

The Effectiveness of Self-, Peer- and Teacher-Corrected Writing on Writing Achievement of Undergraduate Political Science Students at Thammasat University

การศึกษาเชิงเปรียบเทียบวิธีการตรวจและแก้ไขงานเขียนของนักศึกษา : วิธีที่นักศึกษาแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตัวเอง และเพื่อน และวิธีตรวจแก้ไขงานเขียนโดยครูผู้สอน

Saneh Thongrin
เสนห์ ทองรินทร์

Abstract

This experimental study investigates the effectiveness of self- and peer-correction techniques on students' writing ability. Thirty-six political science students were assigned to either control or experimental groups. Throughout a semester, the former received instruction with teacher correction while the latter practiced correcting errors on their own and with their peers. It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the writing achievement of both groups. The participants, however, revealed positive attitudes toward peer- and teacher-corrected writing. They most preferred writing instruction with a combination of teacher-, peer- and self-correction techniques.

บทคัดย่อ

ผู้วิจัยได้ศึกษาประสิทธิภาพของเทคนิคการสอนทักษะการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษ โดยให้ผู้เรียน แก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตัวเองและผู้เรียนแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดร่วมกับเพื่อน เพื่อเปรียบเทียบกับเทคนิคการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดของครู โดยแบ่งนักศึกษาคณะรัฐศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์ จำนวน 36 คนออกเป็น 2 กลุ่มฯ ละ 18 คน เป็นกลุ่มควบคุม และกลุ่มทดลอง กลุ่มควบคุมได้รับการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดจากครู ในขณะที่กลุ่มทดลองฝึกการเขียนโดยวิธีที่ผู้เรียนแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตัวเองและช่วยกันแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดกับเพื่อน จากผลการวิจัยพบว่า ผลสัมฤทธิ์ของทั้ง 2 กลุ่มไม่มีความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติ ผู้เรียนส่วนใหญ่มีทัศนคติที่ดีต่อวิธีการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดโดยเพื่อนและครู และพอใจให้ครูใช้ 3 วิธีร่วมกัน คือ ครู เพื่อน และผู้เรียนร่วมกันแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียน

Background of the Study

Errors are as necessary as they are unavoidable in learning a foreign/second

language. Many language teachers accept that errors of language learners are a natural phenomenon and an essential aspect of the teaching and learning process. Errors are,

moreover, viewed not only as feedback that reflects what and how the learners learn, but also serve as an indicator of teaching that is possibly inadequate and needs to be improved (Hendrickson, 1978, 1980).

Teacher-corrected writing has long been a common way of treating errors. Traditionally, it has been teachers who take priority in treating learners' errors; in other words, the correction technique commonly found in use is the teachers' provision of accurate forms for any deviations in the learners' performance. However, this trend seems to be shifting to self- and especially peer-corrected writing (Boon, 1985; Chaudron, 1984; Farrel, 1977; Hendrickson, 1978; Witbeck, 1976).

Peer correction/response was originally used in first language (L1) writing classes (Bruffee, 1984; Gere, 1987; Nystrand, 1986) and later adopted in second language (L2) writing. Its increased use in L2 writing derives from the process approach to writing and the social constructionist perspective (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Lockhart & Ng, 1995). The process approach attempts to create an environment where writers are encouraged to "take risks and engage in creating meaning" (Zamel, 1987, p. 697). Within this context, writing is seen as a process of discovering and revising ideas (Mangelsdorf, 1992), and peer response is considered a pedagogical activity in which writers work together to discover what they want to say (Zamel, 1982).

Peer-corrected writing has revealed its merits in both L1 and L2 contexts. It helps writers realize that writing is a social cognitive process (De Guerrero & Villamil, 1994). It also helps students communicate their ideas and enhances the development of L2 learning (Mangelsdorf, 1989; Mittan, 1989; Reid, 1993). Moreover, it increases the sense of audience awareness (Mittan,

1989) and student autonomy (Bruffee, 1984; Davis & Omberg, 1987). A number of researchers (e.g. Arndt, 1993; Hongrittipun, 1990; Jacobs, 1989; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mittan, 1989; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Reid, 1993) have explored the use of peer correction and found positive results. Mangelsdorf (1992), for example, investigating freshman ESL composition in an American university, found that peer correction is useful for organization and revision of content. However, the reliability of students' responses may be questionable. Jacobs (1989) also found that 76% of writing improvement resulted from peer correction. In a similar line, Nelson and Murphy (1993) found that the students had some changes in their drafts due to peer revision although they did not have consistent responses.

