depth” (Tardy, 2006, p. 66). In fact, such issues are rarely explored in EFL contexts. Furthermore, appropriation can be particularly serious when the ideology of NESTs is involved in the issue of teacher response in the EFL writing classroom. Too often, the ideology of NESTs not only denotes conceptual and notional ideas, but also involves practices through which such ideas are enacted.

In spite of the pervasive arguments against the native/non-native separation “by virtue of [one’s] better language proficiency and stronger cultural affiliation” (Medgyes, 2001, p. 431), the ideology of NESTs involves the tendency to view non-native speakers of English as “less skilled,” unable to compete with native speakers on their own linguistic terms. Paradoxically, Jenkins (1998) points out, it is teachers and learners from monolingual EFL settings who are typically doubtful that deviation from “native speaker norms” is acceptable. The ideology of NESTs, the dichotomized vision of native speaker–nonnative speaker not only is linguistically based (Moussu & Llurda, 2008), but also socially present
Text Appropriation as Foreclosure From Native English-speaking Teachers in EFL Writing

(Luk & Lin, 2007) in Korea. In fact, the ideology of NESTs as superior teachers in practices of English language teaching (ELT) (Pennycook, 1998) is readily adopted by the Korean government and materialized in the NEST hiring policies. In turn, the Korean government and its people vigorously subscribe and contribute to the wider circulation of the ideology of NESTs (Jeon, 2009).

As illustrated in Figure 1, the native English-speaking teacher, by virtue of his or her privileged status, is called upon by EFL learners to make authoritative pronouncements on matters such as written comments on students’ papers. As expected, NESTs are described as legitimate informants who can provide students with the norms and rules of English. Meanwhile, NESTs intervene in their students’ writing by making directive suggestions in their feedback. It is only natural then, that NEST’s feedback would be uncritically welcomed or accepted by EFL students who are very much like Sperling and Freedman’s (1987) “good girl” writer.

**FIGURE 1**
The Ideology of NESTs in Teacher Feedback and EFL Students’ Revision Cycles

It may well be the case that the majority of EFL students continue to adhere to the pervasive “native and non-native English speaker hierarchy” (Ruecker, 2011), which gives special and superior value to feedback from native English-speaking teachers (Huh, Lee, & Kim, 2013). In these circumstances, native speakers of English are regarded as having greater power than non-native speakers and as holding a dominant position, since they have a greater volume of linguistic resources. By and large, non-native students are subject
to symbolic domination, lending the legitimacy of using English only to native teachers of English as well (Bourdieu, 1991). It, therefore, becomes logical to expect that the native-speaker status would perhaps be the most influential attribute in the potential danger of teacher appropriation in EFL contexts.

3. THE STUDY

The study adopted a case study methodology. Focusing on teacher feedback that responded to students’ ideas and organization as well as their errors in grammar and mechanics, we examine how teacher decisions override student intentions in student writing process, and we highlight how the ideology of NESTs impacts students’ revisions.

3.1. Participants

This study included two EFL college student volunteers who took a course entitled “English Reading and Writing.” In this course, students had several writing assignments, usually integrated with course readings: narrative, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and argumentative essays. Once they completed first drafts, students engaged in peer response activity. After peer response, students turned in draft after draft, and a native English-speaking teacher, Professor M (pseudonym), who had taught this course several times before, commented on each draft, asking them to rewrite the piece but not evaluating the writing directly.

Originally, we recruited a total of three students for a previous case study (Huh et al., 2013). We focus here on just two students, Sung and Jong (pseudonyms) because they did not have much awareness of the native English-speaking teacher’s taking control of their text. Indeed, Sung and Jong incorporated teacher’s comments verbatim into their rewrites. Moreover, they considered that it was native English-speaking teachers’ job to mark their texts. Both were males in their mid-20s and were majoring in English Language Education at a large research university in Seoul, Korea. Neither had experience in English-speaking countries.

We noted that for Sung and Jong, writing is a difficult skill in the native language, Korean. Writing in English is certainly more challenging, and potentially stressful, given the constraints imposed by the English language. They had roughly equivalent writing proficiency, as determined by a holistic evaluation of all the papers each had written in the English Reading and Writing course and they could be classified as “Advanced” according to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012.
3.2. Data Collection and Analysis

The data consisted of all the students’ drafts and revisions in response to teacher comments. For data triangulation (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000), individual interviews with each student were administered once. The interviews were conducted in Korean, and later translated into English. The interviews were conducted separately and tape recorded. Each lasted approximately one hour. Before the interviews commenced, students were informed of the purpose of the study and of how the information they provided would be used. The interviews themselves were semi-structured, in that they had a structured overall framework (McDonough & McDonough, 1997), but they were also heavily directed by the students’ responses.

