



Fall 2019

## Editorial Introduction

Betsy Gilliland  
*University of Hawai'i Mānoa*

Grant Eckstein  
*Brigham Young University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gilliland, Betsy and Eckstein, Grant (2019) "Editorial Introduction," *Journal of Response to Writing*. Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol5/iss2/1>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Response to Writing* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

## Editorial Introduction

**Betsy Gilliland**

*University of Hawai‘i Mānoa*

**Grant Eckstein**

*Brigham Young University*

---

**A**s we enter a new academic year in North American universities, we continue to think about the many ways that teachers, learners, and other writers respond to written texts. While JRW publishes primarily research looking at academic writing, mostly done in institutions of higher education and with courses that specifically teach students how to write, we are also interested in the ways that people (or computers) respond to writing in many other contexts and for many diverse purposes. We welcome manuscripts that consider writing done by professionals in the workplace, writing in graduate science courses, writing for publication, fiction-writing groups, children’s first written texts, responding to writing in languages other than English, and anything else that could be considered in the broad realm of response. Please encourage your colleagues to read the journal and contribute.

This issue contains more articles than we have ever published before, thanks to the plethora of high quality submissions we are receiving. The articles address response concerns for both first- and second-language writers in courses in multiple countries.

Two articles address the experiences of second language writers in English for Academic Purposes courses. In his article “Simultaneous Oral-Written Feedback Approach (SOWFA): Students’ Preference on Writing Response,” Jim Hu discusses students’ perspectives on a particular approach to providing real-time written corrective feedback during one-to-one conferences with university English for Academic Purposes students in Canada. After surveying and interviewing his students, Hu found that they value the approach because they feel it helps them develop autonomy. Chun-Chun Yeh also examines writing conferences in “Interaction and Participation in the Small Group Writing Conference.” Yeh documented small-group conferences between an instructor and four students at a university in Taiwan. An analysis of the participants’ interaction in two different groups revealed that the instructor controlled the discussion and that students rarely interacted with each other, which Yeh attributes in part to the pressure the instructor felt to ensure all students received feedback within a limited time frame.

Three articles in this issue address response practices in U.S. first-year composition courses. Angela Laflen turned to a university’s learning management system (LMS) to understand how students accessed returned writing assignments; Laflen reports on these findings in “What LMS Site Statistics Tell Us About Timing Instructor Feedback on Student Writing.” Results show that far more students downloaded instructor comments on early drafts of assignments than on final drafts and that students were more likely to download commented drafts earlier in the semester than later. In “Bridging Instructor Intentions and Student Experiences: Constructing Quality Feedback, Evaluating Writing Features, and Facilitating Peer Trust as Goals of Peer Review,” Mary K. Stewart takes up the issue of how instructors and students differ in their understanding of the goals and purposes for doing peer review. Stewart found that instructors held varied goals for the process, all of which aligned with recommendations in the literature, whereas students universally felt that the purpose of peer review was to help them improve their current drafts before turning them in for a grade. Contrasting perspectives are also an issue in Daliborka C. Padon’s study, “Responding to Writing Fluency: An Analysis of Writing Teacher Preparation Materials.” Analyzing the messages delivered in

statements issued by various writing-related professional organizations and comparing them to the dominant messages in best-selling advice books for writing teachers, Padon discovered that writing books do not promote the same response practices that the statements encourage.

Two articles in the issue take up concerns for second language writers in U.S. first-year composition courses. Surveying a large population of first- and second-language writers in a large university, Tyler Carter and Suthathip Thirakunkovit's "A Comparison of L1 and ESL Written Feedback Preferences: Similarities, Differences, and Pedagogical Application" discusses ways that the two groups of students hold similar and different views. The students all agreed on their preference for specific feedback for improvement over general comments, but L1 English speakers wanted broadly constructive criticism, while ESL writers preferred language-focused commentary. Finally, Kyung Min Kim's teaching article "Creating Space for Student Engagement With Revision: An Example of a Feedback-Rich Class for Second Language Writers" describes how a "feedback-rich environment" can be established to provide ESL writers in first-year composition with multiple forms of feedback (oral and written) from many different sources (teachers, peers in class, outside peers, writing center tutors, and writers themselves) across several drafts of each assignment. Kim's article provides recommendations for instructors wishing to set up a similar process themselves.

Finally, we have a transition to announce. Grant Eckstein will be stepping down from his post as coeditor of JRW. He has been with the journal since before the first issue, connecting people and resources to help the vision of JRW become reality. Grant was the founding managing editor and will continue to work with the journal in the role of associate editor, working as our liaison with the Brigham Young University editing program, so this is not goodbye but rather happy transitions!

We are also pleased to announce that Katherine Dailey O'Meara, assistant professor of Rhetoric and Composition and Director of Composition at Emporia State University, will be joining us as coeditor. Kat received her PhD at Arizona State University and has been both an author (of "Providing Sustained Support for Teachers and Students in the L2 Writing Classroom Using Writing Fellow Tutors," published in

Vol. 2, No. 2, and “Grammar Agreements: Crafting a More Finely-Tuned Approach to Corrective Feedback,” coauthored with Ryan P. Shepherd and Sarah Elizabeth Snyder, published in Vol. 2, No. 1) and a regular reviewer for JRW. We look forward to Kat’s perspectives on issues of response to writing.

JRW will be represented at the November 2019 Symposium on Second Language Writing and several conferences in Spring 2020. Please check in to say hello. We are also building our Facebook profile, so feel free to “like” and “follow” us for updates on the journal and other response-related news.

#### **Copyrights**

© JRW & Authors.

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).