

PROVIDING FEEDBACK FOR REVISION: Reading and Responding to Students' Writing

A professor's purpose in providing feedback to students about a particular piece of writing should be to give them insight for revising that piece of writing. This purpose assumes that the professor provides feedback during the writing process and that any feedback the professor provides when giving a grade to a student's writing is not designed to help the student revise the writing. A grade is the last assessment of a student's writing, and any comments the professor makes when assigning a grade appear to be superfluous for purposes of revision.

Although professors may agree with the premise that feedback should give students help in revising their writing, professors' understanding of what constitutes useful feedback may in fact run counter to the purpose of providing useful feedback; thus, the first part of this discussion identifies three common uses of feedback that are not in accord with the purpose of revision. The second part, using the literature on feedback, explains why professors might have difficulties providing effective feedback, and the third gives advice about how professors can provide useful feedback that will help students revise their writing.

Common Misperceptions About Feedback

Three common misperceptions about feedback are that its primary purpose is to identify errors, justify a grade, and provide help over a range of writing assignments.

Feedback identifies errors

A professor may use feedback—reading and responding to a piece of writing—to identify errors. Although identifying errors can be incorporated into feedback designed for revision, identifying errors should not be the major purpose for providing feedback. The problem with limiting feedback to the identification of errors—particularly errors in grammar, mechanics, and spelling—is that correcting such errors may not have much to do with improving the substance of a student's writing. If, for instance, a student wrote a brilliant history paper littered with surface errors (errors in grammar, mechanics, and spelling), correcting those errors might be all that remains to make the paper a superior work. Such papers, however, are rare, because students who write brilliant papers generally have a good grasp of grammar, mechanics, and spelling. In fact, students' papers laden with surface errors also generally have problems in logic, sen-

Conclusion

Students should be part of the evaluative process because their involvement in that process has the potential to provide them with skills they will need to evaluate writing not only in academic but also in nonacademic settings. In addition, involving students in the evaluative process causes professors to be involved in the process in ways that they might not have been involved in before. Professors have to ensure that writing assignments are clear and cogent by testing the assignments with a class of students. Professors have to match evaluative criteria with writing assignments by providing evaluative instruments (such as a rubric) or evaluative opportunities (such as peer critiques).

Speck, B. W. (2000). *Grading Students' Classroom Writing: Issues and Strategies*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 27, No. 3). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

tence structure, and organization. To point out surface errors in such papers will do little to help the student revise the writing so that logic, sentence structure, and organization are corrected. In fact, focusing on surface errors does not help students become better writers, and "pointing out too many errors at once actually discourages writers from doing further revision" (Fulwiler, Gorman, & Gorman, 1986, p. 57). When professors respond only or primarily to students' writing by marking errors, students may come to believe that not making errors is what really matters in good writing. Moreover, if the preponderance of feedback the professor gives is identifying errors, students can perceive that the teacher's comments are editorial recommendations, and thus students will correct errors to receive a higher grade, assuming that correcting errors is all the teacher requires (Dohrer, 1991; Mitchell, 1994).

Another problem of professors' and students' fixation on errors is that students may not expand their writing repertoire because they want to play it safe when writing. Such an attitude of caution is inimical to the early stages of the writing process in which trial and error should be encouraged. When the avoidance of errors is uppermost in the hierarchy of writing values, the exploration of a topic is virtually eliminated, because exploration requires a willingness to chart new courses, discard inadequate ways of doing things, and try new methods that the student has not mastered. Error and exploration go hand in hand. If, however, students perceive of writing as reproducing on paper what they have compiled in their minds, then errors in transcription really are the major problem a writer faces. But the transcription view of writing is false, not in accord with the practices of all kinds of writers in various professions and contrary to the findings of modern composition theory. Fixation on errors—whether by students or professors—is detrimental to writing because it does not comport with a process approach to writing.

All of which is not to say that errors are unimportant. Professors need to tell students that errors are important because they can distract readers, provide a reason for readers to criticize the writer's competence, and cause ambiguity in communication. In addition, professors need to tell students that errors, such as pesky problems with spelling, commas, and apostrophes, will become a point of attention toward

the end of the writing process but that students should not concentrate on errors early in the process.

