**Implementation of EFL Peer Feedback in EFL Classroom**

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

In the educational context, most exams, whether testing a student’s foreign language abilities or other educational skills, often rely on the student's writing skills to measure their knowledge. Despite this, writing receives relatively limited attention in the educational system, which may impact its overall development. Writing effectively is crucial to acquiring and mastering English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Nguyen, 2016). Effective writing not only aids communication but also nurtures critical thinking and analytical skills. Historically, the examination and instruction of EFL writing have experienced notable changes, progressing from relative unfamiliarity to becoming central in modern language training (Howard & Smith, 2014). Initially, language learning focused on spoken fluency and understanding of written texts, with minimal emphasis on developing writing abilities. This method originated from an assumption that writing in a different language could be seen as complementary to verbal abilities (Huang, 2022; Lee et al., 2016). Nevertheless, with English’s developing importance in the world throughout the second half of this century, EFL writing found reality. In addition, globalization and subsequent societal changes have heightened the need for proficient written English (Howatt & Smith, 2014).

As a result, teachers and scholars started to reassess and broaden their methods of teaching EFL writing. Research into EFL writing instruction started to thrive, examining various methods, techniques, and evaluation measures. The focus on EFL writing has become even more pronounced in the modern age. The emergence of digital technologies, internet communication, and worldwide collaboration has emphasized the importance of proficient writing abilities. Studies in this domain have evolved to address a broad spectrum of concerns, encompassing writing evaluation and input on the influence of customs on writing methodologies (Howatt & Smith, 2014). Recently, an instructional approach that has gained significant acknowledgment and garnered attention in EFL writing situations is the utilization of peer feedback. Peer feedback strategy, also known as peer review, is the learning process whereby the student is allowed to review another student's written work and offer feedback (Liu & Carless, 2006). Thereafter, students are asked to revise their work based on received feedback.

In this research study, I embarked on a design intervention process. In this crucial step, I established a clear objective based on the issues identified during the problem exploration stage. Various potential interventions were considered, each aiming to achieve the set goal. Recognizing the need for expert guidance, I consulted the school's principal, who formerly served as a pedagogical supervisor for languages. Her extensive knowledge and expertise in this area, combined with evidence from relevant literature, were invaluable in selecting the most appropriate strategies to implement in the subsequent phases of the research.

The present study aims to understand whether peer feedback improves Belgian students’ writing skills. It aims to assess the efficiency of peer feedback as a teaching technique in EFL and determine the extent of student involvement in the peer feedback process. The following research questions are designed to guide our research investigation:

1. What are the impacts of implementing EFL peer feedback within educational settings?

Research sub-questions are:

1. How can EFL teachers integrate peer feedback effectively in EFL instruction?
2. What influence do the various proficiency levels among peer’s influence feedback efficacy?
3. To what extent does EFL peer feedback improve independent writing skills?

The research hypothesizes that organized implementation of peer feedback in a classroom focused on EFL writing will result in a statistically notable enhancement in students' writing abilities.

**Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework**

**Peer Feedback Strategy**

Peer response strategies have existed as a teaching method in English writing and composition classrooms for many years. Peer feedback transpires in oral or written form and occurs in either pairs or small groups (Connor & Asenavage, 1994). Cui et al. (2021) reiterate that peer reviews and feedback remain an active learning process that comes with benefits, including improvement of students' critical thinking and writing skills. Grounded on the principles of collaborative learning, peer feedback offers students the opportunity to improve their work before final submission (Cui et al., 2021). Research shows that peers can offer valuable contributions to other students' writing skills by offering feedback from a reader’s perspective, which helps stuck students’ progress with their writing work, thus offering room for seeking clarification, questioning ideas, and expressing emotional responses to written text (Peterson, 2010).

