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I like it, but is it good?
Identifying Quality Writing

Dr. Peggy Lindsey & Dr. Jinrong Li
Department of Writing & Linguistics
What materials do you provide when you give student assignments?

- Oral announcement in class
- A short written description of the requirements
- An assignment sheet that contains detailed description of the requirements
- An assignment sheet and a grading rubric
Much do you think the students understand expectations and the assessment criteria?
“The only input [our professor] gave us was, ‘You should know what to do. You’re in college now. I will not explain what you need to do.’”

“Everyone was always unsure of what to do because the assignment was only described as a ‘reflection.’”

My professor’s] requirements were very strict, but he was also very transparent on how to fulfill these requirements.’
“For them [professors], the discourses of their disciplines are second nature; for us, they are almost a foreign language.”
The Initial Problem

How can we reduce variation between student and teacher application of rubrics?
# Finding a solution: rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits for students</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students gain clarity in understanding teacher expectations</td>
<td>• Students fail to completely understand assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students have a guide for checking their work and revising</td>
<td>• Students interpret the definition of quality differently from the teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“For them [professors], the discourses of their disciplines are second nature; for us, they are almost a foreign language.”

For us [professors], the discourses of evaluating writing in our disciplines are second nature; for them [students], they are almost a foreign language.”
The Problem

How can we reduce variation between student and teacher evaluations of written texts?
Methods

- Participants
  - Invited 312 students
  - 296 agreed to participate
  - Response rate: 95%

- Instruments
  - Questionnaire: 15 items (background + ratings and explanation of 2 writing samples)
  - Keyword rubrics

- Analysis
  - Change of agreement in essay ratings
  - Analysis of student explanation of ratings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>37.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Ratings of an Adequate Sample Essay

FALL 2016

- Strong: 58%
- Adequate: 37%
- Weak: 5%

SPRING 2017

- Strong: 53.4%
- Adequate: 37.3%
- Weak: 9.3%
Personal Opinions vs. Text-Based Explanation

- “The examples are well chosen and good explained. The assumptions seem reasonable to the chosen ads” (TB, #8)
- “I was never questioning the ideas of the writer and seemed to agree with most of what they were saying.” (PO, #77)
- “This paper was really good” (RG, #99)
Personal Opinions vs. Text-Based Explanation

- “It was a good convincing piece of writing towards the argument. It never offered any opposing points of view though.” (TB, #19)

- “very well written, i dont necessarily agree with the message they are trying to sell to the reader.” (PO, #59)

- “i rated the essay adequate because it wasn't poorly written but the style was a little boring.” (PO, #116)
Personal Opinions vs. Text-Based Explanation

- “The author is reading too much into these ads. If a man appears to be more dominant than a woman it's because he is. It's called biology.” (PO, #12)

- “I believe it was uninteresting” (PO, #23)

- “The analysis was insightful and thorough, but there was a clear lack of editing. Many words were misplaced in sentences and some punctuation was missing.” (RG & TB, #19)
Using *developed* to describe writing

In composition, **development** is the process of adding informative and illustrative details to support the main idea in a paragraph or essay. Also known as elaboration.

Paragraphs and essays can be developed in many different ways. In conventional composition courses (see current-traditional rhetoric), the following patterns of exposition (or models of composition) are often presented as the standard methods of development in expository writing:

- Analogy
- Example
- Cause and Effect
- Classification and Division
- Comparison and Contrast
- Process Analysis
- Extended Definition

(Nordquist 2015)
Analysis of *developed* to describe writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th># who chose developed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments including *developed* features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Develop-related comments</th>
<th>Positive comments</th>
<th>Negative comments</th>
<th>Mixed (+/-) comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8 (25.8%)</td>
<td>17 (54.83%)</td>
<td>6 (19.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72 (71%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>100% of these 37 raters know how to talk about development in writing, but they fail to accurately identify and assess it in their reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEQUATE</td>
<td>55% of these 31 raters fail to accurately connect the keyword to their comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>50% of readers fail to accurately connect the keyword to their comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final result

Only 6 students (8%) out of 72 offered a complete discussion of how developed the essay was.
What we’ve learned

• Students are parroting rubric language, not applying it – they can sound like they’re stating a legitimate evaluation of a text, but cannot accurately evaluate a text

• Keyword rubrics force students to articulate what they actually mean which highlights what language translations students need

• Instructors need to help students see what they think they understand, but don’t

• By focusing on key words, instructors can slow down the process to let students have time to not only learn the language of evaluation, but also the application of it.
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