Students’ drafts were readily available for clarification purposes during the interviews. Thus, a part of the interview centered upon a prompted interview. The main advantage of using a prompt is that it aids the recall of information, producing greater quantities of accurate data (Gass & Mackey, 2000). We hoped that the use of a prompt, in this case a piece of the student’s draft containing teacher written feedback and rewrite, would allow the students to recall the thoughts they had when attending to teacher feedback and utilizing it in their revisions. After the interviews, there was some information missing, and then we conducted follow-up interviews. The students offered additional information that they had not mentioned during the interview.

Using intertextual tracing of students’ texts and interviews with two students, all data sources were closely examined and triangulated within and across data sources. By first investigating each student’s revisions along with teacher comments and later triangulating them with their interviews, we documented students’ personal reactions in relation to how they interpreted and reacted to the native English-speaking teacher’s feedback. In particular, we focused on the teacher’s appropriation of the students’ text.

4. FINDINGS

The findings show that two EFL students in this study, Sung and Jong1, willingly accept their NEST’s feedback for a variety of reasons. This is rooted in the ideology of NESTs (Holliday, 2005; Huh et al., 2013; Ruecker, 2011; Wang & Lin, 2013) and ideological subjectivity (Canagarajah, 2004). Now we turn our attention to the students—Sung and Jong.

---

1 Sung’s and Jong’s texts were originally published in Huh et al. (2013).
4.1. Sung: Suffering from NESTs’ Copyright

Professor M’s comments focused on grammar, accuracy of vocabulary, and organization. Sung accepted every comment given by the teacher, incorporating the teacher feedback verbatim into his final drafts, professing: “Professor M certainly had a much better command of English. His English is authentic, most correct, or standard.” While he expressed a definite preference for the feedback he received from Professor M, Sung can’t easily eradicate his own patterns of thinking and writing: Professor M asked him to get straight to the point, not spiral around it. Sung was uncomfortable modifying his rhetoric. Sung told us repeatedly in his interview how frustrated he was that he could not structure his thought into English patterns in this way:

Whenever I write in English, I state my points at the end of my writing. This is my style. However, Professor M said, I have to state my points clearly in English. Well, that’s different from my writing style. I mean, when writing in Korean, I may not state my points directly. Professor M said to me, Avoid veering off the topic! Never go around your points indirectly! (laugh).

The overriding and inescapable role of evaluator, in addition to the teacher’s status as the expert, adds an authoritarian dimension to the teacher’s attempts at collaboration, leaving students with a fundamental lack of choice when it comes to revising their writing based on the teacher’s comments. For Sung, the grade is the bottom line, so he acquiesced willingly, reshaping his writing according to the teacher comments with each subsequent draft. He complied with the values and expectation of his “evaluative readers” (Comfort, 2001, p. 100). To quote Sung further:

And for good grade…I thought the only reader of my writing was the teacher and my grade was solely determined by his criteria. Thus, I had not dared to defy his comments. And…more importantly, he is a native English speaker.

In the following writing, Professor M mentioned the need for additional “reasons” in J’s thesis statement. He thus asked him to “state exact statement using 3 reasons” (see Table 1). Sung incorporated the three reasons on the revised rewrite. Sung is then “put into the awkward position of having to accommodate… the teacher-reader’s expectations about how the assignment should be completed” (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982, p. 158). Even though Sung managed to decipher the comment, he still felt uncomfortable with changing his writing style.
TABLE 1

Contrasts in Sung’s First Draft and Rewrite - Compare and Contrast Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First draft</th>
<th>Rewrite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By comparing Korea’s education with Finland’s education, I will reveal the</td>
<td>By comparing Korea’s education with Finland’s education, I will reveal the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortcomings in Korea’s education. Unlike impressive educational competence</td>
<td>shortcomings in Korea’s education. Unlike impressive educational competence in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the world, you will see lots of unexamined drawbacks.</td>
<td>world, you will see lots of unexamined drawbacks. I will compare the two countries in terms of educational principle, general doctrine of secondary high school and student’s efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Underlining: Revision based upon teacher feedback

Sung received similar feedback in another paper. Professor M wrote on that paper: “Write the thesis statement containing three reasons.” To Professor M, Sung’s writing was out of focus because he was employing a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which violated the expectations of the native reader. In revision, Sung stated all three main reasons succinctly in the thesis statement of his argumentative writing (see Table 2). However, Sung said, “I write a bad paper because I have difficulty mastering the logic of English.” And further, “My paragraph begins with a general statement. And then develops that statement by a long series of specific illustrations. I wonder if there is something wrong with it…”

