

2001-07-01

In Search of an Optimal Writing Feedback Strategy

Supanee Chinnawongs

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa>



Part of the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chinnawongs, Supanee (2001) "In Search of an Optimal Writing Feedback Strategy," *PASAA*: Vol. 31, Article 3.

DOI: 10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.31.1.3

Available at: <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa/vol31/iss1/3>

This Original Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Chulalongkorn Journal Online (CUJO) at Chula Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in PASAA by an authorized editor of Chula Digital Collections. For more information, please contact ChulaDC@car.chula.ac.th.

In Search of an Optimal Writing Feedback Strategy

Supanee Chinnawongs

Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Abstract

Writing is a language skill most EFL students have problems with. This is due to several factors such as the inherent complexity of the skill itself, a lack of constant practice and inadequate or inappropriate corrective feedback. This paper reports on an exploratory study on writing feedback strategies in which a three-step procedure, that is peer comment, self-evaluation and teacher reformulation, is proposed. Results revealed a positive attitude in the students towards this collaborative feedback strategy. Students demonstrated their skills as critical readers and evaluators. Suggestions and implications are also discussed.

Introduction

EFL corrective feedback has long been a controversial issue in writing instruction. Language teachers have been experimenting with numerous strategies in providing feedback to their students' writing. However, despite the enormous time, effort and energy these teachers have invested, their students fail to demonstrate an increase in writing proficiency. As language teachers, we, therefore, need to rethink the feedback strategies that prove more effective and efficient without turning ourselves into "composition slaves" (Leki, 1990).

This paper is based on an exploratory study of which the goal is to establish the best possible feedback strategies that are compatible with the learning styles of Thai

students. It sets out to investigate how useful the students find peer comment, self-evaluation and teacher reformulation in helping them improve their writing. It also explores how the students view the teacher's role in the revision process.

A Brief Review of Literature on ESL/EFL Writing Feedback

Previous research on writing feedback has shown that EFL teachers tend to focus on accuracy and correctness of surface-level features including grammar, vocabulary and writing mechanics. They are more concerned with language-specific problems and error correction than text-level features such as overall organization, signposting, cohesion, coherence and clarity of meaning (Raimes,

1983; Sommers, 1984; Zamel, 1985). Besides, teachers respond to most writing as if it were a final draft to be evaluated and corrected without taking account of such meaning-level issues as writers' intention, readers' expectations and purpose of writing. Moreover, when responding to content, teachers' comments on student writing are often contradictory, vague and confusing, and they do not offer specific strategies for revising the text (Zamel, 1985). Teachers tend to appropriate students' texts as they want rather than attending to the students' purpose of writing (Sommers, 1984).

Feedback, whether it be form-focused or meaning-focused, constitutes a necessary part of language learning. Especially L2 writers expect to have their writing errors marked and corrected (Raimes, 1985; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Leki, 1991). Students tend to accept the authority of the writing teacher not only as a real reader, but as a coach and an evaluator (Leki, 1990). Studies on the effects of teacher correction on L2 writing have as yet no conclusive results. Like Semke (1984), Zamel (1985) and Truscott (1996) found that despite the teacher's attention to error correction, errors persisted. On the other hand, Fathman and Whalley (1990) revealed that students who received feedback on form made more improvement on writing tasks than those who did not. However, they also reported most students received higher scores on the grammar and content of their rewrites than on their original without any intervention from the teacher. This implies that teacher intervention is not always necessary.

Another form of feedback provided by the teacher is reformulation which is claimed to bring about a better result than mere correction. Reformulation, as defined

by Allwright (1988), is an attempt by a native writer to understand what a non-native writer wants to say and restate it in such a way that is natural to the native writer. According to Levenston (1978) cited by James (1998), the student's writing output is not one but two removes from the native speaker's version. Therefore, when marking the student's text, the teacher needs to reconstruct and then reformulate it. This technique was found to be particularly useful when used with peer group discussion although it may not be appealing to those students who refuse to recognize their problems or those who feel this technique implies the teacher's unrealistic demand of their writing (Allwright, 1988).

