Taiwan Journal of TESOL
Vol. 16.1, 1-39, 2019 **DOI: 10.30397/TJTESOL.201904_16(1).0001**

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT EFL WRITING INSTRUCTION

Christine Chifen Tseng

ABSTRACT

Writing in L2 is considered a very challenging task by both teachers and students. Language teachers play a critical role in facilitating students' L2 writing development. Therefore, it is important to explore their beliefs about writing instruction as their beliefs exert influence on classroom practices. This study draws on the Repertory Grid Technique (RGT) to explore three teacher's beliefs about EFL writing instruction in senior high school in Taiwan. RGT, a qualitative inquiry evolving from Personal Construct Theory, involved three phases of data collection; firstly, the participant described activities in her writing class, which were later grouped and labeled. The activities were the elements, and the labels for activity groups were the constructs, which together formed a matrix for the participant to rate later. The rated matrix then underwent Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The participant's beliefs were extracted as a result of EFA and follow-up in-depth interviews; sources of their beliefs were identified from analysis of the interviews. The results yielded eight beliefs related to teacher involvement, reading-writing connection, structural knowledge, student efforts, students' background knowledge, error awareness, status of EFL writing, and writing as thinking. Five sources of beliefs were identified, including previous learning experience, personal writing experience, personal teaching experience, training from a master's program, and in-service training programs. Knowledge of teachers' beliefs gives the participants an opportunity to reflect on their own teaching; it also provides information for teacher training programs and in-service training programs on enhancing quality and efficacy of teachers' EFL writing instruction.

Key Words: EFL writing, teacher's belief, Repertory Grid Technique, teacher training

INTRODUCTION

Of the four language skills, writing is typically the last ability to be

trained and developed for most students learning a foreign language. Paragraph or essay writing is not taught until students enter secondary school or high school in Taiwan where English is learned as a foreign language (EFL). Writing has been regarded as the most difficult skill to learn by EFL learners. Likewise, teaching EFL writing is also considered a great challenge by many teachers (Hsu, 2005). Research has shown that teachers' beliefs considerably influence their classroom practice (Borg, 2015; Calderhead, 1996; Fives, Lacatena, & Gerard, 2015; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Snider & Roehl, 2007), meaning that teachers' beliefs about teaching EFL writing influences how they actually teach it, which is closely related to pedagogical efficacy. Therefore, understanding what shapes teachers' beliefs about EFL writing is important for teacher trainers in designing programs to prepare prospective teachers as competent EFL writing teachers. Especially in the context of senior high school in Taiwan, teachers are expected to prepare students for high stake writing tests in college entrance exams with limited teaching hours every week and a large class size. Their beliefs about EFL writing instruction and what has shaped their beliefs are worth exploring. A good knowledge of experienced teachers' beliefs and what has shaped their beliefs regarding writing instruction will help teacher educators better understand what contributes to the making of an EFL writing teacher and will equip prospective teachers with solid knowledge and skills to implement writing instruction on day one of their teaching career.

Ways to investigate teachers' beliefs are many, of which questionnaires and interviews are the most commonly used assessment tools (Borg, 2015; Schraw & Olafson, 2015). These two methods and others are either qualitative or quantitative and are often used in conjunction with another method to triangulate the data. This study applied the Repertory Grid Technique (RGT) to explore three senior high school teachers' beliefs concerning EFL writing instruction. RGT, as a verbal commentary approach to beliefs (Borg, 2015), evolved from Kelly's (1955) Personal Construct Theory[1]. Viewing every person as "his own scientist" (Fransella, Bell & Bannister, 2004, p. 5), Kelly suggests that people strive to make sense out of their world in idiosyncratic ways and that they "create and re-create an implicit theoretical framework which", well or badly designed, forms their "personal construct system"

[1] Its fundamental postulate is that "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events" (Kelly, 1955/1991, p. 32).

(Fransella et al., 2004, p. 5). Portrayed as a method "that has scientific and artistic aspects to its execution" (Pope & Denicolo, 1993, p. 531), RGT has merits that other methods do not to investigate beliefs. It relies on both in-depth interviews in line with the processes of grounded theory (Cassell & Walsh, 2004; Charmaz, 2006) and statistical analyses of the raw data; it has advantages pertaining to both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Pope & Denicolo, 1993). Moreover, RGT engages participants actively in the process, which gives the researcher access to how participants construe and make sense of their world in their own words (Cassell & Walsh, 2004).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Influence of Teachers' Beliefs on Classroom Practice

A belief is a proposition, either consciously or unconsciously held, that is accepted as true by an individual and is evaluative and "imbued with emotive commitment" (Borg, 2001, p. 186). A person's beliefs reflect his past experiences (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), underlie his "attitudes and subjective norms" (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980, p. 62) and "serve as a guide to thought and behavior" (Borg, 2001, p. 186). People may hold different, even contradictory beliefs about the same event, entity, or situation, depending on their individual social and cultural backgrounds, personal experiences, and evaluations (Nespor, 1987). Furthermore, people's behaviors are a manifestation of their aggregated beliefs. As Rokeach (1980) put it, "the kind of action it [a belief] leads to is dictated strictly by the content of the belief" (p. 114).

Teachers' beliefs refer to what teachers believe about education and the situation where their teaching takes place (Pajares, 1992). They can be "preconceptions and implicit theories" (Clark, 1988, p. 5) or "the rich store of knowledge that teachers have that affects their planning and their interactive thoughts and decisions" (Clark & Peterson, 1986, p. 258). Teachers' beliefs can be "tacit, often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms and academic material to be taught" (Kagan, 1992, p. 60). Briefly put, teachers' beliefs are "thoughts, conceptions and assumptions held by teachers, consciously or unconsciously, concerning what takes place in the classroom" (Tseng, 2013, p. 5).

Previous studies on teachers' beliefs have made the following findings. First, teachers' beliefs cannot be inferred directly from classroom

practices (Fives et al., 2015), because one practice may derive from diverse beliefs or one belief may result in divergent teaching practices. Sometimes, teachers' practices in class may even seem to be at odds with specific beliefs they hold (Phipps & Borg, 2009). Meanwhile, teachers are not necessarily aware of all their beliefs, nor do they always possess language they need to describe and label their beliefs (Kagan, 1992). Second, teachers' beliefs play an important role in their teaching practice (Barcelos & Kalaja 2003; Borg, 2005, 2015; Calderhead, 1996; Kagan, 1992; Uibu, Salo, Ugaste, & Rasku-Puttonen, 2017). Based on their teaching beliefs, teachers organize information and knowledge and impart it through teaching tasks they design. Third, teachers' beliefs are shaped by their experiences as students, called "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975, p. 61). Finally, teachers' beliefs do not stay the same over time (Fives, et al., 2015); some beliefs are more resistant to change than others, and the earlier a belief is incorporated into a belief structure, the more difficult it is to be changed. Given these findings, to explore teachers' beliefs, it would not be sufficient to observe class or have teachers state their beliefs. Researchers need to employ other methods to deduce teachers' beliefs; teachers' past learning and teaching experience also needs to be taken into account so that a panorama of teachers' beliefs is more likely to be obtained.

EFL Teacher Education and EFL Writing Instruction

In her study of teacher training in EFL writing and teacher learning, Lee (2010) depicts teaching about how to teach writing in Hong Kong as "undeveloped" (p. 145). Undergraduate programs in Hong Kong do not usually address writing theories, and in professional teacher training programs, the teaching of writing has limited coverage and is usually subsumed under a more general course of ELT methodology. The situation in Taiwan closely resembles Lee's depiction. Consider three representative TESOL teacher training programs for secondary education at three public universities. According to the curricula posted on their official websites, at the undergraduate level, only one university offers an elective course specifically addressing the teaching of writing; their graduate programs for TESOL offer one elective course on writing instruction. Generally speaking, preservice teachers have limited, if any, training on teaching EFL writing by the time they start to teach writing.