On the down side, peer correction gives rise to considerable negative impacts. It may be resisted by students who come from cultures that emphasize teacher-centered classrooms and who are not familiar with collaborative learning (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mittan, 1989). Also, students do not have enough "sophistication and objectivity in judging writing" or linguistic skills to revise and edit their works (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). In addition, it results in unsuccessful interaction when some students play a dominant role in the response group, thus leading to the withdrawal of others from the group interaction (Nelson & Murphy, 1992). Even more, Freedman (1987), Connor and Asenavage (1994), Mangelsdorf (1992) and Zhang (1995) found in their study that the students still preferred teacher-corrected writing. In a similar vein, Connor and Asenavage (1994), investigating types of revisions and the impact of peer correction compared to teacher correction, found that only 5% of revisions resulted from peer

response. Zhang (1995) also affirms that the use of peer response, which works quite well in L1 contexts, may not be applicable for L2 contexts.

As it has been said so far, the effect of peer correction on writing ability is still inconclusive. It was, therefore, worth time and effort to investigate whether peer- and self-corrected writing was of use to undergraduate political science students at Thammasat University in the hope that the findings of this study might shed further light on English writing instruction at Thammasat University.

Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study, which intended to evaluate the effectiveness of peer- and self-correction techniques on the writing achievement of undergraduate political science students at Thammasat University, is to:

1. Determine the English writing achievement of students not receiving instruction in peer-correction and self-correction techniques.
2. Determine the English writing achievement of students receiving instruction in the peer-correction and self-correction techniques.
3. Compare the English writing achievement of students receiving conventional techniques with those receiving instruction using peer correction combined with self-correction techniques.
4. Compare the English writing achievement among students of different English writing ability—good, average, and weak—in both groups after instruction.

5. Investigate students' attitudes toward using the peer-correction and self-correction techniques in writing.

Methodology

Subjects

The participants of this study were thirty-six political science students at Thammasat University. They participated in the writing class, EG 212: Structures and Writing in English, in the first semester of 1997.

Data Collection Methods

The data collection methods included the English writing tests constructed by the researcher, a questionnaire eliciting students' attitudes toward the treatment and the researcher's observation.

The Research Design

Both the control and experimental groups taught by the researcher in the regular class of the first semester were provided with the same materials, including the same writing practice in the main textbook and the supplementary exercises. The teaching methodology, however, was different. That is, the control group was taught by the teacher using the traditional correction method while the experimental group was taught by means of peer correction combined with self correction. Furthermore, the questionnaire regarding students' attitudes toward these two combined techniques was provided to the experimental group at the final phase of the experiment since the researcher intended to determine the effectiveness of the treatment. The research design can be illustrated as follows :

Group	Teacher	Teaching Technique	Attitudes toward Teaching Technique
Control group	Researcher	Teacher correction	-
Experimental group	Researcher	Peer and self correction	A rating scale questionnaire

The Instruments

An English Writing Achievement Test

An English writing achievement test, a pre-test and post-test, was constructed by the researcher. It consisted of language in which the difficulty and content conformed with the main instructional materials. The test was comprised of four parts: correction, completion, sentence combination and writing sections. The draft test was refined and corrected by two Thai EFL writing teachers and a native English-speaking instructor at the English Department, Thammasat University. To check the reliability and comprehensibility of the test, the researcher administered it to twenty-four undergraduate students who were taking English in the Summer semester at Thammasat University. Any test focuses/items that were too difficult/easy were adjusted before being implemented with the subjects in the actual study in the following semester.

Teaching Materials

The main textbook, *Structure and Writing in English*, written by Asst. Prof. Boonjira Thungsuk and Asst. Prof. Chuencheewee Chalermpatarakul, was employed. It consists of five chapters: People, Places, Events, Incidents, and Ideas for Writing. In addition, the participants were provided with supplementary exercises selected from authentic materials such as magazines or newspapers. Both the main text and the additional exercises contain a similar language focus: description,

narration and exposition. As such, the teaching materials in this study were consistent with the curriculum and course content.

The Questionnaire

A rating-scale questionnaire adapted from Hongriddipun (1990) was used to elicit the students' attitudes toward peer- and self-correction techniques. It contained three main parts: students' personal information, attitudes toward the treatment and student evaluation on all chapters of the main text when learning with the new techniques. The five-point Likert scales were employed in rating their attitudes. Since this study mainly put emphasis on peer- and self-corrected writing, the questionnaire was only administered to the experimental group at the final phase of the study.