Since the advent of the process approach to writing instruction and the expansion of the learner-centred approach, the teacher's role in teaching and responding to student writing has changed a great deal. In the process approach, writing is seen as a recursive activity in which students attempt to create meaning (Zamel, 1982). Students' texts must serve their purpose of writing and meet the readers' expectations. The role of peer response has thus come into play. Peer response has promised to yield certain benefits. It helps develop a better sense of audience for the student writers and promote collaboration and negotiated interaction among students, thus making them realize the need to make their text clear and understandable to the readers (Beaven, 1977; Jacobs, 1989; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Peer response increases students' confidence and motivation to write and revise, and it enhances their attitudes towards writing (Chaudron, 1984; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Students are also exposed to a variety of writing styles as they read what their peers have written (Lockhart & Ng, 1993). Most

of all, peer response reduces the teacher's burden of correcting every draft (Beaven, 1977; Chaudron, 1984). However, this evaluation procedure is not without a problem. As Jacobs (1989) pointed out, some teachers and students express concern over the fact that peer feedback may be a case of the blind leading the blind due to the students' lack of language ability as well as training in giving feedback. Students may tend to disregard some of their peers' suggestions because they have no confidence in their peers' ability to give them correct advice on their writing. In fact, several factors might play a part in the success of peer response groups such as the learner variables, the role of the teachers, the classroom context as well as the cultural factors (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hyland, 2000).

Another feedback methodology arising out of the growing trend of student-centred learning is self-evaluation. By analyzing or re-seeing and rewriting their own texts, students learn to assume more responsibility for their writing leading up to writer autonomy. They have to learn to read their text critically and not to view it as a final draft. Self-correction helps students develop language awareness, self-reliance, independence and creativity (Beaven, 1977; James, 1998). However, self-correction, like peer evaluation, is not always well received by students who may feel uncomfortable with the freedom they have and who view the teacher as the sole authority in the classroom.

As teachers, peers and students themselves play a very important role in the response process, it is the writing teacher's task to make sure each party concerned responds to student writing at the right time and in the right manner so that the maximum

benefits will be achieved in the learning process.

The Study

The Participants

The participants were 25 students, 9 male and 16 female, enrolled in the "Skills in English for Graduates" course, which is an elective general English course offered to graduate students who want to brush up their reading and writing skills. Their language proficiency levels ranged from intermediate to high intermediate. Most of them expressed positive attitude towards learning English, and reported themselves having an average-to-low writing proficiency. Their need for the writing skill is very high, especially for academic writing such as summaries, term papers, abstracts, and research papers. These students were studying in a variety of disciplines, including engineering, science, pharmaceutical science, dentistry, political science, communication arts and cultural management.

The Writing Tasks

The subjects were assigned to write 2 essays of different rhetorical focuses. One was an argumentative essay in which a situation was given and the students had to defend their position by giving at least three reasons. The other task required the students to write a comparison and contrast. For the latter task, they could choose their own topic or write on the topic given. Only 8 students did choose their own topic, with the reason that they had more information to write about, making the task easier. Those who wrote on the topic assigned stated that this would help them compare their essay with their peers'. Some indicated it was difficult to choose their own topic. These two writing tasks (see Appendix 1) were

out-of-class assignments with no length limit as fluency would also be observed in addition to accuracy and textual coherence.

The Three-Step Procedure

Feedback strategies adopted in this study proceeded in three steps as follows:

Step 1:

(Peer comment)

Students randomly exchanged their first draft and were asked to read each other's text, looking for the main point stated, its weaknesses and strengths. They then responded to their peers in English¹ using the peer evaluation guidelines provided² (see Appendix 2). Peers also varied from the first writing task to the second so as to avoid bias that might occur.

Step 2:

(Self-evaluation)

Students received back their first draft together with their peer's comments and suggestions on how they would revise their draft. For the second writing task, the teacher also located the errors but did not give corrections nor explanations. After that, students started analyzing their own text taking account of peers' advice while rewriting their second draft. They also had to respond to peer readers' comments as to which comments they found most helpful and least helpful.

Step 3:

(Teacher reformulation)

Students submitted their rewrites to the teacher³, who would review the students' revised version, reformulate and retype the whole essay (see Appendix 3) before handing it back to the students together with the written comments and assigned grades. The teacher then selected two reformulated texts for class discussion.