Even so, the writing process allows writers to address various errors throughout the process. For instance, as students see more clearly what they want to say, they begin to fix sentences that are unclear, reorganize their arguments to make more sense, catch a lapse in spelling or punctuation, and so forth. Revising, then, includes identifying and correcting errors, but such identification and correction arise from the student's need to create a coherent text that he or she can understand, not from a preoccupation with error. Because a student's evolving text is quite fluid, some errors the student makes will vanish when a piece of text is discarded. The student will jettison a piece of text, including the comma splice the student didn't see, because the student believes that the text doesn't work in the evolving argument. Students may eliminate some errors unknowingly. Thus, identifying and correcting errors becomes a pragmatic concern for students as they see that something they wrote doesn't quite work and seek to mend it, either by fixing or cutting it.

Nevertheless, once the writer has worked through a series of drafts, the writing process includes a time for formal peer critique, a time when others can give a fresh look at the evolving text. "We all know how much easier it is to see problems in someone else's writing; what that suggests, of course, is that we have a critical distance here that we don't have from our own work" (Fulwiler, 1986, p. 31). This critical distance is one reason peer reviewers can be so helpful. After peer critiques, after more revisions, and as the due date for an assignment is approaching with urgency, the writing process includes a time for editing and proofreading, which is when the student and peer editor can concentrate on finding and eliminating any remaining errors.

Feedback justifies the grade

Professors also can provide feedback to students' writing to justify a grade. Actually, such response is not very useful in providing students with feedback for revision, because the grade is a terminal point in a writing assignment. Once a grade is administered, the writing assignment is finished. The comments a professor makes to justify a grade are evidence for the grade, not feedback for revision. The two ought not be confused.



Some professors might object by noting that giving a grade to a student and providing opportunity for revision so that the student can earn a higher grade do make such feedback useful for revision. Perhaps, but the focus has subtly shifted from fulfilling the conditions of the writing assignment to revising it for a better grade. Wouldn't it be better for professors to provide every possible opportunity (given the time constraints of the class) for students to revise their work so that the professor can thus reinforce the motivation to seek excellence in completing the writing assignment rather than foster a stick-and-carrot approach to writing by encouraging revision for a higher grade? In other words, promoting revision for the sake of a higher grade need not be done when students have every opportunity to revise for the sake of meeting the conditions of the assignment. Then a grade is final and need not be negotiated by asking the student to engage the hope of a higher grade, when, in fact, a higher grade may not be possible. If a student has been given ample opportunity to produce the best work possible up to that point, is it realistic to think that the student will be able to revise the paper sufficiently to make a significantly better grade? Will raising the grade from C- to C be satisfactory for the student or the professor? Will the time required for the student to revise and the professor to reevaluate the paper be justified?

Feedback for one assignment can be transferred to another assignment

Professors might argue that, even when feedback is juxtaposed with a grade, students can transfer the feedback on one writing assignment to the next writing assignment. Professors might believe, for instance, that if they explain to students on one paper how to solve a particular problem of organization or logic, the students will be able to transfer the solution for that problem to the next paper and other papers they write. This purpose for responding is loaded with assumptions that may not be true.

For instance, a solution to a problem in organization in one genre may not work in another genre. Solutions for narratives may not fit argumentative papers. Indeed, if a student is struggling with the requirements of a particular assignment, the student may even make mistakes he or she would not normally make because the student is preoccu-

pled with the difficulty of satisfying new requirements. Or even when the professor repeatedly marks surface errors, a student may continue to make those errors, assignment after assignment. The student simply may not see that *it's* is not the same as *its*, no matter how many times the professor marks the error. In short, the assumption that a student will be able to transfer what he or she learned about revising on one assignment to what needs to be revised on another assignment remains an assumption and does not provide adequate grounds for mixing feedback with a grade.

Certainly, linking revision with a grade might be effective when the professor is teaching students how to perfect a particular type of writing. For instance, when the professor is teaching students how to write a progress report, gives students explicit directions about what a progress report contains, and constructs a series of assignments so that students write a variety of progress reports, then feedback on one progress report could have a salutary effect on students' preparation of subsequent progress reports. Students still may fail to grasp the difference between *its* and *it's*, however, so professors might want to deal with common errors by explaining why *its* and *it's* can be confused and providing students with a means to test their use of the two words.

After considering the difficulties associated with three common problems in providing feedback to students, a professor logically might ask, What constitutes useful feedback? The literature on feedback to students' writing gives two answers to that question. Negatively, the literature explains what not to do and why. This negative side of the literature is important to examine because it gives professors insights into why certain common practices are ineffective and sets the stage for the positive answer the literature offers—what professors can do to give useful feedback. First, let's look at the negative side of the literature.

