



June 2021

Editorial Introduction

Betsy Gilliland
University of Hawaii Manoa

Katherine Daily O'Meara
Saint Norbert College

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gilliland, Betsy and O'Meara, Katherine Daily (2021) "Editorial Introduction," *Journal of Response to Writing*: Vol. 7 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol7/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 scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.



Editorial Introduction

Betsy Gilliland

University of Hawai‘i Mānoa

Katherine Daily O’Meara

Saint Norbert College

We are thrilled to introduce our Spring 2021 issue of the *Journal of Response to Writing*. In this issue, writing and language scholars share their research into and pedagogical recommendations for responding to writers’ work at a wide range of academic levels and from a broad spectrum of theoretical perspectives. These works reveal just how broad the field encompassed by our journal title—response to writing—can be, including quantitative research that examines the effects of written corrective feedback on English as a foreign language (EFL) learners’ grammatical accuracy, qualitative research investigating international graduate students’ socialization through a writing response group, and a more philosophical approach to theories of formative assessment. We summarize each article below and encourage readers to download all five to peruse at your leisure.

In the first article in this issue, “Formative Automated Writing Evaluation: A Standpoint Theory of Action,” Lynette Hazelton, Jessica Nastal, Norbert Elliot, Jill Burstein, and Daniel F. McCaffrey describe two teachers’ classrooms where the formative automated writing evaluation (AWE) program Writing Mentor was implemented as assessment

for learning (Heritage & Wylie, 2018). Considering the two classrooms, one in an adult education program and the other in a community college, the authors develop standpoint theories of action to understand students' uses of Writing Mentor. This approach emphasizes the lived experiences of minoritized groups and distinguishes among intrapersonal factors connected to the learners' uses of the tool. The article concludes with recommendations for both using formative AWE systems in the classroom and developing a locally contextualized theory of practice.

The next article, written by Andrew Cavanaugh and Liyan Song, "A Comparison Analysis of Five Instructors' Commenting Patterns of Audio and Written Feedback on Students' Writing Assignments," reports on a study of university first-year composition instructors' practices using written and audio feedback to comment on their students' writing. The five instructor participants commented on one set of student texts by writing comments in the margins using track changes and then audio recorded their comments on a second set of student texts. The researchers then coded and categorized the comments and compared the two modalities, finding that while all instructors used more words in their audio comments than in their written comments, they varied in how many different points they commented on. Cavanaugh and Song interviewed the instructors to get their perspectives on these practices and suggest that each modality has its own benefits, so instructors should think carefully about what they want to do in their own practice.

Yoshimasa Ogawa's article "Written Corrective Feedback in EFL: Combining Error Codes and Metalinguistic Explanation" analyzes the pedagogical application of a combined approach to written corrective feedback (WCF) in which unfocused error codes and focused metalinguistic explanatory comments were used with Japanese university students' English language texts. The author found some positive effects of this approach to WCF on certain linguistic forms but also noted its dwindling effectiveness over two semesters. He concludes with some recommendations for saving writing teachers time while still supporting students' learning.

In the final feature article of this issue, "English as an Additional Language Doctoral Students' Ongoing Socialization Into Scholarly Writing: How Do Writing Feedback Groups Contribute?," Tracy Griffin Spies,

Yunying Xu, Fatmana Kara Deniz, Gloria A. Carcoba Falomir, and Suheyly Sarisahin describe a group in which doctoral students and a professor provided each other with feedback on their written texts (some course-related and some manuscripts intended for publication). The authors traced the students' socialization as academic writers and found that the group allowed them to develop their self-confidence and self-efficacy while also increasing their academic writing skills. They further discuss how the group also provided an antidote to the often isolating experience of a doctoral program, particularly for international students new to the area where their institution is located.

This issue concludes with a teaching article by Terese Thonus: "Metaphorical Response and Student Revisions." In this article, Thonus outlines how a university writing center introduced tutors to the concept of the deliberate metaphor as a tool for structuring tutor-student feedback conversations. Drawing on conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff, 2014; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), which suggests that carefully selected metaphors help students understand abstract concepts, the tutor and instructor training led to more consistent metaphor use in feedback. This feedback subsequently allowed students to revise their texts more effectively. Thonus's examples illustrate how metaphor-infused feedback works.

We continue to be impressed by the diverse ways that our authors approach the topic of response to writing, as well as the many contexts in which their work is situated. Nevertheless, we would love to receive manuscripts from researchers and teachers in additional geographic and educational contexts, working with writers at even more levels and those writing in languages other than English. Please share this issue and relevant articles from our past issues with your colleagues and students and encourage them to sign up for notifications from the journal on our new platform (<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw>) and follow us on [Facebook](#), [Instagram](#), or [Twitter](#). We hope you enjoy the Spring 2021 issue of the *Journal of Response to Writing*.

References

- Heritage, M., & Wiley, C. (2018). Reaping benefits of assessment for learning: Achievement, identity, and equity. *ZDM: Mathematics Education*, 50(2), 729–741. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-018-0943-3>
- Lakoff, G. (2014, December 16). Mapping the brain's metaphor circuitry: Metaphorical thought in everyday reason. *Frontiers of Human Neuroscience*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00958/full>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

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/>).

Gilliland, B., & O'Meara, K. (2021). Editorial introduction. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 7(1), 1–4.