It should be pointed out that if the essay was fairly well-organized and fully developed with only some surface errors, the teacher would simply cross out the errors and write in corrections. The teacher also discussed the writing problems with some students.

A five-point Likert scale questionnaire investigating the students' views on the usefulness of the procedure was administered at the end of the course. Students were asked about their feedback preferences and beliefs about the benefits of the various forms of feedback.

Results

Which feedback strategy students found useful

Table 1 below shows which types of feedback strategies students found most useful. The types of strategies are rank ordered from the most useful to the least useful.

Table 1
Usefulness of strategies

Type of strategy	Mean (1 = least useful 5 = most useful)	Standard Deviation
Teacher reformulation	4.36	0.56
Self-evaluation	4.2	0.85
Peer evaluation	4.16	0.88

The students viewed text reformulation by the teacher the most useful in helping them deal with their writing problems. Twenty-four of the 25 students ranked it as very useful to most useful. Only 1 student stated it was moderately helpful. Next came self-evaluation, followed by peer evaluation. On the whole this group of students regarded

all the three forms of feedback strategies as very helpful in improving their writing. However, when asked about the degree to which they found peer evaluation helped them improve their writing in terms of content, organization and language, the students expressed less confidence, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Usefulness of peer evaluation

Peer evaluation helped improve	Mean (1 = least useful 5 = most useful)	Standard Deviation
organization	3.64	1.05
content	3.44	0.98
language	3.24	0.99

Which corrective feedback strategies provided by the teacher students found useful

Table 3 shows which types of teachers' feedback strategies the students found most useful.

Table 3
Usefulness of teachers' feedback strategies

Type of strategy	Mean (1 = least useful 5 = most useful)	Standard Deviation
Reformulating each student's text	4.64	0.48
Giving written comments	4.64	0.85
Explaining common errors to class	4.52	0.7
Talking to individual students about their writing	4.48	0.75
Crossing out errors and writing in correction	4.32	0.97
Indicating errors and students self - correcting	3.8	1.06

Reformulation and written comments were found to be the most useful strategies in helping students write, followed by explaining common errors to class while locating errors ranked at the bottom of the list. It is worth noting that reformulating is the only strategy all the students rated as very helpful to most helpful while the other strategies were rated moderately helpful by some students.

What kinds of comments were given by peer students

By analyzing peer comments, it was found that several issues were addressed by the student readers. They provided comments not only on surface errors at the level of grammar, word choice, style and writing mechanics but also on text-level problems such as cohesion, coherence, text and paragraph organization and content or idea development. Some even commented on length and handwriting. Examples are cited below.

Comments on grammar or usage

- ◆ You should use present perfect tense to describe immediate past actions.
- ◆ The prepositions used in Paragraph 3 made me confused.
- ◆ The writer used wrong grammar.

Comments on word choice

- ◆ You should use "currency", not "current", and "least", not "lease".
- ◆ You should use the verb "organize" instead of "organization" because we use a verb after "have to."

Comments on style

- ◆ You should use the written style, not like talking style because it is written work.
- ◆ Avoid the word "you know" in your writing because it is spoken language.
- ◆ You should use formal language in the announcement.

Comments on writing mechanics

- ◆ I don't understand why he used many commas though I understand what he will communicate.

- ◆ If you improve your handwriting, it would be easy for readers to understand.

Comments on textual cohesion / coherence

- ◆ You should use pronoun references instead of repetition of words.
- ◆ I think you should use another marker.
- ◆ Try to use transitions or the linking words to connect ideas in your paragraphs.
- ◆ You begin with "First of all" but you don't have "Second, Next...."

Comments on text / paragraph organization

- ◆ Your essay is not in an essay format. It has no introduction, no conclusion.
- ◆ You should add an introduction so the readers know the ideas in your paper.
- ◆ You should expand your topic in Paragraph 1.
- ◆ You should break your text into 2-3 paragraphs instead of writing it in 1 paragraph.
- ◆ Your second paragraph is too long and complex. You should separate it.

Comments on content

- ◆ I don't understand your thought. You must give more explanation so the reader can understand you.
- ◆ You should give more examples, details and reasons to support your second point.
- ◆ I don't agree with you when you say
- ◆ You should also talk about

General comments

- ◆ You should recheck your essay after leaving it a while.
- ◆ Don't try to translate from Thai to English, or you'll make grammatical mistakes (like I did!).

