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The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore and describe Thai college students’ response to nontraditional writing instruction taught by a Thai teacher who graduated from a university in the United States. Their experience of learning to write in this English writing class, how they responded to and perceived this experience, and the impacts of this experience on their writing development were investigated based on the constructivist theoretical framework. The participants of this study included the teacher and forty-one students who enrolled in a fifteen-week writing course, Writing 1, offered at a public university in Bangkok, Thailand, in the first semester of the academic year 2004.

The data were collected through classroom observation, formal and informal interviews of the teacher and her students, the personal background questionnaire, and archival documents such as students’ writing samples, course syllabus, supplementary exercises, and the textbook. The three major sources of data: field notes observations, interviews, and artifacts, were triangulated and analyzed based on Spradley’s domain analysis and Wolcott’s method for descriptive and analysis process.
Major findings showed that after experiencing the nontraditional writing instruction, the students moved from feeling discomfort to comfort as they gained experience with the writing process. The students began to view writing as a process by moving from correctness to expressionist. This writing class created a stress-free environment that promoted social discourse. After engaging in this writing class, the students exhibited growth in their writing. The findings also reveal that the students’ attitude and perception on writing particularly English writing changed positively. However, the students experienced cultural and instructional frustration as the teacher infused innovative writing instruction into the existing curriculum. There were some mismatches between the curriculum and the assessment, and the mismatch with cultural norms. They needed more assistance and the scaffolding about peer-response from the teacher. The lack of English language proficiency and knowledge in writing inhibited the students’ growth as writers. Based on these findings, theoretical and writing instructional applications especially in ESL and EFL classrooms were presented. Additionally, the relevant and more advanced research was recommended.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale of the Study

Over the past ten years, Thai educators and researchers have paid increasing attention to various types of literacy instruction. The reason for this focus on curriculum promoting literacy may be related to some recent studies on Thai students’ literacy skills (Chuendaechum, 1999; Wisetpong, 1998; Tanuwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarnsophon, 1991; Grewpeng, 1990; Charoenkool, 1990). This maybe because the results from the entrance examination which implies the students’ proficiency in literacy especially in English have shown a decline in Thai students’ reading and writing skills (Matichon Newspaper, 2003). In addition, the report from Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report (2006, Fact and figure, para. 4) based on the data from the 2002/2003 school year reveal that 3.3 million of Thai high school and college students do not have basic literacy skills. Educators, as well as the policy makers, have become aware of this problem and have decided to improve the literacy curriculum and teaching and learning methodology in order to solve this national crisis.

Along with the literacy crisis, English which is considered a foreign language in Thailand has become more important due to globalization and the increasing number of investments from foreign countries. A good command of English is required not only for higher education, but also for getting and keeping a job. While English oral skills have long been emphasized in the academic world and the market, reading and writing skills are becoming important for academic purpose. Additionally, the number of Thai students who pursue their educations in Western countries, like the United States, Canada, and Britain, has increased. Those who want to study abroad need to learn English in order to communicate in both spoken and written language.
Even though English has become essential for Thai students, it has been found that because English is taught as a foreign language, meaning that students rarely have opportunities to use English outside classrooms, their English proficiency is often not sufficient (Sakontawat, 2003). This situation causes many Thai students to attend private institutes for extra tutoring, particularly to develop speaking, listening, and reading skills. Thai students tend to rank writing skills as less important than other skills even though such skills have become crucial for students who desire to pursue graduate study either in Thailand or in a foreign country. Such attitudes toward writing may stem from the fact that writing, either in Thai or in English, is not seen as a vital skill by the education system as a whole. At the high school level, Thai writing is an elective course. Moreover, Thai students rarely have a chance to practice academic writing. In Thai writing classes, students are primarily taught to use language grammatically and to write a variety of letters and poems with proper structure. In English classes, Thai students rarely write. If they write, grammatical structure at the sentence level is emphasized. At the college level, English writing is also an elective course, except for English majors. In most English writing classes, the teachers pay attention to prescriptive aspects of language, such as form, format and correction of language usage, rather than content. (Sakontawut, 2003; Tagong, 1991) In addition, Thai students rarely practice academic writing in English.

In an attempt to promote writing skills, researchers have turned to the study of how different teaching approaches may help Thai students become more effective writers. Many studies were carried out in the 1990’s to compare more traditional ways of teaching writing with a process writing approach, focusing on how writers compose and understand writing as a discovery and self-expressing process (Chuendaechum, 1999; Patarapongpaisan, 1996; Wisessang, 1996; Tanuwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarmsophon, 1991). The results of these
studies show that, based on English/Thai writing achievement tests (pre- and post-tests), the students have higher scores in writing after they were taught by the process approach, and have higher scores in writing compared with those who were not taught by the process approach. The results from these studies are convincing to the teachers and the educators in that the innovative approach like the process-based approach is the way to help Thai students improve their writing skills both in Thai and in English. However, these studies focus on the product, students’ writing performance. Leki (2001) comments that although the results from “the public transcript” of ESL students’ experience, such as students’ writing and teacher’s feedbacks, will provide us with the useful information about writing instruction and how much the students succeed in writing, the students’ voice is missing. In other words, the studies did not explore how the students perceived on the teaching instruction. Therefore, this study aims to explore an English writing classroom taught by a Thai teacher who was educated in the United States and who has adapted an innovative approach in her classroom. The study focuses on the students’ responses to this writing instruction in order to hear their voice and to understand how Thai college students perceive this innovative writing instruction.

Statement of the Problem

Due to the lack of practice and not being probably taught to write, many Thai students do not regard themselves as good writers, particularly in English. They also do not seem to have a good level of awareness regarding their writing skills. As discussed above, student attitudes about writing may be due to this skill being neglected in the classroom. To make matters worse, the students’ experience with writing in the classroom is not impressionable. They are not taught the process of how to write, so they never know the techniques or purposes for writing. Although some students write in their diaries, they do not take this personal writing seriously. Not many students keep the habit of diary or journal writing when they enter college because of the heavy
study load. Some students do not pay much attention to learning to write because they are taught to believe as long as they learn how to use language properly, they can write when they are given a topic, and that this is enough. Yet, studies on Thai students’ writing skills and on writing instruction in English (Tagong, 1991; Patarapongpaisan, 1996; Thammasarnsophon, 1991; Wisessang, 1996; Chinawong, 1999-2000; Lukanaprasit, 1999-2000; Sakontawut, 2003) reveal that Thai college students cannot write proficiently, even with six years of experience studying English. These studies have also found that these students have had few opportunities to improve their writing ability.

Students’ perception of their writing abilities in English is consistent with many studies done on students’ perception of their writing skills (Chirdchoo and Wudthayagorn, 2001; Silva, 1992). When it comes to writing in English, students find it difficult to write, and they blame this on their limited English proficiency but not their lack of writing skills in general. If limitation of English language proficiency is the only problem of their writing ability, traditional writing classrooms, which emphasize language use and structure, should be able to solve this problem and help them improve their English language proficiency. The truth is that Thai students, through teacher-direct instruction, have often “repeated the same kinds of writing problems, such as idea generations and linguistic difficulties” (Thongrin, 2002, p. 3). The question then becomes: Is English language proficiency really responsible for deficits in Thai students’ English writing? It seems that the real problem may be related to the type and amount of writing practice and the focus of writing instruction students get. In the traditional language classroom, the teacher only requires students to write a few times throughout a semester, and only read the final product without attending to the process of writing. If the quality and amount of time spent on writing is the real problem, research should be done to explore what actually goes on in an
English writing classroom in Thailand. Such research should be undertaken to figure out exactly how Thai students are taught to write, how they perceive writing and English writing instruction, as well as to investigate how teachers and educators can help Thai students develop as writers. Another worthy aim of such research should be to examine classrooms in Thailand that have incorporated nontraditional approaches to teaching writing, namely ones that incorporate process-based writing instruction. The process approach to teaching writing has been slowly introduced into writing classrooms in Thailand for the past decade; thus, it is worthwhile to examine a classroom in which some elements of process-based instruction have been implemented. Examining such a classroom will provide a better understanding of what kind of writing instruction works for Thai students, of the difficulty or frustration the students might have when they are exposed to this innovative approach, of what techniques from this new approach are applied and how they work, and what factors influence the students’ learning and development as writers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the current study is to investigate how Thai college students in an English writing class respond to writing instruction which incorporates some aspects of “process writing” implemented by a Thai professor who was educated in the United States. The factors that affect the students’ perception of writing and English writing instruction will be examined in order to gain a better understanding of how Thai students learn to write and how they become aware of the writing process. In addition, I would like to explore whether the innovative writing instruction implemented by this teacher could help Thai students gradually improve their writing skills. If so, what factors teachers should take into consideration when they want to incorporate the “process writing” in their writing classroom. This research is framed and guided by four main questions:
1. How did Thai college students respond to an instructor’s teaching approach in an English writing classroom?
2. What were the impacts of writing instruction on the students’ growth as writers in this writing class?
3. What were the frustrations the students had when they engaged in this writing class?

**Significance of the Study**

In the past decade, teachers and educators have learned that although Thai students have studied English in the classroom for at least six years, their English proficiency is not sufficient, particularly in the area of writing. (Tagong, 1991; Patarapongpaisan, 1996; Thammasarnsophon, 1991; Wisessang, 1996; Chinawong, 1999-2000; Lukanaprasit, 1999-2000; Sakontawut, 2003) Many studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of many different teaching approaches used to help Thai students improve their English proficiency both in reading and writing. However, none of these studies has been conducted in a natural setting, which could reveal exactly how Thai students have been taught using these methods. The lack of knowledge of how students are taught to read and write in the classroom may mislead teachers to implement only a few of new teaching techniques without really getting the students to understand how they learn to read and write and how they perceive teaching instruction. The insight of the classroom structure and how Thai students are taught in their English writing class will help us understand how students struggle while learning to write and how the teacher can help them overcome their frustration. Exploring the classroom will also help the teacher understand how the students develop writing skills through the activities designed by the teacher. Based on the students’ development of writing skills over time, we can also learn what kinds of teaching instruction, techniques or activities help the students improve their writing skills. In addition, examining students’ perception of teaching instruction will provide insight into the students’ awareness of their writing development as they learn to write. Finally, Leki (2001) pointed out that research
studies on L2 writing since 1990 “talk about the students but never gave evidence that the researchers spent any time talking to the students, never asked them one on one what all this (whatever feature of L2 writing was under study) meant to them.” (p. 18) Leki argues that as teachers we can learn “the hidden transcript” by observation and discussion with the students. Supporting Leki’s voice, interviews of many Thai students before this study and in the first interview of this study which show it is apparent that they feel that their voices have largely been ignored by the teachers and researchers when research has been conducted in the field. The current study will incorporate students’ voices into research by taking into account how they think about the writing classroom they experience and how it works for them.

This study will not only shed light on how English writing is taught in Thailand, but will also provide information on qualitative research methodology. It will provide teachers with a picture of the writing classroom from the students’ experience. In Thailand it is difficult to fully observe a real classroom for research purposes because teachers often feel uncomfortable being observed, as they feel they are being supervised for evaluation purposes. Since this is the study that a real classroom has been fully observed by an outsider and the students’ voice is a focus, this study will set an example for other teachers and educators to conduct field research in real classrooms and will show teachers that research is not teaching assessment. Instead, teachers will learn that research enables them to learn about their teaching and to evaluate their teaching to meet the need of the students. The teacher will, indeed, benefit from this kind of research.

As for the education system in Thailand, this study will provide it with a picture of what occurs in an English writing classroom at the college level and how the students experience and perceive such writing classes. The results from this study will help educators and policy makers
understand writing instruction from the learners’ perspective in order to develop foundational curriculum to enhance student learning of writing in both Thai and English.

**Researcher’s Personal Interest in the Study**

“Does Writing Have to Be Painful?” written by Binder (2001) reminds me of my experience as an English learner as well as a teacher. I have been struggling with writing for many years. With my struggle in writing particularly writing in English when I was a graduate student in the United States made me wonder whether Thai students have had the similar experience. I first conducted a case study as a term paper in 2001 to learn how two Thai graduate students who were studying at UF learned how to write in Thailand. I found that they had similar experience as mine when they learned to write at school and at college levels. They did not consider themselves good writers. They rarely practiced writing in class. Based on the experience of these two students along with informal interviews of the other Thai graduate students, I was curious to learn how Thai students were taught to write and how they perceived writing particularly writing in English. Meanwhile, I was introduced to “process writing” when I took a doctoral seminal class in composition taught by my advisor. With her guidance throughout the semester, I found that my writing improved; I felt more confident to write; and I wondered if this is an effective way to teach writing to EFL students like Thai students. Based on the case study I did and the experience I have had from the seminar class, I decided to explore a writing classroom in Thailand in order to find out how Thai students are trained in writing and how they perceived writing experience in the classroom.

I chose to focus on college students because they are the students I will teach and also because of my association at college level in Thailand. Moreover, not only will Thai college students be able to articulate their feelings, perceptions, and attitudes towards writing instruction they experience, they will also provide me with information about their writing experience at
pre-college level which will benefit my study as it will provide the entire picture of writing instruction in Thailand. In addition, the writing class that I chose to observe was taught by a Thai teacher who obtained her Ph.D. in the United States in Rhetoric and Composition. With her background in education and her experience in process writing, her writing class seemed different from a traditional writing classroom and I would be able to seek an answer for my question: Is it possible to implement process writing, an innovative approach, in English writing classroom in Thailand?, If so, how does it work with Thai EFL students?

Along with my questions, this study would help me understand the current situation in teaching writing both at school and the college level, especially from students’ perspective. With this understanding, I could learn how Thai students experience writing instruction: positive and negative aspects. By hearing the students’ voices, I hoped to minimize a gap between “the public transcript” and “the hidden transcript” (Leki, 2001, p. 17), and to help EFL/ESL teachers understand what EFL students go through when they are introduced to an innovative writing instruction with which they are not familiar. Additionally, with this understanding, I could implement a method of writing instruction that I believe will best help my students to learn to write and to become better writers. I would also be aware of difficulties, frustrations, and/or limitations that I might encounter when I introduce this new teaching approach to my students. With this awareness, I would listen carefully to my students’ voice while implementing the new approach and along with the students I would learn to improve myself as a writer and as a writing teacher as well.

**Terminology**

*English as a Foreign Language* (EFL): This term is used throughout this study to refer to English taught in a country where English is not used outside the classroom as a native or an official language.
Writing I: In this study, writing I refers to an English writing course offered to any student whose major is not English at this university. It is one of the elective English courses offered by the Department of Foreign Languages. The students have to pass Foundation English 3 in order to take this course.

Foundation English courses: At this university, Foundation English courses refer to Foundation English 1, 2, and 3. Students are placed into one of these courses when they first enter this university based on their scores on their entrance examination on English language proficiency. Foundation English 1 is a remedial course focusing on grammar to prepare students with low scores on their entrance examination for the next Foundation English courses. Foundation English 2 and Foundation English 3 are required for students to graduate. Foundation English 2 and Foundation English 3 are grammar-based courses focusing on language use and usage. Foundation English 3 is a prerequisite for the other elective English courses. The students may be exempted from these three courses if they have a high score on the examination when they enter the university.

Process writing: Process-based writing pedagogies or writing process approach.

Limitations of the Study

Firstly, because my focus in this study is on writing instruction and how the students experience and perceive a given English writing class, the individual students’ writing process was not recorded while they were writing.

Secondly, I did not aim to measure the students’ English proficiency. The students’ writing performance was not tested; instead I analyzed their writing in terms of writer’s development based on their writing assignments which are defined in Chapter 6 when I discuss the student’s development.
Finally, I did not conduct a longitudinal study to observe the same students throughout the year because this university used a semester system. There are two main semesters. Each semester lasts for 15 weeks. Instead, I conducted the classroom observation with a different group of students for the first semester (from June to October 2004) and the second semester (November 2004 to March 2005). However, these two classes were taught by the same teacher, Ms. B. Therefore, the students’ writing development was not dramatic due to the short period of time.

Summary

In this chapter I presented the rationale of the study. Briefly, the rationale addressed the shift of the study of teaching and learning English particularly English writing in Thailand. The reasons of the shift were mentioned in terms of the students’ performance in language skills. The importance of English as an academic tool and the tool for future career was briefly addressed as well as how English writing was taught in classrooms in Thailand.

The statement of the problem which is related to the rationale was discussed. Based on my own experience as an EFL/ESL learner and a teacher teaching English at college level and the studies (Tagong, 1991; Patarapongpaisan, 1996; Thammasaransophon, 1991; Wisessang, 1996; Chinawong, 1999-2000; Lukanaprasit, 1999-2000; Sakontawut, 2003), I believe that one of the main causes of writing failure among Thai students is related to how they are taught to write in the classroom. In other words, the fact that the teachers always focus on grammar and structure makes the students feel insecure when they write in English and makes them fear writing. As a result, they don’t like writing and their writing skills are limited.

I also illustrated the main purposes of this study along with the research questions. I explored how English writing was taught by the teacher who was educated from the United States. My main focus was on how the Thai college students in this writing class responded to
the writing instruction which integrated some aspects of an innovative approach, “process writing”. In addition, I aimed to investigate the factors affecting the students’ responses to this writing instruction. Along with the purposes of the study, three research questions emerged. These questions related to the students’ responses and their participation in this class. The benefits and problems related to writing instruction were examined, including the students’ attitudes towards writing in English, and the factors affecting students’ writing performance and the implementation of an innovative approach in this writing class.

The significance of the study was addressed. In brief, this study sheds light on writing instruction in Thailand as well as on ESL teaching of writing in terms of implementing an innovative approach, such as process writing, in the English writing classroom. This study will help us as EFL/ESL teachers better understand how EFL/ESL Thai college students respond when they encounter a new writing instruction. In addition, this qualitative study will benefit on the research has been done in Thailand in terms of research methodology and show teachers a different viewpoint of research as a tool to learn about their teaching and how to improve their teaching to meet the students’ need rather than teaching assessment.

Finally, I addressed my interest in this study according to my learning experience and my case study of two Thai graduate students about their writing experience. I also provided the terminology used in this study and discussed the limitations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In a writing class, students need to be taught both how to use the process to their advantage as language learners and writers, and also how to produce an acceptable product upon demand. The shortcoming of the debate around these issues is that process and product have been seen as either/or rather than both/and entities. However, while students certainly need to learn how to pass exams, they also need to perceive writing as a tool for learning, a tool that can be useful to them throughout their professional and personal lives.

(Raimes, 1996)

Introduction

This chapter provides theoretical frameworks and research on composition approaches for understanding how ESL/EFL students learn to write and the impact of an innovative writing instruction on their growth as writers. In the first section of this chapter, I discuss the theories and conceptions that can contribute to understanding of language and literacy learning, particularly for L2 composition. I, then, present theoretical approaches to the teaching of writing to native-speakers of English (NES) that have contributed to shaping the approaches of the teaching of second language (SL) writing. The following section presents approaches to ESL/EFL writing instruction including the implementation of the process-based writing approach in ESL/EFL classrooms. Finally, the factors affecting SL writing are discussed.

Theoretical Framework

There is no one theory or conception that can explain how learning takes place. To understand language and literacy learning, particularly for L2 composition, Krashen’s (1982, 1988) theory of second language acquisition and Vygosky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mind are used to frame this present study.

Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Acquisition

The best methods are therefore those that supply ‘comprehensible input’ in low anxiety situations, containing messages that students really want to hear. These methods do not force early production in the second language, but allow students to produce when they are ‘ready’, recognizing that improvement comes from supplying communicative and
comprehensible input, and not from forcing and correcting production. (Krashen, cited by Schütz, 2005, p. 1)

Stephen Krashen has proposed theory of second language acquisition that consists of at least five hypotheses. To understand how ESL/EFL students learn to write in this present study, the Input or Comprehension hypothesis, the Affective Filter hypothesis, and the Problem-solving hypothesis are used as theoretical frameworks.

**The comprehension hypothesis**

Krashen (1982, 1988) distinguishes between learning and acquisition. ‘Learning’ is the product of formal instruction. It is involved in a conscious process. The example of learning can be found in the traditional instruction that emphasizes the correctness and practices of grammar rules. ‘Acquisition’, on the contrary, is the product of a subconscious process which requires meaningful interaction in the target language. Comprehension hypothesis emphasizes learners’ acquisition. It attempts to explain how L2 learner acquires a second language. This hypothesis claims that learners acquire second language by understanding messages under the conditions of ‘i+1’, and low affective filter. According to this hypothesis, the learner improves and progresses when s/he receives comprehensible input that is one step beyond his/her current stage of linguistic competence. The Comprehension hypothesis can also apply to literacy: reading and writing ability. To help L2 learners learn to read and write in the target language, teachers have to provide them with comprehensible input such as authentic materials, writing activities that allow them to practice and interact with their peers. Interaction with their peers provides the students with comprehensible input that is appropriate for their current stage of linguistic competence. Reading authentic materials gives students chances to expose to language used in the real situation. Exposing to language helps students acquire the target language.
The affective filter hypothesis

According to Krashen, affective variables including motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety, play a facilitative role in second language acquisition. Krashen claims that to promote language acquisition, teachers have to create the environment that increases positive affect, such as motivation and self-confidence, and at the same time, lowers the negative affect like anxiety. L2 writing class with traditional approach tends to raise the affective filter, for example, low motivation, low self-esteem, and a high level of anxiety that prevent comprehensible input from being used for acquisition. To help ESL/EFL students learn to write and grow as writers, teachers should build the environment that lowers the affective filter. Meaningful activities, such as free writing, revision, and peer-response, can promote positive affect and reduce negative affect. These activities help the students feel comfortable to learn to write, and feel confident to take risks and to share their writing with others besides the teacher. Practicing writing more frequently provides the students more chances to expose to the target language. The students will not be afraid to write and gradually observe their progress, which results in feeling of confidence in their writing ability.

The problem-solving hypothesis

According to Krashen (1995), two competing hypotheses that attempt to explain how we learn new facts and new concepts are: the “study hypothesis” and the “problem-solving hypothesis” (p. 347). While the “study hypothesis” claims that we learn new facts and concepts by trying to learn (study), the “problem-solving hypothesis” asserts that we learn new facts and concept by doing or solving problems. In favor with the “problem-solving hypothesis”, Krashen asserts, “If real learning and flow are both natural to the brain and are both enjoyable, and if flow occurs when we are involved in a problem that challenges our abilities appropriately, it may be the case that problem-solving that results in flow is a necessary conditions for cognitive
development to take place” (p. 348). The term “flow” is used in his article to refer to the state of being deeply involved in an enjoyable activity. In other words, to promote cognitive development, teachers should provide students problem-solving activities that are one step beyond their current competence. In L2 writing class, teachers should provide the students more challenging and meaningful activities rather than grammar exercises and imitating paragraph writing. Interacting with peers and writing practices allow the students to learn a new concept of writing as a process and promote their cognitive development by doing and solving problem while they are writing.

Sociocultural Theory

Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mind claims that social interaction plays a crucial role in an individual’s cognitive growth and development. This theory suggests that most learning takes place in “communities of practice” where individuals, under the assistance of or collaboration with more capable others, learn to do thing beyond their current capacity. This concept is known as the “Zone of Proximal Development” (ZPD), proposed by Vygotsky (1978). Vygotsky views language development as a sociocultural and historical process. A child’s cultural development occurs when they interact with others in a social discourse, and later they internalize and reconstruct the knowledge they learn. In writing class, teachers should provide students chances to interact with their peers. Peer-response is one of the activities that allow the students to interact with their peers. Moreover, teacher-student conference provides the students an opportunity to interact with the teacher, the more capable one. Engaging in the conference will allow the students to learn and get help from the teacher in order to move on to the next stage of their development.

Sociocultural theorists, i.e. Tharp and Gallimore (1988), suggest modeling and scaffolding as a means of assisting performance. Via modeling, a process of offering behavior for imitation,
an inexperienced student can observe and imitate the behaviors of the expert. Later on, the student gradually internalizes the imitated behaviors into his or her own capacity. Similarly, scaffolding is a process that the more capable, such as the teacher, assists the novice to learn new facts and concepts. Then, the teacher gradually pulls out their assistance. With the teacher’s assistance, the novice learns how to solve the problem and learns to do things that s/he could not do previously.

In the field of second language composition, the process approach emphasizes the sociocultural influences of the institutions in which students engage in learning (Nelson & Kim, 2001). According to social view, the way students learn and interact with other students and teachers is influenced or shaped by sociocultural factors (Heath, 1983). Social patterns of literacy practices have an effect on students’ cognitive functions (Scribner & Cole, 1981). To understand how students learn to write in a second language, we must explore the sociocultural factors that affect students’ learning and their interaction with other students and teachers.

**Theoretical Approaches to Teaching of NES Writing**

The development of NES composition in terms of teaching began about a century ago. However, the focus at that time was primarily on product. In other words, in most writing classrooms, teachers focused on teaching grammar and literature rather than on how to write. The situation remained as such until 1975, when a writing crisis in the United States arose (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1986). The question, “Why can’t Johnny write?” aroused the interest of the public to pay attention to writing curriculum. One response to public interest was that research in the field of teaching writing increased. The focus of such research included “early development of written symbolism, discourse analysis, story grammar, basic writers, and the ‘new rhetoric, writing apprehension’, classroom practices, response, and the composing process.” (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1986) Thus, since the writing crisis, it appears that the focus
of teaching writing has shifted from product to process. The following sections address the basis approaches—the expressivist approach, the cognitivist approach, the interactive approach, and the social constructionist approach—for the development of NES composition teaching methodologies over the last two decades (Reid, 1993).

**The Expressivist Approach**

The expressive perspective of writing focuses on the writer’s voice. The expressivists, such as Elbow (1973, 1981) and Murray (1985), view writing as a process of discovery and expression. Berlin (1988) argues that writing is “an art, a creative act in which the process—the discovery of the true self—is as important as the product—the self discovered and expressed” (p. 484). Based on the expressive view, teachers emphasize and promote students’ voice, choice and self expression. The focus in composition classrooms, under this approach, turns away from the final product, grammar correction, and structuring of essays to the free writing, which concentrates on self-discovery and self-expression (Reid, 1993). Teachers in expressivist classrooms tend to facilitate classroom activities that are designed to promote writing fluency such as free writing and journal writing, while simultaneously empowering the students by letting them choose the writing topics. As Reid points out, “This approach leads quite naturally to a process classroom” (p. 260). Process writing activities in expressivists classrooms tend to promote “power over the writing act” (Johns, 1990, p. 25). Moffett (1994) argues that students can become proficient at expository writing, as well as other kinds of essays when they develop personal writing.

**The Cognitivist Approach**

Cognitivists see writing as “a thinking and problem-solving process” (Reid, 1993, p. 260). Since cognitivists began to investigate the writing process and process teaching, they have been interested in a model of process of writing (Flower and Hayes, 1997). Two cognitive researchers,
Flower and Hayes (1997), have studied how writers approach tasks. Based on such research, Flower and Hayes have proposed a model explaining the process of writing by problem-solving. According to Flower and Hayes’ model, the main parts of the composition process are: planning, translating, and reviewing. This model has influenced classroom practices. In cognitive classrooms, teachers provide intervention through a variety of pre-writing techniques, including brainstorming, free writing, outlining, and mapping. Students are trained to develop their image of the audience, the situation, and the goals of writing (Reid, 1993). This approach is commonly found in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classrooms. The students in the cognitivists’ classrooms first define a rhetoric problem, explore its parts, generate alternate solutions, come up with a conclusion, and then convert those ideas into words.

The Interactive Approach

Interactivists view writing as a part of dialogue between the writer and the reader (Bakhtin, 1986). In interactive writing classrooms, “both the writer and the reader take responsibility for coherent communication, and the writing-reading connection is primary” (Reid, 1993, p. 261). The transaction between the writer and the reader is the critical aspect of these classrooms. In other words, the writer pays attention to the reader’s expectation while the reader tries to sense the writer’s intention in his/her writing (Zamel, 1992). This leads to the integration of writing and reading. In an interactive approach classroom, the teacher promotes discourse community with meaningful responses through collaborative work such as peer conference or peer-response group.

The Social Constructionist Approach

According to social constructionists, writing is a social act that takes place within a social context for a specific purpose, and that the construction of knowledge is the result of social
interaction. According to Vygotsky (1978), the writing process, which is considered higher mental development, lies beyond both cognitive and individual levels. What Vygotsky means by this is that higher mental functions, writing being one of them, result from the internalization and transformation of social interaction. Similarly, Bakhtin (1973) states that outer experiences, such as spoken and written speech, are socially constructed. In other words, a product of knowledge and language (speaking and writing) is generated and determined by the community of the speaker or the writer (Johns, 1990).

In social constructionist classrooms, teachers promote a discourse community with meaningful responses through collaborative work. Talking about their own writing makes students aware of the writing process. Students also learn to revise their work from peer responses. In this collaborative work, students learn a pragmatic view of composing: sharing their goals and expectations of different discourse communities help to shape their writing.

