Is coaching enough?
Feedback approaches to JMC writing instruction

by Sharlene R. Kenyon
Oklahoma State University

Abstract:

In an effort to innovate and increase the effectiveness of university journalism and mass communication (JMC) writing instruction, educators and universities have incorporated coaching and other process-oriented feedback strategies. Classroom observations and interviews revealed traditional and coaching strategies at work in the JMC classrooms. This article reveals the similarities and differences among JMC university writing instructors and analyzes the significance of recursive cycles of feedback, rewriting and coaching in the design of JMC writing instruction.

Feedback is an important strategy of JMC writing instruction and coaching is one approach for providing feedback. This paper focuses on feedback through the lens of the coaching approach. Coaching has been accepted as a process-oriented feedback strategy in journalism and mass communication (JMC) writing instruction (Clark & Fry, 1991; Pitts, 1989; Schierhorn & Endres, 1992; Wiist, 1997). Not all feedback employs a coaching approach but coaching is a feedback strategy that incorporates the tactics of questioning and instructor-student dialogue in verbal and written forms (Clark & Fry, 1991; Wolf & Thomason, 1986). Observations of seven JMC instructors called into question whether coaching, as the *only* process-oriented strategy of JMC writing instruction, could mitigate central feedback problems of traditional product-oriented writing instruction (feedback limited to mechanics, grammar, style, and structure with few or no opportunities for rewriting) in JMC classrooms.

Scholars demonstrated that the use of a coaching approach in JMC writing instruction was beneficial for writers (Clark & Fry, 1991; Wolf & Thomason, 1986) and coaching supporters called for its integration into JMC writing instruction (Massé & Popovich, 2004; Olsen, 1987; Wiist, 1997; Zurek, 1986). Research documenting the use of coaching in JMC writing instruction is more than a decade old; although the Poynter Institute promotes the use of coaching and offers courses about coaching strategies on its News U website, *newsu.org*. No academic research was uncovered investigating how coaching strategies are implemented in JMC classrooms nor articles considering whether a coaching approach strengthened the feedback problems commonly found in traditional writing instruction.

A multiple case study of writing instruction in the JMC classroom (Kenyon, 2017), found that administrators and instructors believed adding coaching strategies to an otherwise traditional model of

instruction alleviated feedback problems associated with traditional writing instruction mentioned above. The observational and interview data appeared contrary to this assumption. Deeper examination of the data fostered the following research questions:

1. How is coaching enacted in two JMC universities?
2. Is coaching, as a feedback strategy, sufficient to mitigate the limited feedback often associated with traditional JMC writing instruction?

Literature Review

Feedback as Writing Instruction

Feedback is a dynamic and dialogic process that occurs recursively during the progression of a writing course (Elbow, 1998; Lee & Schallert, 2008). "Instructor feedback is considered an important pedagogic tool in the writing process" (Wiltse, 2002, p. 136). Instructor feedback is used as a model for students as they learn to evaluate their own work. Ideally, feedback is a nearly continuous series of collaborative interactions between instructor and student which evolves into a semester long dialogue with the ultimate goal of improving the student's writing.

Feedback scholars observed students prefer a mix of feedback about product and process using both written and verbal delivery formats (Morris & Chikwa, 2016; Wiltse, 2002). The combination of feedback information and formats work together to support student writing, particularly when students have the opportunity to use that feedback as they rewrite a previous draft (Bardine, et al., 2000).

Written feedback is the delivery of feedback in the form of written or electronic communication and may include comments regarding product and/ or process (Wolf & Thomason, 1986). Researchers found that students preferred receiving verbal feedback because they remembered positive comments delivered verbally more consistently than written comments (Morris & Chikwa, 2016). Face-to-face feedback provided a platform for instructor-student dialogue which improved understanding of feedback and provided students with the opportunity to ask questions and make better revision decisions (Yang & Carless, 2013). Studies found students referred back to written feedback more easily than audio or verbal feedback and used it as a reference for other writing assignments (Morris & Chikwa, 2016).

