



2018

## Second Language Teachers' Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response

Joseph J. Lee  
*Ohio University*

Farzaneh Vahabi  
*Ohio University*

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



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

### Recommended Citation

Lee, Joseph J. and Vahabi, Farzaneh (2018) "Second Language Teachers' Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response," *Journal of Response to Writing*. Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.  
Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol4/iss1/3>

This Featured Article 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).



# Second Language Teachers’ Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response

**Joseph J. Lee**  
*Ohio University*

**Farzaneh Vahabi**  
*Ohio University*

**Dawn Bikowski**  
*Ohio University*

---

This in-house inquiry explores the response practices of a group of L2 writing teachers in our specific program to gain a better understanding of these teachers’ feedback practices and to bring about purposeful change within our local context. Data consist of 4,313 electronic feedback (e-feedback) items given by six writing teachers to 36 L2 students on six writing tasks in a first-year writing course for international students. Using Ene and Upton’s (2014) e-feedback framework, each feedback instance was coded for feedback target, directness, explicitness, charge, and location. Although some variations exist, results show that these teachers overwhelmingly focused on form across writing tasks. Findings also show that the e-feedback was primarily corrective, direct, explicit, and within-text. Following a discussion of our programmatic response to this internal investigation, we conclude by arguing that programs can establish philosophies of response grounded in their specific context based on examination of local practices.

*Keywords:* academic writing, in-house inquiry, L2 writing, teacher feedback

---

Lee, Joseph J., Farzaneh Vahabi, and Dawn Bikowski. (2018). “Second Language Teachers’ Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response.” *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(1): 34–69.

One of the most central and challenging activities in which first language (L1) and second language (L2) writing instructors engage is responding to student writing. Giving written feedback is not only a time-consuming and labor-intensive task, but it is also an undertaking “often fraught with frustration and uncertainty” (Ferris, 2014, p. 6). Ferris points out that responding to writing can be a daunting and lonely experience, as each teacher independently must consider such issues as what to focus on (e.g., content, form), when to give feedback, how much to give, and how to provide it (e.g., correction, explanation, question), all the while balancing positive comments and constructive criticism.

Because of its importance in writing teachers' lives as well as the complexities involved in responding effectively to student writing, considerable research has been devoted to investigating various dimensions of teacher feedback. In response, particularly, to Truscott's (1996) oft-cited claims about the futility and harmful effect of written feedback, studies have examined the effectiveness and benefits of feedback in improving students' writing accuracy and development (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2004). They have explored the effects of feedback types that lead to improvements in student writing (e.g., Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005). These studies have not only shown that written feedback can be effective, but they also have demonstrated that feedback focused on rule-governed errors (e.g., verb tense), or “treatable” errors (Ferris, 1999), is more beneficial than feedback focused on errors that are “untreatable” (e.g., word choice).

Other experimental studies have compared the effectiveness of comprehensive and focused feedback (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b) and direct and indirect feedback (e.g., Ferris, 2006). It has been shown that focused feedback on specific mistakes can lead to more productive gains in learners' writing than comprehensive feedback, where teachers respond to all error types. In terms of directness, indirect feedback has been found to lead to long-term development, but direct feedback has also been shown to be useful, particularly for lower-proficiency students (Ferris, 2010). Furthermore, researchers have examined explicit feedback (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a; Ferris, 2006). Evidence suggests that explicitness can be beneficial for some learners, yet Ferris and Roberts (2001)

found no significant difference in improvement between students who received more and less explicit feedback. Despite the numerous studies on written feedback, much of what we know in this line of inquiry is still inconclusive (Guénette, 2007; Liu & Brown, 2015). In their meta-analysis of 32 published articles and 12 dissertations, Liu and Brown (2015) show that lack of consensus in the written corrective feedback literature is primarily because of inconsistent methodological transparency, design, and analysis. Guénette (2007) also attributes the contradictory evidence to differences in research design and methods. Furthermore, similar to Ferris (2010), Liu and Brown (2015) contend that many studies on written feedback “have limited ecological value,” particularly those that have a “one-shot” treatment design and those focusing on targeted items, because writing instructors’ aims are “generally to help students improve overall accuracy rather than accuracy of a single linguistic form or structure” (p. 74). As they further note, most teachers often offer “customized feedback” tailored to the specific needs of individual students to improve their overall writing ability. Therefore, Liu and Brown (2015) conclude with a call for more research on authentic feedback that practicing teachers actually provide.

Recently, a growing number of studies have examined the authentic feedback practices of groups of L2 writing teachers in EFL settings (e.g., Lee, 2009, 2016), US-based intensive English programs (IEPs; e.g., Montgomery & Baker, 2007), and first-year writing (FYW) programs (e.g., Ene & Upton, 2014; Ferris, 2006). Most of these studies have shown that L2 writing teachers’ feedback is principally corrective, direct, and comprehensive, and the feedback target is overwhelmingly concerned with form-level issues (e.g., grammar). In their longitudinal, two-semester study of teachers’ electronic feedback (e-feedback) practices, however, Ene and Upton (2014) found that that nearly 60% of feedback was on global issues (e.g., content, organization), and only about a third was devoted to local matters (e.g., grammar, mechanics). Some differences in the literature on teachers’ response practices, as Hyland and Hyland (2006) suggest, may be due to contextual factors such as educational settings, institutional constraints, and classroom instruction.

Collectively, these studies on L2 writing teachers’ feedback practices have increased our understanding of not only their actual feedback behavior

but also the real challenges teachers face in responding to student writing. Further, they have offered implications and recommendations for individual teachers and L2 writing teacher education. For example, Junqueira and Payant (2015) note that “responding to student writing is not a task that can easily be done in a vacuum and L2 teachers must be responsive to their local realities” (p. 34). They, therefore, suggest that L2 writing teacher education raise teachers’ awareness of the importance of specific teaching contexts in responding to student writing. They also recommend making training in responding to student writing an integral part of the teacher education curriculum (p. 34), given that this task is the most challenging, stressful, and time-consuming activity in the professional lives of writing instructors.

Although we agree with this recommendation to a certain degree, teacher cognition research suggests that teacher education may have varying effects on teachers’ practices (Borg, 2006). These studies have consistently shown that other factors, such as the *apprenticeship of observation* (Lortie, 1975), or what teachers learn about teaching through observations of their teachers as students, as well as institutional and curricular constraints, may have a more powerful influence on teachers’ actual practices (see Borg, 2006, for a comprehensive review). In fact, research on L2 teachers and teaching has repeatedly shown that the context in which teachers work has a tremendous impact on what they do (e.g., Borg, 2006; Farrell & Lim, 2005; Lee, 2016). These contextual factors may include institutional ideology, philosophy, attitude, culture, colleagues, curriculum, and student proficiency and needs (Borg, 2006; Goldstein, 2006; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013). Similarly, L2 writing research has found that these factors can profoundly influence teachers’ responding practices, despite university-based teacher training and even teachers’ willingness to change (e.g., Lee, 2016). Goldstein (2004) contends that “[p]rogrammatic and institutional attitudes towards writing, towards writing teachers, and towards different multilingual populations can greatly affect how teachers provide written commentary” (p. 65).