**Approaches to Teaching ESL Writing**

In general, the progress of non-native speaker (NNS) or ESL composition theory and approaches has been influenced by theories and approaches to NES composition. There are many approaches or methods that have been used in the teaching of ESL writing (Hyland, 2003; Reid, 1993). In this section, I narrow my discussion to four approaches: the controlled composition approach, the current-traditional rhetoric approach, the communicative approach, and the process approach (Reid, 1993).

**The Controlled Composition Approach**

The philosophy of controlled writing was rooted in the Audio-lingual Method (ALM), which is based on the behaviorist’s principle of stimulus-response. There are three major assumptions underpinning the ALM (Reid, 1993). First, “positive reinforcement” is an effective teaching method and error is not allowed. Second, habituation of language is a basis of fluency,
so drills are used for practicing language. Third, oral language is important for success, whereas writing is only a “support” skill. Therefore, writing is taught as a supplementary to oral language and as exercises for practicing language structures and language use. In the classroom, teachers focus on forms of writing, particularly at the sentence-level, on the teaching of grammatical structures and on error correction.

Controlled writing became less popular when research in English showed that emphasis on grammatical correction and sentence-level structure can block the composing process and reduce students’ motivation to write (Perl, 1979; Silva, 1990). Although there have been some concerns about this method of teaching writing, the controlled writing approach is still used in ESL classrooms among other current practices (Silva, 1990; Hyland, 2003).

**The Current-traditional Rhetoric Approach**

The “current-traditional rhetoric approach” or “functional approach” (Hyland, 2003, p. 6) is a combination of basic principles of first language writing instruction and Kaplan’s concept of contrastive rhetoric (Silva, 1990). Instead of focusing only on sentence-level structure and error correction, this approach focuses more on discourse structure and stylistic features of writing. Kaplan’s research (1966) found that ESL writing was influenced by the students’ first language, more specifically, cross-linguistic and rhetorical pattern transfer. Based on contrastive rhetoric, ESL teachers can predict difficulties and possible sources of errors that students will experience when they learn to write in English. In ESL classrooms, teachers point out the differences of the pattern of English writing and that of other languages in order to make the students aware of these differences when they write in English. The current-traditional rhetoric approach focuses on fitting sentences and paragraphs into appropriate patterns. Guided writing and five-paragraph essay styles are used for practicing discourse structures.
The Communicative Approach

The communicative approach is based on the premise of learner-centered teaching. This approach stresses the meaningful purpose of writing and the audience (Raimes, 1983). In this approach, writing is seen as a way to communicate rather than the practicing of grammatical structures. Students are encouraged to write with an authentic purpose and with an authentic audience in mind (Reid, 1993). Meaningful writing tasks are, thus, created in order to let the students practice writing with for a given purpose and a given audience. Situation-initiated activities, such as writing letters to a pen pal from an English-speaking country or writing complaint letters, are used for practicing writing. Teachers in communicative classrooms do not focus on error correction. Instead, they act as readers and give useful feedback to help the students rewrite. According to Reid (1993), communicative writing classes make use of:

- student writing samples and peer review for the students to learn from authentic responses
- purposeful assignments
- the integration of skills including the reading and writing connection
- an emphasis on students’ needs

The Process Approach

Since the 1970’s, the teaching of writing has shifted away from a focus on the written product to a concentration on the writer and the process of writing (Silva, 1990; Reid, 1993). ESL research on process writing follows the research on process writing with native English speakers, and the researchers has focused on how writers compose and understand writing as a process of discovery and self-expression (Zamel, 1976, 1982). For example, Flower and Hayes (1981) studied college students’ writing and found their composition process recursive rather than linear as the writer writes. This approach is based on theories such as expressive and social constructionism. The focus of this approach is on the process of composing, self-expression, and collaborative learning.
In the process approach, instructional activities are designed to help the students express themselves fluently, to help them think and organize their ideas before writing and to help them revise drafts. In the classroom, teachers promote collaborative learning through group work such as peer responses. Also, the teaching premise in this classroom is learner-center. The teachers reduce their authority and play a less controlling role by allowing the students to explore a variety of topics or to choose a topic of their own. In the mean time, teachers allow students to work at their own pace. Students have more time to write, to explore their topic and to revise their work. The sense of audience is also seen as one of the important features in this classroom. Students in process writing classes are encouraged to have their voice in their writing, while simultaneously learning to listen to the audience’s voice in order to help them improve their writing.

Relationships and interactions among peers are vital in this type of classroom because writing is viewed as a social act that takes place within a social context for a specific purpose. Construction of knowledge is a result of social interaction. As stated earlier, for Vygotsky (1978), the writing process, which is considered a higher mental development, lies beyond the cognitive or individual level. Based on Vygotsky’s concept of the zone of proximal development, after working with capable peers or the teacher, the child develops to the next zone. In this sense, social interaction leads to a child’s higher development in problem solving. Therefore, in process writing classrooms, teachers promote peer responses, as well as teacher-student and student-student (peer) conferences, so that students can learn from their peers in order to transform ideas into written texts.

Writing Instruction in Thailand

In Thailand, writing, particularly writing in English, has been taught as a part of teaching language. In language classrooms (both in Thai and in English), the teacher teaches four skills:
listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, writing is not emphasized unless it is a subject for language majored students. Although there may be many approaches introduced in Thai classrooms, in facts, writing instruction in Thailand can be grouped in two main approaches according to ESL/EFL writing instruction: the traditional writing approach and the process approach.

**Traditional Writing Approach**

Writing in Thailand has been taught based on language structure (product-oriented approach). In a traditional classroom, writing is not focused but it was a part of learning grammatical structure. Writing is taught after the other language skills are developed (Thammasarinsophon, 1991). Writing is considered a supplement of learning English language. Writing is a means to practice grammar and for the teacher to evaluate how well the students learned the sentence structure they were taught. The teacher provides the students with exercise drills (sentence-level) to practice and model texts to imitate. Controlled writing and guided writing are used in the traditional classroom. Traditional writing teachers focus on forms or grammatical structure and viewed writing as a part of grammar instruction.

Later on, the teachers in the traditional classroom integrated the “current-traditional rhetoric approach” or the “functional approach” (Hyland, 2003, p. 6) in his/her writing class. After ample traditional study of the familiarization of the language (Hyland, 2003), students are given instruction of how texts function. For example, first they are taught different types of paragraphs such as cause-effect, comparison and contrast, and narration in order to learn the functions of these texts. The teacher, then, explains how language is used to convey the meaning. The teacher also teaches the five-paragraph essay including introduction, body, and conclusion. Later on, the students are asked to write an essay by imitating the format or pattern of language they learned according to the purpose of their writing. In other words, the “functional approach”
emphasizes the purpose of language in writing. The “current-traditional rhetoric” is commonly used in writing class for higher education such as college level, particularly for students majoring in English. The traditional writing approach stresses language structure, rhetoric patterns, and language use. This approach is still found in many writing classrooms in Thailand at all level (Chuendaechum, 1999).

The Process Approach

The process approach was introduced in writing classrooms in Thailand at least fifteen years ago according to the studies done on process approach. For this approach, the teacher focused on the process of writing and allowed the students to explore their writing process through multiple drafts. According to the studies on the process-based approach in Thailand (Chuendaechum, 1999; Tanuwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarnsophon, 1991), the teacher implemented the writing process approach applied in ESL/EFL classrooms. The writing process approach used in Thailand comprises of three main stages: pre-writing, writing, and post-writing (Tanutwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarnsophon, 1991). In the pre-writing stage, the teacher prepared the students for information and language they need for writing. The activities or tasks used in this stage include brainstorming, outlining, mind-mapping, and oral discussion about the topic. The writing stage referred to drafting is based on the information from the first stage. Writing could be group or individual work. Post-writing refers to the revision stage. The activities in this stage included peer-review or peer-response, conferencing, revising, editing, and publishing (the final draft that students turn in).

Although the process approach has been introduced to Thai education for at least fifteen years, according to my survey, not many teachers really use or apply this approach in their writing classroom. The possible obstacles for this situation are the large-size class and the teacher-workload. Mackenzie (2002, 2005) stated that after the teachers were trained for an
innovative approach such as communicative approach they tried it in their classroom for a period of time. However, because of the large number of students and their workload, they did not continue trying and returned to the more familiar traditional instruction. In addition, the traditional instruction was compatible with the current curriculum and assessment (i.e. grammar-based test, multiple choices). In other words, the teachers found that trying a new approach that was not compatible with the curriculum and assessment burned them with more work.

**Implementation of the Process Approach in ESL/EFL Classrooms**

Early process writing theory and pedagogy paid little attention to marginalized students, such as those in lower socio-economic groups, minorities and immigrants. Early theory and practice, therefore, seemed to imply that this approach would work equally well for all students (Tobin, 1994). Awareness of differences in race, class, and culture, however, have since become important, and further research has been done to see whether the above implication is, indeed, supported. For example, Heath (1983) studied the influence of social class on the process of literacy, and Atwell (1987) found that the process approach works well with special education students. Similarly, Delpit (2002) suggested that in order to encourage the African American children to learn Standard English, the teacher as well as the school have to appreciate what the children bring with them from their home. In other words, the teacher has to accept and value their home language, which is part of their identity and culture. The teacher has to learn about the students’ language and culture in order to learn their interest and their need and make the students feel welcome to the school setting. Once they feel welcome, they are willing to learn what we teach.

Recently, there have been more studies on the implementation of the process approach and the techniques or activities used in writing workshop with ESL/EFL students. In this section, I present some studies focusing on the implementation of the process approach with ESL/EFL
Adipattaranun (1992; Fiona, 2000; Matsumoto, 1997; Payton, Jones, Vincent, and Greenblatt 1994), and the studies on the implementation of the process approach with Thai students (Chaisuriya, 2003; Chuendaechum, 1999; Patarapongpaisan, 1996; Tanuwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarnsophon, 1991; Wisessang, 1996).

**The Studies with ESL/EFL students**

Adipattaranun (1992) explored “the variables in the writing process of ESL/EFL students in a process-oriented freshman composition course.” She studied an ESL classroom at college level in the U.S for one semester. The purposes of her study were 1) to observe and describe an ESL writing classroom where the process approach was implemented, and 2) to explore the strategies used by the students while they revised. She collected data by classroom observing, interviewing, and collecting students’ writing and other artifacts. Her focal participants were nine non-English native speakers from Singapore, Taiwan, Malaysia, Korea, Japan, and Indonesia. Although the students in this study studied English in a traditional way which focused on grammar and viewed writing as “a passive and private affair” (Adipattaranun, 1992), the results showed that via process-based instruction particularly revising process, the students “gained audience awareness,… a sense of sharing and support,… knowledge of what good writing entails, …and how to give advice to others and to indirectly teach themselves” (Adipattaranun, 1992b, p. 254-258). In addition, she concluded that the factors affecting the students’ writing quality and their experience of writing in this class were: “1) how students were taught, 2) the quality of peer partners, 3) commitment to success, [and] 4) language difficulties” (p. 259).

Peyton, Jones, Vincent, and Greenblatt (1994) studied adapting writing workshops for ESOL students in the United States. Their data come from four focus group meetings of the teachers in The Book Project held at the end of each school year. The researchers found that at the beginning, it was difficult to implement writing workshops due to constraints such as time,
space, resources, and supportive colleagues. However, after several attempts and a strong belief that writing workshops work, the teachers tried to adapt and make use of what they had in order to encourage students’ learning and writing through writing workshops. These teachers also tried to persuade and work with their uncooperative colleagues in order to solve the problems they faced. Peyton et al. (1994) concludes that “[a]ll teachers struggle with time, space, and resource constraints, and those attempting to change well-established instructional practices wrestle with long-held and sometimes clashing attitudes and procedures within the school system, their students, and even themselves” (p. 483). They suggest that teachers should not mechanically adopt the approach into their classes, but instead should adapt and discover what works well with their particular students.

Fiona (2000) studied teacher’s implementation of writing workshops in Australia. Fiona observed two teachers who volunteered to use writing workshops in their ESL classrooms. Her results show that besides the constraints mentioned by Peyton et al. (1994), the cultural background of the students also plays an important role in the use of writing workshops. For example, Asian students tended to be shy and were not familiar with peer response because they have always received feedback from their teachers when they studied in L1. The teachers had to be patient and explain how to respond and demonstrate it at the beginning of the session and encourage Asian students to participate in the conferences.

Similarly, Matsumoto (1997) studied writing workshops in Japan. However, she conducted her research at an American military base school where she taught in Japan. Matsumoto considers her students ESL students because they have a chance to use English outside the classroom on the base. She conducted four pilot studies in her classroom. Through the first three pilot studies (1/19-2/4/1996, 3/19-5/6/1996, and 5/27-7/17/1996), she explored research tools for
developing the technique and classroom teaching so that it could be tested in her last study and as resources for the data collection. From these four studies, with four to eight students in each case, Matsumoto found that it was difficult to introduce writing workshops in her classrooms because the Japanese students were not familiar with interactive and collaborative learning. In the first study, the students were resistant to the method because the class did not meet their expectations. The students expected to learn and practice grammar and to receive direct instruction through lecture rather than participating in the class. As a result, some of the students dropped out. For her second study, she added grammar practices into her class and found that it worked to a certain degree, so she then decided to adapt some direct instruction into her writing workshops. Another problem she found was the textbook that she had to use according to the program curriculum. She was not satisfied with the textbook provided by the program because it was product-based. By using this textbook she was controlled by a product-oriented program. She tried to find a new textbook that would allow her to adapt to her writing workshop, and did end up changing it, but in the end she still could not find a textbook that suited her needs. Instead of relying on a textbook, she decided to create the teaching material herself. The language abilities of the students was another concern she encountered, so she finally allowed the students to use Japanese in the classroom and sometimes had her assistance translated the instructions from English into Japanese.

Matsumoto (1997) concluded that to implement writing workshop with ESL students, teachers have to know their students well, including their language abilities, and their educational and cultural backgrounds. Additionally, teachers have to explain to the students the purpose of writing workshops and to be good models for them to follow. She also suggests that teachers, at the beginning, may have to mix between the product-based and the process-based
approach in order to make the students more comfortable and to reduce anxiety. In other words, to apply writing workshop, that is learner-centered and emphasize students’ process of writing, in ESL/EFL classroom, the teacher may have to integrate the direct instruction which focus on grammar, language structure, and the students’ product of writing in order to meet the students’ expectation and make them feel more comfortable to learn.

Ping (2000) studied a writing workshop with Chinese ESL students in Canada. She focused on how cross-cultural issues play a role in teaching Chinese ESL students. The four participants in her study were Chinese ESL students ranging in ages from 18-20 years. They were in an advanced writing class. Ping observed these four students in a class in which the teacher used writing workshops. She also interviewed these students about their perceptions of the writing workshop approach. Similar to Matsumoto, Ping states in her interpretation,

> It appears that instructional innovations, such as the process writing approach, are difficult to implement in some classrooms with students from different culture backgrounds, at least, at the beginning period of the semester. Discrepancies in ESL students’ and instructor’s perceptions for teaching may affect classroom instruction and students’ performance. (Ping, 2000, p. 196)

Ping (2000) also suggests that in order to make learning and teaching effective, the teacher has to make the learning more relevant to students’ interest and “balance the curriculum to meet students’ needs by integrating some direct instruction into her teaching” (p. 197).

According to these studies, it seems that there are some factors affecting implementation of an innovative writing approach like the process approach, such as the students’ learning and cultural background, students’ language proficiency, the quality of peers, and the teacher’s workload. The following section will discuss the study of the process approach in Thailand in order to provide more information to better understanding about the situation and the context of this study.
Unfortunately, there are not many studies on the use of the process approach with EFL students, particularly in terms of its implications in the classroom, how it helps EFL students improve their writing, or how students’ culture affects the implementation of the process approach. Introducing this innovative teaching approach in ESL/EFL classrooms, particularly in an oriental setting like Thailand, needs to be explored; furthermore, special attention needs to be paid to the influence of the students’ educational backgrounds and cultural perspectives on the implementation of the approach. Problems may arise due to the differences such as rhetorical, educational and cultural background, when one blindly uses an approach that is successful in one setting in another. The following section devotes to survey of the studies on writing process approach conducted with Thai students.

**Studies on Thai Students**

(Thammasarnsophon, 1991) conducted an experiment to compare English writing ability of twelfth graders who learned English writing through the process approach and product-based approach (direct instruction focusing on grammar and correctness). Thammasarnsophon, a teacher-researcher, divided the students into experimental and control groups (47 and 55 students in each group, respectively). She used pre-test and post-test to evaluate the students’ writing ability before and after learning. The findings revealed that overall English writing ability of the students in the process-oriented class was higher than that of the students in the product-oriented classroom. In terms of the content, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics, the results also showed that the students in the process-oriented group performed better than those in the product-oriented group. However, there was no significant difference between these two groups in terms of language use. Thammasarnsophon (1991) suggested that the teachers apply process-oriented approach in their writing classroom and emphasized brainstorming and discussion in the classroom.
Tanuwongviwat (1995), as a teacher-researcher, compared Thai writing ability of the twelfth grade students learning through the process approach and the criticism approach. He divided the students into two groups according to the different approach. He also grouped the students in each group according to their Thai language proficiency: high, intermediate, and low. He used pre-test and post-test to evaluate the students’ writing ability. The results showed that for all proficiency levels, writing ability of the students in both groups was not significantly different. Moreover, the students’ writing ability after learning through both approaches improved according to the higher scores of the post-test. In addition, Tanuwongviwat (1995) used the questionnaire to explore the students’ opinions on Thai writing instruction they experienced. The results from the questionnaire showed that the students had positive feedback on both approaches in that they thought their writing ability improved and they liked writing more.

Wisessang (1996) studied the impact of the process approach on the ninth grade students’ English writing ability. She divided the students into two groups (experimental and control groups). The experimental group was taught through the process approach while the control group was taught based on the curriculum which focused on the product. Wisessang (1995) used the test scores to compare the students’ English writing ability in both groups. The results of this study showed that the students who were taught through the process approach wrote better than those who were taught through the product approach. Wisessang concluded that the process approach enhanced the students’ English writing ability.

Similarly, Patarapongpaisan (1996) studied the effects of the process approach on the English majored students at college level in Bangkok. She conducted an experiment to compare English writing ability of the students taught through the process approach (experimental group)
and the product approach (control group). She used pre-test and post-test to evaluate the students’ writing ability before and after learning. Similar to the results of Wisessang’s (1996) study, Patarapongpaisan concluded that the process approach helped the students write better compared with the product approach.

In addition, Chaisuriya (2003) studied the implementation of the process approach, which he named “social-constructionist approaches” (p. vii), to teaching technical writing at college level in Thailand. His participants were thirty sophomore science students. He taught this English writing class based on the syllabus he created. His teaching approaches included “collaborative writing, writing as a process, peer-review, teacher/student writing conference, and peer evaluation” (Chaisuriya, 2003, p. vii). The data were collected by observation, interviews and artifacts. The results showed that it was possible and useful to implement the “social-constructionist approaches” in an EFL class such as one in Thailand. Moreover, the students in this study learned more through collaborative writing. He mentioned the main problem found in collaborative writing, such as “participants’ accountability and responsibility, group work management, and the evaluation of participants” (p. vii). The students learned from their peers’ writing and comments to improve their own writing. Chaisuriya (2003) also found that the students’ English language proficiency, particular grammar and vocabulary, was another problem in leaning writing in his class. He also concluded that the assessment should be compatible with the writing instruction. In other words, evaluating only the products of writing alone seemed not to be valid.

The results of these studies showed that the process approach tended to enhance the students’ writing ability both in Thai and English. However, these studies rarely discussed about the variables that affect the teaching instruction and the students’ achievement in writing.
Moreover, they rarely discussed the students’ response on writing instruction particularly the process approach. Unlike the other studies of ESL/EFL writing classroom, the studies in Thailand tended to focus on the test scores as a measurement for students’ writing ability. According to the studies on the process approach in ESL/EFL classroom, it seems that non-western educational and cultural backgrounds have an influence on the implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. For the purposes of the current study, it is necessary to discuss the cultural background of Thai society and the Thai educational system in order to help the readers understand the setting better. First, however, I would like to discuss other factors that influence ESL/EFL writing. Then, the educational and cultural background will be discussed.

Factors Affecting Second Language Writing

There has been much research done on ESL writing in order to help the students improve their writing abilities. One aspect of such research is the exploration of factors that influence second language (SL) writing with the intention of understanding how students write, as well as to identify difficulties and the sources of those difficulties. Researchers hope that understanding ESL students’ writing and their problems will help teachers and students discover a better method for developing students’ writing performance. This section will discuss factors that affect the acquisition of second language writing. Factors affecting or enhancing the acquisition of second language writing have been examined by many researchers, such as Kaplan (1966), Mohan and Lo (1985), Cumming (1994), Kubota (1998), and Ho (1998). The results from these studies reveal that there are positive and negative factors that influence L2 writing. The factors that have been shown to have an impact on L2 writing are first language transfer (L1 to L2), L2 proficiency, and cross-cultural values.
L1-L2 Transfer

There has been much research done on L1-L2 transfer in order to discover if transfer occurs and whether or not it influences L2 writing. The evidence from such research suggests that L1-L2 transfer does exist and that it does affect L2 writing. This section addresses how and what kinds of L1-L2 transfer affect L2 writing. The transfer of first language to second language learning includes cross-linguistic and rhetorical pattern transfer (e.g., Kaplan, 1966; Fieg, 1983), developmental factors (e.g., Mohan & Lo, 1985), transfer of cognitive aspects of writing (e.g., Cumming, 1994; Kubota, 1998), and translation (e.g., Siriphan, 1988; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1994).

A cross-linguistic and rhetorical pattern transfer

The effects of L1-L2 transfer, particularly cross-linguistic and rhetoric transfer, on L2 writing have been discussed and argued since Kaplan (1966) proposed the concept of contrastive rhetoric. It has been found that L1 transfer is one of the main factors affecting L2 writing. According to Odlin (1989), transfer refers to “the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired” (p. 27). Transfer is universal as it occurs when learning any second language (Ellis, 1994).

L1 transfer can result in errors in L2 learning (negative transfer or interference), facilitation in L2 learning (positive transfer), avoidance, and over-use (Ellis, 1994). In terms of L2 writing, both negative and positive transfers have received attention and have been studied extensively. Negative transfer or interference occurs when the L1 differs from the L2, both linguistically and non-linguistically, whereas positive transfer occurs when the L1 and the L2 are similar in some respect.
Since the 1950s, learners’ errors in the L2 could be predicted by comparing and contrasting the grammar of the student’s L1 to that of the target language. For example, Thai students tend to omit a copula when it precedes a predicate adjective as in, “I really happy with them,” because in Thai, a copula in this sentence structure is not needed (Fieg, 1983). Unlike English, Thai, Chinese, and Korean do not have articles, and are not inflectional languages. Therefore, ESL students from these countries tend to make errors of article omission, tense, and plural-noun inflection (Kim, 1983). On the other hand, word order does not tend to be difficult for many ESL students because, like English, many other languages have sentence structure SVO (Krzeszowski, 1981). The first two examples above are instances of negative transfer, while the last is an example of positive transfer.

Studies based on Error Analysis (EA) and Contrastive Analysis (CA) tended to focus on the sentence-level or on grammatical errors. Kaplan (1966) argues, “Foreign students who have mastered syntactic structures have still demonstrated inability to compose adequate themes, term papers, theses, and dissertation” (p. 3). He then introduced contrastive rhetoric into linguistic and educational research on ESL literacy. For Kaplan, rhetoric is “a mode of thinking or a mode of ‘finding all available means’ for the achievement of a designated end” (1966, p. 1). He also argues that writing involves not only linguistic components, but also cultural thought patterns. He studied and identified paragraph patterns of writing from different cultures and concluded that ESL/EFL students carry their L1 rhetoric pattern into their L2 writing. Using L1 rhetorical patterns, such as Oriental writing (the circles or gyres), in English essays would strike English readers as awkward and unnecessarily indirect because English paragraph patterns are linear (Kaplan, 1966). ESL teachers would most likely consider such non-native types of essays poorly organized. Since Kaplan’s seminal study, there have been several other contrastive rhetoric
studies looking at different languages including Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Thai (e.g., Fieg, 1983; Kim, 1983; Söter, 1988). Their results confirm Kaplan’s findings that ESL students write according to the rhetorical pattern preferred by their own culture. Söter (1988) concludes that, according to the study of contrastive rhetoric, which identifies cultural or organizational patterns, “we may further develop our understanding of factors that create difficulties for ESL writers beyond the lexico-grammatical system employed” (p. 201).

Mohan and Lo (1985) challenge Kaplan because Kaplan examined only L2 texts written in English by students from different cultures. Yet, other studies, such as Oi (1984), Indrasuta (1988), and Kobayashi and Rinnert (1994), have examined both L1 and L2 texts written by students studying other second languages, such as Japanese and Thai. The results of their studies also confirm Kaplan’s findings that L1 transfer of rhetorical patterns does occur. The counter-argument of L1-L2 transfer was raised when the results of the studies on ESL writing such as Mohan and Lo (1985), Cook (1988), Zamel (1989) did not support Kaplan’s research in terms of L1-L2 transfer of written discourse features. These challenging studies found that the lack of writing skills in English is not due to their cultural thought patterns, but to other factors, and that these factors that are referred to as developmental factors could have negative or positive influences on L2 writing.

**Developmental factors**

Cummins (1981) argues for the importance of L1 literacy for learning English as a second language. He points out that if ESL learners are fully literate in their L1, they tend to perform better in L2, compared to those who are less literate in their L1. Similarities in development between first language composition and second language composition have also been found (Zamel, 1983). Mohan and Lo (1985) suggest that developmental factors, which include students’ native literacy and educational experience, play an important role for dealing with
organizational problems in L2 academic writing. “Sentence-level skills such as spelling, … and grammatical accuracy are established early, and awareness and control of them declines as they become relatively automatic. Awareness and control discourse strategies, competence in organizing larger units of discourse coherently, are a later development” (Mohan & Lo, 1985, p. 522).

The results of Mohan and Lo’s study show that the organizational problems of Chinese students in academic writing are not due to the preference for Chinese rhetorical patterns of “indirectness”, rather they relate to the way ESL students are taught in English classrooms. Most English instructions in Asia (Thailand, Japan, Korea, and China) are grammar-based and focus on sentence-level rather than discourse level structures (Kim, 1983; Mohan & Lo, 1985; Carson, 1992; Phongsuwan, 1996). Students in such countries rarely have a chance to communicate in written English and are not taught to develop logical arguments or to organize logical sequences of ideas; both of which tend to be important principles for English writing. Therefore, lack of experience in English composition influences low ESL writing scores (Kubota, 1998). Asian students rarely practice a wide variety of English compositions, for example, writing argumentative and persuasive essays. The Thai students in Phongsuwan’s (1996) study reported that their problems in learning English in the United States included a lack of practice in language skills in Thailand and in the United States; a lack of background knowledge; a lack of practicing idea expression; learning from inadequately trained non-native English speaking teachers in Thailand; and differences in educational systems and cultural backgrounds. These ESL students, who were trained to focus on product, did not know the expectations for English writing and how writing is taught and learned in second language classrooms in the United States, which are process oriented. They expressed feeling frustrated and leaning more on their
L1. As a result, ESL teachers evaluated their writing quality as poor or they did not understand what the students were trying to convey. Such studies support the idea that educational experience and L1 literacy transfer to how ESL students learn and perform writing in English.

Cognitive aspects of writing

Another factor which transfers from L1 to L2, thus affecting L2 writing ability, is cognitive aspects of writing. Cognitive abilities include the composing process, writing strategies, and L1 writing ability or expertise. Like developmental factors, cognitive aspects in writing can be a hindrance or a facilitator for ESL students in developing L2 writing abilities. Studies show that cognitive abilities tend to transfer from L1 to L2 (Cummins, 1981). In other words, if ESL students are good writers in their L1, they can carry their writing expertise including the composing process and writing strategies they successfully use in L1 over to L2 writing (Cumming, 1989). On the other hand, if they are not good at writing in their L1, they tend to have low performance in L2 writing. The research suggests that writing process and writing strategies, for example, prewriting, rescanning, revising, and editing, in L1 are comparable with those in L2 (Raimes, 1994; Zamel, 1983). Cumming (1989) and Cook (1988) found positive effects of L1 writing ability on the quality of discourse organization and content in ESL writing, problem-solving behaviors, and quality scores. Therefore, in general, writing performance in L1 influences writing in L2. Kubota’s (1998) study confirms this argument that rather than a contrastive rhetoric factor, “good L1 essays in Japanese and English share some similar characteristics” (p. 88). Kubota also found that L1 writing skills have positive correlations between Japanese and English organization scores. In other words, poor organization in English essays is related to the lack of ability to organize text in L1. According to the results of many studies mentioned above, the cognitive aspects of writing, like developmental factors, tend to be a universal factors affecting L2 writing.
Translation

Translation is another factor related to transfer, which can be negative or positive depending upon how it affects L2 writing. Negative transfer is the result of using word(s) or phrase(s) that two cultures assign differently to concepts, whereas positive transfer results in the use of appropriate or acceptable terms in the target language (Siriphan, 1988). Direct translation or word-by-word translation seems to have a negative effect, particularly when dealing with cultural content or when the structure in the L1 differs from that of the L2. Direct translation can lead to awkward expressions, redundancy, incorrect word choices, or ambiguity for English-native readers. For example, these errors are made by Thai students due to direct translation: “I have to listen carefully, but it was in my left ear and go my right ear out.” “corpse box” (for coffin) (Siriphan, 1988). Siriphan also explains that some errors still occur after students’ editing because they lack training in proofreading and revising skills.