JMC writing educators use feedback as a tool for improving student writing by integrating product and process information. Process feedback "focuses on the writing process (i.e., idea generation, reporting, organization, writing and rewriting) and provides feedback at each step" (Schierhorn & Endres, 2002, p. 58). It facilitates understanding the writer's thinking, thus producing deeper thinking, stronger conceptual development and cohesion in the piece writing (Hresan, 1992; Murray, 2003; Scanlan, 2003). Product feedback focuses on responding "with extensive comments" to the student writer about style, structure, language usage, readability and other target audience considerations for the end product (Schierhorn & Endres, 2002, p. 58; Wiltse, 2002). Some scholars refer to this teaching philosophy as the "editor approach" because instructors concentrate primarily on editing the final draft (Massé & Popovich, 2004; Wiltse, 2002).

The Product-Process Debate

For decades, educators and scholars debated the effectiveness of process-oriented instruction versus the product-oriented outcomes necessary for success in JMC careers (Massé & Popovich, 1998, 2004, 2007; Olsen, 1987; Schierhorn & Endres, 1992; Wiist, 1997; Zurek, 1986). Massé and Popovich (2004) used the terms "editor" and "coach" to frame the debate between product and process approaches (p. 214). "Journalism education has long been dominated by traditionalists," (Massé & Popovich, 2004, p. 217) a traditional "editor" approach concentrates on "writing-as-product" and is exemplified by correcting copy for style and mechanics in the final draft (p. 224). In contrast, coaching focuses on "writing-as-process" which strives to improve the writer's reporting and writing skills (Clark & Fry, 1991; Massé & Popovich, 2004, p. 224). Coaching, as an instructional practice, is generally accepted (Clark and Fry, 1991; Massé & Popovich, 1998; Schierhorn & Endres, 1992; Wiist, 1997). However, empirical studies of the widespread use of coaching practices in JMC writing classrooms is mixed (Massé & Popovich, 2007; Schierhorn, 1990).

Scholars have urged JMC educators to adopt coaching as a strategy for writing instruction because it integrates product and process instruction and encourages more instructor-student collaboration (Massé & Popovich, 2004; Olsen, 1987; Pitts, 1989; Wiist, 1997). In the context of JMC scholarship, coaching is a process-oriented feedback technique in which instructors engage in active, face-to-face dialogue about student writing processes (Massé & Popovich, 2004; Scanlan, 2003). When teachers and

students collaborate during the writing process, the student becomes an active participant in the learning process (Scanlan, 2003; Wiltse, 2002). "Conferences [coaching] can be powerful tools in helping students improve their writing" (Bardine, et al., 2000, p. 101). Asking questions, which is a primary technique of coaching, allows students to work through the problem themselves and the instructor helps the writer without taking over the draft (Murray, 2003; Wolf & Thomason, 1986).

Dialogue and Engagement

On the topic of feedback, weaknesses of traditional writing instruction are limited feedback and few opportunities for rewriting. These weaknesses revolve around a central problem with all writing instruction, time. Critics of coaching and other process approaches point to not having enough time to employ process strategies. "Editing happens quickly, while coaching proceeds gradually" (Schierhorn, 1990, p. 6). The key complaints about a coaching (process) approach are time for multiple drafts, rewriting and feedback for all drafts (Olsen, 1987; Pancini & McKee, 1997). Coaching and conferencing take time (Hresan, 1992). JMC writing instructors struggle with balancing the demands of grading, providing beneficial feedback and teaching the requisite skills involved in the discipline. However, when feedback is coupled with coaching and rewriting, traditional writing instruction can be transformed into integrated product-process instruction (Kenyon, 2017).