Apart from formal training, teachers may build up beliefs about and

skills in teaching EFL writing from other sources. Lortie (1975) views teacher learning as a process of work socialization, wherein individuals internalize the subculture of the group that they associate with in work. For teachers, the process of work socialization begins on the day they become students themselves. Lortie refers to such special occupational effects from schooling as an "apprenticeship of observation" (p. 61), as "being a student is like serving an apprenticeship in teaching" (p. 71) in which a student observes the teacher, evaluates the activity and then consciously or unconsciously replicates or avoids such teaching practice in his/her future classroom. In fact, teachers' previous experiences as students have been found to influence their later teaching practice. Therefore, it would be safe to say that teachers' learning experience can be a source of certain teaching beliefs they hold. However, apprenticeship of observation has some limitation. For one thing, students see what teachers do from their own point of view, which may not exactly correspond to teachers' intentions. For another, students do not participate in teaching all the time. Lortie therefore indicates the importance of teacher training experiences in offsetting beginning teachers' individualistic and traditional experiences to build "a shared technical culture" (p. 67). In other words, in preparing prospective teachers, teacher training programs should provide training experiences for teaching EFL writing, in theory and in practice, both of which are crucial for effective writing classes.

Teacher learning may also continue after formal training is completed. Teacher learning is a process of engaging in the practice of and gaining knowledge about teaching; it can occur in many aspects of teaching practice, which is what Borko (2004) termed "situated learning" (p. 4). Therefore, to better understand teacher learning, the wider social context should be taken into account (Uibu et al., 2017). Regarding teaching EFL writing, high school teachers may build up their knowledge and teaching skills through interactions with colleagues and students, professional development activities, in-service training programs, or any other activities that take place in the teaching milieu, all of which may have a role to play in shaping their beliefs.

Teachers' Beliefs about EFL Writing Instruction

L2 writing instruction has been a great challenge for teachers. Primary and secondary English teachers in Hong Kong consider writing their

weakest competency both in teaching and in proficiency (Hirvela & Law, 1991; Lee, 1996). In taking government-mandated language proficiency tests, English teachers in Hong Kong have scored the lowest in writing (Lee, 2010). English teachers see themselves more as teachers of language than as teachers of writing (Lee, 1996; Reichelt, 2009). Similar perceptions of EFL writing instruction have been identified among high school English teachers in Taiwan. Hsu (2005) investigated senior high school teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction through questionnaires and interviews, and found that five of the eight interviewees considered teaching EFL writing the most difficult task to teach among the four language skills. About 55% of the 65 respondents considered the training that they had in university or graduate school unhelpful for delivering writing instruction in senior high school, and about 71% of the respondents considered that their one-year practicums did not help either.

Previous studies have established teachers' perception of EFL writing instruction as a difficult task, their lack of confidence in conducting the teaching of writing, and the questionable helpfulness of teacher training programs and practicums. Yet, how EFL teachers perceive EFL writing, how they learn to teach writing, why they teach the way they do, and what has shaped their beliefs about EFL writing remain unexplored (Lee, 2013). This study addresses this research gap. Following Tseng (2013), I define teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction as thoughts, conceptions and assumptions held by EFL teachers, consciously or unconsciously, concerning all arrangements and activities related to EFL writing before, during, and after class. By this formulation, the aforementioned studies do not address teachers' beliefs in enough depth to reveal the repertoire of thoughts and assumptions about EFL writing instruction held by teachers.

Application of RGT to Explore Teachers' Beliefs

RGT consists of three main components: elements, constructs, and a linking mechanism (Reger, 1990). Jankowicz (2004) adds another element "topic" to it; a topic is "the subject-matter of a particular repertory grid" (p. 295). Put briefly, a topic is the region of interest of the RGT interview, the domain of investigation. Elements are "the objects of attention within the domain of investigation" (Tan & Hunter, 2002, p. 43); they are examples of the topic. Take this study for example. The topic is a typical EFL writing class of the participant's, and the classroom practice

comprises the elements. Constructs are the ways the teacher categorizes and differentiates between the elements. A linking mechanism is the way the teacher judges each element relative to each construct; it defines the relationship between elements and constructs.

The whole RGT procedure consists of five stages: eliciting elements, eliciting constructs, completing the grid, analysis, and interpretation (Beail, 1985). There is no perfect number for elements or constructs, though the greater the number, the greater the likelihood of being representative[2]. Once the elements are in place, elicitation of constructs can begin by applying the triadic method, in which the participant is asked to state how two of the elements are alike and thus different from the third one; the distinguishing feature forms a construct. It is vital that the elements and the constructs be stated in the participant's language, not the researcher's (Munby, 1983). The triad may go on until the participant thinks the list of constructs is exhausted (Pope & Keen, 1981). Then a grid is set up for subsequent element sorting.

Three most commonly applied ways of element sorting are dichotomizing (tick-cross), rank ordering, and rating scales. Among them, rating offers greater latitude in distinguishing between elements than dichotomizing, and it is not as demanding as rank ordering in terms of the degree of differentiation taxed on the participant (Beail, 1985; Pope & Keen, 1981). Each element will be assigned a rating which reflects its relation to a particular construct. When each cell in the grid is assigned a rating, the raw grid is ready for further statistical analysis. Exploratory factor analysis of the grid will reveal the relationships among constructs, which serves as the basis for a second in-depth interview. The second interview is to identify beliefs and principles underlying these factors or relationships under the co-efforts of the researcher and the participant. Active participation of the participant is a very important feature of RGT. It is advisable to take a flexible attitude when the participant feels it necessary to make adjustments to elements, constructs or categorization of constructs (Fransella et al., 2004; Munby, 1982, 1983; Pope & Keen, 1981). Participants' perspectives make belief statements meaningful and serve as a way to triangulate the data (Huang, 2007).

RGT has been frequently used in many subfields of education, such as science (Chen, 2005), mathematics, music education (Kuo, 2006) as

[2] In practice, Pope and Keen (1981) considered eight to 15 elements provide a useful basis for eliciting a reasonable grid; yet Alban-Meteaf (1997) and Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) considered optimal numbers range from 10 to 25.

well as teaching writing (Huang, 2007) to explore teachers' and students' beliefs (Lan, 1995; Liu, 1999; Munby, 1982, 1984; Nespor, 1987; Olson, 1981). For example, Lan (1995) investigated 13 junior high school teachers' beliefs about teaching Chinese by applying RGT and identified factors that shaped their beliefs. With a focus on teaching Chinese writing, Huang (2007) applied RGT to investigate six junior high school teachers' beliefs. The result yielded 20 beliefs in five categories, and six factors were derived that shaped these beliefs. Compared with Hsu's (2005) investigation of high school teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction, Huang's (2007) study delved more into what underlies teachers' thoughts and behaviors about teaching writing, and the beliefs thus abstracted served better to underlie teachers' attitudes and subjective norms about teaching writing. By contrast, Hsu's (2005) investigation reflected more on teachers' perceptions of teaching EFL writing within their own educational milieu. Replicating Lan's (1995) study, I conducted a case study to explore an English teacher's beliefs about English talented program implementation (Tseng, 2013). Thirty-one elements and 17 constructs were elicited; after factor analysis, the rated grid yielded six meta-constructs. With proper labeling, these six meta-constructs formed the participating teachers' "working beliefs" (p. 30) about English talented program implementation. These studies prove that RGT enables the exploration of teachers' beliefs that underlie their teaching practice.