Translation can also be useful for ESL students though, especially for beginners or students with low levels of L2 proficiency. Kobayashi and Rinnert (1994) found that translation can have a positive effect on L2 writing. They concluded that translation from L1 essays into L2 can help adult ESL learners with low levels of L2 proficiency develop their ideas in the text. It is easier for ESL learners to think in their L1 and discover the meaning that they want to express (Fu, 1995). Students also tend to write more when they first write in their L1 and then translate in L2. In Kobayashi and Rinnert’s 1994 study, adult students, both high and low L2 proficiency, tended to use a variety of language structures, for example, complex sentences, when they translated, whereas they used familiar and simpler structures or ideas when writing directly in the L2. However, the advanced students did not benefit as much from translation, compared to those with low L2 proficiency. On the contrary, they tended to produce more awkward forms of English in their translated versions (Kobayashi & Rinnert 1994). In general, ESL/EFL beginners
tend to translate directly from L1 into L2 when writing in the L2. Intermediate or advanced students sometimes still think in their L1 and translate into English, even though they can write directly in English (Indrasuta, 1988; Siriphan, 1988).

**L2 Proficiency**

Second language proficiency as well as its influence on L2 writing has been studied and mixed results have been found. Many studies (e.g., Raimes, 1985, 1994; Zamel, 1982) have argued that L2 writing does not seem to be influenced by student’s L2 proficiency. Although Raimes (1994) concludes that there is little correspondence between language proficiency, writing ability for college placement, and composing strategies, she also recognized the limitations of her study. Her conclusions are drawn from a quantitative analysis of a multiple-choice test and a writing placement test, and “the lack of correspondence between language proficiency score …assessed according to a writing sample points to the limitations of standardized testing” (p. 149). Nevertheless, these researchers tend to emphasize that, rather than L2 linguistic competence, the composing competence, as well as composing strategies, are the determining factors of L2 writing quality.

On the other hand, several studies (e.g., Cumming, 1989, 1994; Kubota, 1998; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996) have suggested that L2 proficiency is one of the explanatory factors of L2 writing ability. Cumming (1989) argues that L2 proficiency facilitates writing performance in the L2. Second-language proficiency is an additive factor enhancing the quality of writing production and “interacting with the attention that participants devoted to aspects of writing” (p. 81). In other words, advanced ESL students are more apt to refer to more aspects of writing: gist, language, discourse, and procedures than basic writers. Moreover, Aungpredathep (1989) found that students who were more proficient in composing tended to write more fluently, express themselves at greater length and more clearly and to write with a stronger sense of audience than
lower proficiency students. The results of Sasaki and Hirose (1996) confirm that L2 proficiency is one of the factors influencing L2 writing ability. These researchers found that students’ limited L2 proficiency hinders their L1 ability and their L1 composing competence from transferring to L2 writing, and is also related to a lack of concern with organization in L2 writing.

Kubota (1998) also suggests that L2 proficiency can enhance the quality of writing in terms of language use. ESL students with limited English skills, such as knowledge of vocabulary and syntactic control, tend to lack attention to organization, produce simple text structures, and use ineffective connectors. They also rely more upon their first language, which results in L1 interference. The results of Kubota’s study also shows that without enough L2 proficiency skills, many students do not receive high scores in organization despite their good L1 writing skills. In contrast, students with strong L2 language skills get high scores in organization. Therefore, L2 proficiency seems to be a factor affecting quality of L2 writing. Cumming (1994), Sasaki and Hirose (1996), and Kubota (1998) all reveal that L2 proficiency is one of the influences for ESL students with low L2 proficiency skills, both at the sentence and the discourse level. In addition, without sufficient understanding and control in the L2, ESL students apply the rules of the L2 incompletely when they write in English, and induce linguistic errors such as “You like to sing?,” (Ellis, 1994). In summary, despite the counter-argument (Zamel, 1982; Raimes, 1985, 1994), the results of many studies (e.g. Cumming, 1989, 1994; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Kubota, 1998) indicate that L2 proficiency, generally, influences ESL writing.

**Cross-cultural Values**

Besides L1-L2 transfer and L2 proficiency, research on ESL writing has paid attention to the impact of cross-cultural values like collectivism vs. individualism on writing performance (Carson & Nelson, 1994). The argument about how much cultural issues impact learning and writing in a second language has been focused on the role of culture in composition, and to what
extent cross-cultural values influence the way ESL students learn to write in English. Many researchers (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Dean, 1989; Li, 1996; V. Ramanathan, & Atkinson, 1999; Ramanathan, & Kaplan, 1996; Ransdell, 1998; Thongrin, 2002; Voges, 2001) have studied the impact of culture on ESL writing. Some argue that culture has a very important impact on ESL students’ writing difficulties and on developing pedagogical approaches to cope with these difficulties (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Li, 1996; Ramanathan, & Atkinson, 1999; Ramanathan, & Kaplan, 1996; Ransdell, 1998). Others argue that culture is only a minor factor affecting ESL writers in learning to write in L2 (Atkinson, 1999; Lucas, 1989; Spack, 1997; Voges, 2001). In general, socio-cultural background has been found to affect ESL students’ writing performance and development in L2 writing.

Many studies on cross-cultural issues related to ESL writing have focused on the issue of individualism and collectivism. Some ESL students come from collectivist cultures, Chinese and Japanese for example. For collectivist culture, individuals work for the sake of the group or society. They admire and value the authority. This cultural perspective shows up in their writing as Asian students avoid using ‘I’. Instead, they prefer to use ‘we.’ They also like to imitate classic or well-known phrases or idioms in their writing, instead of being original or creative (Ho, 1998). Unlike Asian culture, Western culture, like that in America, promotes the use of individual voice both in and outside the classroom. Children in this culture are trained to express themselves and their ideas. Given this difference, Asian students struggle when they come to ESL classroom where individual voice is valued. ESL students have to learn and adjust themselves to express their idea in their writing by using “I”. Also, for ESL students like Chinese, Japanese, and Thai, the concept of copyright or plagiarism in writing is found difficult.
to understand because in their culture imitating classic works from other authors is valued and considered as good writing.

Given collectivist culture, students’ expectations of the principles and practices in the ESL writing classroom is different from that of most mainstream teachers. This mismatch of expectations between ESL learners and teachers causes problems for ESL students in terms of developing in writing, participating in the classroom and with the concept of “critical thinking” (Ramathan & Atkinson, 1999). When ESL students are in mainstream classrooms, they are frustrated with the activities and interaction between the teacher and the students and among peers themselves. This frustration is caused by the mismatch of expectations. For Asian students, they expect the teacher to give lectures. The role of the teacher is transmitter of information, while the role of students is the passive receiver. Students are expected to listen and not ask many questions. Asking questions, in Asian culture, shows disrespect and is viewed by teachers as challenging behavior on the part of the student. To the contrary, in American classrooms, the students are expected to actively participate by asking question, and expressing their opinions.

Difficulty and frustration with active participation can also be found when ESL students are asked to participate in group work or in peer reviewing activities. For instance, writing groups in composition classrooms in the United States function more for the benefit of the individual writer than for the benefit of the group. This concept is different from the concept of group work in collectivist cultures, where group work is used as “a technique for knowledge acquisition and as a method that teaches and reinforces the group ethic of their collectivist cultures (Carson & Nelson, 1994, p. 23). Given this mismatch, Asian students tend to passively participate in group work in mainstream western classrooms. They are seen as silent students.
For peer reviewing, Asian students rarely comment on their peers’ work because “in collectivist cultures, relationships that include group members are perceived as more nurturing, respectful, and intimate than they are in individual culture” (p. 24); thus, commenting on an individual’s work is viewed as disrespectful, as it does not reinforce nurturing or intimacy. This notion is described in Japanese norms of politeness (Matsumoto, 1997), and this behavior is also found in Thai students when they have to review their peers’ writing. Thai students hesitate to give strong comments. They rather start with the compliments first and, only if necessary, they prefer to give indirect critical comments (Thongrin, 2002). For Thai culture, this notion can be explained by the norms of politeness and the cultural word “Kreng-Jai”, which is similar to “consideration”.

From these studies, it is evident that culture plays a very important role in ESL learning and writing. However, Voges (2001) studying the impact of culture on ESL writers argues that for her two participants, one from India and the other from Central Mexico, individuality, motivation, language proficiency, and difference of prior writing experience or educational background play more important role in learning to write in English than cultural issue. Voges perceived culture as “only part of the individual” (p. 101) which has less influence on students’ writing problem than other factors.

To sum up, there are many factors affecting SL writers. Atkinson’s (1999) revision of the notions of culture and individuality allows us to explore ESL writers and their developing strategies in writing broadly and insightfully in terms of the factors that influence SL writers. Therefore, researchers as well as educators should reexamine the impact of culture (e.g. L1-L2 transfer, developmental factors, cross-cultural issues) and individuality such as their attitude toward English writing and past writing experience on ESL and EFL writers.
Interpretations of Thai Culture and Educational System

There is no doubt that cultural perspectives, one way or another, influence the way students respond to new teaching approaches. It is important to discuss and explain cross-cultural attitudes especially those toward the educational system in order to gain better understanding about the students’ cultural and educational background. Therefore, the following session is partly based on my own experience and my interpretation as a Thai teacher and learner.

Culture and language are interdependent. Culture supports language teaching and learning because language is a tool or media to transform and perceive knowledge (Bruner, 1986). For ESL/EFL teaching, cultural perspectives need to be taken into consideration because cultural awareness and second culture learning help students understand the social context and learn language successfully (Kramsch, 1991). Addressing cross-cultural issues helps teachers to understand the interactions and responses of students towards the target language, teaching methods, and overall learning.

Thai society is based upon hierarchical patron-client relationships where “a number of subordinates support a leader who holds their allegiance by successfully advancing their interests” (cited in Thongrin, 2002, p. 45). This attitude can be seen in the way Thai children always obey and respect their elders, particularly their parents and grandparents. Juniors avoid arguing with seniors. The concept of hierarchical relationships and authority can also be found in the Thai language. Thai shows not only the relationship between the speakers in terms of authority, but also shows their status through the use of given linguistic patterns. Thai is classified into three main categories, one used for the king and royal family, one used for monks or priests, and the other category used for ordinary people. Thai for ordinary people has further subtle categories in terms of politeness markers related to status of the people. For example, Thai language has several words for ‘thank you’, each used by people of different status. For example,
“khob-khun” is a neutral term for ‘thank you.’ “Khob jai” is used by the senior or a higher status person when he/she talks to the younger or lower, while “khob-pra-khun” is used by the younger or junior when he/she talks to the older or senior.

In education, this cultural concept can be seen in the relationship between the teacher and the students. The students treat the teacher as a wise and knowledgeable person and believe in what they are taught. The power or authority of the teacher promotes teacher-centered classrooms. The students rarely express their ideas or opinion without the teacher’s permission. Kennedy (2000) states that Thai culture promotes students’ passivity. She explains, “The Thai culture is remarkably deferential to people in authority roles and it is very difficult for most Thai to speak out in the presence of an authority” (p. 78). Thai students are trained to expect the teacher to give lectures or transmit the information to them. As a result, Thai students become passive and unlikely to engage in critical thinking.

Other cultural concepts that seem to play an important role in learning are “kreng jai” or being considerate, and losing face. Thongrin (2002) discussed these concepts in that the students in her study tended to feel “kreng jai” and be afraid of making their peer lose their face when they gave the feedback to their peer’s writing. The results of these cultural concepts can be seen in their feedback which tended to be short, general and positive. The students in her study discussed that because of the concepts of “kreng jai” and losing face, they were frustrated to give a sincere feedback. However, Thongrin noticed that later on when the students understood the purpose of peer-response and found that they were able to learn from their peers’ comments, they began to write a longer and more specific feedback to be useful for the writer.

As the process writing approach addresses the individual and focuses on the learners, it can be anticipated that when this approach is introduced to Thai students, they will be unlikely to
understand the premise behind such an approach. As discussed earlier in regard to Asian students in general, Thai students may hesitate to participate or rarely express their ideas in class and group discussion because they have not learned how to speak their minds; therefore, they may be afraid of losing face or may feel embarrassed if they express their ideas. In teacher-center classrooms, Thai students often lack self-confidence. They are afraid to critique others’ work. In addition, from my experience and interviews, although Thai students may receive feedback from their peers, they still expect or wait for the teacher’s feedback and value the teacher’s feedback rather than their peers’ because they believe that the teacher is more knowledgeable and will always provide the right answer.

**Resiliency and ESL/EFL Students**

Another aspect that is related to ESL/EFL learners is resiliency. The students’ success or failure in academic setting seems to gain more attention. Instead of studying the risk, more researchers (Sanacore, 2000a, 2000b; Temes, 2000; Thorne, 2001; Walker, Gleaves, & Grey, 2006) have paid attention on resilient behaviors and the factors enhancing the adaptation. Resiliency in ESL learners is a possible explanation why some students are successful in academic setting while the others fail and drop out of the school. Likewise, with challenging environment like an innovative approach, some ESL/EFL students may be able to cope with the unfamiliar situation and tasks and become successful learners. It is worthwhile to look at the resiliency of ESL/EFL learners in order to gain better understanding about their successful behaviors.

Resiliency is defined by many researchers. Winfield (1991) defines resilience as “vulnerability or protective mechanisms that modify an individual’s response to the risk situation and operate at critical turning points during one’s life” (p. 7, cited in Thorne, 2001, p. 27). According to Masten, Best, and Garmezy (1990), resiliency is referred to “capacity for or
outcome of successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances” (p. 425, cited in Thorne, 2001, p. 28). In addition, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1994) defined this term as “heightened likelihood of success in school and in other life accomplishments, despite environmental adversities, brought about by early traits, conditions, and experiences” (p. 46, cited in Thorne, 2001, p. 28). According to these definitions, resiliency can be seen as the positive or successful adaptation of the learners when they encounter the challenging or unfamiliar environment.

Thorne (2001) studied the Caribbean middle and high school students. She studied the high and low achieving English speaking Caribbean students as well as impact of the attitudes of their parents and teachers on these students. The results showed that despite the unfamiliar environment as well as teaching style, the Caribbean students were able to adapt themselves successfully if they were supported by the teacher and their parents. In addition, she suggested that to enhance resiliency on ESL learners like the Caribbean, “1) better assessment of English – speaking Caribbean students’ ability to use Standard English and 2) greater planning and collaboration among parents, teachers, and students are recommended” (Thorne, 2001, p. v).

Moreover, Sanacore (2000a) argued that in order to help the literacy learners particularly the ones in challenging environment to become successful learners, the teachers had to promote the resilient circumstance. She suggested six strategies promoting the resiliency in the literacy learners. They are:

“1) [r]ead aloud children’s literature…; 2) [e]ncourage the selection of a wide variety of authentic literature…; 3) [g’ive extra support to individuals who experience difficulty selecting appropriate resources…; 4) [p]rovide time for pleasurable reading and writing…; 5) [e]ngage learners in interactive activities that help them think about their thinking…; and 6) [a]sk questions that stimulate responses from all children” (p. 5-8).

Additionally, Temes (2000) studied the factors that affect the resilience in the Mexican-American high school students in an ESL classroom. Based on the review of research done in
this area as well as her experience of teaching, she interviewed the Mexican-American students, discussed with them, as well as keeping the journal written by her participants and herself on the discussion. Temes (2000) stated the factors that affecting the success of ESL learners. They are “internal protective factors” and “environmental protective factors’ (p. 61). Internal protective factors include attitude and personality traits, while the latter ones include other sources such as information, advice, and supports that enhance students’ adaptation to a new environment.

Despite the different environment and expectations of ESL/EFL students, some of them tend to adapt themselves in order to become successful students. The teachers and parents can help promote the resilience by giving the students positive supports and relaxing environment. In writing class, the teacher should provide the students time to practice, guide them through the process of writing, and promote collaborative learning, such as peer-response.

Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, I review and discuss three main areas: theoretical approaches to NES writing, SL writing instruction, and factors affecting ESL/EFL writing, such as language transfer (L1 to L2), L2 proficiency, and cross-cultural values, and Thai culture. As evident from the above review, the body of research focusing on ESL writing has largely overlooked how different cultures adapt to innovative teaching methods; furthermore, there are actually few studies on the implementation of the process writing approach in EFL settings. Within the few studies that do exist, even fewer have addressed teacher training, how EFL students perceive and respond to this approach, or how cross-culture interacts with this approach. Introducing a new teaching method, like the process approach, in a Thai context would be very insightful. The following questions emerge:

1. How did Thai college students respond to an instructor’s teaching approach in an English writing classroom?
2. What were the impacts on the students’ growth as writers in this writing class?

3. What were the frustrations the students had when they engaged in this writing class?
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I discuss the methods through which this research was conducted. I present the theoretical framework, followed by the researcher’s perspective. Then, I describe the location of the study and the procedures for participant selection. The last section of this chapter presents the method of data collection and data analysis and issues of trustworthiness.

Theoretical Framework

This qualitative study is situated under the constructivist theoretical framework. Constructivists adopt the perspective that knowledge is constructed by inquirers based within the context they study. Even though the terms constructivism and constructionism in some sources are often used interchangeably, Crotty (1998) distinguishes these two terms as: “the term constructivism for epistemological considerations focusing exclusively on ‘the meaning-making activity of the individual mind’ and to use constructionism where the focus includes ‘the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning’” (p. 58). That is, constructivists emphasize the meaning constructed by individuals.

The ontological background of constructivism is based on relativism which holds that there is no single reality, but there are multiple realities created by individuals. (Patton, 2002) Epistemologically, constructivism is based on Subjectivism (Guba & Lincoln, 1990). Constructivists see the researcher as an instrument and “Subjectivity is not only forced upon us by the human condition… but because it is the only means of unlocking the constructions held by individuals” (Guba, 1992: 26 quoted by Pickard & Dixon, 2004: 5).

In the present study, constructivism refers to the form of research focusing on the attempt to make sense of or to interpret the experience and perception of the participants via the researcher’s perspective. The knowledge that emerges from observations, interviews with the
participants, and documents is part of the research process and was constructed by the researcher within the context of this study. Therefore, the research findings are based on the assumption created by Guba and Lincoln (1989) in that “Data derived from constructivist inquiry have neither special status nor legitimation; they represent simply another construction to be taken into account in the move toward consensus” (p. 45 cited by Patton, 2002, p. 98). That is, the knowledge constructed by the researcher of this present study is one of many possible interpretations of the similar data.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purposes of the study, as well as research questions, were shaped by this constructivist perspective. The present study aimed to explore how the participants, Thai college students, constructed their experience of learning to write in this English writing class, how they responded and perceived this experience, and the impacts of this experience that they constructed on their writing development as writers. Based on constructivist perspectives, I studied the multiple realities constructed by the students and the implications of the experiences they gained from this writing class for their teaching and learning. The students’ perception on writing instruction was shaped by culture and linguistic constructs, and by interacting with other students and the teacher. For conducting the study based on the constructivist framework, I attempted to capture a variety of students’ experiences and perceptions through different sources such as classroom observation, interviews, and documents and artifacts. The students’ background and culture were used to identify and understand the students’ experience and their responses to this writing instruction. Based on these research purposes, the following research questions were used to guide the study:

1. How did Thai college students respond to an instructor’s teaching approach in this English writing class?
2. What were the impacts of writing instruction on the students’ growth as writers in this writing class?

3. What were the frustrations the students had when they engaged in this writing class?

**Researcher’s Perspectives**

In qualitative research, the researcher is “the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). As a researcher, I realize that my personal background as an EFL/ESL student and teacher and my theoretical background unavoidably play a role in my interpretation. It is, therefore, important to report my personal background, my beliefs, and the history of this study in order to enhance the objectivity and credibility of this research and to help me, as a researcher, remain cautious about my bias when entering the field to collect data as well as during analysis.

**An EFL Learner and Teacher**

As an EFL student, I shared similar experiences with the students in this study. I understood how EFL students struggled when learning English as a foreign language. I also shared the difficulties of writing both in my first language (Thai) and in English. Being educated in a traditional writing classroom in Thailand, I wrote about two to three essays in a semester in Thai. In Thai writing classes, I also learned letter writing by imitating writing. For essay writing, I was given a topic related to special occasions such as Father’s Day or Mother’s Day to write in class and then turned it in. The teachers focused on language usage and grammatical structure. Some teachers occasionally taught some strategies to make the introduction or conclusion interesting. But ultimately, students were left to write the essay by themselves based on the topic given. The teachers’ duty was marking students’ essay.

In English writing class, I was taught how to write something like a five-paragraph essay, including an introduction, a body and a conclusion. The teachers always corrected my language
usage and grammatical structure. Language usage was emphasized over content ideas. I learned to write according to the expectations of the teachers and to the westernized style of writing, which was different from Thai writing. Unlike writing in Thai which tended to be wordy and used indirect statements, English writing style was straight-forward. My grades depended upon how many mistakes I made and on how complicated language on the essay I used.

My learning experience allowed me to be an empathetic listener and observer, and to work hard to understand the students’ writing background. However, this also means that I have been cautious about my biases and tried not to use my own experience to judge the experience of the participants. In this study I intended to describe and present the participants’ experience and perception of their English writing classroom. My experience only provided a special lens to aid in interpreting the data as an insider.

As an EFL teacher, I had a chance to teach an English writing class once, and the text I used was entitled “Writing Process”. I shared my experience of trying to use the process approach with the teacher in this study; however, my beliefs and teaching experience were not exactly the same as hers. My aim was to explore and interpret her experience of teaching English writing, via students’ perception, using my teaching background to help me understand the context better. In addition, it is also important to note that as classmates in the same graduate program in Thailand, Ms. B and I shared the similar educational background, and we are now colleagues. Although I have never taught Writing 1 at the university where she has been teaching, I have shared first hand knowledge of the setting and the context of this setting.

An ESL Learner

As a graduate student in the United States, I was an ESL learner. I found that as an ESL student, I had more opportunities to use English, both in and outside the classroom, and that I had more opportunities to practice my English compared to being in an EFL situation. I also
encountered culture differences, in which I had to adjust myself. I soon discovered that in American classrooms at the college level, interaction and discussion with the professors and among classmates was important for learning. My learning habits changed from being passive to active. The first year, I kept quiet and waited for my turn to speak. I was afraid that I might ask a dumb question. I was not used to classroom discussions, although I was familiar with group work activities. Years passed, and I got used to how American students voiced their ideas. I had to learn to use examples to back up my opinions, not just to give general opinions or comments.

Despite learning a new knowledge, I found that writing was challenging for me. Similarly, other Thai students I met at this university stated that writing was their problem with learning in the United States. This was possibly the reason that made me want to study the teaching of writing in Thailand: in order to help Thai students develop their writing skills and to prepare them to study in English-speaking countries like the United States. After I was introduced to writing workshops, I found that I could improve as a writer when I learned how to write and practice writing with assistance from the teacher and my peers. Additionally, I was fascinated in writing workshops and wanted to know how they would work if used in EFL classrooms. Based on my learning and teaching experience, as well as the difficulty in English writing as an ESL/EFL learner, I thought the improvement of writing instruction was needed in Thai schools. My curiosity was not easily satisfied by existing literature, as there was little research by Thai teachers on this topic. There are many factors affecting how to learn to write in a second or foreign language. I wondered if any teachers, who were educated in English-speaking countries, would apply or adapt their foreign experiences regarding teaching writing with their students. If so, how would they use or adapt what they learned for their students in Thailand. With different
educational and cultural backgrounds, how would Thai students react to such a teaching approach which appeared strange culturally to them?

**Perspectives on Research Methodology**

In a constructionist perspective, I have learned that it is not enough to study only the present situation, but that history counts as well (Vygotsky, 1978). We, as human beings, are shaped by history and culture. In order to understand human beings’ consciousness, researchers have to understand the history and culture of the participants involved with the study. Similarly, to understand the writing of EFL students, as researchers, we have to enter their world, English writing classrooms, to learn and understand their experience in a particular class, as well as to learn about their prior experience and background regarding their learning to write in order to understand why they react to certain situation.

Constructivists believe that activities create meaning in the individual mind (Crotty, 1998). However, culture or society is the source of intelligence and “the source of the interpretative strategies whereby we construct meaning” (Fish, 1990, p. 186). So, in order to understand the phenomena and the participants, we need to understand how they interact with their world and how they make sense of it. Crotty (1998) also states “as engaging with their world and making sense of it, such a description is misleading if it is not in a genuinely historical and social perspective” (p. 54). That is, in order to describe and interpret the experience of Thai students learning to write in English, the natural classroom should be explored to learn how they engage and make sense of their learning experience. Quantitative research limits or ignores some important variables, particularly cultural background and prior knowledge, and tries to control the setting, thereby creating an unnatural social environment (Patton, 2002). Moreover, quantitative research does not study participants in the context. Without considering the whole context, quantitative research does not allow us to fully describe the participants and their
interpretation of the phenomenon. Therefore, I decided to use a qualitative study to explore the participants’ experience of being taught to write in English in this particular class.

Finally, via the lens of constructivists, the focus of this study was on the participants’ experience on this English writing class: how writing was taught in this English writing class, how the participants responded to a given writing instruction, how their writing performance and attitude changed towards writing, and the factors affecting their learning to write in this class. With these intentions, quantitative research was not capable of providing in-depth information because quantitative research emphasizes product rather than process. For example, quantitative studies on the writing process in Thailand tend to focus on students’ writing achievement (based on scores from writing tests) after they were taught by the writing process approach or techniques based on this approach (Chuendaechum, 1999; Tanuwongviwat, 1995; Thammasarnsophon, 1991). This kind of research does not allow us to see the changes that may have taken place during the students’ experience in the classroom. More importantly, this kind of research tends to ignore the students’ voice, which might have reflected how effectively the teaching approach was used (Leki, 2001). Without studying the process of change and students’ experience, we are not able to understand what happens when the writing process approach is introduced to EFL students.

Pilot Study

The purposes of the pilot study were: 1) to find an appropriate research site, and 2) to train myself in classroom observation and participant interviewing. I started to look for an appropriate classroom setting in June 2002 when I visited Thailand during the summer. It was challenging to find a setting that suited the purposes of this study. I found few teachers who were willing to let me observe their classes regularly because generally Thai teachers were not comfortable letting anyone besides their supervisors observe their classes, particularly for a long period. The aim of
this study was also to examine how a teacher who was trained in an English-speaking country teaches English writing; therefore, time was spent searching for such teachers. Through contact with friends and colleagues, I finally met three college teachers, Ms. B, Ms. O, and Ms. T (pseudonyms) who were educated in the United States and allowed me to conduct my pilot study in their classes.

In November 2003, the second semester began as did my pilot study. With the approval of the teachers and their departments, I started classroom observations for seven weeks (from the beginning to the midterm examination week). These classes met twice a week for a total of 3 hours per week. During this period, except when there was a conflict between the schedules of Ms. O’s and Ms. T’s classes, I visited each classroom twice a week spending one and a half hours observing each day. The majority of information was gathered from three main sources: observations, formal and informal interviews, and artifacts. The interview schedule was planned during classroom observations based on the participants’ convenience. Because I conducted this pilot study in order to train myself in doing observation and interview, the information gained from this pilot study was used as a background of the study.

**Observation and Field-note Development**

To train myself in observing the classroom, during classroom observations, I tried different methods of taking field notes in order to gather information about teaching instruction, as well as students’ behaviors and reaction to each task or activity. I tried a few different techniques of taking notes.

My first field note was written in English based on what I saw in the classroom with my comments or questions in the right margin. When I reviewed my first field note, I found that my words seemed to interpret, rather than describe, what was going on in the classroom: more importantly they lacked the voice of the classroom and its participants because sometimes it was
difficult to find appropriate English vocabulary to match what the teacher and the students said in Thai. Also, my comments and questions in the right margin made it difficult for me to trace back to the incident that initiated my notes. This review prompted me to try another way of writing my field notes.

For the second field note, I tried to put down the teacher and the students’ own words as much as I could in Thai or in English, and I took note of any reactions while they participated in conversations or activities. Still, I put my own notes in the right margin, but I added the beginning of a given incident. Although it was still difficult to trace the original incident, it was easier for me to separate the field notes and my thoughts. With these field notes, I learned more about what was going on in the classroom and how the students responded to the instruction and to the activities. They also allowed me to use the participants’ own words for data analysis. Moreover, these field notes recorded what was exactly happening in the classroom which included their reactions and responses, including sense of humor (i.e. laughing, teasing) and wondering (i.e. questioning, discussing). Because the second method of taking field notes yielded more useful data, I decided to record my observations in this way. However, for recording my comments or my questions, I found that it was more convenient for me to use brackets to indicate my own thoughts, so I eventually abandoned putting my comments in the right margin.