It is interesting to note that the student readers attempted to look for the strengths of their peer's essays before providing constructive criticisms. Most of them offered encouraging words of advice. For example:

- ◆ I think your writing is pretty good, and you'll write better if you have more time.
- ◆ Your essay is short and can read easily.
- ◆ Your content is good but the organization is not complete.
- ◆ The reasons you mention sound reasonable and you have such a good handwriting.

Also, quite a few students conveyed a humble or even an apologetic tone in their comments. For instance:

- ◆ My ideas may be wrong. However, I hope they'd be useful for you.
- ◆ Please don't be angry with me. I have to apologize to you if I gave too many comments.
- ◆ After all, I'm not an expert myself. Please forgive me if I made a mistake in my suggestion.

What kinds of peer comments students found helpful or not very helpful

Most of the student writers found comments given by their peers useful while they reported that not very helpful comments were those that they disagreed or did not understand what the readers wanted, and where or how to correct. Of particular interest was that many students indicated praises or positive comments would not help them with revision. They stated, "It made me proud of myself and my English won't improve," or "I like the explanation more than the compliment."

What changes observed in the students' rewrites

Most of the student writers responded well to peers' comments. If they agreed, they would try to adjust their essays according to the advice given. An improvement in the text structure as well as an increase in length can be observed in many rewrites. After reviewing their own texts, some even made revisions on other features not mentioned by their peers. However, most would make only local revisions unless advised by their peers.

Discussion

Results indicate that the three-step writing feedback strategies i.e. peer comment, self-evaluation and teacher reformulation are well received by the students, with teacher reformulation being given the highest ranking. Each of these strategies have their own merits and they should be utilized appropriately in the evaluation process.

The Role of Peer Comment

The students in this study appear to have some reservations about peer evaluation. One factor might be due to the Thai culture of learning, which is traditionally teacher-centred. As Hyland (2000) suggested, students from some culture might prefer teacher guidance to peer response groups. Unlike their peers, the teacher is highly regarded so they do not feel threatened to lose their face. It might also be the case that these students have an average-to-low writing ability; therefore, they feel constrained by their weak language skills. Some may feel uncomfortable making negative statements about peer writing (cf. Reid, 1993) as evidenced by the apologetic tone in their comments. Others may not trust the feedback of their peers, especially those who

have high self-esteem and confidence in their ability. The finding corresponds with what Chinnawongs (forthcoming) found among science undergraduates who ranked peer evaluation as the least useful corrective strategy.

However, despite the lowest ranking in the present study, the mean of peer evaluation is still considered very high (\bar{x} = 4.16). The high rating is also supported by many students' statements that all the comments given by peers are useful. As illustrated, these students read peer writing critically, and try their best to offer their views and suggestions on how the writers can improve their writing at all levels—surface, textual organization and propositional content. Comments as detailed and text-specific as such may not be provided by the teacher who teaches a large class and has to correct all the students' papers. As Cumming (1985) remarked, peer feedback can be more valuable than teacher feedback.

Peer feedback does not only save the teacher's time but it benefits students both as writers and readers. As writers, they have come to realize that if they want to be understood by readers, they need to make the meaning clear. This encourages decision making on the part of the writers, allowing them to determine their own meaning and how best to express it (Lockhart & Ng, 1993). As readers, they are exposed to a variety of writing styles and can better judge what makes good writing. However, it takes time and constant practice before one becomes an effective writer. That explains why when asked to what extent reading peer essays helps improve their own writing, most students rated it as average.

In addition, peer evaluation establishes rapport between students and creates the

cooperative atmosphere that promotes learning. As the data indicate, the students try to provide positive comments and soften their critical tone when giving advice. These students are also quite supportive, which helps reduce anxiety on the part of the writer. More importantly, reading peer writing may boost confidence and motivation as students discover their peers are having similar problems. This serves to remind them of the importance of mutual collaboration.

However, like what Lockhart and Ng (1993) suggest, peer response merely serves as guidance for revision, and the student writers have to make a final decision as to what changes would be appropriate for their writing. As was found in the study, one student responded to her peer comments: "Your suggestion about the conclusion of my paper is useful but I prefer my old conclusion."

