



December 2022

Editorial Introduction

Kat O'Meara
Saint Norbert College

Betsy Gilliland
University of Hawaii Manoa

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Meara, Kat and Gilliland, Betsy (2022) "Editorial Introduction," *Journal of Response to Writing*: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol8/iss2/1>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Response to Writing* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.



Editorial Introduction

Katherine Daily O'Meara

St. Norbert College

Betsy Gilliland

University of Hawai'i Mānoa

Welcome to the fall 2022 issue of the *Journal of Response to Writing*! This issue includes three featured articles, three teaching articles, and a book review for your enjoyment. Two key themes manifest in our fall issue: The first is the idea that feedback/response necessitates clear and effective communication among stakeholders and that collaboration and negotiation are key aspects of this process. The second key theme is the association of response with equitable assessment practices, namely contract grading in a number of different manifestations. Our previous issue included a teaching tip that brings together the topics of contract grading and response (O'Meara, 2022), and we are excited to share more about this popular topic. Both themes confirm that for response to be successful, we cannot go at it alone. Classroom teachers, students, and writing center directors and consultants can all benefit from more candid relationships and a clearer articulation of expectations, goals, and needs.

In the featured article “Using Lessons From Collaboratively Processing Written Corrective Feedback,” Nicholas Carr uses sociocultural theory (SCT) as a lens to examine how two English language learners coconstruct

knowledge from processing the written corrective feedback (WCF) they received on coproduced texts. Carr reports that transfer of knowledge occurs in multiple ways, including being able to use the knowledge generated through the learners' interactions when completing other tasks individually, as well as displaying the ability to transform their knowledge to meet demands in new contexts. Carr's study furthers the extant literature on WCF, advocating for collaboration throughout the writing process.

In a timely article investigating first-year composition (FYC) instructors' perspectives on different modes of in-person and online writing feedback, Ariel M. Goldenthal et al. report their findings in "Feedback Practices in Hybrid Writing Courses: Instructor Choices About Modality and Timing." In this study, the authors surveyed and interviewed 14 writing instructors to understand how they decided on approaches to response during different formats of writing class, including how they made use of the university learning management system (LMS). Findings from this study suggest that teachers have not yet fully figured out how best to balance modalities to maximize the affordances of each.

In the final feature article, "Feedback as Boundary Object: Intersections of Writing, Response, and Research," Lindsey Harding et al. utilize the research term *boundary object* (Star & Griesemer, 1989) to describe the negotiation and collaborative processes that occur in response practices used by students and teachers (e.g., a teacher's response to student drafts, a student's response to teacher feedback, and a teacher's response to student revisions). The authors propose that this nascent theory calls for rethinking feedback's role in the writing classroom and that considering feedback as a boundary object can better facilitate communication, action, and understanding in the process of student writing.

Sarah Klotz and Kristina Reardon continue the conversation about teacher-student negotiation in this issue's first teaching article, "Crafting a Writing Response Community Through Contract Grading," by bringing course-embedded writing fellows and writing center pedagogy into the equation. Klotz and Reardon are a classroom teacher and a previous writing center director, respectively, who argue for a more intentional relationship between these two roles. The researchers note that new iterations

of response are taking center stage in the writing classroom thanks to the rising popularity of grading contracts. Their work suggests that cultivating connections between different writing sites can improve and sustain students' relationships to the feedback process.

Sarah M. Lacy's teaching article, "Feedback Conversations: An Activity to Initiate Instructor-Student Dialogues About Writing Development," introduces readers to an approach the author has used in teaching undergraduate writing classes. In feedback conversations (FCs), the teacher engages students with reading and making sense of written feedback through dialogues using Google Docs comments. Lacy profiles two students from her classes, one who found a new sense of self-efficacy through the FC process and another who, though not actively engaged with the conversation, nevertheless made progress with their writing.

The final teaching article in this issue, "Student Interpretation and Use Arguments: Evidence-Based, Student-Led Grading," by Laura Aull, picks up the issue of conventional versus contract-based grading. Importantly, Aull laments that "assigning grades is distinctly lonely terrain" for writing teachers (p. 2) and offers an alternative-assessment approach that foregrounds students' response to their own writing and engages them in the process of assessment. Aull recommends that students craft their own interpretation and use arguments (or IUAs) to advocate for the grades they want to receive on their work.

Finally, in our first book review in several years, we continue on the topic of contract grading. Amanda Sladek examines Ellen C. Carillo's (2021) book *The Hidden Inequities in Labor-Based Contract Grading*, highlighting how Carillo's short book points out some of the challenges raised by labor-based contract grading, including ways that the process may put some students at a disadvantage. In addition to noting the strengths of this new book, Sladek's review also draws attention to some of its limitations and suggests additional sources for readers interested in delving deeper into the topic.

While this fall issue does not include any teaching tips, we strongly encourage you to submit your great ideas in this new genre for publication in our next issue. Work published in the "Teaching Tips" section of the *Journal of Response to Writing* will be reviewed by the editors, leading to

a quicker turnaround time than other accepted genres. Read about all the ways you can publish with us on our "[Submission Guidelines & Policies](#)" [page](#) of our website. You can also sign up at the JRW site to be notified when a new issue drops and register to review for us! As always, you can find us on social media: [Facebook](#), [Instagram](#), and [Twitter](#). Thanks for reading, and enjoy the fall 2022 issue of the Journal of Response to Writing.

References

- O'Meara, K. D. (2022). Building response into labor-based grading contracts. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 8(1), 81–91.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001>