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Abstract

This paper reports an action research study that aimed to improve the English writing skills of Mexican students. In this research, an action plan that lasted for seven weeks was implemented, in which Likert-scale questionnaires, documentary evidence, think aloud protocols, and semi-structured interviews were used as data collection instruments. The participants were ten EFL Mexican students whose English proficiency levels ranged from beginner to low-intermediate. The students were asked to write essays and engage in peer feedback activities using evaluation checklists. Results showed improvement in revision quality especially between drafts, as well as the learners’ positive perceptions of the collaborative nature of writing. Moreover, despite an apparent increase in low level errors, the findings also seem to indicate that there was a decrease in high level errors in the post test, in comparison to the pretest, which indicates an improvement of students’ writing quality. However, due to the multilevel characteristic of the group, less-skilled students’ faced difficulties to carry out some procedures.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Writing is essential for humanity; its vital role both nowadays and in the past cannot be denied. We only have to go back in time and remember that history began with the invention of writing. That is to say, for a civilization to have a history, it must have left written records. Hence, “those people who lived before the invention of writing are, by this definition, prehistoric” (Gill, 2014, p. 1). In an attempt to define the role of writing for EFL (English as a foreign language) learners, numerous definitions were discovered. For this reason, it was decided to begin with a broad definition of what writing means for EFL and native learners. In White’s and Arndt’s, (1991) opinion:

> Writing is far from being a simple matter of transcribing language into writing symbols: it is a thinking process in its own right. It demands intellectual effort, which usually has to be sustained over a considerable period of time. Furthermore, precisely because cognitive skills are involved, proficiency in language does not, of itself, make writing easier.

(p. 3)

According to the aforementioned definition, writing cannot be considered an easy skill as it is a process that requires writers not only to be proficient in the language they are to use, but also to have developed their cognitive skills. Another reason why EFL learners find it difficult to achieve a high English writing proficiency is strongly related to living in foreign language contexts, in which students do not have ready-made contexts for communication beyond their classrooms (Brown, 2001). Consequently, efforts must be made to create opportunities to communicate. This suggests that, at the very least, EFL learners need to be motivated and autonomous, to a certain extent, if they desire to be proficient users of English, since developing language skills in a foreign language is a matter of exposure that is difficult to find without pursuing it.

It seems to be that the importance of EFL writing could be easily relegated to a lower place. Regarding this, Tribble (1996) comments that
…most people can get through their lives, very effectively with an ability to write no more than a shopping list, or the odd message, a few of us ever need to write essays, manuals, novels or newspaper articles

(p. 1)

What is more, it gives the impression that many EFL learners prioritize speaking over the other three language skills. Hence, becoming successful writers is not the ultimate goal for most EFL learners since many of them can survive without mastering this skill (Tribble 1996).

Nonetheless, writing cannot be considered unnecessary as it is one of the four language skills which are: speaking, writing, reading and listening (the former two are productive, while the latter two are receptive). Consequently, ignoring one of the two productive skills affects peoples’ language production negatively, and limits students’ communicative competence (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014). Therefore, knowing how to write properly undoubtedly enables people to be more integrative and as a result more communicatively competent. The opposite evidently has a different impact upon them. In fact, in his work, Vygotsky (1994) states that literacy is a form of communication; thus, students need to learn to develop their writing in order to communicate with others (Schram, 2002). Furthermore, writing is an essential skill for those who pursue intellectual purposes and job opportunities (Tribble, 1996).

In traditional EFL classrooms, writing does not seem to be considered a communicative activity, but rather an evaluation of students’ ability to write flawlessly. One possible way of changing this could be by including peer feedback. Owing to its collaborative nature, it gives students the opportunity to experience writing as a social activity and it encourages them not only to improve their writing skills, but all their communicative skills in English (Hirose, 2003). Over and above this, the pedagogical benefits of peer feedback have been well reported (Hirose, 2003; Schram, 2002; Taguwon, 2011). Nonetheless, there is still a need for research in the Mexican context where few studies on peer feedback have been
performed. Thus, it is expected that this paper will provide a better understanding of this phenomenon in this context.

1.1 Rationale
Writing in today’s schools and universities has a central role as a measure for academic success (Hahin, 2012). Students work hard to gain more control over their English writing skills. In addition to this, teachers devote a great deal of time and effort teaching students how to make more informed decisions when writing. However, as Hanin (2012) states that:

…a consensus seems to prevail among language instructors that students view writing not only as a particularly challenging discipline but as the singly most difficult aspect of English language acquisition

(p. 60)

It is important to mention that a few decades ago, teachers were mainly concerned with the final product of writing, as well as what language products should ‘look’ like. In order to cover the writing requirements, all the compositions had to contain certain principles of English rhetorical style, a proper level of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling and structure (Brown, 2001). Therefore, it seems that teachers expected their students to be proficient writers at the first attempt.

Throughout the years, the writing process has contributed to change the teachers’ and students’ mistaken notions that being able to write well is a talent that one either has or does not have. Consequently, nowadays, it is widely accepted that “good writing usually develops from extensive reading, some specific training and a good deal of practice” (Davies & Pearse, 2000, p. 83). This view of writing has helped teachers and learners to no longer consider writing as a product, but rather as a process.

1.2 Research Context
The context in which this study was carried out is a private English school located in Xalapa, Veracruz. The curriculum consists of five semesters or more depending on the students’ performance. The courses are classified into four levels, basic,
intermediate, pre-advanced and advanced, and a TOEFL PBT preparation level. However, students can present the EXAVER exam, which is a local certification validated by Cambridge University, when it is considered they have reached an appropriate English level. Each class meets twice a week for three hours in total over five or six months. Students are expected to learn to speak fluently and accurately in a variety of settings. Furthermore, emphasis is also placed on writing as students are expected to learn to write in English beyond the translation exercises that typically take place in some schools.

1.3 Participants
The participants in this study were ten Mexican students enrolled on an English course. They were three males and seven females with majors in music and dance. The ages of the participants were between 23 and 30 years old. Their course had two main objectives, one short term and the other long term. The former aimed at preparing students to pass an English examination (EXAVER I), the latter sought to prepare students to be communicatively competent. At the time of the study, not only were the students interested in obtaining a certification, as this was a requirement for their academic or professional fields, but also they wanted to develop their speaking and writing skills since they had plans to travel or study abroad. Hence, despite the fact that the students were heterogeneous in terms of academic majors, they were homogeneous in terms of motivation to take the course. It is important to highlight that even if the students belonged to the same group, they had different English proficiency levels as some of them had already taken other English courses, while for some others this course was the first they were taking. Thus, their English proficiency levels ranged from beginners to low-intermediate.

1.4 Description of the Problem
After reflecting on my own teaching practice, I realized that students shared Hanin’s (2012) opinion that writing is the most difficult skill to master. As their ability to write in English was usually limited, the learners seemed to feel frustrated
at not being able to express themselves understandably in English despite their efforts.

1.5 Purpose
Having identified the problem, I decided to conduct a research project in my particular setting, where I had observed that students could neither detect nor correct many of their errors in writing. They seemed to have a clear idea of what they wanted to write, yet they were unable to express it understandably in English due to their mistakes in writing. With this in mind, the objective of this study was to examine my own teaching practice and context in order to understand the nature of the problem, and thus, design and implement a plan of action that would enable students to become aware of their errors in writing, so they could self-edit and self-revise their own drafts.

1.6 Research Questions
Based on the objectives of this research, two research questions were designed:

➔ What is the nature of students' writing problem?
➔ How can I help students improve their writing ability?

1.7 Map of research report
This paper is organized in five chapters. Chapter one, the introduction, presents the rational of topic investigation, research context, participants, aims and research questions. Chapter two includes a review of the literature that supports this study. In order to do so, it presents topics such as: the writing process and peer feedback. In chapter three the methodology implemented in this study is explained, as well as the design and implementation of an action plan, which aimed at providing a solution to the students' limited ability to write. In chapter four, the results after the implementation of the plan of action and the data collection
techniques that were employed to gather information are examined. Finally, chapter five discusses the outcomes of this study, its implications and limitations, suggesting ideas for a possible further investigation.
Chapter Two: Writing as a social activity

The social nature of writing has been emphasized in several empirical research findings as well as in Vygotsky’s (1978 as cited in Hahin, 2012) theory on learning and language. Based on this theory, Hahin (2012) affirms that “writing is a learning activity in which the writer learns best through interacting with his peer reviewers” (p. 61). To reach a better understanding of writing as a social activity, this chapter discusses sub-topics such as: The writing process, revising, editing, feedback, traditional feedback, peer feedback, advantages and drawbacks.

2.1 The Writing Process
The writing process can be divided into four different stages: planning, drafting, revising and editing. It is a non-linear process that allows writers to move from one stage to the other and forward and backward as needed. Regarding this, the “Ontario Ministry of Education” (2014) suggests that “effective writers can cycle through these stages (planning, drafting, revising and editing) until they are satisfied that the writing achieves its purpose” (p. 3). In Al-Hazmi and Scholfield’s (2007) opinion, reviewing and rewriting a written composition contributes more to writing improvement than does almost any form of instruction in writing. Additionally, Hilgers (1984 as cited in Schram, 2002) highlights that “effective writing requires not only the ability to write, but also the ability to make appropriate evaluations of writing, which is essential in making revisions” (p. 7). Notwithstanding, even though revising and editing are crucial stages of the writing process and have proven to be beneficial to improving writers’ writing proficiency, they are often neglected as they are considered to be unimportant (De Almeida, 2007). That is one of the reasons why in this paper, special attention will be paid to these two stages of the writing process.
2.1.1 Revising and Editing

Revising is a process in which writers correct some of their mistakes or add a new idea to their drafts. Sommers (1982 as cited in Taguwon, 2011) sees revising as “a process of making changes throughout the writing of drafting, changes which make drafts congruent with writers’ intentions” (p. 3). To put it another way, the goal of this stage is to modify content, organization, and style. According to (Taguwon, 2011), editing requires two basic kinds of changes:

1. Fixing errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, spelling and formatting.
2. Improving the way to express ideas to find a more effective way to say what you want to say.