Therefore, rather than focusing on individual or groups of teachers in potentially disparate settings, Middlewood and Abbott (2015) propose that, in order to transform practice, change needs to start at the program

(or school) level. They advocate that programs (or schools) need to adopt the stance of a “learning organization,” which engages in in-house reflexive inquiries of local practice (e.g., classroom instruction, assessment), if such programs and schools desire to realize context-specific transformations. While also informed by external research, such a program seeks out candid answers to uncomfortable questions relevant to its specific context in order to achieve positive internal improvements. In the L2 writing literature, Matsuda et al. (2013) is one example of an in-house inquiry. As they suggest, it is crucial to engage in internal inquiries of local practice in order to realize purposeful change within the specific educational context. Particularly concerning written feedback, we agree with Christiansen and Bloch (2016) and Lee (2016) that the specific institutional context in which feedback occurs matters because writing programs espouse, explicitly or implicitly, a certain policy and approach that may or may not always coincide with teachers’ beliefs and practices (Matsuda et al., 2013; Montgomery & Baker, 2007).

Adopting the stance of a learning organization, this article reports on an in-house inquiry into the response practices of a group of first year writing (FYW) teachers in our particular context. Specifically, we explore the following question: What types of written feedback do ESL composition teachers in our context provide across a range of student-produced written texts in an FYW course?

By gaining a better understanding of these teachers’ feedback practices, our aim is to bring about purposeful changes in our approach to responding to student writing within our local context. As Middlewood and Abbott (2015) argue, results from such program-internal inquiries can have a greater impact on bringing about changes in local practice than can external forces. In the following sections, we describe our local context and the methods employed. This is followed by the discussion of findings of and responses to our in-house inquiry. We conclude by arguing that programs can establish philosophies of response grounded in their specific context based on examination of local practices.

## Method

### *Context*

Our program, focused on academic literacies for specific purposes, is housed in the linguistics department at a large public university in the US Midwest. The program provides advanced writing, oral communication, and critical reading instruction for matriculated international and domestic graduate and undergraduate students. Beyond courses, our program offers online and in-person tutoring for both L1 and L2 students through our internally coordinated writing, reading, and oral communication labs. Furthermore, we have a dedicated research unit, consisting of faculty and graduate students, that conducts research in and of our local educational context in order to inform our curriculum and teacher development. Although the program primarily focuses on graduate-level instruction, it oversees two FYW courses, specifically designed by the program to meet the writing demands of international and multilingual undergraduate writers.

ENG D160, the focus of this study, is a required course only for those matriculated international undergraduate students who have been placed into it based on the TOEFL iBT writing section score below 24, a score of 5/6 on the institutional IEP's composition test, and/or a grade of B or higher in the IEP's advanced composition course. The standardized curriculum is designed to develop students' academic knowledge of and abilities in organization, coherence, idea development, summarizing, paraphrasing, grammar, vocabulary, and source use. The course not only develops these students' general academic writing abilities but also prepares them for the second course in the FYW sequence for all international and multilingual undergraduate students, which fulfills the institutional FYW requirement for graduation.

At the time of data collection, the assessed writing assignments for the course included a summary task, a summary-response task, a multi-draft argumentative essay, and two in-class written tests. For the summary assignment (200–250 words) in Week 4 and summary-response assignment (500–750 words) in Week 6 or 7, students wrote only one draft on required texts that all students read. In-class test 1 (in Week 7 or 8)

required students to read two short texts with differing viewpoints on a thematic topic and write a short response (about one paragraph in length) to one of the two sources provided. In-class test 2, given at the end of the semester (Week 16), required students to write a one-paragraph response that integrated information from two sources provided on the semester's theme. The multidraft essay assignment required students to choose a topic related to the theme (e.g., social media, public health) and write an argumentative essay between 900 and 1200 words, using at least four academic sources (formatted in APA style). The assignment stages included a proposal, an outline, and three drafts (the drafts were due in Weeks 13, 14, and 15).

All assignments were submitted electronically via Blackboard, a virtual course management system, and teachers assessed and provided e-feedback using standardized grading rubrics. Although tailored specifically to each assignment, all rubrics included categories of content, organization, academic vocabulary, source use, and mechanics, with scores allocated for each category. A grammar category was also included. However, unlike the other categories, students were not awarded points for correct grammar use. Instead, students could lose two or three points per error type, depending on the grammatical error type. Two points could be deducted if two or more grammatical errors concerning verb form, determiners, or noun form were present; three points could be subtracted if three or more grammatical errors dealing with sentence structure, verb tense, or missing subject occurred. Depending on the writing assignment, teachers were expected to respond to different aspects of student writing; however, no detailed instruction was provided on exactly how to give feedback. For the summary assignment, summary-response assignment, and in-class tests, teachers were expected to provide e-feedback on both discourse and form issues. On the multidraft essay project, students and teachers had one-on-one conferences for the outline and draft 1. Teachers were expected to respond to only content and organization on the outline and draft 1, but grade and comment on content, organization, source use, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics on drafts 2 and 3. Besides these assessed writing tasks, students also engaged in four ungraded in-class collaborative writing activities, for which teachers were expected to focus on content and organization issues only.

Lee, Joseph J., Farzaneh Vahabi, and Dawn Bikowski. (2018). "Second Language Teachers' Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response." *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(1): 34–69.



The course is taught by teachers with L2 writing training but with limited teaching experience who are mostly part-time instructors and graduate teaching assistants (TAs). For these teachers, continuing professional support is provided in the form of ongoing mentoring, periodic meetings with the coordinator, supervisor observations, materials sharing and development, and norming sessions conducted for grading assignments, in which randomly selected student texts are evaluated. Additionally, TAs work on one of the program's research projects in their first semester as graduate students, and in their second semester they do their practicum with either the composition coordinator or a teacher who has taught ENG D160 multiple times. During the practicum, they observe the class, support the class teacher, meet weekly with the practicum supervisor to discuss class observations, meet with the class teacher regularly, attend norming sessions, and teach mini and full lessons throughout the semester. In their second year as graduate students, TAs teach classes independently with continued support as listed above. At the time of the study, TAs were given general guidance on responding to student writing, yet no specific instructions were provided.