The Study

RGT was applied to explore three Taiwanese high school teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction and to identify sources of these beliefs. In particular, the following two research questions were addressed:

(1) What are the beliefs held by teachers about EFL writing instruction in senior high school?
(2) What has shaped these beliefs about EFL writing instruction?

METHODS

Participants

The three participating teachers, Ling, June, and Sue (all pseudonyms), are English teachers from public senior high schools in central Taiwan.

They were recruited for this study as experienced teachers who have frequently joined in-service teacher training courses and showed considerable curiosity about discovering their own teaching beliefs through RGT interviews. Ling obtained her bachelor's degree from a public university in southern Taiwan, majoring in English literature, and her master's degree in ESL from the UK; she has taught for 15 years. June obtained her bachelor's degree in English literature from a public university in northern Taiwan and her master's degree in linguistics from another Taiwanese university; she has taught for 16 years. Sue got her bachelor's degree from a teacher training university in northern Taiwan, majoring in English, and her master's degree in linguistics from the same university. She has 17 years of teaching experience.

Procedure

Elicitation of elements and constructs

With each participant, I first explained the theoretical basis of RGT, summarized Tseng's (2013) study, and explained how the method could be replicated to explore teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction. Then I began the elicitation by asking: What do you do to teach English writing? Please recall all the activities and preparation you do, and what you ask your students to do before, during, and after the writing class. Each activity was written down verbatim on a card, either in Chinese or in English, depending on which language she used, which formed an element of the grid. The elicitation of elements went on until the teacher felt the list included most, if not all, of her teaching activities. All of the elicited elements were reconfirmed by the teacher. Appendix A shows all of the elements elicited from all three participants.

The triad method was then applied to elicit constructs. I picked three cards from the pile, and the teacher would pinpoint a quality shared by two of the activities while differentiating them from the third one. I wrote down this quality and its contrasting quality on two separate cards, which formed two constructs. Then I chose another set of three cards and repeated the procedure to obtain two more constructs. The construct elicitation went on until the participating teacher felt that the list was complete. She went over the constructs to determine whether any should be deleted or revised. All of the constructs were reconfirmed later. The elements and constructs were made into a grid for later rating, and the interview was transcribed verbatim for later reference.

Rating and data processing

Each teacher then rated the degree of relatedness of the elements against each construct. A five-point Likert-type scale was applied, with 1 indicating "very low relatedness" and 5 indicating "highly related". Appendix B is an example of a completed raw grid. The grid data were then analyzed with the help of exploratory factor analysis from the SPSS package, yielding a rotated component matrix, which showed the loading of each construct under each component (or factor). Based on the constructs in each group, I extracted a meta-construct and formulated a statement, which was checked and confirmed by the participant in a follow-up interview.

Belief extraction and in-depth interviews

In the follow-up interviews, the participant first checked if any clashes existed among the constructs in each component; if so, she could move any construct to the group where she considered it fit better. Once this categorization was finalized, I assigned a label or theme (Cassell & Walsh, 2004) such as Student Effort or Teacher Involvement to each construct group. Then based on the theme and constructs in every group, a statement was formulated to represent this group. Each statement represented a belief regarding EFL writing instruction. The participant checked the statements, ensuring that they represented her beliefs; she might revise the statements where necessary. For the finalized beliefs, the participant further clarified how these beliefs related to her implementation of teaching EFL writing; she was also encouraged to reflect from where the beliefs might have originated.

Data Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis was performed on the grid data in SPSS. With "principal components" as the extraction method and "varimax with Kaiser normalization" as the rotation method, a rotated component matrix was produced. Varimax was applied on the assumption that the components were orthogonal and that constructs belonging to the same component were correlated.

RESULTS

There were 28 elements and 17 constructs elicited in Ling's first interview. After two rounds of processing, five factors were extracted. Table 1 summarizes the statistical analysis of Ling's constructs with factor loadings whose absolute value is below .3 being omitted. After scrutinizing the categorization of constructs, Ling made some rearrangements of the constructs. I subsequently modified the belief statements pertaining to Factors I and IV, which were later reconfirmed by Ling. Table 2 shows Ling's beliefs and their sources. Note that multiple sources can underlie one belief. For example, consider Ling's first belief about writing structure came from a combination of her master's program training, seminars and workshops held for in-service teachers, and articles and books she had read about EFL teaching. The other four beliefs, instead of originating from the formal training she had for an EFL teacher, derived from seminars, workshops, her personal experience as a learner, her teaching philosophy, and generally held beliefs about learning.

June's first interview elicited 25 elements and 16 constructs, and the principal component analysis of her grid data extracted four factors. Table 3 summarizes the statistical analysis of her constructs with factor loadings whose absolute value is below .3 being omitted. In a follow-up interview, after scrutinizing the categorization of constructs, she rearranged her constructs and explained each modification. I then accordingly modified the belief statements. June made some changes to the wording of the statements, but agreed with all the labels of each factor. The finalized belief statements and sources are summarized in Table 4. June's beliefs came from three main sources. The first was her personal experience as a learner, including student experiences as well as her personal learning preferences and writing experience. The second source was her teaching experience, including her observation of student performance. The third source was the training she had from an overseas in-service program along with an action research project she conducted to fulfill one of its requirements. Like Ling, June learned to teach EFL writing by teaching it. Her previous teacher training from a master's program did not form her beliefs on teaching EFL writing. Instead, her teaching beliefs resulted from her personal learning and teaching experiences and an in-service training program.

Sue's first interview elicited 30 elements and 16 constructs. The principal factor analysis of her complete grid data extracted five factors, each of which contained two to five constructs as shown in Table 5, which

omits factor loadings whose absolute value is below .3. This distribution of constructs was suitable for meta-construct extraction, negating the need for a second round of processing the grid data. In a following interview, Sue made some rearrangements of the construct categorization. Accordingly, I modified the belief statements, and Sue agreed with all the factor labels. The finalized belief statements as well as the sources of her beliefs are summarized in Table 6. Sue's beliefs were derived from five sources: previous learning experiences, personal teaching experiences, including observations of student performance, training from her master's program, personal experience as an EFL writer, and teacher in-service training programs, including seminars, workshops and self-study teacher resources. Unlike June, Sue acknowledged the training she had from her master's program. Moreover, Sue was in the habit of writing in English. She not only taught EFL writing, but wrote in English on a daily basis. Her experience in EFL writing prompted her to believe that EFL writing is purposeful and should be applied in everyday life.

There is one thing worth mentioning about the elements and constructs elicited from the participants. Four of Ling's elements (E8, E14, E16, E27) happened to overlap with four of her constructs (C2, C6, C10, C12), and two of June's elements overlapped with two of her constructs (C11, C15). No overlapping of elements and constructs was found in Sue's grid. Such overlapping can happen when some teaching activities are not described with enough specification. For example, when Ling was randomly presented with E6 (Teacher analyzes good writing samples), E25 (Students set up portfolio of their own) and E27 (Instruction on writing skills) and asked to point out one feature that is shared by two of the elements and distinguishes the other, she categorized E6 and E27 as related to instruction of writing skills, but not E25. As a result, the construct derived from this triad was "instruction of writing skills". Since RGT accentuates the engagement of the participants and the uniqueness of the way individuals categorize the world, such overlapping of some elements and constructs is acceptable as long as it does not hinder later rating (Easterby-Smith, 1980).