Sung gradually learns a crippling lesson about academic writing—no decision about organization is valid until Professor M says it is valid. This is an obvious example of egregious appropriation. Here, we see Sung adopting a non-native identity. Sung strongly believed that English writing was best taught by NESTs, saying that “non-NESTs are very unlikely to succeed in educating students about English rhetorical structures.” Sung takes it for granted that NESTs are more ideal writing teachers than non-NESTs based on linguistic and cultural grounds.
TABLE 2
Contrasts in Sung’s First Draft and Rewrite - Argumentative Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First draft</th>
<th>Rewrite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has not been so long time that people started recognizing the serious influences of smoking on health in the Korean society. Do you have the experience of walking behind the smoker despite you are a non-smoker? Maybe your answer is yes. What kind of feeling comes up from your mind when you are in that situation? Most people will say it is uncomfortable. However, there are even more serious effects if you walk behind the smoking person. Now I will talk about why the smoking should be banned in the public places.</td>
<td>It has not been so long that people started recognizing the serious influences of smoking on health in Korean society. Do you have the experience of walking behind the smoker despite being a non-smoker? Maybe your answer is yes. What kind of feeling comes into your mind when you are in that situation? Most people will say it is uncomfortable. However, there are even more serious effects if you walk behind the smoking person. Here are three reasons why the smoking should be banned in the public places. Smoking in the public places can harm other people’s health. It can also lead adolescents to follow the smokers’ behaviors. Lastly, smokers in public areas can infringe upon non-smokers’ rights around them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold: Teacher’s direct correction; Underlining: Revision based upon teacher feedback

On the narrative essay, Professor M wrote the comment: “The title could be more creative.” Despite his tendency to incorporate every teacher comment in his subsequent revision, Sung did not change the original title, “The Forbidden Secret.” The teacher’s comment as such gives no direction to Sung about how to make the revision, and Sung wonders what it means to be creative. As Sung puts it, “I don’t have a clear idea of how to be…creative. I think it’s better to leave the title as is...” Hence, Professor M appropriates Sung’s text by controlling the choice, purposefully or accidentally, that Sung made.

4.2. Jong: More Than Welcoming of Teacher’s Priorities

Jong equated improvement in English with teacher feedback. In his words, “feedback is important because it can help me find out what I got wrong.” With this focus, Jong perceived his native English-speaking teacher as “a judge of grammaticality” (Scott, 1996, p. 120), explaining that:

Just after I finished military service, I came back to school. Because I did not use English for a while, my English ability would have declined. I really appreciated Professor M’s making direct correction on grammar and mechanics, and on vocabulary use. So I relied on teacher commentary. I don’t think I could become perfectly close to native speakers, but I think I can approximate to some extent.
Um… with practice and with help of native English-speaking teacher.

As such, the teacher gave written error corrections on every single paper Jong wrote. Jong was amazed that his teacher would invest so much time responding to his first drafts. Such feedback, focused predominantly on sentence-level errors, sent important messages to Jong about how his writing was being viewed by the native English-speaking teacher (Séror, 2008). Jong admires his teacher’s native proficiency, saying, “I was never doubtful about my professor’s ability and my trust in his ability was quite high...I had trust in my professor. He was a native English speaker.”

Jong further considered “standard English as the only legitimate form of the language and monolingual native speakers... as its only legitimate speakers and owners” (Pavlenko, 2003, p. 257). Jong comes to believe that “some types of English are ‘more English’ than others” (Lippi-Green, 2004, p. 292). Here, the native speakers of English receive a large amount of privilege because their dialect is perceived as the norm. In this regard, Jong portrayed his teacher as an ideal English language teacher. This point was firmly demonstrated in his interview:

He was a native English speaker. I think native English speakers are ideal teachers. Because my professor is a native English speaker, he had power over me...And he was a kind of criterion in the English-speaking community Thus, I felt forced to follow him. Yes, almost absolutely. Especially in the revision processes, I think he had nearly every power to control my writings. I had no doubt about his control at all. I did not have any criticism over his teaching.

Jong accepted all of his teacher’s feedback. He was forced to follow his suggestions because his professor had absolute authority to give him a grade. He states: “Um, and he had power over me. I mean, he was an assessor and I was a non-assessor. Almost absolutely, I think he had nearly every power to control my writings. Because he determined whether my writings were good or not, and what I was most concerned about was the grade on my writings.” As Reid (1994) puts it, “the specter of the final grade looms large in [Jong’s] mind (p. 287).”