Procedure

Prior to the experiment, a pre-writing test constructed by the researcher was administered to the participants in both groups to evaluate their English writing ability. During the experimental phase, the control group studied in the traditional writing class whereas the experimental group was taught using peer-and self-correction techniques. At the final phase of the experiment, a post-writing test was provided to both groups to assess the participants' progress. Finally, a questionnaire was administered to the experimental group at the end of the experiment to determine the participants'

attitudes toward using the non-traditional techniques.

Findings and Discussion

Finding 1: The English writing achievement of students not receiving instruction in the peer-correction combined with self-correction techniques

Table 1

A Comparison of the Control Group's Scores Gained from the Pre-test and Post-test

Test	Mean	S.D.	T value	Two-tail Prob.
Pretest	61.22	14.81		
Posttest	82.05	14.50	11.06	.001

N=18

The data in Table 1 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference at the 0.001 level between the mean score obtained from the pre-test and that obtained from the post-test of the control group. This means there was a noticeable improvement in writing achievement by the participants in the control group. This result suggests that the

participants can improve their writing ability after practice using conventional techniques. As a result, the errors corrected by the teacher have a measurable effect on enhancing students' writing improvement. Students probably feel that the teacher best provides the necessary information and explanations regarding their linguistic and writing problems.

Finding 2: The English writing achievement of students receiving instruction using peer-correction combined with self-correction techniques

Table 2

A Comparison of the Experimental Group's Scores Gained from the Pretest and Posttest

Test	Mean	S.D.	T Value	Two-tail Prob.
Pretest	50.83	12.87		
Posttest	83.61	8.60	18.12	.001

N= 18

As shown in Table 2, there was a significant difference between the mean score of the pre-test and post-test at the 0.001 level, indicating that students improved their English writing achievement substantially after being trained to practice with peer- and self-correction techniques. Along these lines, Arndt (1993), Mangelsdorf (1992) and Mittan, (1989) reveal many benefits of using peer correction incorporated into the writing classroom. Peer correction, for instance,

helps students view errors as a common concern in the learning process. It also stimulates their existing knowledge, resulting in competence being reinforced or expanded. In similar fashion, self-correction provides such benefits with greater confidence in their writing ability. It also encourages self-criticism in students. Accordingly, it might be concluded that students in the experimental group benefited from practice of correcting their own and their peers' errors.

Finding 3: A comparison between English writing achievement of students receiving conventional techniques and that of students receiving instruction in the peer-correction combined with self-correction techniques.

Table 3
A Comparison of the English Achievement of the Control and the Experimental Groups

Groups	Mean	S.D.	T Value	Two-tail Prob.
Control	82.05	14.50		
Experimental	83.61	8.60	0.39	> 0.05

N= 18 (in each group)

The data in Table 3 indicates that the mean score of the control group and that of the experimental group did not differ significantly from each other ($p > 0.05$). The reasons for this finding may be twofold. On the one hand, the study time of both groups was different. Students in the experimental group attended a morning class, 9:30-11:00 a.m., whereas those in the control group began the class from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. This difference might have resulted in unequal learning biologically and psychologically. On the other hand, the results may be due to an inadequate number of students. Specifically, there were only 18 students in each group, which was not sufficient to

represent the standardized sample size. Increasing group size might have produced different results. This unsatisfactory conclusion relating to peer correction is similar to Chaudron's (1988) study, which found no significant difference between the amount of improvement that resulted from teacher- and peer-correction techniques. In a similar vein, Teo (1986) also found that peer correction did not create improvement of students' subsequent written work. As such, to see clearer pictures of the implementation of peer-and self-corrected writing, researchers might conduct further research in this area.