(p. 3)

Consequently, it is vital not to take the importance of the revision and editing stages for granted, since they contribute in polishing the texts and making them comprehensible to the readers. Wakabayashi (2008) describes the role that these two stages play as part of the writing process as follows:

The advantage of the process approach is that drawing attention to the constant need to draft and revise fosters the sense of ownership of one’s writing and encourages students to make improvements by themselves. In other words, learners who adopt the process approach become self-critical and objective writers who are able to reflect on their writing. However, effective self-revision is still quite difficult in the early stages of learning, and reader feedback is crucial to assist learner development.

(p. 94)

This is precisely the reason why feedback is viewed as a useful tool to improve the quality of writers’ compositions, especially when it refers to novice writers whose knowledge of the target language is limited. Consequently, their ability to revise and edit their own texts tends to be limited as well. With this in mind, it can be claimed that, ‘students’ failure in error correction is mainly due to their failure in detecting errors” (Lee, 1997, as cited in Wing 2012, p. 101).
2.2 Feedback

Feedback means making positive comments on someone else’s writing in order to help them identify the blind points in their work (Schram, 2002). De Almeida (2007, p. 3) suggests that “students tend to view their first draft as a finished product”. According to the “Ontario Ministry of Education” (2014), the main purpose of peer feedback is to encourage learners to look at their own and others’ writing with a more critical eye, as well as to allow students to:

- have an audience for their writing, other than the teacher;
- develop skills in editing and proofreading;
- receive peer input about possible errors and areas of concern, in a ‘low-risk’ process;
- have positive, small-group discussions.

(p. 132)

2.2.1 Traditional Feedback

Traditional feedback is a product oriented process in which teachers usually ask students to work quietly and individually (Johnson & Johnson, 1990, as cited in Schram 2002). Teachers are the only evaluators of the students’ compositions. Nonetheless, as it is not common to ask learners for more than one draft. The evaluation frequently consists in grading students’ first composition as the final product. However, in some other cases, students’ drafts are not even graded or returned (Halimah, 1991, in Al-Hazmi & Scholfield 2007; Way, Joiner, & Seaman, 2000, in Taguwon 2011).

This type of feedback tends to be a solitary task that encourages memorization and copying strategies (Kulsirisawad, 2012). In traditional settings, teachers as well as students usually see the teachers as knowledge givers, this leads the student to become “a passive recipient of the knowledge” (Holden & Usuki, 1999 in Kulsirisawad 2012, p. 2). Consequently, traditional feedback is known as direct feedback. In this respect Williams (2003 as cited in Kulsirisawad, 2012) affirms that:

When direct feedback is given, students for the most part only copy the corrections into their subsequent drafts. The vast majority
of students do not record nor study the corrections pointed out in the feedback. Such a feedback technique does not teach students how to recognize or correct errors on their own. (p. 3)

As a result, direct feedback may cause “the absence of critical thinking” on the part of the students (Muncie, 2000 in Kulsirisawad 2012, p. 2). Additionally, many students do not seem to understand their teachers’ corrections. This explains the reason why similar errors frequently reappear in learners’ subsequent writing assignments (Truscott, 1996, in Kulsirisawad 2012). Traditional feedback may also cause that students, who are corrected by their teachers, feel afraid of making mistakes and as a result, limit the complexity of their writing (Sheppard, 1992, in Kulsirisawad 2012).

According to the aforementioned, there is no doubt that traditional feedback flourishes in teacher-centered settings in which

…teachers may focus on improving students’ learning outcomes, but lack of caring about how they produce their products during their writing process, then students become less interested in writing

(Taguwon 2011, p. 1)

Nonetheless, it is important to mention that even if teachers have been usually criticized for promoting this type of feedback, large class sizes, time constraints, low English proficiency on the part of the students, as well as lack of financial support and training, have contributed to make teachers to adopt traditional feedback in class (Yang, Badger & Yu, 2006, in Shzh-Shen Lee 2010).

2.2.2 Peer Feedback

During peer feedback, learners work collaboratively to exchange ideas and comment on one another’s compositions. This is based on the belief that editing and revising somebody else’s writing assignments fosters students’ critical thinking and eventually will allow them become critical of their own drafts (De Almeida, 2007). Another belief is that students become better writers by writing, but little or
no improvement can be shown if they do not receive feedback. In the words of Topping et al., (2000 in Taguwon 2011), “it is an arrangement for peers to consider the level, value, worth, quality or successfulness of the products or outcomes of learning of others in similar status” (p. 4).

2.2.3 Advantages

In terms of clarity, a student may understand a peer's comments easier than a teacher's comments since peers share problems and knowledge. Moreover, they use the same language without using professional jargon (Lee, 1997; Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006; Tsui & Ng, 2000, in Wing 2012). Apparently, many students consider written teachers' comments as being “unspecific, incomprehensible, contradictory, inconsistent, inaccurate, vague, over general, abstract, formulaic, and idiosyncratic” (Zamael, 1985, in Rollinson, 2005, p. 25). What is more, Guénette (as cited in Lee, 2010) affirms that students constantly need to be helped to understand the teachers' comments.

In terms of critical thinking, peer feedback raises students' linguistic awareness of their writing errors, and motivates them to pay much more attention to correct their errors when writing. It also boosts students' critical thinking and reasoning (Mazdayasna & Tahririan, 2001, Taguwon 2011; Muncie, 2000 and Saito & Fujita, 2004, in Kulsirisawad 2012). Furthermore, it “encourages them to become critical readers of others' written compositions” (Teo, 2006 in Kulsirisawad 2012, p. 4).

In a study carried out by Tsui and Ng (2000) they found that,

…many students expressed the belief that teachers, as experts, should be able to figure out what the student was intending which is something their peers, as non-experts, may not be able to do (Lee, 1997, in Wing 2012, p. 101)

Hence, learners assume that teachers mark all the mistakes in their writing assignments. On the other hand, when receiving peer feedback, learners are not sure of how many errors their peers have detected, consequently, “they review their own work more carefully” (Miao Badger & Zhen, 2006 in Wing, 2012, p. 102).
This appears to be the reason why students perform more self-corrections on their papers when working with peer feedback than when receiving teacher's feedback (Lee, 1997, in Wing 2012).

Another advantage of peer feedback is that it promotes audience awareness among learners as they read and respond to their peers' writing assignments (Kulsirisawad, 2012; Wing, 2012). This is because writers do not see the teacher as the only reader and evaluator of their texts. Conversely, they see their classmates as authentic readers of their compositions. Therefore, through this process they gain an understanding of what is unclear to the audience and “with the expectation of group members to be the readers, the writers usually try their best to compose comprehensible essays for target readers” (Lin, 2010, p. 21).

A research performed by Hirose (2003) with Japanese university students suggests that peer feedback promotes collaborative work and helps students improve their writing and communication skills. Regarding this, Lin (2006) claims that, during peer feedback, students can learn from each other and work together to achieve a common goal. What is more, students perceive their peers as “genuine collaborators and interested readers” of their work and not as evaluators (Muncie, 2000, in Kulsirisawad 2012, p. 4).

Peer feedback is also related to a greater level of student autonomy (Kamimura, 2006, in Kulsirisawad 2012); it “helps student writers become less dependent on the teacher” by placing a strong emphasis on pair and group work (Van Der Pol, Van Den Berg, Admiraal, & Simons, 2008 in Kulsirisawad 2012, p. 4). In fact, Kulsirisawad (2012) points out that

…by helping students develop a sense of self-reliance, the students will learn to become more engaged and start to trust their own ability. In turn, they will feel empowered and gradually become more independent learners who take responsibility for their own learning

(p. 6)
Thus, it can be claimed that through peer feedback students become involved in their own learning process and this is precisely what gives them control over their writing skills (Little, Ridley, & Ushioda, 2003 in Kulsirisawad 2012).

Moreover, due to the multiple drafts and revisions, peer feedback encourages a greater sense of ownership of students' own compositions (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). It is also helpful in terms of immediacy because learners obtain a more or less immediate response from their classmates, which hardly ever occurs when feedback comes from the teacher (Rollinson, 2005; Wakabashi, 2008). Furthermore, it “improves the process and product of students’ English writing”. Lee 2010, p. 129). Lastly, the findings of a study carried out by Taguwon, (2011, p. 15) revealed that “peer feedback increased students’ positive attitudes and motivation in English writing class” and decreased students’ frustration.

### 2.2.4 Drawbacks

As previously stated, peer feedback is valuable, yet it may not always be successful due to different reasons, for instance, students' low English proficiency, as well as insufficient time and/or lack of task training in peer feedback (Lee, 2010). Another reason may be learners' reluctance to accept their peers' comments as they may consider them to have insufficient skills to review others' work. In addition to this, it has been documented that some students prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback (Lin, 2010 in Wakabashi 2008; Wing, 2012) possibly for the same reason.

