Feedback-focused article codebook 2-27-24

<u>Description of feedback</u>: Any excerpt in which the participant describes or details the feedback they've received.

Node 1: Impact of writing feedback on affect, motivation, community membership, and agency

Category	Code	Description	Subcode
Affect	<u>Affect: Positive reaction</u> Positive reaction because the student appraises the feedback as **helpful, useful, justified, and/or confidence boosting** (for the writer or text).	The student reacts positively to the feedback, as they consider it **helpful, useful, justified, and/or confidence boosting** (for the writer or text). This includes expressing gratitude for the feedback.	
	<u>Affect: Negative reaction</u> Positive reaction because the student appraises the feedback as **unhelpful, unclear, not justified, discouraging, and/or overwhelming** (for the writer or text).	The student reacts positively to the feedback, as they consider it **unhelpful, unclear, not justified, discouraging, and/or overwhelming** (for the writer or text). This includes feeling like the writer is too reliant on the feedback.	

	Affect: Mixed/growth mindset reaction Mixed reaction because the student reacts negatively to receiving the feedback, but realizes its positive benefits (i.e., helping the text and/or the writer to grow).	The student has a mixed reaction to the feedback. This may include the student stating that at first they felt bad about the feedback, but then they realized its value for the growth of the writer or text.	
	Affect: Lacking feedback Negative reaction because the student wished that they would have received more feedback.	The student complains about not receiving sufficient feedback on their writing.	
Motivation-revise/*cont inue writing*	Motivation-revise: Pos-**interaction** Positive motivation because of **positive interaction** with feedback provider, including AI	The feedback provider makes the participant motivated to continue through their feedback because it's encouraging and/or has a positive tone, or because the student feels like they have accountability through their relationship with this provider.	
	Motivation-revise: Pos-*impact* Positive motivation because of **impact** of feedback on the written work and/or on the student's skills/accomplishments	The student describes feeling motivated to revise/continue writing because they realize that by implementing the feedback, they will improve the work and/or their skills (writing, professional competencies). This includes the outcomes of implementing the feedback (accomplishments), such as publication.	
	Motivation-revise:	By having a negative, or limited,	

	Neg-**interaction** Negative motivation because of **interaction** with feedback provider, including AI	interaction with the feedback provider, the student feels demotivated to continue revising and writing.	
	Motivation-revise: Neg-*impact* Negative motivation because of a perceived **LACK** of **impact** of implementing the feedback on the quality of the written work and/or on the student's skills/accomplishments	Because the student doesn't have a chance to revise the writing for a change in their accomplishments (grade), or because they don't feel that anything will change if they revise following that feedback, they are unmotivated to implement the feedback.	
	Motivation-revise: Other	A catch-all for anything else participants report.	
Motivation- *continue in grad school*	Motivation-continue: Pos-**abilities & belonging** Positive motivation because it helps the student to realize how they are progressing (positive reinforcement), makes them aware of their capabilities and/or develop necessary abilities, and their fit in their area / graduate school	The feedback motivates the student to continue in graduate school because it (1) rewards them for their progress, (2) makes them aware of their skills ("I can do this"), (3) helps them develop skills, or (4) makes them feel like they belong in graduate school/in their field.	
	Motivation-continue: Pos-sense of support (*interaction*) Positive motivation because it helps the student to feel like they have the **support** (from an	The feedback motivates the student to continue in graduate school because it gives them a sense of support in graduate studies, typically through interaction with other agents (human or computer).	

	advisor, peer, other feedback provider, including AI) necessary to succeed in graduate school		
	Motivation-continue: Neg-**abilities & belonging** Negative motivation because it makes the student think that they are **NOT** progressing (negative reinforcement), makes them feel that they do not have capabilities and that they are not developing them, and they do not fit in their area / graduate school	The feedback does NOT motivate the student to continue in graduate school because it does NOT (1) reward them for their progress, (2) make them aware of their skills ("I can'T do this"), (3) help them develop skills, or (4) make them feel like they belong in graduate school/in their field.	
	Motivation-continue: Neg-sense of support (*interaction*) Negative motivation because it makes the student feel like they do **NOT** have the **support** (from an advisor, peer, other feedback provider, including AI) necessary to succeed in graduate school	The feedback DOES NOT motivate the student to continue in graduate school because it DOES NOT give them a sense of support in graduate studies.	
	Motivation-continue: No effect No effect on motivation.	The student states that the feedback has no impact on their motivation to continue in graduate school. This could be because they consider themselves to be 'too tough' to be impacted by feedback, that they aren't at a stage where feedback is	

		impacting their motivation to continue in grad school, or that they view writing as 'irrelevant' to their success in graduate school.	
Community membership	<u>Community: Yes- **abilities & belonging**</u> The student feels more part of the community because the feedback helps them to <u>realize how they are progressing</u> (and areas for improvement), makes them <u>aware of their capabilities</u> and/or develop necessary abilities, and their <u>fit in their academic community</u>	The student claims that the feedback impacts their sense of membership in their academic community in a positive way, as it provides insight into their belonging in the community, based on fit and/or (developing) abilities.	
	<u>Community: Yes- *modeling & demystifying*</u> The student feels more part of the community because the feedback helps them to realize writing for this community can be like (and that it is possible)	The student claims that the feedback impacts their sense of membership in their academic community in a positive way, as it helps them to understand the standards of their field and that it's possible to attain success with writing in their field.	
	<u>Community: No- **lack of abilities & belonging**</u> The student feels less part of the community because the feedback helps them to <u>realize how they are NOT progressing</u>, makes them <u>aware of their LACK of capabilities</u> and that	The student claims that the feedback impacts their sense of membership in their academic community in a negative way, as it provides insight into their lack of belonging in the community, based on fit and/or (not developing) abilities.	