The Role of Self-Evaluation

Results indicated that the students revised their drafts not only in light of their peers' suggestions but also based on their own analysis. This is supported by their high rating of the usefulness of reading their own essay in helping them improve their writing. Some made changes even where their peers did not comment on. They added content and adjusted the organization at their own discretion as they might probably be influenced by reading their peers' texts. Others fixed grammar and sentence structure. An important goal of language learning is to raise language awareness in the students (James, 1998). Self-correction is then believed to be a means to achieve this goal as the students learn to analyze their own linguistic repertoires. Allowing students the opportunity to correct themselves could

strengthen their critical thinking and reasoning power. It is a major step toward writer autonomy.

It is, however, worth noting that a large number of the students in this study only attended to local errors, not meaning-related problems, unless otherwise suggested. This supports previous studies' finding that unskilled writers are primarily preoccupied with surface errors and did not view writing as a recursive process (Zamel, 1983; Raimes, 1985).

The Role of Teacher Reformulation

Reformulation by the teacher was found to be a very useful evaluation writing tool. The students in the study showed strong reliance for both oral and written feedback on the teacher and demanded individual attention. It is quite appropriate for the teacher to provide reformulations after the students and their peers have contributed to the revising process. For one thing, L2 learners want to have their errors corrected by the teacher (Radecki & Swales, 1988; Leki, 1990) as it is possible that students with limited language proficiency may not be capable of editing their peers' writing and will probably provide miscorrections. Also, some students will hate their writing if asked to do too many revisions (Caudrey, 1996).

There are several reasons why teacher reformulation is quite effective. To begin with as it is text-specific, it directly addresses the problems of each student writer. While the reformulation attends to problems at both the correctness level and the communicative level (Atari & Triki, 2000), it is especially useful for illustrating a gap in content as well as organizational flaws, which are beyond the sentence level. Reformulations allow students to see their texts in a continuous flow of discourse, not as disrupted as when

the teacher simply writes in corrections. Students will readily see the mismatch between their writing and the teacher's reformulations, which serve as personalized models. It makes students aware that revision involves adjustments at various levels. By comparing the teacher's reformulations and their own versions, the students might, subsequently, be able to do their own reformulations. Furthermore, as Allwright (1988) suggested, used with peer group or class discussions, reformulation succeeds in convincing writers that it is their responsibility to facilitate the reader's task. The only caution that needs to be pointed out is that reformulating is demanding and time consuming, and the teacher must be a "sympathetic reader with good inferencing skills" (Wall et al., 1988, p.123). Otherwise, he might substitute his own ideas for those the student writer was trying to express.

Conclusion

This study seeks to find out what would be the most effective writing feedback strategy for Thai students. To answer this question, one needs to define the context of a particular writing class. As is found out in this study, a three-step discourse-based approach to EFL writing revision has proved to be appropriate and useful for graduate students with intermediate language proficiency levels and an average-to-low writing proficiency. Peer comment, self-evaluation and teacher reformulation employed in that sequence help strengthen the students' revising skills. Peer response not only provides authentic but sympathetic readers to the students as they share common interests and writing problems, thus fostering cooperative learning and empowering students to hone their skill as readers. In addition, while giving feedback

on their peers' writing, students have an opportunity to further practise writing for real communication since they primarily aim at getting their points across. This will, in turn, help them write with more fluency and greater confidence. Likewise, self-evaluation not only serves as a confidence-building tool but a language awareness-raising device whereby students learn to detect their own writing errors. Meanwhile, students are trained to read their papers through critical eyes. Besides, self-correction can lead to better retention. Teacher reformulation used as a last resort helps students to successfully sail through the "journey of writing discovery" (Zamel, 1982), allowing them to view their text as something that can be resurrected. These three evaluation procedures when used in conjunction with one another and in the stated sequence offer students with different learning styles and strategies opportunities for learning.

Some limitations of this study should be acknowledged, though. Since only a small number of students were involved, and only two writing tasks were under study, results may not be generalized to all writing contexts and must be interpreted as trends only. Also, more training in giving feedback might be needed so the students would be able to read a given text more critically.

