



Winter 2019

Editorial Introduction

Grant Eckstein
Brigham Young University

Betsy Gilliland
University of Hawai'i Mānoa

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



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

Recommended Citation

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

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol5/iss1/1>

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 ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.



Editorial Introduction

Grant Eckstein

Brigham Young University

Betsy Gilliland

University of Hawai'i Mānoa

Welcome to the first issue of the fifth volume year of the *Journal of Response to Writing*. We are excited to bring you two feature articles and one focused on teaching. Together, these articles span the three major domains we aim to cover: native language, second/additional language, and foreign language writing response. Additionally, the set of articles takes up issues of students' feedback perceptions and provisions of feedback that can facilitate better student writing.

In the first feature article, titled "Composition Students' Opinions of and Attention to Instructor Feedback," Jennifer Cunningham questions *whether* native-language students in composition classes read their instructors' feedback. Instructors may be tempted to believe that the labor they put into written feedback is wasted on inattentive students, but Cunningham's research contradicts this view. Using a survey design with open questions, and garnering responses from over 200 participants, she found that an overwhelming majority of students (94%) reported reading their instructors' feedback. Furthermore, students' purposes for reading feedback favored a desire for improved grades slightly ahead of a desire to

improve writing. Survey participants also expressed preferences for clear explanations from teachers of how they could improve.

The second article examines foreign language writing and response. “Beyond Accuracy: Rethinking the Approach to Spanish Second Language Writing through a Tutoring Intervention” by Lisa Kuriscak involved writing-fellow feedback on higher-order concerns. Nearly 100 students in a 300-level Spanish class wrote rough and final drafts of papers at the beginning and end of a semester of study. Half of the students were asked to meet multiple times with a Spanish tutor to work on higher-order issues such as idea development or organization. Kuriscak notes that all writers improved over the semester irrespective of whether they met with the tutor. Moreover, lower-order writing improved more than higher-order writing, which suggests that students still tend to focus heavily on gram-mar and vocabulary in foreign language writing contexts. Nonetheless, treatment group members saw a small improvement in their higher-order writing, suggesting a benefit associated with that kind of intervention.

Our final piece is a teaching article that focuses on the pedagogical application of peer review. In “Anonymizing the Peer Response Process: An Effective Way to Increase Proposed Revisions?” by Joe Garner and Oliver Hadingham, the authors point out that students often avoid giving critical feedback in peer review sessions. This can be exacerbated in cultures where group harmony is valued. With the goal of increasing critical response, the authors created an anonymized peer re-view experience and contrasted this against one in which reviewers were aware of each other’s identity. Anonymizing the process led to more critiques among the intermediate students, but the same finding was not significant among the advanced students, even though both groups stated a preference for anonymized peer review. Thus, the authors recommend using anonymized peer review to increase student satisfaction, but they especially recommend it for intermedi-ate-level students with backgrounds that value group harmony. While the authors used paper-based anonymized peer review (where students had removed their names), they suggest that teachers could also utilize online applications that would allow for blinded reviews while still allowing real-time interaction between author and reviewer.

In sum, we hope this issue of *JRW* provides added insight into ways that teachers can structure written responses in a way that best helps their students across a variety of contexts and locations. Better response, we believe, leads to greater student achievement.

Finally, we would like to thank the authors who submitted their research and teaching manuscripts to *JRW* and would similarly encourage other readers to share their insights with this community. Likewise, we want to express our deep gratitude to the many reviewers who volunteered their time and expertise to the unpaid but critical task of reviewing the manuscripts that follow. Their selfless service is paramount to *JRW*'s success. We also wish to thank the copyeditors and typesetters, many of whom are editing students in Brigham Young University's Department of Linguistics. Thanks to you all, and enjoy the latest issue of *JRW*.

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/>).

Eckstein, G., & Gilliland, B. (2019). Editorial introduction. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 5(1): 1–3.