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Abstract
This paper reports on a study of thirty Saudi EFL university students’ reactions to peer feedback in a composition classroom. Over a period of twelve weeks, the participating teacher followed a process approach to teaching EFL writing. Students were encouraged to draft, redraft, and peer-collaborate before submitting essays for appraisal. Data, elicited via a questionnaire, is analyzed, plausible explanations of the emerging results are provided, and implications for EFL/ESL composition teaching are accordingly drawn. The results showed that the subjects perceived peer feedback as ‘useful’. The subjects also demonstrated a preference for ‘direct corrections’ as a feedback method and a familiar focus of peer feedback on surface levels of writing (i.e., mechanics and grammar).

Introduction
During the last two decades, research on writing has begun to unpack and explore the writing process, especially through observation and think-aloud studies with writers as they write compositions or undertake other ‘normal’ writing tasks. This moves away from the older concern exclusively with the quality of the ‘product’ at the end of the process. The influential Hayes and Flower (1983) model of the writing process, reflected to some degree in many process approaches to teaching writing (e.g., White and Arndt, 1991), distinguishes three central aspects of that process—planning, translating (turning thoughts into words, i.e., composing), and reviewing (in order to edit and revise).

Though the research has arrived at the present view of writing by predominantly studying native speaker writers, more research on non-native speakers has also been done (see, for example, Krapels, 1990). EFL/ESL writing teachers have borrowed techniques from first-language writing instruction in their writing classes. A useful technique in a process-centered
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curriculum is peer review sessions during which students share their working drafts with peers "as the drafts are developing in order to get guidance and feedback on their writing" (Leki, 1993: 22, cited in Nelson and Murphy, 1993). Nelson and Murphy (1993: 135) state that "the essence of peer response is students' providing other students with feedback on their preliminary drafts so that the student writers may acquire a wider sense of audience and work toward improving their compositions."

At the stage where a writer reviews or revises what he has already written, or any part of it which may occur after very short or quite long intervals, several sources of feedback may be exploited to facilitate evaluation which constitutes a key component of any such reviewing or revising process. First, there is the ever-available self-feedback, though in some older, product-oriented approaches to teaching writing, self-assessment was not really prompted, when students were required to write one-draft essays (Al-Hazmi and Scholfield, 1999). Such an approach is still the prevalent one in many Arab countries (Halimah, 1991), in contrast with the situation of our Arab subjects who were working more within the 'process approach' to teaching writing (see under method). Secondly, in a classroom context, there may be peer feedback from one or more classmates, where a process or cooperative learning approach is being implemented. Thirdly, as in all classroom contexts of writing, there may be teacher feedback, if the teacher reads and comments on a draft before it is regarded as final and handed in. However, on many occasions teachers do not have the luxury of time to provide such feedback on students' pre-final drafts, and teacher feedback is then only on the final draft, and frequently combined with some formal assessment (Al-Hazmi and Scholfield, 1999). "In part it is this limitation of teaching time that gives rise to interest in whether feedback has value if the teacher cannot provide pre-final draft feedback: the basic premise is that any feedback beyond the writer's own may be of use, given the notorious difficulty anyone has in seeing their own shortcomings, compared with the ease with which they may identify others' deficiencies" (ibid. p. 3). Furthermore, Nystrand (1986) notes, in a study comparing peer review with teacher review, that "students increasingly viewed their peers not as judges of their writing but rather collaborators in a process of communication" (p. 184).Peer feedback may have positive effects for the learner and be a viable tool to the teacher: 1) Teachers' time may be saved by eliminating certain editing tasks, thus freeing them for more helpful instruction and guidance. 2) Peer feedback is regarded as being more at the learner's own level of development, thus, perceived as more relevant than an older or superior teacher's feedback. 3) The reader seems to learn more about writing through reading critically others' papers, Keh (1990).

Peer reviews, both oral or written, require the practice of politeness strategies on the participants' part (Johnson, 1990). In keeping with recommendations voiced by some researchers (e.g. Johnson, 1990; Nelson
and Murphy, 1993), we made sure that our subjects worked co-operatively and treated one another politely during peer review sessions.

Cultural differences among learners are also deemed a potential problematic area when applying peer feedback technique. Nelson and Murphy (1993) argue that although most L1 studies provide a persuasive argument in favor of writing groups, the results of L1 studies do not necessarily apply to L2 learners. According to Nelson and Murphy (1993), L2 students differ from L1 students in a number of ways. First, English is not the native language of L2 learners, so in the process of learning it, L2 students may not trust other learners in responding to their compositions, and thus, may be hesitant to incorporate their peers’ suggestions while revising. Second, in teacher-centered classroom cultures students may ignore their peers’ suggestions because they feel that their peers are not knowledgeable enough to make worthwhile comments about their work (Nelson and Murphy, 1993).