Finding 4: A comparison of the English writing achievement among students of different English writing ability

Table 4

A Comparison of the English Writing Achievement of the Students of different English Writing Ability in both Groups after Learning

Writing Ability	Control		Experimental		T Value	Two-tail Prob.
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Good	93.50	6.86	93.25	4.79	-0.06	> 0.05
Average	84.90	7.94	83.90	5.70	-0.32	> 0.05
Weak	63.50	17.18	73.25	5.56	1.08	> 0.05

N= 4, 10, 4 (for good, average and weak English writing ability)

The data in Table 4 reveals that the difference between the mean score of students of different English writing ability in both groups was not significant ($p. > 0.05$). It might be interpreted that teacher-, peer- and self-correction resulted in the same improvement of such good, average and weak students. However, the difference of weak students' mean score was higher than that of the good and average students' mean score. This may be because weak students might no longer have perceived errors as their weakness in learning when they engaged in correcting each other's writing. Moreover, the process of peer correction might have activated their existing knowledge, resulting in greater competence since most students stated in the evaluation questionnaire that these

techniques helped them recognize writing errors better. In addition, when matching with their good or average counterparts, weak students might have learned from the other two groups. On the contrary, it might not have been of use to good or average students to be paired with weak students. As such, weak students, rather than good or average students, might receive greater benefits from these two techniques. However, the different result may be due to the fact that the number of students in each level was not sufficient to represent the standardized-sample size. That is, good, average and weak students composed only 4, 10 and 4 students respectively. A larger sample size is, therefore, recommended for further study.

Finding 5: Students' attitudes toward using the peer- and self-correction techniques

Table 5

Percentage of Students' Response to the Peer-Correction and Self-Correction Techniques

Item No.	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	NA
1.	22.2	61.1	16.7			
2.	16.7	66.7	11.1	5.5		
3.	16.7	72.2	11.1			
4.	30.5	58.5	11.0			
5.	33.3	44.4	16.7	5.6		
6.		11.1	27.8	44.4	16.7	
7.		50.0	33.3	11.1	5.6	
8.		22.2	33.3	44.5		
9.		16.7	44.4	38.9		
10.	22.2	55.6	16.6	5.6		
11.	11.1	5.6	16.6	66.7		
12.	5.5	55.6	27.8	11.1		
13.	33.3	50.0	5.6	11.1		
14.	27.8	61.1	11.1			
15.		27.8	38.9	33.3		
16.	6.7	66.6	16.7			
17.		55.6	44.4			
18.	50.0	27.7	11.1	5.6	5.6	
19.	83.3	16.7				

N= 18

SA: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, U: Undecided, D: Disagree,

SD: Strongly Disagree, NA: No Answer

Nineteen items in the questionnaire were as follows:

In your opinion, the peer correction technique _____

1. helps you study English better.
2. enables you to improve your writing skills.
3. helps you recognize errors better.
4. encourages you to exchange English knowledge.
5. helps you have more confidence.
6. makes you embarrassed.
7. is too time-consuming.

In your opinion, the self correction technique _____

8. helps you study English better.
9. enables you to improve your writing skills.
10. helps you recognize errors better.
11. helps you have more confidence.

12. is too time-consuming.

In correcting errors, the teacher should _____

13. correct students' errors.

14. have students correct errors with their peers.

15. have students correct errors on their own.

16. have students correct their errors on their own and with their peers.

17. correct students' errors and have them correct errors on their own.

18. correct students' errors and have them correct errors with their peers.

19. correct students' errors as well as have them correct errors on their own and with their peers.

(Adapted from Hongrattipun, 1990)

Table 6

Percentage of Students' Evaluation of their Writing Ability

Chapter	very good 5	good 4	average 3	slightly poor 2	very poor 1	no answer
1	18.8	48.6	23.6	9.0		
2	11.2	49.9	20.5	18.4		
3	4.3	30.7	47.6	17.4		
4	9.8	27.7	48.6	11.6	2.3	
5	13.5	48.1	29.3	4.3	4.8	

N= 18

Chapter 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5: People, Places, Events, Incidents and Ideas for Writing

From the data revealed in Table 5, the peer-correction technique was considered not only to help students study English better (61.1%), but also to enable them to improve their writing ability (66.7%). In terms of retention, the data indicates that it helps them recognize errors better (72.2%). Some stated that the peer-correction technique encourages them to exchange English knowledge (58.5%) and help them have more confidence (44.4%). This technique, however, has some limitations. The students agreed that it takes too much time (50.0%), and the process of peer review makes them feel embarrassed (44.4%).

The self-correction technique seemed not so helpful for the participants. They disagreed as to whether this technique can help them study English better (44.5%)

and help them write on any topic with confidence (66.7%). They were also uncertain if the self-correction technique helps them improve their writing skills (44.4%). Generally, it was too time-consuming for them to practice self-corrected writing (55.6%). They agreed that they recognize errors better because of this technique (55.6%), however.