### *Data and Analysis*

Before presenting the data and analysis, it is important to note that the study is exploratory and descriptive in nature; it should not be interpreted as evaluative. This examination of written feedback arose from a discussion on feedback (e.g., balancing feedback on discourse and form, feedback types and amount, managing paper load) and goal setting during our program's annual retreat. As a learning organization that constantly seeks to better understand our internal practices in order to realize meaningful changes within our program, we decided that one of the many areas we wanted to explore was our internal feedback practice.

Data analyzed consist of e-feedback given by six ENG D160 teachers on assignments written by six randomly selected students in each teacher's class (36 students total).<sup>1</sup> Among these teachers, three were male and three were

---

<sup>1</sup> The study's data are derived from the Corpus of Ohio Learner and Teacher English (COLTE), an ongoing five-year corpus project of the English used by ESL students and instructors currently being compiled by the Classroom Research Unit of the English Language Improvement Program (ELIP) at Ohio University. Since September 2013, we have collected thousands of samples of assessed ESL student writing and teachers' electronic written feedback.

female. At the time of this study, two were full-time lecturers, three were part-time instructors, and one was a TA. Five had at least an MA in applied linguistics/TESOL, and the TA was pursuing her MA in applied linguistics/TESOL. All teachers had taken graduate-level course work in teaching L2 writing. Their university-level teaching experience ranged from one to six years ( $M = 3.67$ ;  $SD = 2.07$ ), though it is important to note that they had taught only one or two FYW courses per term over these years.

The 36 randomly selected students were matriculated international undergraduate students majoring in diverse fields of study, including business, economics, media studies, and engineering. Twenty-two students were male and 14 were female. Typical of our institution and US universities in general (IIE, 2014), most students were L1 Mandarin Chinese speakers ( $n = 27$ ). The remaining students represented a variety of other L1 language backgrounds such as Arabic (3), Portuguese (3), French (1), Japanese (1), and Korean (1). This distribution of language backgrounds is representative of the student population who enroll in ENG D160. These students had studied English in their respective home countries for an average of 8.38 years ( $SD = 3.44$ ). While two students reported not having participated in an IEP, the remaining 34 students, as typical of students at our institution, had studied in a US-based IEP for an average of 3.31 years ( $SD = 2.13$ ).

The data consisted of all writing assignments that the 36 students wrote and e-feedback provided on these assignments by the six teachers. That is, the data included these teachers' e-feedback on 36 summary, 36 summary-response, 36 in-class test 1, 36 essay draft 2, 36 essay draft 3, and 36 in-class test 2 writing tasks. Table 1 provides full descriptions of the student assignments collected. As can be seen, the average grade for each assignment was a B (85.63%) or higher. However, in the summary-response assignment, one student earned a 34.5% because he only included a "poor summary" (teacher comment). The same student also earned the lowest grade for test 1 (65%), but he received passing scores on other assignments (78.5%–87.5%). In contrast, one female student earned a grade of A on each assignment; she earned 100% on both essay drafts 2 and 3, and her lowest score was a 93% on the summary.

Table 1

*Description of Student Papers*

Assignment	<i>n</i>	Tokens	Mean length ( <i>SD</i> )	Mean grade % ( <i>SD</i> )	Grade range %
Summary	36	7,954	220.94 (31.03)	85.63 (06.63)	70.0–96.0
Summary-response	36	22,281	618.92 (117.40)	86.29 (10.61)	34.5–96.0
Test 1	36	8,600	238.89 (37.73)	88.27 (08.12)	65.0–100.0
Essay draft 2	36	37,689	1,046.92 (197.59)	87.31 (05.81)	78.0–100.0
Essay draft 3	36	38,246	1,062.39 (186.00)	91.26 (05.64)	80.0–100.0
Test 2	36	8,831	245.31 (30.80)	89.19 (05.82)	74.0–99.5
Total	216	123,601	572.23 (387.64)		

In total, we examined 4,313 e-feedback items provided on 216 texts, as shown in Table 2. It should be noted that essay draft 1 was excluded, since the teachers were expected to respond only to content and organization on that draft, but we were interested in examining student texts that received both global (i.e., content, organization) and local (e.g., grammar, mechanics) feedback. However, we included essay draft 3, a revised version of essay draft 2, to analyze the amount and types of feedback provided on the final draft.

Table 2

*Description of Teacher Feedback*

Assignment	<i>n</i>	Teacher feedback total	Mean feedback (SD)*	Feedback range
Summary	36	644	17.89 (10.04)	7–47
Summary-response	36	849	23.58 (12.32)	7–56
Test 1	36	680	18.89 (08.52)	6–41
Essay draft 2	36	1,141	31.69 (20.23)	1–84
Essay draft 3	36	528	14.67 (09.11)	0–42
Test 2	36	471	13.08 (06.26)	1–32
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>4,313</b>	<b>19.97 (13.35)</b>	

Note. \* Mean feedback is the average number of feedback instances per text.

As also shown in Table 2, there was a wide range of feedback provided on each writing task. For example, on essay draft 3, a student who earned 100% received zero feedback; she only received the rubric with the grade. In contrast, a student who earned 81.5% on essay draft 2 received 84 feedback instances. Additionally, while the teachers tended to provide more feedback on papers receiving lower grades, this was not always the case, as was also found in Montgomery and Baker (2007). For example, a student earning 90% on essay draft 3 received the most feedback (42 instances), while a student who earned 78.5% on the summary received only 10 total responses.

In analyzing teacher e-feedback in these texts, we first followed Ferris, Pezone, Tade, and Tinti's (1997) suggestion for classifying compound comments. For instance, if a feedback item included several different points that crossed feedback boundaries, each unit was separated:

- (1) XXXX - you have some very complex ideas in this paper. You did fix some of the grammar issues, however, I noticed that you only focused on the ones that

were highlighted and I did not highlight all of your errors. Make sure that you work on proofreading in your future writing so you can catch these mistakes.<sup>2</sup>

In this end-of-text comment, the first sentence focuses on the overall quality of the paper. The second sentence acknowledges improvements in grammar, but it also explicitly indicates that some grammatical mistakes were not attended to. Using a directive, the third sentence explicitly directs the student to proofread more carefully.

Upon segmenting the feedback items, we used Ene and Upton's (2014) e-feedback coding scheme to analyze all feedback instances. Their framework consists of four main categories: *feedback target*, *feedback directness*, *feedback explicitness*, and *feedback charge*. The *feedback target* category consists of three subcategories: (1) *general*, or overall quality of paper, paragraph, or other part of the paper; (2) *discourse level*, or content and organization feedback; and (3) *form level*, or feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Each of these subcategories is further classified into more fine-grained subtypes. While relatively comprehensive, we noticed that some subtypes were overlooked in the *form-level* category. Codes for part of speech and directing student to visit the teacher were also absent. Therefore, we added the part-of-speech and teacher assistance subtypes to the scheme.