Previous studies

In a study undertaken by Obah (1993) in which ESL college writers worked together and provided feedback on the drafts they had written, subjects were urged to recommend changes and to indicate areas that were interesting in the drafts they had read. Obah reports that students indicate that the treatment had enabled them to overcome the fear of talking in the class, the fear of making mistakes and the fear of exposing their ignorance. They also thought that such tasks provided fun. In addition to this, they indicated that they found learning easier. On the negative side, they complained about partners who did not want to collaborate with groups. A further “… criticism concerned initial feelings of inadequacy where some participants said that they had felt like the blind leading the blind, unable to make constructive comments on another’s paper” (p.12).

The feeling of inadequacy by Obah’s subjects is similar to that expressed by university level ESL subjects in a study undertaken by Jacobs (1987), in which subjects worked in groups of three and commented on each other’s written work. When asked how they felt about this procedure, they indicated that they did not feel confident enough to review work done by their peers since they were of the same level. They expressed a need for outside help. They also indicated that there were some students who were upset by comments made by their peers.

Using peer feedback in ESL has also been questioned on the grounds that L2 learners may mistrust each others’ responses to their writing. As a result, students may not incorporate suggestions offered by their peers (Nelson and Murphy, 1993). Nelson and Murphy undertook a study involving 4 university level ESL learners, attempting to establish whether ESL writers utilize peer comments in revising their drafts. Part of the procedure used to
collect data involved videotaping the students as they worked in peer response groups. Data, therefore, came from transcripts of the videotapes and students' first and second drafts of their written work. Nelson and Murphy suggest that whether students incorporate peer input or not depends on whether their interaction with the other student is co-operative or defensive. In a co-operative interaction, the writer constructively discusses with the reviewer and seeks to elicit clarification, whereas in a defensive interaction, the writer disagrees with the reviewer and justifies what he has written. Such a tendency among writers to be defensive was also observed by Freedman (1992) when she found that the ninth grade students tended to defend their drafts from the peer criticism. Such tendencies can, therefore, be seen to limit the effectiveness of peer feedback.

Investigating ESL students' perceptions of their peer reviews on their compositions, Mangelsdorf's (1992) study included forty advanced ESL writing students at the University of Arizona. The subjects were heterogeneous representing native speakers from 17 languages, including 4 Arabic-speaking students. She asked the students to respond in writing to the following questions:

- Do they find it useful to have their classmates read their papers and give suggestions?
- What kinds of suggestions do they often receive from their classmates?
- What kinds of suggestions are most helpful to them?
- In general, do they find the peer-review process valuable?

She also asked five teachers about their evaluation of the students' reaction to their peers' reviews.

The data were analyzed in two ways: first, she examined the comments globally to determine the students' overall responses to their peers' reviews. Secondly, she analyzed the teachers' and the students' comments by dividing them into "communication units" (following Langer and Applebee, 1987). Each unit began a separate expression about a thought or behavior. She found that 69% of the students' communicative units expressed positive thoughts about the peer reviews; 31% expressed negative thoughts. For teachers, 60% of their communicative units expressed positive thoughts about the peer reviews, while 40% of the communicative units expressed negative thoughts about the peer reviews. She reported that such an activity helped students revise the content of their drafts, but she noted that some peers were not able to give useful advice. Further, she noted that five of the students from Asian backgrounds expressed totally negative views of peer feedback. These students came from cultures that stress teacher-centered classrooms. This suggests that peer reviews may be resisted by students not familiar with a collaborative, student-centered setting. The students' comments demonstrated
that they preferred teacher-directed discussion of their writing rather than the peer reviews of their papers.

Similarly, Tang and Tithecott (1999) investigated the perceptions of 12 international students from Asia, studying English as SL in Canada, towards their peer responses to their writing and whether their perceptions changed over time. They also examined whether students changed their writing as a result of participating in response sessions. The methodology of this study included analysis of student journal entries, audiotapes of peer response sessions, and the students' drafts and final versions of their writing. Results showed that, in general, “students tended to be positive about their peer response and they became somewhat more positive as the semester progressed”. Although they expressed some concerns about peer feedback, a few of them revised their writing using their peer comments.

On the contrary, Sengupta (1998) found that her 12 secondary school Asian ESL students did not believe that peer evaluation could lead them to consider themselves as real readers. Furthermore, “none of the twelve seemed to perform any revisions arising out of their peers’ suggestions” (p.21). Similar results were obtained by Saito (1994), when her students were critical of peer feedback and self-feedback but indicating that they found teacher feedback most useful, particularly, when it focused on grammatical errors.

Mooko (1996) compared peer reviews with self-assessment of 81 ESL secondary school students in Botswana. He noted that peers complained about the quality of peer input and peer attitude. Consequently, peer reviews, both oral and written, require the practice of politeness strategies on the participants’ part (Johnson, 1990).