More so, peer feedback reiterates and aligns with Donald Groves’ five-step writing procedure including the pre-writing stage, drafting, revising, editing, and publication stage. These stages of writing, especially peer editing, are highly important to investigating EFL peer feedback implementation (Marzano, 2004). The pre-writing stage allows students to develop topics based on their experiences, stick to their interests, and build ideas on the presented challenges (Kamal & Faraj, 2015). Drafting facilitates creating rough drafts and perfecting content while revising allows re-reading and sharing thoughts. EFL students can significantly benefit from this stage through discussions, instructor guidance, and accepting and reflecting feedback while figuring out ways to implement it (Huang, 2022). The editing phase is characterized by restructuring and correction of any mechanical errors, at this stage, EFL students can learn and improve their writing for quality performance, which is then presented in the publication phase. With peer reviews and feedback, errors in students' writing are minimized, encouraging learning, and offering alternatives, especially when students are passive in responding to teacher feedback (Amira & Samiha, 2019). Teachers have a role to play in the peer review process by ensuring that students have the skills to give feedback and revise their drafts based on provided feedback, so they improve the quality of their writing.

Howatt and Smith (2014) write that teachers have quite several reasons for implementing peer feedback in an EFL setting. First, peer readers offer important feedback, which allows peer writers to revise their work based on the comments provided. Secondly, peer feedback is different from the teacher’s feedback in the sense that teacher feedback tends to be general, whereas peer feedback is more specific (Yu & Lee, 2016). Finally, becoming a critical reader of other peers’ work makes students critical readers and revisers of their pieces of writing.

Finally, peer review and feedback encourage students to play a central role in the writing process, thus allowing them to obtain much-needed information from others to improve their writing. By integrating peer feedback into an EFL classroom, learners not only benefit from direct peer feedback but also get the chance to participate in a community of practice, thus fostering responsibility for their learning.

**Social Constructivist Theory In Learning**

The theoretical foundation for the implementation of EFL peer feedback lies in social constructivism, which asserts that knowledge is actively built through significant exchanges within social and cultural settings. This viewpoint is based on the research developed by Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky theorized that students learn about the world around them from the More Knowledgeable Others (MKOs). The MOKs, according to him, are teachers, students, or authors. Strategies supported by social constructivist theory include collaboration and conferences with mentors (McRobbie & Tobin, 1997). Vanhaltren (2016) states that the Social Constructivism Theory's basis is self-efficacy, based on the Social Learning Theory designed by Albert Bandura. With self-efficacy, there is a foundation of motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishment. In agreement, Papastergiou (2006) argues that knowledge is formed individually but developed within cultural context through interactions, enhancing individual and communal awareness of the specific element under study. The author further informs that support within collaborative environments aids in efficient task accomplishment and eliminating potential or existing tasks affecting individuals or the group (PaPastergiou, 2006). Peer feedback aligns with the social constructivist education viewpoint; when students participate in peer feedback exercises, they actively engage in a communal exchange where they converse and evaluate one another's written work (Papastergiou, 2006).

Vygotsky further expands the Social Constructivist Perspective by introducing the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Lev Vygotsky argues that the Zone of Proximal Development symbolizes the mental area amidst what a student can achieve independently and what they can accomplish with suitable direction and assistance from external or surrounding factors (McLeod, 2023). McLeod (2023) affirms that ideal learning occurs in the ZPD, pushing learners to expand their abilities while offering support to connect the difference between current skills and future growth. McLeod (2023) argues that peer feedback aligns strongly with ZPD by offering a mechanism for students or learners to support one another in the learning process. Often, peers will offer insights, suggestions, and constructive criticism that fall within the learner's ZPD, thus helping them to bridge the gap between what they can do independently and what they can achieve with support from other knowledgeable peers.