Moreover, owing to some psychological factors such as a students' lack of self-confidence, they may feel uncomfortable to comment on their classmates' work. Furthermore, the need to maintain harmony can lead to situations where the reviewer minimizes the criticism of their partner's work, thus “creating a situation where the peer-review process is of little value” (Carson & Nelson, 1996, in Wing, 2012, p. 96). High levels of absenteeism also affect peer feedback as no pair work can be done without collaborators (Lin, 2010, p. 4). Lastly, Hyland (2003, in Al-
Hazmi & Scholfield, 2007, p. 241) argues that even if peer feedback is beneficial to writing in real life, “it is not usable in exams”.

All in all, it can be claimed that peer feedback is a collaborative activity that promotes the implementation of the four steps of the writing process. In addition, it plays a strong emphasis on revising and editing so as to increase students’ awareness of their strengths and limitations. Furthermore, even though it has some drawbacks, these are outnumbered by the advantages, which range from the improvement of learners’ writing quality, to the development of their critical thinking.
Chapter Three: Methodology

In action research, researchers try to interpret information and get inside individuals and institutions to understand situations and people (Koshy, 2005). Methodology plays a central role in the gathering and interpretation of the data collected. Notwithstanding, without a proper methodology the process of gathering and analyzing this information can lead to bias and subjectivity. In the words of (Koshy, 2005), methodology involves a set of procedures or rules that aim at interpreting or solving a problem. The goal of this chapter is to provide a detailed explanation of the action plan used for this investigation, which includes the following data collection techniques: questionnaires, documentary evidence, think aloud protocols and semi-structured interviews. Other aspects in this chapter are: verification of data, and data analysis.

3.1 What is Action Research?
In order to carry out this study, action research (AR) was selected as it fits well with the nature and purpose of this research. In the words of Ferrance (2000, p. 6) AR searches for “solutions to everyday, real problems experienced in schools”. It perceives teachers as researchers, or explorers who are committed to investigating and taking action in their personal teaching contexts (Borg, 1965; McFarland & Stansell, 1993 in Ferrance 2000; Burns, 2010).

To solve the problems detected in schools, teachers need to be critical of their own context and self-reflective of their teaching practice (Burns, 2010). However, as Ferrance (2000) argues, teachers’ primary goal is not the acquisition of theoretical knowledge of Education, but rather the changing of their teaching instruction to impact students. To put it another way, an AR “can inform teachers about their practice and empower them to take leadership roles in their local teaching contexts” (Mills, 2003 in Donato 2003, p. 1). AR helps teacher-researchers, to gain understanding of their teaching practice, contexts and
students. However, the data needs to be systematically collected so as to allow teachers to make informed decisions. Hence, “the changes made in the teaching situation arise from solid information rather than from our hunches or assumptions about the way teachers think things are” (Burns, 2010, p. 2).

### 3.1.1 The Phases of Action Research

Kemmis and McTaggart (1988, in Donato 2003) argue that the essential phases of AR include: (1) developing a plan for improvement, (2) implementing the plan, (3) observing and documenting the effects of the plan, and (4) reflecting on the effects of the plan for further planning and informed action. In this respect, Kemmis and McTaggart’s classical model offers a practical way to summarize the fundamental components of the AR, as it can be seen in the model below.

![Cyclical AR model](image)

**Figure 1: Cyclical AR model based on Kemmis and McTaggart (1988)**

Kemmis and McTaggart (1988 in Burns, 2010, p. 9) claim that each cycle “may become a continuing, or iterative, spiral of cycles which recur until the action researcher has achieved a satisfactory outcome and feels it is time to stop”. That is to say, the phases of the AR are not necessarily linear since a researcher can move from one phase to the other as needed.
3.1.2 Advantages of Action Research
The advantages of performing AR are many; teachers, students, parents and school authorities can be benefited. According to Ferrance (2000) the most meaningful advantages of AR are: (1) it focuses on issues of collective interest, (2) teachers do not just follow the latest educational approaches, but they discover things by themselves, (3) it promotes teachers' professional development, (4) it encourages collegial interactions, (5) it has potential to impact school change, and (6) it makes teachers reflect on their own practice.

There are different types of AR depending on the participants involved. Ferrance, (2000) affirms that it

…can involve a single teacher investigating an issue in his or her classroom, a group of teachers working on a common problem, or a team of teachers and others focusing on a school- or district-wide issue

(p. 9)

For the purpose of this investigation, individual teacher research focused on a single issue.

3.2 Action Plan
In order to verify the existence of the problem, and understand its nature, an initial research phase was carried out. The methods of data collection employed consisted of Likert-scale questionnaires (APPENDIX A), non-participant observations (APPENDIX B), and documentary evidence (APPENDIX C). The Likert-scale questionnaires consisted of thirteen close ended-items designed with the purpose of identifying students’ attitudes towards writing in English as well as the perception they had of their own writing skills. To avoid bias and promote objectivity, systematic non-participant observation was carried out by an English teacher from the same school where this investigation was performed. Finally, students' writing assignments were collected and used as the documentary evidence for this cycle of the investigation. The Likert scale technique and the
documentary evidence will be further explained in section 3.3 of this paper, as they were also some of the techniques used during the action plan implementation.

The outcomes of this research demonstrated that students were unable to communicate successfully in English due to their excessive mistakes in writing. Moreover, despite their efforts to revise their drafts, students did not seem to be able to identify their errors and as a consequence self-correction was almost non-existent. These findings also displayed that students’ fear of making mistakes seemed to be caused by their lack of confidence in their own writing abilities, as they did not consider themselves as competent writers. Thus, a possible solution seemed to indicate the need to acquaint students with writing and revision strategies that would help them to become competitive writers.

Based on the outcomes of this initial research, I decided to conduct a research project in my particular setting, where it was observed that students lacked strategies to detect or correct many of their errors in writing. Owing to the excessive number of mistakes, they could not express themselves successfully when writing in English. Since research has suggested that cooperative environments promote learning and facilitate language acquisition (Schram, 2002), peer feedback was chosen to assist students improve their communicative skills by helping them self-edit and self-revise their written compositions. As Bartholomae (1980 in Rollinson, 2005) claims,

…it is easier to teach students (as readers) an editing procedure than it is to teach students (as writers) to write correctly at the point of transcription. This may in the end be a more achievable pedagogical objective than getting them do it right the first time (p. 29)

In the words of Kulsirisawad (2012,) the basic structures of peer feedback are as follows:
The students write an essay on an assigned topic. Then they choose a partner by their preferences and exchange their work with that person. This process is reciprocal, meaning the students take turns playing the role of a teacher commenting on each other’s written work.

(p. 4)

Research has also suggested that peer feedback contributes to L2 writing revisions, as well as the process and product of students’ English writing (Lee, 2010). Other advantages are: the development of critical thinking, learners’ autonomy and social interaction among students (Shunlin, 2013). In addition to this, the use of peer feedback is supported by some well-known pedagogical theories and approaches, such as the process approach of teaching writing, the Vygotskian socio cultural theory, the five principles of cooperative learning (CL), and the student-centred approach (Liu & Hansen, 2002 as cited in Hirose, 2003).

Therefore, this action research aims to assist students become aware of their errors in writing so they can self-edit and self-revise their own drafts. In order to do so, the details of existing ways of working on students’ writing assignments were changed because even if the current content book provided students with opportunities to practice their writing skills, it did not contain writing strategies to assist students develop their writing proficiency. For this reason, a plan of action was designed and implemented. The implementation took place for a period of seven weeks and was divided as follows: stage 1 (1 week), stage 2, (1 week), stage 3 (1 week), stage 4 (4 weeks), stage 5 (1 week) as displayed in the chart below.
Stage 1
• Administering Likert scales. Adapted from Taguwon (2011)

Stage 2
• Administering pretests.

Stage 3
• 1) Coaching students on the principles and objectives of peer feedback. Adapted from Rollinson (2005).
• 2) Coaching students on how to use the evaluation checklist. Adapted from Al-Hazmi & Scholfield (2007)
• 3) Peer feedback Simulation. Adapted from De Almeida (2007)

Stage 4
• 1) Writing first drafts.
• 2) Providing oral and written peer feedback.
• 3) Delivering second drafts.

Stage 5
• Administering the post test.

Figure 3: Action plan; stages and activities

Stage 1
In this stage Likert scales were administered to the students with the purpose of understanding their attitudes and concerns towards writing, revision, and feedback (APPENDIX D). The data collected from the Likert scales was used to design the actions for the stage 3.

Stage 2
In stage 2, students were asked to write a composition at home with whatever drafting and revision they considered necessary. They had access to dictionaries, electronic devices, or someone else’s advice. This draft served as an indicator of the students’ writing quality (pretest) and was later compared and contrasted with students’ last composition (post test) in order to identify any improvements in their
writing proficiency. Students' pretest (APPENDIX E), post test and essays were fully transcribed for the purpose of facilitating the analysis and coding.

**Stage 3**
The data collected in stage 1 was used to design the actions for this stage, which consisted in persuading students of the value of peer feedback, as well as acquainting them with its concepts and principles. Rollinson (2005) points out the importance of training students on peer response to improve their revision skills. Along this line of thought, Zhu (2001) suggest that training is essential to teach students how to conduct a successful peer feedback session.