Who should correct such errors is another point to be interpreted. Some agreed that the teacher should correct students' errors (55.0%) and have students correct errors with their peers (61.1%), others stated that the teacher should have students correct their errors on their own and with their peers (66.6%), and that the teacher herself should correct students' errors and have them correct errors on their own (55.6%). Moreover, 55.0% strongly agree that errors

should be corrected by the teacher and students' peers. It cannot be decided whether students believe they should correct such errors on their own (38.9%). Most interestingly, most of them strongly agreed that errors should be cooperatively corrected by the teacher, students themselves and their peers (83.3%).

As for self evaluation indicated in Table 6 regarding students' writing ability on each chapter of the text mainly used, 48.6%, 49.9%, 30.7% and 48.1% stated that their writing skills regarding most chapters—People, Places, Events and Ideas for Writing—were good. Some indicated an average level of writing skills on Incidents (48.6%).

Clearly, students receiving the peer- and self-correction instruction generally responded with favorable attitudes toward peer correction. They preferred peer and teacher-correction as they felt that writing groups were anxiety-free environments where they could understand peer language, and the teacher was more resourceful. Most of them, however, expressed negative attitudes toward the self-corrective technique. Students might not have been as confident when correcting their own errors probably because they are accustomed to studying in the teacher-centered approach. As such, they might have had problems with self-correction, and it might have been difficult for them to depart from the teacher-monopolized classrooms. They, nevertheless, could make effective use of the process of student talk. This indicated that they could be free from traditional instruction and move gradually forward to the student-centered approach.

Pedagogical Implications

As stated in the questionnaire, most students did want to study in a classroom

where teacher-, peer- and self-corrections were integrated. As such, English writing teachers may consider relying upon the use of these combined techniques. The combination of these three techniques can be more effective than any single technique since no single technique can be the most productive in all situations. Alternatively, teachers may employ these three integrated techniques at the first phase of teaching and then gradually insist on self- and peer-correction after students gain enough confidence to be more independent. Eventually, students may be able to correct their own errors at the final phase of the course.

Also, collaborative writing/group writing is another activity that the teacher can make full use of. An informal peer review group for beginning students may consist of three or four students reading or listening to their peers' drafts and commenting on interesting and/or confusing points. Then, students revise their writing based on these responses. More advanced students, however, employ a worksheet to answer questions regarding their peers' thesis statement, unity, development and/or focus. Students then complete the worksheet for their peers' drafts and discuss the suggestions made for revision with each of their peers.

To implement peer-corrected writing successfully, Berg (1999) suggests some helpful guidelines for the writing teachers as follows:

1. Create a comfortable classroom atmosphere that promotes trust among students by conducting a number of in-and-out-of-class, get-to-know-you activities.
2. Establish the role of peer response in the writing process and explain the benefits of having peers, as opposed

to just teachers, respond to students' writing.

3. Highlight the common purpose of peer response among professional and student writers by examining the acknowledgements in textbooks and other publications, and discuss how both ask others to read their work.
4. Demonstrate and personalize the peer response experience by displaying several drafts of a text written by someone who the students know and demonstrate how peer comments helped improve the writing.
5. Conduct a collaborative, whole-class response activity using a text written by someone unknown to students and stress the importance of revising the clarity and rhetorical level aspects rather than sentence-level errors.
6. Address issues of vocabulary and expressions by comparing inappropriate comments with appropriate ones.
7. Familiarize students with the response sheet by showing samples and explaining its purpose as a tool designed to help them focus on important areas of the writing assignment.
8. Involve students in a response to a collaborative writing project by having them use the peer response sheet to respond in pairs or groups to a paragraph written by another group of students. Based on the responses, have the pairs of groups then revise their original collaborative paragraphs.
9. Allow time for questions and expressions of concern by talking to students about their writing, the peer response, the revision they made, the difficulties in judging classmates' comments and lack of confidence in their revision abilities.
10. Provide revision guidelines by highlighting good revision strategies and explaining that peer response helps authors understand the difference between intended and perceived meaning.
11. Study examples of successful and unsuccessful peer response using videotapes or printed samples to examine level of student engagement, language used and topics discussed.

(Berg, 1999, p. 21)

Furthermore, Berg (1999) provides students with some peer review guidelines including emphasizing the meaning of the writers' text, avoiding getting stuck on such local errors as spelling mistakes or grammatical errors and telling the writers what they do not understand about their writing. Such guidelines might be of importance to students to use in the process of peer review.