The above review indicates that there are few studies, especially in the foreign language writing literature, that examine students’ reactions to the type of revision used on the evaluation of the students’ written products. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, no attempt has been made to study Arab students’ reactions to peer feedback and relate its findings to the wider EFL/ESL writing research community. It is hoped that this study will fill this gap.

**Purpose of the present study**

This study is an attempt to answer a number of questions related to EFL students and their reactions to their peers' feedback, using as an example Arab students' feedback on the writing of Arabic speaking students majoring in English as a Foreign Language with special reference to Saudi Arabia. The main purpose of this study is to investigate the methods and types of feedback EFL students employ in providing feedback to their peers' writing. In addition, this study examines the students’ reactions towards their peers' written comments.
Research questions and expectations

The present study was undertaken as the first in a series to be conducted with learners in the same English department, and given the practical limitations of access and time, the most useful approach seemed to be via a questionnaire covering key areas of interest. In the context of the fairly lightly researched nature of foreign language writing, it was decided to gather data relevant to major themes where there were expectations from previous work.

The main questions in the study were as follows, with expectations broadly based on the picture emergent from the literature, and on background information related to our subjects:

- What is the Arab EFL students' preference for the methods of feedback used by their peers? Expectation: direct corrections.
- What areas do students prefer to receive feedback on from their peers? Expectation: Grammar and mechanics.
- Do students feel that peer feedback improves their writing? Expectation: yes.
- What types of feedback do students prefer (i.e. teacher feedback, teacher feedback or self-feedback?) Expectation: teacher feedback.

Method

The procedure followed in using peer feedback

The teacher (one of the authors of this paper) followed a process approach to teaching writing where students were encouraged to draft and redraft their compositions before they reached the final product. The subjects produced four compositions as part of their coursework over the twelve-week period of the study. In the interests of maximizing naturalness, the treatment of peer feedback was implemented during classes held in the usual way by the regular teacher. Students' writing was also assessed in the normal way for school purposes as coursework. One writing task on a single topic was continued over three periods of 50 minutes each on different days, and there were four such triple-period sessions over the duration of the study.

The first period of any writing session always consisted of prewriting activities followed by writing a first draft. The prewriting involved collective class discussion searching for and generating relevant ideas. The teacher generally directed the students to pay attention to content and organization at this stage. While producing the first draft, students worked individually and received help from the teacher only. In general, the teacher was observed to cooperate in the research by behaving as far as possible uniformly across writing sessions. Students used to complete writing the first draft at home. The teacher assigned the second period to peer feedback in pairs. Peer
revisers, therefore, had about 25 minutes for each student to examine and comment on the other’s draft. In the third period, students worked individually on producing a final draft in class making use of their peers’ comments. The teacher generally directed the students to add material and examine the draft at all levels when revising at this final stage. Feedback pairs were assigned by the teacher randomly, and stayed the same over the four sessions, except when a subject was absent and the pairing had to be altered. Students commented on their peers’ drafts with the help of a revision sheet (Appendix 2) adapted from White and McGovern (1994). The revision sheet typically lists points for revisers to look for or questions to answer about what they have written. They have been shown to help students in revision (Dimento, 1988; Freedman, 1992) especially since these subjects were unfamiliar with revising before the present study.

Questionnaire

Mann (1985) indicates that the well-known methods employed in gathering data in empirical research could be classified into three major techniques:

- Holding interviews with sample subjects.
- Conducting tests relevant to the research under investigation.
- Distributing questionnaires among sample subjects.

However, using any of these techniques usually depends on the nature and the purpose of the research undertaken. In this study, a questionnaire (Appendix 1) was used to investigate the research problems mentioned earlier.

The questionnaire was especially devised to answer the research questions of this study in the form of rating scale questions so that the subjects would find it easy to respond to various aspects of peers’ feedback. The items included required the subjects to respond to a 5-point scale survey (Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, and Never). These items focused on different areas of peers’ feedback and their reactions to it. This involved questions about the nature of feedback students received on their composition assignments, their views about feedback, their focus of attention on different aspects of feedback, and their preference for various types and methods of peers’ feedback. Besides the 5-point scale questions, a number of open-ended questions were included in order to give the participating students the freedom to express their opinions about different aspects of their peers’ feedback.

The questionnaire was based on Cohen’s (1987) who examined ESL students’ reactions to the feedback provided by their teachers on their compositions. The decision to use Cohen’s questionnaire was because it
would elicit a great deal of information from the subjects about their reactions to their peers' feedback. However, modification was necessary so that the new questionnaire would suit the study under investigation (Cohen's questionnaire focused on students' reactions to their teacher's feedback while ours was concerned with students' reactions to peer feedback).