**Collaborative Document Editing (CDE)**

The innovative aspect of this EFL peer feedback intervention revolves around Collaborative Document Editing (CDE). This method prioritizes promoting cooperation and establishing a shared educational setting where learners can utilize the opportunity of shared learning from one another's abilities, limitations, and distinct viewpoints (Kanno, 2020). In this approach, learners are grouped and responsible for collaboratively composing documents on subjects. This is consistent with Vygotsky's Social Constructivist Perspective, which maintains that optimal learning transpires when pupils are challenged above their present capacities with adequate instruction and support (Papastergiou, 2006). CDE is distinguished by essential traits, such as promoting group dynamics that foster collaboration and cooperation, which are vital abilities in the EFL setting (Kanno, 2020). It enables learners to seek explanations and help, maintaining a supportive learning environment inside their ZPD. Every team is accountable for generating papers on subjects, enabling them to explore extensively the content. The foundation of this approach is sharing the documents with different groups for peer assessment, encompassing an extensive procedure of reading or studying, assessing, and proposing enhancements to the documents. CDE effectively encourages analytical reasoning abilities, improves understanding of the content, and nurtures a collaborative learning environment (Sarita, 2017). During this process, students adhere to the iterative nature of writing being able to easily draft, obtain feedback, evaluate based on peers' suggestions for adjustments, and edit their work as encouraged by Graves' Theory (Kamal & Faraj, 2015). Contrary to traditional feedback, which frequently includes postponed written replies, this approach allows instant involvement (Chomsky, 2019). It enables peers to edit, remark, and discuss while reviewing the document, facilitating more transparent communication and fostering an engaging learning encounter.

**Conclusion**

This theoretical framework presented in this chapter establishes a foundation for understanding the integration of EFL peer feedback in the classroom setting. By combining the principles of social constructivist theory, peer feedback strategy, Donald Graves's five-step writing process, and Collaborative Document Editing, the study emphasizes how the integration of these elements contributes to language development among EFL learners.

**Chapter 3: Intervention**

The intervention phase of this study signifies a crucial point in exploring and incorporating peer feedback in EFL writing. Expanding on the theoretical underpinnings and past observations, this intervention aims to apply theory and examine the effects of organized peer feedback on students' writing skills through empirical research. This section gives details on the instruction facilitation process and peer grouping process which seek to help students leverage peer feedback and improve their writing skills in an EFL setting.

**Instruction Facilitation in EFL Peer Feedback**

Efficient instruction facilitation is central to the EFL peer feedback processes in the research intervention, involving both the delivery of explicit instructions and criteria and the active engagement of educators. Clear and comprehensible instructions and guidelines form the foundation of the peer feedback sessions, ensuring a systematic, focused, and positive evaluation process (Cui et al., 2021). These instructions establish the standards for valuable feedback, eliminating ambiguity regarding what qualifies as useful input. They also define the specific elements to be assessed in peers' writing, providing a structured framework for those offering feedback (Cui et al., 2021). This precision and clarity enable students to participate in peer evaluation with intention and accuracy, aligning with Vygotsky's principles of guided education (Papastergiou, 2006). Guides play a critical role in ensuring the effectiveness of peer feedback sessions. They actively promote and steer sessions to align with research goals and sociocultural learning principles.

Moreso, the concept of scaffolding as reiterated in ZPD, entails offering temporary support to learners, and in the context of peer feedback, this could mean that peers offer guidance, examples, or explanations to help each other understand and improve their work. Peers will scaffold the learning process by providing feedback that is tailored to the learner's current abilities, gradually increasing the level of challenge, and facilitating growth in understanding and skill. Huang (2022) argues that the scaffolding techniques are thoughtfully integrated into the EFL writing environment, offering students structured support and guidance during peer evaluation. The aim is to enhance students' understanding of effective feedback methods and foster their development as proficient peer evaluators. Teachers provide clear guidance in offering valuable feedback, emphasizing the significance of precise, practical suggestions that promote growth (Huang, 2022). They stimulate meaningful discussions by posing thought-provoking questions and prompts that encourage students to reflect deeply on their writing and the feedback they receive (McLeod, 2023).

