November 2021

Editorial Introduction

Katherine Daily O'Meara
St. Norbert College

Betsy Gilliland
University of Hawai'i Mānoa

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

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Language and Literacy Education Commons, Modern Languages Commons, Other English Language and Literature Commons, and the Other Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature Commons

RW

JOURNAL OF RESPONSE TO WRITING

Editorial Introduction

Katherine Daily O'Meara
St. Norbert College

Betsy Gilliland
University of Hawai'i Mānoa

Welcome to the fall 2021 issue of the *Journal of Response to Writing*! This issue once again establishes *response* as a practice with incredible breadth, depth, and variety. In this issue, five feature articles present research on writing and response in multiple languages (whether first or second), at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. You will read about interactions among students and those between students and teachers, as well as inquiries that come from the points of view of both feedback-givers and feedback-receivers. The authors also present studies that incorporate a creative variety of methodological approaches: reflective journaling, screen recording, interviews, stimulated recall, duoethnography, case studies, and more. Each article is briefly introduced below; we encourage readers to download them all to engage with each study in its entirety.

In the first of two articles in this collection that are centered around response in a language other than English, we include a study of 18 students who are learning Spanish. In "Spanish Writing Learners' Stances as Peer Reviewers," Emilia Illana-Mahiques and Carol Severino investigate

how students interpret and enact peer review processes. They identify four "feedback-giving stances" or roles that students tend to adopt when responding to classmates' writing: critical, sensitive, interpretive, or supportive. Illana-Mahiques and Severino share how the positionality of students during peer review can impact their commenting practices and overall decision-making, and that even when a group of students is given the same peer review training, the way they apply this knowledge can vary widely. The authors suggest that it is beneficial for teachers to give students the space to ask themselves two questions: Who am I during peer review? and What does this say about my own and others' experiences with response?

The second study examines another multilingual context: this time, students who have Spanish as a first language (L1) and are learning French in Costa Rica. In "Student Engagement with Teacher Written Corrective Feedback in a French as a Foreign Language Classroom," Maria-Lourdes Lira-Gonzales, Hossein Nassaji, and Kuok-Wa Chao Chao examine the different ways French as a foreign language (FFL) students engage with their teacher's written corrective feedback (WCF). They identify three types of engagement: affective, behavioral, and cognitive. The authors found that students' level of attention to feedback varied and was affected by their differing levels of affective and cognitive engagement. Their findings suggest that if teachers help students process the feedback they are given, students can better engage with that feedback. This result has implications for determining the effects of WCF on students' writing and revision processes —from the *feedback-receiver's* point of view. Lira-Gonzales et al.'s study is the first article of two in this issue that considers WCF.

"Toward a Better Understanding of the Complex Nature of Written Corrective Feedback and Its Effects: A Duoethnographical Exploration of Perceptions, Choices, and Outcomes" by Eva Kartchava, Yushi Bu, Julian Heidt, Abdizalon Mohamed, and Judy Seal is the second WCF-focused article in this collection. In this study, we get a glimpse into response from the *feedback-giver's* point of view. This article is collaboratively written by

a teacher-educator and four graduate students who are all preservice teachers enrolled in a course on pedagogical grammar. The study incorporates duoethnography, a method of qualitative research in which two or more people simultaneously investigate a particular phenomenon and then reflect upon and potentially reconceptualize their experiences. Kartchava et al.'s study takes a look at grad students' reflections on the process of giving WCF to English for academic purposes (EAP) students. The authors critically examine their understanding and practices of WCF, particularly how their previously held attitudes about feedback-giving impact their current practices. Readers can reflect on their own attitudes about and histories with response, and how these determine the ways they approach feedback in their own contexts.

Just as there is no definitive answer for how to give the "best" feedback, there is also no "best" answer for how to teach paraphrasing. Ling Shi's study "Professors' Views of Content Transformation in Students' Paraphrasing" adds to the conversation and explores the question of what makes a good paraphrase. Shi interviewed 27 professors from across the disciplines who reviewed and responded to a collection of paraphrases written by graduate students. The study focuses on content transformation—the process students use between reading the text and paraphrasing it—as well as the ways teachers respond to these paraphrasing moves. This nod to intertextuality (Spivey, 1997) illuminates the connections that occur when students select, organize, and relate information to paraphrase in their own writing. One of Shi's findings is that differences in teachers' disciplinary or cultural contexts may lead to variation in their assessment of students' paraphrasing capabilities. This finding suggests that paraphrasing is a skill that should be explicitly taught in specific disciplines and supported at the graduate level.

Our final featured article is another study that focuses on the practices of graduate students. Shakil Rabbi recounts a case study of one graduate student in "Uptake Processes in Academic Genres: The Socialization of an Advanced Academic Writer Through Feedback Activities." Rabbi observes

how this student takes up feedback while writing research articles in her fields: political science and gender and women's studies. Graduate students often have the unique positionality of "simultaneously performing the role of expert and learning the content needed to be a full member of a discourse community" (this volume, p. 151), and this study identifies the genre competencies (Bawarshi, 2003) that are necessary for graduate students to enculturate and enhance their socialization into the academy and their fields. Rabbi suggests that, like paraphrasing (Shi, this volume), peer review and response activities should be incorporated at the graduate level.

A common theme running through each manuscript in this collection is the idea that writing and response are interactive, collaborative endeavors whose success hinges on communication with and the support of others. The diverse contexts present in this issue give readers the opportunity to reflect on the feedback networks we have all experienced at various points in our careers, whether as students or as teachers. We hope the diversity of research presented in this issue inspires you to think about response to writing in your own academic contexts and against the backdrop of your own material conditions. What unique ideas about response might you contribute to an upcoming issue? We encourage authors to submit manuscripts from any student age group, any language context, and any institutional type. Check out our new website/platform (https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/) and follow us on social media (Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter). We look forward to moving the conversation off the page and into the world! Thanks for checking out the fall 2021 issue of the *Journal of Response to Writing*.

References

Bawarshi, A. S. (2003). *Genre and the invention of the writer: Reconsidering the place of invention in composition*. Utah State University Press.

Spivey, N. N. (1997). *The constructivist metaphor: Reading, writing, and the making of meaning.* Academic Press.