Interview Development

For the informal interviews, I had opportunities to talk with some students in class. For formal interviews, I translated my guide questions (See Appendix B) into Thai and asked my colleague, who was an expert in translation, to review my questions. I made some changes in the language and sentence structure according to her suggestions. For this pilot study, I had one formal interview with Ms. B’s students and one student from Ms. T’s class. For my data
collection, this interview experience helped me develop the way I would approach the students as individuals and as a group, and how I should convey my questions in order not to guide their responses. I decided to use Thai in the interviews to allow the participants to feel free to express their feeling and their thoughts. For my data collection, I decided to do three interviews with each participant, one at the beginning, one in the middle, and one at the end of the semester.

**Selection of Participants**

The previous description detailed a pilot study in order to select the setting of the main study and to train myself as an observer and an interviewer. Although these three classrooms seemed to serve the purposes of this study, due to limitations of time, I decided to focus my study on one class. I chose Ms. B class to be my focal class because the other teachers did not teach writing at the time I started collecting my data for this study. To serve the purposes of the study, “purposeful sampling” (Patton, 2002) was used for sampling procedures. The strength of purposeful sampling was due to selecting the rich-informative context of the study that provided a great deal about the important issues that the researcher aimed to study. With rich information of the setting, this study provided in-depth understanding of the context under the study (Patton, 2002). More specifically, “criterion sampling” (Patton, 2002) was applied for selecting the setting and participants of this study. Because the purpose of this study was to explore an English writing class that the teacher was educated from English-speaking country and s(he) used, adapted, or implemented an innovative approach for writing instruction, I predetermined the criterion of importance. Then, I reviewed and studied the possible settings and participants that met the criterion, and selected the focal one that yield the information rich for this study. Ms. B’s English writing class served the purpose of this study in many ways. First, the teacher was educated in an English-speaking country, and she admitted that she used or applied aspects of the process writing approach in her classroom. Secondly, this research studied how the teacher used,
adapted, or implemented an innovative approach to teaching writing with her students. Last but not least, Ms. B was willing to participate in this study. The attitude of the teacher towards this study was very important. Because of her willingness, I gained her full cooperation for the study. Ms. B’s attitude was the key because she made the participants feel comfortable when I entered her classroom and observed how she taught. She was also open enough to share her opinions and comments about this research, which made the research more meaningful overall. With the oral permission of the chair of the department of Foreign Languages and the permission of Ms. B, the teacher, I started my data collecting in Ms. B’s classroom.

Research Participants

Ms. B

Ms. B is an instructor at a public university (KU) in Bangkok, the capital of Thailand. This public university is one of the major universities in Thailand. The students who attend KU have to pass the National Entrance Examination. All students are required to take 12 credits of foreign languages to meet graduation requirement. From these 12 credits, the students are required to take 9 credits of Foundation English. The purpose of learning English is for academic purposes such as reading English texts in their field of study, writing papers, reports or class assignments. The Department of Foreign Languages under the Faculty of Humanities (equivalent to the College of Liberal Arts in the US) is responsible for English courses including Foundation English (I, II, III) and other foreign languages such as Japanese, German, French, and Chinese. The three Foundation English courses have a focus on grammar structures and skills. After taking these three Foundation English courses, the students have to take three more credits of any foreign language courses. Most of the students choose one of English courses offered by the Department of Foreign Languages. Writing 1 is one of these courses offered for them.
Ms. B received her bachelor’s degree in education and got her master in Applied Linguistics in Thailand. Later, she received her Ph.D. in the United States. During her doctoral study in the United States, she was introduced to process writing in theory and through practice, which led her to try some ideas in process writing approach into her writing instruction when she returned to Thailand. She introduced journal writing in her English classroom for non-English major students. She believed that integrating some elements in both product-based and process writing approach would benefit her students. However, she accepted that it was difficult to apply all process writing activities in her writing classroom because of the large number of the students and the restrict requirements of curriculum. In no choice, she had to prepare her students for the writing examination which stressed more on language usage rather than content writing.

In her writing class, she let her students work on multiple drafts, had students respond to each of their writing, and helped each other edit their work. She did not solely focus on grammar instruction, and told her students not to be worried about correct grammar during drafting phase. Rather, she taught the students how to write and improve their writing performance through the activities she introduced.

Students

The focal student participants in this present study were forty-one students attending to Writing 1 (355231) in the first semester of academic year 2004 (June – October 2004). There were twenty males and twenty-one females. The class had 29 sophomores and 12 seniors. Their average age was 20 years old. They were studying in the fields of Engineering, Business and Administration, Economics, Education, Humanities, Bio Fishery, Forestry, and Veterinary. In the personal background questionnaire, these participants revealed their different experience in learning English language. The range of the years they had studied English in school was from 6
to 17 years; the average was 13 years. The personal information about the student participants will be described in more details in chapter four.

Data Collection

Data were gathered from three main sources: observations, formal and informal interviews, and artifacts such as collecting students’ writing samples, course syllabus, supplementary exercises, and the textbook. The different data collection methods were used to strengthen the study in terms of data triangulation (Denzin, 1978). The observations provided insights for the classroom context, the teaching instruction, and the students’ engagement in activities and interaction with peers and with the teacher. Formal interviews which were semi-structured served as a tool to explore the students’ response and perception to this writing class particularly the activities they engaged and as a cross checking for observation and data interpretation. Artifacts such as students’ writing served as evidence of the students’ writing development, while the textbook, course syllabus and supplementary exercises provided a background of the context of this writing class. The other archival research data, such as my journals and memos helped to document and guide my data collection and analysis process.

My data collecting began in June 2004 when the semester started. I collected the data for the whole semester for 15 weeks (June 2004 – October 2004). The class met twice a week (on Tuesdays and Thursdays), 90 minutes per period, for a total of 3 hours per week. Before conducting the study, Ms. B introduced me as a researcher to her students in her first class. Then, she allowed me to introduce myself and explain my study to her students for the rest of the class (about 30 minutes). In order to conduct this study, I asked the students and the teacher for their consent to participate in this study.

First, I introduced my study and gave the students the consent form and personal background questionnaires (see Appendix C) to complete.
Second, I informed them that they were being asked to join the study voluntarily, and that by signing the consent form, they were agreeing to this. I explained to them the content of the consent form and asked them to return it to me at the end of this class or the next period.

For the personal background questionnaire, I asked the students to complete it in class in Thai or in English. A few students could not finish the questionnaire and asked to turn it in the next period. I received all consent forms signed by the students and the teacher at the end of the first class. I received all completed questionnaires by the third period.

During this period, I visited the class twice a week spending one and a half hours observing each day. At the end of the first period, I talked to a few students sitting next to me and tried to build relationships with them in order to reduce their anxiety when I conducted the formal interviews later. They asked me more about my study, and they seemed to be interested in this project. A few of them even told me that this was the first study they had participated in that showed interest in hearing their voices. They wished to be heard, never happened. The semi-structured interviews were scheduled based on the participants’ availability.

After each observation, I typed my field notes on my computer (see sample of field note sheet in Appendix D). Typing my field notes served as the reflection which is an important part of field research (Patton, 2002). I had a chance to reread and recalled what I observed and noted the comments or thoughts that I had in order to find out in the next observation or in the interview.

After the first semester completed, I continued to observe writing instruction as a follow-up study in a new class with the same teacher but with different students in the following semester. However, for the second semester, I observed the class once a week instead of twice a week due to my own time limitations. I followed the same introductory procedure in that I
distributed the consent forms and the personal background questionnaires to the students during the first period. One of them did not want to participate in this study and did not sign the consent form, but he completed the questionnaire. Even though he did not participate in the research, he was the one who talked to me the most while I was observing this class. I only chose seven students as focal participants for the follow-up. I chose these focal participants according to their writing proficiency and their willingness to participate in the formal interviews. The data I collected from these participants were used to confirm the data I collected from the first semester.

**Observations**

The aim of a qualitative study is to provide detailed and in-depth information of the specific context under study. According to Patton (2002), observations of a setting play an important role in: 1) providing firsthand information of the class under study, 2) better understanding and to capture the context of the study, and 3) allowing the researcher to bring out the personal knowledge, reflection on the observed, during the interpretation of the data. Data from written field notes can also be used to guide in-depth interviews and, when combined with information from other sources, will support the interpretation of the teaching and learning experience in the classroom. In the present study participant observations were used to gather the firsthand information of the classroom, of writing instruction, and of the students’ participation in the writing activities. Patton (2002) states that there are variations in observer’s involvement, ranging from “complete immersion in the setting as full participant to complete separation from the setting as spectator” (p. 265), and the extent of the participation in the setting can change over the period of the study. He adds that sometimes the extent of the participation is due to the study’s setting, in which it is not possible for the researcher to become a participant. For my study because the theoretical framework is based on constructivism and my aim of the study was
to explore how writing was taught and how the students reacted to this instruction, I did not want to interfere with the natural setting. Therefore, I did not fully participate with the students and the teacher in the classroom. However, I adapted Patton’s participant observation in terms of the extent to which I participated in the class due to the occasions provided. In other words, I occasionally participated with the participants, such as, when the students asked me to help them with their writing, when the teacher asked me to share my opinions with the class, or when she asked me to take care of this class when she was not available.

To observe classroom events and to identify the patterns of behaviors of the informants, I was present in the classroom, but did not participate or interact with the informants to any great extent (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002). I did not guide or discuss with the instructor the instruction unless it became necessary for the study or unless the teacher asked for my suggestions. During the observations, I tried to maintain a distance from the teacher in order to avoid interfering or influencing her beliefs and her instruction. Moreover, keeping distance from the teacher helped me gain the students’ trust. In other words, the students felt more comfortable and trusted me when they found that I did not have close contact with the teacher. Meanwhile, I helped the students when they asked. I conferred with the students about their writing. The students frequently asked me about English usage and asked for my opinion about their writing. With the teacher, we had informal talks about her writing class and writing instruction before and after the class.

To carry out this study, I observed the entire class by sitting in a corner in the back of the room. The classroom observations began at the second meeting of the course. In class, I took field notes in a notebook with details emphasizing teaching instructions, students’ reactions or responses, their conversations, and the students’ routine while writing. I began by recording the
date and the starting time of the class. I drew a diagram of the classroom focusing on the organization of the classroom. I recorded the time of each classroom activity, particularly the times of the composing activities. When the teacher let the students write, I observed the overall task and took notes on their writing behaviors including conversation, interaction, and body language (i.e., student stopped to think, or asked his/her friend about vocabulary or sentence structure).

To gain trust, I offered my help as a teaching assistant if the students asked for my help during their writing or during the class activities. Most of the time, the students sitting close to me would ask for my assistance. For example, at the beginning, they often asked me about vocabulary, either regarding spelling or word choice. Later on, they asked about sentence structures or how to convey their thought in English. After the midterm examination, some students started asking me to read their writing and give them my feedback. In the last month, a few students asked me to read their work and wanted to have a conference with me after class. I had several one-on-one conferences with individual students to discuss pieces of writing that the students wanted to publish.

With the teacher, I offered suggestion if this assistance did not interfere with her beliefs and instructions. I sometimes discussed issues with the teacher when she asked me to do so, and I helped her with other work such as grading the midterm papers for the grammar part, substituting for her when she had a meeting or conference, which helped me build a friendly relationship with her. When I substituted, she would give me handouts or directions of class work. By having this relationship, she was willing to help me cross-check my analysis, particularly about her beliefs and her method of instruction.
Data from each observation were transcribed as soon as possible. I identified the language used for each field note entry in order to reveal “the same differences in language usages as the actual field situation” (Spradley, 1980). For example, I recorded the actual language the participants used (Thai or English) and noted the usage of language (e.g., argumentative, emotional, etc…) in the personal comment column. I collected three forms of participant observation records described by Spradley (1980): condensed accounts, expanded accounts, and my fieldwork journal. I typed my field notes and organized my field notes in three columns: fielded notes (condensed accounts), personal notes or comments (expanded accounts), and codes used for data analysis. (See Appendix D) The condensed notes “taken during actual field observation represent a condensed version of what actually occurred” (Spradley, 1980, p. 69). The condensed accounts were recorded in the first column, and these verbatim and concrete records of what was said and observed in the classroom provided a detailed description of the classroom context that were useful for analysis and interpretation. The condensed account of the field notes was valuable because it was recorded on the spot, which made it accurate. The expanded accounts were made as soon as possible after each session in my journals, or during the observation in brackets next to the account. The expanded account helped “fill in details and recall things that [are] not recorded on the spot” (p. 70). Additionally, I kept a fieldwork journal as a record of my personal feelings about fieldwork. This journal contained my personal comments on the observation experience: ideas, feelings such as confusion, mistakes or problems arising during the fieldwork, or when I had a conversation with the student participants or the teacher after the class. This journal was an important source of data. It was a tool to remind me of the thoughts about the events occurring during the observation. It was also used as a guide for the interviews and for data analysis.
Interviews

Interviews were used to gain detailed information of participants’ perception and responses to their experiences in this English writing classroom. The interviews were guided by the observation field notes. I used an interview guide, a set of questions or issues to be explored, (Patton, 2002) to build upon and explore each participant’s responses. The interview guides provided me the basic lines of inquiry to pursue with each respondent, helped me interview a group of respondents more systematically and comprehensively, and, at the same time, allowed each respondent to reveal their perspectives and experiences. During the interviews, I developed and adjusted the questions on the interview guides depending upon the respondents’ responses, their understanding about the topic being interviewed, and the extent to which I was able to detail the important issues. As previously stated, the student interviews were arranged at the beginning of the semester, after the midterm examination, and after the last class. The formal interviews for the teacher were arranged in the fourth week and after the midterm examination (the ninth week). During the observations, I often engaged in informal talks with the teacher after the class, which were recorded with my expanded accounts.

Teacher interviews

The goal of interviewing with the teacher was to give the teacher a chance to describe how she implemented or adapted the process writing approach in her English writing classroom. Open-ended questions (see Appendix B) were used as a guide to let the teacher talk about her teaching experiences.

In the first interview which was conducted before the midterm examination (the fourth week), I inquired the teachers’ educational history, teaching experiences, teaching of writing in particular, and her attitudes in language teaching and learning, including her belief in writing instruction. The information from this interview helped me understand how the teacher defined
her beliefs, how she transferred these beliefs into her teaching, and the rationales behind each strategy she selected to use in her classroom.

In the second interview, using the information from the field notes and the notes from the first interview, I asked the teacher to talk about the sessions I observed in the classroom, her perceptions and comments on the use of writing instruction and classroom activities, and the students’ reactions or responses to the use of these strategies or activities. This interview aimed at asking the teacher to clarify what she did in her classrooms. I conducted the second interview during the ninth week. I also asked the teacher about the curriculum demands and how these demands impacted her instruction. In addition, I asked the teacher about the students’ writing performance on the midterm examination. This information revealed the teacher’s perception of the students’ performance and of her reflection upon her instructions. The information from the second interview was used to enrich and confirm the data collected by observations.

I did not have a formal interview with the teacher after the final examination due to time constraints and her workload. Instead, we had an informal talk after the class ended. During the talk, the teacher reflected on the classroom events and on her overall instruction. I asked her to evaluate her own instruction throughout the semester, the students’ writing development and performance, and her attitude towards this particular classroom.

**Student interviews**

After the second observation, I decided to interview all students because they showed a great deal of enthusiasm and willingness to cooperate, and they wanted to share their opinions with me. For me, students’ voice helped me to understand the instruction and learning environment. In addition, the students in this class studying in different field, a wide span of ages, and with wide range of English abilities and writing experiences. Their personal
backgrounds seemed to impact their perception of the writing instruction. With information gained from all students, my data became detailed and in depth.

1. Formal interviews

After making the decision, I asked the students to sign up for the first interview after the third meeting; the second interview, the week before the midterm examination; and the third interview, after the last class meeting and after the final examination. The interviews were arranged as individual and group (2-5) interviews, depending on the students’ availability and comfort levels.

The students were interviewed in a conversational style in Thai. I allowed them to ask me questions and sometimes I shared my thoughts or feelings with them if it was necessary, which also helped to build trust. The open-ended questions (see Appendix B) were created to allow the students talk about their experiences learning English writing in this class. The interviews lasted from 45 to 90 minutes. The structure of the interview was guided by the data collected through the observations except the first interview. The goal of the interviews was for the informants to reflect on their experiences of writing instruction in this class. I asked the students specifically how they perceived the writing instruction and the activities that took place in the classroom.

The first interview was aimed at learning more about the students’ background, learning to write in Thai and in English, and their response to this writing class after the first meeting. The guided questions were based on the information on the questionnaires that the students completed. The other questions emerged from the students’ responses and were related to their writing experience and their perception or attitudes of learning to write in Thai and in English.

The second interview was aimed at learning more about the students’ perception of the writing instruction and activities they engaged in this class. The guided questions were, thus,
based on field notes. Some students asked me about activities that they were not familiar with, or about terms used by the teacher that they did not understand. Responding to their question, I asked the respondent to recall their experience about those activities or I shared with them as it was necessary. The third interview aimed to gain more in-depth information regarding the writing instruction and students’ responses to this class, to learn the overall perceptions of the students towards this writing class, and to explore how this writing class affected their writing performance.

2. Informal interviews

During observations, there were some incidents that occurred which needed to be explored or clarified immediately, including outbursts or strong emotions related to the activities. Exploring these incidents may shed light on how students feel about certain activities. In cases as such, informal interviews were used following each incident. Although I could make a note of the event and ask the participants about it later, such impromptu interviews provided opportunities to gain information at the moment, which the participants might not be able to recall later, and they also provided the participants with opportunities to review an incident and their reaction simultaneously. I had informal exchanges with the teacher and the students between or after classes when I noticed any incident that might reveal the students’ reaction to this class instruction. For example, I once talked to the teacher while we were walking back to our office about a question-answer session and how she responded to a student’s question. I wondered why she limited the scope of students’ question. She explained to me her reason for this issue, as well as shared with me her experience with a former class.

Documentary Data

I also collected documents and artifacts related to the study including student drafts and finished pieces of writing, student journals, the textbook and teaching materials, the course
description, tests and evaluation summaries, and other related documents such as faculty meeting
tests and evaluation summaries, and other related documents such as faculty meeting reports related to the course. I made copies of students’ writing from the beginning to the end of reports related to the course. I made copies of students’ writing from the beginning to the end of the semester. These documents were a rich source of data because they were not created for the purpose of research (Merriam, 1991). The documents and artifacts represented and reflected the instruction and students’ writing performance and development. The documentary data were valuable in explaining and confirming the participants’ interpretation, responses and perceptions of the instructional approaches, and classroom experiences.

After a month of observation, I also discussed with the teacher if she could ask the students to write a personal response after each class. The teacher agreed with me, and asked the students to write a reflective note after each class. However, the students often forgot to write a reflective note after each class because they had to rush to another class. Some students gave me their reflective notes when we met at the next class. These reflective notes were collected as supplementary data.

**Personal Background Questionnaires**

A personal background questionnaire (see Appendix C) was used to survey the students’ personal information, writing backgrounds, and perceptions about writing experiences in their former classrooms. The questionnaires were based on previous studies of ESL writing. The questionnaire had two main parts: personal background and writing experience. The personal background section included personal information, educational background, and reading and writing habits. The second part asked the students about their experiences of learning to write both in Thai and in English including writing instruction and difficulties in writing. The use of a questionnaire conveyed a broad perspective of the students’ writing experience from past to present, and explored insight into different lenses they might use to perceive the writing class under study. The closed-ended questions on the questionnaire were quantitatively analyzed,
whereas the data from open-ended questions were qualitatively analyzed and used to guide, support and enrich the interview data.

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative studies are involved in a recursive process of data collection analysis (Patton, 2002). When designing qualitative study, a researcher cannot create a rigid research design. Instead, Patton (2002) suggests that qualitative research needs to engage in a simultaneous process allowing previous collected data to inform and shape upcoming research activity. The data analysis process is inductive in that it occurs throughout the data collection process, sometimes a new unit of analysis can emerge during fieldwork or from analysis of data. In this sense, a qualitative study is the analysis process that is formed by the data.

For analyzing and presenting the data of this study, I adopted and adapted the ways to organize and report the qualitative data presented by Wolcott (1994): description, analysis, and interpretation. He defines these terms as follow:

*Description* addresses the question, “What is going on here?” Data consist of observations made by the researcher and / or reported to the researcher by others.

*Analysis* addresses the identification of essential features and the systematic description of interrelationships among them—in short, how things work. In terms of stated objectives, analysis also may be employed evaluatively to address questions of why a system is now working or how it might be made to work “better.”

*Interpretation* addresses processual questions of meanings and contexts: “How does it all mean?” “What is to be made of it all?”

(Wolcott, 1994, p. 12)

In my data analysis, this process was not a fixed linear approach. In fact, it was recursive and dynamic. Because he analysis process occurred throughout the data collection process, the procedures of data analysis could start again at any time. While collecting data, I also worked on the analysis process and used the information or questions generated from the analysis in the
next interview or to discover more information during observations. In addition, I used the researcher’s notebook to document the analysis process. In the process of collecting and analyzing data, I triangulated the data from several sources: observation field notes, interviews, my personal journal and memos, students’ writing samples, the textbook, the course syllabus, and supplementary exercises, in order to find similar information from different sources (Fetterman, 1989; Kirk & Miller, 1986, Denzin, 1978).

The analysis began by creating descriptions of the experiences of the teachers and the students in English writing classrooms according to the students’ questionnaire and the first interview. The data were first described in order to gain the general information about the past experiences of the participants towards writing instruction.

In order to start analyzing the data for writing instruction and the students’ responses for this class, I first read my field notes, my interview transcripts, and the students’ writing samples. I started from my field notes. I read my organized and typed field notes to search for patterns as well as topics. I adapted Spradley’s (1980) worksheet for doing domain analysis, for analyzing the data from observation. I also adopted Wolcott’s (1994) method for descriptive and analysis process. I wrote down words and phrases (domains) to represent the patterns and topics in the field notes, and then put these words or phrases on the domain analysis worksheet adapted from Spradley (1980) (see Appendix E).

At the same time, once I transcribed an interview, I started analyzing the interview data in the same way as I did for observation data. I read through the transcript to search for information that was related to writing instruction and the students’ perception or response to the writing instruction. I highlighted those words or phrases on my transcripts. I also used Spradley’s domain analysis worksheet for doing domain analysis.
Next, the domains gained from the first analyzing process were categorized and interpreted for emerging themes. Meanwhile, the questions developed from doing domain analysis were used for the ongoing observation and interview process, as well as for interpretation and to look for emerging themes. In short, analysis started with specific coding to generate categories of ideas or explanations of the teachers’ and students’ experiences in searching for central incidences or disconfirming evidence and then interpret the meaning of those categories. After that, I triangulated the findings, both from observations and interviews to discover the themes.

The students’ writing samples were analyzed based on content analysis in order to find any evidence of students’ writing development. The information from the analysis of writing samples was used to confirm the students’ words in the interviews and the classroom observations. Sets of writing samples from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the semester were analyzed to explore their writing development in terms of length of the writing, the complexity of the sentence structures used, the language usage, and the organization of the ideas of their essays.

**Credibility, Transferability, and Dependability**

The nature and purpose of qualitative research is to explore, understand, and discover a phenomenon or a case in depth. To design a strong qualitative research study, notions of validity and reliability must be addressed. For qualitative research, the concept of validity can be interpreted as credibility and transferability, while the concept of reliability is referred to as dependability or consistency (Merriam, 1995).

To establish the credibility and transferability of this research, triangulation of multiple sources of data was used. The logic of triangulation is based on the concept that no single method is perfect or able to provide adequate explanation (Patton, 2002). According to Merriam (1995), triangulation can confirm the emerging findings (building credibility of findings), and lead to dependability or consistency. I used multiple sources of data including observations,
interviews, documents and artifacts, field notes, journals and the researcher’s notebook to compare and crosscheck the consistency of information obtained. Multiple sources of data can contribute significantly to the credibility of findings relying on different evidence rather than a single source of data (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

To evaluate the data collection and findings for accuracy, fairness, and perceived validity of the data analysis, I asked participants to review the data and findings during the data analysis process, and I crosschecked the participants’ information while I interviewed them by repeating what I heard or asking them to clarify what they said. Patton (2002) points out that participant review or member crosschecking is important not only to confirm findings, but also to reassure that the right questions are being asked (Patton, 2002; Merriam, 1995); thus, having checked the data with the participant increases consistency.

Beyond the rigor of methods, the credibility of the researcher is also significant for trustworthiness in qualitative research. Relevant to the credibility of the investigator, Patton (2002) states that, “The principle is to report any personal and profession information that may have affected data collection, analysis, and interpretation” (p. 566). In qualitative research, the researcher is the basic instrument. Merriam (1998) explains “[d]ata are mediated through this human instrument” (p. 7). Because of that, qualitative inquiry is inherently subjective. Therefore, in order to make a qualitative account credible, I have addressed my background including beliefs, assumptions, values and biases that may have affected data collection, analysis, and interpretation. In order to establish qualitative researcher credibility, I was aware of how my presence at the site may have affected what has been observed. “Prolonged engagement” and “persistent observation” (Creswell, 1998) in the field can help minimize the influence or effect of observer presence. Collecting data over a long period of time helps build trust with participants.
and ensures an in-depth understanding and interpretation of the case (Merriam, 1995).

Additionally, the researcher’s occasional participation and awareness of my presence at the settings also helps establish the researcher credibility (Creswell, 1998).

It also needs to be noted that for qualitative research there is no absolute single truth. Truth is contextually defined and it depends on the needs and interests of those who adopt it. To build objectivity or trustworthiness and accuracy in this study, I carefully selected “descriptive methodological language that best describes” my own study and procedures (Patton, 2002, p. 576). Rich, detailed descriptions of procedures and findings leads to an understanding of the experience under study as it was lived by the participants, as well as an understanding of how the research was conducted, and how the data were collected, analyzed and interpreted. Detailed description also allows readers to make decisions regarding transferability, and use or compare it with their experience to construct knowledge (Patton, 2002; Creswell & Miller, 2000).

**Summary**

This study focused on one college English writing class with the participants of a teacher and 41 students in Thailand. The study took place during the first semester (June 2004-October 2004) and during the second semester (November 2004-February 2005). The data were collected through 67-hour classroom observations, formal and informal interviews of the teachers and the students, and documents and artifacts. During observations, I took notes and kept these field notes (230 typing pages) for my data analysis procedures. I also kept a journal to help me reflect and comment on the events I noticed while I observed the classroom or interviewed the participants. For data analysis, I adopted and adapted Wolcott’s (1994) ways of analyzing and presenting data: description, analysis, and interpretation. During collecting data, I was aware of factors affecting the creditability and reliability of this case study. To produce strong qualitative
research, I established trustworthiness and credibility by using various strategies such as triangulation, prolonged engagement, and rich, detailed description.
CHAPTER 4
THE CONTEXT FOR THE STUDY

This chapter provides the context for the study: the teacher and the students, and the English writing classroom. First, I describe the teacher participant according to the classroom observations, the interviews, and informal talk; followed by a portrait of the student participants in this class in terms of their learning and writing background, as well as their purposes for taking this class. Finally, the teaching instruction is documented, including the instructional techniques and writing activities, to demonstrate how the teacher implemented the activities borrowed from process writing approach.

The Teacher

Educational Background and Writing Experience

As stated in the previous chapter, Ms. B received her bachelor’s degree in Education and her master’s degree in Applied Linguistics from universities in Thailand. She has taught English as a foreign language at universities for seventeen years. At the time of this study, she was teaching English at a public university in Bangkok, Thailand. During teaching at this university, she received a scholarship to pursue her studies at the doctoral level in the United States. She decided to study Rhetoric and Composition at Indiana University, Pennsylvania (IUP), and received her Ph.D. in 2000. After graduating, she returned to Thailand.

Ms. B was reluctant to regard herself as a writer. She did not recall how she was taught to write in Thai schools. Like other Thai students, she rarely wrote at school. She remembered that she wrote more often when she studied for her master’s degree, during which she mostly wrote expository writing like reports or research papers. She liked writing poems in Thai but she did not like expository writing. At that time she was not sure about becoming a professional writer.
Instead, she decided to be an English teacher. Nowadays, she thinks about writing articles, both academic and nonacademic.

When speaking about English writing, Ms. B experienced frustration. This difficult experience inspired her to explore how to improve her writing, and how to help EFL students learn and improve their writing performance as well. Ms. B, like other second language students, struggled with her writing particularly when she was a doctoral student in the United States. Because she was not taught how to write and rarely wrote both in Thai and in English at school, Ms. B had a problem when she wrote her papers for classes in the United States. She recalled that her writing experience at school consisted of being assigned a topic or theme to write according to a special occasion. Although she wrote more when she pursued her master’s degree, she did not write well at that time. She became interested in writing when she was a doctoral student because she wanted to improve her writing. As an ESL doctoral student, she struggled with writing academic writing to meet the expectation of the professors. Through writing more frequently along with help from her professors with English as her readers and mentors, Ms. B’s writing improved. She learned how to write and discovered her own writing process. With this experience of writing and her study on theories and practices in rhetoric and composition, she decided to try what she learned to her students in Thailand.