The *feedback directness* category concerns the directness (e.g., direct correction) or indirectness (e.g., highlighting) of the feedback. The *feedback explicitness* category focuses on whether the feedback is provided explicitly (e.g., explicit correction) or implicitly (e.g., confirmation check). The last category in their framework, *feedback charge*, is related to whether the feedback is positive, in the form of encouragement or praise, or nonpositive (i.e., corrective feedback). Although Ene and Upton (2014) analyzed the location of feedback in their study, it was not explicitly included in their coding scheme. Therefore, we added the category *feedback location*. This category was used to distinguish within-text (I) and end-of-text (E) feedback as a way to analyze the amount of within- and end-of-text feedback included. The following examples illustrate the coding system used:

---

<sup>2</sup> All excerpts are transcribed directly from the teachers' comments verbatim. Any spelling, punctuation, or grammar errors are from the original sources.

(2) . . . many college students cannot pass online courses compared to traditional classes, and **less fewer** students can get university degrees. [Vw (word/phrase choice) / Dc (correction) / Ec (correction or evaluative comment) / Rn (non-positive feedback) / I (within-text feedback)]

(3) **Transition?** China has one of the largest populations in the world . . . [Otr (transitions) / Ds (explicit statement something is wrong or problematic) / Iw (indicates a problem but no correction provided) / Rn (nonpositive feedback) / I (within-text feedback)]

(5) Try to work on your sentence structures a little more in future writing. [Gs (sentence structure) / Dd (directive) / Ed (directive) / Rn (nonpositive feedback) / E (end-of-text feedback)]

(6) Overall, excellent summary response. [Q (overall quality) / Da (acknowledgement of correct language usage or agreement with content) / Ec (correction or evaluative comment) / Rs (positive feedback) / E (end-of-text feedback)]

In (2), the teacher provides direct and explicit correction on vocabulary within the text, while in (3) the teacher directly indicates that a transition problem exists but offers no explicit correction. Both (5) and (6) are end-of-text comments. The former is an explicit directive on sentence structure; the latter offers a positive comment on overall text quality. Appendix A describes Ene and Upton's (2014) modified coding scheme used in this study.

After pilot coding 60 papers (approximately 25%), the first and second authors worked independently to manually code every feedback instance in the remaining 156 student papers, upon which the feedback items were normalized to occurrences per 1,000 words (ptw). To establish intercoder agreement, every feedback category was checked. Agreement between the first two authors was extremely high for each category: *target* (89.9%), *directness* (97.7%), *explicitness* (95.7%), *charge* (100%), and *location* (100%). The remaining discrepancies were discussed until we reached full agreement.

## Results

The results show that the frequency of responses varied across writing assignments. Essay draft 2 received the most feedback (9.23 ptw), followed by the summary-response (6.85 ptw). However, the shorter assignments (summary, test 1, and test 2) and essay draft 3 received fewer instances of feedback (5.21 ptw, 5.5 ptw, 3.81 ptw, 4.28 ptw, respectively). While some studies have found no relationship between text length and feedback quantity (e.g., Ene & Upton, 2014), our analysis shows that there might be a relationship, supporting Storch's (2010) contention that assignment length impacts feedback quantity. In what follows, we present the results of each feedback category analyzed in turn.

### *General, Discourse-level, and Form-level Feedback*

The teachers provided little general feedback about the overall quality of papers. The analysis shows a decline of general feedback over time, with the first writing task (summary) receiving most of this type of feedback (2.69%) and the last task (test 2) receiving the least (0.26%). The small amount of generalized feedback provided was in the form of end-of-text comments and was mostly positive evaluation of the quality of the work. One teacher provided a general comment on at least one student paper per assignment while another teacher offered no general feedback on any paper. The remaining teachers were highly inconsistent in providing such comments. Our findings are consistent with Ene and Upton (2014), who also found that teachers in their study offered few commentaries on overall text quality. Rather than offer such general commentaries, Ene and Upton suggest that teachers are inclined to focus more on providing text-specific feedback because "students tend to make the most substantial revisions in response" to these types of comments (p. 89). However, the degree to which this may be the case in the present study is unclear.

Table 3 shows the frequencies of discourse- and form-level feedback in each of the assignments analyzed. The overwhelming amount of feedback on these texts focused on form. In fact, between 68.8% and 87.6% constituted issues pertaining to form. Proportionally, the summary received the

least form-centric feedback, with about 31% devoted to discourse issues. However, besides essay draft 2, Table 3 shows a steady diachronic increase in the percentage of form-focused feedback.

Table 3

*Frequencies of Discourse- and Form-Level Feedback*

Assignment	<i>n</i>	Discourse feedback frequency (%)	Form feedback frequency (%)	Total frequency
Summary	36	1.58 (31.2)	3.49 (68.8)	5.07
Summary-response	36	1.39 (20.7)	5.32 (79.3)	6.71
Test 1	36	1.08 (20.1)	4.30 (79.9)	5.38
Essay draft 2	36	2.33 (25.7)	6.74 (74.3)	9.07
Essay draft 3	36	0.60 (14.6)	3.50 (85.4)	4.10
Test 2	36	0.47 (12.4)	3.33 (87.6)	3.80
Total	216	1.24 (21.9)	4.42 (78.1)	5.66

*Note.* Frequencies are occurrences per 1,000 words.

Therefore, although variation in the amount of feedback given per text type exists, there seems to be less distinction in terms of the feedback target, with most feedback focused on form. Our findings do not support some studies that have found that, while feedback practices vary, ESL writing instructors are inclined to place greater emphasis on global over local issues (e.g., Ene & Upton, 2014; Ferris, 2014; Ferris et al., 1997). However, the results converge with other studies, which have shown that writing teachers tend to focus more on local matters (i.e., form), despite their reported beliefs of mainly concentrating on discourse issues (e.g., Lee, 2009; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). In their case study of a novice ESL teacher, Junqueira and Payant (2015) also found that, in contrast to the teacher's stated belief, she primarily focused on form in her actual practice. Likewise, the teachers in the present study placed



greater importance on form, in spite of the recommendations of balancing discourse- and form-focused feedback by L2 writing specialists (e.g., Bitchener & Ferris, 2012).

