

บทความวิชาการ (Academic Article)

Approaches, Feedback and Assessment in EFL Writing Course at Undergraduate Level at University of Phayao, Thailand: Teachers' Empiric Experience

Singkham Rakpa¹

สิงห์คำ รักป่า¹

Abstract

This academic article aims to elucidate teacher's crucial mandatory teaching missions involving with three main tasks; techniques in teaching writing or writing approaches, feedback provision, and writing assessment. The elucidation of three mentioned tasks was written along with the supporting data from interview with three writing teachers of University of Phayao, Thailand. Interview data was based on empiric teaching and learning practice in the second semester academic year 2012. The data obtained from the empiric teaching experience revealed that three main tasks had been completely carried out with some constraints due to certain conditions within learner's language ability and with certain context and these three tasks were not practical in actual teaching and learning setting.

Keywords : EFL Writing Course, Approaches, Written Assessment, Written Feedback

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้มุ่งอธิบายภารกิจสำคัญ 3 ประการ ด้านการสอนการเขียน คือเทคนิควิธีการสอน การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ และการประเมินการเขียนของผู้สอนการเขียน จากข้อมูลเชิงประจักษ์ที่ได้จากการสัมภาษณ์ผู้สอนการเขียนสามท่าน ที่รับผิดชอบสอนการเขียน ให้กับนิสิตระดับปริญญาตรีสาขาภาษาอังกฤษในภาคเรียนที่ 2 ปีการศึกษา 2555 พบว่า อาจารย์ทั้งสามท่านได้ทำภารกิจทั้งสามได้ครบถ้วน แต่ในการปฏิบัติจริงในชั้นเรียน เทคนิคการสอน การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับและการประเมิน ไม่สามารถปฏิบัติได้ทั้งหมด เพราะข้อจำกัดและเงื่อนไขด้านความสามารถด้านภาษาของนิสิตและบริบทในชั้นเรียน

คำสำคัญ: การสอนการเขียน, วิธีการสอน, การประเมินการเขียน, การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ

¹ สาขาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา จังหวัดพะเยา 56000

¹ English Department, School of Liberal Arts, University of Phayao, Phayao Province 56000

Corresponding author e-mail : s.rakpa@gmail.com

Received: 11 November 2013; Accepted: 25 April 2014

1. Introduction

English majored undergraduates of University of Phayao are required to enroll the core subjects that are compulsory to meet the major requirements. The paragraph writing course is one of them. The course [1] aims at training students to be exposed with intensive productive skills (writing) at paragraph level to effectively communicate, being able to write main paragraph and supporting sentences with cohesion devices. In teaching writing, writing teachers have to engage themselves with three important tasks relating to writing, techniques in teaching writing or approaches, feedback provision and writing assessment, and these are required and inevitable jobs. In real practice, these may not be practical and effective with certain constraints. These three tasks are obligatory and challenging for writing teachers to carry out their teaching writing to achieve the final goal of writing.

Theoretical framework: Three main tasks for writing teacher

A. Techniques in teaching writing

As mentioned, in writing class, writing teachers' teaching mission involves with three main tasks. Firstly, effective approaches to teaching writing are to be carefully chosen and introduced. Six prominent approaches as pointed by Raimes (1983) [2] are: Controlled-to-Free Approach, the Free-Writing Approach, the Pattern-Paragraph Approach, the Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach, the Communicative Approach, and the Process Approach.

Controlled-to-Free Approach emphasizes speech and writing served to achieve mastery of grammatical and syntactic forms. Raimes points out that controlled writing starts when learners

are supplied with "a great deal of the content and/or form [such as] an outline to complete, a paragraph to manipulate, a model to follow, or a passage to continue" (p.95). The controlled-to-free approach, in practical way, is consecutive: first, sentence exercises are given to students, then they are provided with paragraphs to copy or manipulate grammatically. Then, they are allowed to change questions to statements, present to past, or plural to singular, words to clauses or sentence combination. Students are permitted to move to autonomous writing. The Free-Writing Approach focuses on content and fluency rather than accuracy and form. In other words, this approach emphasizes writing quantity rather than quality. In actual practice, vast amounts of free writing on given topics with only slight correction are assigned by teachers. The successive process begins with belief that once ideas are written down on the page, grammatical accuracy and organization are followed. In this manner, 5-10 minutes writing activity is given by the class teacher. Students are free to produce writing on any topic without worrying about grammar and spelling.

The Paragraph-Pattern Approach stresses on organization rather than accuracy of grammar or fluency of content. The approach emphasizes the importance of organization at the above-sentence level or organization on the paragraph level. In this approach, students are allowed to copy paragraphs and imitate model passages. Exercises on writing directly or indirectly linked to how parts of writing are organized into paragraph units. For instance, students are asked to rearrange scramble sentences into their correct order. In this approach, teachers need to teach students know things like topic sentences, linking devices, as well as ordering. Besides, writing

practices are carried out in variety of ways. The approach is practiced based on the principle that people from different cultures have their own way to construct and organize communication with each other.

The Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach stresses on simultaneous work more than one composition feature. Teachers who follow this approach maintain that writing cannot be seen as composed of separate skills which are learned sequentially. Therefore, students should be trained to pay attention to organization while they also work on the necessary grammar and syntax. This approach links the purpose of writing to the forms that are needed to convey message.

The Communicative Approach stresses on the purpose of writing and the audience for it. Student writers are encouraged to act like writers in real- life situation and ask themselves the crucial questions about purpose why they are writing this, and audience that will read their work. In practice, students create writing exercises whereas their teacher, other students, or people from out of the class become the audience.

Process Approach is defined as an approach where the focus and emphasis are on techniques and procedures rather than on the learning outcome(s).The Process Approach does not focus on written product, but on the process of writing (pre-during and post). In practical mode, process writing is the process which students write their works following a model specified by the instructor in each stages and sub-stages. Emphasis shifts from the nature of the final product, to the process used to create the final product. The process approach is currently popular and recognized as an effective one that helps develop students' writing.

B. Feedback provision

Secondly, teachers have to deal with feedback provision to students' written works. In writing class, what can normally be observed is a writing teacher pays attention to pupils by providing feedback to pupils' written works. Consequently, feedback becomes essential in terms of providing encouragement to students and is critical in improving as well as consolidating learning. Several research results confirm the importance of feedback in terms of its value as pointed by F. Hyland (1998) [3] that second language writers highly valued teacher written feedback and Leki (1990) [4] states that feedback on grammar is predominantly favored by many learners. Feedback and its goal are to teach skills that help students improve their writing proficiency with minimal errors and maximum clarity. Accordingly, teachers should find the effective way in enabling pupils by using feedback in terms of providing assisting.

Forms of feedback

There are two general forms of feedback, feedback on form and feedback on content [5]. The first category is the work of a teacher whose task mainly deals with correction of surface errors; locating the place and type of error without stressing correction provision to point out errors. After this, students are required to copy the corrections and underlined indication and they have to correct errors on their own. The second feedback on content consists of comments written by teachers on student's drafts showing problems with suggestions for improvements on future rewrite. Tickoo [6] suggested four forms of feedback; self-correction, peer-correction, correction in musical chairs and in pairs and group workshops. He again gives suggestion for busy teachers in providing feedback to support

students' writing. Normal comments focusing on meaning in feedback are like; *give more examples ,change the sentence by making it clearer, this point or idea is difficult to understand etc.(p.82)*

Types of written feedback

According to Hyland [7] (2003), there are three types of written feedback, teacher written feedback, teacher-student conferencing and peer feedback. Teacher written feedback is normally done by the traditional writing teachers.

Teacher written feedback

Summary form of teacher written feedback to students as techniques can be given in accordance with the most common being commentary, rubrics or cover sheets, minimal making, taped comments, and electronic feedback. Among these, rubrics or coversheets

are said to be a highly recommended assessment tool because they are efficient and effective as far as grading matter is concerned. With clear guidelines for writing assignments, rubrics are also helpful to teachers to glade students' works. Besides, teachers are able to know the knowledge capacity of each student. This form of feedback is beneficial to teachers in terms of being transparent in grading practice. In rubric form, the criteria on content, reader awareness, style, mechanics, and process has been used for an assessment to the students' assignments. Holst [8] suggests criteria for writing evaluation ac with 6 levels; excellence, very good, good, satisfactory, weak and unacceptable. Byrne [9] (1988) suggests correction codes while giving feedback as shown in figure 1 below.

Figure 1 Correction Codes for an expository essay in a university writing class

Symbol	Meaning	Symbol	Meaning
S	Incorrect spelling	^	Something has been left out
W	Wrong word order	[]	Something is not necessary
T	Wrong Tense	PM	Meaning is not clear
C	Concord (subject and verb do not agree	P	Punctuation is wrong
NA	The usage is not appropriate		
WF	Wrong form		
S/F	Singular or plural form wrong		

Source: Byrne (1988)

Teacher-student conferencing

Face-to –face conferencing is another type of feedback provision. Hyland [10] points out it “has important advantages as it can supplement the limitations of one-way written feedback with the opportunities for “teacher and the student to negotiate the meaning of a text through dialogue” (McCarthy, 1992:1) [11]. Positive impact of conference can be found both in teachers and

students and conferences are successful in that way that “students are active participants, asking questions, clarifying meaning, and discussing their papers rather than passively accepting advice” (Hyland, 2003, p.192) [12]. Writing teachers can utilize face-to-face conferencing in different ways. He suggests several forms of conferences ; one-to-one activities between a teacher and a student outside, writing workshop where the students work

in their writing and consult their teachers or classmates when necessary, setting regular time (15 minutes every month) during teachers' office hours.

Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is referred as a practice in language education in which one student gives response to work of another student. In language scenario either first language or second language, especially writing skills, students are provided equally opportunities to learn from each other, checking each other's work along with comments. Comments obtained from peers are known as peer feedback. In practical way, it is a two-way process. In peer feedback practice, practical form normally includes corrections, opinions, suggestions, and ideas to each other. According to Lui & Carless, (2006, p. 280), peer feedback can be defined as '*a communication process through which learners enter into dialogues related to performance and standards*'. [13]

With regard to advantages of peer feedback, peer feedback is beneficial in terms of encouraging students do more practices in writing, building and increasing student's confidence, and equipping students with social affective strategies like careful listening, effective speaking, clear expressing, appreciating others, and compromising etc. In this regard, several studies advocate positive results. For instance, Ferris (1995) [14] points out a number of benefits of peer feedback such as confidence and critical thinking, multiple perspectives, a sense of classroom community, the level of their writing from sharing ideas and giving constructive comments. In the same line of thought, White and Caminero (1995) [15] opine that offering peer feedback and learning from each other among students is very beneficial also in this manner they learn to communicate effectively, and accept different views expressed by others while listening, thinking, and participating in careful, critical and constructive way.

Apart from the above works, comprehensive studies on impact and benefits of peer feedback by Kulsirisawad (2013), Mohammed Farrah (2012), Luiza Zeqiri (2012), Al-Jamal (2009), Hirose (2009), Tang and Tithecott (1999), and Lee (1997) [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] showed the positive result of peer feedback for writing skills in different ways. Peer feedback can be undertaken in many forms as suggested by Hounsell (2008) [23]. For example, students can give one another feedback on drafts or assignment plans, e.g. by making evaluative comments and offering suggestions for improvement; students can give comments on a piece of written work or presentation that are designed to sit alongside, or round out, written feedback from tutors etc.

Peer feedback, in practical way, is a two-way process from one student to another in writing setting. It is merely a form of comments, but prior to the use of peer feedback students should be informed about advantages, purposes, being respectful to classmates' works as well (Hyland (2003, p.202) [24].

Peer response sheet

To make peer feedback more effective in class, there is a set of sheets called peer response sheets that "help structure peer review activities by providing guidance on what participants should look as they read". Response sheets can therefore provide a valuable form of indirect instruction about good writing practices and genre format" (Hirose, 2009) [25]. Mittan (1989: 216-17) [26] suggest principles for designing like, clear instructions as to the purpose, audience, and procedure for completing the form, limiting the sheet to one page, using the questions that give encouragement questions and suggestions, and varying the question types like open-ended types, reformulation of ideas etc.

Ferris and Hedgcock (1998; 178) [27] offer general guidelines for effective peer response to

make peer response as integral part of the course, as the model the process, to build peer response skills progressively throughout the term etc. Although positive impact of peer feedback is clearly seen as shown in numbers of research reports, it still has some drawbacks in using peer feedback in class like trust and reliability among learners. They still prefer teacher's feedback. In brief, an improvement of second language is not complete without feedback in terms of providing the writers with sense of audience and synthesizing them to the needs of readers. Besides, it promotes accuracy and clear ideas and develops an understanding of written genres.

C. Written Assessment

After the completion of language teaching and learning procedure, the successive process is teachers spend their class time to assess students' language ability. An assessment is beneficial for both teachers and learners alike as pointed out by Cohen (1994,) [28] that such assessment is valuable for both the teachers and learners. The assessment tasks are not intimidating process for learners but are developmental in nature. Learners are provided ample opportunities to demonstrate what they know and do not know, and providing useful feedback both the learners and for their teachers. It means that when teaching writing comes to an end, the written assessment, the most essential final part of writing, dealing with scoring method and criteria to assess students' written works are obligatory. Trupe [29] stated that in general assessment of writing skill, two forms can be used, formative or designed and summative. The first refers to the assessment that evaluates learners' strengths and weaknesses to effect remedial action whereas the second form aims at seeing how much student has learned at the end of a course.

Forms of written assessment

Writing assessment can take many forms. The prominent forms in actual application are writing product and the writing process. In process assessment, teachers monitor the process which students use as they write whereas in product assessment teachers evaluate students' finished compositions. In both types of assessment, the goal is to help students become better writers. (See McKenzie & Tompkins (1984) [30].

The methods of process assessment

The methods of process assessment can be done via three methods, conferencing, anecdotal records and checklists and using self-assessment.

A. Conferencing is a central means of assessing the writing process. It is a meeting to discuss work in progress. In practice, as teachers listens to students talk about writing, they can learn how to help students work through the process. While in the process, teachers should balance the amount of their talk with the students' talk and allow the students to take responsibility for discussing and thinking about their own writing.