When students receive feedback only after they complete a story, they engage less with feedback and perceive feedback to be "poor or unhelpful" (Morris & Chikwa, 2002, p. 133). "Student engagement with feedback… is one of the key elements for successful student learning" (Morris & Chikwa, 2002, p. 126). As students and instructors participate in multiple cycles of feedback and rewriting, the recursivity of the collaboration and engagement with feedback builds an ongoing dialogue (Elbow, 1998). Rewriting enables the student to connect instructor feedback with weaknesses in their work. These connections help students to recognize the usefulness of instructor feedback and the ongoing processes of rewriting (Bardine, et al., 2000; Morris & Chikwa, 2016). Receiving feedback becomes less intimidating when instructors are viewed as coaches and collaborators during the drafting process (Bardine, et. al, 2000). Coaching engages students actively in the learning process; it recognizes

"a story's problems as well as the means to fix them lie within the person reporting and writing the piece" (Scanlan, 2003, paragraph 2). Scholars assert that coaching paves the way for integrated product-process instruction (Massé & Popovich, 1998) and some universities are introducing a philosophy of coaching into their JMC introductory writing courses in an effort to incorporate more process-oriented instruction (Kenyon, 2017) .

Method

Seven instructors who taught either introductory journalism writing or reporting courses participated in a larger multiple case study of writing instruction in JMC classrooms (Kenyon, 2017). All instructors had previously been professional journalists. The instructors were recruited from Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) accredited journalism schools at large public universities in the south central United States. Snowball sampling (also known as chain sampling), which is a qualitative sampling method used when the knowledge or experience of the participant is critical to the study, was utilized in the study (Patton, 2002). A chain of participants was formed as one participant recommended another participant with the requisite knowledge. The identities of the instructors and universities were intentionally concealed to protect the anonymity of the participants.

The characteristics and rationales for choosing introductory writing courses and early reporting courses were as follows:
- The entry-level courses are usually *required* (serves as a prerequisite) of all majors in JMC.
- Introductory and first reporting courses require the greatest amount of instructor support for student writers.
- Introductory and reporting courses are commonly taught by instructors of all academic designations: graduate assistants, adjuncts, or tenured professors.

Both universities had guidelines for the courses observed; however University 1 allowed instructors a great deal of instructional freedom with a few general guidelines from the department.

In contrast, University 2's course manager tightly controlled all aspects of the introductory writing course, from the assignment schedule to required instructional techniques and online lectures. The design of University 2's course was traditional in that course assignments were oriented toward many different ge-

neric structures and writing styles. Grading focused narrowly on mechanics (spelling, punctuation, style and grammar). Students encountered few opportunities to rewrite. Complete revisions, for content or organization, were not rewarded with an improvement in grade.

Even though neither school would be considered a small program, the relevance of the coaching techniques and course design considerations are relevant to all JMC writing classrooms. Responsibilities for grading and other classroom business rested solely with the individual instructors. Table 1 compares the participants and their classes.

An important difference existed between graded assignments and lab activities. *Graded assignments* contributed to student grades and final drafts were completed outside of class time. Examples of graded assignments were: news stories, sports stories, features, advertisements, news releases and broadcast stories. In contrast, *lab activities* were low-stakes class activities (no grade or participation grade; Elbow, 1998) in which students learned a skill or concept related

to JMC writing, practiced that skill in class, wrote a story, received quick written and verbal feedback near the end of class. Lab activity feedback was a quick, in-the-moment conversation, lasting usually less than one minute about short pieces, usually less than a page in length. Students immediately engaged with the feedback to rewrite the story before leaving class. The conversations described were not deep; however they were meaningful and central to understanding, and demonstrating feedback conversations as illustrated in the findings.

