

PEER-EDITING PATTERNS IN THE ENGLISH ONE COMPOSITIONS OF DLSU-MANILA STUDENTS

MARIA N. CUSIPAG

De La Salle University-Manila

The researcher examined the peer-editing patterns that De La Salle University-Manila first-year college students exhibited when editing the essays of their classmates. She attempted to answer the following questions: (1) What peer-editing patterns are used by college freshman students when editing the compositions of their classmates? (2) What ratings on form and content do these compositions obtain in the different peer-editing patterns used? (3) Are there significant differences among the peer-editing patterns used in terms of ratings on form and content? (4) Are there significant gains between drafts in both the ratings on form and content of compositions using different peer-editing patterns?

Forty students belonging to one class analyzed four model essays which were corrected using four editing patterns. They were instructed to choose one pattern which they were to use when editing the essays of their peers. Ten out of 40 students were allowed to choose one pattern. The last ten students who belonged to another class were not shown any of the four model essays to prevent them from being influenced by the patterns used by the other four groups. The respondents were asked to write an essay following a prompt. Their essays were edited by their peers using any of the patterns that they chose. Those that were not shown any pattern edited the papers using their own strategy.

Findings of the study proved that some form of editing resulted in considerable improvement in the students' argumentative essays. In addition, it was found that there was no significant difference in the mean gain scores among all the treatment groups which means that there is no one best pattern that results in significantly improved writing.

1. Introduction

The usual practice of several English teachers doing the sole job editing their students' compositions is becoming passé most especially among college students who are taught the process approach to writing. Current trends in writing instructions have given importance to peer feedback in second language classrooms. With the increased role of peer review in written pedagogy, the need

to allow peers to give feedback during the revision stage of composition writing has given greater impact in the practice of improving the quality of compositions of students.

The revision/editing stage is very significant in the writing process. Students revise their work based on the oral and written remarks of their peers and teachers which are termed *feedback*, *response*, or *correction*. They reexamine what had been written by their peers in order to check how effectively they have communicated their ideas to their intended readers. They come to realize that revising is not merely checking for language errors but improving global content and organization of ideas (Seow, 2002).

Peer editing/revising, therefore, occupies an essential role in an English classroom. Besides making the load of the English teachers light, it becomes a way of assessing how much students display their knowledge in manipulating the language used by the writer. With peer feedback, student's communicative power is enhanced by encouraging them to express and negotiate their ideas (Mendonca & Johnson, as cited by Lockhart & Ng, 1996).

This particular phase of the writing process has drawn so much attention from educators and researchers considering the varied errors that students commit in their drafts, the teachers' strategies in correcting errors, the style of the writer in composing or correcting his/her own work, or the different techniques that a peer uses when reviewing his/her classmates' piece of writing. In colleges and universities, two or three drafts are required for editing before the final draft is written. Essay writing is a requirement; hence, students have to do their best to comply with the process and pass the English course. Students, depending on the instructions of their teachers, may be required to do peer editing first on any of the drafts before the teachers give their feedback. In some cases, the drafts are reviewed separately by both teacher and peer. When peers review the drafts of their classmates, they take extra time to examine closely how well the writer communicated his/her ideas in writing both in form and in content. *Form* refers to grammar such as the correct usage of nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections, as well as mechanics such as punctuation marks, capitalization, italicization, indentation, and spelling. *Content* refers to clarity and comprehension, appropriacy, accuracy, coherence, relevance, organization of ideas, or adequacy of information. Peer editing on content may be very complicated among the less proficient learners but with teachers' guidance, they may be able to do it. Thus, the issue on form and content editing, particularly if the order when to use them is significant, was stressed in this study.

Quite a number of studies have been particularly concerned about the use of peer feedback in writing classes (Chaudron, 1984; Devenney, 1989; Caulk, 1994; Mendonca & Johnson, 1984; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2002). In a study conducted by Devenney (1989, in Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2002) on how teachers and peers evaluate and respond to student writing, his findings showed that

“peers, unlike teachers, did not use grammar as a basis for evaluating but that they showed more personal identification with author and text than did teachers” (p. 85). Whereas most students are particular in checking grammatical errors, his study did not reveal such a practice.