B. using *anecdotal records and checklists*, teachers can chart students' development and gather information that will help them determine grades and quality. Anecdotal records provide teachers with details about students' writing that provide a tool for continuous literacy assessment. Over time, these records provide comprehensive pictures of the students as writers.

McKenzie & Tompkins (1984) [30] as quoted in the site provided *anecdotal records and checklists* for teachers to gather information that can help them determine grade and quality of students' work. The main content of checklist consists of pre-writing, drafting, revising and publishing. In each stage, teachers carefully check sub-stages if students follow them. For example, in the pre-writing, teachers check whether students are able to identify the purpose of

the writing activity. (See process writing checklist list in McKenzie & Tompkins's work)

C. using self-assessment

When students assess their own writing and writing processes, they develop a sense of responsibility. In self- assessment, students assess their own writing and decide which pieces will be shared or evaluated. As students work through the

writing process, they may address the quality of the writing and the effectiveness of the message. They may also judge if they have met the requirements for the given assignment. Early in the course, teachers can introduce students to the concept of self-assessment by creating a handout with questions such as sample in figure 2.

Figure 2 Sample Self-Assessment

Does my composition make sense?
Does it say what I want it to say?
Does it say it clearly?
Can the reader follow my thinking (i.e., my organization)?
Are there any details that need to be deleted? Added?
Am I happy with this composition? What makes this piece of writing strong? Weak?

Product assessment

Second evaluation is based on product. Assessment of the process which students use when writing is of great importance; however, the finished composition or product is also important as an indication of writing achievement. Product assessment is often equated with a grade, yet this type of assessment attends only to the students' cognitive domain.

Forms of product assessment

Holistic scoring

Forms of product assessment include both holistic and analytic scoring. Holistic scoring is one of the forms of product assessment stressing the rapid way of judging students' overall performance without using a checklist. Teachers pay attention to aspects of composition like content and conventions. Scores are given to the works after being holistically assessed. Diederich [31] provides sample writing rubrics with criteria from 1-5 to judge students' overall works. In short, 5/5 score is awarded to the work with well organization, 4/5 score for work clear

and recognizable form, 3/5 score for work in recognizable form with superfluous information, 2/5 score for inconsistent and meandering work, and 1/5 score for work with lacks focus and coherence, and without organizational pattern. (See full detail in Diederich (1974). In fact, holistic scores often emphasize creativity and overall effect. It is important for students to be given evaluation criteria before the commencement of writing.

Analytic Scoring

An analytic scoring is the way to assess students' work on each criterion separately; high weight of score given to one factor like structure and low score for conventions or mechanics. Analytic scoring may be slower than holistic scoring in terms of assessing, but provides more detailed feedback than the holistic scoring. Diederich's Scale (1974) is the most widely used analytic measure but it must be used cautiously in order to reflect the instructional focus. It is easy to adapt the scale for specific purposes. (See table 1)

Table 1 Sample Analytic Scoring Criteria

1-Poor 2-Weak 3-Average 4-Good 5-Excellent	
Writer:	Reader:
Quality and development of ideas	1 2 3 4 5
Organization, relevance, movement	1 2 3 4 5
Style, flavour, individuality	1 2 3 4 5
Wording and phrasing	1 2 3 4 5
Grammar, sentence structure	1 2 3 4 5
Punctuation	1 2 3 4 5
Spelling	1 2 3 4 5
Manuscript form, legibility	1 2 3 4 5
Total score:	

Source: (Diederich, 1974, p.54 [31]). Adapted from *Measuring Growth in English*, the National Council of Teachers of English.

Approaches to scoring

One of the hardest aspects of writing for teachers is to provide scoring to students' work as methods of scoring deals with giving marks after evaluation and an appropriate approach to scoring for teachers. In providing scoring to written works, reliable and valid scoring after assessing are very crucial and assessment depends on human graders. However, at present in pedagogical field the role of computer in writing scoring is highly emphasized. Rudner et al (2001) [32] have overviewed the three well-known approaches to scoring written essay by computer. They are; Project Essay Grade (PEG), introduced by Ellis Page in 1966, Intelligent Essay Assessor (IEA), first introduced for essay grading in 1997 by Thomas Landauer and Peter Foltz, and E-rater, used by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and developed by Jill Burstein

To do scoring is not just giving marks, but criteria are needed to use in the rubric to score the writing sample analytically. At paragraph level, students' essay is scored with respect to different elements on scale of low to high depending on

writing teachers who set the criteria. In this regard, Litz (2007) [33] suggests six different elements on a scale of one (low) to six (high); overall development, organization, support, sentence structure, word choice and mechanics.

Stix (1997) [34] (as cited in Litz) refers this rubric co-construction process as negotiable contracting. His research confirms the effectiveness of assessment and appropriate direction provided by teachers can benefit students in many ways. Students can accurately assess their strengths and weaknesses. Besides, they also gradually regard assessment as a positive tool for educational enrichment and growth not as an arbitrary form of reward or humiliation.