DISCUSSION

Teaching Practice on EFL Writing Instruction

The element repertoire elicited from the participants comprises 45

different teaching activities (See Appendix A). Among them, ten teaching activities were shared by all three participants. They all explained to students the criteria for evaluating the writing test in the college entrance exam, introduced different genres, taught writing skills, corrected students' writings, analyzed their common errors, gave students both in-class and take-home writing assignments, asked students to do peer editing and to revise their writings. These common teaching activities suggest that the writing task in the college entrance exam plays an important role in the three participants' writing classes even though none of the constructs nor the eight beliefs manifests such an exam-oriented emphasis. The three teachers all mentioned that when they evaluated students' writings, they gave scores based on the criteria provided by the College Entrance Exam Center; analyzing students' errors and having students revise their writing were done with the hope that students would produce written texts with fewer errors; take-home writing assignments were given to save class time for other teaching practice. It may be safe to say that the three participants placed much emphasis on preparing students for the college entrance exam in the writing class. Meanwhile, all the participants made it a point to correct students' writings and analyze their errors; they all stated that correcting errors is one good way to learn how to write better.

Eighteen other teaching activities were shared by two participants, and the remaining 17 activities were teaching practices employed by one participant. These activities can be further categorized into four groups according to the objectives they were expected to reach. Activities to stimulate ideas included using semantic maps, group/pair discussion, and asking pre-writing questions. Some activities were meant to raise learners' awareness or to build up meta-knowledge, such as analyzing students' common errors, teaching test-taking strategies, analyzing good writing samples, asking students to proofread their writing, and teaching writing structure. Some activities were employed to give feedback to students, including evaluating writing by groups, pointing out errors but not correcting for students, and giving individual instruction. Still some activities were meant to provide students with good input and more opportunities to practice, such as having students memorizing good sentences/passages or simulating good writing samples, reciting good writings, practicing writing topics from previous entrance exams, keeping English journals, and so on.

The activities used by individual teachers were also meant to reach one of the four objectives mentioned above. Some of these activities are

worth mentioning. Ling urged her students to prepare portfolios of their writings, as she believed that this was a good way to build up confidence and motivation in students. Moreover, she also gave students a mid-term exam on writing, which included writing a composition and cloze tests on writing samples distributed to students. By doing so, in fact, Ling was conducting formative and summative evaluations. June mentioned brainstorming in particular when describing her teaching practice; she also gave different writing topics to different classes for practice because she acknowledged collective interests and preference of each class, which she believed should be catered to so that students could produce better written texts. Sue also employed some teaching activities not shared by the other teachers. She highlighted the importance of writing structures by comparing Chinese and English writing structures and using graphic organizers to help students organize ideas. Meanwhile, she extended writing outside the classroom by encouraging students to write journals and emails in English and recording good sentences or passages for students from whatever she read. As far as these individual teaching activities are concerned, it seems that Ling was more like a teacher of language who teaches with an emphasis on evaluation and discrete points of the English language, while June and Sue were more like teachers of writing who place more stress on idea generation and putting English writing to good use in real life.

Teachers' Beliefs about EFL Writing Instruction

Aggregating the three teachers' beliefs yields a list comprising eight entries as is shown in Table 5. The eight beliefs can be labeled as teacher instruction/involvement, student efforts, reading-writing connection, background knowledge, writing structural knowledge, error awareness, status of EFL writing, and writing as thinking. Under each label, each participant may have their own belief statement which is slightly different from others'. This list is not exhaustive; it is likely that the participants held other beliefs not elicited in this study. What is certain is that these are working beliefs held by the participating teachers regarding EFL writing instruction.

Of the eight beliefs extracted, three of them were commonly held by three participants, including teacher instruction/involvement, the reading-writing connection, and structural knowledge. They all believed that to prepare students to be EFL writers, teachers need to invest in tremendous

time and effort to instruct, motivate students and correct students' papers. Teachers need to impart structural knowledge of English writing and to provide students with opportunities to practice to reinforce such knowledge. They also consider reading and writing related activities that can reinforce each other. Teacher involvement also included teachers giving corrective feedback to students about their writing, which has been a focus of interest in L2 writing and second language acquisition research and is also what makes teaching writing a most demanding and laborious task. Although no consensus has been reached concerning the effect of corrective feedback on L2 writing accuracy (Polio, 2012; Truscott, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012), the three participants made it a point to correct students' writings. How the participants approach and perceive giving feedback to student writings was not delved into in this study, but high school teachers' beliefs and perceptions about giving corrective feedback would be a topic worth exploring.

Two beliefs were held by Ling and Sue—student efforts and background knowledge. They believed that it takes constant practice for students to build up the ability and confidence to write well in English. Although the factor of "student effort" was not extracted by June, the three participants recognized the benefit of imitation and rote learning in learning to write better. By imitating good writing samples and producing memorized sentences or phrases, it is more manageable for students to produce readable, though not original, written texts, which helps to build up confidence in students. Ling and Sue also believed that writing should be personalized and that with more background knowledge, students have more to contribute and can write better.

Three beliefs were held by one teacher—error awareness, writing as thinking, and status of EFL writing, the former two held by June and the last one held by Sue. June believed that error analysis and error awareness is important or even crucial for students to becoming good EFL writers. That explained why among other things she would require students to analyze common errors of the class and to correct errors by themselves. Indeed, noticing and attention is a driving force to advance L2 development (Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012; Schmidt, 2001), and written error correction is one way to draw learners' attention to their interlanguage problems (Polio, 2012). Sue believed that writing in English should not only be learned as a course but also be applied in daily life and that writing is purposeful. This belief lent further support to the inference that Sue

practiced the teaching of writing more like a writing teacher than a language teacher.

Factors Shaping Teachers' Beliefs about EFL Writing Instruction

The participants derived their beliefs from five main sources: (1) previous learning experience, (2) personal teaching experience, (3) in-service training programs (4) training from master's programs, and (5) personal writing experience (either EFL or L1 or both). Not all five sources accounted for all participants' beliefs, and the first three sources were the commonly shared belief sources.

The three participants acknowledged that their experience as EFL learners did have influence on shaping their beliefs about EFL writing; they were all under the influence of their "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975, p. 61). Meanwhile, they all mentioned that it was not that they duplicated one specific teacher's teaching practice, but that they extracted some good teaching activities from their previous teachers, modified them, and then developed a model that worked for them. Sue even said that she tried not to teach the way she was taught in high school. "I can't remember how my teacher taught writing in high school. I didn't know what a topic sentence was until I became an English major myself. All I remember about writing English composition is that our teacher gave us a topic written on the blackboard, gave us some time to write, and then collected our writing when the bell rang. I never teach writing this way." As is shown in the participants' reflection, previous learning experience, good or bad, can have an influence on teachers' teaching practice and beliefs; teachers may replicate or avoid particular teaching practice they experienced as learners. However, without solid training in teaching EFL writing, replication or avoidance of certain teaching activities may be merely an intuitive reaction to personal learning experience, instead of application of theoretically sound pedagogy.