**Peer Grouping**

Establishing peer groups during the intervention signifies an intentional and careful procedure directed by the overarching goal of maximizing the efficiency of peer input within the English as a Foreign Language writing learning environment. A pre-test and a language proficiency levels serve as the basis for grouping, as students with similar language abilities tend to share comparable writing skills (Kamal & Faraj, 2015). Grouping students based on language skills ensures that the feedback they give and receive aligns closely with their developmental needs (McLeod, 2023). This approach enables students to engage in meaningful discussions, draw connections from their writing, and receive constructive feedback that fosters progress and advancement. However, this approach has potential limitations that require addressing for effective group outcomes. For instance, the possibility of homogenized feedback, where learners with comparable linguistic abilities might offer similar insights. Students may also outgrow their groups as their language abilities progress, requiring regular reorganization. This adaptability accommodates changes in their Zone of Proximal Development, ensuring that the peer feedback process remains responsive to students' evolving learning paths, in line with Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (Bodrova & Leong, 1998). Moreover, the categorization procedure considers additional aspects, including students' previous writing encounters, cultural heritages, and methods of communication. By considering these diverse aspects, the establishment of peer groups seeks to establish a varied yet united learning setting where students can utilize their combined abilities, offer culturally aware input, and navigate the complexities of intercultural communication with sensitivity and flexibility.

**Assessment Impact on Writing Skills**

Incorporating pre- and post-assessment tests into this intervention is pivotal, offering a comprehensive view of peer input's impact on students' writing skills. These assessments align seamlessly with Graves' five-stage writing process, enabling a detailed examination of student abilities. They are crucial milestones highlighting the diverse facets of writing aptitude and covering a broad spectrum of skills and proficiencies. Pre-assessments, the initial gauge, capture students' writing skills before organized peer feedback is introduced (Kamal & Faraj, 2015). These assessments provide a comprehensive overview of students' writing abilities, evaluating their capacity to generate ideas, construct well-organized frameworks, conduct research to support arguments and adhere to writing conventions. Furthermore, initial evaluations assess students' ability to independently generate ideas, identify errors during the writing process, and assimilate constructive criticism into their work (Kamal & Faraj, 2015). They form the foundation for understanding students' writing aptitude and enable a thorough analysis of progress and improvement (Huang, 2022). Follow-up evaluations are instrumental in assessing the intervention's impact, particularly the role of peer feedback in enhancing writing skills.

**Chapter 4: Methodology and Planning**

**Participant Selection and Data Collection**

In this experimental research, two classes from a school in Belgium, enrolled in the 5th year TSO secondary education, will participate as the treatment group. The first class comprises 26 students, while the second includes 11 students. Additionally, another class from the same educational level, consisting of 16 students, will serve as the control group. The first consideration during the participant selection was language proficiency, or the student's English proficiency level. Language proficiency levels can be measured through standardized language proficiency tests and assessments depending on the duration a student has studied English, fluency in speech, reading, writing, and understanding (Cui et al., 2021). This approach results in a broader range of linguistic issues being addressed in the feedback process, benefiting all participants.

**Data Collection**

The data collection process for the intervention incorporates a range of methods including surveys, questionnaires, and moderator observations. These methods help gather insights on peer assessment experiences from both the educators and students, focusing on student engagement. Feedback quality, and session involvement. Notably, direct observations by teachers specifically assess the dynamics of peer interactions and the alignment of feedback quality with established guidelines. To ensure the effectiveness of these observations, a well-established protocol is used, which outlines clear criteria and standards. This protocol is designed to assess the quality of discussions and verify that the peer feedback is consistent with the proposed guidance. For enhanced sessions, a dedicated website will be developed to purposely provide comprehensive content on feedback principles, thesis statement construction, content analysis, compliance with writing standards, guided feedback reflection on how to give and receive feedback, collaborative document editing techniques, effective topic sentence formulation, and other vital writing skills. They will also learn to provide detailed, constructive, and research-aligned feedback, considering critical aspects such as content, organization, language proficiency, and adherence to writing conventions (Cui et al., 2021). This approach ensures systematic feedback focusing on essential writing aspects.