### ***Content- and Organization-Focused Feedback***

The teachers provided limited rhetorical-level feedback, but, when they did, the emphasis was predominantly on content as opposed to organization, supporting previous studies (Ene & Upton, 2014; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). In fact, over 80% of the discourse-focused responses pertained to content ( $M = 1.03$  ptw), and slightly above 17% related to organization ( $M = 0.22$  ptw). Examining the subcategories of content-focused responses revealed consistency across writing tasks; over 87% concerned development, clarity, and overall content quality, and less than 13% referred to content accuracy. While the teachers provided relatively little feedback on organization, they responded primarily on the subcategories of transitions, cohesion, topic sentence, and idea placement (80% plus) across assignments, and feedback on paragraph order was completely absent, even in multiparagraph texts. However, some subcategories—thesis statement and overall quality—varied considerably. Comments on thesis statements, for example, were not present in the summary-responses and test 2, while they were more highly present on test 1 (17.4%) and essay draft 2 (9.2%), most likely because of the nature of the tasks.

### ***Grammar, Vocabulary, and Mechanical Feedback***

Turning to local issues, we also found uniformity in the types of form teachers focused on. Although grammar ( $M = 1.90$  ptw) was the principle aspect teachers commented on, vocabulary ( $M = 1.40$  ptw) was also highly emphasized, especially in the summary and essay draft 2. The distribution of form types ranged across assignments; however, most grammar-related feedback was on verb tense/form, noun form, sentence structure, articles, and part of speech (73% plus). The remaining grammar issues were on agreement (e.g., subject-verb), omission (e.g., missing object), pronouns, word order, and overall grammar quality, though the last two subcategories were nonexistent in some assignments (e.g., test 1, essay draft 3). While we expected to observe decreasing trends in terms of the types of form-focused feedback provided across assignments and

over time, as found in other studies (e.g., Ferris et al., 1997; Junqueira & Payant, 2015), no such pattern emerged. For example, verb tense/form received the most attention on the summary and the least in test 1, and sentence structure received considerable attention on the summary-response but little in test 2. However, a reverse trend occurred for articles and noun form; articles received the most attention in essay draft 3 while noun form was the most commented-on type in test 2.

Although they focused more on grammar overall, the teachers placed a considerable amount of effort responding to wording or phrasing issues. In fact, the quantity of feedback on grammar and vocabulary provided was virtually equal for the summary and essay draft 2. The summary received 1.29 ptw of vocabulary feedback and 1.30 ptw of grammar feedback. Likewise, in essay draft 2, the teachers provided 2.48 ptw of vocabulary and 2.52 ptw of grammar feedback. This suggests that the use of appropriate academic vocabulary was something that these teachers highly valued or perhaps was easier to mark. Upon examining the two subcategories of vocabulary feedback, over 98% of all feedback unsurprisingly was on word and phrase choices; very limited feedback was devoted to the overall quality of vocabulary use. The teachers also provided extensive feedback on mechanical issues ( $M = 1.09$  ptw). The summary-response (1.51 ptw) and essay draft 2 (1.67 ptw) received the most responses on mechanics. In both text types, the teachers primarily responded to general formatting and documentation issues. Even in the last writing tasks (test 2), over 18% of the feedback was on mechanics.

### *Feedback Directness and Explicitness*

Table 4 presents the frequencies of direct and indirect feedback across assignment types. Although Bitchener and Ferris (2012) recommend that teachers combine both direct and indirect feedback, the majority of feedback provided, irrespective of writing task, was direct, which is consistent with previous studies (Ene & Upton, 2014; Lee, 2009). Direct feedback consisted of mostly direct corrections (38.4%), statements indicating problems (32.2%), directives (11.8%), and deletions (6.3%). In fact, these four subcategories comprised approximately 89% of all direct feedback types. At the extreme end, 61% of all feedback in test 2 was direct corrections; the summary received the fewest instances of such corrections, but

28% was still of this type. Also, the summary and essay draft 2 received a slightly greater number of statements of problems than direct corrections. Yet, combined with deletions, the teachers mostly fixed student writing directly using Microsoft Word's track changes function. While supporting Lee (2009), who also found that corrections and deletions were common practices of Hong Kong EFL teachers, the findings differ from Ene and Upton (2014), who discovered that directives and rule explanations were more common in their study. While infrequent, the vast majority of indirect feedback was of the underlining/highlighting type (93%–98%); rarely did the teachers use other strategies (e.g., error codes).

Table 4

*Frequencies of Direct and Indirect Feedback*

Assignment	<i>n</i>	Direct feedback frequency (%)	Indirect feedback frequency (%)	Total frequency
Summary	36	4.83 (92.7)	0.38 (7.3)	5.21
Summary-response	36	5.62 (82.0)	1.23 (18.0)	6.85
Test 1	36	4.76 (86.2)	0.76 (13.8)	5.52
Essay draft 2	36	7.31 (79.2)	1.92 (20.8)	9.23
Essay draft 3	36	3.90 (91.1)	0.38 (8.9)	4.28
Test 2	36	3.21 (84.3)	0.60 (15.7)	3.81
Total	216	4.94 (84.9)	0.88 (15.1)	5.82

*Note.* Frequencies are occurrences per 1,000 words.

Similar to Ene and Upton's (2014) finding, the teachers provided mainly explicit feedback, as shown in Table 5. Also, converging with Lee (2009), the vast majority of explicit feedback was in the form of explicit corrections, ranging from 51.6% in the summary to 79% in test 2. The teachers also provided explanations of problems and directives to correct problems, but rarely were examples or error codes used. As also shown in Table 5, the

teachers provided more implicit feedback in the summary-response and essay draft 2. Implicit feedback was realized mostly in the form of indicating a problem without offering any correction, but the teachers also asked for clarification and confirmation.

Table 5

*Frequencies of Explicit and Implicit Feedback*

Assignment	<i>n</i>	Explicit feedback frequency (%)	Implicit feedback frequency (%)	Total frequency
Summary	36	4.07 (78.1)	1.14 (21.9)	5.21
Summary-response	36	4.26 (62.2)	2.59 (37.8)	6.85
Test 1	36	3.83 (69.4)	1.69 (30.6)	5.52
Essay draft 2	36	5.54 (60.0)	3.69 (40.0)	9.23
Essay draft 3	36	3.10 (72.4)	1.18 (27.6)	4.28
Test 2	36	2.80 (73.5)	1.01 (26.5)	3.81
Total	216	3.93 (67.5)	1.89 (32.5)	5.82

*Note.* Frequencies are occurrences per 1,000 words.

*Feedback Charge and Location*

In congruence with Ene and Upton (2014) and Lee (2009), the vast majority of feedback was corrective. Besides the first assignment (summary), which received about 9% of positive feedback, the teachers provided no more than 7% of praise or encouragement across the remaining assignments. Further supporting previous studies (Ene & Kosobucki, 2016; Ene & Upton, 2014; Ferris et al., 1997), an inordinate amount of feedback was provided within the text, with very few end-of-text comments. The summary assignment received the greatest number of end-of-text comments (21%). However, in the other texts, less than 6% of the feedback was provided at the end of the text. As was the case in Ene

and Upton's (2014) study, most of the feedback was provided as comment bubbles using Microsoft Word's review function, but, as mentioned above, the teachers also used the track changes function extensively to make corrections or deletions.