Recommendations for Further Study

Since the class time of the groups was different, replication of this study should be conducted without the time difference. Also, as this study was quantitatively oriented, future researchers may conduct some qualitative studies, such as a case study to see the particularity and thick description of self- and peer-correction in EFL fields. Further, the issues about the effectiveness, the implementation of self and peer-corrected writing, students' attitudes toward these techniques and the readers' role or group dynamic are still controversial especially in EFL areas. As such, further investigation into these mixed results is highly recommended.

This research was funded by the Department of Academic Affairs, Thammasat University in 1997 and presented at The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Graduate Student Research Conference, the USA, on April 8, 2000.

The researcher's note : I am deeply indebted to the Department of Academic Affairs, Thammasat University, for 1997 grant support, Asst. Prof. Chuencheewee Chalermpatarakul, Ms. Usuma Chuenchompoo and Mr. Thomas Coghlin for their highly valued criticism on the Writing Achievement Test, Asst. Prof. Boonjira Thungsuk for her helpful comments on this paper, Mr. Ross C. Taylor for his great hand with the language used, Mr. Manoon Kusonmano for his generous assistance with statistics and especially the undergraduate political science students at Thammasat University for their willing cooperation. My research would not have been completed without these invaluable favors.

References

Arndt, V. (1993). Response to writing: Using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. N. Brock and L. Walters (Eds.), *Teaching composition around the Pacific Rim: Politics and pedagogy* (pp. 90-116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Berg, E. C. (1999). Preparing ESL students for peer response. *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 20-25.

Boon, C. K. (1985). Error analysis and composition marking. *Guidelines*, 7(1), 13-21.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "Conversation of Mankind." *College English*, 46(7), 635-653.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, 15(2), 1-14.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on learning and teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257-276.

Davis, N. F., Omberg, M. (1987). *Academic writing: Process and product*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 484-496.

Farrell, K. J. (1977). A comparison of three instructional approaches for teaching written composition to high school juniors: Teacher lecture, peer evaluation, and group tutoring. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 38(4), 1849-1850-A.

Freedman, S. W. (1987). *Response to student writing* (Research report no. 23). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Gere, A. R. (1987). *Writing groups: History, theory and implications*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Grabe, W. G., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. New York: Longman.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). The treatment of errors in written work. *Modern Language Journal*, 64(2), 216-221.

Hongrittipun, S. (1990). An investigation into the effects of self-correction in combination with peer correction on students' writing proficiency and their attitudes. *Unpublished M.A. thesis*, Mahidol University.

Jacobs, G. (1989). MisCorrection in peer feedback in writing class. *ERIC Journal*, 20(1), 68-76.

Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions and content. *Language Learning*, 45(4), 605-655.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1989). Parallels between speaking and writing in second language acquisition. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 134-145). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 274-284.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207-219). New York: Longman.

Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 171-193.

Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 135-141.

Nystrand, M. (1986). Learning to write by talking about writing: A summary of research on intensive peer review in expository writing instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *The structure of written communication* (pp. 179-211). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Teo, A. (1986). An investigation into learners' attitudes toward peer correction and its effects on their subsequent written work and their ability to self-correct. *Unpublished M.A. thesis*, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology, Thonburi.

Witbeck, M. C. (1976). Peer correction procedures for intermediate and advanced ESL composition lessons. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(3), 321-326.

Zamel, V. (1982). The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(2), 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 697-715.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the effective feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

Appendix

An English Writing Achievement Test

Part I: Corrections (20 points)

Directions : Correct the underlined errors and add a correct word or phrase in place of ^ in the spaced provided.

Vegetarians' Festival in Phuket

During the first to the ninth day of the ninth lunar month, ethnic Chinese in Phuket become strict vegetarians. The period is marked with grand ceremony and festivity, (1) ^ might be called a Vegetarians' Festival.

One day before the ceremony, Chinese altars are (2) thorough cleaned and treated with aromatic smoke. A wooden pole is raised exactly at midnight, (3) which offerings are made to the nine respected gods. Citations are read to invoke the gods, (4) induce them to reside at the ceremony. Nine oil-lamps are then hung on the pole, signaling the beginning of the Festival. During the nine days, ceremonies are performed at the altar, both day and night. Gods and spirits are invoked to take possession of bodies of the mediums (5) ^ bless the people or drive away their troubles. These gods or spirits are presumably those of the dead ancestors of the people, worshipped and (6) regular given offerings by their descendants. During that particular moment, the mediums are unconscious and not involved in, nor responsible (7) ^ their actions. To prove its point, the possession spirit sometimes turns against the medium and uses weapons to cut or to hurt it, (8) ^ the medium is hardly scathed or wounded. One of the significant (9) ceremony involved is the fortification of the altar, with five men (10) assign as guards around the altar to protect the ongoing ceremony inside.