**Ms. B’s Perspective on Process Writing**

Ms. B defined process writing as “the invention of writing which indicates the nature of the writing act. The process can be phased as pre-writing, drafting, writing, re-writing, and editing. Each phase can be started over at any point during the act of writing.” When she was first introduced to process writing, she realized that writing was not a “one-time perfect production”, and “(it) takes time and it needs processing.” What she meant by the word “processing” is that, while writing, she was thinking and processing her thoughts into written
words on the paper. She was communicating with herself and trying to convey her ideas to
readers via the written text. With this concept of writing in mind, Ms. B discovered that “I
forgive myself that the first time what I write needs not to be perfect, that I am drafting, and that
re-writing is needed, and that editing can be postponed to the final phase of the writing act.” Her
writing improved after she had gone through the whole process. In addition, Ms. B found that, as
a second language student herself, writing in English was harder for ESL students. However, she
believed that when writing in English, the students should learn to produce their writing closely
to Standard English. She sometimes felt frustrated when implementing the process writing
approach in her class because of time constraints. Despite the constraints, Ms. B still believed in
teaching the process writing approach. She particularly believed in the revision process, which
she insisted should be used to make her students learn to think and write, and finally they
developed their writing competency as English writers.

After receiving her Ph.D., Ms. B started teaching Writing 1 which was an elective course
for any students in this university. Teaching this course gave her a chance to introduce process
writing to her students. She wanted her students to experience writing the way she did. She felt
that the writing process helped her improve her writing ability and discover her own writing
process. Going through writing multiple drafts, she became a better writer and understood how
difficult it is to learn to write in a second or foreign language. Her own growth made her believe
in process writing.

Going through multiple drafts could help my student writers learn to write better. If they
are helped develop their process, writing would not be that difficult. The students would be
less frustrated because they were allowed to try out their writing, to accept something
imperfect before getting the final piece. Writing process approach accepts students’ rough
draft during the drafting process without punishment with low grades.
This approach would set the students free from focusing on grammatical structure and correctness. The students would have chances to explore their ideas throughout the composing process. With this opportunity to work with their writing, the students would eventually discover what they wanted to write and how they wanted to convey their thoughts in their writing.

Ms. B. loved to read original works by students, but not those copied from textbooks, so she gave students credit for their creativity. She believed that working in a friendly atmosphere and having the freedom to write, the students would write what they wanted to and would not copy from the text. She found that in this class, some students tried to add their voice or what she called ‘personal involvement’ to their piece of writing. Compared with former classes she taught, she found that the students’ writing in the class which this study observed improved in terms of the level of personal involvement the students put into their work. This performance made her feel satisfied and enjoy teaching process writing more.

The Student Participants

Personal Data and Educational Background

There were forty-one students attending this writing class. All of them had passed Foundation English III, a prerequisite for Writing 1. Before entering the university, they had studied English for at least six years, some as long as fifteen years. Thai students had different English learning experience at school because English was not mandate at the primary school level. Some private primary schools provide English as extra curriculum. Therefore, many of the Thai students in this study who grew up in rural areas began to learn English in the fifth grade. They were not directly taught how to write because writing has not been a main focus of learning Thai and English.

Among these 41 students, twenty were males and twenty-one, females (see Table 4-1). They were in their second to sixth-year of college, and ranged from 18 to 24 years old. They
were from different majors, including: Engineering (Computer, Water Resources, Industry, and Electronics), Business and Administration, Economics, Education (Math, Physical, and Business), Humanities (Thai, Mass Communications, and Philosophy), Bio Fishery, Forestry, and Veterinary. Most of the students liked reading (33 out of 41), and over half of them liked writing (27 students). Most of the students in this study usually read Thai textbooks, newspapers, magazines, and comics, and most of them wrote homework or academic reports in Thai (see Table 4-2). Some of them wrote short answers for tests. It is interesting to note that the students did not regard themselves as writers in English; many of them claimed that they could write in Thai but not in English.

**Writing Experience at School**

On self-reported, none of them had taken a writing course before either in Thai or in English at school. In other words, writing was included in a language course such as Thai language and English language. According to the National Curriculum for Basic Education for grades 1-12, two of the 8 subjects students have to take are Thai Language and Foreign Language. Most schools choose English as the Foreign Language subject. Foreign Language starts in middle school. In language classes (both Thai and English), students learn four skills, speaking, listening, reading, and writing. However, writing practice seemed to be ignored. According to Leki (1992), this is because most of the teachers are not keen on teaching writing. Actually, there are only one or two units of writing in the course syllabi for language classes; therefore, students only write 2 to 3 times per semester. As a result, the students in this study acknowledged that they never took writing class, though they did do some writing when they were at school.
Writing in primary school

According to the interviews, the students in this study were rarely taught how to write in Thai. What they could remember was that the teachers gave them a topic on special days, such as Mother’s Day or Father’s Day, and told them to write about those topics without any instruction or guidance. The students wrote in class and then turned what they were able to write in to the teacher. Sometimes writing was assigned as homework. Teachers graded their writing, focusing on language usage. They gave general comments such as ‘good writing’, ‘good introduction’, or ‘beautiful language.’ The teachers underlined or corrected the mistakes in their writing and then returned it to the students. Generally, the students didn’t have to correct or rewrite the piece. If they did, they just corrected what the teacher pointed out and turned it in again. One student said, “Just giving marks [grade]. … [The teacher] did not correct anything, just gave marks” (Pat, INT-1, 16). Students reported they wrote two to three essays each semester. Another type of writing they learned in Thai class was writing letters and poems. They practiced writing personal letters, permission letters, and a few types of Thai poems. Looking at a few textbooks used for teaching Thai in primary schools, I found that the students learn one type of letter or poem per semester, and they do this by following the format and models provided in the textbook. For writing in English, the students in this study reported that they were not taught to write in English class.

Writing in middle school

In middle school, the participants in this study had less opportunity to write in English than in primary school. Some students, who had moved to cities like Bangkok said, “Our schools did not emphasize writing. They focused on content areas” (Pat, INT-1). This may be the case because the students had to be prepared for high school examinations, in which writing is excluded. As in primary school, their teachers just gave them topics to write about, graded their
writing and pointed out mistakes, which mainly were sentence structure and grammatical mistakes. Not many students had experience revising their papers. Some had a chance to rewrite but they didn’t pay much attention to content; they only corrected grammar and what their teachers asked them to correct.

In middle school, English is offered as a required subject. In many of the schools attended by the students in this study, the students were only taught language usage and grammar in order to take a test. It is not a surprise then that the only writing done was for a test, which usually consisted of writing sentences; for example, substituting sentences, combining sentences, filling in blanks, or short answering. If the students had to write an expository essay, the teacher would provide them with a model paragraph from the textbook and ask them to write according to the model. However, a few of the students in this study did have a better experience learning to write in English. One of these students was in a school in the south of Thailand. He had an English-native teacher who taught them how to write. He regularly had individual conferences with the teacher about his writing. He received comments on his writing not only about grammar but also about the content. He added, “I could write well because of this experience and I liked to write in my free time too” (Sak, INT-1). But when he entered the university he rarely wrote anything because of the heavy study load.

**Writing in high school**

Similar to middle school, the participants wrote little in high school. This was because during high school, the students were prepared for the entrance examination to the university level. This national examination emphasized knowledge of content areas and language usage. English writing was not included in the entrance examination. Therefore, the teachers focused on grammar in their language classes, both in Thai and English. In English classes, the only writing
assignment the students remembered was writing a paragraph introducing themselves or a
description of a person or a place. Some students remembered nothing of writing at high school.

**Writing in college**

At the university in this study, the students were required to take 12 credits of English in
order to graduate. There were required English courses called Foundation English 1, 2 and 3,
which are grammar-based. The students were placed into each Foundation English course based
on the English score of their Entrance Examination. At this university, except English majors and
minors, the students who did not take English writing course, had less opportunity to learn to
write. In each Foundation English course, writing activities were only an optional suggestion at
the end of each unit; so whether the students wrote or not depended on the teacher. Mostly,
students wrote at the sentence level for grammar practice. Such exercises included substitutions
or writing short answers for reading. As in middle school, teachers followed the syllabus and
prepared their students for the tests, which were grammar-based. Sometimes there was a control
paragraph writing task on the test. In this case, the teachers would assign the students a
paragraph to write based on the grammar they learned in a particular unit. The students’ writing
was focused on grammar and followed the model given in the textbook. Writing exercises were
simply for demonstration of the mastery of language skills. Like other students, those in this
study were not taught how to write in English before taking this writing class.

In contrast to the requirements of the English language program, the students in this
university had to take a Thai writing course as one of basic subjects in order to graduate. At the
time I conducted this study, the Thai writing course focused on grammar, sentence structure, and
language use rather than teaching writing. According to the textbook used for this course and my
informal observations, the students did not have a chance to write at all. The exercises were
based on filling in the blank and correcting the mistakes in each sentence or in a paragraph. The
students had to learn the appropriate Thai language used by the Royal family as well. Therefore, even though this was a writing course, the students were not trained to write.

In summary, from primary school to college, the students in this study rarely practiced writing after primary school where they experienced some unguided writing. In general, writing is only for learning language or a way to practice language structures and usage (Sakontawut, 2003). I was not surprised that the students in this study did not regard themselves as writers, and that they commented that their writing was not good; ranging from 1 to 5, most of them rated their writing in Thai at a 3, and a 1 or 2 for writing in English. The students’ experience in writing is representative of the traditional writing instruction in Thailand, which will be described at the end of this chapter.

**Purposes for Taking This Writing Class**

According the interview, many of students nowadays registered for classes that, they thought, were easy for them and there was not much work. However, the students’ report on the questionnaire (see Table 4-3) showed that the most common reasons they took this writing class are as follows:

1. They wanted to practice writing in order to use it in real situations and in the future.
2. They wanted to improve their writing skills.
3. They wanted to write fluently.
4. It is a requirement (any elective English course) for graduation.
5. It is an interesting course.
6. They were able to register for this course, and
7. They want to learn to write.
It seems that many students in this class expected to learn to write in English in this class, and wanted to improve their writing skills.

**The Students' Perception of Writing and Difficulties in Writing**

When talking about writing, the students talked mostly about grammar and the use of language. It is interesting to note that they really did think about writing, but when they were asked what writing was, they could not express it. They had never thought about what writing was, and were never told what writing was. They did, however, seem to have some vision about what good writing was. They perceived good writing in different ways. Many of them viewed good writing as that which communicates ideas clearly. It should also be easy to understand and not ambiguous, and it should represent the ideas of a writer. Table 4-4 shows the students’ perceptions of writing before they took this writing class. It seems that the students were aware of the importance of writing as the tool to communicate their ideas to readers or to an audience.

The students also shared their perceptions about difficulties in writing both in Thai and in English. In Thai writing, the common four problems they encountered are:

1. organization,
2. the use of written language or formal language rather than using spoken language,
3. spelling, and
4. word choice and language use.

The students seemed to pay attention to the language rather than the content they wanted to express, which was not surprising according to their writing background. Moreover, it was found that in a Thai Language class at the university, the students were still taught writing the same way that they were in high school; that is, they learned language use and structure. They had to write correctly and use appropriate language in their Thai writing classes.
The students also had difficulties when they wrote in English. They complained that they didn’t know enough English vocabulary for writing. Also, most of them were worried about grammar, in that they were afraid to make grammatical mistakes. This experience occurred because throughout their schooling, many teachers focused on grammar and language usage. Their teachers corrected grammatical mistakes in their writing and their grades were reduced due to their grammatical mistakes. This kind of experience made them fear writing and think that writing in English was more difficult than writing in Thai because they didn’t know grammar and vocabulary well enough to produce acceptable work.

**Traditional Writing Instruction in Thailand**

In Thailand, writing was included as an aspect of language classes, both in Thai and in English, and was normally neglected by the teacher. This is because writing was not a part of the examination. Students typically wrote two to three times per semester. In Thai language classes, teachers focused on language structure and language usage rather than writing process. What happened in a writing session was that the teacher gives the students a topic or theme. Tagong (1991) described the writing instructions in Thailand as follows:

… In elementary and secondary school, it was customary for a teacher to assign a topic or theme for the students to write usually as homework and sometimes during the class session. Students were given no opportunity to do multiple drafts, nor did they receive comments from a teacher during their composing. Once their first draft was finished, they handed it in for a grade. On the returned and graded essay, the teacher rarely suggested any changes since the student was not to rewrite the same essay again. What appeared on paper, in red ink, were primarily crossed-out words with suggested substitutions or comments about the use of right words for the right person or the right occasion… The ideas were emphasized, but not as much as surface features. (p. 123)

In Thai language classes, one kind of writing the students experience was writing letters. The teachers followed a model and an explanation in the textbook and asked the students to write a letter according to the model. Each semester the students learned to write one kind of letter, such
as an official letter, a personal letter, or a permission letter. In middle and high school students, in addition to writing letters, learned to write poems. Again, the teacher gave a model or a pattern for a given type of poem, and then the students were asked to write a poem for homework. The teacher graded the students’ letters and poems focusing on the surface features like format and language usage.

Similar to Thai language classes, in English classes, students rarely wrote essays. Writing was also a part of English language instruction, but the curriculum focused on grammar and language usage, and reading. Mostly, writing was only for language practice, which was mainly at the sentence level. In a composition session, the teacher used a traditional approach, which was product-based, to teach writing. (Sakontanut, 2003; Tagong, 1991) The teacher introduced a model of English composition and explained its format: introduction, body and conclusion. Sometimes the teacher explained how the introductions in Thai writing and English writing were different.

Ms. B’s Classroom

The Structure of Writing Instruction

Ms. B established a friendly and relaxing environment for her students. During my class observations, Ms. B’s classroom contained many activities and interactions between the teacher and the students and among the students themselves. From the beginning of the semester, Ms. B provided routine activities based on the writing process and writing curriculum, and let the routines become more flexible throughout the semester.

Physical Appearance of the Classroom

This English writing class was held on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Each class meeting lasted about 75 to 90 minutes because the teacher had to let the students
leave about 15 minutes early for the next class. Figure 4-1 shows how the classroom was arranged.

A teacher’s table was at the front of the room. Ms. B liked to sit on the table while talking to the students. While the students were busy writing, she was sometimes sitting at this table and doing her own work, including reading the students’ writing. Sometimes she left the room in order to let the students work on their own. She wanted the students to become rely on themselves and their peers and less depended on her while they were writing. The students’ seats were arranged to face the teacher’s table. In this room, there were about 42 seats as shown in Figure 4-1. The students arranged a narrow path between the fifth and the sixth rows for the teacher to walk around. The students always sat with their friends in the same spot, which they took on the first day of the class. The seniors always sat in the back row. I always sat at the back row, the second seat close to the back door.
Building a Less Serious, Relaxing Atmosphere

From the first class meeting, Ms. B tried to establish a less serious, relaxing atmosphere in the class. On the first day, she informed the students about the course syllabus. She explained to the students what English Writing I was, the assignments, the tests, and the grading criteria (see Appendix G). Ms. B told the students that for this class, there would be a lot of in-class writing practice. In other words, the students would mostly write in class and were not allowed to make up their work if they were absent. She emphasized the writing practice and writing process.

After an orientation about this course, Ms. B. asked the students to take out a piece of paper and write about themselves. She called it freestyle writing. She told them to write what they wanted her to know about them and to not worry about grammar. She wanted to create relationships with the students and also get to know them via writing. At first, the students seemed to be uncertain about this assignment. Some looked at their friends, some started writing, and some took out their piece of paper and stared at it. The students in the back row did not seem to know what to write. Each looked at his piece of paper, wrote a sentence and paused for a while. Sometimes they talked with their friends sitting next to them. Some students used their talking dictionaries to find words. Some students asked their friends how to spell a word. In my first interview with the students, some stated that they were shocked because they did not expect to write during the first period without any instruction or lecture. When looking at their first pieces of writing, I found that some of them wrote a half page, and some wrote a few sentences.

Before the end of the class, she collected their writing. She asked for their permission to read some of their writing out loud in order to get to know them. The students didn’t say a word. She started to read the first one. While reading, she asked the students whose writing she was reading to stand up and introduced themselves. She read it without correcting their English. She sometimes asked questions to get more information about the students, and talked with them. I
noticed that she tried to make the students feel relaxed by making jokes with the male seniors. When she started reading, the students were listening to her. The student whose writing was read stood up to introduce herself or himself. As the readings progressed, the students started to talk more, turned to see who the writer was, and answered the teacher’s questions. They laughed when the teacher teased the seniors. The atmosphere changed from a quiet room into a lively one. Ms. B, while reading, changed her tone to make it dramatic. Sometimes she raised her voice, sometimes she read gently, and sometimes she skipped the personal part to make the students curious. She seemed to know with whom she could make jokes. She teased them based on the information they wrote, but not on the grammatical mistakes. The way she read and the way she approached the students made them laugh and got them talking. She tried to remember their names, asked related questions, and laughed with them. The students told me that the teacher made them feel less nervous and more relaxed. They thought the teacher was friendly and funny, and that she was not strict, particularly about grammatical mistakes. By doing so, Ms. B used her own words to make the class relaxing and this was her personal teaching style as well.

Ms. B’s Instructional Techniques

This section describes the way Ms. B organized her writing classes. She designed activities in order to help her students learn and enjoy writing. She wanted her students to experience the writing process and discover their own process of writing. Throughout the semester, Ms. B emphasized revising and peer response.

Organization of Writing Classes

According to the course syllabus, the students were required to complete 6 writing assignments for the whole semester, one writing assignment for each unit. For this class Ms. B let the students write four drafts for each assignment. The structure of this writing class was
imitating the cycle of the writing process for each assignment: brainstorming, free writing, revising and peer response, editing, and the final draft. Ms. B usually began her classes with general conversation and then referred to the last writing assignment She called this beginning session a warm-up, which lasted about 5 minutes. After the warm-up, she would brainstorm for about 10 minutes to get the students’ ideas about the writing task. Ms. B liked to use question and answer for brainstorming.

If there was a new writing assignment, Ms. B would let the students do free writing for 30 to 40 minutes. Ms. B would give a general topic based on one of the topics in the unit. However, she would not let the students consult the textbook when they did freestyle writing. Then, she would ask them to exchange their writing with their peers, and one student would read and give feedback for their peers’ writing; this lasted for about 15 to 20 minutes. Sometimes if there was enough time, she would ask the writer to reflect on their peers’ feedback or write about their plan for revising for the next draft based on their peers’ feedback. This activity would last about 5 to 10 minutes. Before class was dismissed, Ms. B would assign the students homework. Some of the assignments were revising their drafts or preparing some reading materials for the next class. For the homework assignment, Ms. B sometimes wrote down the instructions on the whiteboard to make sure that the students understood what they had to do for their homework.

Her class structure would be different if it was during the second and third drafts stage of the cycle. Ms. B began her classes during these phases with a greeting and general conversation for 5 minutes. Then she would explain the grammatical structure based on the mistakes the students made in their former drafts as examples. The grammar lesson focused the key language usage for each unit, which was based on topics such as introducing themselves, describing a person, or describing a place or a past experience. This session would last about 15 to 20
minutes, depending on the students’ understanding and the mistakes they made. Ms. B often used a question and answer format for the grammar lesson. She asked the students to see if they had background knowledge about the grammatical structure, and then let them ask question related to the grammar lesson. Ms. B did not answer the students’ questions directly. Instead, she guided them by asking them questions to make them think by themselves. Sometimes she asked them to consult the course textbook or other grammar books. Sometimes Ms. B would use the textbook during explaining grammar. For this kind of lesson, Ms. B would ask the students to do the exercises in the textbook orally. After that, she would ask the students to read their writing for about 15 minutes and look for grammatical mistakes related to the lesson they discussed earlier. This was an editing session with the specific purpose. While editing their draft, Ms. B sometimes encouraged the students to ask her if they had a question about their writing based on the grammar point. At this point, Ms. B sometimes asked the students to exchange their drafts for editing. Then she asked the students to rewrite their work for 30 minutes. At the end of the class, she assigned homework for the next class.

**Use of the Writing Process**

Ms. B explained in interviews that she planned her whole semester according to the cycle of writing process: pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing. She did not have a rigid lesson plan for each class. What she had in mind was the various stages of the writing process, and where the students were in the process. Then she thought of an activity that fit each stage. Sometimes she had an activity before going to class, sometimes she just had a broad picture of what she wanted the students to do, but she let her class lead her to the actual activity. She called this an impromptu activity. However, she always had her students write in class. She adjusted the implementation of the writing process to the 80 minute class period in order to meet her students’
needs. Her overall organization involved brainstorming, independent writing, revision and peer response, and editing and publishing.

**Brainstorming**

Ms. B always started her class by brainstorming. She urged her students to generate ideas by asking them questions and jotting down their ideas on the board. The purposes of brainstorming were to draw out the students’ backgrounds on the topic or language usage, to get the students to think, and to prepare the students to write. Ms. B believed that speaking would help them generate ideas for their writing.

**Independent writing**

For each unit, Ms. B would let the students write independently for 40 minutes. She called this first draft free writing. During class observations, I noticed that when she started a new unit, Ms. B would have her students have free-style writing after brainstorming. She encouraged the students to write whatever came to mind and concentrate on their ideas. She told them not to worry about grammar or language at this point. She assured them that they were allowed to make mistakes for free writing by telling them that she would not reduce their grade for grammatical mistakes. She told the students that if they did not know how to write in English, they could write in Thai. She told them not let the language interrupt their flowing of thoughts. She wanted them to put their ideas on paper. During free style writing, Ms. B would ask the students not to talk because it would interrupt their thought process. She also told them not to erase anything. She told them to cross it out if they wanted to change something or if they made a mistake. Most of the time, Ms. B would leave the room during free-style writing. She wanted them to write independently. However, during my observations, when Ms. B left, some students talked to each other or asked the person sitting next to them for spelling.
Another kind of free-style writing was reflective journal writing. Ms. B used reflective journals as a way for her students to reflect how they wrote, to become aware of their writing process, and to plan their next draft. For the reflective journal, Ms. B allowed the students to write in Thai because she thought that to reflect their thoughts, the native language would help the students express their thoughts more easily and fluently. Ms. B would let them write in their journals for 15 to 20 minutes. Usually, Ms. B often asked her students to do this kind of free-style writing after revising or peer-response.

**Revising and peer response**

After the first draft or free-style writing, Ms. B would let the students revise their writing. Ms. B called it drafting. The students revised three times for each writing assignment. Ms. B emphasized revision because she believed that revising was the most important process in writing. For revising, Ms. B would have two main activities for this phase. First, she would let the students revise by themselves for homework. Second, she would ask them respond to each other’s writing. The feedback from peers was for revising their next draft. They sometimes revised in class or did it at home. Ms. B also asked the students to read other English materials to help them improve their writing by exposing them to authentic materials so they could see the way English is used and to get some information for their essays. For example, for describing places, after free-style writing in class, she asked the students to bring in an English text about an interesting place. She asked them to read the text and look for some specific information, as well as to take into account how the writer wrote or introduced the place. In class, she let the students revise their writing using the information they had learned from the reading.

For peer response, during my observation, I found that at the beginning, Ms. B would read their responses in class without revealing whose writing it was. The students rarely responded or gave feedback except writing their general comments, such as ‘easy to read’, ‘interesting
information’, or ‘nice handwriting’. Ms. B encouraged them to respond to content for the first draft. She asked them to describe how they felt when they read their peer’s writing and what should be changed or improved. She did not want them to correct the grammatical mistakes. She wanted the students to focus on content first. Also, another goal she had was that she wanted them to trust their peers. She often told her students to give sincere comments, but not those that create negative feelings because the purpose of peer response was to help their peers improve their writing. With this kind of response, the students started to enjoy reading and giving feedback to their peers. During interviews, the students said that they liked peer response and liked to read their friend’s writing because they could see how their friend wrote and how they used English. Also, the peer’s feedback helped them know how to revise their writing. They eventually came to trust their friends’ responses.

After the second draft, I noticed that Ms. B would ask her student to revise and at the same time to be aware of the language focus for that unit. During the peer response or revising stage of the second draft, Ms. B would start with grammar lesson by discussing the language structure and language usage for the particular unit. For example, simple present tense was emphasized for describing a person. She pointed out some of the mistakes the students made in their writing concerning the use of simple present tense. She then asked the students to look for other grammatical mistakes in that area. She let them ask her questions on particular grammar points. She told me in interviews that the students made many kinds of grammatical mistakes when they wrote in English, but at this time she wanted them to focus on the grammar and language usage mentioned in each unit and related to each topic of writing. She wanted them to understand those structures and be able to use them correctly in their writing because this was important for the test. During my class observations, I found that the students paid more attention when they
looked for mistakes in their writing. They told me in interviews that they learned more about grammar than before because they learned from their mistakes and the teacher let them find out by themselves instead of just telling them what was right and what was wrong or giving them a lecture.

Editing and publishing

After the third draft, it was time for editing before turning their final draft to the teacher. However, it was only the fifth assignment that Ms. B asked the students to edit their writing for publishing. She told them to type or use a word processor for their final draft and to prepare an envelope with the address of the sender and receiver on it. She would mail the pieces of writing to the publisher of an English newspaper or English magazine in Thailand. It was the last individual assignment. She asked the students to revise and edit carefully, particularly for grammatical mistakes and spelling.

After the third draft, she focused on grammar. Students edited their writing based on the grammar they had learned in class, and they could consult the textbook if they were not sure about how to correct their grammatical mistakes. For editing, Ms. B introduced and explained writing correction codes to her students and asked them to use those codes when they edited their peer’s writing. Ms. B gave some points for every draft. She told her students that her criteria for grading each draft was based on the focus she pointed out during the revision. The first draft focused on content and ideas. The second and third draft focused on revision of both content and structures. Ms. B expected the students to turn in their final draft with clear content, appropriate organization, and corrected for grammar.

Summary

The context of this study was described in this chapter according to what the teacher, Ms. B, did in the writing class. Firstly, the teacher educational and teaching background was
provided including her belief on writing process approach. Then, the students’ background i.e. personal and learning background, particularly in learning writing at school, was portrayed. The last section of the chapter described the teaching instruction focusing on the activities the teacher used in this writing class and how the teacher employed each activity.

Table 4-1 Students’ personal background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 18 – 19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20 – 21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 22 – 24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Experience in learning English (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 – 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 9 – 11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 12 – 14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 15 – 18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grade for Foundation English III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B – B+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- C – C+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D – D+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NA (not answer or Exempt)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3.5 – 4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3.0 – 3.49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2.5 – 2.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2.0 – 2.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1.5 – 1.99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NA (not answer)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bio Fishery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Veterinary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Attitude towards reading
   - Like reading    33     80.49
   - Don’t like reading   8   19.51

8. Attitude towards writing
   - Like writing    27     65.85
   - Don’t like writing 14  34.15

Table 4-2 Students’ experience in reading and writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reading materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Textbooks</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Newspaper</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Novels</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Magazines</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Periodicals</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Comics</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thai Dharma books</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outside reading (assignment)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Japanese books (translated)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Writing materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Lists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Homework/reports</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Poems</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Diary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Short answers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Essays/stories</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Novels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Comics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Letters</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Notes/appointments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-3 Students’ reasons in taking this writing course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Want to practice writing in order to use it in real situations and in the future</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To improve writing skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Want to be able to write well/fluently/correctly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is a requirement (any elective English course) for graduation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is an interesting course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was able to register</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Want to learn to write</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To graduate in this semester</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Think that I can learn this subject (writing) compared to other English courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Want to know writing principles in different kinds of writing in order to communicate with others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To be able to tell or write different stories</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would like readers to understand my writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Want to try it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Not good at writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Am interested in writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-4 Students’ perceptions of writing before taking this class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Writing</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Difficulties in writing in Thai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Organization</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Word choice such as Royal vocabulary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Have to write in a written language or using spoken language in their writing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Spelling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Language use</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Repetition (wordy) and the content is not concise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Sentence structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Lack of creativity to make writing interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Cannot write in limited time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Relationship between persons (speaker and audience)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11. Lack of practicing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Writing</td>
<td>Frequency (n = 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12. The topic and the feeling or emotion about the topic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Difficulties in writing in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Don’t know English vocabulary</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Worry about grammar, am afraid of grammatical mistakes, structures such as tenses</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Meaning and communicating</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Sentence structure such as word order</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Translation into English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. The content may not be related to the topic given</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. Lack of practicing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. Rarely have a chance to use in real life situations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Don’t like writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Communicate writer’s purpose or idea clearly</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Easy to understand, not ambiguous</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Concise and cover the topic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Grammatical correct</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Use beautiful and appropriate written language</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. Well organization</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7. Neat, beautiful hand writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8. Interesting plot, content</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9. Have the author’s voice, authorship, style</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10. Write with attention or purpose</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11. Be imaginative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12. Correct word choice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13. Combine experience and new information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS WRITING CLASS

In chapter 4 I described the classroom setting and the activities the teacher employed to help her students learn to write in English. In order to understand the writing instruction used in this class and how it affected the students’ growth in writing, the present chapter discussed the characteristics of this writing class because the context of the experience is important in making sense of the human experience such as interactions, behaviors, and events (Vygotsky, 1978; Bakhtin, 1986).