In like manner, Caulk (1994 in Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2002) found in his study that “many of the students’ suggestions were valuable, providing information that the teacher did not mention in her comments” (p. 190). The study revealed that teacher and student feedback do not contradict but seem to be complementary rather than redundant.

Rinnert and Kobayashi (2002) analyzed the perception of EFL writing among students and teachers. They found that students could respond well to content, giving appropriate and helpful feedback. Inexperienced students “could react to the content of an essay personally by presenting different views or ideas, or by asking for clarification of the writer’s meaning” (p. 202). Experienced students, on the other hand, “were capable of providing rhetorically related comments on such features as the writer’s point and use of examples, as well as on macro/micro-level structures” (p. 202). Moreover, they were able to “respond to the different aspects of their peers’ essay with a frequency approaching that of the Japanese teachers, although not all their comments were necessarily as sophisticated as those given by the teachers” (p. 202). In fact, Caulk (1994) observed the same thing in his study that a majority of the students’ comments were appropriate.

Nystrand and Brandt (1989), in their investigation of native speaking adult students who were engaged in peer conferences, found that interacting with peers encouraged revision and enhanced students’ attitudes towards writing (Lockhart & Ng, 1996).

In the same manner, Nelson and Murphy (1993) examined whether ESL university students incorporate suggestions given by peers when revising their drafts. Findings showed that student writers made some changes based on the feedback during peer response. Interaction in a cooperative manner was more likely to lead to revision than when negative or defensive interaction had taken place.

Jacobs (1989) supported the use of peer feedback. First, he believed that the growing popularity of teaching writing as a process with several dimensions had made peer feedback more appropriate because there is more emphasis on revision. Second, he agreed that these dimensions of the writing process -- creating ideas, shaping those ideas into a piece of writing, and then fixing the form of that writing -- had provided more points at which feedback could be offered.

Lewis (2002) provided some reasons why peer feedback is more important. According to her, “proofreading other people’s work prepares students for proofreading their work. Furthermore, students have a great variety

of suggestions. It is instant, and it is boring if all feedback comes from the teacher” (p. 21).

Aside from the effectiveness of peer feedback, some researchers have compared different types of combinations of form-focused and content-focused feedback. In a study conducted by Fathman and Whalley (1990, in Ashwell 2002) on the use of form and content feedback given by teachers, they concluded that giving content and form feedback simultaneously is just as effective as giving content feedback or form feedback separately.

The present study examined the peer feedback patterns of DLSU-Manila English One students in their argumentative essays. Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. What peer feedback patterns are used by freshman students when correcting the argumentative essays of their peers?
2. What ratings on form and content do these compositions obtain in the different peer feedback patterns used?
3. Are there significant differences among the peer feedback patterns used in terms of rating on form and content?
4. Are there significant gains between drafts in both the ratings on form and content of compositions using different peer feedback patterns?

2. Theoretical Framework

The role of peer feedback on writing has brought about quite a number of studies not only for the first language learners but for second language learners as well. George Jacobs (1989) advocates that peer feedback broadens learner’s involvement by giving them additional roles of readers and advisors to go with that of a writer. In his study on peer feedback, he cited Davies and Omberg (1986) who said that this helps learners become more autonomous, thus preparing them to write without a teacher to correct their errors. Therefore, with learner’s autonomy, students all the more need to be taught how to give feedback on their peer’s compositions. The Manoa Writing Program Faculty Board (2000), in their article entitled “Peer Review and Feedback Forms,” states:

.... Practice sessions are important for the success of peer review. They give you a chance to clarify the criteria and even aspects of the assignment if that proves necessary.