**Feedback training**

The research intervention initiates with a thorough pre-assessment section, where selected students individually craft essays on specified topics provided in the Appendix. This crucial step of the research study serves as a baseline for evaluating language proficiency at an individual level while also identifying areas for improvement, thus guiding subsequent peer groupings and feedback training sessions. Post-pre-assessment, the students will be arranged into three groups based on their initial performance, marking the onset of 15 minutes feedback training sessions conducted twice a week for three weeks. The small groups allow students to actively engage, articulate their ideas, and cooperate efficiently without individual shyness getting in the way. More so, each feedback session will lead to small tasks including thesis development, checking and understanding writing conventions, developing transitional body paragraphs, among others. Within the groups, CDE will be used to enable collaboration and togetherness in the learning process. To maintain the independence of peer feedback's impact, results won't be shared with pupils during the study, preventing teacher feedback influence on their writing. Teacher feedback's effect will be separately assessed in later evaluations, ensuring research integrity.

Guided feedback reflections are critical in helping instructors integrate feedback into EFL writing for improved results (Cui et al., 2021). Other types of guided reflection include feedback integration reflection, which includes previous responses; comparison reflection, in which students compare comments from peers; and language skill emphasis reflection, which emphasizes language proficiency. On completion of training, the intervention will progress to a post-test phase, where each student will be expected to write an essay and will then share it with their group members through CDE. Group members will have the opportunity to apply what they have learned in feedback sessions by reviewing each other's essays. They will offer suggestions on various aspects such as subject-verb agreement, word count, spelling, and noun usage. Additionally, they will provide positive or negative feedback on the essay's topic, structure, and any inconsistencies. Peer editing also enables students to inquire about specific details, arguments, and language use in the essays. The individual post-test is designed to assess and evaluate each student's grasp of EFL writing skills, thus identifying individual learning needs and progress. Post-test also allows students to reflect on how the peer feedback and collaborative writing process influenced their learning journey individually. By incorporating these individual reflections and assessments, the intervention seeks to ensure a well-rounded evaluation of each student's capabilities in the context of peer feedback through CDE intervention.

**Ethical considerations**

Ethical considerations are paramount in implementing the EFL Peer feedback, especially in selecting participants. Ethical considerations entail issues such as consent and privacy, fair participant treatment, and equity. In the research exercise, participants will be treated fairly and equally regardless of their age, gender, sex, language or ethnicity. Informing them earlier about the study goals and their expected contribution and roles during the exercise will ensure that there is informed consent. Additionally, confidentiality and privacy will be upheld to the core, especially with sensitive data collected during interviews. Other ethical considerations include avoidance of any form of prejudice and seeking and obtaining a formal approval from the relevant ethical authority before starting the research.

**Reliability and Validity**

The methodology adopted various approaches with the sole goal of enhancing research validity and reliability. First, the sample selection varied but carefully selected with consideration on aspects such as language proficiency. This ensured that the research findings remain relevant to and credible. Secondly, the methods used in data collection such as surveys, observations, and interviews allowed for data triangulation. Thirdly, the participant's selection criteria encouraged key measures such as educational ability and scores, thus enhancing research consistency. Fourthly, the research was experimental and the control measures adopted were strategically introduced to minimize confounding variables, thus promoting the reliability and validity of the research. Fourthly, instruments in the pre-testing and post-testing sections were conducted to refine research instruments and ensure that they effectively measure the research milestones, thus contributing to research trustworthiness. Finally, the standardized writing assessments used in pre- and post-assessment adhere to recognized test preparation and approval rules.
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**Appendix A**

**Questionnaire Self-Reported Language Proficiency**

**Language Proficiency**

1) On a scale of 1 to 5, with one being "Not at all proficient" and 5 being "Very proficient," please rate your proficiency in the following aspects of English:

* Speaking:
* Reading:
* Writing:
* Listening comprehension:

2) What are the results of your assessments in English?