This chapter uses second language acquisition perspectives particularly Comprehension hypothesis (Input hypothesis), the Affective Filter hypothesis, and the Problem-solving hypothesis proposed by Stephen Krashen (1977, 1982, 1995, 2002, and 2004), and Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural perspective as the main theoretical frameworks to discuss the characteristics of this writing class. Through merging descriptions and themes of the findings, I categorized the characteristics of Ms. B’s writing class into three major foci:

- Teacher’s personality
- Focus of writing class (Learning environment)
- Style of class

**Teacher’s Personality: Kind and Friendly**

Research in second language acquisition (SLA) theories and models over the past 30 years have found that one of the factors involved in adult second language (L2) learning is learners’ attitude and motivation toward the target language learning. Attitude and motivation is one of the psychological variables that play an important role in L2 learning and success (e.g. Gardner, 1985; Nagle and Sanders, 1986; Krashen, 1987, 1988). According to Krashen (1987, 1988), motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety which he calls “affective variables” play a facilitative
role in second language acquisition. In order to help the learners, especially the ones in a monolingual context like foreign language (FL) learning who tend to have less positive attitude and low motivation to learn the target language, to succeed in learning and acquiring L2, the teachers have to lower the level of affective filters (Krashen, 1987, 1988; Wudthayagorn, 2003; Schütz, 2005). The study of Cohen and Norst (1989) shows that the teacher’s personality plays a crucial part in comforting the students, particularly the adult learners, when they study L2 or a foreign language. Moreover, the results from their study reveal that “the teacher’s unfailing caring, support, positiveness, encouragement, kindness and patience can help to overcome anxiety in time, and that these attributes are actually more important than technical knowledge or skill” (p. 61).

For the present study, the predominant impression that all students expressed their feeling about this writing class was the teacher’s (Ms. B’s) personality. The students’ words about her were “kind and friendly.” When asked about the outstanding features of this writing class, all students said it was the teacher’s personality that made them enjoy learning this writing class. The teacher’s personality played an important role in creating a relaxing atmosphere and helped the students feel less stressful. The students revealed that this writing class was different from their past experience in English learning. According to Lo (1996), the teacher in a traditional writing classroom tends to be strict on correctness and writing is taught based on the format of examination. The atmosphere in the traditional writing classroom, in which writing is a means for testing grammar and sentence structures, makes the students feel stressful and feel fear to write because they are afraid to make errors. This stressful atmosphere leads to the students’ negative attitude towards English writing. Unlike their past experience in learning English and in writing, the students in this study found Ms. B friendly, amusing, and not strict on correctness.
From the first meeting, Ms. B began to build an atmosphere that promoted nontraditional instruction for her process writing approach. She told the students that writing in her class was not a means for testing grammar and sentence structure but she wanted them to learn to write and practice writing. She did not focus on grammar and sentence structure for the first draft. She wanted the students to feel free to write and express their ideas in their writing. This concept of teaching writing and her personality—kindness and friendliness—facilitated the students’ learning and lowered their anxiety when they experienced the unfamiliar instruction. Cohen and Norst (1989) state that the personal qualities of the teacher such as the warmth, friendliness, and empathy are crucial factors that can help the learners who have low motivation to be able to enjoy their language experience. Similarly, about 30% of the students in this writing class who had low motivation to learn to write such as Benz, Nini, Wee, Tit, and Chai changed their attitude toward English and writing in English. These students were required to take any English course in order to graduate. They did not have an intention to improve their writing skills when they first chose this course. However, as time went on, these students’ attitude toward English and writing in English became positive due to the teacher’s personality. Wee said in the second interview that he had a positive attitude towards this writing class because the teacher was friendly, and not strict. The teacher’s personality made this writing class enjoyable, he added.

It is obvious that Ms. B’s personality played a crucial role in creating the basic motivational conditions (Krashen, 1982, 1988; Cohen and Norst, 1989; Dörnyei, 2001; and Wudthayagorn, 2003). With her personality—kindness and friendliness—Ms. B lowered the students’ anxiety and built a friendly, relaxing and supportive atmosphere that enhanced the students’ positive attitudes and motivation to learn to write in a nontraditional English writing class as Wat and Pat said:
The teacher did not put pressure on us. The teacher was not serious, not strict. This encouraged my friends and me to learn. It made me feel that this English writing class was not a dangerous zone. It made me want to come to class, and I noticed that my friends were rarely absent. (INT-2)

**Focus of Writing Class**

This writing class was a nontraditional writing class in which the teacher tried to adapt the process approach that she experienced into her class. The students encountered an unfamiliar experience they rarely found when they learned English in the past. What made this class different from the traditional language class were the types of activities and the structure of the teacher’s instruction that focused on writing rather than on grammar. Krashen (2004) in his Comprehension Hypothesis claims, “[L]anguage acquisition does not happen when we learn and practice grammar rules. Language acquisition only happens when we understand messages” (p. 2) Actually, Krashen does not reject learning grammar rule but he suggests including grammar as a supportive role to fill in some of the gaps such as for accuracy in writing. The teacher can promote and teach grammar for editing stage of the composing process. Moreover, Krashen (1995) claims that the students learn through the process of problem-solving rather than direct instruction. In other words, the students learn new facts and concepts by doing, not by listening to the lectures. For a writing class, engaging in a variety of activities and practicing writing more frequently will help the students not only learn to write, but they also learn language from their writing and errors they make. In order to provide learning environment to promote writing in this writing class, the teacher emphasized activities that helped the students learn how to write and practice writing more, such as free writing, peer-response, revising, and question-answer.

**Types of Activities: Promoting Learning to Write**

Ms. B believed in writing process approach and she found that to help the students learn to write, the students needed more practice in writing. In this writing class, she introduced the
students to a new concept of writing and helped them improve their writing skills. Ms. B provided the students time and opportunities to write, revise and get others’ responses via a variety of activities response which were basic needs of writers (Graves, 1983; Murray, 1985; Atwell, 1987; and Calkins, 1994). Moreover, Ms. B tried to encourage her students to be independent writers in order to develop their sense of ownership through free writing and peer-responses.

In addition, to learn to write in L2, the students have to deal with not only the composing process, they have to deal with the language that they are not comfortable with. In other words, in the L2 writing class, the teacher has to facilitate the students to develop their composing process (expressing the ideas) and to learn language as a tool to communicate their ideas. The learner acquires the second language when they receive second language comprehensible input—the input that is one step beyond his/her current language competence (Krashen, 1982, 1988, 2002). Besides comprehensible input, engaging in the problem-solving and pleasant activities results in language acquisition and cognitive development (Krashen, 1995). Another theory contributes to understanding language and literacy learning is a sociocultural theory developed by Vygotsky (1978). This theory suggests the role of social interactions in an individual’s cognitive development. It claims that learning takes place when an individual interacts with the others who are more advance in the community. To become an expert, an individual has to go through the socialization process (Vygotsky, 1978). In this writing class, the students were engaged in question-answer session and peer-response that provided the students not only comprehensible input and problem-solving activities for language learning but also a chance to interact with their peers and the teacher in the community of practice.
The implemented activities that the students found helpful for their growth as writers are free writing, peer-response, revision, and question-answer. These activities provided the students the three basics that writers need when they write: time, ownership, and response (Graves, 1983; Murray, 1985; Atwell, 1987; and Calkins, 1994). The students had sufficient time to write and revise, and opportunities to get responses from their peers and the teacher.

**In-class writing: Providing sufficient time to write and promoting ownership**

In this writing class, there were three types of in-class writing: free writing, journal writing, and reflective writing. Free writing referred to first draft writing for each assignment. For this activity, the teacher gave a prompt or a general topic such as writing about oneself, or writing about a memorable experience. The prompts were related to the topic of each unit in the textbook. The teacher allowed the students to freely express any ideas they wanted to communicate, and the students did not have to worry about error-free composition because the teacher did not emphasize or expect accuracy in this stage in the writing process. The teacher even allowed the students to use Thai (their first language) if there was an expression or word that they did not know how to express in English. Journal and reflective writing referred to writing exercises where the teacher asked the students to reflect on previous writing assignments or on the process of writing a draft. Sometimes, in their journal the students were expected to ask questions about their writing. For both journal and reflective writing, the students could also use Thai.

The students were given the opportunity to practice writing for about 30-45 minutes during every period via free writing and revision. The students reported that they found this time of practice writing to be very beneficial for their writing development and helped them grow as writers. According to the course syllabus, the students had to complete six writing assignments during the semester. Through the semester, the students wrote more frequently for six
assignments. They freely wrote for their first drafts and wrote for revision (3 drafts). In addition to improvement in their writing skills, they also said that writing activities made them feel free (feeling free from structure and stress, and freedom of language), let them express their voice, and helped them become confident writers. In this writing class, Ms. B provided the students sufficient time to write, and revise their drafts.

Atwell (1987) said, “growth in writing takes time” (p. 56). The students need regular and frequent time to grow and develop their writing skills which are not a linear process. They need adequate time to learn from their former writing, to take risks, and learn what works and does not work for their writing. The students in the present study were similar. They needed time to grow and learn to improve their writing skills. In order to help her students learn about their writing and grow as writers, Ms. B provided them regular, frequent time to practice writing. Through writing more frequently in a short period of time (15 weeks), the students found that their writing improved in terms of length, language structures and grammar, and creativity (as described in chapter 6). Additionally, although 15 weeks seemed to be a short period of time for growing as writers, through frequently writing, the students acquired a new concept of writing as a process, and became confident in writing in English.

Free writing set the students free from accuracy and stress they had experience in the past. They were allowed to write freely in their own styles and not worry about grammar for the first draft. They wrote what they wanted to. In other words, they wrote their own stories rather than what the teacher expected them to write. This freedom as well as sense of ownership made the students feel relaxed and encouraged them to write more in order to improve their writing. The students in this study believed that the more they wrote the better writers they became. In the past they were afraid to write because teachers always emphasized accuracy and highlighted
grammatical errors. Previous teachers expected error-free first drafts from the students. As a consequence, the students feared writing, or hesitated to try a new sentence structure because they feared red marks on their papers. Students would try to circumvent the possibility of getting bad grades by writing short essays in order to make as few mistakes as possible. They would also strictly imitate the sample paragraph in the textbook. They did not feel free to write what they really wanted to communicate to the audience, as the only audience they had was the teacher who did the grading. For example, Jane, Nat, Nok, and Tida talked about their past experience, “… as we studied writing in the past, most teachers emphasized grammar. That is, they did not allow us to think and have imagination. They followed the textbook.” (INT-1)

Unlike their past experiences, in this writing class, the students learned that they were free to express themselves in their writing. Free writing reduced the students’ fear from accuracy and eliminated their frustration associated with the purpose of writing. Free writing lowered the students’ affective filters such as fear and anxiety and helped the students acquired the target language (English) when they wrote and also they learned to write in English (Krashen, 1982, 2004). Free writing increased the students’ self-esteem in writing because it made the students feel more confident to write in English because they did not fear to make mistakes. They knew that they had a chance to revise their piece of writing and to correct the mistakes they made. The students felt confident to create their stories longer. Tida expressed,

In this writing class, we have freedom in writing. It is like you don’t have to worry about grammar at first. If you are always concerned about grammar while writing, you will not be able to create your story. (Tida, INT-1)

Jane agreed with Tida. She added that being concerned about grammar all the time would block the flow ideas. Nat and Nok stated in her first interview that if the teacher emphasized grammar, the students would be afraid of writing. Many of the students expressed that after writing more frequently, they were not afraid to write any more and they found that they expressed their ideas
more easily. Like other students in the class, Pat, Wat, and Fuada were proud of themselves when they found that they wrote an entire page. Pat said that he had never written more than a half page, while Wat never thought that he would be able to write in English.

I am proud that I can write in English now. Before if the teacher asked me to describe a person, I didn’t know I could write even three lines. But now I can write a page. I think I learn to write and not just a beginner. (Wat, INT-2)

I improve my writing skills a lot. I had never tried to write in English. Now I can write in English for a whole page despite some errors. (Pat, INT-2)

It worked in that we had chances to express our opinions. With freedom to think, we were not afraid to write. We were able to describe more and felt confident to write better because we wrote what we wanted to. (Fuada, INT-3)

The students felt confident in writing in English and they tried to use less Thai in their writing. They found that some of their ideas flew out in English, and that they did not need to write in Thai and translate to English. Additionally, when the students translated Thai words into English words by using dictionaries, they discovered that they learned new vocabulary which helped them write in English more fluently. Like other students, Mate (INT-3) confirmed that he was not afraid to write any more. He attributed his lack of fear to practicing writing during each class period and to the fact that the teacher emphasized expressing voice over other aspects of writing.

In addition, good writing teachers should give their students not only time but also ownership for their writing (Atwell, 1987). Atwell says that good writing teachers do not take responsibility for their students’ writing but they help them be responsible for their writing. In other words, good writing teachers should encourage their students to be independent and know what they want to do about their writing. Ms. B used free writing or independent writing as a stage to shift the responsibility for writing to the students. Free writing allowed the students to search for their stories to share with the others. The students felt that they owned their stories. For instance, Mate said that he, like other peers, knew his stories better than the others or even
the teacher because they were his stories. In this sense, the students built their sense of ownership for their stories. However, in terms of revision, the students still needed the teacher’s feedback to tell them how to revise. For example, Fuada in the third interview asked for the teacher’s feedbacks for his writing because he did not know how to revise his stories. He wanted the teacher to tell him what and how to improve his stories and his writing. This is because Thai students are used to the direct instruction from the teacher to tell them what and how to do their tasks. It is too soon to change this habitual behavior within 15 weeks. Although the students developed the sense of ownership by creating their stories, they still needed time and teacher’s assistance to develop their sense of ownership in writing and revision. Peer-response is another activity that can promote ownership and allows the students to rely on their peers and themselves more.

**Peer-response: Valuable response and personal conflict**

The only time for the students to seek for responses was when Ms. B introduced them to peer-response. The students in this study participated in another new activity—peer-responses, sometimes referred to as peer-editing. In this writing class, peer-response and peer-editing were used interchangeably. Prior to this class, the students rarely had their peers or others read their writing before except to the teacher for a grade. A few students might have friends read their stories but not very often. This is because in Thai society, teachers are the experts of knowledge. The students believe in teacher as authority of teaching. They do not want any opinions from their peers whom they consider as non-experts. That is why Thai students tend to depend upon the teacher. In order to provide the students response and ownership, Ms. B introduced them to peer-response.

In this class there were two main tasks involving peer-response: responding to the first draft and responding to the revised works. They were different in terms of the focus of the
response. For responding to the first draft, the teacher asked the students to read and respond to the content only. She emphasized the communication between the author and the reader. She told them not to look for grammatical errors but rather focus on content, understanding, and impressions. For responding to the second and third drafts, the teacher gave the students guidelines of what to look for. The guidelines were mainly the grammar structures related to the writing assignment and were the language focus of each unit in the textbook.

The students in this writing class found these two kinds of peer-response helpful and they thought the teacher wanted them to learn from their peers’ writing. Through experiencing peer-response activities throughout the semester, the students became confident writers and found peer-response a place for them to learn how to write, to become critical readers, and to learn about grammar and apply it when they revised their own writing. Besides, peer-response made them learn to value their peers’ comments and encouraged them to share their writing and their ideas to the others besides the teacher.

[Peer response was] Good. We learned our mistakes and what we should revise from peers’ feedbacks. Sometimes we thought our work was good but it was just our opinion. Having readers gave us various opinions. Also, we learn from peers’ work about their writing styles, and vocabulary that we did not know before. I could imitate their styles and add some ideas in my work. (Nan, INT-2)

We learned from peers’ works such as writing styles, a variety of sentence structures, and we applied them with our works. We learned our mistakes and what we should revise. (Tisa, INT-3)

When we read peers’ works, we reviewed what we learned because we had to use our knowledge [to give feedbacks]. We learned from their mistakes and when we wrote our stories, we would not make that kind of mistakes. I think we exchanged the knowledge. (Korn, INT-2, 3)

[From their feedbacks] We knew what the readers expected from our writing and we learned how to write for the audience. (Phum, INT-2, 3)

It (peer-response) was fun because when we read peers’ works, we learned from them. Also, we had to apply what we knew in order to read, correct their works and gave the feedbacks. It was not just read but we had to comment their works. (Mate, INT-2)
We learned the weak points we made in our writing. We used the other’s writing as a model and apply it to the next assignment. (Lisa, INT-2)

We can learn by comparing our writing with the others’. It helped me learn to organize my stories better. (Ya, INT-2)

Although the students valued their peers’ feedbacks as time went on, they were not sure that their peers could help them learn better than the response from the teacher. Thai students experience the direct instruction which is based on teacher-centered; as a result, they trust the teacher the most that he/she is the knowledgeable person who can help them learn. According to their past experience and the educational system, the students in the present study relied only on the teacher who transferred the knowledge to them. With this value and attitude, when Ms. B asked the students to exchange their writing for peers’ response, they felt frustrated. They did not trust that their peers would be able to help them due to their limited English proficiency. They believed that the teacher was the only person who was capable of correcting their writing, particularly the grammatical errors because the teacher knew the best.

But I don’t like the way we had to give feedback. I mean sometimes we had to check if they made any mistakes. For myself, I could not find my mistakes in my writing. How could I check or find out their mistakes. I don’t know what’s wrong with their works. I don’t quite like it…. When I read their stories, I understood, but the teacher asked us to check their grammar such as the use of verbs. I could not edit my work, so I could not correct theirs. (Tida, INT-2)

Sometimes peers’ correction might not be grammatically correct and we could not be sure about that. We had to apply grammar and language usage in the examination. If our peers ‘correction was not right according to the teacher’s opinion, we would not be happy. Our peers had similar level of language proficiency and knowledge. It’s like they knew “snake snake fish fish” (just basic skills) but we needed the teacher to point out right or wrong. The teacher would know better than we did. (Paula, Tisa, Rachael, and Wan, INT-2)

I like when the teacher gave feedback because I was sure that it was wrong and I learned from the teacher’s correction. Sometimes I was not sure about peers’ feedbacks whether it was right or not. (Su, INT-2)

Me too. For example, when I read my friend’s work, I understood and did not find any grammatical mistake. But when the teacher read it, she found some. I felt like I already read it and I understood. Why were there mistakes? I could not read and give a feedback. (I
could not do peer-response) I was not confident that what I wrote was right or not. At first I thought what I wrote was ok, I understood. I was confident that I did not have any grammatical mistakes. Sometimes when the peers read, and wrote feedbacks that my sentence was ungrammatical, or they didn’t understand, or you might use the wrong verb. Something likes this. I was confident that I was right, but when I read their feedback, I was confused. I was not sure if my sentences were grammatical correct or not. I was confused…. Finally, I got confused. (Nok, INT-2)

In addition, they were not familiar with letting others except the teacher read their writing. Some students felt that their writings, particularly the first drafts, were not good enough to share with the others and they were afraid of the loss of “face” which is “a very important aspect of status” for Thai people (Jones, 2003, p. 34). Meanwhile, the students were afraid to give the direct or harsh feedback to avoid causing their peers’ humiliation or loss of face. This is one of the crucial Thai society values. Thai people in order to maintain harmony, they avoid to confrontation—overt expression of anger, displeasure, and criticism (Klausner, 1993; Jones, 2003). Giving feedback was considered and perceived by Thai students as giving criticism. As a result, they felt frustrated to give direct feedback and they tended to exchange their writings with their friends rather than to their classmates whom they rarely knew. The students expressed this frustration when they talked with me in the interviews. This behavior can also be explained by cross-cultural psychology called a low-context communication culture and a high-context communication culture (Gugykunst, 1998; Ting-Toomy, 1999; and Ageyev, 2003). Low-context communication, which is found in American culture, “tends to be direct, precise, and clear”, whereas high-context communication, which is found in many other countries like Russia and Asian culture, “tends to be indirect and ambiguous” (Gudykunst, 1998, p. 57). The differences between high- and low-context communicative patterns have an influence on interpersonal interaction and can lead to culture clashes and mutual frustration (Hofstede, 1997; Gudykunst, 1998). As peer-response is originally found in a low-context communication culture like American culture, the frustration and culture conflict in interpersonal relationship can be
expected when this activity is adapted in the high-context communicative style like Thai society. The logical reasons for being indirect in a high-context communication like in Thai culture include an attitude of conflict avoidance and “saving face” (Ageyev, 2003). The students tended to give indirect opinions or general feedback in order to avoid the conflict or harsh feeling or to save their peers’ face.

I felt shy or ashamed if the teacher gave my story to the peer I did not know. I was afraid of their response, how he/she felt about my writing. But if the reader was my friend, he would tell me directly. Sometimes I saw that the students who read my story was talking and laughing with her friend. I saw her ask her friend to read it too. But she did not give me a frank comment or her opinion about my writing. When I got my paper back, she gave a plain and general feedback. I felt losing my face (humiliated). This is the different (between friend reader and peer reader) because sometimes the reader who was not a close friend would be afraid to give us a sincere comment. On the other hand, I was not afraid to comment whether my friend or peer reader because I did not quite kreng jai anyone. (Fuada, INT-3)

I preferred to choose my own reader because I knew him and his personality. When I wrote comments for my friend, it would be something funny but I would give friendly feedback if I didn’t know the author. For my friend, I felt comfortable to express my opinion and to tease him, but with the one I did not know personally, I would be polite. (Wee, INT-3)

It is obvious that peer-response, on one hand, is the place for the students in this study to seek for feedbacks to help them revise their writing. The students felt that they learned to write and learned language usage from their peers’ feedback and their peers’ works. On the other hand, because the students were familiar with the direct instruction and believed that the teacher was the only knowledgeable person in the classroom, they were frustrated when they were asked to give and receive feedbacks to their peers. They were not sure that they could really help their peers to improve their writing especially for grammar and sentence structures, and at the same time, they did not trust their peers’ English proficiency. They were afraid that they would get the wrong feedback and that would lower their grade for the grammar-section in the examination. At the end of the semester, although many of the students felt more comfortable to give and receive feedbacks from their peers, they still expressed their concerns about grammar correction which
they wanted the teacher to check for them rather than their peers. Moreover, although the
students felt that giving feedback was helpful to them and their peers, they were afraid to give
sincere or critical feedbacks because they did not want to make their peers, especially the ones
they rarely knew, lose face. It will be more helpful if the teacher encourages the students to give
sincere and constructive feedbacks by creating the atmosphere that allows the students to know
each other more in order to decrease the sense of unfamiliarity among the students. Mate and Kit
said in the second interview that if they knew the other students better, they would be more
comfort to give the direct or sincere feedback.

**Revision: Time to rewrite and rethink**

Revision was an activity that the teacher allowed the students to have more time for their
writing. The students, while revising, had time to rethink and rewrite to make their pieces or
writing readable to meet the readers’ expectation. Also, through the revision process, the students
learned that writing was a process that needed time to complete. In the past, the students learned
that writing was a one-complete draft because they were not allowed to revise their pieces of
writing except to rewrite by correcting the mistakes pointed out by the teacher. The students
learned that a good writing needed time and needed multiple drafts to produce the final readable
piece. Through revising, the students reread their works, read their peers’ feedbacks and applied
those feedbacks for revision. They added and cut some information, rearranged the stories to
make it readable for the readers. They grew as writers through revision process.

It’s good in that we had a chance to check our work. Sometimes I rewrote the whole story
because I could not think in the classroom because of time limitation. I decided to rewrite
it. Mostly, I added the information when I revised. Sometimes I edited grammatical errors,
looked for suitable vocabulary. (Paul, INT-1)

(Via revision) I felt that we improve our work and our ideas. We learned from our mistakes
that we corrected. (Ya, INT-2)
Moreover, through revision, the students learned to solve their problem when they wrote. While they revised their work, they solved their problem about writing, and at the same time, the students acquired the knowledge of writing and the target language (Krashen, 1995). They learned grammar and sentence structures. They took risks to use the new structures they learned in class in their writing because they knew that it was a chance for them to learn and use it. They did not fear to try out the new structures. Through revision, the students learned by problem-solving which would help them grow as writers.

We learned new things every time we revised. For example, when we learned something new in class and when we read what we wrote, we could apply what we just learned in our work which might make our work better. If we revised, we wrote longer than we edited. It helped us organized our stories better. (Korn, INT-2)

With a variety of activities, the teacher allowed the students to have time for their writing, provided them to get feedbacks from their peers, and to encouraged them to develop their sense of ownership when they engaged in activities in class. With sufficient time to work on their writing, the students understood the concept of writing as a process and learned how to improve their writing through free writing, peer-response, and revision. In addition, learning by doing (practicing writing more frequently, revising their drafts, and giving peer-response) enhanced the students to grow as writers, to learn how to write and improve their writing skills, as well as to acquire English language (Krashen, 1995). This can be seen through Tai’s conclusion:

At first I thought this class was a burden. I had a lot of homework to do. Compared to learning English in the past, I learned about grammar and did grammar exercises in the textbook. That’s it. But for this writing class, I had to search for information and did everything by myself. I felt hard. Later, I found that I gained benefits from this class. These tasks helped me improve my writing a lot. (Tai, INT-2)

**Question-answer: Language acquisition and culture adaptation**

Question-answer activity in this writing class had two forms: an oral session and a written form in journals. Mostly when mentioned about question-answer, the students referred to the oral
sessions. For question-answer activity, Ms. B allowed the students to ask questions based on their writing. The students mainly asked about grammar and sentence structures rather than composing process. According to my observation, a question-answer session was the main stage for the students to learn language and to interact with the teacher. The teacher used this session to explain grammar and sentence structures that the students needed or had difficulty with. Interestingly, although the students claimed that this activity was useful and was a chance for them to interact with the teacher and to learn language, a few of them often asked questions, while about half of them rarely raised questions in class, and some of them occasionally asked questions.

It is notable that second language writers are afraid to make mistakes, particularly grammatical errors due to the attitude of the teacher who emphasizes the correctness rather than composing process (Leeds, 2003). In L2 writing class, the students understand that to learn to write, they have to pay attention on errors in language use. They understand that their linguistic competence is their main problem in learning to write in L2. As a result, the students particularly those with a low level of L2 proficiency tend to focus on language use rather than on ideas. According to their past experience in learning English, the students in the present study had the similar understanding about English learning process and learning to write in English. They thought that they could not write well because of their limited English proficiency. Therefore, they paid more attention to linguistic competence than to ideas and the content. In question-answer sessions, they asked mainly on grammar, language usage, and vocabulary. The following is an excerpt of the observation field notes which is a part of question-answer session.

S5: Could you please explain the third topic (Definite articles)?
Ms. B read the text.
S5: Is it wrong to say: we got to a train station in Had Yai?
Ms. B repeats the question and asks: Do you know which station? (no answer) If I say “a train station” it implies that I don’t know which station. This is about definite information. (S5 is taking note)

S9: I hate a lizard and I hate the lizard.

Ms. B: ‘a’ does not only mean ‘one’ but it has a Thai concept as ‘one’

S9: If we want to say this, which one will we use?

Ms. B: Use what?

S9: ‘the’

Ms. B: If it is specific, we use ‘the’, but if we mention about it in general, we can say, “I hate lizards.” If you say, “I hate the lizard”, you specify which one.

S6: How about “I have a class” and “I have class”

(Field note, page 38)

Through question-answer activity, the students in this writing class learned language use and usage based on their interest and their needs. The teacher did not lecture and anticipated what the students should learn. With their interest, the discussions during this session were comprehensible for the students. It was authentic discussion that enhanced the students’ language learning and cognitive development. (Bakhtin, 1986) The students found that they learned grammar when they engaged in question-answer sessions.

We learned more. For example, sometimes our friends asked questions that I didn’t pay attention before. When they asked, it made me think and when the teacher answered, we learned from her explanation. I got benefits. (Jane, INT-2)

As I mentioned above that although the students felt that they benefited from question-answer sessions especially in terms of learning grammar and language usage, they felt uncomfortable to raise their questions in class due to the cultural aspect in the classroom, and they were concerned that the teacher did not teach them much about grammar. This concern was related to the examination structure of which 50% was grammar-based. This was because this writing course was a product-based course which focused on form. It served the traditional writing class in which writing was a means for learning grammar and sentence structures. As a
result, one of the main parts of the examination tested the knowledge of grammar and sentence structures. Additionally, according to their past experience in a traditional writing class, the students understood that to be able to write, they had to learn grammar and structure (Lo, 1996). In other words, writing is a by-product of learning grammar and language usage. After the midterm examination, the students were worried about grammar, and in the second interview they revealed this concern.