Student responses such as: “This is good” or “This is bad” are too general to be helpful and don’t give a writer enough information on how or what to improve. Show students how to go beyond generalities by reinforcing appropriate and effective comments as students offer them in discussion. Encourage them to specify what needs improvement and what works well (p.1).

Teachers indeed stay in the background during peer feedback sessions. They only come to the rescue when their assistance is needed.

Ashwell (2000), in his study on teacher response, mentioned,

Advocates of a process writing approach to second language writing pedagogy have made various suggestions about the best way teachers can respond to their students' writing. One of these suggestions is that teachers should attend to content in preliminary drafts before switching to focus on form on later drafts. The supposition is that by doing so, the teacher can encourage revision (making large-scale changes to form) on the final draft. One assumption is perhaps that focusing on form too early in the writing process can dissuade from revising their texts. Another assumption is that giving advise that is intended to encourage revision too late in the process requires students to take risk when there is no chance for redress. It is also assumed that revision and editing need to be dealt with separately... (p. 227).

Uncertain whether the content-then-form pattern of teacher response is more effective than other patterns, Ashwell (2000) conducted a study along this line. He used the pattern (1) content then form (2) form then content, and (3) form-content then form-content. His findings revealed that the first pattern did not produce significantly different results from the other two patterns used.

Considering the ideas of Jacobs (1989), the Manoa Writing Program Faculty Board (2000), and Ashwell (2000), this study had been conceptualized. Prior to this study, however, Cusipag (2003) conducted one on self-editing patterns which proved very useful to the present study.

3. Methodology

3.1 Preliminary Study

A preliminary study was conducted by the researcher during the first term of school year 2001-2002 to investigate how students edit the drafts of their classmates' essays. Students were given instructions to edit the argumentative essays of their peers using four drafts – the last to be the final draft. After a series of class discussions and exercises on editing errors on form and content, they were given the choice to edit their peers' drafts – from the first to the third – either on form (F) or on content (C), or both (FC).

All English One teachers during the same term were interviewed by the researcher to clarify how they did their editing in the drafts of their students. It

was revealed that similar to students' practices, most of the teachers gave feedback on both form and content in draft one (D1) and draft two (D2); some required their students to edit D1 on form while they gave feedback on form and content in D2; a few others permitted their students to edit on form in D1 while they did corrections on content in D2; and the least gave feedback on content in D1 before they gave feedback on form in D2.

The researcher, having confirmed her concept on feedback patterns among students and teachers in the English department, attempted to investigate which of the feedback patterns would work best in the peer-edited essays of freshman students.

3.2 Study Proper

Prewriting Phase

Fifty students from the two English One classes of the researcher during the second term of school year 2001-2002 were used as subjects of the study. They were given prewriting activities such as (1) brainstorming with peers, (2) writing an outline, (3) performing exercises on how to cite references within a text, (4) and writing a bibliography using the APA style. After reading the prompt, questions on brainstorming were given such as the following: (1) Why was President Gloria M. Arroyo installed into office in January 11, 2001? (2) After almost two years in her administration, do you consider her an effective president? (3) What do other people say about her which you agree or disagree? For outlining, a general outline was discussed and written on the board out of which they were expected to prepare their own sentence outlines for their essay.

Having written their outlines, the four groups of respondents were asked to read the following prompt:

Mrs. Gloria Arroyo has been installed into office on January 20, 2001 as President of the Philippines when President Joseph E. Estrada was ousted from his post due to people power. After almost two-years in her administration, do you think she has been an effective president?

Support your answer in an essay of 500 words. Your paper will be sent to the Philippine Daily Inquirer for a possible publication.

The sample outline included an introduction which covered (a) some background information why President Gloria M. Arroyo was installed into office in January 11, 2001, and (b) thesis statement whether they considered President Gloria M. Arroyo an effective president or not. The body of the essay was composed of the sample arguments, opposing views, and a refutation for

each opposing view. The conclusion included a summary of the arguments and a restatement of the thesis of the essay.

