



2018

## Editorial Introduction

Grant Eckstein  
*Brigham Young University*

Betsy Gilliland  
*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

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



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Eckstein, Grant and Gilliland, Betsy (2018) "Editorial Introduction," *Journal of Response to Writing*. Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol4/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](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).



# Editorial Introduction

**Grant Eckstein**

*Brigham Young University*

**Betsy Gilliland**

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

---

**W**e are thrilled to introduce and welcome you to our fourth volume year of *Journal of Response to Writing*. This is the seventh installment of the journal, and we are encouraged by JRW's growing readership and increasing dissemination of scholarship internationally. As we continue to offer a shared venue for practitioners and researchers of English composition, second language writing, foreign language writing, and writing center studies, we hope that you will kindly share this open-access, online resource with your colleagues and students who are interested in issues of response to writing.

In this issue, we are pleased to introduce a range of fascinating articles that offers important insight into response practices across multiple formats, programs, and student backgrounds. In our first article "Peer Reviews and Graduate Writers: Engagements with Language and Disciplinary Differences While Responding to Writing," Kate Mangelsdorf and Todd Ruecker examine the efficacy and potential of graduate L2 peer review sessions. This under-researched area of inquiry is meaningful given the assumptions many teachers and graduate students share that feedback

on graduate-level writing is best provided by content experts with native language proficiency. This study followed 12 graduate students (nine L2 writers) over a 16-week peer review course to examine the impact of language background and discipline on peer review interactions. From their investigation, the authors argue that “students’ attitudes toward language difference. . . played a greater role in making successful peer reviews than students’ categorization as L1 or L2 students.” Manglesdorf and Ruecker further arranged students in peer review groups by similar disciplines, yet they still found that differences in education level (M.A. vs. Ph.D.) could interfere with helpful peer reviews. Nevertheless, the authors indicate that regardless of linguistic or disciplinary differences, all graduate writers can increase their rhetorical awareness of academic writing as a positive outcome of graduate peer review sessions.

In our second article, researchers in an academic literacies program at a large university in the United States conducted a programmatic review to investigate the response practices of part-time and graduate student instructors who teach a composition course in which only international undergraduate students are enrolled. The article “Second Language Teachers’ Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response,” by Joseph J. Lee, Farzaneh Vahabi, and Dawn Bikowski, investigated more than 4,000 pieces of electronic feedback provided to 36 students. An analysis of this feedback corpus showed teachers primarily offered “corrective, direct, explicit, and within-text” feedback, something that the researchers describe as “inordinate” and judged as partially conflicting with current recommendations for effective response practices. Using these insights, the researchers describe purposeful curricular revisions that shifted response practices toward more principled and contextually-appropriate approaches to responding to student writing, which can serve as a model for other programs wanting to evaluate and possibly improve their collective response practices.

Jennifer Grouling, in her article “The Genre of Teacher Comments from Hard Copy to iPad,” sought to determine how teachers’ commenting practices changed by technological medium. Five teachers participated in the study and provided comments on sample rhetorical analyses that were delivered either as hard copy papers or as electronic documents on

an iPad. Using a mixed methods design, Grouling found little difference in the way teachers quantitatively commented across technologies except that the teachers made more marginal comments on hard copy papers than iPad equivalents. Teachers' affective experiences across technology, however, did show some variability. For instance, teachers who expressed frustration with the iPad also had slightly higher rates of imperatives in their electronic comments. Grouling concludes that technologies may affect teachers' emotions when commenting on student papers, which may in turn impact their response approaches. She further recommends that technology should be considered as a factor in future response research.

Our final paper is a teaching article by Elizabeth Busekrus titled "A Conversational Approach: Using Writing Center Pedagogy in Commenting for Transfer in the Classroom." In the article, she encourages teachers to adopt some practices common in writing center scholarship as a way to facilitate transfer across writing tasks. Such writing center practices include goal setting (making feedback intentional) and engaging in dialogic feedback. Busekrus argues that transfer is more likely to occur when these practices are incorporated, and she offers some examples of how this can be done within a composition or writing-intensive class.

Overall, the articles in this issue combine to paint a picture of response as a critical and complex process worthy of thoughtful academic scrutiny. And, given the fact that response is widely used in writing situations with the purpose of promoting writing/writer development, it is all the more imperative to examine the nature and potential utility of response to writing in various forms and contexts. We look forward to more of this intellectual inquiry into response practices and hope that you enjoy reading the current issue as much as we have.

Finally, we wish to thank the many authors, reviewers, and editors who have contributed to this issue. It is only because of their support that JRW can continue to provide cutting-edge research on response to writing.

#### 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, Grant and Betsy Gilliland. (2018). "Editorial Introduction." *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(1): 1–3.