To reach the goal of education, the final process of the study given to learners is an assessment or evaluation. In practical, the assessment, to teachers, may be regarded as an unwelcome work. However, it is a very crucial aspect of teaching and the evaluation requires procedures which link closely to planning, design, teaching strategies.

At the intermediate and advanced levels in writing, when the teaching and learning come to evaluation, teachers face questions what aspects of writing that should be concerned in evaluating student writing, and to the weighting to be given to

each aspect. (Tickoo, 2004, p.83) [35]. Brown (1994, p.342) (quoted in Tickoo) suggested three areas to assess students' written work (See table 2 below) can be a direct answer to questions faced by teachers.

Table 2: An evaluation for student's writing

Content	Discourse	Syntax
- thesis statement	- topic sentence	- vocabulary
- related ideas	- paragraph unity	- mechanics
- development of ideas through experience, illustration, facts, opinions	- transitions	- spelling
- use of description, cause or effect, comparison or contrast	- discourse markers	- punctuation
- consistence focus	- cohesion	- citation or references (if applicable)
- organization	- rhetorical conventions	- neatness and appearance
- effectiveness or introduction	- reference	
- logical sequence of ideas	- fluency	
- conclusion	- economy	
- appropriate length	- variation	

Assessment of writing in the English language classroom with traditional way of grading plays the crucial role but should not be the sole means for assessing student's writing. Writing assessment can take many forms. The prominent forms in actual application are writing product and the writing process. In both types of assessment, the goal is to help students become better writers.

Normally, writing teachers may use different approaches to score their students' written works with appropriate guidelines and process to scoring. It is very compulsory to set criteria for scoring, otherwise writing assessment is aimless. It is very challenging task for writing teachers to carry on writing class to reach the final goal of writing.

Empirical data on University of Phayao's writing lecturers

In teaching writing teacher have three commitments to perform to accomplish the final goal of writing course: approaches and writing techniques, feedback provision, and written assessment. Techniques or approaches employed by teachers sometimes may be unpractical with some constrains related to many factors such as teacher, learner, text, materials and learning environments. It is automatically for writing teachers to adapt, apply and employ different approaches and techniques in eclectic way to suit with learning context. With regard to feedback provision, writing teachers can handle with this task using their own ways or follow feedback provision suggested by academic scholars, especially in ESL and EFL writing scenarios. In doing so doing, both ways may still have some limitations due to certain conditions in actual practice in writing class. The last task, written

assessment, as well, may be workable with some techniques and formats designed by scholars. In contrast, writing teachers in EFL context may find some constraints to employ written assessment techniques designed and proposed by some scholars. As a result, they have to adjust and manage written assessment on their own ways to make their mission accomplished.

The following account deals with empiric data gathered from real experience of the University of Phayao's three writing female teachers. They reflected their teaching writing experience based on three tasks: approaches or writing techniques, feedback provision, and written assessment. Negative reflections like limitations, drawbacks of teaching techniques, feedback provisions, and writing evaluation are elaborated. In contrast, they also disclosed positive aspects of effective teaching approaches, feedback provision and written assessments.

Profile of Teacher, students, and Writing Course

Pattama (pseudonym), a female teacher, is qualified with master degree in ELT /EFL and 5 year teaching experience. Her main assigned responsible teaching job is mainly on writing at paragraph level. Majority of their learners was from English major. In English major, 2nd year undergraduates are required to enroll the core subjects that are compulsory to meet the English major requirements in which the Paragraph Writing Course is one of them. The course aims at training students to be exposed with intensive productive skills (writing) at paragraph level to effectively communicate, being able to produce main paragraph and supporting sentences with cohesion devices [45]

The account of teachers' real teaching experience is here elucidated based the data obtained from interviews with three writing

teachers who taught undergraduates majoring in English, Paragraph Writing. The content of interview question is based on three main tasks involving with teaching writing. The following is a set of questions in interview to explore writings teachers' views on teaching techniques, feedback provision, written assessment, and real practical aspects in teaching and learning scenario. (See figures 5-7 below)

Figure 5 Questions for interview

Please indicate your choice with a tick ✓ in brackets []

A. Approaches to teaching writing:

1. Do you use any of the following approaches?

[] Controlled-to-Free Approach emphasizes

[] The Free-Writing Approach

[] Paragraph-Pattern Approach

[] The Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach

[] The Communicative Approach

[] in integrated way

2. From your real experience, are above approaches affective in actual practice? If they are, what are good points? (Give 1 approach as example) _____

If not, what are constraints? _____

3. What do you normally want to see in students' works? Rank your choice with number 1,2,3 respectively

[] fluency [] accuracy [] fluency and accuracy

[] mastery of grammatical and syntactic forms

[] organization

[] purpose of writing and the audience

Figure 6 Questions for interview**B. Feedback provision**

Teachers have to deal with feedback provision to students' written works

1. What form of feedback do you usually give feedback to students' work?

☐ doing correction of surface errors; marking of the place and type of error without providing correction form

☐ comments written by teachers on student's drafts that usually point out problems and offer suggestions for improvements on future rewrite

2. What type of feedback you employed in your writing class?

☐ teacher written feedback

☐ teacher-student conferencing

☐ peer feedback

☐ mixed type

3. Are these three types of feedback really effective in your class? If yes, why are they practical? _____ If not, what are limitations _____

4. How is students' response toward your feedback?

☐ Negative or ☐ positive

Figure 7 Questions for interview**C. Written Assessment**

The written assessment, the most essential final part of writing, deals with scoring method and criteria to assess students' written works.