On a final note, although the proposed three-step procedure may be no panacea for all writing situations, it proves to be a fruitful and viable method in this study. It is hoped that its implementation in a similar EFL classroom context would render benefits to both teachers and students.

Notes

1. English was deliberately chosen so as to give the students an opportunity to practise writing for real communication

- without being too concerned over linguistic accuracy.
2. It must be noted that no specific training in providing written feedback was given. However, throughout the course, these students were encouraged to express opinions, exchange their views and comments on each other's performances.
 3. In an ideal situation, the reformulator is supposed to be a native speaker of English. However, in most EFL classrooms, the teacher who is a non-native speaker has to do the reformulation, which is also the case in this study.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Associate Professor Antikar Rongsa-ard who read and made helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

The Author

Supanee Chinnawongs has been teaching EFL at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI) since 1980. She obtained her Ph.D. in Linguistics from Georgetown University, U.S.A. She is currently chairperson for CULI's Curriculum Committee. Her academic interests include teaching reading and writing and language testing.

References

- Allwright, J. (1988). Don't correct – Reformulate! ELT Documents, 129, 109-116.
- Atari, O. & Triki, M. (2000). The formal features of oral and literate strategies of communication: Their implications for EFL writing revision. IRAL, 38, 95-107.
- Beaven, M. (1977). Individualized goal setting, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.) Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging (pp. 135-156). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Caudrey, T. (1996). Process writing. In G. Fulcher (Ed.) Review of English Language Teaching, 6 (2), 3-23.
- Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. RELJ Journal, 15, 1-14.
- Chinnawongs, S. (forthcoming). Needs, problems, and instructional preferences of EAP science student writers: Teacher versus student perspectives. Thai TESOL Bulletin, 15 (1).
- Cumming, A. (1985). Responding to the writing of ESL students. In M. Maguire & A. Pare (Eds.) Patterns of development (pp. 58 – 75). Ottawa: Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Fathman, A. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing (pp. 178 – 190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. (1996). Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective. London: Longman.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. Language Teaching Research, 4, 33 – 54.
- Jacobs, G. (1989). Mis correction in peer feedback in writing class. RELJ Journal, 20, 68-76.
- James, C. (1998). Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. London : Longman.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written responses. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing (pp. 57 – 68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing class. Foreign Language Annals, 25, 123 – 143.
- Levenston, E.A. (1978). Error analysis of free composition: The theory and the practice. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4, 1-11.
- Lockhart, C. & Ng, P. (1993). How useful is peer response? Perspectives, 5, 17 – 29.
- Radecki, P.M. & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. System, 16, 355-365.
- Raimes, A. (1983). Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In A. Freedman et al. (Eds.), Learning to write: First language/second language (pp. 258 – 272). London: Longman.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229 – 258.

Reid, J. (1993). Teaching ESL writing. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice – Hall.

Sommers, N. (1984). Responding to student writing. In S. McKay (Ed.), Composing in a second language (pp. 160 – 169). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Semke, H.D. (1984). The effects of the red pen. Foreign Language Annals, 17, 7-31.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46, 327 – 369.

Wall, D. et al. (1988). Developing student writing – A subject tutor and writing tutors compare points of view. ELT Documents, 129, 117 – 129.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195 – 209.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced students: Six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165 – 187.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79 – 101.

Appendix 1

Writing Task 1

Early this year Thailand's national parks increased the entrance fee for foreign visitors from 20 to 200 baht. Since then, there have been a lot of complaints from foreign tourists about the unfair treatment as Thai visitors are only charged at 20 baht.

Suppose you were Forestry Department authorities, how would you defend your position that the increase is necessary and fair. Write an essay giving at least 3 reasons to support your opinion.

Writing Task 2

You may choose to do either A or B.

- A. Some people prefer to work for a large company. Others prefer to work for a small company. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of these two options. Use specific examples to support your answer.
- B. Select a topic of your own and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the issue you have chosen. Use specific examples to support your answer.