Writing Task

The fifty respondents were asked to answer the prompt with their sentence outline as their guide. They were required to write the first draft of their essay, have it peer-edited before they write their second draft, until they write their fourth draft which is their final draft. After the final draft had been written, the researcher picked out fifty sets of compositions making a total of 200--40 for C-F-FC; 40 for F-FC-FC; 40 for FC-FC-FC; and 40 for the *no feedback pattern group*.

Revising Task

Pre-editing

Forty respondents were shown guidelines on editing errors on form and content (See Appendixes A, B, and C). In addition, they were given four model essays to examine closely the feedback patterns used. They were instructed to form four groups and choose one pattern as their model. These patterns include the following:

Draft 1 (D1) (D4)	Draft 2 (D2)	Draft 3 (D3)	Draft 4
1. Content (C)	→ Form (F)	→ Form and Content (FC)	→ Final Draft
2. Form (F)	→ Content (C)	→ Form and Content (FC)	→ Final Draft
3. Form and Content (FC)	→ Form (F) and Content (FC)	→ Form and Content (FC)	→ Final Draft
4. Form (F)	→ Form and Content (FC)	→ Form and Content (FC)	→ Final Draft

Another group of ten students who belonged to another class was shown the guidelines on editing errors on form and content. However, they were not shown any of the four model essays that were edited using the four

feedback patterns. This was deliberately done so that they would not be influenced by any pattern used by the four other groups. This fifth group was called the “no feed back pattern” group.

Peer Editing

The first groups of students peer edited their classmates' drafts according to the pattern that they chose. The students in the fifth group were instructed to correct the essays of their classmates without following any pattern after receiving the sample errors on form and content. Only the first three drafts were peer edited but not the fourth or the final draft.

Revising

In all five groups, peer writers revised their drafts only after they had been edited by the same five peer editors. In cases when their peers seemed not to have done satisfactory editing, they had to confer with their editors or their teacher to solve their problems.

Rating the Compositions

The two hundred compositions were typed before they were given to twelve outside raters. Typing was done in order to avoid bias from the raters on poor handwriting. Such raters used the band for content which had been prepared and validated by the DLSU-Manila English faculty (See Appendix D). Errors on form were rated by dividing the total number of errors committed by the total number of words in one entire draft of the essay.

The different raters were assigned to rate one draft each. They were all college English teachers and they were given proper instructions on how to rate the papers. The average of their scores was taken into consideration.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Peer-editing Patterns Used by Freshman Students

Based on the findings in the preliminary study conducted, it was evident that freshman students used any of the following patterns when editing their classmates' essays: (1) F-FC-FC (form in the first draft, form and content in the second draft, and form and content in the third draft), (2) FC-FC-FC (form and content in all the drafts), (3) F-C-FC (form in the first draft, content in the second draft, and form and content in the third draft), and (4) C-F-FC (content in the first draft, form in the second draft, and form and content in the third draft). Table 1 shows the results of the preliminary findings:

Table 1. A Preliminary Survey of Peer -Editing Patterns Preferred by DLSU Freshman Students

(N=80)

Patterns	No. of Students who Used the Pattern	Percentage
1. FC-FC-FC	29	36.25%
2. F-FC-FC	22	27.50%
3. F-C-FC	13	16.25%
4. C-F-FC	9	11.25%
5. No Feedback Pattern	7	8.75%
Total	80	100%

As shown in Table 1, FC-FC-FC was the most preferred peer-editing pattern. Students in this group did not only check their drafts on form but on content. Most students preferred editing first on form (see patterns 1, 2, and 3), while only a few started editing on content (see pattern 4).

This finding was also confirmed by Chandrasegaran (1986) in her study. She believed in Krashen's Monitor Model (1977) saying, "Since it is a system of consciously learnt rules, it is to be expected that when at work in the revision process, the monitor will more readily identify errors, then text-level defects..." (p. 31).