* Speaking:
* Reading:
* Writing:
* Listening comprehension:

**Writing Experience**

1) Do you have any prior experience in writing activities or coursework related to English language or literature? (e.g., essays, creative writing, research papers)

* Yes
* No

If yes, please provide some details about your prior writing experience:

2) Have you completed any individual writing projects outside of regular coursework? (e.g., personal blogs, short stories, poetry)

* + Yes
	+ No

If yes, please describe these projects:

3) Have you participated in other English language learning experiences involving writing? (e.g., language clubs, writing workshops, online courses)

* + Yes
	+ No

If yes, please provide details about these experiences:

**Feedback Preferences**

1) How do you feel about receiving peer feedback on your writing?

* Excited and open to feedback
* Open to feedback but a little nervous
* Indifferent
* Prefer not to receive feedback
* Other (please specify)

2) Do you have any specific expectations or preferences for the feedback you receive on your writing? (e.g., grammar corrections, content suggestions, overall impressions)

3) Are you comfortable providing feedback to your peers on their writing?

* Very comfortable
* Somewhat comfortable
* Neutral
* Somewhat uncomfortable
* Very uncomfortable

**Cultural background**

1) What is your cultural or ethnic background? (You can provide as much detail as you're comfortable with.)

2) Do you think your peers should know any language-specific cultural nuances or communication styles from your background during feedback?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!

**Appendix B**

**Principles for Providing Constructive Criticism**

1. Be precise and clear.
2. Focus on the task rather than personal critique.
3. Use positive language.
4. Offer balanced feedback highlighting strengths and weaknesses.
5. Suggest solutions.
6. Encourage self-reflection by asking questions that prompt learners to think critically.
7. Respect cultural sensitivities.

**Appendix C**

**Self-Reflection Questionnaire**

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, how comfortable are you with providing peer feedback in English writing assignments, with 1 being very uncomfortable and 5 being very comfortable?
2. How frequently do you participate in peer feedback sessions for written assignments? (Rarely, Occasionally, Often, Always)
3. Are you of the opinion that peer feedback has had a beneficial effect on your writing abilities? (Yes, No, Unsure)
4. How content is you with the caliber of input you receive from your peers? (Extremely Unhappy, Moderately Unhappy, Indifferent, Moderately Happy, Extremely Happy)
5. Have you received any training or guidance on how to offer constructive peer feedback? (Yes, No)
6. Please rate the following aspects of peer feedback sessions on a scale of 1 to 7, with one being "Not Effective" and 7 being “Highly Effective":
	* Clarity of feedback provided
	* Feedback's applicability to your writing
	* Constructiveness of feedback
	* Room for discussion during feedback sessions
	* Effect of feedback on your writing improvement

**Appendix D**

**Observation Checklist**

1. **Session Information** a. Date and time of the peer feedback session. b. Assignment or writing task being discussed.
2. **Student Engagement** a. Active participation. b. Students’ willingness to ask questions or seek clarification.
3. **Feedback Quality** a. Specificity of feedback provided by peers. b. Feedback's applicability to the writing assignment.
4. **Resource Utilization** a. Use of digital tools or platforms for feedback when applicable.

**Appendix E**

**Weekly Plan**

A thorough plan organized by week will be provided, including important research tasks, significant events, and due dates. The plan will include:

* **Week 1:** Preliminary stage, including participant enlistment, obtaining required authorizations, and gathering pre-assessment data.
* **Week 2-3:** Implementation of the intervention stage, comprising organized peer feedback sessions, initial instructor guidance, and data gathering.
* **Week 4:** Ongoing peer feedback sessions, further instructor guidance, and continued data gathering.
* **Week 5:** Post-assessment data collection, finalizing peer feedback sessions, and initial data analysis.