1. What form of written assessment do you normally use in class and it works in actual practice?

☐ writing process: teachers monitor the process in writing used by students.

☐ writing product: teachers evaluate students' finished compositions.

2. Are these two really effective in your class? If yes, why are they practical? _____ If not, what are limitations? _____

A. Approaches to teaching writing: Teacher 1

To answer the first question "Do you use any of the following approaches?" Pattama who taught 50 English majored undergraduates Paragraph Writing preferred using the Grammar-

Syntax-Organization Approach. To her real experience, some teaching approaches are effective with some limitations. She liked the Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach because it has aspects of grammar, syntax and organization. This approach also is collaborative with the main objectives of the Paragraph Writing Course which aims at training students to be able to write main paragraph and supporting sentences with cohesion devices to effectively communicate. In actual practice, this approach works well. However, there are some limitations or constraints when students do not have sufficient vocabulary, grammar competence, idea organization, content management, and essay format. It is impossible to utilize each aspect due to time limitation and students' language competency. For example, according to her view, writing cannot be seen as composed of separate skills which are learned sequentially. Therefore, students should be trained to pay attention to organization while they also work on the necessary grammar and syntax.

What she actually found is that mostly students are familiar with leaning language in separated skill or paired one (reading and writing). Integrated way of teaching does not work well and she has to adapt the Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach to suit with her students' background. The word "organization" in writing seems new to her students. They knew nothing about organization. As a result, she devoted her time lecturing about how to organize a paragraph. In a nutshell, her students had to be taught grammar competence, idea organization, content management, and essay format to make themselves capable enough with activities assigned in the Grammar-Syntax-Organization Approach.

In class activity and home assignments; she wanted to see students' mastery of grammatical and syntactic forms as its aspects cover the body of knowledge of grammar and syntax which are primary bases for writing skill. In reality, her learners' works were not in satisfactory ones, as in their assignments accuracy (grammar and syntax) and fluency aspects were not found together.

B. Feedback provision

In writing class, teachers have to deal with feedback provision to students' written works. To the question what form of feedback she usually provided to her students' work" the first teacher answered that with regard to feedback provision she prefers doing correction of surface errors; marking of the place and type of error without providing correction form due to her workload and time limitation. Nevertheless, she also did not comments written on students' drafts pointing out problems and giving suggestions for student's future improvement. She also called slow learners to meet in person after class. She observed that slow learners felt relaxed and comfortable in personal meeting. They felt free to ask questions related surface errors they could not figure out in class. To assist them improve writing, she devoted her extra time for slow learners' improvement. Besides, she did correction of surface errors; marking of the place and type of error with correction codes.

Regarding type of feedback, she used peer feedback followed by teacher written feedback and teacher-student conferencing respectively. She trained students how to be good peer commenting others' works. Face-to-face conference, 1 hour after office work and small workshop on writing were their favorite activities carried out by them. They opined that all these types of feedback were effective and practical.

Yet, teachers had to know which to be used first and so on. Limitations found according to them, were related to daily teaching workload and large number of students. For them, feedback provision was time consumption. They had to spend ample time for this task. Frequently, they had to review grammar rules when students repeated the same errors like singular and plural nouns, irregular verbs etc. In terms of students' response to feedback, both positive and negative response was given. Some students preferred teacher's feedback rather than their own classmate's peer. Some also kept silent on teacher's feedback on their works. They were not certain about what and why their teacher commented. The same errors were recommitted. This shows that students did not pay attention to teacher's feedback.

C. Written Assessment

Pattama preferred product assessment to writing process assessment. She opined that they like product assessment because it is very convenient for fast assessment and also easy to fix the number of assignments. However, she also use process assessment in class depending on type of essay i.e., cause and effect and argumentative essay. Pattama pointed out that process assessment, though effective and beneficial to learners, cannot be used in class throughout semester. To the question whether process assessment and product assessment are really practical, she said 'not really' with some explanations. According to her, both are workable, but process assessment is time consuming one whereas the product is ideal for academic assignment and grading system which stresses on number of students' written works. In brief, three writing teachers use both forms; much weight is put to product assessment.