There were seven students who did not follow any pattern at all. Three of them peer-edited drafts on form, none in draft 2, and form in draft 3. Three edited on form in the first 2 drafts but not in draft 3. Another student edited content in draft 1, none in draft 2, and form in draft 3.

4.2 Ratings on Form and Content

Table 2 shows the students' rating (mean scores) on form. The ratings were taken by dividing the total number of errors by the total number of words in the draft. Ashwell (2000) says that this rating measures formal accuracy in relation to the amount of words written in the draft. In the fourth draft, no editing was done.

An analysis of the ratings shows that within D1, FC-FC-FC garnered the highest number of errors (.0209), followed by the No Feedback Pattern group (.0156). The third was F-C-FC (.0129), while the group with the least number of errors was F-FC-FC (.0126). Within D2 and D3, the No Feedback Pattern group had the least number of errors (.0038), while the patterns with the highest number of errors were committed by the C-F-FC group (.0131) in D3 and FC-FC-FC group (.0692) in D4. Across drafts, it is very evident that D1 had the

highest number of errors in all the treatment groups. The errors became lesser in D2 and much lesser in D3 in the first two groups but not in the last two groups. The reason for this is that in the process of improving D2, the peer writer gave additional sentences and paragraphs which incurred additional errors on form.

As expected, the errors committed in the first two patterns were minimized from the first draft to the third draft. This implies that the student showed progress in their compositions as they kept on revising their work. Another factor is that they did not have additional sentences nor paragraphs which incurred additional errors. This finding, where the later drafts suffered more errors, runs parallel to the findings of Sengupta (1998). The result of her interviews gave the following remarks:

- They felt that *additions* and *explicatures* had not led to adding relevant information or macro-level changes and thus, no major improvement was apparent.
- Errors seemed to have increased due to additions and *explicatures* which led to readers opting for the original as *better*.

Table 2. Students' Ratings (Mean Scores) on Form

Pattern	D1	R	D2	R	D3	R
1. C-F-FC			0.0131	1	0.0055	5
2. F-C-FC	0.0129	3			0.0111	3
3. F-FC-FC	0.0126	4	0.0090	3	0.0135	2
4. FC-FC-FC	0.0209	1	0.0115	2	0.0692	1
5. No feedback pattern	0.0156	2	0.0038	4	0.0094	4

Table 3 shows the students' ratings (mean scores) on content. These ratings were given by outside raters whose specialization was in English and currently teaching in the college level. To rate each draft, the band prepared and validated by the DLSU English faculty was used.

An examination of the data shows that within D1, FC-FC-FC obtained the highest rating (84.099), followed by C-F-FC (83.967) and F-C-FC (83.921) groups. The last two ratings went to the No Feedback Pattern group and the F-FC-FC pattern group. Within D2, FC-FC-FC (83.134) and C-F-FC (81.366) groups again got the first two highest ratings. Within D3, F-C-FC (85.66) ranked the highest. This was followed by C-F-FC (85.198), FC-FC-FC (84.934), and F-FC-FC (84.264). The No Feedback Pattern group obtained the lowest rating which was 83.948. Within D4, C-F-FC (88.099) got the highest rating while the No Feedback Pattern group got the lowest (85.166). Across drafts, D4 got the highest rating in all the treatment groups.

There were irregularities in D1 and D2 ratings for C-F-FC, F-C-FC, and FC-FC-FC pattern groups. The ratings decreased from D1 to D2. However, other patterns consistently increased from D1 to D4 which should really be the case such as F-FC-FC and the No Feedback Pattern group. The irregularities may have been due to factors like blurred photocopies of the drafts given to the raters or the students may have been very excited in improving their essays in D1 but not in D2. The next factor may be the kind of content editing that peer editors performed in the drafts. Probably the raters preferred the content of the compositions in D1 rather than in D2 because the added sentences had more errors. For the final draft, all the students did their best to impress their readers; thus, they got the highest in this draft.