### Discussion

Our analysis revealed some variations in the amount and types of feedback that teachers provided on student writing. The summary-response assignment and essay draft 2, two of the longer assignments, included not only greater total instances of feedback but also received more form-focused feedback, direct and indirect feedback, and implicit feedback. Also, essay draft 2 received the highest amount of discourse-level (mainly content-focused) and explicit feedback. The summary, which was the first and shortest writing task, received the most positive feedback. While such variations exist, the teachers, across task types, primarily provided form-focused feedback, supporting some previous studies (Lee, 2009; Montgomery & Baker, 2007) yet diverging from others (Ene & Upton, 2014; Ferris, 2014; Ferris et al., 1997). Most feedback was direct and explicit (Ene & Upton, 2014), typically in the form of explicit corrections and deletions, similar to Lee's (2009) findings. Also supporting previous findings, the overwhelming majority of feedback was corrective and occurred in marginal comment bubbles or directly in the text (e.g., Ene & Upton, 2014). Further, while some previous studies found that the amount of feedback on form decreased diachronically (e.g., Ferris et al., 1997; Junqueira & Payant, 2015), no such pattern emerged in this study.

Upon reflecting on the overwhelming emphasis on direct/explicit feedback on form across assignments, we identified a few potential reasons for this prominence. One possible reason may be due to the course goals. Using academic grammar and vocabulary appropriately are two main learning objectives. The teachers might have considered feedback on form to be crucial in meeting the goals, particularly since most in-class teaching emphasized content and organization instruction with limited instruction on form. Although these course objectives may be contributing factors, the extent to which these constraints compelled the teachers to place such importance on form in their responses is unclear (Lee, 2009).

Relatedly, it is possible that the nature of the writing assignments impacted the teachers' practices. While the course included a multidraft essay project, all other writing tasks were "one shot" (or single draft). Therefore, although these teachers might have been aware of the importance of process writing, they might have felt inclined to "adopt a product-oriented approach" to giving feedback (Lee, 2009, p. 18), perhaps because of the nature of the assignments. However, this may not explain the fact that, even in essay draft 2, the vast majority of responses pertained to form with little to no negative or positive feedback on discourse issues, similar to Montgomery and Baker's (2007) findings.

Another important component of the curriculum that might provide insight into these teachers' practices is the grading rubrics. In their exploration of the relationship between feedback and rubrics, Ene and Kosobucki (2016) found that rubrics have a profound impact on what teachers emphasize and how they give feedback. They suggest that institutionally mandated rubrics can compel teachers to focus on aspects they perceive the program values. Although the standardized rubrics for all course assignments placed greater weight on content and organization, they also included categories focused on grammar, vocabulary, source documentation, and mechanics. With both vocabulary and source documentation, ten points were possible for each; five points were devoted to mechanics. As mentioned earlier, however, for the grammar section, papers did not earn any points for successful use; rather, they could lose up to two to three points per grammar error type. If two or more grammatical errors involving verb form, articles and determiners, or part of speech, for example, were present, two points per error type could be deducted. If three or more grammatical errors relating to sentence structure, verb tense, or subject omission, for example, were present, three points could be deducted for each type. Therefore, the rubrics could have had an effect on these teachers' feedback practices. However, we suggest that these three factors combined might have led these teachers to place greater effort on responding to form over content and organization.

Beyond the curriculum, the literature suggests other possible explanations for the inordinate amount of direct/explicit form-focused feedback. In her study, Lee (2009) found that the majority of teacher feedback was

direct/explicit correction. As she suggests, while teachers may believe that students should be responsible for identifying and correcting their own errors, teachers have a tendency to do so themselves because they believe that students are incapable. Furthermore, she found that teachers tend to place more emphasis on form in their feedback because student texts include far more form- than discourse-level problems. It is possible that our teachers also viewed the focal students' writing to include a greater number of errors on form than on content and organization. As the literature also indicates, the *apprenticeship of observation* (Lortie, 1975) and prior experience can have tremendous influences on teachers (Borg, 2006). It is possible that these teachers were responding to their students' writing not only in a similar way to the way they were given feedback as students but also based on their previous teaching experience. The literature also suggests that "fatigue and an overwhelming paper load" can affect teachers' practices (Ferris et al., 1997, p. 173). Since commenting on ideas may require a greater cognitive load and amount of time, it is possible that directly correcting local problems could have been perceived tacitly as being easier to do and cognitively less demanding (Ene & Upton, 2014), considering the number of writing tasks and student texts to which the teachers needed to respond. Furthermore, as Montgomery and Baker (2007) suggest, since many ESL students believe that commenting on form errors is a crucial part of writing instruction, and these students seem to prefer "lots of comments" on form-related matters (p. 93), writing teachers tend to accommodate students' preferences. It could be the case that the focal teachers in our context also might have met what they tacitly believed to be their students' expectations. Nevertheless, such an emphasis on correcting form not only signals to "students that local issues are more important than global issues" in writing but also suggests that "they should prioritize local errors" in their writing (Montgomery & Baker, 2007, p. 95).

### An In-House Response

In response to our findings, we have taken and continue to take several measures to ensure that our teachers have the resources, tools, and support needed to move beyond their current responding practices. First,

we have worked together to revise the ENG D160 curriculum. Besides the in-class test, out-of-class writing assignments are now multidraft in order to encourage our teachers to adopt a process-oriented approach to feedback. These multidraft writing tasks include a synthesis paper, in which students synthesize information from at least three sources, and a secondary research paper, which builds on the synthesis assignment, with a minimum of four sources. We have also considered ways for students to respond to feedback on the in-class test to not only provide them opportunities to improve their grades but also to emphasize process writing (e.g., submitting a revised version of the test based on teacher feedback; engaging in a reflective writing task in which students reflect on goals, successes, and future plans). Also included in the curriculum is more space for instruction focused on targeted grammatical items commonly misused by our students as well as time for teacher- and peer-assisted in-class writing, proofreading, and editing.