This stage was divided into two parts. The first part included the presentation of the elements of an evaluation checklist (a set of yes / no questions to be answered while students read and analyzed each other’s papers) (APPENDIX F) and how to apply it to written compositions. According to de Almeida (2007)

> Under the initial guidance of the checklists, students become familiar with the aspects of discourse which are central to the communicative power of their texts, and little by little gain more confidence in order to become more autonomous revisers of their own texts

(p. 6)

The second part of this stage was adapted from Rollinson’s (2005) and consisted of coaching students on peer feedback and creating effective peer response groups. According to this author, the objectives of training students concerns three areas:

- awareness–raising (the principles and objectives of peer response);
- productive group interaction (collaboration, supportiveness, tact, etiquette);
- productive response and revision (basic procedures, effective commenting, reader-writer dialogue, and effective revision).
Subsequent training involved providing students with non-threatening revision activities adapted from De Almeida (2007). In this part, the teacher showed participants authentic drafts written by EFL learners, which were taken from a study by Schram (2002) (APPENDIX G). The drafts were written on the board and analyzed collaboratively using the evaluation checklist. The teacher modeled adequate and collaborative comments during the group discussions and clarified some students’ concerns about the texts, such as: structure, layout, salutations, mechanics and punctuation. Students’ comments were either text-based or surface-level.

Later, they were trained in pair work, which was unfamiliar to them. The participants were divided into pairs, due to the limited number of students, and asked to read two drafts, comment on them and mark the inconsistencies they found. Next, they discussed the drafts’ strengths and weaknesses taking as a reference, the checklist. This was followed by a group activity that allowed them to compare and contrast their observations with those from others. Finally, a class discussion of the most effective types of comments was held.

Stage 4
After the training period, the participants took 30 minutes to write a first draft individually in class. Throughout the writing session the teacher could not be consulted. Next class, the students were set in pairs and asked to exchange their drafts (APPENDIX H), previously photocopied by the teacher. They spent another 30 minutes providing and receiving peer feedback in class. The students read in silence their classmates’ compositions and marked the elements that interfered with the communication. Some students sought clarification from their classmates by asking them the meaning of certain confusing ideas. Immediately after, the checklist was completed. Even though, they were asked to use the checklist while reading each other’s papers, the majority of the students preferred to use it after analyzing their classmates’ drafts. The learners gave the papers back to their
peers and, to make sure the comments and recommendations were understandable; they explained orally how the papers could be improved. The students were instructed to speak in English. Nevertheless, Spanish was allowed in cases of difficulty. During the revision (the written and oral feedback) the teacher could not be consulted. Once each student had received feedback on their papers, they were asked to rewrite their first draft at home and deliver a second one a week later. However, in order to monitor the changes the teacher kept a photocopy of each of the students’ first and second drafts. This procedure took place on a weekly basis during four weeks. It is important to mention that the students’ content book determined the topics the students wrote about, as it is indicated below.

**Composition Topics:**

- Pretest. descriptive or narrative: ‘my daily routine’
- Task 1. descriptive or narrative: ‘my hometown’
- Task 2. expository: ‘reasons for choosing my major’
- Task 3. expository: ‘my favorite TV program’
- Task 4. expository, ‘a rewarding working experience’
- Post test*. expository: ‘my childhood/teenage hood’ or ‘my family’

* Although the post test offered two options, most students chose the first one.

At week seven, after six weeks of experimentation, the participants were post-tested. As the pretest, the post test (APPENDIX I) was completed at home with no time constraints. Checklist, dictionaries, electronic devices, and/or someone else’s feedback were all permitted.

**3.3 Data Collection Instruments**

As in the verification of the problem, the instruments used for collecting data were Likert-scale questionnaires (APPENDIX A) and documentary evidence (APPENDIX C). However, in order to give a voice to the students and gain insight
in the strategies, and the knowledge that the students employed to correct their own written compositions, semi-structured interviews and think aloud protocols were also included as methods of data collection.

3.3.1 Likert-Scale Questionnaires
Likert scales use close ended-items which have a limited choice of answers. In the words of Boone and Boone (2012) a Likert scale, “is composed of a series of four or more Likert-type items that are combined into a single composite score/variable during the data analysis process” (p. 2). The outcomes of the combined items are used to provide a quantitative measure of a personality trait. Since the participants of this investigation did not have an advanced language level, the Likert scales used in this research were designed and answered in Spanish. While in the initial research phase Likert-scale questionnaires were intended to identifying students' attitudes towards writing in English, as well as the perception they had of their own writing skills, in the pre-training stage, they were used with the purpose of understanding students' attitudes and beliefs towards writings, revision and feedback (APPENDIX D). The data collected served to establish the parameters to train participants in stage 3.

3.3.2 Documentary Evidence
Documents can provide essential evidence and are very useful for constructing the whole picture. They reveal the “constraints and pressures which impact on peoples' daily work” (Newman, 2000, p. 2). In the words of Koshy (2005)

These sources can often provide a useful background and context for the project and also can be very illuminating, especially when you are comparing what is claimed and what has happened in practice

(p. 96)

One of the advantages of documentary evidence is that it can support other forms of evidence collected. Furthermore, “students' written work and portfolios can help
the researcher to note progress over time” (Koshy, 2005, p. 96). Considering all the above, students’ multi-draft writing assignments were collected weekly and used as the documentary evidence for this cycle of the investigation. These writing assignments comprised the students’ first and second drafts of each essay (APPENDIX H) as well as the pretest (APPENDIX E) and post tests (APPENDIX I). That is to say, students’ first and last compositions, which were compared and contrasted based on the British Council writing correction code (2007) (APPENDIX K). This aimed at monitoring any improvements in the students’ ability to self-revise and self-edit their own texts.

3.3.3 Think Aloud Protocols

Think aloud protocols are frequently used in cognitive psychology and education to observe peoples’ cognitive processes while solving a problem (Branch, 2000; Olmsted-Hawala, 2010). The basic principle of this method is to encourage the participants to verbalize their thoughts while working on a task or a set of tasks. The participants’ utterances during the execution of the tasks are usually tape-recorded to be analyzed lately (Van den Haak, 2003).

These protocols provide information about the participants’ reasoning that could not be obtained by simply looking at the students’ corrected pretests. It gives data about strategies and the knowledge that the participants used to correct their own written compositions. They were chosen as a data collection method since it is a method that serves “to gain insight in the knowledge and methods of human problem-solving” (Van Someren, 1994, p. 1). In the words of Branch (2000), there is a dramatic increase in the amount of information that can be collected when the participants perform a task while thinking aloud compared to the same subject working under silent conditions.

Think aloud protocols were implemented at the end of the intervention stage to collect data about the process that the students went through to revise and edit their own drafts. The participants were required to analyze their pretests individually while thinking aloud. What they said was recorded and used as data to
analysis of the outcomes (APPENDIX L). This process followed these steps: 1) analyzing their drafts, 2) identifying their writing mistakes and 3) correcting their writing mistakes.

3.3.4 Semi-Structured Interviews

According to Harrell (2009) “Interviews are discussions, usually one-on-one between an interviewer and an individual, meant to gather information on a specific set of topics” (p. 6). This information is typically about the interviewees’ attitudes, opinions, perspectives and meaning and serves to gain insights into their situation (McKenzie 2007). In Harrell’s (2009) words there is a wide variety of reasons for choosing interviews as a data collecting method, as it allows the researcher to discover how strongly a person holds an opinion in order to prioritize different issues of interest. Furthermore, they can be used to gather information on past or present behaviors or experiences. What is more, interviewees “appreciate the opportunity to express their opinions and experiences in person, rather than in another pen-and-paper survey” (p. 10).

Interviews can be classified as: unstructured, semi-structured and structured, based on how much control the interviewer has over the interaction (Harrell, 2009). For the purpose of this investigation semi-structured interviews were used (APPENDIX J) “as Interviews of this type are suited to working with small samples and are useful for studying specific situations” (Laforest, 2009).

Semi-structured interviews are used to gather qualitative information (Laforest, 2009). They are the most common type of interviews in educational research, and follow a set of pre-designed questions with considerable flexibility that allows other related topics to be included in the interview (McKenzie, 2007). Harrell (2009) describes their process and objectives:

In semi-structured interviewing, a guide is used, with questions and topics that must be covered. The interviewer has some discretion about the order in which questions are asked, but the questions are standardized, and probes may be provided to ensure that the researcher covers the correct material. This kind
of interview collects detailed information in a style that is somewhat conversational. Semi-structured interviews are often used when the researcher wants to delve deeply into a topic and to understand thoroughly the answers provided.

(p. 27)

Semi-structured interviews were used to keep a record of the participants’ reactions, opinions and impressions towards the action plan. It is important to mention that all the students were interviewed and taped-recorded in Spanish due to their limited language level. The interviews lasted about fifteen minutes and were carried out by the teacher-researcher. Fully transcribed versions of the interviewed were used to analyze the data collected. Tape-recording also made it possible for the researcher to give full attention to the context of the interview.

3.4 Verification of findings

To verify the findings, data triangulation (Mills, 2003) was used. Regarding this, Golafshani (2003) argues that in qualitative research reliability and validity are replaced by trustworthiness. He also points out that triangulating data is not only defensible, but highly recommended. In the words of Koshy (2005)

…the process of triangulation involves sharing and checking data with those involved. This should lead to the researchers being able to construct a more reliable picture

(p. 160)

Another valuable strategy to prove credibility was member checking, which according to Shenton (2004) involves conversing with participants so that the teacher can verify whether or not the observations and judgments were consistent with students’ actual perceptions.

The data collected in this study was triangulated by means of comparing and contrasting the data analysis of the Likert-scale questionnaires, documentary evidence; think aloud protocols and semi-structured interviews. In addition to triangulating the previously mentioned instruments, the interpretations of the semi-
structured observations were validated by member checking, in order to establish the findings a trustworthy.

The data collected from the documentary evidence was quantitative as the mistakes and corrections that students’ made on their papers were quantified in percentages. The semi-structured interviews and think aloud protocols provided qualitative data. However, all the data obtained was analyzed as a whole and classified into categories. In the words of Looi (2014) “Complementary approach between both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies can provide better results” (p. 100). The qualitative research methodology portrays the participants’ behaviors, values, beliefs and assumptions that cannot be reduced to numbers. On the other hand, as the quantitative research methodology does not depend upon the researcher’s interpretation, thus, the results are objectively verifiable (Looi, 2014).