[The teacher] should teach more grammar, and should have us work more on grammar exercises. Although she did teach grammar but she should do more. The teacher should answer our questions in stead of not answer and ask us back. This made me puzzled…. I think if we learn more grammar we will be able to write…. Having knowledge of grammar but writing ungrammatical sentences is better than not knowing grammar. Writing class at school or university should teach grammar first, and have the students to write as homework. If it is a short writing, it may be a class assignment. (Wan, INT-3)

[We] wanted the teacher to give more time for writing assignment especially homework (grammar exercises). I wanted her to give explanation or answer when we asked questions. (Nini, Tanya, Tai, and Su, INT-2)

[I] wanted the teacher to teach the content in the textbook more. The examination emphasized the content in the textbook that the teacher did not teach… (Tisa, INT-3)

Yes, my friends in another class told me that this (the content in the textbook such as sentence patterns and control writing exercises) would be in the test, but our teacher did not teach us. (Wan, INV-3)

There was one part that I thought the teacher did not prepare us for that part in the test. It’s about making questions from the sentences given. The teacher rarely taught us how to make questions. So, I could not do this part. (Korn, INT-2)

The students’ concern about examination is understandable. In this writing class Ms. B would not follow the textbook and would not focus on exercise drills in the text until a few weeks before the examinations. She wanted her students to experience their writing process and learned from their writing. At the same time she believed that if the students could write, they would learn language via their writing. Moreover, she allowed the students to ask questions which mainly were grammar-based and she took that chance to explain it. However, not many
students raised their questions when the teacher allowed them to because of the culture constraint and the way the teacher responded to their questions. According to Thai culture, respect for others is considered as an important value and attitude. Thai children are brought up to respect their parents, the elders, and the authority (Jones, 2003). Thai students respect their teacher who is considered as the elder, the wise, and the authority in the classroom. The students will not dare to argue with the teacher or even ask them questions. Foley (2005) concludes about the status of teachers in Thailand as a knowledgeable and respectful person and “[t]o question that knowledge is not to question ideas but to question or doubt the person” (p. 229). For students, being quiet in class is considered an appropriate behavior and the way to show the respect for the teacher. Merged with respect, kreu ng jai which Klausner (1993) defines as “diffidence, deference and consideration” (p. 258) also play a part in the students’ behavior in asking the teacher questions in the classroom. Klausner notices that kreu ng jai probably results in ones’ reticence to seek for help or ask for something from a superior unless it is really necessary. He suggests that this type of traditional Thai behavior can be seen in the classroom “in transition as students argue with their teachers” (p. 259). The reflections on Thai culture about respect and kreu ng jai concept by Jones (2003) and Klausner (1993) can explain the students’ behaviors in this writing classroom when they participated in question-answer sessions. Moreover, the students themselves accepted that they were not comfortable to ask questions in class unless it was really necessary.

It may be because of the way we were raised from our parents and the way we were taught at school. Mostly, children were not allowed to express their opinions in the classroom. Some adults may feel annoyed. In other words, they would not pay much attention to the children’s questions. (Mate, INT-2)

Because it’s like the knowledgeable person and the one with less knowledge. The teacher held knowledge and wisdom but the students like us felt that we were not knowledgeable and did not know how to ask a question. (Mate, INT-2)

Most Thai children [students] were trained to be passive: just listen to the teacher, the teacher came in and lectured. Mostly, students rarely asked questions. (Kay, INT-2)
We were used to the way we learned in the past. The teacher taught but not let the students ask a question.” (Chai and Tit, INT-2)

Besides the cultural value of respect and *kreng jai*, the students’ responses in the interviews implied another Thai culture value of loss of “face”. This value is related to the concept of *kreng jai* and leads to avoidance of confrontation or overt expression of their opinions and criticism. Jones (2003) explains the status of “face” in Thai society that “The Thais will experience shame if they do something that others would regard as dishonorable, and they expect to be treated honorable and not have their dignity offended” (p. 34). With this concept, Thais will avoid giving direct or harsh opinions because they do not want to humiliate others or make others lose their face. At the same time, Thais will be concerned about their “face” so that they will not show or share their opinion unless they are sure that it is right, valuable, and appropriate to express. This traditional Thai behavior can be seen in transition as students respond to their teacher’s question or to their peers’ writing. In this writing class, this concept of “face” results in the way the students participated in question-answer sessions. Many students in this class were afraid to raise their questions or answered the questions because they did not want to lose their face among their peers because they felt that their questions were not important or worth to ask. Meanwhile, they rarely answered because they were not sure whether they had the right answer. Here are some of their explanations about their behaviors in question-answer sessions.

I was afraid to give a wrong answer. I did not dare to raise my hand to answer. It is common that Thai students were afraid to answer. Not many students would express their opinions in class. We were used to this way. I didn’t know why but if I could answer or knew that I had a better answer, I might share it with class, but if I was not sure, I’d rather keep quiet. (Benz and Nan, INT-3)

Knowing other students in the class would help me not afraid to ask and answer the teacher’s questions. [I] would not feel ashamed. … We were afraid that we would ask a silly question. (Yut, INT-2)
They (adults and teachers) might think that the students’ question was not that difficult. Why couldn’t they get the answer by themselves? (Why bothered to ask the teacher?) (Mate, INT-2)

In general, if we were in class, most students did not ask questions because they were afraid of what their peers would think about their questions. Their peers might think that their questions were simple, not worth to ask in class and everyone knew who raised the questions. But if we were allowed to write the questions, I thought more students would ask. (Nan, INT-2)

[I] was afraid to ask the teacher because I was afraid that it was a simple question and everyone already knew the answer. (Tit, INT-2)

[You (the researcher) sat] next to me. Asking you (the researcher) was personal. If [I] asked Ms. B in the front, it would be a public. Sometimes it was just simple questions. (Sak, INT-3)

… Sometimes I felt my questions were silly or simple, the other students might have known the answers. So, I liked to ask the teacher after class, not in class. (Paul, INT-1)

Some students who rarely participated in Q-A activity and would only speak up when the teacher directly addressed them or when they really needed help gave a reason that they felt ‘shy’ to ask the questions in class. These students said that they were rarely allowed to ask questions in other classes. Therefore, they were not used to asking questions in this class. They would rather ask their peers instead because they found it was not comfortable to ask the teacher in class. Gradually, some of the students, such as Kit, Paul, and Yut, who were shy initially, began to participate by asking the teacher questions. However, this did not happen frequently for these students. They explained that they would ask the teacher when they really needed help about grammar and language usage. Otherwise, they would rather ask their peers. This response behavior is related to social values like being humble and seniority system. ‘Shy’ for Thai people seems to relate to the way we are taught to be humble, not show off. Asking questions or speaking up is considered by Thais as showing off. Along with the seniority system that prohibits Thai students to argue or discuss with the teacher in class makes them become ‘shy’ and not feel
comfortable to ask the teacher. Many times, they prefer asking their peers because of the same status that makes them feel more comfortable.

Nan and Benz gave another reason for not participating in oral Q-A activity. It was because of the teacher’s response—the way the teacher limited the scope of the questions and how she responded to their questions. In this writing class, the teacher, in order to focus on one aspect at a time, decided to limit the scope of the questions each time. For instance, at one time, she let the students ask the questions about simple sentence pattern, or another time, she allowed them to ask questions about present simple tense. The teacher would not answer or explain if the students asked the questions that were not relevant to the scope she allowed them to. She would tell them that it was not relevant. Another response that made the students felt afraid or frustrated to raise their questions is the way the teacher responded to their questions. Similar to Nan and Benz, Tisa, Wan, Rachel, and Paula complained that rather than giving them the answers, the teacher sometimes asked them to find the answer by themselves. The students felt that they didn’t know how to do so. Even though some of them consulted grammar books after the class, they still wanted the teacher to explicitly explain or give them the answer in class. In addition, the teacher sometimes threw the questions back, which made them feel uncomfortable because they did not expect to be made to think like this. Although they understood that the teacher wanted them to work on their own, they would like to have the direct answer or more guidance particularly about grammar and language usage. As a result, some students found no point to ask the teacher and did not want to take a risk if the teacher asked them to think on their own instead of answering their questions. These students expressed:

Sometimes I was afraid to ask. Sometimes I asked but it was not the topic that the teacher allowed, so she did not answer. That made me afraid to ask anymore. If I asked a question and the teacher said it was not relevant, I felt shy (ashamed). (Lisa, INT-2)
Sometimes when we asked the teacher questions, she asked us back rather than giving us answers, and made us puzzled. So, we were afraid to ask questions because we were afraid that she would ask us back and we did not know how to respond. (Wan, Tisa, Rachel, and Paula, INT-2)

The preconception of traditional classroom has a major impact on these students. In traditional classroom the teacher transmits the knowledge to the students, one-way interaction. As a result, Thai students are used to receiving, not thinking nor solving the problem on their own. Paul in the first interview claimed, “Mostly I could not think of anything to ask. I did not know what to ask because I was not trained to think.” The students became passive and did not want to work hard to learn to get the answers. When Ms. B encouraged them to think and solve the problem by themselves the students felt uncomfortable. In addition, in Thai society, the authority of teaching belongs to the teacher. This makes Thai students not confident to find out their own answers. They feel that only the teacher can give the right answers because he/she knows best. Although the students can consult the textbook, they are not sure they will understand it as the teacher does. They need the teacher to confirm what they learn or interpret from the textbook by giving lectures or explanations.

In summary, the students found question-answer activity, which were teacher to students or students to teacher patterns, both in oral and in written forms, interactive. In addition, participating in question-answer activity provided a chance for them to learn about English grammar, language usage, and writing techniques; unfortunately, not all of them orally asked the questions during this activity. Those who rarely spoke up chose to listen to their classmates asking questions and waited for answers. As stated above, there were various reasons due to Thai values and educational system, which prevented them from orally interacting with the teacher during Q-A sessions. Paul summarized, “The teacher provided us opportunities but not all the students took the advantage of them” (Paul, INT-3).
It is obvious that writing activities in which the students engaged in this class not only are the opportunities for them to learn second language (English), but also the opportunities for them to practice writing. They learned English grammar and language usage when they wrote and when they engaged in peer-response, revision, and question-answer activity. With these activities, the students were provided time, response and ownership what were basic components for writing. However, engaging in the activities which were foreign to them somehow makes them feel uncomfortable and frustrated because of their past experience and different cultural values. Some students might gradually overcome their frustration and started getting used to these activities, some did not. This leads to their behaviors that hinder their learning and writing development in a new situation. For example, some students did not give the sincere feedbacks to their peers and at the same time they did not trust their peers’ feedback about grammar. As a result, the students did not fully learn and gain benefits from their peers’ response as it should be.

**Writing Concept: From Correctness to Expression**

Engaging in this writing class, the students went through the process of adaptation from the familiar environment to the foreign environment. Adapting a new writing instruction in EFL classroom is like transplanting native plants into the foreign soil. The native students have to adapt and adjust themselves to meet the requirement or to accomplish the goal of this writing class. The focus of this writing class was to introduce the students to the new concept of writing as a process of expressing and communicating their opinions and their ideas to the audience, not as a by-product of learning language. Ms. B mentioned at the beginning of the semester that this was writing class, not English language class. She emphasized practicing of writing rather than grammar. She provided the students activities such as free writing, peer-response, and revision, to help them learn how to write and promote their expression.
In the second and third interviews, the students reported that their concept about writing changed or expanded. Prior to taking this writing class, for them writing meant writing one single draft and imitating writing from textbooks. In terms of English writing, this meant completing grammatical exercises in textbooks. They also stated that when they wrote essays in English, they thought of grammar and that made them afraid to write. From the interviews I found that the students’ concept of writing as being only an assignment they had to complete changed. After midterm examination during the second interview, when the students talked about writing, they always mentioned the importance of the thinking process. To get a piece of writing they had to think about their experiences and chose which information should be included in their writing. The students said they spent a lot of time thinking and searching for information when they wrote. In their past experience, they never had a chance to think much when they wrote. Therefore, after taking this writing class, they felt that writing allowed them to think and express their ideas and voices rather than simply imitating a paragraph in a textbook.

Moreover, in the second and third interviews, the students talked about a more important change in their writing. They began to show ownership in their writing. Before taking this class, the students wrote to please the teacher because the teacher was the person who graded their essays. In the first interview, the students stated that they wrote what the teacher wanted them to write and tried to avoid making mistakes that may result in a low grade. To avoid making mistakes the students tended to write short essays and imitate models. On the contrary, after taking this class, the students wrote for themselves to express their ideas.

Many students felt that free style writing allowed them to add their voice and style of writing to their stories. In the interviews, the students were proud of their stories and how much they could write. Pat and Wat were the best sample of this. They were very proud that they could
write what they wanted in English. When I asked the students how this writing class helped them improve their writing ability, here what they said:

I had never before had my voice in my story. Finally, in this class, I am able to tell my story to the readers including the teacher and I, not the teacher, owned the story. (Wat, INT-2)

A lot. I think [it helped me] a lot. I never tried to write English before. Now I am able to write [in English] about a page although there might be some mistakes. (Wat agreed.) But I can write for a page. (He said proudly.) From the first day when you asked me whether I used to write or not, I said that I never wrote. But now I can write [in English] for a page. But I don’t know whether I write ungrammatically or not. (Pat, INT-2)

We had never been asked what we thought. None of the teachers listened to the students’ voices. (Pat and Wat, INT-1)

… we think for ourselves. We wrote in our style. There was not a fixed style of writing. It was up to us, what we wanted to write. … We had chances to write our own stories. (Jira, Nee, Orn, INT-2)

I am not afraid to write. I am more confident to write because I write what I want to. I took a risk and learned from my mistake. (Sak, INT-3)

Free writing practice helped the students express themselves freely while letting them free from correctness. At the beginning, the students felt uneasy to write what they wanted to because they were used to the direct-instruction and were worried about grammar when they wrote. Gradually, they felt more confident to express themselves through their stories. When the learners began to write their own stories, they enjoyed writing and tended to write more (Fu, 2000). They were not afraid to make mistakes or grammatical errors because they learned that writers cannot get it right at the first time. They could make their writing better by revising it. Revision and peer-response enhance the students to listen to their peers more. They learned about the audience’s expectation which they were aware of when they wrote.

When introducing the innovation in the educational context, any kind of change is expected. Pennington and Cheung (1995) described the factors shaping the adoption of the innovation of process writing in Hong Kong including cultural conflict and educational
background of the context. This writing class in which the teacher adapted the innovative writing instruction to promote the new concept of writing also led to the students’ adaptation in learning to write and their perception of writing. The students, through extended writing practice over the semester, gradually perceived the concept of writing as a process of expression and communication. Through the interpersonal communication in a variety of activities, the students in this writing class, started to internalize what they experienced in this context and their previous experience in writing. The conflict between the old and the new experiences can be seen in their behaviors when they engaged in the activities as described above. At the end, the students’ understanding of the nature of writing changed from the perception of writing as a correctness and error-free first draft to the perception of writing as a process, a tool of expressing their ideas, a tool for thinking, and a problem-solving process. They also learned that a good writing comes from multiple drafts via revision.

The students’ conceptual change is possibly explained by Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of teaching and learning. The students’ conceptual change is contributed to the teaching-learning process of both the teacher and the students’ peers. Interacting with the teacher and the students’ peers in a process of negotiation and co-construction of knowledge in a learning environment helps the students develop a new conceptual framework (Vygotsky, 1978; Galperin, 1982). It is found that introducing conflicting information possibly results in fostering conceptual change (Haenen, Schrijnemakers, & Stufkens, 2003). Mason (2001) found that the conflicting information only is not adequate for conceptual change. The students may only combine the diverse information and their prior knowledge superficially, rather than reconstruct the concept at the semantic level (Vosniadou, 1999; Haenen et al., 2003). Supporting data, alternative theory, and a variety of learning activities may help the students restructure the conceptions (Harrison,
Grayson, & Treagust, 1999; Mason, 2001). This is in accordance with the sociocultural view on teaching and learning. According to Vygotsky’s (1978) “cultural development appears twice: first, on a social level, and later, on the individual level: first, between people (interpsychological), and then inside the child (intrapsychological)” (p. 57). Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) modified this sociocultural view that “The transition from inter- to intra- mental functioning … is dynamic process of reconstruction and qualitative change in which the novice and the expert collaborate in constructing a mutual activity frame” (p. 467). By teacher’s introducing a new concept or conflicting information, and providing the students more data as well as activities that promote the interaction with the teacher and the students’ peers, “the students will be stimulated to become aware of an alternative way of thinking” (Haenen, et al., 2003). Through “the dynamic process of reconstruction and qualitative change” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994, p. 467), the students will restructure their conceptions. This process leads to the conceptual change. In this writing class, the teacher introduced the new concept of writing which is contrast with the traditional concept. To help the students reconstruct their prior knowledge and the new one, the teacher provided the students activities like free writing, peer-response, and revision to stimulate the students’ awareness of the two different conceptions. Engaging in these activities, the students’ concept of writing emerged. As a result, the students developed the conceptual change. According to the second and the third interviews, the students revealed their understanding about writing as a process and a tool for expression better when they talked about free writing. They understood that writing was not only a text produced, but also involved what the writers employed such as drafting, revising, and editing, when they wrote.

In general, in order to promote the writing development and language learning, Ms. B created the environment that was different from the traditional writing classroom. The focus of
this writing class shifted from a traditional classroom to the learner-centered one through the activities that promoted learning and writing. To help the students learn to write as well as acquire language, the teacher provided the students meaningful context with a variety of activities such as free writing, peer-response, revision, and question-answer, to let the students learn by doing and writing through the problem-solving process rather than lecturing and grammar drills (Krashen, 1995, 2004). Writing was emphasized instead of grammar. Through the various activities, the students perceived the new concept of writing as a process of expressing their ideas. In other words, the adaptation of writing concept shifted from writing for correctness to writing for expression.

**Style of Class**

Believing in process writing, Ms. B employed some activities such as free writing, peer-response, and revision used in process approach in her writing class. Implementing this nontraditional approach made this writing class different from the ones that the students were used to. In the traditional writing class, particularly English writing class, the teacher gives lectures and explanation about grammar and structures and “encourages students to contribute to classroom communication only through the presentation of a finished draft, of a well-thought-through idea” (Young & Lee, 1987, p. 85). The traditional teacher emphasizes accuracy rather than fluency and meaning. The students rarely participate in a variety of activities. The students in this study compared this writing class and the ones they experienced in the past. They said that in this writing class they had chances to engage in different activities and they were busy all the time. On the contrary, before taking this writing class, they just listened to the lecture about grammar and then they wrote an imitating paragraph or essay as homework. They learned by doing in this writing class. Besides, the style of this writing class was different in that the teacher did not lecture but she used the conversational style for teaching or explaining grammar or
structures. It was an engaged-learning class. The students were “busy” or occupied by various activities. In addition, this writing class was open-ended style.

Conversational Style

To develop cognitive development, authentic dialogue or authentic discussion should be employed (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978). In this writing class, in order to help the students develop the concept of writing as a communication between the writers and the readers and learn the purposes of writing; Ms. B used informal guidance or conversational style, instead of prescriptive instruction. She also taught grammar and language structures via question-answer sessions. Although the teacher often initiated the communication or discussion in the question-answer session, it was two-way communication and no right or wrong answer. She allowed the students to raise the questions related to their writing works. Based on their questions she explained grammar to them via conversations. She rarely answered their questions directly. Instead, she responded by asking them a question back to make them think and try to get the answer by themselves. Unless the students got the answers, the teacher gave them the answers and explained more to help them understand. The following is the excerpts of the conversations occurred in this classroom. It shows how Ms. B responded to the students’ question and how she talked to the students when she taught grammar, writing tasks, or when she responded to their writing. The excerpt was from the classroom observation of the second class period. The teacher responded to their first draft of the first assignment (Introducing yourself). She called each of the students randomly and responded to their writing. Then she moved on to the purpose of this writing assignment.

Ms. B: Watcharasak, Watcharasak
(No response, silent)
Ms. B: Did I pronounce his name wrong? I could not guess any other pronunciation. Is he absent today? So, let me gossip about him.
(She reads his writing and makes some comments) Why did he have to tell that he is studying at KU. I’ve already known it. (She continues reading.) But I don’t like what? I can’t read it.

Ms. B: Wattanasak
S31 raises his hand and responds.
Ms. B: Ok. You’re from Engineering, Water Resources.
Ms. B: Polachai
S30 stands up.

…

Ms. B calls another student and asks her some questions based on her writing.
Ms. B: Have you been there for long? Since you were born?
S: No.
Ms. B: Where were you from?
The student doesn’t answer. So, Ms. B speaks to her in Thai. Then,
Ms. B: I didn’t ask the right question. I thought you moved from the other province to Bangkok. But you just moved from On-nuch, a place in Bangkok, to the present one in Bangkok too. (So the student could not answer because she thought that the question “Where were you from?” intended to ask about moving from another province.)

…

11.28 am.
Ms. B: Why did we write this? When will we write to introduce ourselves?
S5: To apply for a job.
Ms. B: And what you wrote is for applying for a job? Well, let talk about the real situation.
S5: To know us.
Ms. B: Yes, to know you. I’d like to know you.
S: To write a pen pal.
Ms. B: To write a pen pal. Yes. What is pen pal?
(Silent. No response. Ms. B write “Pen pal” on the board.)
Ms. B: What does “pen” mean?
Sts: Paak-ka (a pen)
Ms. B: What does “pal” mean?
Sts: *Puen* (friends)

…

Ms. B: Writing for life
Ms. B: Shaking your head. What does it mean?
S38: I can’t think of anything.

…

11.33 am.

Ms. B: What did you write?

Sts: [Name 
  Nickname 
  Faculty]

Ms. B: Keep saying. Writing is speaking.

Sts: [Phone number 
  Home stay 
  Hobby]

Ms. B: Hobby such as watching football, playing the guitar. What else’s?

…

Ms. B: You can tell about personality, appearance. (She gives examples of 
  personality and appearance such as tall and some Thai words with 
  explanation.) Tall and dark is appearance.

Ms. B: What else’s?

(Silent)

Ms. B: You look at me. Why do you look at me? You look and I look 
  back. Good. This is better than avoiding my eye contact.

(Students are silent and then laugh softly.)

Ms. B: What else’s?

S13: Favorite

Ms. B: Yes, favorite such as favorite star

S38: … What we did during summer.

Ms. B: That is life experience during summer

…

Ms. B: (reads a student’s writing) “If I have money, I’ll go shopping.”

What is this sentence?

S: If-clause.
Ms. B: If-clause? This is not a grammar course. This is writing. Grammar is not writing. In this class grammar is not focused. Writing, how you write is focused. So, what does this sentence “If I have money, …” tell us? Why did the writer write it?

S: Tell the future.

Ms. B: Telling the future. In the future if I have money, I’ll go shopping.” Only this sentence, it doesn’t work. It’s too vague. I have to read again.

Ms. B reads the sentences before this one, and then asks them again.

Ms. B: Is the sentence related to the previous ones? How?

S: The hobby.

Ms. B: If I have money, I’ll go shopping. Is this a hobby? If this is a hobby of Thai students, Oh! The future of Thailand! But it seems to be part of it because he was talking about his free time such as when he has free time, he watches TV. If he just wrote this sentence alone, we would not know what it’s about. So, what am I discussing?

(Silent)

S14: There must be some connection of what we are talking.

Ms. B repeats his words.

Ms. B: In writing what this tells us?

S6: Purpose of writing

Ms. B: Purpose of writing? Please explain more.

S6: … (I can’t catch her words.)

Ms. B: What makes you write that? Why do you write this sentence?

S5: Write a statement to support.

Ms. B: To support before or after it?

S5: Before

Ms. B: And does this one support?

S7: It is an expectation.

Ms. B: Expectation? Effective writing should be what the writer wants to communicate with the readers and the readers have to receive the same message. Why do we write? We write for readers, other people or even us, the writers themselves. If the others read and comment our work, what are we going to do? Have you ever written for the readers?

Sts: the teacher
Ms. B: Except the teacher. Have you written a letter to your parents? No!
What have you written in your life?

S: Short note

…

S: Greeting cards

(Field notes, pages 10-15)

The excerpt shows that when the teacher started the conversation, the students gradually joined it. The participation of some students made the class relaxing and encouraged the others to join the conversation later. The way the teacher responded to the students’ responses was friendly. The students felt safe to answer and share their opinions. The conversational style of teaching made the students feel relaxed, not be afraid to try or take risks. The students made comments on the teaching style of this writing class as the following:

The teacher’s style of teaching is different from the others. It’s like conversational style rather than lecture which was good. It made us feel more relaxed. (Siwa, INT-3)

The teacher had free style of teaching. … The class environment is relaxing, not serious. We did not follow the textbook. (Jira, Nee, and Orn, INT-2)

This class is informal. The teacher did not give lectures, but she explained in conversational style. (Sak, and Fuada, INT-3)

This class was child-centered. I mean the teacher let the students think and express their opinion first…. The teacher let us think and prepare before writing. (Jane, INT-2)

Besides, the students started to think about their writing and what they wrote regarding to the reader and the writer. Before taking this writing class, the students did not think about readers and the purpose of writing. They wrote for the teacher to grade. The way the students responded to Ms. B’s questions at the beginning is possibly because of their previous experience in learning to write both in English and in Thai. They were taught to focus on error free sentences and language used in writing rather than the content. When they were asked about their writing, their answers were based on the teacher’s expectation in the past. At the beginning of this conversation, the students tended to stick to the grammar and sentence structure. However, Ms.
B tried to point out the purpose of writing in the real situation and made the students aware of the readers’ point of view. The way Ms. B responded made them realize that this writing class was different from the former writing class that they experienced. In stead of lecture about writing—the format of writing and sentence structures—Ms. B used the conversational style of teaching to help the students think and learn that the purpose of writing is to communicate with the readers. Language was a tool for communication. Their concept of writing and writing process gradually changed partly due to the conversations with the teacher and their peers.

[The Q-A] made us think better and had different point of views. We learned about good writing and how to write. This made us write longer. (Jira, INT-3)

For the first assignment, it was the same (as we wrote in the past) and we used the familiar sentences that we used in the past. So we didn’t have to worry about grammar. Nowadays, I have written for communication and understandable. I did not think about grammar when I wrote the first draft. (Ya, INT-2)

**Engaged Learning**

This class is different from the traditional language classroom in that the teacher got the students involved in various activities particularly writing tasks, peer-responses, and question-answer sessions. The students did not come to class and did nothing except listening to the lectures and taking notes. Engaging in activities helped the students learn to write (Calkins, 1994). Additionally, Krashen (1995, 2004) argues that to help the SL learners acquire target language the teacher should let the students solve the problem and practice more rather than doing the grammar drills. In this writing class, Ms. B helped the students learn to write as well as learn the language via activities. She provided the students opportunities to practice writing more frequently. The students wrote every period, discussed or talked with their peers about their writing (peer-responses), and learned grammar and structure via question-answer. These activities allowed the students to think and work on their own initiative (Jira, Nee, Orn, INT-2). Jai (INT-2) said that, for this class, the teacher and students exchanged their ideas and the
students were not passive. She explained that the teacher did not only transform information to
the students but the students also participated in teaching/learning activities. The students
expected to write and do other activities when they came to class. The students did not feel bored
because they were busy, engaging in different kinds of activities. The followings are what the
students concluded about this class.

The teacher had activities that kept the students engaged all the time. The students did not
just sit and listen to the lectures. (Wat and Pat, INT-3)

Engaging in a variety of activities made this class successful because the students paid
more attention. (Jira, INT-3)

The outstanding characteristic of this class is that the students were active by doing a
variety of activity. Although at first I felt bored because of the load of work, later I felt ok
because I knew that practicing more helped me improve writing. (Yut, INT-3)

Open Ended

One of the styles of this writing class is that the teacher was open to the students’ ideas.
She let the students think and find out the answers by themselves. If necessary, she would help
them by giving them explanation. With conversational style of teaching, Ms. B always used
open-ended questions to let the students share their opinions. She rarely judged their answers as
right or wrong. She tried to help them get the answers by asking rather than telling them the
answers. This kind of her response made the students feel less stressful and more relaxed when
they participated in the question-answer sessions. More students began to join the conversations.
The following excerpt showing the open-ended questions and the way Ms. B responded to the
students’ answers or ideas when she wanted to explain how to describe a scene. She read the
students’ writing and made some comments. Then she read the passage in the textbook and asked
the students to compare their own stories and the sample passage (Sarah’s letter) in the textbook.

Ms. B: This one is the present scene. The first part can’t be drawn. He could tell this is
KU student from the back.

