**Peer Feedback on Draft**

**Feedback to Kirandeep Kaur**

Write **6 paragraphs** (**4 to 6 lines each**) where you give comments on your peer’s draft by focusing on these aspects:

* **What were the strengths of the essay?**

The essay effectively explores the causes of academic dishonesty and proposes practical solutions, such as counseling programs, collaboration-focused culture, academic integrity courses, and plagiarism detection tools. The introduction provides a clear overview of the issue, while the body paragraphs present well-developed arguments supported by examples and reasoning. The inclusion of appropriate punishments for academic dishonesty enhances the essay's credibility and highlights the importance of maintaining academic standards. The conclusion effectively summarizes the main points and reinforces the significance of fostering an environment that prioritizes integrity and personal growth.

* **What were some places in the essay where you had trouble following the writer's ideas, and why?**

There were a few instances in the essay where I found it challenging to follow the writer's ideas. One such area was in the first body paragraph, where the writer introduced the concept of implementing counseling programs and stress management workshops as a solution to academic dishonesty. However, the connection between this solution and the cause of academic pressure could have been more explicitly stated, making it difficult for me to understand the logical progression of ideas. Similarly, in the second body paragraph, while discussing the lack of understanding and appreciation for the value of knowledge as a cause of academic dishonesty, the transitions between ideas felt abrupt. This lack of smooth transition made it harder to comprehend the writer's train of thought consistently. Overall, although the essay presented clear ideas, improving the connection between ideas and providing smoother transitions would have enhanced its overall coherence and clarity.

* **Is the essay well-organized in terms of overall structure (intro, middle, conclusion) and paragraph/topic order? Why/Why not?**

Yes, the essay is well-organized in terms of its overall structure and paragraph/topic order. It begins with a clear introduction that introduces the issue of academic dishonesty and states the purpose of the essay. The body paragraphs follow a logical order, addressing different causes of academic dishonesty and proposing corresponding solutions. The first body paragraph focuses on the pressure to succeed and suggests counseling programs, stress management workshops, and fostering a culture of collaboration as solutions. The second body paragraph addresses the lack of understanding and appreciation for knowledge and proposes solutions such as emphasizing the value of learning, integrating ethics education, and implementing plagiarism detection tools. Finally, the essay concludes by summarizing the main points and emphasizing the importance of addressing academic dishonesty. The organization of the essay allows for a coherent flow of ideas and enables the reader to easily follow the writer's arguments.

* **Are there unconventional features of the writing (sentence structure, grammar, layout, etc.) that you find disrupted your reading of the essay? Elaborate on your answer.**

No, there are no unconventional features of the writing that disrupt the reading of the essay. The sentence structures are appropriate and adhere to standard conventions. The essay is well-structured with clear paragraph breaks and transitions between ideas, making it easy to follow. However, there were two noticeable grammatical errors. Firstly, there is a comma splice after the word "conventions", which could be corrected by using a conjunction or separating the clauses into two distinct sentences. Secondly, a missing word "making" before the phrase "it easy to follow" results in an incomplete sentence. The sentence would be correct if it stated "making it easy to follow." Despite these errors, the overall writing style and organization of the essay are commendable.

* **Was the essay a critique or evaluating the author's argument? Why/Why not?**

The essay can be seen as more of an informative and persuasive piece rather than a critique or evaluation of the author’s argument. The reason is because the essay presents a discussion of the causes of academic dishonesty and proposes solutions to address the issue. The writer’s primary focus was on exploring the reasons behind academic dishonesty and offering suggestions for promoting integrity, rather than critically analyze or evaluate the author’s specific argument. Moreover, the essay presents points, supported by examples and suggestions, to address academic dishonest, without directly questioning or challenging the author’s perspective.

* **What are areas the writer should improve on?**

The writer can improve the essay by providing more specific and concrete examples to support the points. Additionally, the writer should strive for greater clarity in the ideas by ensuring smooth transitions between paragraphs and sentences. Furthermore, to make the essay more coherent and readable, several sections could be rephrased or rearranged. The essay may also use a deeper analysis of potential constraints or opposing arguments to the solutions suggested, as this would show a deeper comprehension of the subject. In order to prevent making small mistakes that might confuse the reader, the writer should also pay attention to grammar and sentence structure.