The participants' teaching experience was also important in shaping their beliefs about EFL writing instruction, which Lortie (1975) referred to as learning-while-doing work socialization. All of them mentioned that they did not really know how to teach EFL writing when they first became high school English teachers, even though they had been trained in TESOL methodologies. In the first few years of teaching, they relied on how they were taught EFL writing in both high school and college, that is, their apprenticeship of observation. Later, as they accumulated teaching

experience, they could modify their approaches for greater efficacy. In a way, they learned how to teach by teaching. As Ling said about how she came to where she was, "I learned how to teach EFL writing by teaching it." Sue also said that there was so much room for improvement the first few years she started to teach writing, and that she now had more confidence with many years of teaching experience and new ideas in teaching EFL writing. Lortie (1975) pointed out that this kind of work socialization had had and would still play an essential role in the teaching occupation, which still holds true nowadays. The training the three participants had before taking their teaching jobs, both formal schooling and practicum, did not fully prepare them to teach EFL writing. As Lortie (1975) put it, "compared with the crafts, professions, and highly skilled trades, arrangements for mediated entry are primitive in teaching" (p. 59); the internship student teachers do is of shorter duration, more casual without specific steps to follow compared with internships in the fields of law or medicine. Under such circumstances, it is common that student teachers do not necessarily have the chance to observe or practice teaching all four language skills, particularly writing, during the practicum period. As a result, learning-while-doing becomes a major approach to work socialization once student teachers become novice teachers.

Training from master's programs also influenced teachers' beliefs. Both Ling and Sue acknowledged the training they received in their respective master's programs. Both Sue and June got their master's degrees in linguistics and had taken courses in TESOL. Unlike Sue, June did not recognize an influence on her EFL writing instruction from the training she had in her master's program: "To tell you the truth, I did not really know how to teach writing the first few years I taught writing in class. I didn't think I had enough training on this. I learned teaching methodology but no methods for dealing with teaching writing in particular…" Sue graduated from a teacher training university, majoring in English with a focus on TESOL, but little of the TESOL-related training she had in university focused on teaching EFL writing. Both Ling and June majored in English literature in university, and neither of them received TESOL training until they went into master's programs. The three participants' teacher training experiences and their perception of their training suggest that the special schooling they had received for teacher induction did not fully prepare them to teach EFL writing in senior high school, which explains why they relied on apprenticeship of observation and learning-while-doing. Therefore, in teacher training programs, EFL

writing instruction methods should be taught explicitly, so that trainees become aware of the methods and apply them in teaching later.

Another source of beliefs was in-service training programs the participants had attended. These programs, held by supervising authorities (i.e., the Ministry of Education), were mainly in the forms of seminars or workshops, lasting for a morning to a couple of days. They were aimed to fortify EFL teachers' knowledge of EFL writing theories and to impart practical teaching strategies. The three participants reported that the in-service training programs were useful and that they implemented what they had learned in their own writing classes. Ling said she came to realize how reading could be used to supplement writing and the importance of writing structure; June talked about her learning of learner awareness in improving learning; Sue said she learned how to employ graphic organizers to teach writing structure and help students organize ideas. In-service training programs thus became an important resource for these teachers to make professional improvement.

The last source of beliefs was the teachers' personal writing experience. This experience influenced how they looked at EFL writing, which in turn would influence how they arranged writing activities both inside and outside of the classroom. For instance, Sue had a habit of writing in English, by emailing foreign friends regularly, and keeping a journal. She considered EFL writing not just as something to learn in class but also as an everyday life activity. Consequently, she required her students to make it a point of practicing EFL writing outside of class in real communicative contexts, such as emailing or keeping a diary. Sue's teaching practice corresponded to Casanave's (2009) advocating that writing teachers need to write and see themselves as writers so as to pass on enthusiasm to students. June, influenced by her experience of Chinese writing, believed that writing was a thinking process; as a result, she spent considerable class time on activities that helped students organize their ideas before writing. By contrast, Lin did not recognize influence from her writing experience. Though she encouraged students to take advantage of the internet to practice EFL writing, this activity had a different purpose based on a different belief—practice makes perfect.

RGT as a Reflective Approach to One's Own World

When evaluating RGT in organizational studies, Cassell and Walsh (2004) mentioned that the way "the process of construct elicitation

engenders reflectivity on behalf of the interviewee" accords the interviewee "the opportunity to reflect on their own assumptions…" (p. 69). When asked how they felt about RGT at the end of the last interview, the three participants responded positively. They had seldom considered what beliefs they held about EFL writing instruction, but the interviews prompted them to reflect on their own teaching, and they were glad to have their beliefs verbalized through this study. Given that RGT prompts participants to reflect, this method not only gives the researcher access to participants' mindset, but also grants the participants a reflective approach to their own world.

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. At the belief extraction stage, to save time, I did the labeling to produce belief statements. Although the participants were free to make changes to the labels and belief statements, the possibility remains that the participants were influenced by my interpretation. Second, the grid data could not faithfully extract working beliefs unless the participant gave a faithful account of her teaching activities and preparations. Nevertheless, even if some of the elements turn out to be conscious fabrications of the participant, the resultant extracted beliefs are not invalid or uninformative. After all, it is such constructs that reveal how the participants perceive and differentiate events, and from which meta-constructs or beliefs are extracted. Therefore, beliefs thus extracted can still be taken as held by the participant, not imposed by the researcher; however, they may not necessarily underlie the teacher's real teaching practice. Finally, given that only three participants were involved in this study, generalizing the results should be done with caution.

CONCLUSION

By applying RGT, the present study has extracted a more faithful inventory of teachers' beliefs on EFL writing instruction than observation or questionnaires. Such inventories may not be exhaustive, but they do represent the basis of teachers' EFL writing instruction; they are the working beliefs that underlie teachers' classroom practice. The eight beliefs extracted from this study pertained to its particular participants; some beliefs were shared, whereas the others were only held by individual

teachers. However, the study is not meant to achieve generalization, but to provide readers with a different approach to exploring teachers' beliefs. Follow-up case studies are desirable and recommended, either in Taiwan or in other EFL milieus, to construct a more inclusive inventory of teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction. From such an inventory, the beliefs that are commonly shared by all participants may be identified as core beliefs, and those held by individual teachers can be considered idiosyncratic. Knowledge of other teachers' beliefs gives teachers an opportunity to reflect on their own teaching; it can also inform programs for training new and in-service teachers to enhance the quality and efficacy of teachers' EFL writing instruction. Moreover, on the basis of the beliefs thus extracted, large-scale RGT surveys can investigate teachers' beliefs on EFL writing instruction in general. Such information could be valuable for compiling tools to measure teachers' beliefs, as well as for its pedagogical implications concerning EFL writing instruction and teacher training education. Finally, comparing teachers' and students' beliefs about EFL writing may provide valuable information about how to bridge the gap between what is taught and what is learned in EFL writing classes.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alban-Metcalf, R. J. (1997). Repertory grid technique. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), *Educational research, methodology and measurement: An international handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 315-318). New York: Pergamon.

Barcelos, A. M. F., & Kalaja, P. (2003). Conclusion: Exploring possibilities for future research on beliefs about SLA. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 231-238). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Beail, N. (1985). An introduction to repertory grid technique. In N. Beail (Ed.), *Repertory grid technique and personal constructs: Applications in clinical and educational settings* (pp. 1-24). London: Croom Helm.

Borg, M. (2001). Key concepts in ELT. Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal, 55*(2), 186-188.

Borg, S. (2005). Teacher cognition in language teaching. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 190-209). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3-15.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers' beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 709-725). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Casanave, C. P. (2009). Training for writing or training for reality? Challenges facing EFL writing teachers and students in language teacher education programs. In R. Manchón (Ed)., *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching and research* (pp. 256-277). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Cassell, C. & Walsh, S. (2004). Repertory Grids. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 61-72). London: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.

Chen, K. K. (2005). *A study on teaching Plate Tectonics with multiple analogies from the perspective of system paradigm: An application of Repertory Grid Technique.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.

Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 5-12.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.

Easterby-Smith, M. (1980). The design, analysis and interpretation of repertory grids.

International Journal of Man-Machine Studies, *13*, 3-24.
Fives, H., Lacatena, N., & Gerard, L. (2015). Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 249-265). New York: Routledge.
Fransella, F., Bell, C., & Bannister, D. (2004). *A manual for repertory grid technique* (2nd ed.). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 332-347.
Hirvela, A., & Law, E. (1991). A survey of local English teachers' attitudes toward English and ELT. *Institute of Language in Education Journal, 8*, 25-38.
Hsu, J. Y. (2005). *A study of senior high school English teachers' practices and beliefs about writing instruction.* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung.
Huang, Y. J. (2007). *A study of junior high school Chinese teachers' beliefs on teaching composition and their formative factors.* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.
Jankowicz, D. (2004). *The easy guide to repertory grids*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist, 27*(1), 65-90.
Kelly, G. A. (1955/1991). *The psychology of personal constructs*, *Volume one: A theory of personality.* New York: Norton (reprinted by Routledge, London).
Kuo, T. J. (2006). *The study on teacher beliefs of young children music teachers*. (Unpublished master's thesis). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.
Lan, X.-Y. (1995). *A study of Chinese teachers' teaching beliefs and the formation factors in junior high schools in Taiwan.* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.
Lee, I. (1996). Hong Kong primary teachers' perspectives on ELT. *RELC Journal*, *27*(2), 100-117.
Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(3), 143-157.
Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(3), 330-345. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.07.001
Liu, W.-D. (1999). *Analysis of teachers' teaching belief system and the relationship between teaching belief and teaching behavior.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.
Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology. *Instructional Science, 11*(3), 201-225.
Munby, H. (1983). *A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs and principles.* Paper presented

at the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED228215).

Munby, H. (1984). A qualitative approach to the study of a teacher's beliefs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21*(1), 27-38.

Nespor. J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(4), 317-328.

Olson, J. K. (1981). Teacher constructs and curriculum change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12*(1), 1-11.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.

Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System, 37*, 380-390.

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 375-389.

Pope, M. L., & Denicolo, P. (1993). The art and science of constructivist research in teacher thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9*(5/6), 529-544.

Pope, M. L., & Keen, T. R. (1981). *Personal construct psychology and education*. New York: Academic Press.

Reger, R. K. (1990). The Repertory Grid Technique for eliciting the content and structure of cognitive constructive systems. In A. S. Huff (Ed.), *Mapping strategic thought* (pp. 301-309). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Reichelt, M. (2009). A critical evaluation of writing teaching programmes in different foreign language setting. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language context: Learning, teaching and research* (pp. 183-206). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Rokeach, M. (1980). *Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change.* London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schraw, G., & Olafson, L. (2015). Assessing teachers' beliefs: Challenges and solutions. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 87-105). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snider, V., & Roehl, R. (2007). Teachers' beliefs about pedagogy and related issues. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(8), 873-886.

Tan, F. B., & Hunter, M. (2002). The Repertory Grid Technique: A method for the study of cognition in information system. *MIS Quarterly, 26*(1), 39-57.

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

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

Tseng, C. C. (2013). Exploring teacher beliefs about English talented programs in senior high school: An application of Repertory Grid Technique. *English Teaching & Learning, 37*(1), 1-42.

Uibu, K., Salo, A., Ugaste, A. & Rasku-Puttonen, H. (2017). Beliefs about teaching held

by student teachers and school-based teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 63*, 396-404.

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments to help improve earlier versions of this paper. Her sincere gratitude also goes to Prof. Andy Gao at the University of New South Wales for his constructive suggestions. Special thanks also go to the three participating teachers for their time and being so generous to share their ideas and thought in teaching EFL writing.

CORRESPONDENCE

Christine Chifen Tseng, Department of Applied English, National Taichung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Email address: chifen@nutc.edu.tw

PUBLISHING RECORD

Manuscript received: June 11, 2018; Revision received: January 7, 2019; Manuscript accepted: January 15, 2019

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Elements elicited from the participants (Teaching practice of the participants)

Ling's	June's	Sue's
On students' part:		
--Common activities		
•Ss revise their own writings	•Ss revise writings	•Ss revise their writings
•In-class writing activities	•Classroom writing with a time limit	•In-class writing activities
•Take-home writing assignments	•Take-home writing assignments	•Take-home writing assignments
•Peer editing	•Pair evaluation/peer editing	•Peer editing
•Semantic mapping		•Semantic mapping
•Group discussion	•Pair/group discussion before writing	
•Ss simulate writing samples	•Ss simulate good sentences	
	•Ss memorize writing samples	•Ss memorize good sentences and passages
	•Ss read out loud good writings	•Ss read out loud good sample writings of Ss in class
	•Ss analyzes Ss' common errors	•Ss analyze and comment on others' works
	•Summary writing	•Ss summarize reading articles
	•Ss practice writing on topics from previous entrance exams and commercially made test papers	•Ss practice writing topics from previous exams
--Individual activities		
•Ss proofread their own works	•Brainstorming	•Guided writing
•Ss decide topics for writing	•Different writing topics for different classes	•Free writing
•Ss use internet to practice writing		•Ss write journals, emails in English
•Ss set up portfolio of their own		•Ss practice writing in different genres

On teacher's part:		
--Common activities		
•T explains to Ss criteria for writing evaluation in college entrance exams	•T explains to Ss criteria for writing evaluation in college entrance exams	•T explains to Ss criteria for writing evaluation in college entrance exams
•T evaluates and corrects student writings (T reads student writings in detail and corrects errors for Ss)	•T reads and corrects Ss' writings in detail	•T corrects Ss' writings
•T analyzes common errors	•T analyzes Ss' common errors	•Error analysis
•Instruction on writing skills	•Writing skills instruction	•T teaches rhetoric
•Introduction to different genres	•Introduction to different genres	•T introduces writings of different genres
•T provides extensive reading materials	•T introduces structural knowledge about EFL writing by using reading materials of all kinds	•T uses reading texts to teach writing
•T corrects student writing by group	•Group evaluation	
•Instruction on writing format	•Instruction on writing format and punctuation	
•T points out errors but not correct them for Ss	•T points out errors and asks Ss to correct them	
•Test-taking strategy instruction		•Test-taking strategy instruction
•T analyzes good writing samples		•T analyzes good writing samples
•T provides writings of different genres		•T provides sample writings of different genres
	•Instruction on writing structure	•T introduces English writing structure
	•T gives individual instruction	•T gives individual instruction
	•T reads out loud students' good writings	•T chooses good writings of Ss' and share them with class
--Individual activities		
•T collects related materials before class		•T collects good sample writings for students
•To give writing mid-terms		
•To give cloze tests on writing samples		•T compares Chinese and English writing structures
•T decides topics for writing		
		•Use graphic organizers
		•T asks pre-writing questions