Data Collection and Analysis
In the fall semester of 2016 data were collected beginning in September and ending in November. For each case (individual instructor) data included course assignments, course syllabi, multiple semi-structured observations and one semi-structured interview which intentionally took place following the final observation. The writing scholarship that shaped and organized my data collection and analysis included the concepts of editor and coach approaches (Massé &

Table 1. Participant Comparison Table

	University 1	University 2
Participants	Four (1 woman, 3 men)	Three (3 men)
Academic designations	Visiting professor, clinical professor, associate professor, assistant professor	Two adjunct instructors, one graduate student.
Pseudonyms	Bob, Ed, Helen, Howard	Carl, Tim, Walter
Classroom Environment	2 110-minute class meetings per week (3 instructors) 2 50-minute lecture meetings and 1 110-minute lab per week (1 instructor)	2 110-minute class meetings per week
Courses and Assignments per semester (16-week course)	Introductory course: 2 graded assignments and 20 lab activities Reporting: 8 graded assignments and 20 lab activities	Introductory course: 20 graded assignments, no lab activities
Rewriting	Students required to rewrite every graded assignment. Rewrites made up 40% to 50% of the final grade for graded assignments.	Students were allowed to rewrite only 2 graded assignments during the semester. A rewrite could return 10% to their final grade (mechanical errors).

Popovich, 2004) and writing process theory (Graves, 1983; Murray, 2003).

An initial structural analysis identified the instructors' strategies for feedback instruction and a progression of in vivo and focused coding allowed me to make connections between general feedback strategies and the personal philosophies and instructional priorities each instructor made in their practice (Charmaz, 2014; Saldaña, 2013). The lenses of writing process theory (Graves, 1983; Murray, 1978, 2003) and newswriting process (Conn, 1968; Murray, 2000, 2003; Pitts, 1989) helped me to understand and articulate the meaning and function of feedback within a coaching approach (Massé & Popovich, 2004).

Findings

This article focused on coaching as an instructional approach to feedback (not every aspect of coaching instruction) and how coaching presented itself during classroom observations. The findings demonstrated what coaching instruction looked like in action at two universities and illustrated that the coaching approach used both verbal and written feedback. The instructional tactics related to coaching rely on the recursivity of feedback. Feedback interactions became a collaborative conversation about student writing; the immediate piece the student was working on and all the cumulative pieces. The coaching strategies in this article present teaching practices that integrate process and product instruction in the JMC writing classroom. These findings reveal, when students write, receive feedback, rewrite and receive more feedback, a long-term dialogue develops on the subject of the student's writing.

"Most of the time, it is questions that I'll ask them."

When observing coaching in the instructional process, feedback was presented in the form of questions about the draft and how or why the student wrote the story as they did. All seven JMC writing instructors integrated product and process instruction under the dynamic umbrella of a coaching approach to feedback.

"Most of the time, it is questions that I'll ask them," said Howard (University 1). Questioning is a primary tactic of the coaching approach. "In their story, I'll ask why? And then that kind of gets them thinking, 'Oh, yeah, I probably need to explain that a little bit more.' Or I may write in there how, how did that happen?" Howard coached using open-ended

questions to engage his students in deeper thinking, guiding them toward better rewriting. It was this instructional move, questioning, that placed the cognitive activities of learning and thinking on the shoulders of the student. Students learned to solve their own problems in their writing and thus overtime grow as writers. Howard focused on structure as well. "I'll highlight an entire paragraph and say this should be your nutgraph, but its missing x, y, or z," said Howard. In this excerpt Howard was teaching product through coaching. He drew attention to what the student had done correctly such as locating the nutgraph, but also made the student aware of problems they may not have seen, without Howard correcting the problems as the traditional editor approach would have done.

At University 2, Walter's written feedback demonstrated his ability to teach process and product in his coaching as well. "I'm probably overly thorough, I've been doing comments in the text instead of out to the side like Word will let you do," said Walter. "I just comment in red on the text. I'll say, 'this doesn't work because you missed three of the five W's or whatever. 'When did this happen?' 'What time did this happen?'"

Walter integrated product and process-oriented instruction through a coaching approach in written feedback as he comments in the document, "when did this happen?" In his written feedback, he also pointed to AP style when he said they missed the five W's. Walter acknowledged the need for product-oriented instruction, particularly because University 2 assignments cover so many different styles and structures of JMC writing. Coaching was explicitly required practice at University 2. All instructors coached writers by asking questions about student writing. It was also common to hear the instructors point out, but not correct, style and grammar problems during a coaching session.