On the second day, the (11) star-worship ceremony is performed and offerings are made to ask for (12) protect for the participants. The (13) excite practice like climbing the pole on knife-blades (14) carry out at certain major altars, to exert the power of the gods. (15) Sharpen knife-blades make up the steps, but the medium would walk on them and emerge unhurt. The most significant (16) ^ sacred ceremony, meanwhile, is the fire-walk. A line of purified vegetarians (17) form, led by the possessed medium, to walk onto the bonfire. It is a solemn and sacred ceremony (18) ^ which some people are not allowed to participate, not even as spectators. Before midnight (19) ^ the last day of the Festival, processions are held to see off the residing spirits. The gods or spirits would indulge in a farewell stint by piercing the mouth and the cheeks of the mediums with skewers.

During the nine days of the Festival, the participants refrain from consuming meat, adhere to the precepts and chant prayers. These bring both satisfaction and peace within (20) itself.

1. _____	11. _____
2. _____	12. _____
3. _____	13. _____
4. _____	14. _____
5. _____	15. _____
6. _____	16. _____

7. _____	17. _____
8. _____	18. _____
9. _____	19. _____
10. _____	20. _____

Part II: Completion (20 points)

Directions : Complete the following story with the information that makes the story logical and meaningful. Your completion may be words, phrases, clauses or sentences.

An unexpected event happened to me last night. I had a telephone call from my friend _____ his party at 9:00 p.m. that night at the house. I agreed because _____. At 9:00 p.m. _____ and found the house was quiet and it seemed that _____. Anyway, I decided to ring the bell, but _____. Then I thought it could be a joke that my friend had played on me, so _____. But a moment later, a thought struck me. I went back to the house, _____ and found that it was unlocked. Therefore, _____ closing the door behind me, I was suddenly blinded and surprised by a flash of light. _____, I found that I was surrounded and heard the tune “Happy Birthday” being sung for me. So I finally knew that _____. If you have had this kind of experience, _____.

Part III: Combination (20 points)

Directions : Combine the following sets of sentences into ONE sentence, using any method of combination you have studied.

1. a. Journey to reach the Tarutao Islands is long and difficult.
 b. The Tarutao Islands are rated as some of the leading heavenly islands for travelers.

2. a. These islands are the first national park at sea.
 b. These islands are situated on the Andaman Sea at the Malaga Channel, Indian Ocean.

3. a. The name “Tarutao” was derived from the local dialect.
 b. The name “Tarutao” means “desolation.”

4. a. In the olden days, these islands were used to hold political prisoners.
 b. It was easy to supervise these prisoners.

5. a. Later on, it became a hiding place for the pirates until both the Thai and British authorities eradicated them.

b. Finally, the Forestry Department set this place up as a national park.

6. a. There are not much level grounds on the islands.
b. They are still abound with wild flowers and animals especially the turtles.
c. The turtles come to lay eggs on the beach between September and April.

7. a. Some people want to spend their holidays on these islands.
b. They should spend at least two nights there.

8. a. One night should be spent at the national park office on the Tarutao Islands.
b. The other night should be spent in the Adang Islands.
c. Both offer opposing view of the Islands.
d. Both have accommodation facilities.

9. a. Besides being the office of the national park, it contains aquariums.
b. Aquariums show various lives.
c. It also contains a small museum.
d. A small museum displays different implements.
e. Different implements are used during the prison days.

10. a. As for accommodations, there are 13 bungalows.
b. There are also 3 large houses.
c. Three large houses consist of enough rooms for one hundred guests.
d. There are also tents to hire for those people.
e. People are more adventurous.

11. a. The best time of year to visit these Taratao Islands is between December and March.
b. The weather is fine with a clear blue sky and a pleasant climate without any storms.

Part IV: Paragraph Writing (60 points)

Directions : Write a well-organized paragraph on both of the following topics.

1. "Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn"
The description should include both physical appearances and personality. Also include her outstanding works.
(120 words approximately)
2. "How to avoid wasting energy." (150 words approximately)