Table 3. Students' Ratings (Mean Score) on Content

Pattern	D1	R	D2	R	D3	R	D4	R
1. C-F-FC	83.967	2	81.366	2	85.198	2	88.099	1
2. F-C-FC	83.921	3	82.001	5	85.866	1	87.433	2
3. F-FC-FC	81.666	5	82.168	3	84.246	4	85.601	4
4. FC-FC-FC	84.099	1	83.134	1	84.934	3	86.000	5
5. No feedback pattern	81.899	4	82.165	4	83.948	5	85.166	5

For Table 4, mean gains in ratings on form were analyzed. The difference in the mean scores of two drafts were computed. The dependent or correlated *t-test* was used to test if significant differences existed. For F-C-FC, there was a significant difference shown between D2 and D1 ($t > 2.262$). Between D3 and D2, as well as D3 and D1, no significant difference existed in all treatment groups. Across drafts, neither were significant gains obtained in all the treatment groups.

Table 4. Mean Gains in Ratings on Form

Pattern	D2-D1	<i>T</i>	D3-D2	<i>t</i>	D3-D1	<i>t</i>
1. C-F-FC	-0.0058	2.2344	-0.0776	-1.858*	-0.0018	-0.5430
2. F-C-FC	-0.0077	-2.4642	0.0059	2.0138	-0.0018	-0.5287
3. F-FC-FC	-0.0037	-0.7779	0.0046	0.5968	0.0009	0.1807
4. FC-FC-FC	-0.0095	-1.0880	0.0578	0.9527	0.0483	0.9229
5. No feedback pattern	-0.0117	-1.5371	0.0056	0.8070	-0.0062	-0.5764

Critical Value: ($t @ 5\%$ level of significance) = 2.262 two-tailed test, 9 df

Critical Value: ($t @ 1\%$ level of significance) = 3.250 two-tailed test, 9 df

Table 5 shows the mean gains on content. It is evident that all the five treatment groups exhibited no significant difference between D2 and D1.

However, this was exactly the opposite between D3 and D2 where all four treatment groups except for the No Feedback pattern were either significant or highly significant. Examining the overall gains in D4 and D3, F-C-FC, F-FC-FC, and the No Feedback pattern all had significant differences. Between D4 and D1, all treatment groups showed no significant differences.

Table 5. Means Gains in Ratings on Content

Pattern	D2-D1	<i>t</i>	D3-D2	<i>t</i>	D4-D3	<i>t</i>	D4-D1	<i>t</i>
1. C-F-FC	-2.601	-3.181	3.832	4.067**	2.901	3.538	4.132	4.191
2. F-C-FC	-1.920	-2.212	3.865	6.370**	1.567	3.184*	3.512	3.054
3. F-FC-FC	0.502	0.907	2.096	3.726**	1.337	2.900*	3.935	5.504
4. FC-FC-FC	-0.965	-1.190	1.800	3.048*	1.066	1.498	1.901	1.440
5. No feedback pattern	0.266	0.284	1.783	2.738	1.218	2.781*	3.267	3.895

Critical Value: (*t* @ 5% level of significance) = 2.262 two-tailed test, 9*df*

Critical Value: (*t* @ 1% level of significance) = 3.250 two-tailed test, 9*df*

Difference Among Treatment Groups

Using the *F*-test or the ordinary ANOVA 1 for independent groups, Table 6 and Table 7 show that there is no one best treatment or revision pattern among those used by the participants in the study.

Table 6. One-Way ANOVA Summary Table (Mean Gains on Form)

Source	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i> Ratio	Prob.
Between	0.021	4	0.0051665	.891	0.4770
Within	0.261	45	0.0057966		
Total	0.282	49			

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA Summary Table (Mean Gains on Content)

Source	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i> Ratio	Prob.
Between	30.865	4	7.716	.734	0.5733
Within	472.782	45	10.506		
Total	503.647	49			

We can say that FC-FC-FC may be the best among the patterns (Table 4 – mean gains in ratings on form) because it showed the greatest gain for rating on form. F-FC-FC may be another best treatment (Table 5 – mean gains in ratings on content) because it had the greatest gain for rating on content. On the whole, the study reveals that English One students can use any pattern when editing their essays. They may not even use any pattern at all for as long as they improve their drafts conscientiously before they submit their final drafts to their teachers.