Finally, it is important to remember that this investigation was not concerned with evaluating teachers’ and students’ performance or learning as a final product. Instead, it was focused on making adjustments and improvements in the teachers’ teaching practice, as well as understanding and improving students’ process of learning. Hence, even though there are two types of evaluation, formative and summative, for the reasons described above, the former was used to assess the overall plan of action.

The “Northern Illinois University, Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center” (n.d.) defines formative evaluation as follows:

Formative assessment provides feedback and information during the instructional process, while learning is taking place, and while learning is occurring... A primary focus of formative assessment is to identify areas that may need improvement. These assessments typically are not graded and act as a gauge to students’ learning progress and to determine teaching effectiveness (implementing appropriate methods and activities)

(p. 1-2)
In short, formative evaluation monitors students’ progress and collects data to identify and meet their needs (Linn & Gronlund, 2000; Salvia et al., 2007; William, 2006 in Burns, 2008). In Chappuis and Chappuis’ view (2008) this type of evaluation offers the following advantages for learners and teachers:

The timeliness of results enables teachers to adjust instruction quickly, while learning is in progress. The students who are assessed are the ones who benefit from the adjustments. The students can use the results to adjust and improve their own learning.

(p. 8)

Chapter Four: Findings

In this chapter, the data obtained is presented into two sections. The first section includes the quantitative data and discusses the essay content analysis and the pretest and post test content analysis. The second section explores the qualitative data: students’ self-correction awareness, revision concerns, revision before and after the Intervention, and emotional aspects. Afterwards, it discusses students’ perspective of writing, revision strategies and grammar difficulties. Lastly, this chapter deals with students’ levels of satisfaction and evaluation checklist appreciations. It is important to mention that, the written scripts of the participants, as well as their quotes, are presented as they expressed them originally.

Section One: Quantitative Data

4.1 Essay Content Analysis
Students’ mistakes and correction on their written compositions were counted and classified into thirteen categories that were adapted and modified from the British Council writing correction code (2007). The errors were categorized as follows:
sentence structure (SS), logical development (LD), unclear message (UM), word choice (WC), verb tense (VT), word form (WF), spelling (S), punctuation (P), extra word (E), missing word (M), connector (C), subject/verb agreement (SV), and singular plural issues (SP). The first three categories are high level aspects while the other ten are considered low level aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mistakes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the areas in which the highest percentages of mistakes were found in the four essays were: P, E, S, and WC, which are all low level aspects. The areas with the lowest percentages of mistakes were the three categories that represent high level aspects: SS, LD and UM. It can also be observed that in essay 1 the participants made more mistakes in the second draft than in the first one in categories such as: S, E, C, SS, LD and UM. However, increasing corrections in the following drafts may be interpreted as more active participation from students in the revising procedures as the intervention progressed.
4.2 Pretest and Post Test Content Analysis

The mistakes and errors made by the participants’ in the pre and post test were categorized into the thirteen categories previously mentioned. The findings of these written compositions were compared and contrasted as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mistakes %</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>Word average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre test</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Students’ pretest and post test

The analysis of the pretest and post test demonstrated an increase in the students’ amounts of errors in the post test in comparison to the pretest in low level aspects such as: WC, VT, WF, S, P, E, M, and SP. Errors in C and SV, which are low level aspects and SS, LD and UM, which are all high level aspects decreased in the post test, which in turn resulted in more understandable compositions for the reader. The results also showed an increase of about 100% in the total amount of words in the post test, which could be understood as the learners’ attempt to take risks in writing.

Section Two: Qualitative Data

4.3 Self-Correction Awareness

In the think aloud protocols, the students managed to identify and correct mistakes on their pretest in all of the 13 categories. These findings seem to indicate that they had improved their ability to self-revise and self-edit their own papers in low and high level aspects. However, they also demonstrated that the participants were unable to identify basic errors such as spelling or extra words, which could
be considered a consequence of their low language proficiency level. Nonetheless, it evidences that, despite their limitations, the participants had become more critical of their own drafts. The following data shows some of the students’ corrections during the think aloud protocols.

Student C identified the need to add connectors to make the sentences cohesive.

Pretest: “I play cello in the afternoon. I go running every morning and exercise until my body hurts. I love watching TV everyday.”

Think aloud protocol: “Añadiría conectores para que funcionaran como las coyonturas del texto. Por ejemplo, aquí. I play cello in the afternoon, punto, y luego un conector. After that, coma, I go running every morning and exercise until my body hurts, punto. Besides, coma, I love watching TV everyday.”

Student A focused on correcting spelling.

Pretest: “Becaose she is tender and nice. She speeks funy and she is friendly.”

Think aloud protocol: “Becaose?, no, becaose creo que está mal. speek? Eso tambien está mal, debería ser speaks. Because she is tender and nice. She speaks funy.”

Student G adjusted the sentence structure to make it coherent.

Pretest: “…and their moments are for my very happines.”

Think aloud protocol: “… and their moments are for my very happines, happy. Creo que cambiaría eso completamente. Mm creo que debería escribir their moments are very happy. No. I am very happy. ¡sí! eso suena mejor.”

Student J carried out a permutation at the word choice level.
Pretest: “I believe that Miguel in his previously live was a magician”

Think aloud protocol: “I believe that Miguel in his previously live... life, ¿no?. I believe that Miguel in his previously life was a magician.”

This suggests a significant enhancement in the participants' ability to self-revise and self-correct their own drafts. In addition to this, it illustrates the participants' improvement in terms of efficiency to detect their own errors despite time constraints.

4.4 Revision Concerns

The data reported that the students' revisions focused on both, low and high level aspects of writing when revising: Grammar (40%), organization (25 %), coherence (24%), spelling (10%), punctuation (5 %), vocabulary (5 %), and Content (1%).

An example of the students' revision concerns is illustrated by student D as follows:

Pues me enfoco más en las preposiciones, los tiempos de los verbos y la puntuación porque me parece que eso es lo que me hace entender el texto. Si no está claro eso lo suficiente, aunque sea sólo una coma o un puntito, ya se me dificulta entender todo lo demás.

Regarding the aspects that students revised the most, it can be highlighted that there was a big gap between grammar (50%) and content (1%). It is also worth noticing that grammatical aspects represented almost half of students' revision concerns. These results are aligned with Daoud and Al-Hazmi (2002) which demonstrate that low proficiency writers prioritize low level aspects even when using checklists that bring attention to high level aspects. However, as it can be seen in the analysis of the students' multi drafts, it could also imply that the students made more errors in low level aspects than in the high level ones, and as a consequence they focused on those aspects more.
4.5 Revision Before and After the Intervention

Three of the participants mentioned that after the intervention they revised their drafts less than before because they felt more confident of their writing skills. One student expressed that she does not revise her finished drafts because now she pays more attention when writing. Two other students mentioned that they revise more in depth, but they spend less time revising. Three participants claimed to revise more and have noticed that their drafts have fewer mistakes, and only one answered that she revises much more than before because she always has something to improve.

For instance student D states that:

Lo reviso más, sin embargo, tengo un poquito más de soltura ya, recurro a revisarlo comparándolo con los anteriores donde mis compañeros me hicieron correcciones, retomo eso, ah, ahora sí y ya como a la tercera vez ya no se me olvida.

In a similar way, student J added that:

Empezaba a escribir eh iba parando, a lo mejor en cada oración, pero sentía que no avanzaba porque me empezaban a surgir como muchas dudas y decías ¿es así, o no es así? entonces me trabajaba mucho y me trabajaba mucho y lo que hice ya las últimas veces fue escribir todo, así como de corrido, lo que me iba saliendo, después lo que estuviera mal lo cambiaba. Como que de alguna manera empecé a confiar más pues en mí.

It appears to be that peer feedback procedures impacted positively the students’ confidence to write, and as a consequence their inhibitions and fears related to this activity decreased. According to Zheng (2012), what students learn from the face-to-face interaction can leave a deeper impression on them, “contributing to their consolidation of language knowledge” (p. 122). What is more, by reading and criticizing other students’ drafts, they can broaden their minds and avoid making similar mistakes in their writing and develop their critical thinking which results in better revisions.
4.6 Emotional Aspects
During the interviews, two students claimed to have felt nervous due to the limited amount of time to write in class and the pressure to write well. For instance student E answered that:

Muy contento, de repente como, este, nervioso porque como que quería hacer lo mejor posible y expresar muchas cosas, pero luego no me salía y a veces, este, como que, no sé, me sentía que me hacía falta conocimiento ¿no? pero al final, o sea, fui avanzado, ya me fui sintiendo cada vez más cómodo al momento de escribir.

In a similar way, others commented that they felt uncomfortable during the first weeks as they were not used to offering or taking criticism. One student commented that the lack of confidence in his writing and revision skills made him feel overwhelmed at the beginning of the intervention. On the other hand, other students expressed to have felt happy to be able to communicate with others and help them improve their writing. Regarding this, student A reported that:

…me dio gusto poder, o sea, tener las herramientas para acomodar mejor los textos, eso no, nunca lo había hecho, así ayudarle a alguien a arreglar su escrito no lo había hecho tampoco, entonces me dio gusto saber que sí puedo ayudar a otros.

In general, all of the students claimed to have been comfortable once they managed to establish communication with their peers, and to have felt relief since they could count on their classmates to revise their drafts before giving them to the teacher.