Appendix 2

Peer Review Worksheet

Reader response and revision

1. **Reader: Read through the draft twice. Then, without looking back at the essay,**
 - a. write one sentence that states what you think are the main ideas of this paper.
 - b. explain what you liked best.
 - c. describe where you were confused.
 - d. what specific detail do you remember most clearly?
 - e. write a short letter to your partner explaining how his/her writing can be improved. BE SPECIFIC and explain WHY you think these changes will be helpful to the reader.
2. **Writer: Complete these sentences:**
 - a. The most helpful comment I received was _____

 - b. The least helpful comment was _____
_____ because _____

(Adapted from Reid, J, 1993)

Appendix 3

Sample Text

The student's version (Writing Task 1)

Although, there are a lot of complaints from tourists. In my opinion, increasing the entrance fee for foreign visitors coming to Thailand's nation park is necessary. For the first reason, this current economy of Thailand is the most depressed in history. Therefore, more money's flow into our country is important for this crisis. I think that the brightest way is from traveling because there exist many beautiful natural place in Thailand attracting a lot of foreign tourists.

Moreover, decreasing of Thailand's currency rate makes money's value of 20- baht so tiny. As the result, increasing entrance fee makes sense in economic feeling furthermore, the cost of living in Thailand is so cheap. I think that 200- baht for entrance fee is proper rate. Finally, because there are a lot of tourist which come to Thailand' natural park. So the environment is destroyed rapidly. Money is necessary for maintainance.

From above I said, I think that increasing the entrance fee is fair and necessary.

The teacher's reformulation

Although there are a lot of complaints from foreign tourists, in my opinion, increasing the entrance fee for foreign visitors coming to Thailand's national parks is necessary. For the first reason, the current economy of Thailand is the worst in history. Therefore, more cash flow into the country is important in boosting the economy. I think tourism would be the best source of income because there exist many beautiful natural tourist attractions in Thailand.

Moreover, a fee increase is quite reasonable given the devaluation of the Thai baht. Foreign tourists probably spend less for better services while travelling in Thailand. Furthermore, the cost of living here is relatively low. Therefore, a 200 baht fee is a proper rate.

Finally, high maintenance costs are required if a lot of tourists come to visit the national parks. With an influx of tourists, the environment is likely to be destroyed rapidly.

For all these reasons, I think increasing the entrance fee is fair and necessary.

Appendix 4

Questionnaire on Writing Evaluation

(You may answer in Thai.)

1. Name _____
2. Faculty _____ Major _____
3. Of the two writing tasks assigned:

☐ a justifying the need to increase the parks' entrance fee

and ☐ b discussing the advantages and disadvantages

- which one do you find the more difficult? _____ ☐ a _____ ☐ b

Why? _____

- which one do you like the best? _____ ☐ a _____ ☐ b

Why? _____

4. For the writing assignment, do you prefer
_____ to choose your own topic?
_____ to write on the topic assigned (by the teacher)?

Why? _____

5. Before you write, how often do you prepare an outline of your essay?
_____ always _____ often _____ sometimes _____ rarely _____ never

6. To what extent ...

	Most helpful \longleftrightarrow Least helpful				
	5	4	3	2	1
6.1 do you find reading the first drafts of your essay help you produce a better second draft?					
6.2 do you find reading an essay written by your classmate help you improve your own writing?					
6.3 do you think peer evaluation or comments help improve your writing?					
6.4 does peer evaluation help you improve your writing in terms of...?					
a. content					
b. organization					
c. language					
6.5 does text formulation help you deal with your writing problem(s)?					

To what extent.....

	Most helpful \longleftrightarrow Least helpful				
	5	4	3	2	1
6.6 do you think these feedback strategies will help?					
a. Teacher only indicates errors and students self-correct.					
b. Teacher crosses out all errors and writes in correction.					
c. Teacher gives written comments.					
d. Teacher explains common errors to class.					
e. Teacher talks to individual students about their writing.					
f. Teacher reformulates each student's texts.					

	Most likely \longleftrightarrow Least likely				
	5	4	3	2	1
7. To what extent are you likely to have problems in these areas when you write?					
a. Grammar and sentence structure					
b. Vocabulary/Word choice					
c. Organization					
d. Generation of ideas/Content					
e. Spelling/punctuation					

8. Do you think what should be done if one wants to be a good writer?

9. Other comments or suggestions in terms of writing instruction.