A. Writing Approach Teacher 2-3

Both Narakorn (pseudonym), the second female lecturer with 30 students and Chadana ((pseudonym), the third female teacher with 25 students, preferred using the integrated way as she could combine good aspects of each approach in her writing class setting. To their real experience, some teaching approaches are effective with some limitations. They liked Free-Writing Approach because the main emphasis in the Free-Writing Approach is on content and fluency rather than accuracy and form or emphasizing writing quantity rather than quality. Both had an idea that no matter what were written on the page, then gradually accuracy of grammar and organization would follow. Nevertheless In free writing, students working in small group were allowed to select a free topic as they liked, and then Narakorn and Chanada asked their students to plan writing structure, and trained them how to organize, find topic and supporting sentence and concluding sentence. After, students were able to compose. In actual practice, a piece of composition consumes much time. Although the activity works well, to their observation, few students worked while the rest did nothing but wait. At stage of writing, both lecturers further described, students were allowed to write in their mother language in case of difficult word. Practically, they noted down difficult words in Thai language. Next, they would utilize Thai to English translation technique and this resulted in run-on and fragment problem. Their works needed feedback from the teachers. Pertaining to

constraints, free writing approach works for certain extend due to students' vocabulary limitation, the use of words in a real context, and owing to the adaptation in using sentence structure at paragraph level. Besides, the influences of writing structure of Thai which continue narration without rhetorical pattern like English. Finally, both teachers concluded that free-writing approach would work effectively for students whose basic use of English and vocabulary were good enough. What they really wanted to see in their students' works was fluency and accuracy.

B. Feedback provision

With regard to the form of feedback, both teachers normally give comments written on their student's drafts pointing out problems and offered suggestions for future improvements. To the question about type of feedback, Narakorn and Chanada combined teacher written feedback, teacher-student conferencing and peer feedback together depending on class context. In practice, they both found that these types of feedback when being used together provide their great benefits. For example, peer feedback came to effect when finished written works were given for the first draft along with editing checklist. Those who did work as peer feedback would check works holistically or paragraph organization, and also provided feedback on linguistic features. What had been found in the first draft work was the peers were not able to understand what was written. What the peer could do was to do in accordance with their understanding. Then students would edit their works based on the

peers' comments and suggestions, and submit the second draft to the teacher for the feedback, scores, suggestions and word and sentence corrections. To finalize each work, it took time to do feedback. Both teachers felt happy when their students asked about feedback when they were doubtful about.

C. Written assessment

To answer the question related form of written assessment, both lecturers employed writing product that they evaluated students' finished compositions. They both pointed out that writing product worked well and did not consume time like the writing process. Actually they preferred both form. They had to choose writing product because of time constraint in course syllabus. The writing product served teacher's need in terms of time limitation.

3. Conclusion

In conclusion, three tasks assigned to three writing teacher are practical in real teaching and learning context in the University of Phayao with some constraints as shown in the empiric interview data revealed by Pattama, Narakorn and Chanada the writing teachers. They did not rely solely on one approach of teaching writing, but employed eclectic method to make their writing more effective stressing accuracy, fluency and organization. In feedback provision, Pattama mainly did correction on surface errors due to limited time and do more comments if time and other condition permit whereas Narakorn and Chanada used mixed types of feedback teacher written feedback, teacher-student conferencing and peer feedback were used. Three teachers

preferred product assessment as it was easy and convenient to give marks to written works and it was not time consuming.

The three main tasks were clarified based on their significance, advantages and, guidelines from well-known-scholars. In practical way, the above three tasks under the supervision of the writing teacher of the University of Phayao work well with learning and teaching context of University of Phayao. However, they were not practical due to certain drawbacks related to teachers, learners, text, material and learning and teaching environment. Data gather from interview reveals that mission on three tasks of teaching writing had been accomplished for certain extend.

4. References

1. Undergraduate Manual. Nareusan University. 2008. p.629.
2. Raimes, A. Techniques in teaching writing. New York: Oxford University. 1983.
3. Heyland, F. The impact if teacher-written feedback on individual writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7 (3), 255-86. 1998.
4. Leki, I. Coaching from the margins: issues written response. In B.Kroll (ed.), Second Language writing: insights from the language classroom (pp.57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Hyland, K. Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003.
6. Tickoo, M L Teaching and Learning English: A sourcebook for Teachers and Teacher-Trainers. New Delhi: Oriented Longman. 2004. pp.81-82.