As a feedback tool, coaching is designed to assist writers through the processes of writing such as information gathering, rehearsing, drafting, editing and sharpening the story focus (Murray, 2000). Howard preferred using the coaching approach. "I've found that the coach method works so much better than just telling them and just hitting them upside the head when they don't have it right. The coach method works really well if you can be there with them when they're editing their stuff or when they're putting together their script," said Howard. Howard's comment pointed out the importance of instruction during the

drafting process for JMC students. By supporting and collaborating with students during the drafting, focusing, and editing stages, errors in thinking can be redirected, students build trust with their instructor, and the immediacy of feedback during the writing process improves learning.

"Sometimes you just need to say… 'That just won't work.'"

The participant instructors, particularly at University 2, saw coaching as process-oriented instruction and worried about using an editor approach (traditional product-oriented instruction); however this author viewed their balanced approach as integrated product and process instruction as suggested by Massé & Popovich (2007). Many study instructors (the instructors who participated in this study) explained coaching was difficult particularly in the introductory writing courses. All instructors in this study had been professional journalists. They recognized mistakes in student writing so quickly, they had to restrain themselves from taking control and just editing the students' writing.

Even though all instructors integrated a coaching approach to feedback into their instruction, they also admitted to naturally gravitating toward a traditional editor approach. Helen spoke about her struggle this way, "I'm a natural editor, where my mind wants to tune out what I'm reading and just fix the actual errors. But I force myself to focus on the content too, because that stuff is very important. If you have structurally sound sentences, but they're aren't saying what they need to say… then that's still a big problem."

Carl expressed similar challenges. "I have a hard time not approaching it [coaching] like an editor," said Carl. "To me, it's as clear as a bell what's wrong in a sentence. So they read something to me, or I'm looking over their shoulder, and I say, 'Ok read that sentence out loud. That doesn't make any sense. I know what you're trying to say, but do you see how this isn't working?'" Carl tended toward editing, "I will rewrite their sentences for them when I go through stuff… but not without explanation. I don't just fix it and move on. I'm hands on."

"Sometimes you just need to say 'that's bad,' or 'that just won't work,'" said University 2 instructor, Walter. He indicated the inexperience of the students and the design of the course never let students get comfortable enough with any writing style to allow for an editor approach to become unnecessary. Ed at University 1 also noted students needed more writing

experience in order for instructors to move beyond the editor approach and establish authentic coaching dialogue with students.

It was clear during interviews and observations that the instructors tended to see themselves more as editors than coaches, even though they all employed coaching as a feedback strategy. All study instructors incorporated product-oriented and process-oriented feedback within their coaching and written feedback. This combination of feedback was seen across all study instructors and across all courses which is consistent with feedback scholarship (Morris & Chikwa, 2016; Wiltse, 2002).

"I really want them to come up with their own solutions."

Feedback through a coaching approach engages students with feedback (verbal and written) in the processes of writing and places the responsibility for learning and decision-making upon the student writer. All instructors identified repetition, engagement with writing practice and instructor feedback as important for student learning. The type of feedback students received differed depending upon the situation. When instructors coached during lab, feedback was verbal and the dialogue between student and instructor was dynamic. Written feedback also followed the first and final drafts.

Coaching feedback encouraged students to take an active role in finding, understanding, and correcting errors in their own work. University 1 introductory JMC writing instructor, Helen, talked about coaching students to edit and revise their own work. "I really want them to come up with their own solutions… So, it [coaching] makes things better. It helps them understand the problem. If I ask questions, it helps them find a solution, but they still have to find the solution themselves," said Helen. "I want them to see how to improve. When it's your own writing and you see an adjustment to your own writing, it [learning to edit and clarify] really sets in."