As a piloting procedure, six Arab EFL students were requested to answer the questionnaire in order to ensure that all items were clear and to assess the approximate time needed for answering this questionnaire. All items were clear and students did not have any difficulty in answering the various items except for one question which seemed ambiguous, and therefore, was amended. They spent between 40-50 minutes in answering the whole questionnaire.

In addition, the questionnaire was administered anonymously in English by one of the researchers during the class-scheduled time at the end of twelve-week period. The researcher, having distributed the questionnaire, made sure that the subjects understood the items of the questionnaire by responding to all questions raised.

This questionnaire comprised two main parts. The first part involved background questions about the students' level of study and about the writing courses they had taken. The second part included various items about the peers' feedback and how the students responded to it.

**Subjects**

This study involved the participation of thirty Arabic-speaking students majoring in English as a Foreign Language at King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia. The subjects who responded to the questionnaire were the third year students who had already studied several writing courses. They were all male and came from similar socio-economic background and age group, ranging from 20 to 24 years of age.

**Data Analysis**

SPSS for Windows was used to analyze the responses of the students to the items of this questionnaire. Responses were scored on a 5-point scale (always = 4, often = 3, sometimes =2, rarely = 1, and never = 0). The data were analyzed for descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations owing to the exploratory nature of the study. The t-test for paired samples was also used to compare a few related items of the subjects' responses. Tables used here present the mean and the standard deviation (SD) for the students’ responses.
Results and discussion

The following section reports on how our subjects in the present study react to and handle their peers’ written feedback. This involves the presentation and discussion of the responses of these students to the items of the questionnaire designed for this purpose.

Students’ perception of the usefulness of peer feedback

The first question addressed to students was whether they perceived peer feedback as being useful. The analysis of our subjects’ responses, in line with our expectation, showed that they perceived peer feedback as being useful with a mean score of 3.13, S.D.: .82. Subjects’ perception of the usefulness of peer feedback might relate to their willingness to have a second opinion about their drafts from a different source other than the teacher. The results of the study, as we shall see later in this paper, also suggest that students have high regard for local correction of mechanics and grammar as “useful”, even though it may not actually be.

Reading peers’ feedback

This item (Question 2) was included to obtain information from students about how often they read the feedback on their compositions after they had received them from their peers and whether they read the whole composition with the feedback or just the feedback provided. The researchers found that half of the participants (51.7%, n=14) said they read the entire composition with the feedback on it when their peers returned their compositions. Also, 27.6% (n=7) reported that they read most of the composition with the feedback on it. The high mean score of this item (mean: 3; S.D. 1.1; n=29) supports the results of the previous item and suggests that Arab EFL learners perceive peer feedback as being useful and important for improving their writing and, therefore, they said they read it. The results also showed that some students (17%, n=7) thought of peer feedback as error correction and that they did not need to read the whole paper to get value from it since they could spot peers’ error corrections without reading the entire composition.

Understanding peers’ feedback

The students were asked to what extent they understood their peers’ feedback they received on their compositions. The purpose of this item (Question 3) was to find out how difficult the peers’ feedback was. The subjects indicated that they had no difficulty understanding their peers’ feedback reflected by a high mean score: 3.20 and a low S.D. 0.66.

The participating students were also asked about what might have caused the peers’ feedback to be difficult for them to understand. Among the answers given were using difficult language, using complex sentences, making unclear suggestions and questions, giving too many details, or that the peers’ handwriting was difficult to read.
Table (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for difficulty</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult language</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex sentences</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear suggestions</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult questions</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult handwriting</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many details</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows fairly low means for most of the categories included in this item indicating that students did not come across much difficulty in understanding peer feedback on their compositions. This result suggests that the majority of the subjects respond positively depending on their knowledge of the L2 and thus understand their peers’ feedback. We notice, however, that the highest mean score was the peers’ use of unclear suggestions (2.2). This result could be attributed to students’ preference to be told the answers rather than to have suggestions that require them to spend more time to get the right answer. It could also relate to students’ unfamiliarity with such a technique. In other words, teachers in this department do not normally write lengthy comments and their corrections usually take the form of words, short phrases and sentences or they just mark the location and type of errors in students’ writing without providing the correct alternatives (Asiri, 1996).

Students’ preference for methods used by peers in providing feedback

The purpose of the items in this section (Question 6) was to find out what methods students wanted their peers to use and what methods they actually used when giving feedback on their papers.