Jong’s acceptance is readily apparent in the following excerpt, where he follows his teacher’s suggestion of “more description of the destruction of the storm in the first paragraph will make this essay more memorable,” as indicated in Table 3. The changes to Jong’s text illustrate a “hidden polemic” (Kamberelis & Scott, 1992) in which Professor M has recontextualized Jong’s original words, bringing in meaning that Jong had not intended. This excerpt indicates, once more, Jong’s concerns over the revision centered primarily on the native speaker’s perceived superior knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 1</th>
<th>First draft</th>
<th>Rewrite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once was on the TV news due to heavy rain in summer. In 2006 when I was a high school student, my class made a group tour to Gangwon-do on the summer vacation. We enjoyed ourselves playing soccer and swimming on the beautiful beach. It really was a nice trip until we heard the heavy rain would fall severely.</td>
<td>When people think about rain, some of them come up with various topics related to such as romance or relaxation hearing drizzling rain. What comes first to my mind when I see rain is nothing related to those emotional or soulful things; I just think of TV since I once was on the TV news due to heavy rain in summer. In 2006 when I was a high school student. . . It really was a nice trip until we heard the heavy rain would fall severely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 3</th>
<th>First draft</th>
<th>Rewrite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We stayed night in that school hearing the rain pour in despair. Everyone felt tired after sleeping in the uncomfortable classroom. Teachers were busy calling school what had happened to us, and students looked hopeless. …</td>
<td>We stayed the night in that school hearing the rain pour in despair. Everything was full of darkness and invisible except only when thunder lit the classroom. Everyone felt tired after sleeping in the uncomfortable classroom. Teachers were busy calling school what had happened to us, and students looked hopeless. …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold: Teacher’s direct correction; Underlining: Revision based upon teacher feedback

However, the following excerpt presents concrete evidence of the teacher’s appropriation of Jong’s text. In fact, the teacher “imposed [his] own idea of “Ideal Text” on the student’s writing (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982, p. 159) with his remark of “Too statistical. Delete it.” Unfortunately, when the teacher attempted to fix Jong’s text (Hyland, 2000), the Ideal Text seemed to exist only in his mind. As a result, Jong made unsuccessful revisions by conforming to the teacher’s suggestion wholesale (see Table 4). In producing the revised draft, Jong did not decide what to do but only how to do it. Jong made the changes his teacher wanted rather than those that he perceived were necessary, sacrificing his own intentions during the rewriting, “since the teachers’ concerns imposed on the text create the reasons for the subsequent changes” (Sommers, 1982, p. 149). After all, Jong succumbed to the teacher comment sacrificing his own intention during his rewriting.
TABLE 4

Contrasts in Jong's First Draft and Rewrite - Compare and Contrast Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First draft</th>
<th>Rewrite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, there is a difference between two movies in specific figures of box-office record. According to Internet Movie Database (IMDB), the total earnings of Titanic are 1.8 billion dollars and its overseas grosses are 1.2 billion dollars.</td>
<td>However, there is a difference between two movies in specific figures of box-office record. According to Internet Movie Database (IMDB), the total earnings of Titanic are 1.8 billion dollars and its overseas grosses are 1.2 billion dollars. On the other hand, Avatar earned 2.7 billion dollars all over the world, and its foreign grosses are more than 1.9 billion dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total gross of Avatar in Russia is twenty times more than that of Titanic; while Avatar recorded 120 million dollars.</td>
<td>The main factor of this difference is that the market of foreign countries is not more open and expanded compared to that of the past when Titanic was released. Also, the total income gap between the two movies is due to inflation and the development of technology. A ticket of a movie now costs two times more than that of twelve years ago. Moreover, most people watched Avatar with 3-dimensional, which is more expensive than 2-dimensional, and it caused the total box-office income to grow more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titanic earned only 5 million dollars, Avatar earned more than 100 million dollars.</td>
<td>Moreover, most people watched Avatar with 3-dimensional, which is more expensive than 2-dimensional, and it caused the total box-office income to grow more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Underlining: Parts deleted based on teacher feedback; Shading: Revision by student

It also seems clear that Professor M gave commentary that ignored Jong’s purpose for this particular text and attempted to shift that purpose. In addition, Professor M asked Jong to change the title he had initially created for his narrative writing. The essay, which described his experiences of being isolated due to heavy rain and being interviewed for a TV news report, was originally titled Being on the News by Rain. However, Professor M commented, “Don’t explain the story. Suggest with mystery.” Jong attempted to follow his teacher instruction by changing the title to Dancing in the Rain? Interview in the Rain!