**Appendix F**

**Pre- and Post-Test Assignment**

**Pre-Writing Assignment: Standardized Writing Evaluation (Initial Assessment)**

*Instructions:* Please choose one of the following topics and write an essay based on your chosen topic. Focus on clarity, organization, grammar, and vocabulary. Write your answer within a word count range of 250 to 300 words in the space provided. You do not need external sources for this assignment; simply express your thoughts and ideas.

**Topic 1**: The Impact of Technology on Society

Explore the impact of technology on society today. Discuss technology's positive and negative effects on our daily lives and provide examples to support your arguments.

**Topic 2**: The Benefits of Reading

Write an essay on the benefits of reading. Discuss how reading books, magazines, or articles can enhance a person's knowledge, empathy, and overall well-being.

**Topic 3**: The Role of Education in Personal Growth

Discuss the role of education in personal growth and development. Explain how education can empower individuals to achieve their goals and positively impact their communities.

**Topic 4:** The Benefits of a Healthy Lifestyle

Write an essay on the benefits of leading a healthy lifestyle. Discuss the importance of regular exercise, a balanced diet, and stress management in maintaining overall health and well-being.

**Post-Writing Assignment: Standardized Writing Evaluation (Post-Assessment)**

*Instructions:* Please choose one of the following topics, like the pre-assessment, and write an essay based on your chosen topic. Focus on clarity, organization, grammar, and vocabulary. Write your answer in the space provided.

**Topic 1**: The Impact of Technology on Society

Explore the impact of technology on society today. Discuss technology's positive and negative effects on our daily lives and provide examples to support your arguments.

**Topic 2**: The Benefits of Reading

Write an essay on the benefits of reading. Discuss how reading books, magazines, or articles can enhance a person's knowledge, empathy, and overall well-being.

**Topic 3**: The Role of Education in Personal Growth

Discuss the role of education in personal growth and development. Explain how education can empower individuals to achieve their goals and positively impact their communities.

**Topic 4:** The Benefits of a Healthy Lifestyle

Write an essay on the benefits of leading a healthy lifestyle. Discuss the importance of regular exercise, a balanced diet, and stress management in maintaining overall health and well-being.

**Appendix G**

**Rubric for Writing Assignment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **4 Points** |
| Content | The essay minimally addresses the topic and lacks depth or clarity. | Essay partially addresses the topic with little depth or clarity. | The essay addresses the topic with both advantages and disadvantages. | Essay thoroughly and effectively addresses the topic with depth. |
| Organization | Essay has a poorly structured introduction, body, and conclusion with unclear transitions. | Essay has an unclear or underdeveloped introduction, body, and conclusion with ineffective transitions. | Essay has a clear structure with some transitions between paragraphs. | Essay has a clear and effective structure with smooth transitions. |
| Language Use | Sentences lack clarity, and variety, and contain significant errors. Vocabulary is inappropriate. | Sentences may lack clarity or variety and contain some errors. Vocabulary may be repetitive. | Sentences are mostly clear and varied with minor errors. Vocabulary is mostly appropriate. | Sentences are clear, varied, and free of errors. Vocabulary is appropriate. |
| Mechanics | The essay contains numerous spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors and significantly falls short of the length requirement. | The essay contains some significant spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors and may not meet the length requirement. | The essay may contain some minor spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors but meets the length requirement. | An essay is free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors and meets the length requirement. |

**Appendix H**

**Feedback Sessions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Give Suggestion  | * Address mistakes
* Check and suggest subject-verb agreement
* Word choice and spelling
* Feedback on singular and plural noun use
 |
| Give Positive Feedback  | * Feedback on the topic
* Feedback on the essay structure
* Feedback on specific essay parts
 |
| Ask Questions  | * As questions on specific essay details
* Ask questions relating to essay arguments
* Questions on language use
* Questions on specific parts of the essay
 |