The study confirms Ashwell's (2000) finding that giving content feedback first and later on form is not significantly better than giving form feedback first and then content.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The results show that there is no significant relationship among the feedback patterns used – whether peer editing is done first on content or on form, or both content and form. The mean gain scores among the treatments groups reveal that there is no one best pattern that results in a significantly improved composition.

While it is true that a student may use any of the patterns discussed or not at all using his/her own creativity, it would be best if composition teachers continue to give more exercises on peer editing in short phrases or paragraphs whether on form or on content. Doing so gives them a feeling of security in their work before consulting their teachers for assistance. Furthermore, teacher conferencing may be very helpful. This makes students gain more confidence in having their errors explained to them by their teacher rather than merely reading their teacher's comments on their paper.

REFERENCES

- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to students writing in a multiple draft composition class. Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
- Caulk, N. (1994). The effects of feedback on students' composition revision. *RELC Journal*, 15(2), 1-14.
- Cusipag, M. N. (2003). Self-editing patterns in the argumentative essays of DLSU English One students. *Tanglaw*, 9(1), 87-106.
- Devenney, R. (1989). How ESL teachers and peers evaluate and respond to student writing. *RELC Journal*, 20, 77-89.

- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178 – 190). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, G. (1989). Miscorrection in a peer feedback writing class. *RELC Journal*, 20(1), 69-75.
- Krashen, S. D. (1977). The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finnochiarro (Eds.), *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (pp. 152-161). New York: Regents Publishing Co.
- Lewis, M. (2002). *Giving feedback in language classes*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1996). Evaluating and discovering during peer response. *RELC Journal*, 27(2), 65-82.
- The Manoa Writing Program Faculty Board (2002). Peer review and feedback forms (file: 111A\7.htm)
- Mendonica & Johnson (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769.
- Nystrand, M., & Brandt, D. (1989). Response to writing as context for learning to write. In C.M. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research*. Urbana.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rinnert C., & Kobayashi, H. (2001). Difference in perceptions of EFL writing among readers in Japan. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85.
- Sengupta, S. (1998). From text revision to text improvement: A story of secondary school composition. *RELC Journal*, 29(1), 110-133.

APPENDIX A

Form Feedback

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Format <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Poor handwriting b. Wrong side of the paper c. Title d. Leave margin e. Do not start sentence on a different line f. Leave space between words g. Do not divide word h. Do not abbreviate | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Spelling 8. Articles (<i>a, an, and the</i>) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Use an article here b. Use a different article c. No article here 9. Preposition (<i>in, on, at, etc.</i>) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Use a preposition here b. Use a different preposition c. No preposition here |
|--|---|

2. Punctuation
 - a. Use punctuation
 - b. Use different punctuation
 - c. Do not use punctuation
3. Verbs
 - a. Wrong tense
 - b. Wrong verb form
 - c. Wrong voice (active/ passive)
 - d. Wrong or missing helping verb
 - e. Omit verb
 - f. Use a different verb
4. Nouns (and pronouns)
 - a. Should be singular
 - b. Should be plural
 - c. Uncountable (no *a, an, or -s*)
 - d. Possessive (*'s* or *of* + noun)
5. Paragraph
 - a. Indent paragraph
 - b. Indention not needed
6. Vocabulary Corrections
 - a. Word missing
 - b. Use a different word
 - c. Omit word
 - d. Use a different format of the same word
10. Coordinators (*and, but, or*)
 - a. Coordinator needed
 - b. Omit coordinator
11. Adjectives and adverbs
 - a. Use comparative form
(*-er, more + ...*)
 - b. Use superlative form
(*-er, more + ...*)
 - c. Use adj. form
 - d. Use adv. Form
 - e. Omit adj. or adv.
12. Sentence
 - a. Fragment (subject, verb or object missing)
 - b. Fused (make two sentences)
 - c. Begin a new sentence
 - d. Incorrect word order
13. Clauses
 - a. Subject missing
 - b. Verb missing
 - c. Omit relative pronoun (which, who, that)
 - d. Relative pronoun needed
 - e. Incorrectly placed clause
14. Capitalization