In another example of the damage done to texts by inappropriate control, Jong detailed in an essay the similarities and differences between two famous movies, Titanic and Avatar, and gave it the title, Two Amazing Revolutions. At the end of the essay, Professor M wrote, “Title is a bit boring” without any concrete suggestions as to how to change it. Again, Jong
blindly accepted the teacher’s feedback and changed the title to The Movie That Became a Milestone, a title more mundane and boring than the one it replaced. Confronted with this, the teacher responded by controlling (co-opting, rewriting, correcting) Jong’s texts in order to obliterate the problem and alleviate his discomfort.

As the previous examples illustrate, commentary demanding that Jong should change a title is appropriation. Ironically, Jong always accepted his teacher appropriating his texts because of his perception of the teacher’s power as a native speaker. In other words, Jong’s respect for the status and power of his native English-speaking teacher allowed his teacher to subvert his work. Although his native English-speaking teacher may not have intended for Jong to sacrifice his own intentions or meanings to conform to teacher comments during the course of revision, Professor M was unwittingly engaged in “coercive relations of power” (Cummins, 2000, p. 44) by making these directive comments.

As a result, Jong internalizes the message that the directions imposed by the native English-speaking teacher are natural, objective, and legitimate (see Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001). If he does not fit, that is because there is something wrong with him, not with the NEST (Kanno, 2003). EFL learners, including Jong, in this context are often unable to achieve the “impose reception” (Bourdieu, 1991). We can see then that to “cede control of the text to the teacher” (Reid, 1994) may not be unusual in the native-non-native relationship between teacher and student.

In Jong’s argumentative essay, Professor M provided a comment that said “The refutation arguments of other side are not dealt with in-depth enough.” This type of rubber-stamped comment again points to a problem with the student’s writing, but it unfortunately does not give any direction for revision. Nevertheless, Jong followed this feedback as usual, painstakingly rearranging and adding to his original refutation paragraph (See Table 5).
Some people say that absolute grading has low dependability in that it can cause too general grading which is called “grade inflation.” While it may be true that absolute grading also has some side effects, relative grading is not a perfect solution to prevent the blind points of evaluation. As it is noted in the third and fourth paragraphs, relative grading also can cause unjust results to students in specific situations, which are inevitable. We should consider securing the objectivity of absolute grading rather than substitution of a grading system itself. Clear notice and validity of the criteria of evaluation should be obtained to persuade students to learn that their grades will be directly proportional to their effort into those unreasonable results of relative grading but also motivate students to study harder for themselves.

So far, we noted that Professor M played the role of gatekeeper in responding to student writing, in this role, he may (even unintentionally) appropriate student writing. In light of these circumstances, both Sung and Jong welcomed teacher comments into their texts to make their revision process more manageable. Ostensibly, welcoming teacher control is an opportunity for them to relinquish their will to control. However, by relinquishing their control, they are also welcoming the appropriative behavior the teacher brings via the power of the native English speaker. By extension, both students believe that such appropriative behavior is necessary when it comes to shaping their English discourse.
5. CONCLUSION

In this study, Sung and Jong had a rather reduced level of choice when dealing with teacher feedback. Whether this is due simply to a desire to please the teacher in order to receive good grades or because they have greater respect for the teacher's skill at writing is not at issue here. Both cases reflect a lack of critical evaluation of the feedback they received on their essays. This is because both students consider themselves a “dependent foreigner” as well as “blundering non-native speakers,” and their NEST as an “authoritative native-speaker” (Canagarajah, 2004). As a corollary, such “ideological subjectivity” in the EFL writing class made it virtually impossible for the students to take control of their own writing in the EFL classroom.

According to Reid’s (1994) view of responding to ESL/EFL students’ writing, a teacher’s goal is to help accommodate EFL students to the linguistic and rhetorical choices they make. Hence, students’ accommodation to such choices in EFL writing is valued and encouraged. However, the teaching of NESTs’ cultural and rhetorical knowledge to their students invokes “the danger of perpetuating established power hierarchies” (Connor, 2002, p. 505). Indeed, Sung and Jong struggled in the feedback and revision cycles to negotiate their hegemonic beliefs and expectations of their native English-speaking teacher.

Widdowson (1994) argues that “[English] is not a possession which [native speakers] lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold” (p. 385). Ironically, Sung and Jong never voluntarily retained ownership over their own English writing. They thought that they could, and should, only copy the norms and rules of English provided through their native English-speaking teacher’s feedback. In this case, the ideology of NESTs strongly influenced students’ feedback practices. Clearly, the danger of text appropriation already looms large behind the ideology of NESTs. We reluctantly confess that EFL students’ writing is easily in foreclosure from native English-speaking teachers, as EFL students are overshadowed by the ideology of NESTs.
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