Table (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct corrections</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols and codes</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single words</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete sentences</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (3)

Methods claimed to be used by peers in providing peer feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct corrections</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols and codes</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single words</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete sentences</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 reveals, contrary to our expectations, that the subjects expressed their preference for receiving more suggestions feedback since this method was chosen as their first choice with a high mean score of 2.9. However, there is a mismatch between students' preference for 'suggestions' feedback and what they reported their peers actually used (mean: 1.6). On the other hand, direct corrections (Table 3), as we expected, ranked first among other feedback strategies students actually used when commenting on their peers' papers (mean: 2.63). The reason may be that this method is the most recognizable method to those students, which is usually applied to spelling and grammatical mistakes. In addition to what we have seen above, students preferred to be told the correct answer instead of working them out themselves since they depended on a teacher-centered approach (e.g. Liggert, 1983).

Another method the participating students expressed their preference for was 'direct corrections' with a mean score of 2.63. The responses of the subjects revealed an interesting match between their preference for 'direct corrections' and 'direct corrections' they said they actually received from peers, scoring at the same level (mean: 2.63). Students' willingness for receiving direct error corrections has been noted in Leki (1990).

As can be seen from Tables (2, 3), students indicated their preference for more frequent feedback in the form of 'single words', but in reality this method was among the least ones used by our subjects. For other methods, however, there was no big difference in the mean score between what students said their peers used and what they said they preferred to see their peers using (i.e., difference ranged from 0.1 to 0.6). Students were also asked if peers asked them to rewrite compositions. The analysis of the responses showed a low mean score for this item, less than half on the rating scale (mean: 1.83). This result is expected since the above discussion revealed that the most common strategy students used in providing feedback was 'direct
corrections.' The results, however, revealed a mismatch between the amount of rewriting (mean: 1.83) students asked their peers to do and students' preference for this type of feedback (mean: 3.1). This is because our subjects pointed out that 'rewriting the whole paper' helped them considerably to learn from the problems marked in their papers. This was a significant difference, according to the t-test for paired samples, (mean difference: 1.3, \( p = .001 \)). This situation is to be contrasted with lower scores recorded for students' desire that their peers 'rewrite on another piece of paper just the sentence on which an error appeared' (mean: 1.9), or 'rewrite near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong' (mean: 1.1).

**Attention to peer feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All feedback</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on content</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on organization</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on vocabulary</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on grammar</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on mechanics</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and expand after reading feedback</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and expand without checking feedback</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not do anything</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items in Question 7 focused on the type of peer feedback the subjects incorporated into their compositions (e.g., feedback on grammar, content, etc.). The results (Table 4) indicated that students sometimes attended to and incorporated all of the feedback they received from peers. As one might expect, the students reported that they incorporated more peer feedback on lower-order aspects of grammar, mechanics and vocabulary than higher-order of content and organization. This is because it is easier and more straightforward for our EFL subjects to process and incorporate feedback related to grammar, mechanics and vocabulary than content and organization. Similar results have been reported in Al-Hazmi and Schofield (1999) for their advanced Arab ESL subjects.

**Preference for types and focus of feedback**

Items in Questions 8 and 9 were designed to get information about our subjects' preference for the different types of feedback and what peers' feedback actually dealt with. The participants expressed high preference for feedback related to the main aspects in their compositions (i.e., content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics).
Table (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores for the various aspects are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Subjects, in line with our expectations, indicated that peer feedback they received dealt with all the aspects of their compositions, but it was more focused on grammar and mechanics. The T-test for paired samples revealed significant differences between students' report on the frequency of the peers' feedback and students' preference for organization (p = .02) and content (p = .000). That is, the students expressed their favor for receiving feedback on organization and content more than their peers gave them as the organization and content mean score was 3.37 for their preference in contrast to 1.7 and 1.97 consecutively in receiving these kinds of feedback. In addition, the subjects expressed their desire for more 'suggestions' than what they had received, as we indicated earlier in this paper. This agrees, to some extent, with the findings of Cohen and Cavalcanti (1987) as half of their EFL students reported that they would prefer more emphasis on content and organization.

Satisfaction with feedback

Subjects were asked if, on the whole, they received the kind of feedback they would have liked on their compositions (Question 11). Our subjects indicated that they had often received the feedback they liked (mean: 3; S.D. 1.5). The students also reported that the feedback they received from peers helped them improve their compositions (mean: 3.1; S.D. 1.5). This supports
the students' responses to the previous items about their attention to and incorporation of the various aspects of the peers' feedback and indicates that the students were generally satisfied with the feedback their peers had provided on their compositions. Interestingly enough, and contrary to our expectations, our subjects reported that the feedback type they preferred most was peer feedback (mean: 2.9) in comparison to teacher feedback (mean: 2.3) or self-feedback (mean: 1.5). The teacher-centered background in our EFL subjects' classrooms led the researchers to expect that students would naturally favor teacher feedback more than peer or self-feedback (Asiri, 1996). More light will be shed on this variable when reporting the results at the open-ended questions later in this paper.