Through coaching feedback and modeling, Helen's critical eye for editing and rewriting helped students understand how to draft and edit their own work. Her coaching approach engaged students in the processes of critiquing and problem-solving. Helen acted like a coach –modeling skills and guiding writing practice, and then sending students out to practice these skills on their own. Helen prepared students to think, act and write like professionals.

"We play ping-pong."
The active communication cycle of coaching, drafting, written feedback and rewriting developed into a nearly continuous semester–long dialogue between student and instructor with the focus being a conversation about the student's writing. University 1 students engaged in two or three lab activities in preparation for each graded assignment. A philosophy of coaching guided the design and presentation of lab activities at University 1.

"Here are the basics you need, let's go over it. Ok now go do it. And then I give you feedback," said Bob (University 1). "Actually we play ping-pong." Lab activities were essential to Bob's teaching. Lab activities highlighted the process skills (drafting, clarifying, editing), professional journalism thinking (recognizing news value, interviewing, fact-finding) and product skills (AP style, story form) necessary to complete the next graded assignment.

During lab activities Bob coached and students practiced journalism process and thinking skills with short writing assignments. Upon completion of the day's lab activities, students printed off their work and Bob individually coached students for less than one minute, offering product and process-oriented feedback. Students immediately made the changes discussed before leaving class just as a reporter would quickly rewrite a story in the newsroom. "I give them a lot of feedback and I give'em what I call love letters. There's were I break it down and give them their score, because feedback is important. And because it's okay to make mistakes, just not the same ones. So I try to get them to make different mistakes."

Howard also conducted lab activities, but additionally, Howard coached as students worked on rewrites during lab time. "I can see as they do more assignments and rewrites, their nutgraphs [nut paragraphs] improve, their reporting of the whole context of how that game fits into the bigger picture, that improves over the course," said Howard. All of Howard's graded assignments required accompanying rewrites. Howard believed coaching was effective as students engaged with feedback during rewriting.

Rewriting kept the feedback conversation going and helped students engage actively in the feedback process. Feedback research found, without rewriting students do not engage as deeply with feedback (Bardine, et al.2000). Morris and Chikwa (2002) argued, "Student engagement with feedback… is one of the key elements for successful student learning" (p. 126).

"We need to teach them how to write."
The strategies of low-stakes practice and rewriting are important to overcoming the feedback limitations often associated with traditional JMC writing instruction.

At University 2 the near absence of low-stakes practice and rewriting cemented in detrimental aspects of traditional instruction. This was a significant contrast to University 1 which required rewrites for all graded assignments, and employed low-stakes lab activities weekly.

When students engaged with the feedback during rewriting of the same piece and in low-stakes writing assignments, their focus was not limited to style, mechanics and structure. Students were freer to concentrate on and experiment with product skills such as leads, description, attribution, and quotes and process skills such as exploration, rehearsal, story focus, writing clarity, and story development. Low stakes activities supported professional journalism skills.

Although some instructors intended to implement a process approach through coaching, the absence of rewriting and low-stakes writing practice in the course design resulted in traditional writing instruction. The University 2 course manager explained that a course design committee spent more than a year reconstructing their introductory writing course. She said, "The committee worked really hard to accommodate all of the different disciplines in the j-school." The head of the course design committee explained they used a course design document provided by the university's center for teaching excellence. Another design committee member explained coaching was a tradition at the university, and their coaching strategy was based on Scanlan's 2003 article, *The Coaching Way*.

As University 2 instructors coached, they asked questions and helped students make writing decisions as suggested by Scanlan (2003). University 2 instructors actively strolled around the classroom during student writing time, as coaching was a required part of their instruction. Other than written assessment feedback, coaching during class time was the only opportunity for instructors to give feedback in University 2's instructional design. Students did little rewriting and corrected only mechanical errors to improve their grades. University 2 instructor, Tim, explained it best. "This, [revision] basically doesn't help students a lot. Because for example, in one revision you can only get 10% more than what you have got. And if you made two spelling errors, if you made like two punctuation errors, you can lose 10 points. So when they

come back, they say, 'okay I fix these two punctuation errors, I get my 10 points back' and they leave. I mean I cannot say anything because they're right!"