APPENDIX B
Content Feedback

A. Cohesion

1. Thesis Statement

- Where is the thesis statement that should link the introduction to the body of the paragraph?

2. Transitional Devices

- Please use transitional devices

B. Unity (single topic/ idea)

- How about combining your sentences to form a more unified paragraph?
- Your paragraph talks about more than one topic. Just have one.

C. Comprehension

1. Thought/ idea is well communicated.

- This paragraph is not very clear. Please explain further.

2. Easy to understand

- I do not understand this. / What do you mean by this?

3. Specific

- Please be more specific here. / Please be specific.

4. Structure

- I think you have to restructure your sentences so I would understand what you mean.

D. Details/ Examples

- Can you put in more details or examples to prove your point?

E. Clarification

- Are you referring to _____?

F. Relevance

- You talked about the U.S. setting. Why not use the Philippine setting?

G. Adequacy/ Supply of more words

- Please add more sentences/ paragraphs to your essay.

H. Praise/ Complement

- Good!

I. Admonition

- This is not a good sentence.

J. Repetition

- You said this already.

K. Wordiness

- Your paragraph is too long.

L. Accuracy

- How accurate are your data?
- What is your source for this?

M. Organization

- Don't you think this sentence should be included in your introduction/ conclusion?

APPENDIX C
Form and Content Feedback

Was Pres. Joseph E. Estrada an Effective President?

Can you give a more appropriate term for this?

President Joseph E. Estrada, after more than a year in his administration as President of the Philippines, is driven from his post as a result of people power. He Please explain this.

What does this mean?

was involve in a wheteng scandal where he received millions of pesos as reported in the daily newspapers.

How about citing specific sources?

Many other malpractices were revealed by people in His own staff except in his loyalists. Our country seems

Can you give examples?

To have a dim future; thus, I believe he is not a very efective president even if other people think otherwise.

Please explain this further.

APPENDIX D
Department of English and Applied Linguistics
DLSU-Manila
Academic Writing Scale for English One

<i>Description</i>	<i>Rating</i>
1. Addresses the prompt specifically. 2. Expresses the thesis statement (TS) and background clearly. 3. Provides appropriate and sufficient details. 4. Ends with a strong sense of closure, creates impact on the reader. 5. Provides totally accurate information. 6. Organizes/ arranges ideas logically. 7. Shows a high degree of coherence and cohesion. 8. Exhibits a highly original style. 9. Shows a high degree of grammatical accuracy/ language control. 10. Has a strong intellectual and / or emotional appeal to the reader.	4.0 = 97-100 (Excellent)
1. Address the prompt generally. 2. Expresses the TS but background information is sufficient. 3. Provides appropriate but insufficient details. 4. Ends with a sense of closure but does not create an impact on the reader. 5. Shows minor inaccuracies of information. 6. Organizes/ arranges ideas rather loosely. 7. Shows some degree of coherence and cohesion. 8. Shows evidence or originality and style. 9. Shows reasonably accurate use of lexis and grammatically patterns. 10. Appeals intellectually and/ or emotional to the reader.	3.5 = 93-96 (Very good) 3.0 = 93-96 (Good)
1. Addresses the prompt partially. 2. Addresses the TS vaguely and provides insufficiently background. 3. Provides inappropriate and insufficient details. 4. Gives a vague sense of closure and does not create an impact on the reader.	2.5 = 85-88