Why Professors Might Have Difficulties Providing Effective Feedback

A major assumption I have criticized throughout this monograph is that professors, because of their formal authority, possess subject matter and teaching authority. This faulty assumption has led to the assertion that because a professor has formal and subject matter authority, the professor automatically has teaching authority. If that were the case,

then professors would know how to respond effectively to students' writing, because effective response to students' writing is a characteristic of teaching authority. Indeed, there would be no need for literature designed to train teachers of composition (of all people!) how to respond effectively to students' writing. Yet such literature is readily available (see, e.g., Connors & Glenn, 1992; Larson, 1986; Peterson, 1995; Tavers, 1993). Not surprisingly then, the literature on professors' responses to students' writing calls into question the assertion that professors "just know" how to respond effectively to students' writing (Connors & Lunsford, 1993).

For example, professors say they are evaluating students' writing using criterion *x* but actually evaluate using criterion *y*, sending mixed messages to students (Kline, 1976). Professors may incorrectly question intent in students' writing, providing directives for revision that take control from students (Crowley, 1989; Heller, 1989; Welch, 1998) and diverting students from *their* intentions in writing (N. Sommers, 1982). Even the comments professors make may refute the advice they give, as, for example, when professors tell students "how important it is to write well" but write comments on students' compositions "suggest[ing] just the opposite" (Patterson, 1983, p. 178; see also S. Smith, 1997; Straub, 1996).

In essence, the way a professor reads students' writing is critically related to the way the professor evaluates students' writing. Professors read students' writing using three overlapping personae: experienter, examiner, and evaluator (Cowan, 1977). Then, in commenting on students' writing, professors send mixed messages to students because the professors have not distinguished among the personae. In reflecting on her reading of students' writing, Ede came to realize that the "natural, inevitable, and commonsensical" way she thought she read students' writing was really "complex and problematic" (1989, p. 156). Others have noted the problematic nature of the way professors read students' writing (Lawson & Ryan, 1989; Miller, 1984; Murray, 1989; Nold, 1978; Schwegler, 1991; Stewart, 1975; Zebroski, 1989). In short, professors neither read nor respond to students' writing the same way all the time. As professors, we give students a response to their writing based on *one* particular reading of that writing. And that one particular reading is not necessarily characteristic of the other particular readings our colleagues give when they respond to students' writing.

The way a professor reads students' writing is critically related to the way the professor evaluates students' writing.

In addition, when students evaluate professors' responses to their writing, they raise questions about how effective those responses are (Lynch & Klemans, 1978; Whichard, Gamber, Lester, Leighton, Carlberg, & Whitaker, 1992). Indeed, students may not understand professors' comments in the way the professor intended the comments to be understood (Hiatt, 1975; Ziv, 1982). And it's slight consolation that although professors can give conflicting advice to students about students' writing, the impact of most professors' comments is negligible (Sloan, 1977). This observation may be too quick to exonerate professors' feedback, however, because such feedback may be harmful when professors mislabel errors or fail to identify them in students' writing (Greenbaum & Taylor, 1981).

These general observations about problems with professors' responses to students' writing are accompanied in the literature by specific responses that are not particularly helpful. Those specific responses can be grouped into three categories: cryptic responses, negative responses, and too much response.

Cryptic responses

Cryptic responses are either one-word comments (e.g., "awkward") or abrupt commands (e.g., "rewrite this"). I encountered such a cryptic response while working with a graduate student on his dissertation. The student's adviser had recommended that the student pay a professional to edit his dissertation, so the student called me. In the course of working with the student to help him revise his dissertation, I met with him after his adviser had responded to one of the chapters in the dissertation. Next to one paragraph, the professor had written in large letters, "revise." I asked the student what the professor wanted the student to revise. He said, "I don't know." I then asked the student whether he had asked the professor what needed to be revised in the paragraph. The student responded, "He told me just to revise it." Little wonder that the impact of one-word comments on students' papers can be limited (A. D. Cohen, 1987).