In addition, we have revised the grading rubrics for all FYW courses to minimize teachers' compulsion to hyperfocus on local issues (Ene & Kosobucki, 2016). Specifically, the rubrics now include a section where students can earn points for successful language use rather than being strictly penalized for only misuses. Relatedly, regular training sessions on responding to student writing and using the grading rubrics appropriately have been established. In such sessions, we have underscored the need to balance discourse and form feedback, direct and indirect feedback, and negative and positive feedback (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). We have also encouraged teachers to include end-of-text comments that balance successful areas in student writing as well as areas for continued development, as it has been found that learners appreciate such comments (Ene & Kosobucki, 2016). In their case study of an L2 learner, Ene and Kosobucki found end-of-text comments to be "the most informative, have clarifying power, and support learner motivation" (p. 10). They, therefore, contend that "there is value in adopting pedagogical practices that include marginal and end comments for L2 learners" (p. 11), supporting other L2 writing researchers (e.g., Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

To further support our teachers, we have offered other professional development opportunities. These activities have included brownbag



discussions on feedback (e.g., balancing feedback on discourse and form, direct and indirect feedback, time management and paper load) in which all of our teachers shared their approach to written responses, as well as engaged in collaborative feedback in which groups of teachers work together on student papers in order to learn various options for providing feedback from their peers. Furthermore, our internal inquiry has led to our teachers reflecting on their beliefs and practices in seeking congruence in their teaching lives. They have written initial feedback statements outlining their feedback approach and rationale to encourage reflection on beliefs and practices on giving feedback (Junqueira & Payant, 2015).

As a program, we also have participated in online discussion series on feedback and assessing writing sponsored by TESOL's Second Language Writing Interest Section. In collaboration with other units at our institution, one of the leading experts on L2 writing was invited to share current research and "best practices" on providing feedback to L2 learners with not only our teachers but with the larger community of writing teachers at our institution. Engagement in these series of discussions led to some important principles: prioritize feedback on meaning, focus feedback on individual student needs and readiness, limit form-focused feedback to encourage risk-taking, prioritize form-focused feedback on mistakes affecting meaning, include both praise and constructive criticism, and encourage student reflection.

These activities and discussions in turn have led to the development of a program-level statement on feedback (see Appendix B), which complements our existing programmatic teaching philosophy. As Matsuda et al. (2013) discovered in their institutional investigation, teachers form an "impression" of a program's policies, even in the absence of such policies. Similarly, Montgomery and Baker (2007) found that, without an officially articulated philosophy, regular in-house teacher training sessions on feedback have a limited (to nonexistent) effect on changing teachers' practices. Lee (2016) contends that, without a commitment to and support for teacher improvement at the administration level, even teachers' willingness to change is momentary at best. Rather than taking a top-down approach, all teachers involved in our program collaboratively participated in writing our shared philosophy on feedback that is aligned with current

“best practices” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Ferris, 2014) as well as our collective teaching experiences in our local context. This jointly-constructed statement has allowed us not only to reflect upon and reexamine our own previous individual beliefs and practices but, more importantly, to also take a more intentional, committed, principled, and collective approach to responding to student writing. Both our program-level teaching and feedback philosophies emphasize our shared core values and are intended to guide both teachers and administration in developing and teaching our courses as well as in the training of new instructors and TAs. As the field’s search for the most effective approach to responding to student writing continues, so too is our committed pursuit, as reflected in this present study, in providing students in our local context with what we, as an organization, believe is the most helpful feedback based on our continued internal data-driven examination of our response practices.

### Conclusion

In this in-house inquiry, we explored the feedback practices of a group of FYW teachers in our program in order to better understand their response behaviors, which resulted in bringing about purposeful change within our local setting (Middlewood & Abbott, 2015). As Middlewood and Abbott maintain, “Only by regularly reassessing internal practices can improvements occur” (p. 23). Since we, as a collaborative program, consider ourselves to be a learning organization with a shared sense of purpose, this in-house inquiry is one aspect of our internal questioning as reflective practitioners.

Although the findings of our internal inquiry may not be generalizable to other educational settings, we suggest that issues emerging from our local examination may resonate with those in similar contexts. We conclude with some recommendations for such programs. First, we believe that it is crucial for programs to establish a clearly articulated program-level statement on their philosophy of and approach to teaching in general and responding to student writing in particular (Matsuda et al., 2013; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). It is critically important for each program to have in place a clear position on its approach to feedback, be committed to the approach,

and offer support for teachers. Such a statement, however, needs to be constructed collaboratively in order for all stakeholders involved to be invested in the process and engage in practices in accordance with the communal philosophy.

Additionally, we highly encourage programs to engage in their own in-house inquiries in order to better understand their internal practices and to make informed, purposeful, and context-specific changes. Yet it is crucially imperative that programs take a collaborative, nonevaluative, and exploratory approach to these endeavors. As Middlewood and Abbott (2015) propose, programs should work toward establishing their “shared purpose to develop into a purposeful change model” (p. 59) to pursue continuous development of their local learning organization. In so doing, programs would create a “culture of positive restlessness” (p. 58) and collaboratively pursue locally relevant inquiries in order to bring about meaningful improvements in their specific context.

### **Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank the editor and anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful and constructive comments, and the teachers for participating in the study.

## References

- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 102–118.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010a). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*, 193–214.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010b). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 207–217.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 191–205.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267–296.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Christiansen, M. S., & Bloch, J. (2016). “Papers are never finished, just abandoned”: The role of written teacher comments in the revision process. *Journal of Response to Writing, 2*, 6–42.
- Ene, E., & Kosobucki, V. (2016). Rubrics and corrective feedback in ESL writing: A longitudinal case study of an L2 writer. *Assessing Writing, 30*, 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.06.003>

- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2014). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. *System*, 46, 80–95.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.011>
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Lim, P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ*, 9, 1–12. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej34/a9.pdf>
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime . . . ?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49–62.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Context and issues* (pp. 81–104). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181–201.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490>
- Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6–23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.004>
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 155–182.

- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90032-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90032-1)
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 63–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.006>
- Goldstein, L. M. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 185–205). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.01.001>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*, 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Institute of International Education (IIE). (2014). Open doors 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Leading-Places-of-Origin/2013-15>
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). “I just want to do it right, but it’s so hard”: A novice teacher’s written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27*, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.001>
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers’ beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal, 63*(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Lee, I. (2016). Teacher education on feedback in EFL writing: Issues, challenges, and future directions. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*, 518–527. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.303>

- Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30*, 66–81.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.011>
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 68–86.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.10.001>
- Middlewood, D., & Abbott, I. (2015). *Improving professional learning through in-house inquiry*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self assessment and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 82–99.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
- Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*, 29–46.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119181>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*, 327–369.  
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>

## Appendix A

### Teacher Electronic Feedback Coding Scheme

(adapted from Ene & Upton, 2014, pp. 90–91)

#### 1. Feedback target

Category	Code	Explanation	Example
General	Q	Overall quality of a paragraph, larger part of a paper, or entire paper	“Your summary is overall well written.”
Discourse level			
Content	Cc	Clarity or understandability	“Is this related to the steps?”
	Cd	(Lack of) development	“You have to explain why this is good.”
	Ca	Accuracy of information or interpretation, or a claim’s truth value of a claim	“The source does not say this. I have read this source and this is not correct.”
	Cq	Overall quality of content of a whole paragraph or paper	“Effective discussion of Gladwell’s work.”
Organization	Otr	Transitions	“There should be a transition here.”
	Oth	Thesis statement	“Thesis of this paragraph?”
	Oto	Topic sentence	“Good topic sentence.”
	Och	Coherence and cohesion	“You do not connect this to hacking or identity theft.”
	Op	Idea placement	“Why mentioning the hospital here?”
	Oo	Paragraph order	“I think you should reorder your paragraphs.”
	Oq	Overall quality of organization	“Very well organized.”