Appendix B. Ling's completed raw grid

Elements \ Constructs	Related to personal experiences	Instruction on writing skills	Strategy instruction	Giving assignment	Students practice	Teacher evaluates and corrects student writings	Related to reading	Teacher participation	Student participation	Students simulate writing samples	To build up students' confidence	Introduction to different genres	Ss apply different accesses to practice writing	To build up background knowledge	To find out errors	To build up Ss' structural knowledge of EFL	Analysis of purposes for writing
E1: Group discussion	4	1	1	2	3	1	3	3	5	1	4	1	1	4	1	1	1
E2: Ss decide topics for writing	5	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1
E3: T decides topics for writing	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	3	4
E4: Instructions on writing format	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	4	3	4	1	5	5
E5: Ss proof read their own works	2	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	5	2	3	1	2	1	4	2	2
E6: T analyzes good writing samples	1	5	5	1	2	1	4	4	3	2	2	4	1	2	1	3	5
E7: T analyzes common errors	2	3	2	1	1	4	3	4	4	4	1	3	1	2	5	3	2
E8: T evaluates & corrects student writings	3	2	1	1	2	5	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	2	3
E9: To give writing mid-terms	3	1	1	3	4	5	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	2
E10: peer editing	4	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	4	2	4	2	1	4	5	3	4
E11: Test-taking strategy instruction	3	4	5	1	2	1	3	4	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	2
E12: take-home writing assignment	3	2	2	4	5	3	2	1	5	2	3	1	3	2	1	3	3
E13: in-class writing activity	4	3	3	1	4	3	2	2	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
E14: Ss simulate writing samples	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	2	4	5	3	3	4	2	1	2	3
E15: T provides writings of different genres	4	3	2	2	4	2	4	2	4	5	3	4	2	3	1	3	3
E16: Introduction to different genres	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	5	4	3	2	5	3	3	1	3	3
E17: T explains to Ss criteria for writing evaluation in college	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	1

entrance exams																	
E18: T collects related materials before class	2	3	3	1	1	1	4	5	1	2	2	3	4	2	2	1	1
E19: Semantic mapping	2	3	3	1	3	2	1	2	4	1	4	1	3	3	1	1	3
E20: T provides extensive reading materials	3	2	2	4	3	2	5	3	2	4	2	3	2	4	1	2	3
E21: Ss revise their own writings	3	2	2	3	5	1	2	2	5	1	4	1	1	2	4	3	2
E22: T points out errors but not correct them for students	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	5	1	1	1	2	2	2	5	1	3
E23: T reads student writings in detail and correct errors for them	4	2	1	1	2	5	3	5	1	1	2	1	2	2	5	2	3
E24: To give close tests on writing samples	2	2	2	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	1	3	2	1	2	3
E25: Ss set up portfolio of their own	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	1	5	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	1
E26: T corrects s writing by groups	3	4	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	3
E27: Instruction on writing skills	3	5	4	2	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	4
E28: Ss use internet to practice writing	4	2	3	4	5	1	3	1	4	3	4	3	1	3	2	1	4

Table 1. Summary of exploratory factor analysis of Ling's constructs

Factor	Construct	Component					Communality
		1	2	3	4	5	
I	C2: Instruction on writing skills	**.859**					.855
	C3: Strategy instruction	**.835**					.802
	C12: Introduction to different genres	**.668**					.747
	C17: Analysis of purposes for writing	**.810**					.780
II	C4: Giving assignment		**.800**				.671
	C5: Student practice		**.913**				.882
	C11: To build up students' confidence		**.610**	**-.515**			.766
III	C6: To build up students' structural knowledge of EFL writing			**.861**			.858
	C8: Teacher participation		-.498	**.642**			.727
	C9: Student participation	-.486	.416	**-.626**			.817
	C15: To find out errors			**.615**	-.416		.596
IV	C1: Related to personal experiences				**-.549**		.603
	C13: Students take different approaches to practicing writing				**.630**		.531
	C14: To build up background knowledge				**.333**		.202
	C16: To build up students' structural knowledge of EFL writing	.349			**.620**		.536
V	C7: Related to reading				.	**.865**	.855
	C10: Students simulate writing samples				.397	**.774**	.822

Note. Cumulative total variance explained is 70.882%

Table 2. Ling's beliefs and sources of beliefs about EFL writing instruction

Construct	Belief	Source of Belief
Factor I: **Writing Structure** C2: Instruction on writing skills C3: Strategy instruction C12: Introduction to different genres C17: Analysis of purposes for writing C16[a]: To build up students' structural knowledge of EFL writing	It is important to give instructions on writing skills, strategies, genres, and purposes of writing so as to build up students' structural knowledge about EFL writing.	1. Master program training 2. Seminars and workshops 3. Self-study materials (related books, research papers and articles)
Factor II: **Student Efforts** C4: Giving assignment C5: Student practice C11: To build up students' confidence	It takes a lot of practice to polish writing skills; the more students write, the better they can write and the more confidence they have in themselves.	1. Generally held belief that "practice makes perfect" 2. It applies to writing in all languages: the more you write, the better you write.
Factor III: **Teacher Involvement** C6: Teacher evaluates and corrects student writings C8: Teacher participation C9: Student participation C15: To find out errors	The teacher must invest in a lot of time and efforts in correcting students' writings.	1. Positive feedback from students 2. A good way to get a better understanding of how students perform overall 3. Expectations from students 4. Personal teaching philosophy—Teachers should be devoted to teaching
Factor IV: **Background Knowledge** C1: Related to personal experiences C13: Students take different approaches to practicing writing C14: To build up background knowledge	EFL writing should be personalized; when students have enough background (content) knowledge, they can write better.	Seminars and workshops
Factor V: **Reading-Writing Connection** C7: Related to reading C10: Students simulate writing samples	Writing and reading are related activities; reading materials serve as good writing samples; the more students read, the better they can write.	1. Seminars and workshops 2. Personal experience as a college student

Note. a: moved from Factor IV

Table 3. Summary of exploratory factor analysis of June's constructs

Factor	Construct	Component				Communality
		1	2	3	4	
I	C4: Student thinking stimulation	**.906**				.868
	C5: Student active participation	**.950**				.939
	C6: Teacher-centeredness	**-.950**				.936
	C9: Teacher instruction	**-.953**				.952
	C10: Students making efforts	**.954**				.961
	C13: Teacher teaches discrete points about writing	**-.797**	.307			.819
	C14: Idea generation	**.739**			.478	.800
II	C1: Related to reading		**-.488**	.427	.431	.606
	C11: Teacher reads and corrects students' writings in detail		**.836**			.803
	C15: Individual instruction		**.897**			.866
	C16: Whole-class participation	-.466	**-.723**			.799
IV	C2: Reinforce knowledge of writing			**.890**		.873
	C3: Knowledge of writing format	.448		**.867**		.805
V	C7: Writing practice				**.492**	.496
	C8: To cultivate students' ability to analyze and appreciate writing	.365		.567	**-.657**	.887
	C12: Overall writing appreciation				**-.858**	.799

Note. Cumulative total variance explained is 82.566%

Table 4. June's beliefs and sources of beliefs about EFL writing instruction

Construct	Belief	Source of Belief
Factor I: **Teacher Instruction** C6: Teacher-centeredness C9: Teacher instruction C13: Teacher teaches discrete points about writing	Teachers need to prepare Ss for EFL writing. It takes preparatory work on teachers' part in teaching EFL writing as writing in English is different from writing in Chinese in many ways.	1. Personal learning experience 2. Personal learning preference
Factor II: **Error Awareness** C11: Teacher reads and corrects students' writings in detail C15: Individual instruction C16: Whole-class participation	Writing instruction should be given both class-wide and individually; both teachers and students must be aware of errors commonly made by students; students can learn a lot from their errors; error awareness and analysis is important or even crucial to becoming EFL writers.	1. Training from an oversea teacher in-service training program 2. Personal learning experience 3. Reinforced by personal teaching experience
Factor III: **Writing Structure** C2: Reinforce knowledge of writing C3: Knowledge of writing format	Being new to students, knowledge about writing structure, format, and rhetorical skills needs to be taught to students; it can be mastered only through repeated practice and reinforcement.	1. Training from an oversea teacher in-service training program 2. Reinforced by a personal action research
Factor IV: **Reading-Writing Connection** C8: To cultivate students' ability to analyze and appreciate writing C12: Overall writing appreciation C1[a]: Related to reading	Writing and reading are related activities; to be good writers, students need to be good readers first.	1. Personal teaching experience 2. Observation of student performance
Factor V: **Writing as Thinking** C4[b]: Student thinking stimulation C5[b]: Student active participation C10[b]: Students making efforts C14[b]: Idea generation C7[c]: Writing practice	Writing is a process where students need to think and generate ideas and it takes a lot of practice and efforts to write well. Writing is thinking; to teach writing is to teach how to think and how to generate ideas.	1. Observation of students' difficulty in EFL writing 2. Personal writing experience