Students' responses to cryptic comments fall into two categories. When a student reads "revise" without any other direction, the student can either say, "I thought something was wrong with this passage, but I couldn't place my finger on it, and I still can't," or the student can say, "What's wrong with this passage? Seems OK to me!" Cryptic comments do not

provide enough information for the student to revise according to specific directions. If the student does attempt to revise a passage based on a cryptic comment, the student has to make assumptions about whatever problem the professor believes is at issue but has not stated. The bald assertion "revise!" and the masked judgment "awkward!" are cryptic statements that do not provide students with adequate information about what needs to be revised. "Without specific directions for improvement, the student does not know where to begin" (Hahn, 1981, p. 10).

Negative responses

Another problem with professors' responses is that they tend to be negative (Daiker, 1989). Part of the reason for negative responses to students' writing may be that professors do not read students' writing the way they read other writing. Although professors do not read published texts with the intention of finding the type of errors that they find in students' writing, professors generally expect to find errors of various sorts when reading students' papers, so they look for errors—problems in logic, ill formed sentences, various surface errors. In essence, the professor compares students' writings with standards used to evaluate published texts. If true, it is unfortunate, because students' writings have not had the opportunity to go through the publishing process to the extent that published texts do. Students do not, for instance, have the privilege of consulting with a professional copy editor who labors intensively over a text to ensure that it is without spot or blemish. (Besides, such classroom consulting would be called plagiarism in many academic circles.) Students do not have the chance to review page proofs one last time before the text is published. So if students' writing is being evaluated on standards used to evaluate published writing, students ought to be given the same opportunities published authors, such as professors, have to create texts that can withstand the scrutiny of professional readers. When professors use the writing process in their classes, they give students many of the opportunities published authors have to create professional texts, but the level of care a published texts receives is, in most classrooms, still difficult to provide.

Another reason professors might make negative comments on students' writing could be frustration. While reading a batch of papers, the professor may become disheartened,

realizing that the students did not do well in their attempts to fulfill the conditions of the writing assignment. The problem may be that the writing assignment was faulty or that the students were not given enough time to complete the assignment or that instructions were insufficient. Nevertheless, a professor might believe that the problems with poor writing rest with students and begin to make negative comments on their papers: "Who in the world would believe something like this? Only a moron"; "This is a stupid thing to say"; "Dumb idea"; "Didn't you complete freshman composition?"; "Your poor writing ability suggests that you shouldn't be in college"; and so on. Such comments are not very useful in helping students revise their work and put the professor in a poor light, suggesting that he or she is not willing to help students improve but instead wants to demean students.

To counter any tendency to make unprofessional negative comments, professors can do two things. First, they can determine whether their pedagogy is a problem in helping students fulfill the writing assignment. Advice earlier in this monograph on developing a writing assignment can be consulted to check the clarity of a writing assignment. Even an excellent writing assignment, however, can be hindered by a pedagogy that does not lay out the writing process for students and identify checkpoints at which the professor will answer questions, ask students to produce drafts, and allow for peer review and self-evaluation. Second, professors may have to realign their preconceptions about what students *should* be able to do with what they can do. If most students in a class are not producing writing at a level of quality the professor believes is acceptable, then the problem may be the level of quality the professor has established. Sometimes, for instance, professors judge freshman students' writing on measures of quality that more properly apply to graduate students' writing. Admittedly, the problem of standards is sticky, but if students en masse are not meeting the standards of quality a professor establishes, something appears to be out of sync, and the professor's standards should not be immune from consideration as a potential problem.

Professors' negative responses to students' writing suggest that professors may have difficulty praising students' writing. The literature confirms this idea, noting that praise is a rare commodity in professors' responses to students' writing. Perhaps professors believe that only the best papers deserve

praise or that students will mistake praise of some parts of the paper for an endorsement of the entire paper or that students should be mature enough to accept genuine criticism that is not laced with the palliative of praise. Genuine praise has an important affective impact on writers, however. "Writing to people who care about us—or what we have to say—engages us as writers more than writing to people who read our work in order to grade us" (Fulwiler, 1986, p. 25). When professors do not praise students for what is good in their writing, professors can discourage students from wanting to revise their writing and perhaps from wanting to write much at all. Students like both positive and negative comments, but a paper with mostly negative comments can be depressing (Reed & Burton, 1985).

When professors do not praise students for what is good in their writing, they can discourage students from wanting to revise their writing and perhaps from wanting to write much at all.

Too much response

Yet another problem the literature on response to students' writing identifies is too much response. Professors might think that they are doing a great service to students by writing comments on a student's paper that exceed the amount of text the student wrote. Although the impulse behind such a practice may be based on noble intentions and a keen sense of professional responsibility, the practice can be quite ineffective because students can be overwhelmed by too much response, wondering, "Where do I start in revising this paper?"