Form level			
Vocabulary	Vw	Word/phrase choice	"This is not the right word."
	Vq	Overall quality of vocabulary	"Excellent use of academic language . . ."
Grammar/ syntax/ morphology	Gs	Sentence structure	"Modify your sentence structure in this paragraph."
	Go	Omission (e.g., subject, verb)	"This sentence has no subject."
	Gw	Word order	"Word order: 'people are increasingly using'"
	Gv	Verb tense or form	"Be careful what tense you use."
	Gn	Noun form	. . . countriesy (plural forms) . . .
	Gart	Articles	For example, in the movie "2012" . . .
	Gagr	Agreement (e.g., subject-verb)	. . . negative effects areis analyzed.
	Gp	Prepositions	. . . diversity of options for students . . .
	Gpron	Pronouns	. . . that it they can diminish students' ability . . .
	Gpos	Part of speech	. . . both extroverted and introverted personalities are actively in social networks . . .
	Gq	Overall quality of grammar	" . . . there are some grammar problems."
Mechanics	Mp	Punctuation	Although, (punctuation: comma unnecessary)
	Ms	Spelling	. . . and especial (Sp., special) classes to learn . . .

Lee, Joseph J., Farzaneh Vahabi, and Dawn Bikowski. (2018). "Second Language Teachers' Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response." *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(1): 34–69.

Writing process	Md	Documentation or attribution	“Who is the author of this source, Huang or Fast Knife Blue Shirt”
	Mf	Formatting	“Double spaced/indent”
	Mq	Overall quality of mechanics	
	Pr	Revision	“I’m giving you another opportunity this time to revise what you have here.”
	Pw	Writing lab assistance	“See writing lab.”
	Pt	Teacher assistance	“We worked two hours in finding sources, but if you need more help I’ll be happy to meet with you again.”
	Wq	Overall quality of revision	“Effective revisions.”

## 2. Feedback directness

Category	Code	Explanation	Example
Direct	Dc	Correction (correct form provided: replacement, reformulation, insertion)	InTo conclude, the author indicates that . . .
	Ds	Explicit statement that something is wrong or problematic	“capitalization”
	Dr	Rule or explanation is provided	“You cannot use the indefinite article with a plural.”
	Dd	Directive	“Delete”
	De	Example is provided	“For example: also, in addition.”
	Du	Incorrect form is crossed out	. . . the author still advises adults <b>need</b> to spend some time . . .
	Da	Acknowledgment of correct language usage or agreement with content	“This is a really interesting idea!”

Indirect	Ig	Error is graphically marked: underlining, highlighting, circling	. . . I agree that social media become more popular and a lot of people start using it . . .
	It	Error count is provided	“3 verb tense errors”
	Ict	Error codes are used (e.g., wc for word choice)	“C/NC noun”

### 3. Feedback explicitness

Category	Code	Explanation	Example
Explicit	Ec	Correction or evaluative comment	Similarity <sup>ly</sup> , in China, a few years ago . . .
	Ed	Directive	“Do not start your paper with a question.”
	Ect	Error codes	“POS”
	Ep	Explanations or statements that something is wrong or problematic	“Too close to original”
	Ew	Example is provided	“Instead you need a construction like ‘Gossip still has a positive effect because it can maintain . . .’”
Implicit	Icc	Confirmation check	“Other information on the internet, right?”
	Icr	Clarification check	“What do you mean by ‘manipulation’?”
	Ip	Explanation without correction	“The verb ‘discuss’ is typically followed by a noun or noun phrase.”
	Iw	Indicates something is wrong but no correction is provided	. . . the king of this country wants people to do some crazy business (informal) to shift their minds.”

#### 4. *Feedback charge*

Category	Code	Explanation	Example
Positive	Rs	Praise, encouragement, or acknowledgment of something positive	“Great intro to this information!”
Nonpositive	Rn	All feedback that is not Rs.	“I’m not sure what you mean by this word.”

#### 5. *Feedback location*

Category	Code	Explanation	Example
Within-text	I	Feedback provided within in the paper (e.g., comment bubbles, track changes)	“research is a non-count noun
End-of-text	E	Feedback provided at the end of the paper	“Your summary is strong, but your response is rather unfocused.”

## Appendix B

### Program Statement on Feedback

The starting point of our philosophy on responding to student work is the needs of our students. We view response as a complex social process and activity centered on helping students negotiate and communicate their individual meanings. As a learning activity, we view response as a dialogic, interactive, and goal-oriented endeavor that involves scaffolding and mediation through selective intervention in order to assist students in developing the knowledge, abilities, and tools necessary to become autonomous and competent communicators.

Based on this philosophy, we approach our response practices according to the following guidelines:

1. Feedback will be customized to the specific student and context (class, assignment, draft/presentation, etc.).

2. Feedback will include both encouragement and constructive criticism.
3. Feedback will focus more on global concerns (i.e., content, organization) than on local issues (e.g., grammar, mechanics, phonology) unless these local errors are major concerns that interfere with meaning.
4. Feedback will include questions to promote student thinking and autonomy, or when ideas are unclear. Imperatives are used if the issue must be revised.
5. Feedback on errors will be selective and targeted rather than comprehensive, based on course objectives, student need, and assignment; not all errors or problems will be identified in the feedback.
6. In written assignments, feedback on errors, such as grammar, mechanics, citations, or word choice, will be primarily indirect. Direct feedback will be used when it is likely the student is unable to fix the error on his or her own, and an explanation will be included. Feedback on errors will be provided the first few times for repeated errors or concerns, and then students will be asked to find and correct these errors on their own.
7. Summative comments will be included in the feedback, moving from something positive to then highlighting a few of the main areas and concerns in need of improvement.
8. For each assignment, a grading rubric will be used. Students will practice with the rubric, or at least discuss it, before submitting or presenting their work.
9. Graded assignments are integrated into the course (e.g., reviewed in class with students revising/asking questions, discussed during office hours/conferences, etc.).

#### 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/>).

Lee, Joseph J., Farzaneh Vahabi, and Dawn Bikowski. (2018). "Second Language Teachers' Written Response Practices: An In-House Inquiry and Response." *Journal of Response to Writing*, 4(1): 34–69.