	they are <u>not</u> developing them, and their LACK of <u>fit in their academic community</u>		
	Community: No effect	<u>Community: No effect- **doesn't matter in field**</u> The student claims that the feedback has no effect on their sense of belonging in the academic community due to their belief that: (a) Writing/English ability doesn't relate to success in field	The student claims that the feedback does not impact their sense of membership in their academic community, because Writing/English ability doesn't relate to success in their field.
		<u>Community: No effect- program *stage*</u> The student claims that the feedback has no effect on their sense of belonging in the academic community due to their belief that: (b) They're not far along enough in their program to feel like part of the academic community	The student claims that the feedback does not impact their sense of membership in their academic community, because they're not far along enough in their program to feel like part of the academic community.
		<u>Community: No effect- not in academic community</u> The student claims that the feedback has no effect on their sense of belonging in the academic community due to their belief that: (c) The nature of their goals makes them not aligned with	The student claims that the feedback does not impact their sense of membership in their academic community, because the nature of their goals makes them not aligned with the academic community of their program.

		the academic community of their program	
		Community: No effect- this feedback not relevant The student claims that the feedback has no effect on their sense of belonging in the academic community due to their belief that: (d) This feedback wasn't important / salient enough to have an effect	The student claims that the feedback does not impact their sense of membership in their academic community, because this feedback wasn't important / salient enough to have an effect.
Agency	**Full** agency I have full freedom but I still take feedback seriously	The student describes having complete freedom over their writing. They also mention considering the comments, even though they don't have to accept them.	
	Limited agency- pos I don't feel I have freedom, but feedback helps me improve	The student describes having limited freedom over their writing, which they see as a good thing for the quality of their writing or for their experience as a (developing) writer.	
	Limited agency- neg I don't feel I have freedom, and I resent that	The student describes having limited freedom over their writing, which they see as a bad thing for the quality of their writing and/or for their experience as a (developing) writer.	

Node 2: Differential impact across students, contexts, & feedback providers

Category	Code	Description
By program type	<u>Feedback difference- **program** (research)</u> Students in more research-focused programs tended to have richer feedback experiences	This code is applied in any cases where a student attributes the kind of feedback that they receive to the program they're in (focused on research vs. professional goals). Also, we will apply this code if we notice that students report receiving richer feedback (more in-depth, more rounds of it) when they are engaged in research projects. This code may be applied during analytical memo writing.
By context of writing	<u>Feedback difference- **class** type</u> Students tend to receive less writing feedback, and lower quality feedback, in their disciplinary courses than in UWP classes.	We will apply this code in cases where students describe the feedback they receive in UWP classes and disciplinary classes, specifically if they describe their disciplinary class feedback as being less in quantity and/or quality than that in UWP classes.
	<u>Feedback difference- **activity** type</u> Students describe receiving different amounts and levels of feedback quality when engaging in **research**-related writing vs. **professional** writing vs. **disciplinary course** writing.	This code should showcase patterns of feedback based on the different contexts in which students write: for research, professional contexts (e.g., emails, cover letters), or for disciplinary courses. Let's exclude UWP courses here, as they are accounted for in the previous code. This focuses on <u>human</u> feedback for these activities.
By feedback provider	<u>Level of **expertise**</u> Students evaluate the feedback of someone or a machine based on its level of expertise (e.g., with writing, content knowledge, or English- NS or NNS).	We will apply this code in cases where students mention having better experiences with, or trusting more, the feedback from providers who they describe as having greater expertise in their field, in writing, or in English (i.e., native speaker preference). This extends to AI, if students evaluate it as having or lacking expertise.

	Relationship Students evaluate the feedback of someone or a machine based on the relationship that they have (or lack) with them or based on the quality of the **interaction** that the student had with this feedback provider.	We will apply this code in cases where students mention having better experiences with feedback providers with whom they have better relationships. This extends to AI, if students describe having or lacking a relationship (of trust) with it.
	Availability & **Timeliness** Students evaluate the feedback of someone or a machine based on how easily they are able to access this feedback (its availability) and how quickly they receive this feedback (its timeliness).	We will apply this code in cases where students mention having better experiences with feedback providers (including AI) who can provide feedback when they need it.
	Ability to help the student/text **grow** Students evaluate the feedback of someone or a machine based on the extent to which it helps them grow, as a writer, academic, and/or professional, or for their text to grow.	We will apply this code in cases where students mention having better experiences with feedback providers (including AI) who help them grow. Students may describe certain feedback providers serving as a crutch for students, such that they don't learn or improve as writers.

Node 3: Changes in feedback & impact over time

Category	Code	Description
Fall quarter-required UWP class	UWP course requirement effect Greater language, and often	This code relates to students (or us as researchers) noting that students received more language and/or writing-focused feedback in the fall quarter because of the

	writing-focused feedback in their first quarter	feedback in UWP 225.
Student activities & involvement	<u>Increasing involvement over time = richer feedback experiences</u> Students tended to have richer feedback experiences over time, as they became more involved in research or professional projects	This code relates to students (or us as researchers) noting that students received more/better feedback over time as they became more involved in research (e.g., article writing, thesis proposal) or professional projects (e.g., practicum project).
Popularization of Gen-AI	<u>Tech changes = more AI feedback</u> Students began to rely more on AI tools for feedback once they entered into the mainstream.	This code relates to students (or us as researchers) noting that students started to use AI tools more for feedback after ChatGPT became accessible to the public in November of 2022.