Handling peer feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make mental notes</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write down problematic points</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify points to be explained</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for teacher's help</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for peer's help</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to previous composition</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult a grammar book</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult an expert</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores (Table 7) for this item (Question 12) indicate that subjects handled peer feedback by 'asking for peers' explanation', 'referring back to previous composition', and 'identifying the points that need explanation'. Another set of strategies students less frequently used in handling their peers' feedback was 'writing down problematic points by type' and 'making mental notes'. As can be seen from Table 7, subjects, however, showed little interest in 'asking for teacher's explanation', 'consulting an experienced person', and 'consulting a grammar book' when handling their peers' feedback.

Results of the open-ended questions

In this section, we present the results of the students' responses to the open-ended questions. It must be pointed out that a different procedure was used to analyze the data of this section. In other words, because of the nature of the responses to the questions of this part, SPSS was not applicable here and, therefore, items in this part had to be analyzed manually. The findings are presented in percentages.
In responding to the question "What would you like most about self-feedback?", 26 students out of the total number, 30, answered this question. The majority of the 65% said they liked self-feedback because they could discover their own errors and correct them independently. 15% said they liked it because it gave them self-confidence, and about 8% said they liked it because they could devote more time and attention to what they had written. However, about 12% said they did not like anything about the method because it did not help them improve their writing.

Twenty-eight students responded to the question of what they liked most about peer feedback. 54% said they liked this method because their classmates pointed out their errors and showed them how to correct the errors. 21% of the students said they liked it because they could benefit from the ideas, suggestions, and experience of their peers. 14% of the subjects said what they liked most about peer feedback was that they felt more comfortable and more confident when their classmate provided feedback on their compositions. The reason, they said, was that their peers were of the same level of study, and they could, therefore, provide satisfactory feedback. This supports the findings of Nystrand (1986) and Obah (1993) when they note that students viewed their peers as collaborators rather than judges and that the students overcome the fear of making mistakes. Two students (7%) said they liked their peer feedback when their peers took their writing seriously and provided useful feedback on their compositions. One student said he did not like his peers' feedback at all.

The subjects were also asked about what they liked most about their teachers' feedback. 27 students answered this question with a large majority of 81% saying that they liked it. These students said they liked it because it was useful as it explained their errors and showed them how to write their compositions in a better way. 11% said they liked the suggestions their teachers provided and 7% said they liked it because their teachers had better and/or more experience (than their peers) from which they could benefit.

The students' responses to these two questions reveal that the students were affected by the teacher-centered approach which had been dominant for long time and, therefore, in most cases, teacher feedback was the only available and the most familiar source of feedback on their writing.

In contrast to the previous set of questions, the following three questions were included to inquire students about what they disliked most about the different methods of feedback, i.e., self feedback, peer feedback, and teacher feedback.

Twenty-nine students responded to a question of what they disliked most about self-feedback, the majority of 86% said they disliked the method because they could not usually identify their own errors and, therefore, could not improve their writing. 7% of the students said that they disliked this
method because they could not do it seriously. Another 7% also said there was nothing they disliked about self-feedback.

When asked about what they disliked most about their peer feedback, 29 students responded to this question. 62% said that their classmates might have faced the same problems and could not discover or solve their problems, or the level of proficiency of their classmates could have been lower than that of the papers they were dealing with. These students also said that the feedback of their peers focused on the forms and the minor errors and ignored the content and the major errors. About 21% of the students’ responses indicated that they did not like their peers’ feedback, because they did not trust their classmates, because they did not, as they said, provide honest and truthful feedback. This confirms what Obah’s (1993) subjects said that “they had felt like the blind leading the blind,” because the peer is “unable to make constructive comments on another’s paper” (p.12).

Out of the 29 students who responded to the last open-ended question, 38% said what they disliked most about their teachers’ feedback was the difficulty to understand and then to attend to because of using difficult language or using symbols that they were not familiar with.

Comparing the subjects’ answers to this item with their answers to a previous item, when they were asked about the difficulty of their peer feedback, it seemed that these students found their peer feedback easier to handle than the teachers’ feedback. 27% said there was nothing they disliked about the teachers’ feedback. 14% said they disliked it because it did not cover everything and there was not enough detail. Other students said they did not like it either because of the low marks the teachers gave or being too critical.

Conclusion

The subjects in the present study behaved much like those in previous studies. Expectations were supported with respect to the usefulness of peer feedback, and to some extent in relation to peers’ preference for ‘direct corrections’ as a feedback method. The familiar focus of peer feedback on surface levels of writing (i.e. mechanics and grammar) was also found. The expectation that peer feedback would lead to improvement in students’ was highly supported by the data.

Evidence against expectations primarily included preference for peer feedback in comparison with teacher feedback and self-feedback, as our subjects were used to a teacher-centred approach prior to the present study (Ligget, 1983), and preference for feedback to be on content and organisation as opposed to mechanics and grammar.