4.7 Students’ Perspective of Writing
After the intervention, all of the participants expressed positively about writing in English. Some reasons they gave for enjoying this activity were: its interactive nature, its beneficial outcomes, and its completeness. A representative example of this was expressed by student A: “hasta el momento me ha gustado mucho
porque veo que he progresado y ya me puedo comunicar con mis compañeros en otro idioma.”

Student G also commented that:

“…creo es una muy buena forma de aprender y luego si queda alguna duda, casi siempre regreso a los escritos porque creo que tienen más ideas generales que las oraciones sin contexto.”

After comparing students’ perceptions of writing before and after the intervention, an increase in students’ positive view of writing is evident. This may be linked to the opportunities they had to experience writing as a cooperative activity during the peer feedback activities, in contrast to its solitary nature that they had experienced in previous writing tasks.

4.8 Revision Strategies
All of the students claimed to prefer peer feedback over the traditional feedback. Some of the reasons the participants gave were as follows: it is easier for them to identify their mistakes when someone helps them; writing for someone else makes writing interactive, interesting, and an attractive activity; when the mistakes are pointed out they can be recalled and avoided in future assignments; they make an extra effort to write clearer and more carefully when someone else revises their drafts; they realize that they have improved their ability to revise; and they learn different writing styles from their classmates. These outcomes are linked to the students’ emergent positive view of writing as they suggest that the participants valued the collaborative nature of peer feedback. Another possible explanation is that the students were aware of the improvement in their writing proficiency and attribute it to the peer feedback procedures. By way of illustration student J expressed,

…pues me gusta más así de revisarlo con el compañero y que, o sea, escribir uno para que lo revise y que un compañero escriba otro para que yo lo revise porque estamos, bueno, creo que me exige estar más al pendiente de escribirlo bien para que mi
compañero entienda, porque el maestro siempre lo va a entender y te va a hacer las correcciones pero este, de esa manera creo que hay que ser muy claros para que él lo entienda.

Student E responded that:

...fui viendo mi nivel para con los demás. De repente pensé que estaba muy, muy atrás y gracias a ellos [mis compañeros] también avancé, me aclararon las dudas y...en principio sí sentía el abismo pero ya no. Creo que justamente al escribir me di cuenta de eso.

Student F also mentioned that:

Aprendí nuevas palabras, o palabras que ya sabía pero se me habían olvidado, como no las uso tanto, entonces...tiendo a utilizar ciertas frases muy más repetitivas. Entonces cuando lo comparto con otra persona, esa persona me dice que las repito mucho y me ayuda a buscar otras palabras o sinónimos, y eso me gusta porque me ayuda a enriquecer mi vocabulario y mi habilidad para escribir por consecuencia.

4.9 Grammar Difficulties

The difficulties that students encounter when revising their classmates’ compositions coincide with the difficulties they face when revising their own writing assignments. The aspects that they mentioned as the most problematic were: verbs conjugations, syntax, spelling, connectors, verb tenses, prepositions, organization and development of ideas. Almost all of the students expressed that these difficulties came from their lack of grammatical knowledge. As it can be noticed, once more they placed grammar as the heart of revision and paid little attention to aspects such as punctuation, vocabulary and content. This correlation between beginner students and their readiness to focus on grammatical aspects has been confirmed in many studies (Wing, 2010; Al-Hazmi & Scholfield, 2007; Hsien-Chuan, 2010) which argue that students focus on grammatical issues because they are not ready yet to focus on more complex aspects of the language. A representative example of this was commented by student C:
Me enfoco más en la gramática, pero revisar las conjugaciones de los verbos, era pesado para mí, porque tampoco yo las tengo como muy bien aprendidas, entonces me costaba trabajo al revisarlas, este, saber si estaban en especial bien escritas.

4.10 Levels of Satisfaction
All of the students mentioned they were satisfied with the revision their peers gave them because they learned from their recommendations. Regarding this, student C expressed that:

Sí, claro que estoy satisfecho con las correcciones que recibí, pues como voy avanzando de manera progresiva, cada puntuación que ellos me hacían pues se me quedó, entonces todas las anotaciones que ellos me hicieron, hicieron que el conocimiento adquirido ya quedara fijo.

However, they recognized some of their peers’ limitations such as: not being able to see all the mistakes, and not seeking for clarification. For instance, student H expressed that:

Sí estoy satisfecha con las indicaciones que me daban… sí estaba de acuerdo. Siempre estuve de acuerdo con lo que me sugerían pero creo que tal vez sí podían haber dado más, este, indicaciones o más consejos, o sea como que casi mis compañeros no me preguntaba “aquí estoy entendiendo esto ¿eso es lo que quieres decir?"

In contrast, only one student expressed that he was not satisfied with the revisions he gave to his classmates because he was not able to correct his peers’ spelling or grammatical mistakes. As was the case of student B, who mentioned that: “No estoy satisfecho con mi revisión, pienso que puede ser mucho mejor en… cuestiones ortográficas tal vez, más claridad en los verbos.”

The rest of the class claimed to be satisfied with their own revisions, but recognized that they were not able to identify all their classmates’ mistakes as another student commented:
Sí estoy satisfecha con mi revisión, a veces siento que hay como un límite en el que yo puedo revisar, entonces, pero siempre hice lo mejor para corregir lo más que pude, pero a parte de esas correcciones creo que sí hay muchas más que ni yo ni nadie así de mis compañeros podemos ver, ahorita, no en este momento.

The students’ concerns about their limitations may be linked to the fact that they saw themselves and their classmates as evaluators of the written compositions, instead of as collaborators. These findings conflict with Muncie’s (2000, in Kulsirisawad 2012) outcomes, which may imply that more training was needed so as to convince students of their cooperative role during the oral and written feedback.

### 4.11 Evaluation Checklist Appreciations

Students’ opinions about the writing checklist were divided. Three of the students’ considered it to be: tedious, complicated, irrelevant, overwhelming and disconnected from the activities. While seven students mentioned that the checklist was: helpful, clear, easy to use, effective and pertinent. It is important to mention that the students’ preferences correlate with their efficiency to write in English that was observed in class. Hence, those students who spent more time writing the essays found it difficult to handle the revisions and fill in the checklist in thirty minutes. This time constraint possibly caused these students to feel frustrated and overwhelmed. By a way of illustration student F expressed that:

> Honestamente no creo que la hoja de revisión fue de ayuda. Pues, creo que estaba más preocupado por traducir lo que decía la hoja, por entender lo que decía la hoja que, era un poco complicado y tedioso hasta cierto punto. Y me hacía preocuparme por el tiempo. Eran más importantes las puntuaciones que me hicieron mis compañeros, a lo que pude anotar en la hoja.

However, in contrast, another student expressed that:

> Para mí sí fue de muchísima ayuda porque son puntos, claves, y como que en esa hojita venía todo resumido lo que hay que revisar en un escrito, tanto propio como en el de un compañero, pero creo que lo que más aprendí fue como la coherencia y el
orden, que tuviera un inicio, un punto importante de desarrollo y luego una conclusión. Creo que eso es lo más importante; que tenga coherencia.

The multi-level nature of the class appeared to be responsible for the different levels of appreciation of the evaluations checklist. The fact that the students' with the lowest language proficiency levels expressed negatively about the checklist, seemed to be highly related to the difficulty they found in carrying out the procedures in a limited amount of time, in contrast to students with higher language levels, who did not face timed constraints.
Chapter Five: Discussions and Reflections

This final section includes a brief summary of the action research process. First, the identification and examination of the problem is explored. A brief review of how the action plan was designed, implemented and evaluated is included, with the purpose to evaluate the success of the plan of action. Moreover, the implications of the findings and the limitations of this study are discussed, as well as some personal reflections. Lastly, this section underlines ideas for a possible further investigation.

After analyzing the data, it can be concluded that the implementation of the action plan succeeded in raising students’ awareness of their writing mistakes, increasing their ability to correct errors in their own and others’ drafts, boosting their confidence to write in English, and improving their writing quality by making their drafts clearer to the reader. These changes may imply that peer feedback is a valuable tool to improve students’ writing ability, even when the students’ language level is low. In general, this suggests that peer feedback procedures can benefit not only the clarity of students’ drafts, but also increase their positive attitudes towards writing.

5.1 Implications
First, the fact that the quantitative data showed that mistakes in second drafts decreased in comparison to the first drafts in essays 2, 3 and 4, supports the belief that the multiple-draft process lead to improvements in students’ writing quality. What is more, the comparison between drafts displayed a significant improvement in the overall communicative effectiveness in many of the second drafts, especially in those written by the less-skilled writers. This also suggests a substantial increase in peer and individual revision quality. Nonetheless, other aspects such as the availability of resources to revise and edit at home, and the unlimited time that the students had in the second drafts, in comparison to the first ones that were written in class, may have also contributed to the improvement in the quality.
Second, despite peer feedback training at the beginning of the intervention, the majority of the students argued to have felt nervous and uncomfortable while providing feedback to their classmates, especially during the first weeks. This is apparently explained by the participants’ current language level since according to De Almeida (2007) less-skilled students tend to experience a stronger sense of frustration due to their lack of ability to express their thoughts. This phenomenon had been studied by authors like Rollinson (2005), Stanley (1992), and Kulsirisawad (2012) who emphasize the importance of proper preliminary peer feedback training, in order to prevent students’ confidence to be affected by their lack of ability to carry out the procedures. Thus, guidance and supervision throughout the intervention is required as well as the provision of enough vocabulary to express and respond to criticism.