Even though the course design limited his feedback, Tim was always coaching. He sat down next to each student, and it was not uncommon to hear students say, "Thanks, that helped," or "You did a good job telling me what to do." In my first observation, a student asked Tim, "Does this sound better?" Tim's reply was, "It's not wrong, but we can make it better," and he sat down to help the student work through the problem.

Walter was much the same way when he coached students. He squatted or pulled up a chair and put himself on the same level as the student. This stance positioned him more like an equal than someone standing over the student, assessing his or her writing. When Walter was working with a student, he asked, "How does it sound to the ear?" Only if Walter had spent several unproductive minutes with the student would he say, "If it were me, I'd try something like this…" but that was a rare occurrence during observations.

Other than written feedback on the final draft, this coaching feedback dialogue was the only chance for students and their instructors at University 2 to engage in feedback conversations. This was a marked difference from University 1 where instructors and students engaged in multiple feedback conversations for every graded writing assignment. The limited opportunity for feedback dialogue at University 2 came from the course design and was not the choice of instructors. University 2 instructors were very process-oriented with their instruction, but the absence of lab activities, feedback and rewriting limited student practice of process and product. The instructors explained they understood the course design was flawed, because students were not given time to learn, practice and rewrite their assignments. Carl put the larger issue of introductory JMC writing instruction into perspective, "We need to go back to something that's writing based. We need to teach them how to write."

Discussion and Conclusion

I argue that coaching is not enough; coaching instruction must cultivate feedback conversations. Student rewriting and engagement with feedback was an essential process for establishing and maintaining feedback conversations. Observational and interview data revealed that the instructors who established patterns of feedback dialogue and nurtured an environment that acclimatized students to write, receive feedback, and rewrite believed in the efficacy of feedback dialogue. Throughout the semester interactions between instructor and students increased and interview data reinforced this observation.

- "I've found that the coach method works *so* much better….The coach method works really well if you can be there with them when they're editing their stuff or when they're putting together their script, or when they're whatever it is…. I'll sit down with them. I'll show them what they're doing wrong. I'll give them suggestions. I'll even tear their story apart and then say you need to do this, and this, and this, and this and start over to fix it."

- "… the past couple weeks students started to hit their stride, a lot better writing and storytelling, although the first page still needs work. But it's just hammer them again, and repeat, repeat, repeat. Write, feedback, do it, do it, do it."

Both University 1 instructors above used lab activities in nearly every lab meeting. They required rewriting and provided written feedback after both drafts. These instructors coached students as they wrote in class. The observations and subsequent analysis of this study agree with previous feedback scholars who found that students asked more questions and seemed to connect more effectively with feedback during rewriting when feedback was perceived as bi-directional dialogue (Lee & Schallert, 2002; Morris & Chikwa, 2016; Yang & Carless, 2013).

Developing course designs and teaching strategies that facilitate feedback conversations is possible for instructors at any type of institution. Incorporating a coaching philosophy committed to feedback conversations and designing courses to facilitate a coaching pedagogy requires a transformation of teaching practice. I recommend the following practices for JMC introductory writing courses:

- Use low-stakes lab activities regularly (daily if possible).
- Provide written and verbal feedback during and at the end of lab activities.
- Provide multiple opportunities for students to engage with feedback as they draft, write and rewrite.
- Utilize lab activities to prepare students for high-stakes assignments.
- Develop grading practices which reward large scale rewriting.

I also recommend practices to avoid in JMC introductory writing courses:

• Abstain from high-stakes assignments without low-stakes practice such as lab activities.
• Resist high-stakes assignments that are not tied to rewriting.
• Avoid grading practices that are limited to style, structure and mechanics only.
• In introductory courses, resist incorporating too many disparate genres (newswriting, public relations, advertising, broadcast, filmmaking, and technical writing in one introductory course.)