Drawing firm conclusions from this study seems difficult because of the small number of subjects used and the fact that the EFL/ESL writing context in the Arab world and elsewhere is varied and diverse. The messages for the
استخدام التغذية الراجعة التفاعلية في مادة الإنشاء في اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية

سلطان الحامدي و إبراهيم العسيري

ملخص

استهدفت هذه الدراسة استطلاع عينة من (30) طالباً جامعيًا سعودياً متخصصين في اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية حول التغذية الراجعة التفاعلية في مادة الإنشاء.

اتهم مدرس المادة (أحمد الباحثين)، خلال فترة الدراسة، منهجية تعليم الكتابة كعملية إدراكيّة حيث كان يشجع الطلاب على الكتابة والمراجعة وتبادل الآراء حول الكتابة التي انتهت كل طالب مع نظيره قبل تقديمه من قبل المدرس.

تمثلت منهجية البحث في استبيان قام الباحثان بتحليل نتائجها وربطها بأدبيات الموضوع واستخلاص التوصيات لتدريس مادة الإنشاء في اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية.

أظهرت النتائج أن الطلاب برون أن التغذية الراجعة التفاعلية مفيدة لكتابتهم مفضلين التصوير والراجعة كإحدى طرق التغذية الراجعة. كذلك أظهرت الدراسة أن التغذية الراجعة التفاعلية ركزت على جوانب النحو وضوابط الهجة والترقيم.
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Appendix I: Questionnaire

DEAR STUDENT,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to analyze the feedback you receive from your peer (classmate) and the methods you use in responding to the feedback on your writing. You are kindly requested to answer the questionnaire, by choosing one answer to each of the following questions, and return it to the researcher. The information you give will be used for research purposes only.

Thank You.

PERSONAL DATA

NAME: (OPTIONAL)..................................................
YEAR OF STUDY:..................................................
HOW MANY COMPOSITION COURSES HAVE YOU HAD AT THE UNIVERSITY?  ( ) COURSE(S)

1. How often do you perceive your peer feedback on your composition to be useful?
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

2. How much of each composition do you read when your peer returns it to you?
   a-All of it  b- Most of it  b- Some of it  c- Feedback only  d- None of it

3. How often do you understand your peer feedback.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

4. If you do not understand your peer feedback, is that because of:
   A. Using difficult language.
      a. Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
   B. Using complex sentences
      a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
   C. Making unclear suggestions
      a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
   D. Asking difficult questions
      a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
E. Peer's handwriting is difficult to read.
   a. Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

F. Giving too many details.
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

5. How often does your peer ask you to re-write your compositions?
   a. Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

6. How do you like your peer feedback to be on your paper?

A. Direct corrections
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

B. Symbols and codes
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

C. Single words
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

D. Phrases
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

E. Complete sentences
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

F. Suggestions
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

G. Questions
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

7. When attending to your peer feedback, which of the following do you incorporate more?

A. All peer feedback
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

C. Feedback on content
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never

D. Feedback on organization
   a-Always    b- Often    c- Sometimes    c- Rarely    d- Never
E. Feedback on vocabulary
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
F. Feedback on grammar
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
G. Feedback on mechanics (spelling, punctuation, etc.)
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
H. Revise and expand the composition after reading the peer feedback
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
J. Revise and expand without looking at the peer feedback.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
K. Not do anything
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

8. How often does the peer feedback deal with the following?

A. Content
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
B. Organization
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
C. Vocabulary
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D. Grammar
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
E. Mechanics (e.g., punctuation, spelling)
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

9. Do you prefer to have more feedback on the following areas of your composition?

A. Content
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D. Organization
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
E. Vocabulary
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D. Grammar
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

E. Mechanics (e.g., punctuation, spelling)
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

10. How often does your peer use each of the following methods when commenting on your writing?

A. Direct corrections
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

B. Symbols and codes
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

C. Single Words
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

D. Phrases
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

B. Complete sentences
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

F. Suggestions
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

G. Questions
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

11. How often do you receive the feedback that you like your peer to put on your composition?
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

12. Describe what you do when you go over your peer feedback.

A- Make mental notes
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

B- Write down problematic points by type
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

C- Identify the points to be explained
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D- Ask for teacher explanation
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
E- Seek explanation from a peer
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
F- Refer back to previous composition
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
G- Consult a grammar book
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
H- Consult an experienced person.
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

13. How often do you feel that your peer feedback helps you improve your composition?
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

14. When your peer returns your paper after giving feedback on it, do you look carefully at the marks indicating problems in?
A- Content
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
C. Organization
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D. Vocabulary
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
D- Grammar
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
E- Mechanics (e.g., punctuation, spelling)
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never