On the other hand, the difficulties encountered by some students regarding the use of the evaluation checklist, and the negative appreciation of it by some of the participants, contradicts Al-Hazmi and Scholfield’s (2007) and De Almeida (2007) research. Apparently, this contradiction may be accounted for by the difference between the language levels of the students of this research. It seems to be that, the negative comments about the checklist came from the less-skilled students who faced time constraints when trying to fill the checklist. Perhaps, they were not ready in proficiency terms to handle peer feedback. Thus, this evidence reinforces De Almeida’s (2007) view of the less-skilled learners as likely to be emotionally affected by their language limitations. This implies that teachers should make careful decisions when it comes to challenging students’ language skills so as not to affect their confidence. It may also indicate that they needed more training before being capable of using the checklists effectively.

The results also showed agreement among students’ appreciation for peer feedback activities. These findings are consistent with a study by Al-Hazmi and Scholfield (2007) that indicates that peer feedback fosters positive attitudes towards writing. It is also aligned with Taguwon’s (2011) research outcomes which
show that students who are exposed to peer feedback procedures increase their motivation and decrease their frustration to write in English.

The outcomes of the pre and post tests indicated an increase in the percentages of error in 8 of the 13 categories on the post test, in comparison to the pretest. These findings contradict the general tenor of previous studies in which improvement is seen in most of the aspects. However, it is worth noticing that in the post test, students double the length of their compositions which may have resulted in more errors. This may also be explained by students’ progressive ambition to write more complex sentences, and/or by the different requirements of the pretest and the post test. For instance, there is a variety of verb tenses in the post test that is not observed in the pretest, as well as an appropriate development and organization of ideas in most of the compositions. Therefore, even though errors increased in low level aspects, they decreased in high level aspects, which in turn, made the learners’ compositions more understandable to the reader.

Lastly, the fact that some students mentioned that after the intervention they revised their composition less seems to contradict the purpose of the study by suggesting that they did not improve their ability to self-revise and edit their own drafts. Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind that spending more time in revising and editing does not necessarily mean doing it better. For instance, in the think aloud protocols, it was observed that the students were able to find and correct mistakes in their drafts in the 13 categories. This may also lead to the possible conclusion that the students’ boost of confidence, as well as the continuous revisions of their classmates’ drafts, had increased their efficiency and quality to self-revise and self-edit their own written compositions.

5.2 Limitations
Several limitations may have impacted this study. First, possibly the intervention of seven weeks was not enough to provide students with sufficient training on how to use the evaluation checklist effectively or how to provide feedback. Second, due to the limited number of participants, the findings of this research may not be replicable in other contexts. Lastly, the fact that the researcher was the teacher of
the class may have affected the objectivity of this study and as a result, the findings and data may be subject to other interpretations. However, despite these limitations, this study still provides insights into the Mexican EFL classroom, and indicates the pedagogical benefits of peer feedback. What is more, it provides evidence on how peer feedback fosters students’ ability to self-revise and self-edit their own written compositions.

5.3 Conclusions
Based on the observations of my particular context and participants, it was identified that the students’ limited abilities to write in English made their compositions difficult to understand. As a consequence, an initial research that aimed at understanding the nature of the problem was carried out. Likert-scale questionnaires; non-participant observations and documentary evidence were implemented as methods of data collection. Results suggested that students’ excessive amount of mistakes made the students’ drafts almost illegible. This appeared to be caused by their lack of strategies to self-revise and self-edit their own drafts. Therefore, an action plan of seven weeks was designed and implemented to improve students’ writing skills through peer feedback. In this second research, the methods used were Likert-scale questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, documentary evidence and think aloud protocols.

In the second research, an overall increase in the participants’ revision quality was observed. In addition to this, the participants seemed to appreciate the procedures and value of the cooperative nature of writing. Think aloud protocols demonstrated that students had increased their ability to recognize and correct the written mistakes that they had previously made, and which they were not able to detect before the intervention. Moreover, overall improvement in the students’ ability to communicate appears to be caused by the multiple draft revisions of others’ compositions, which fostered their critical thinking, and helped them see their own drafts from the readers’ perspective. However, the errors in the post test outscored the errors in the pretest in low level areas, but they were outnumbered in high level
areas making students’ compositions more understandable. All in all, the increase in students’ corrections as well as the improvement of their writing quality that is observed in the data, suggests that the main goal of this study was met.

It is worth mentioning that after this research, I gained new insights into the difficulties low proficient students face when writing, especially when they are required to write beyond their abilities and without previous training. I understood how complex it is for them to meet the requirements, and how little, I as a teacher, used to listen to their needs before this study. Furthermore, I could see clearly how teachers’ beliefs about how writing should be can easily be accepted and even appropriated by the students, either it implies seeing writing as a final product or as a process.

Thus, as a result of carrying out this research, and after reflecting on the findings, I plan to make some modifications in my teaching practice. First, I anticipate taking time out of every week to listen to students’ main concerns about their skills. Moreover, I will encourage students to bring their dictionaries and electronic devices to class, in order to help them improve the revision of their own drafts in everyday conditions. In addition to this, I will take advantage of the writing activities and peer feedback procedures in order to improve their pronunciation and increase their vocabulary.

5.4 Ways Forwards
Based on the findings of this study, some recommendations are suggested for future research so as to have a broad understanding of this area of study. First, the time period of this study lasted seven weeks. Therefore, a longitudinal study is recommended to boost students’ confidence when implementing the peer feedback procedures. Moreover, before any type of collaborative work, there needs to be a lot of emphasis in the training stage. Thus, students could not only receive training on how to work collaboratively or how to use the evaluation
checklist, but they could also be provided with vocabulary and expressions to comment on each another's compositions.

Future investigation might collect and analyse the writers’ drafts and evaluation checklists with the readers’ comments on them, in order to examine the types of mistakes the readers had been able to identify, whether the writers accepted or rejected the corrections, and to what extent students corrected other aspects on his/her own. Further research also needs to provide the participants with continuous guidance during the peer feedback activities, and special attention needs to be provided to the less-skilled students. Individual conferences between the writers and the teacher could be held every week so as to give students the opportunity to clarify doubts about revision aspects. Additionally, the same requirements for the pre and post test should be established in order to have a more objective picture of students’ errors and corrections.

Finally, as this study was carried out with only ten EFL Mexican students in a multilevel classroom in a private language school, the findings of this Action Research may not be generalized to other cases. Thus, a multi-case study from various private and public Mexican institutions is needed, to explore the writing improvement of the participants after the implementations of the peer feedback procedures.
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APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A: LIKERT-SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE

¿Qué tan de acuerdo estás con las siguientes afirmaciones sobre la escritura en inglés? Por favor, marca con una X el nivel que, a tu juicio, consideras pertinente. Tus respuestas no serán usadas para evaluar su desempeño en clase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muy en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>No estoy seguro</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Me gusta escribir en inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Me parece fácil escribir en inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Me da miedo equivocarme cuando escribo en inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cuando escribo en inglés cometo muchos errores gramaticales (mal orden de las palabras, mala conjugación de verbos etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cuando escribo en inglés cometo muchos al errores ortográficos (cambio una letra por otra, me faltan o sobran letras etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cuando escribo en inglés cometo muchos al errores de puntuación (no sé cómo y cuándo usar las comas, los puntos etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cuando escribo en inglés encuentro difícil organizar mis ideas (no tengo bien claro como iniciar mi texto, desarrollarlo y/o cómo concluirlo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cuando escribo en inglés encuentro difícil conectar mis ideas (no conozco los conectores o no sé cómo usarlos, por ejemplo, but, then, next, and, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Me parece fácil revisar mis escritos y corregirlos por mí mismo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: CLASS WRITING NON-PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Writing Behaviors</th>
<th>Applies Spelling Patterns in Written Work</th>
<th>Writes Clearly and Effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates an interest in writing</td>
<td>Uses the writing process (pre-write, draft, revise, edit and edit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rewrites to improve writing</td>
<td>Plans, organizes and writes with an introduction, a body and a conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applies phonics rules and spelling patterns in written work</td>
<td>Uses resources to spell unknown words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses resources to spell unknown words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses the writing process (pre-write, draft, revise, edit and edit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans, organizes and writes with an introduction, a body and a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other comments:**

_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
I think Nancy in her other life was a realtor person, because one realtor was a person who is practical and very fast, organise, and was good with the sales.

She sold many houses and she was very rich, I think she had many properties and many persons served for her.
APPENDIX D: LIKERT –SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE

¿Qué tan de acuerdo estás con las siguientes afirmaciones sobre la escritura en inglés? Por favor, marca con una X el nivel que, a tu juicio, consideras pertinente. Tus respuestas no serán usadas para evaluar su desempeño en clase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>No estoy seguro</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.-</td>
<td>Creo que el maestro es responsable de evaluar los escritos de los alumnos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.-</td>
<td>He revisado los escritos de mis compañeros antes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.-</td>
<td>Creo que los alumnos también deberían participar en las evaluaciones escritas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.-</td>
<td>Creo que los alumnos pueden evaluar los escritos de sus compañeros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.-</td>
<td>Creo que los alumnos son capaces de revisar sus propios escritos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.-</td>
<td>Me sentiría cómodo si se me pidieran darle una calificación a los escritos de mis compañeros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.-</td>
<td>Me sentiría cómodo si se me pidiera darle una calificación a mis propios escritos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.-</td>
<td>Me siento satisfecho cuando el maestro sólo le da una calificación a mis escritos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.-</td>
<td>Creo que la retroalimentación que me da el maestro ayuda a mejorar mi escritura en Inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.-</td>
<td>Creo que la retroalimentación que me dan mis compañeros ayuda a mejorar mi escritura en Inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.-</td>
<td>Creo que el trabajo en equipo ayuda a mejorar mi aprendizaje del inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.-</td>
<td>El apoyo y estímulo de mis compañeros mejora mi aprendizaje del inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.-</td>
<td>Me gusta leer los escritos de mis compañeros y darles consejos sobre estos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Taguwon, L. (2011)*
APPENDIX E: PRETEST