The problem with too much response is that it tends to be diffuse and unfocused. If, after reading all that a professor has written, the student is left wondering where to begin in revising his or her paper, the problem may be that the professor has provided too much response.

How Professors Can Provide Useful Feedback

Difficulties professors might have in providing useful responses to students' writing point to ways professors can provide useful feedback. At the very least, we can learn from unhelpful responses that professors can provide useful feedback to help students revise their work—detailed, focused responses that include praise. More can and should be said, however, about how professors can provide helpful feedback, including differences in professors' and students' perspectives when they read a text, pointers for reading text aloud, pointers on how to write marginal comments, and pointers on how to write terminal comments.

Differences in professors' and students' perspectives when they read a text

When providing feedback on students' writing, professors need to keep in mind that students may read a text differently from the way a professor reads a text. Professors have been trained to read texts in certain ways, particularly regarding disciplinary conventions and rhetorical arguments. Students, however, are apprentices, learning how to read history, philosophy, psychology, and sociology texts—perhaps all in one semester. As apprentices, students need to be taught how to read texts in particular disciplines and how to write texts for those disciplines. The professor cannot assume that just because students have completed their writing requirement for general education they can write an acceptable paper for any discipline. Rather, professors might want to take the position that students are *not* prepared to write an acceptable paper when they walk into class the first day, not because the students are mentally deficient, but because they are untrained in disciplinary conventions.

The professor also might find it helpful to recognize that students are much more willing than professors are to read a paper with a generous attitude, filling in gaps the writer left (Newkirk, 1984). One consequence of this generous approach to reading is that students may not understand why a professor is asking for more detail or pointing out a gap when, from a student's perspective, the reader bridges that gap by supplying what the author obviously intended but didn't state.

Another problem with reading professors may want to consider is differences in students' gender. A woman may not write according to male patterns of written communication, and professors might want to acknowledge that a female (or male) approach to writing should not disallow a male (or female) approach. The recognition of different approaches to writing based on gender may not be apparent at first when professors investigate it, but literature on those differences should sound a caution to professors who believe that "good writing is good writing" without considering the impact of gender on how one defines good writing (Ballard & Clanchy, 1991; Barnes, 1990; E. Flynn, 1989; J. Flynn, 1989; Gabriel, 1990; Haswell & Tedesco, 1991; Stygall et al., 1994).

When professors are aware of differences in the ways they read a text and the ways students read texts, professors

can begin to respond to students' writing by reading an example of a student's writing out loud to a class and explaining how they interpret the text. For instance, a professor can select a text a student wrote the previous year to fulfill an assignment, mask the student's name, and make an overhead of the text. The professor then reads part of the text, perhaps the first paragraph, and explains what works and what doesn't.

In using students' writing in class, I have found particularly bad examples are useful in helping students learn how to read a resume, for instance. Students begin to see what doesn't work and why. I use a series of graduated examples so that bad examples lead to better examples that in turn lead to good examples. The purpose is to show students how to read a text so that they formulate principles of text interpretation they can use when they revise their own work and evaluate their peers' writing.

Speaking comments on students' papers

One way to continue oral instruction for revision is "cassette grading" (Carson & McTasney, 1973; Hays, 1978; Hurst, 1975; Olsen, 1982), in which the professor records his or her comments on students' papers by using a cassette player. One of the virtues of cassette grading is that students hear the professor responding to the text extemporaneously or with some focus from a text the professor has already marked. Such response can have an immediacy and an authenticity that may be hard to capture in other ways.

Writing comments on students' papers

Commonly, however, professors respond with written comments about students' writing with the purpose of providing advice and direction so that students can revise their papers. It is vital to note at the outset of this discussion on written comments, however, that professors have latitude in the way they write comments. For instance, after analyzing the written comments of 12 composition scholars on a set of student papers, Straub and Lunsford (1995) found that the scholars used different styles in making written comments: authoritative, directive, advisory, Socratic, dialectic, and analytical. Thus, no one style can account for the various types of helpful responses professors can make about students' writing. The following guidelines, offered in part as a counterbalance

to the negative approaches cited in the literature on responding, may be useful to professors who are wondering how to make effective written responses to students' writing.