7. Hyland, K. Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003.
8. Holst, J.K. Write 101: Writing English. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University.1993.
9. Byrne D. Teaching writing skills. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education. 1988.
10. Hyland, K. Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003.
11. McCahey, S.J. The teacher, the author, and the text: variations in form and content of writing conferences. Journal of Reading Behavior, 24 (1), 51-82. In Hyland, K. Second language writing. Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003. p.192.
12. Hyland, K. Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003.
13. Liu, N. & Carless, D. (2006). "Peer feedback, the learning element of peer assessment". Teaching in Higher Education. 11(3). 279-290.
14. Ferris, D. (1995). "Students reactions to teacher response in multiple draft composition classrooms." TESOL Quarterly. 29. 33-53.
15. White, A. S. & Caminero, R. (1995). "Using process writing as a learning tool in the foreign language class". The Canadian Modern Language Review. 51(2). 323-329.
16. Kulsirisawad P. Student's Perceptions on the Integration of Peer Feedback on Grammar Errors in EFL Writing Classroom. Retrieved June26,2013 from <http://ejournals.swu.ac.th/index.php/hm/article/viewFile/3038/3058>
17. Mohammed Farrah. The Impact of Peer Feedback on Improving the Writing skills among Hebron University Students. An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities). Vol. 26(1), 2012. http://www.academia.edu/1399177/The_Impact_of_Peer_Feedback_on_Improving_the_Writing_skills_among_Hebron_University_Students
18. Luiza Zeqiri. The Role of Peer Feedback in Developing Better Writing Skills. SEEU Review. Volume 8, Issue 1, Pages 42–62, ISSN (Print) 1409-7001, DOI: 10.2478/v10306-012-0003-8, February 2013
19. Al-Jamal. (2009). "The Impact of Peer Response in Enhancing Ninth Grader's Writing Skill".Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational & Psychologic Sciences. Vol. 1-N0. 1 January 2009. (Retrieved October 22nd. 2010) http://uqu.edu.sa/files2/tiny_mce/plugins/filemanager/files/admins/pag3673/e1.pdf.
20. Hirose, K. (2009) Cooperative Learning in English Writing Instruction through Peer Feedback. Aichi Prefectural University. Retrieved June26, 2013 from <http://jasce.jp/conf05/hirosepaper.doc>
21. Tang, G. M. & Tithecott, J. (1999). "Peer Response in ESL Writing". (Retrieved June 19th. 2011). TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL duCanada Vol. 16. No. 2. Spring 1999 www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/view/716. In Mohammed Farrah. The Impact of Peer Feedback on Improving the Writing skills among Hebron University Students. An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities). Vol. 26(1), 2012.
22. Lee, I. Peer Reviews in a Hong Kong Tertiary Classroom.TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL du Canada. 15(1). Winter 1997. Retrieved June 19th 2011). Retrieved June26, 2013 from www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/view/692/523.
23. Hounsell, D. The Trouble with Feedback: new challenges, emerging strategies. TLA Interchange Issue 2.<http://www.tla.ed.ac.uk/interchange/spring2008/hounsell2.htm> (2008)

- (Cited in Involving students in feedback: Enhancing Feedback University of Edinburgh. Retrieved June 26, 2013 from <http://www.enhancingfeedback.ed.ac.uk/staff/resources/involvingstudents.html><http://www.enhancingfeedback.ed.ac.uk/staff/resources/involvingstudent.html>
24. Hyland, K. Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards (ed.) Cambridge University Press. 2003.
25. Hirose, K. (2009) Cooperative Learning in English Writing Instruction through Peer Feedback. Aichi Prefectural University. Retrieved June26, 2013 from <http://jasce.jp/conf05/hirosepaper.doc>
26. Mittan R. The peer review process: harnessing students' communicative power. In D.Johnson and D. Roeb (eds.), Riches I nwriting: empowering ESL students (pp.207-19). New York: Longman.
27. Ferris, D., and Hedgcock, J.S.. Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process, practice. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
28. Cohen, A.D. Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom. Heinle& Heinle Publishers; 2 edition 1994.
29. Trupe, A. L. Formative Assessment of student writing, an article in Bridgewater College Writing Center. 2001. Retrieved June 15, 2008 from <http://www.bridgewater.edu/WritingCenter/Resources/sumform.htm>
30. McKenzie & Tompkins, 1984, p. 211. Used with permission of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis. Retrieved June 23rd, 2013 from <https://www.k12.gov.sk.ca/docs/ela102030/pg129.pdf>
31. Diederich, P. 1974. *Measuring growth in English*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. Retrieved June 23rd, 2013 from <http://schoolnet.org.za/CoL/ACE/course/ukzncore2b/documents/core2b.writing-product.htm>
32. Rudner, Lawrence - Gagne, Phill. An Overview of Three Approaches to Scoring Written Essays by Computer. ED458290 2001-12-00 ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation College Park MD. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED458290.pdf>
33. Litz, D. (2007). Student-directed Assessment in ESL/EFL: Designing Scoring Rubrics with Students. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 13(11). The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XIII, No. 11, November 2007 .Retrieved June 3rd, 2013 from <http://iteslj.org/>
34. Stix, A. (1997). Creating rubrics through negotiable contracting and assessment. *US Department of Education: ERIC #TM027246*.
35. Tickoo, M L. *Teaching and Learning English: A sourcebook for Teachers and Teacher-Trainers*. New Delhi: Oriented Longman. 2004. p.83