I love to exercise! I get up early in the morning and go bicycling for about four hours. I do yoga every day. I go walking sometimes at nights. I love playing basketball once a week. I often lift weights. I never walking. I always swimming. I do aerobics four times a day. I usually play soccer.
# APPENDIX F: EVALUATION CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer used capital letter for:</th>
<th>The texts has a clear:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Beginning sentences</td>
<td>- Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Names</td>
<td>- Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Places</td>
<td>- Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Days, months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Used period at the end of a sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use question marks at the end of questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Used some interesting adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Used any similes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Used connectives like because, but, so, then, also, next, etc. in the sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Needs more details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contains relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contains irrelevant information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comments:

_______________________________________

_______________________________________

_______________________________________

______________________________

Adapted from Al-Hazmi & Schofield (2007)
APPENDIX G: AUTHENTIC EFL COMPOSITIONS

The Happiest Man of the World

One day a man bom is very happyest and pretty when he have 12 years old he transformed in happy boy his best fiiend is Jonny his twin is Omar his enemy is Plik, Juan and Koji when Emmanuel 22 he is in the disco and he is attacked by a horse he form a team is Jonny. Omar an Emmanuel our enemy is in the jail. 2 montsh later his enemy exit the jail. Oh not Emmanuel call his fiiend and plink is have invent this invent is men he have a power that is papapa Emmanuel fight with his friends he win but

"Peter Pan and Jhony"

Once upon a Time a girl name Wendy And a bad boy That his name is Peter Pan want to killed Jhony; Peter Pan is very Bad Jhony is The boy f-i-iend of Wendy and Hook is the son of Jhony and wendy and in The night Hook go to Destry all The Indians and all The family of him is very happy because Jhony killed Peter Pan in Peter Pan is very Happy because he is a Devil.
**Cindirella**

Cindirella lived in a big, big house. One mother, the mother, is ugly and bat. The mother had 3 daughter very, very uglies and bat. Had one cat. Cindirella worked in the big house and Cindirella is a good girl. Cindirella had many fiiends! Animals! they were good friends.

One day the hadamadrina they help him and they she happy. One prince and Cindirella dancing in the palace.

The End

**Snow White**

They was a woman, her name was Snow white and she was very pretty. Another woman would like to look like snowhite because she was beutifuU, the woman wants to kill her and she prepared a poicen. One day later the woman went to the house of snow with and she puted the poicen in her water, she drink all the water and the woman thinks that snow with is was die, but no she don't, she only was felt down and the woman went to her house very happy but she don't know that snow with was alive. A month later the woman die because a bear kill her. Now snowhite is very happy because enibody want's to kill her.

Taken from Schram, E. M. (2002)
Dear Monse

How are you?... I want to say you something about my hometown

The name of my hometown is Xalapa, Xalapa is in México, now a days Xalapa is a beatiful place, but before was most beatiful.

Before Xalapa was a quiet place, it was many flowers and trees, the streets was beatiful and tradicional rocks, the building and houses looked old.

People in Xalapa were very simple and calnd. Our traditions was very important, like the day of deads. Before in Xalapa there aren’t fast food, Xalapa had “antojitos”.

The weather was beatiful, was cold and clowdy, and was windi, now a days Xalapa is hot and little dirty.

Xalapa is a big and noisy city but have nature in many parts.
Dear Monse

How are you?... I want to say you something about my hometown.

The name of my hometown is Xalapa, Xalapa is in México, now a days is a beatiful place, but before was most beautiful...

Before was a quiet city, it had many flowers and trees, the streets was beautiful and tradicional rocks, the buildings and houses looked olds.

People in Xalapa were very simple and kind. Our traditions was very important, like the day of the deads. Before there aren’t fast food, Xalapa had “antojitos”

The weather was beatiful, was cold and cloudy, and was windy, now a days Xalapa is hot and little dirty.

Xalapa is a big and noisy city but it has nature in many parts...

See you...
Dear Mez;

My history with the music begin with my grandfather, he is a good musician plays the saxophone, and he have the band.

My cousins and me learn reed the music, our grandfather asked us which instrument play in the band, I answered the trumpet.

Two years after enter to the Music faculty, here know the classic music and so all possibility of my instrument, since then I loved the music.
Dear Mez:

My history with the music begin with my grandfather, he is a good musician, he plays the saxophone, and he has a band.

My cousins and me learned to read music, our grandfather asked us which instrument we would like to play in the band, I answered the trumpet.

Two years after enrolled to the Music faculty, in here knew the classic music and saw all possibilities of my instrument, since then I loved the music.

See you soon.

Carlos.
Dear Carlos:

I want to tell you about my favorite TV program, is “The Wonderful years” is a serie from the 80s and 90s created in the US. Is about the live for a kid from US. He is from a traditional family for the 50’s, His live is influided for the changes in the history, the second war and for the economy for his country.

The history is star wer his brother go to the war and his sisther is acepted in a organization for a peace. Is very intesting because take a vision for the people from this days.

I hope your see some times.

By Ralf
Dear Carlos:

I want to tell you about my favorite tv program, it is “The Wonder Years” it is a serie from the 80s and 90s created in the USA, it is about the life of an american kid. He is from a traditional family from the 50’s. His life was influenced by changes in the history, the second war and country’s economy.

The story began when his brother went to the war and his sister is accepted in a peace organization.

The serie was very interesting because exposed a vision of the people of that time.

I hope your see some times.

Ralf
Dear Luisa,

When I worked like a teacher with teenagers was a very difficult work, because they not interesting in the class or music or anything. I had many work to do. I began knowing they likes and interest, in the music or others things. In this moment I new what I need do for the kids. I propose them that they choose the activitys and the music they like from this moment all the kids liked from a band of rock and cumbias and the girls liked from a gospel choir. When you find their likes, you find the way.

Mario
Dear Luisa,

When I worked like a teacher with teenagers it was a very difficult work, because they weren’t interested in the class, music or anything, I had many work to do. I began knowing their likes and interests in the music and others things. In this moment I knew what I needed to do for my students. I proposed them that they choose the activities and the music they like. From this moment all the kids wanted to form a rock band and cumbia’s group, the girls wanted to form a gospel choir.

When you find their like, you find the way.

Mario
APPENDIX I: POST TEST

Dear Cris,

You want to know how I became so pragmatic. Well I think I’m pragmatic since childhood because I have always enjoy to do many things at the same time. If you want to do a lot of activities at day only you need to organize your mind.

Every month I try to write a schedule then I rank the most important event and I prepare it first. Each Week I do a little schedule in my mind too, and every day organize my activities per hour.

Is a good way for being an a responsible person, but some times it is hard and boring.
### APPENDIX J: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preguntas Principales</th>
<th>Preguntas Adicionales</th>
<th>Aclaraciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué aspectos revisabas en los escritos y por qué?</td>
<td>¿Cómo los revisabas?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Cuándo los revisabas?</td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Por qué te enfocabas en esos aspectos?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué tanto revisas tus escritos ahora, en comparación con lo que lo hacías antes de la intervención?</td>
<td>¿Cuánto tiempo le dedicabas a la revisión de tus escritos antes?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Cuánto tiempo le dedicas a la revisión de tus escritos ahora?</td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Por qué los revisabas más/ menos?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cómo te sentiste durante las actividades en las que intercambiabas los escritos con tus compañeros?</td>
<td>¿Por qué te sentiste de esa manera?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Cuándo experimentabas esos sentimientos?</td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál es tu percepción acerca de la escritura en clase?</td>
<td>¿Por qué opinas eso?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál estrategia de revisión prefieres, individual o colaborativa?</td>
<td>¿Te gustaría trabajar de manera individual de nuevo?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Te gustaría trabajar de manera grupal de nuevo?</td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué dificultades encontraste al revisar tus escritos?</td>
<td>¿Pudiste superar esas dificultades?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Por qué? ¿Por qué no?</td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Estás satisfecho con la revisión que diste?</td>
<td>¿Por qué?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál es tu opinión acerca de la hoja de evaluación?</td>
<td>¿Cómo mejorarías la hoja de evaluación?</td>
<td>¿A qué te refieres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Puedes darme un ejemplo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Te gustaría comentar algo más sobre el la revisión en parejas o la escritura?</td>
<td></td>
<td>¡Gracias!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Al-Hazmi & Schofield (2007)*
APPENDIX K: WRITING CORRECTION CODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Word Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Verb tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Word form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Extra word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Missing word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Logical development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Subject/ verb agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Singular/plural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Unclear message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Writing correction code adapted from Activities © BBC | British Council 2007*
APPENDIX L: THINK ALOUD PROTOCOLS

SAMPLE

Pretest: In my hause my family have a casettes wit guitar classic. My mother takl
I like soo much licened this casettes.

Ralf: ‘hause’ también no se escribe así. Eh... “my family have...” “have” tal vez
 tendría que escribirlo en tercera persona ¿no? ... ‘has’, porque es una cosa. En
lugar de ‘a’ nada más ‘cassettes’. No sé si ‘wit’ esté… bueno no está bien escrito
falta la ‘h’ intermedia. Entonces “whit” no sería lo mejor, sino ‘for’, ‘for guitar
classic?’ mmm no, tal vez, sí podría utilizar ‘whit’. Entonces “my mother takl” eso
está mal escrito, es la ‘l’, pero en la otra línea ‘talks’ esa sí está bien ¿no?