More research should inquire specifically into how student writing improves with rewriting and the amount of feedback dialogue. This author recognizes this limitation in the data and plans further study in this area. It is important to analyze the effectiveness of rewriting and feedback, as assessment of student learning is becoming more important at the university level. Coaching as a feedback strategy is an effective element to JMC writing instruction; however, coaching and feedback need support in the course design. Instructors and course designers who employ the coaching approach should have a thorough pedagogical understanding of coaching as a feedback strategy.

References

Bardine, B. A., Bardine, M. S., & Deegan, E. F. (2000). Beyond the red pen: Clarifying our role in the response process. *The English Journal*, *90*(1), 94-101.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.

Clark, D. (1987). *Free to write: A journalist teaches young writers*. Heinemann Educational Publishers.

Clark, D. & Fry, R. P. (1991). *Coaching writers: Editors and reporters working together*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Conn, E. L. (1968). Tentative conceptualization of the newswriting process. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *45*(2), 344.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Heinemann Educational Books, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College composition and communication*, *33*(1), 76-88.

Hresan, S. L. (1992). Process method of teaching the news writing class. *Journalism Educator. 46(1)*, 61-65.

Kenyon, S. R. (2017). *Writing instruction in the journalism and mass communication classroom.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing trust between teacher and students through feedback and revision cycles in an EFL writing classroom. *Written Communication*. 25 (4), 506-537.

Massé, M. & Popovich, M. (1998). Assessing faculty attitudes toward the teaching of writing. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *53(3)*, 50-64.

Massé, M. & Popovich, M. (2004). The national media writing faculty study. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *59(3)*, 241-238.

Massé, M. & Popovich, M. (2007). Accredited and non-accredited media writing programs are stagnant, resistant to curricular reform, and similar. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 62(2)*, 142-160.

Morris, C., & Chikwa, G. (2016). Audio versus written feedback: Exploring learners' preference and the impact of feedback format on students' academic performance. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *17*(2), 125-137.

Murray, D. M. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. *Research on composing: Points of departure*, 85-103.

Murray, D. M. (2000). *Writing to deadline*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Murray, D. M. (2003). Teaching writing as a process not a product. In Villanueva, V. (Ed.) *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader. Revised and Updated* (pp.1-6). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Olsen, L. D., (1987) Recent composition research is relevant to newswriting. *Journalism Educator*, 42(3), 14-18.

Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pitts, B. (1989). Model Provides Description of News Writing Process. *Journalism Educator*, *44*(1), 12.

Poynter Institute (2017)

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative*

researchers. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Scanlan, C. (2003). The coaching way. *pointer.org*, Retrieved from http://www.poynter.org/2003/the-coaching-way/11214/.

Schierhorn, A. B., & Endres, K. L. (1992). Magazine writing instruction and the composition revolution. *The Journalism Educator*, *47*(2), 57-64.

Wiist, W. M. (1997). Seeking a coaching style of teaching news writing. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 51*(4), 68-74.

Wiltse, E. M. (2002). Correlates of college students' use of instructors' comments. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 57*(2), 126-138.

Wolf, R. & Thomason, T. (1986) Writing coaches: Their strategies for improving writing. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 7(3), 43-49.

Yang, M. and Carless, D. R. (2013). The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(3), 285-297.

Zurek, J. (1986). Research on writing process can aid newswriting teachers. *Journalism Educator, 41*(1), 19-23.

Dr. Sharlene Kenyon (skenyon@jswtech.com) has taught for more than 20 years at both college and secondary levels in the disciplines of communication, English, history, and scholastic journalism. She earned her PhD in 2017 after completing a thesis on writing instruction in JMC introductory writing and reporting classrooms. Her research interests are writing instruction, professional development and JMC genre study.