- *Create a dialogue when writing responses, particularly marginal responses.* Show students how to read a paper from a professor's viewpoint. For instance, a professor can ask questions ("How can a person who believes in theirism explain the geological evidence that seems to contradict theistic claims?"), make observations ("I don't understand how a person, such as the one you are using as an example in your paper, can say that circular reasoning is normative and then appeal to evidence as a way for people to determine what is true."), pose possibilities ("I agree that people should have concern for their neighbors, but what if my neighbor does destructive things, including harming my loved ones? How would the principle of altruism you are recommending allow me to deal with my neighbor?"), and ask for clarification ("How exactly are you defining the word *vicarious*?"). The purpose of creating a dialogue with students is to help them see how a person who thinks critically about things responds to a text so that they can revise their writing to answer the questions the critical thinker poses. Evaluation should be "an open-ended transaction with the student writer rather than a final pronouncement of merit on the student's writing" (Diogenes, Roen, & Moneyhun, 1986, p. 61).
- *Point out successes.* Let students know when something they wrote works—which does not mean that the professor is obligated to praise students for every comma properly used. It does not even mean that professors need to balance praise with other comments. Rather, it means that a word of encouragement, judiciously placed, may motivate a student to see the value of revisions. Something of value can be improved while something of little value may not be worth the effort needed to add value. Although praiseworthy grading (Dragga, 1985, 1988; Zak, 1990) focuses on an almost exclusive use of praise, students need more than encouragement. They need specific direction for revising their papers.
- *Refrain from making unprofessional comments.* "Responses manifesting scorn, hostility, condescension, flippancy, superficiality, or boredom are always out of line"



(Howarth, 1984, p. 142). Such responses are out of line because they are unprofessional. Although a professor might make snide comments about a colleague in a book review of the colleague's work or take potshots at colleagues who hold to theoretical views that are at variance with the professor's, such responses are inappropriate when professors mentor students during the writing and grading processes. While a purpose of those processes is to indoctrinate students into disciplinary conventions, the professor is not obligated to treat students with the disdain that may be typical of an academic discipline.

- **Summarize.** In making comments at the end of a student's paper, the professor can summarize the gist of the marginal comments, providing students more specific direction for revising. A professor might recommend that a student consider doing x , y , and z to reorganize the paper, develop a particular point more fully and relate it to the other points in the paper, consider the relationship between parts A and B of the paper, and write a section that shows how the two relate, and so on. The terminal comment is a time when the professor can summarize his or her response to the paper.
- **Give students options.** Students want to know which comments they need to take seriously. This approach to the professor's comments is problematic, because students are asking for a recipe. The professor can help students move beyond the recipe approach by giving one or two suggestions for dealing with a problem. Professors can write, "If you want to take direction x in revising your paper, then you might consider focusing on y . However, if you want to take direction O in revising your paper, then you might consider focusing on P ." In other words, professors should give students options, not mandates, for revising.
- **Write comments that model good writing.** Yes, professors' comments on students' papers fall into the category of a rough draft. Nevertheless, professors can model good writing by making clear and cogent comments, which does not mean that the comments will be free of errors. Professors should explain to students that professors' comments are rough draft material, liable to all the foibles and follies of unedited comments. Nevertheless, the substance of the comments should be models of effective communication.

- **Defer assigning a grade as long as possible.** A grade ends a writing assignment and may not be much help in giving students substantive feedback about the quality of their writing. So the professor might consider focusing on the writing and grading processes as long as possible before bringing them to closure. Deferring grades should not be an excuse for waiting until the last moment to inform students that they are failing. Rather, professors who defer grades should provide students with feedback about their writing and give them some provisional idea of how they are doing, say at least C-level work or below.

The appendix provides an example of how effective techniques can be used to respond to a student's paper.

Conclusion

Providing students with feedback so that they can revise their work effectively is a hard job, requiring a professional and compassionate reading of students' writing. Examples of the negative responses cited in this section serve as a caution so that professors will refrain from giving feedback that will not help students revise their work. Examples of positive responses and guidelines for making positive responses serve as aids the professor can use to perfect the art of providing positive feedback to students. One way to gauge the effectiveness of feedback from professors is improvement in the drafts students produce guided by a professor's responses. When students do revise their writing based on a professor's feedback to produce better drafts, the professor can experience a great deal of satisfaction, knowing that students took to heart at least some of the professor's suggestions for revision and produced praiseworthy papers.