Note. a: moved from Factor II; b: moved from Factor I; c: moved from Factor IV

Table 5. Summary of exploratory factor analysis of Sue's constructs

Factor	Construct	Component					Communality
		1	2	3	4	5	
I	C6: Teacher instruction	**.844**					.871
	C7: Student practice	**-.897**					.896
	C8: Teacher makes good preparation before class	**.822**					.818
	C14: Students learn to put thoughts into words	**-.834**	-.336				.822
	C15: To build up meta-knowledge about writing	**.508**		.496			.616
II	C9: Students learn to be critical readers		**.902**				.838
	C10: To raise Ss' awareness of good writing	.367	**.771**				.808
	C13: Related to reading		**.825**				.747
III	C1: To build up Ss' structural knowledge about EFL writing	.312		**.864**			.848
	C4: To build up Ss' confidence		.490	**-.636**			.671
	C5: Reinforcement of structural knowledge			**.790**			.745
IV	C2: To stimulate students' thoughts		.386	-.524	**.641**		.852
	C3: Related to personal experiences		-.306	-.313	**.584**	-.491	.775
	C16: To build up background knowledge				**.801**		.775
V	C11: To apply EFL writing in everyday life	-.329				**-.841**	.841
	C12: Writing as a course		-.418	.520		**.537**	.750

Note. Cumulative total variance explained is 79.196%

Table 6. Sue's beliefs and sources of beliefs about EFL writing instruction

Construct	Belief	Source of Belief
Factor I: **Teacher Instruction** C6: Teacher instruction C8: Teacher makes good preparation before class	Teachers need to make good preparation before class and give instructions on EFL writing as writing in a foreign language is different from writing in one's native language.	1. Personal experience as an EFL writer 2. Personal teaching experience
Factor II: **Reading-Writing Connection** C9: Students learn to be critical readers C10: To raise Ss' awareness of good writing C13: Related to reading	Writing and reading are related activities and they reinforce each other; students must be good readers before they become good writers.	1. Master program training 2. Teacher in-service training program 3. Previous learning experience
Factor III: **Writing Structure** C1: To build up Ss' structural knowledge about EFL writing C5: Reinforcement of structural knowledge C15[a]: To build up meta-knowledge about writing	It is necessary to build up students' structural knowledge about English writing and give them opportunities to practice to reinforce such knowledge. Writing English composition is not translating the Chinese version into English. Students need to know that the two languages present ideas in different ways.	1. Teacher in-service training program 2. Seminars and workshops 3. Self-study teacher resources
Factor IV: **Background Knowledge** C2: To stimulate students' thoughts C3: Related to personal experiences C16: To build up background knowledge	Writing should be personalized; when students have enough background knowledge, they have more to contribute and write better.	1. Training from Master program 2. Reinforced by teaching experience
Factor V: **Status of EFL Writing** C11: To apply EFL writing in everyday life C12: Writing as a course	Writing in English is not only learned as a course but also should be applied in daily life. Writing should not be for writing's sake; writing is purposeful.	1. Personal experience as an EFL writer 2. Reinforced by students' performance

Factor VI: **Student Efforts** C7[a]: Student practice C14[a]: Students learn to put thoughts into words C4[b]: To build up Ss' confidence	It takes a lot of practice for students to build up confidence and ability to write well in English.	1. Personal writing experience 2. Observation of student performance 3. Generally-held belief

Note. a: moved from Factor I; b: moved from Factor III

Table 7. Overall table of participants' beliefs and sources of beliefs

Factor/Belief	Holder			Source
	Ling	*June*	*Sue*	
Teacher instruction/involvement Teachers must invest in a lot of time and efforts in correcting students' writing. (Ling) Teachers need to prepare Ss for EFL writing. (June & Sue)	√	√	√	(1) Previous learning experience (J) (2) Experience as an EFL writer (S) (3) Personal teaching experience (L, J, S)
Student efforts It takes a lot of practice for students to build up confidence and ability to write well in English.	√		√	(1) Previous learning experience (L) (2) Experience as an EFL writer (S) (3) Personal teaching experience (S)
Reading-writing connection Reading and writing are related activities; to become good writers, Ss need to be good readers first.	√	√	√	(1) Previous learning experience (L, S) (3) Personal teaching experience (J) (4) Training from Master program (S) (5) In-service training program (L, S)
Background knowledge Writing should be personalized; with more background knowledge, Ss have more to contribute and can write better.	√		√	(3) Personal teaching experience (S) (4) Training from Master program (S) (5) In-service training program (L)
Structural knowledge It is necessary to build up Ss' structural knowledge about English writing and to give Ss opportunities to practice to reinforce such knowledge.	√	√	√	(4) Training from Master program (L) (5) In-service training program (L, J, S)
Error awareness Error awareness and analysis is important or even crucial to becoming good EFL writers.		√		(1) Previous learning experience (J) (3) Personal teaching experience (J) (5) In-service training program (J)

Status of EFL writing EFL writing should be not only learned as a course but also applied in everyday life.		√	(2) Experience as an EFL writer (S)
Writing as thinking Writing is thinking; to teach writing is to teach how to think and generate ideas.	√		(2) Personal writing experience (J) (3) Personal teaching experience (J)

高中英文寫作教師信念

曾琦芬
國立臺中科技大學

以第二語言(L2)寫作一向被學生與教師視為非常具挑戰的任務。教師在協助學生培養 L2 寫作能力的歷程，扮演關鍵的角色，因此探索教師對於寫作教學的信念是非常重要的，乃因教師信念會影響教師的課室教學。本研究利用凱利庫存方格(RGT)探索三位台灣高中英文老師對英文寫作教學的信念，RGT 是源自個人建構理論(Personal Construct Theory)的質性研究方法，可分為三個階段實施以蒐集資料，首先，參與教師描述其寫作教學的課室活動，這些活動會被分類及標示，課室活動就是元素(element)，活動分組的標示即為構面(construct)，二者構成一個矩陣；其次，參與教師給予每個矩陣細格一個分數，填妥的矩陣會進行探索性因素分析；最後，藉由因素分析結果以及深度訪談，便可萃取出參與者的信念；信念的來源會在訪談的分析結果中釐清。研究結果整理出八項寫作教學信念，與教師投入、閱讀寫作連結、作文結構知識、學生努力、學生的背景知識、錯誤知覺、英文寫作的角色、以及寫作即思考等有關。五個教師信念來源包括先前的學習經驗、個人寫作經驗、個人教學經驗、碩士課程的訓練、以及在職訓練。瞭解教師信念給予參與教師反思自己的教學的機會，同時也提供師資培育和在職訓練單位相關資訊，以提升教師在英文寫作教學的品質與效能。

關鍵字：英文寫作、教師信念、凱利庫存方格、師資培訓