15. If there are many problems in a composition, what do you want your peer to do?
A- Mark all problems, major and minor.
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
B- Mark all problems the peer considers major, but not the minor ones.
   a- Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  c- Rarely  d- Never
C- Mark most but not necessarily all of the major problems if there are many of them.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
D- Mark (point out) only a few of the major problems no matter how many there are.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
E- Mark all repeated problems whether major or minor.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
F- Mark any problems that might interfere with communicating your ideas.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

16. How do you want your peer to indicate an error in your written work?
A- The peer corrects out what is incorrect and write in the correct word or structure.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
B- The peer shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
C- The peer only shows where the problems are.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
D- The peer ignores problems in English (i.e., vocabulary choice, grammar, and mechanics) and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

17. When your peer marks problems, how does he usually do it?
A. Rewrites the sentence, phrase or word carefully.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
B. Shows where the error is and gives hints about how to correct it?
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
C. Only shows where the error is.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
D. Only says there are problems in English in your work.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
18. How carefully do you look at the marks your peer makes on your written work?
A. Read each one carefully.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
B. Look at some marks more carefully than at others.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
C. Mainly pay attention to peer’s comments on the ideas expressed.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never

19. If you only look carefully at some of the marks your partner makes on your written work, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully?
A. Marks indicating problems in content.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
B. Marks indicating problems in organization.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
C. Marks indicating problems in vocabulary choice.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
D. Marks indicating problems in grammar.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
E. Marks indicating problems in mechanics (punctuation, spelling, etc.).
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never

20. Of the marks that your partner makes on your composition, which ones do you remember best?
A. Comments on the content.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
B. Comments on the organization of the paper.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
C. Marks indicating problems in vocabulary choice.
   a-Always  b- Often  c- Sometimes  d- Rarely  e- Never
D. Marks indicating problems in grammar.
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

E. Marks indicating problems in mechanics (punctuation, spelling, etc.).
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

21. If you make an error you don’t know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?

A. To your teacher
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

B. To another student friend
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

C. To a grammar handbook
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

22. If you turn to one of your sources (in Number 21 above) for help in correcting your problems, whose advice do you usually remember best?

A. Teacher’s advice
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

B. Student friend’s advice
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

C. The book’s advice
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

23. What helps you most to learn from the problems marked in your paper and helps you avoid making those problems again?

A. Rewriting the whole paper
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

B. Rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence on which an error appeared
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never

C. Rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong
   a-Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   c- Rarely   d- Never
D. Just reading through the paper carefully without writing anything (making mental notes)
   a- Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   d- Rarely   d- Never
E. Nothing, because you know you will probably forget and make the same error again no matter what you do.
   a- Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   d- Never
24. What type of feedback do you prefer most?
   A. Self-feedback
      a- Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   d- Rarely   d- Never
   B. Peer feedback
      a- Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   d- Rarely   d- Never
   C. Teacher's feedback
      a- Always   b- Often   c- Sometimes   d- Never
25. What do you like most about self-feedback?
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
26. What do you like most about peer feedback?
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
27. What do you like most about teacher's feedback?
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
28. What do you dislike most about self-feedback?
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
   ..............................................................
29. What do you dislike most about peer feedback?

30. What do you dislike most about teacher’s feedback?
Appendix 2: Evaluation checklist

Dear student,

Read your classmate's draft carefully and then comment on it using the following evaluation checklist (Adapted from White and McGovern, 1994)

1. Content
1.1 Is all the information relevant to the topic?
1.2 Are there gaps in the information?
1.3 Has enough been written about the subject adequately?

2. Organization
2.1 Is the subject or topic stated clearly in the introduction?
2.2 Are the topics or main ideas in each paragraph clear?
2.3 Are there appropriate examples for each main idea?
2.4 Is there enough discussion and analysis of examples?
2.5 Does each paragraph flow smoothly, or does it read like a list?
2.6 Is there a conclusion? Does it summarize the main points effectively?

3. Cohesion
3.1 How do sentences connect with those that come before and those that follow? Are they joined smoothly, or do they read like a list? Do some sentences need to be combined? Do some sentences need to be divided?

4. Vocabulary:
4.1 Is specialist or technical vocabulary accurately used?
4.2 Is general vocabulary accurately used?
4.3 Have words been chosen with an accurate sense of their meaning as well as their use in context?
4.4 Can you think of better synonyms for some words?
5. Grammar

5.1 Do subjects and verbs agree? Are singular and plural subjects used with correct verb forms?

5.2 Are verb tenses correctly formed and correctly used?

5.3 Check the correct use of:

- Prepositions- in, on, at, for, to, etc.
- Articles- a, an, the.
- Relative pronouns- who, which, that.

6. Mechanical accuracy

6.1 Does each sentence end with an appropriate mark of punctuation, e.g., full stop, ? question mark?

6.2 Is punctuation correctly used within sentences?

6.3 Check spelling.