(Students laugh)
Ms. B: (reading) “He made me and my friend have fun.”
(Ms. B smiles and laughs while she is reading. She moves back and forth as she is reading. This makes the students laugh. She read at the end and laughs. The students laugh too.)
Ms. B: Too soon to end.
(She chooses another one.)
Ms. B: Present scene. (She continues reading)
Ms. B: “… She cooks delicious.” This means she already tasted it. “…She goes home.”
Oh! The author knew that she goes home!
(Students laugh.)
Ms. B: These are what you wrote. Compared with Sarah, what’s the difference?
(Silent)
Ms. B: Compare them. Try drawing the pictures from your friends’ stories and from Sarah’s.
S: … (I couldn’t catch her words).
Ms. B: You said Sarah focused on the important details.
S15: Sarah wrote from inside to outside.
Ms. B: Sarah wrote from inside to outside. So, what about this one and that one?
S20: Sarah described where she was, but we wrote as if we were in the distance.
Ms. B walked around.
S35: Sarah told her story as a shot, but we describe our stories continuously.
S34: Sarah’s story is interesting and longer.
Ms. B: Longer?
S34: Sarah’s story is longer.
S26: We can picture what Sarah describes the scene, but we can’t draw a picture for our stories because we just described an event.
Ms. B: (Repeat his words) Sarah described the scene, not the event.
(Field notes, pages 191-192)
From the excerpt above, Ms. B tried to encourage the students to share their opinions about this assignment, to describe the scene. She found that the students did not understand how to describe the scene. Therefore, she asked them to compare the text, Sarah’s letter and their own writing. Comparing their stories and the sample passage made the students learn how to describe
the scene better than lecturing. Under the assistance of the teacher, by asking them questions and
giving them some comments to guide them, the students reconstructed their understanding about
describing the scene. (Vygotsky, 1978)

Summary

This chapter shows the characteristics of this nontraditional writing class that promoted the
students’ attitude towards English and writing in English and provided them learning
environment to enhance writing development. Due to the students’ previous English education
which emphasized grammar and language usage, the students viewed writing as a means to
practice grammar and language structure. Additionally, the teachers’ expectation and the way
they gave feedbacks to the students’ writing made the students fear of writing creatively. The
writing teachers expected the clean first draft; error-free writing. The students were afraid to take
risks because they were afraid to lose the points. Unlike the traditional writing classrooms, Ms. B
tried to encourage the students to write and free them from their previous concepts of writing.
Her style of teaching, the conversational style, helped lower the students’ affective filters.
Another outstanding characteristic is the focus of this writing class or learning environment.
According to writing process, the teacher got the students involved in various activities that
enhance them to learn to write. Besides, engaging in different activities such as free writing,
revision, and peer-response helped the students transform from passive learners to active learners
and reconstruct the concept of writing from correctness to expression. However, due to the
cultural difference, the students felt frustrated when they experienced peer-response. According
to the Thai cultural concepts of krengjai and losing face, the students in this study were afraid to
give sincere and constructive feedbacks to their peers because they considered the feedbacks or
comments as criticism that may make their peers lose face. Finally, the style of this writing class
such as conversational style of teaching enhances the students to become active learners and writers.
CHAPTER 6
WRITERS’ DEVELOPMENT

In Chapter 5 I addressed the two research question: How do Thai college students respond to a new teaching instruction in an English writing classroom?, and What concerns and frustration did the students encounter while participating in this writing class? Although the students had positive responses towards this writing approach, they pointed out some concerns they had when they participated in the activities provided. Their responses as well as their concerns led me to the other research question. In this chapter, I will address the other research question: What was the impact of the writing instruction on the students’ growth as writers in this writing class? I will discuss the impact on the students’ attitudes toward writing, perceptions of the roles of the teacher and the learners, perceptions of writing, and writing development.

Definition of Writer’s Development

The purposes of this study and the research design allowed me to explore writer’s development as an affective phenomenon rather than a linguistic or strategic phenomenon. By viewing a writer’s development as an affective phenomenon, I mean that I did not focus on the development of the students’ process of writing (what they did when they wrote an essay) and their final written products; instead I emphasized their perceptions when they engaged in this writing class. Their writing works were used to verify their perceptions of writing development. A significant response from the students is that they felt their writing improved and they became confident writers. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify and narrow the term “writer’s development” in order to suit this investigation.

The research on the affective factors in writing such as emotion, motivation, self-esteem, and self-efficacy (Brand, 1989; Cleary, 1991; Hayward, 1991; Thomas, 1992) shows the relationship between the affective factors and the students’ growth as writers. To investigate the
writing classroom and the students’ responses without looking at the students’ feeling and attitude toward their writing development would ignore one of the important pictures of the students’ response which is necessary for the teacher to learn how well her instruction is as well as activities and materials are learned.

For the purpose of this study, I adopt the definition of “writer’s development” defined by Malicka (1996) in her study. She defined this term as “a self-reported CHANGE in attitude, feeling, beliefs, and/or thought about writing. … Writer’s development, then, is defined as an affective change within the writer herself” (p. 21). In this study, students’ written performance, such as students’ writing, is used only to verify the students’ words and the researcher’s findings about their development as writers. Students’ written performance is not used as a reliable assessment of the visible changes in the quality of students’ written product. To study the students’ response to this writing class in terms of writer’s development, students’ attitude toward their writing development will help us understand how they affectively change as writers.

**Students’ Attitudes towards Writing: Before and After**

When talking about attitudes towards writing, I am referring to how the students felt about writing, particularly writing in English. The questionnaires and interviews I conducted were used to investigate their attitude towards writing. The questionnaires were completed by the students at the first week of the semester. I interviewed the students at the beginning of the semester, after the midterm examination, and at the end of the semester. I also relied on observations of their behavior as they participated in class. The data I collected revealed that the students’ attitudes towards writing, as well as their concepts of writing, gradually changed. In addition, I found that their expectation of taking this course was modified as the study went by.
On the questionnaire about 65% of forty students reported that they liked writing. When asked how often they wrote, they stated that they wrote most frequently in Thai for academic purposes, such as homework or reports. Most of them rarely wrote in English. During the interviews conducted at the beginning of the semester, when asked about writing both in Thai and in English, the students confirmed that they liked to write in Thai, not in English. Besides academic writing, about one-third of the students stated that they wrote in their diaries in Thai, but not all of them kept writing their diaries when they entered the university due to the heavy course load. During the first interview, the students stated that they had a negative attitude towards English writing due to their past experience in English classrooms and with writing instruction. They felt stressful when they had to write in English. They did not want to write much because they were afraid to make grammatical mistakes which would affect their grades. They also felt that they were not able to write in English because of their limited English proficiency.

After the first month of being in this writing class, the students’ attitude towards English writing began to improve. Before taking this class, the students did not like writing in English and they were afraid of writing. They felt that writing particularly in English was difficult and only the students with high level of English proficiency were able to write well. Through the semester, there was a reduction in their fear of writing in English. From my observations, after a few weeks, the students did not hesitate anymore to write in English when they were asked to. The first week most of them took a lot of time to start writing and wrote only three to five lines for the first draft of the first assignment. During the first interview, conducted during the third week, they reported that at first they did not know what to write and they did not know what the teacher’s expectations were. They were only familiar with highly structured assignments which
the teacher would show them a paragraph or an essay that they should imitate. They were afraid to make mistakes in their writing because they did not know how the teacher would grade their writing. Then, after Ms. B told them not to worry about the grammar and allowed them to use Thai in their writing, they reported feeling relieved, and the feeling that writing in English was difficult gradually changed. They were willing to take risks.

After the first week, Wat recalled that he did not like English, nor did he like writing in English. He said that ever since his first English class, he had hated it. He did not see the necessity of learning English because he never used it in real life. Moreover, the teachers emphasized grammar and sentence structures which he did not understand. When he attended the university, he discovered that English was important for his future career. Even still, he did not understand English grammar and structures, which were the main content in his English learning, nor did he like writing in English before he enrolled in Ms. B’s writing class. Wat described his past experience with English as follows:

I had negative attitude towards English since I first learned English. I didn’t know why. I didn’t pay attention to English. I think it was because I thought it was not our mother language. So, I thought I was not good at English. But now I think my English is better. I feel good about it too because I found it is not so difficult. I can use it in my real life. (Wat, INT-1)

For example, when I studied English Foundation 2 and 3, the teachers emphasized grammar. I always reviewed the grammar lesson and did the exercise after class, but after that I forgot. Then I had to memorize vocabulary, learned by rote…. I could memorize all vocabulary but when I read a sentence, I could not translate it because I could not understand the other words. (Wat, INT-2)

His attitude towards English and writing in English changed. He felt that he could write despite his limited English. He was not afraid of writing because Ms. B allowed him to use Thai if he could not find the words in English. Similarly, Pat did not like English and writing in English either, but his attitude during the course of the semester improved. Pat became more confident in his English writing abilities because he felt that he could write in English and that it
was fine to mix between Thai and English because he could translate those Thai words into English later. He began to feel that writing in English was not so difficult, and he was not afraid to write any more.

This writing class helped me improve my writing a lot. Since I never wrote in English, now I can write a story in English for a page although it may have some mistakes. (Wat, INT-2)

Yes (agreed with Wat). Although I may make some grammatical mistakes, I am proud of myself that I can write in English. Since the first day of the semester, you (the researcher) asked me whether I wrote or not and I told you that I never wrote in English. But now I can write a page in English. (Pat, INT-2)

Another impact on the students’ perception of writing was that the students had some insight into the fact that they were getting more out of the class than their original expectation for taking the course. I consider that the purpose for taking English class is related to their attitude towards learning English and learning to write in English. In fact many Thai students think that English and writing in English are difficult. However, they have to take English courses because they are required for graduation. Many students in this study had similar attitude when they took English courses. Therefore, what they reported in the interview was different from what they reported in the questionnaires.

In the beginning, over 50% of the students reported on the questionnaire that the main purpose for taking this course over other English courses was to improve their writing. At the same time, they gave the reason of selecting this writing course because they thought it was simply to get the credits for graduation. I asked them again about the purpose of attending this writing class at the end of the semester, and over 50% of the students confirmed that they first took this class because they heard that it was easy to get a good grade and because they had to take an English course to fulfill a requirement for graduation. Particularly, the senior students would take any English class that fit their schedule. Wat and Pat explained that the seniors like
themselves did not have much choice due to their time schedule. However, they were lucky that they were able to attend this writing class. Pat added during the third interview that he wanted to take a writing class because he thought he would be able to make it, compared with reading class which he would have a hard time completing the assignment. Only 20% of the students took this class in order to learn to write and improve writing according to the interview. It appears to me that when the students went through all activities in this writing class, their expectation of attending this class had changed. After the second month, the students became interested in this class because they found that they could improve their writing and practice English skills. They thought that learning to write in English would be beneficial to them in the future. Therefore, they put more effort in this class than they originally planned. They found that they were able to develop as writers if they were taught how to write and practiced writing more often.

Perception of Teacher’s and Learner’s Roles

As one of the purposes of this study is to investigate the students’ perception of an innovative English writing classroom, I decided to examine whether or not the students’ perception of the role of the teacher and students changed through the course of the semester. In order to collect data to answer this question, I asked the students about their roles and the teacher’s role in this class during the third interview. I analyzed their answers in terms of how they described the participants’ role during classroom interaction. I focused on the relationship and interaction between the teacher and the students: how the students perceived their roles in this writing classroom as well as how they perceived the teacher’s role.

The general view, discussed in detail below, is that the students tended to perceive the teacher’s role as being different from the role of a traditional classroom teacher, but that their roles were the same. They perceived the teacher’s roles as a guide, a supporter, a facilitator, and
an instructor; whereas, they perceived themselves as the learners or the receivers who followed the teacher’s directions and prescription. They also perceived their role as the doers or participants, the ones who performed the tasks such as writers or participated in activities like peer-response. The fact that there were no changes in perception of their own roles through the course of the semester was surprising given that they acknowledged Ms. B’s class as being learner-centered.

**Teacher as a Guide, a Facilitator, a Supporter**

When the students discovered that this writing class was different from other traditional writing classes, it would not be unusual that they would view the teacher from a different point of view; and, indeed, this is what they did. The students stated that one of the outstanding characteristics of this class was that it was learner-centered. They acknowledged that the teacher did not only lecture or give directions, but that she provided them with opportunities to perform various activities. The teacher let them think and study by themselves. Fuada and Sak described how Ms. B taught like this:

I think a good point of this class is that the teacher did not open the textbook and gave a lecture based on the textbook when she started each lesson. Instead, the teacher asked us to study or search for information about the topic for each lesson from website or any books….This gave us a chance to read and study writing style before (writing our essay)…. We expanded our ideas when we read other texts. (Sak, INT-3)

The teacher just suggested and encouraged the students to participate. (Rachael, Tisa, INT-3)

The teacher was a guide. She would let us work on our own. If we had any questions, we asked her. She taught us to solve the problem by ourselves by telling us to search for the answers. (Jira, INT-3)

Engaging in the writing practices that allow the students to be autonomous, they perceived the teacher as a guide, a facilitator, and a supporter in class rather than a lecture as they always did (Chowdhury, 2003). They explained that the teacher always suggested or gave them advice
when they performed each task. The teacher explained to them how to do each activity, but the students themselves had to think and perform each task. In the traditional classroom, the teacher gave a lecture when they started a new lesson, then gave examples, and finally asked the students to do some exercise drills or do imitating writing or controlled writing. Unlike a traditional class, the students in this class wrote in their own styles and searched for information that they wanted to include or write about. When they had a problem, the teacher allowed them to ask questions, but she did not give them a direct answer. She gave the students the freedom to think and write on their own. At the same time, the teacher provided the students many activities, such as free writing, peer-response, and revising, for them to learn to write and to improve their writing skills. She encouraged them to write without worrying about making grammatical errors. What the teacher did in this class made them feel that the teacher wanted them to be independent learners, not to depend only on her. The students felt that they learned to write by writing, but not simply by listening to lectures and directions.

**Teacher as an Instructor**

Interestingly, some students also viewed the teacher as an instructor—knowledge transmitter or information provider. They viewed the teacher as a person who told them what and how to do each activity. It seems from their statements that sociocultural influences play an important role in how the students view the teacher. Although the students viewed the teacher as facilitator, they still viewed the role of the teacher as information provider or the authoritative standing of the teacher. The students viewed Ms. B as an instructor or the provider of information because they felt that the teacher gave them explanations and also gave them directions in order to complete each task or to perform each activity. Moreover, they felt that the teacher was the person who gave orders and the students were the ones who followed the orders. This view of the teacher is common among Thai students. They were taught both at home and at
school to view the teacher as an instructor, someone knowledgeable and someone who transmits knowledge to the students. Although Ms. B gave them some freedom, she still had to teach and give lectures (explanation about grammar structures) to meet the students’ expectations and to teach the curriculum designed by the coordinator of this course.

Although the students stated that they felt relaxed when the teacher did not focus on correctness in language, and found the class interesting because the teacher did not lecture, they still wanted the teacher’s direct instruction. These students have only had experience in traditional classrooms. When they encountered freedom in this writing class and had to think and solve problems by themselves they felt insecure in terms of coming up with correct answers.

Teachers in Thailand had always told the students the correct answer and had always made them think that there is always a right and a wrong answer. There is also the attitude in Thai schools that the teacher is the only person who knows the best, and that the students are the receivers of the knowledge. In other words, the teacher transmits the knowledge to the students. This kind of perception is related to the Thai culture view of teaching and authority, as well as to the hierarchical nature of Thai society.

Sense of hierarchy can be observed through Thai personal relationships. Klausner (1993), an American who has spent more than half of his life in Thailand and is interested in various of Thai culture, observes the pattern of hierarchical behavior and concludes, “There are well defined patterns of behavior required for both parties in the symbiotic relationships of patron-client, teacher-pupil, elder-younger, boss-worker, master-servant” (p. 272). The behavior that is obviously observable is the one that the lower rung of the hierarchical ladders shows to those above. For instance, deference, diffidence, and respect are the behaviors that the person with lower rank of the hierarchy shows to the superior. Meanwhile, the superior is expected to keep
the relationship meaningful and complete by giving moral and/or material supports, advice, and protection to the inferior (Klausner, 1993). For Thai society, the hierarchical behavior is normally framed by seniority, status, power, and knowledge. The ones with higher rank are considered as authoritarians. In this study, the students who were considered as inferiors in the classroom showed their respect to the teacher by being obedient. Consistent with Chowdhury’s (2003), the social and cultural norms play an important role in shaping the way students viewed the teacher’s role. Chowdhury discusses, “The culture in Bangladesh is one that a long traditional of unconditional obedience to authority. The teacher is seen not as a facilitator but as a fount of knowledge. … The south Asian teacher is the authoritarian purveyor of knowledge, one to lead and to draw matters to a correct conclusion” (p. 289). With this cultural constraint, when EFL students expose to the new and unfamiliar approach, their perception of the teacher’s role seems to be conflict with their expectation due to their past experience shaped by their social and cultural norms.

Students as Learners and Apprentices

While the students in this study viewed the teacher’s role as a guide, facilitator, supporter, and an instructor, I was not surprised that they perceived themselves as students and apprentices. This is because in Thai culture, both inside the classroom and in society, the students and youth are trained to obey people in positions of authority, including teachers and elders, such as their parents and grandparents. At first I was not sure what they really meant when they said their role was that of being students or doers. I asked them to clarify what they meant by this. The students explained that they followed the teacher’s instructions or directions to perform a task or activity. The followings are what Wee, Wat and Pat said:

The teacher assigned the tasks and [students] did as they were told to. (Wee, INT-3)
Mostly, the students received [knowledge from the teacher]. (Wat and Pat, INT-3)
Although they had more freedom than in traditional classrooms, they just did what they teacher told them to, no more or less. For example, some students, such as Wee, might not have wanted to revise their essays, but they had to do it because the teacher told them to and because it affected their grade. I asked them if they would revise their essays if the teacher had not told them to. Some students like Wee sincerely responded that they would not have revised it or that they might have revised it only once.

In fact, I was also bored. I was lazy to do [revising multiple drafts], but I had to because, first, it was a teacher’s order. Second, it affected us both in practicing writing and in the examination. (Wee, INT-3)

Although I was not surprised by responses like the one above, I somehow felt that they might not really understand their role in this class. Most of them repeatedly told me that this class was different from other classes and that the teacher tended to make it learner-centered. When they told me that they viewed themselves as apprentices, I thought they meant participants or performers who participated in activities energetically. I believed that, based on my observation, they generally enjoyed doing activities. Meanwhile, some of the students felt that they had too much work, compared with their friends who attended other writing classes. They sometimes wanted the teacher to reduce the number of revisions for each assignment. I understand that it is not easy to change students in a short period of time (15 weeks); especially because they were used to playing the traditional student role. They expected to learn from the teacher. For example, although they understood that the teacher would like them to be independent and to learn how to solve problems on their own, some students complained that they wanted the teacher to just give them a direct answer when they asked her a question.

The teacher should answer our question in stead of not answer and ask us back. This made us puzzled. I didn’t know who was wrong. … I think if we learn more grammar we will be able to write. Although we learn grammar rule and use it wrongly, it is better than not learning. Writing class at school or university should teach grammar first, and have the
students to write as homework. If it is a short writing, it may be a class assignment. (Wan, INT-3)

The teacher should answer the question directly. Sometimes the teacher did not answer the question, sometimes she asked us to find out or check grammar text books. The teacher please answered our question because we did not know how to find out the answer. Sometimes we could not find it. (Kit and Siwa, INT-3)

[We] wanted the teacher to give more time for writing assignment especially homework [grammar exercises] I wanted her to give explanation or answer when we asked a question. (Nini, Tanya, Tai, and Su, INT-2)

Besides their past experience in the prescriptive classrooms, the possible explanation for the conflict perceptions on their role may relate to their understanding of the term ‘learner-centered’. The term ‘learner-centered’ may be a culturally situated. Like the term ‘communicative’ in a language classroom which seems to be a culturally situated word and is different in its connotations and expectation across cultures (Holliday, 1994; Hall, 1997). Hall (1997) and Holliday (1994) point out the cultural connotation and expectation across cultures when the term ‘communicative’ is used in a language classroom that what may be communicative in one setting might not well be in another. This incident depends upon the local culture which may or may not compatible with the premise of communicative approach. For example, the classroom with small amount of students with plenty of resources supports communicative approach, while the big class with few resources might be incompatible with communicative approach. The term ‘learner-centered’, which is coined and originated in the culture that emphasizes individuals such as American culture, may be perceived or interpreted differently in EFL countries due to cross-culture. With cultural difference and their past experience with prescriptive teachers, the students in this classroom may perceive and understand this term ‘learner-centered’ approach literally as the approach that promotes the students to do the task as the teacher assigned, in stead of the one that promotes the independent learners who were responsible for their writing and their learning. They were in the process of
transforming their roles from the old one to the new one. This leads to their perception of their roles as a combination of the old role (learners) and the new one (apprentices).

Changes in Writing Perception

In the second and third interviews, the students reported that their concept about writing changed or expanded. Prior to taking this class, for them writing meant writing one single draft and imitating writing from textbooks. In terms of English writing, this meant completing grammatical exercises in textbooks. They also stated that when they wrote essays in English, they thought of grammar and that made them afraid to write. After taking this class, the students found that writing entailed more than writing just one draft. Nini, Tanya, Tai and Su in their second and third interviews described writing as a multiple draft process. They thought that to get a finished piece of writing, they had to revise and revise. They said they had never thought of revising a piece of writing before they entered this writing class.

Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of teaching and learning, particularly the zone of proximal development, asserts that “…, learning awakens a variety of international development processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers” (p. 90). Haenen, Schrijnemakers, and Stufkens (2003) modify Vygotsky’s assertion to explain the conceptual change in that the child develops academic concepts during the teaching-learning process “through, embedded in, and mediated in and by relationships with peers and adults” (p. 251). In other words, interacting with adults and more competent peers enhances the child to emerge, absorb, and internalize the new knowledge or the new concepts. In this writing class, the students had more chances to interact with the teacher and their peers via writing activities. Interacting with the teacher and their peers helped the students develop the new concept of writing as a process.
From the interviews I found that the students’ concept of writing as being only an assignment they had to complete changed. After midterm examination in the second interview, when the students talked about writing, they always mentioned the importance of the thinking process. To get a piece of writing they had to think about their experiences and chose which information should be included in their writing. The students said they spent a lot of time thinking and searching for information when they wrote. In their past experience, they never had a chance to think much when they wrote. Therefore, after taking this writing class, they felt that writing allowed them to think and express their ideas and voices rather than simply imitating a paragraph in a textbook.

Moreover, in the second and third interviews, the students talked about a more important change in their writing. They began to show ownership in their writing. Before taking this class, the students wrote to please the teacher because the teacher was the person who graded their essays. In the first interview, the students stated that they wrote what the teacher wanted them to write and tried to avoid making mistakes that may result in a low grade. To avoid making mistakes the students tended to write short essays and imitate models. On the contrary, after taking this class, the students wrote for themselves. Some students such as Nat and Wee stated:

We knew our own story better than any others so we did not need any help from the teacher for the content but we needed help with language usage. (Mate, INT-2)

Many students felt that free style writing allowed them to add their voice and style of writing to their stories. In the interviews, the students were proud of their stories and how much they could write. Pat and Wat were the best sample of this. They were very proud that they could write what they wanted in English. When I asked the students how this writing class helped them improve their writing ability. Here what they said:
I had never before had my voice in my story. Finally, in this class, I am able to tell my story to the readers including the teacher and I, not the teacher, owned the story. (Wat, INT-2)

A lot. I think [it helped me] a lot. I never tried to write English before. Now I am able to write [in English] about a page although there might be some mistakes. (Wat agreed.) But I can write for a page. (He said proudly.) From the first day when you asked me whether I used to write or not. I said that I never wrote. But now I can write [in English] for a page. But I don’t know whether I write ungrammatically or not. (Pat, INT-2)

We had never been asked what we thought. None of the teachers listened to the students’ voices. (INT-1-Pat and Wat)

I can write, not the beginning level, [but] it’s ok at some level. That is before taking this class or after I passed Foundation English 3, if you asked me to describe a picture, oh ho, how many lines I could write, three [lines] maybe or maybe not. But if you ask me now, I can write. I don’t know how to explain it to you. I feel that my writing improves. (Wat, INT-2)

…we think for ourselves. We wrote in our style. There was not a fixed style of writing. It was up to us, what we wanted to write…. We had chances to write our own story. (Jira, Nee, Orn, INT-2)

I am not afraid to write. I am more confident to write because I write what I want to. I took a risk and learned from my mistake. (Sak, INT-3)

Before taking this class, when the teacher assign writing task, I had to write in Thai first, and then I translated it into English which was very difficult. Now I began to write in English. I thought in Thai and then wrote in English without writing in Thai as I used to. The teacher made us feel good about English. … The teacher was not strict on grammar and reduced the points. In general, she wanted us to be able to write and like writing. When we saw our grade, we felt that this was our ability. It made us proud of ourselves and our writing. (Jane, INT-3)

The students reported their attitude towards writing as well as their perception on writing changed. In terms of writing as a process, the students learned to aware that writing is a process of discovery and to generate the ideas, not just transcribe them. Moreover, in the process of writing, the students learned to interact with their peers to exchange the feedbacks. In terms of writing as a product, the students stated that they wrote longer essays and stories and they improved their writing performance in terms of using new vocabulary and grammatical structures and had better organization. In the following section, I will use their writing product to
show and verify the students’ change in their thought about their writing development and their writing performance.

**Writing Development**

As mentioned in Chapter 5, the students in this class had experienced a change in teaching approach from the outset of the course. They engaged in various activities that made them became active writers. They learned to write for communication purposes and for an audience. They gained a sense of ownership when they were allowed to choose their own topics. They learned to express themselves through their writing. They also learned more about the English language, its grammar and structures via writing, peer-responding, revising, and editing. The students found that their writing skills and writing performance improved. They reported that they learned to think and write faster, wrote longer essays and stories, and were more careful about grammar and structures when they revised. They thought that their writing was better organized as well.

This section presents the analysis of students’ writing samples in terms of surface features, content, craft, and language. The surface features include length, spelling, and handwriting. The content refers to ideas and details while craft refers to organization, style, and word choice or vocabulary. Language includes grammar and sentence structure. I decided to analyze the first draft of five writing assignments of nine focus students representing low, intermediate, and high English proficiency students because the first drafts particularly the first four assignments were written in class which well represented their writing ability when time was limited. Only the fifth assignment was homework assignment. The sixth assignment was group work assignment so I decided not to include it in this analysis. Their real names are withheld, and the pseudo names were used instead. The first and second assignments were about describing people (Introducing yourself, Introducing your friend), and the third assignment was describing a place (Your
favorite place). The forth assignment was describing past experience (Your experience of learning English), and the fifth assignment was a narrative (Your impressive experience).

**Surface Features**

**Length**

The students tended to write longer after the first assignment. Wat and Fuada, although their second, third and forth assignment were gradually longer, wrote shorter in their fifth assignment due to the fact that the topic about an impressive experience was more complicated. The length of the students’ writing increased from first assignment to the fifth assignment (see Table 6-1). The mean scores of the number of words and number of sentence show that the students with low English proficiency wrote longer from 74 words, 7 sentences to 160 words, 14 sentences. The intermediate level wrote from 146 words, 14 sentences to 217 words, 27 sentences. Similarly, high English proficiency students wrote longer from 134 words, 17 sentences to 214 words, 21 sentences. The students tended to write longer with more details and elaborate in their writing.

**Spelling**

The low English proficiency students, especially Fuada, tended to spell incorrectly for simple words in the first assignments but later their spelling was better except Fuada who seemed to have a problem with spelling. For example, Wat spelled ‘hope’ as ‘holp’ or ‘basketball’ as ‘bass’. For the word ‘basketball, I think he used the short word for it or he was not sure how to spell it. Tit spelled ‘seniar’ for ‘senior’, ‘hards’ for ‘hard’ in his first assignment. Tit learned from his former mistakes. When he wrote about his past experience (fourth assignment) he did spell the word ‘hard’ right in the same sentence pattern, but he made another mistake like ‘vocabulary’ and ‘unknonw’. Among these three students, Fuada had the problem with spelling the most. He made some errors on spelling in every assignment, such as ‘leanning’
For the intermediate and high English proficiency students, they did not have the problem with simple words, but they did have misspelling for longer words or the words that they rarely wrote although they heard them or spoke them. For example, Kit misspelled ‘Argiculture’, ‘keybroad’, ‘routines’, and ‘nursesary’, while the others rarely had misspelling. I think Kit had a problem with the words that the spelling and the sound did not match, or the diphthongs. The other students seemed not to have the problem with spelling. Their misspellings might be just typo.

**Handwriting**

The students’ handwriting was easy to read except a few low-English proficiency students such as Fuada. The female students tended to have neat handwriting even in their first draft. Male students had readable handwriting but many scratches for the first drafts because the teacher told them not to bother about misspelling. She told them not to erase but just cross out. So, there were some crossing out or scratches in their first draft.

In general, according to the surface features, the students’ writing improved. They wrote longer stories, made less errors on spelling. They learned from their mistakes in the former works. Their handwriting was readable and the high English proficiency had good handwriting.

**Content**

The content includes the ideas and the details of the essay or story. The students had experience for the first topic (Introduce Yourself). However, the students with low English proficiency tended to have simple or basic ideas when they wrote about themselves in their first
draft (see Table 6-2). For the first and second assignments, they described a person (introducing themselves and describing their friend). Their ideas were not complicated because they just describe who they were. They introduced their name, described their age, their major, where they were studying, where they lived, and what they liked to do. After the second draft, they added more details about their routines because the teacher told them to write about routines, which was one of the focuses for this unit. Fuada’s first draft of the first assignment showed that the ideas were poorly expressed due to the use of vocabulary:

Hello, My name is (name) Surname (last name). Now I leaning in Engineering Faculty at 5 year. My nickname is “Benz”, but My friend tell to me “YIck” (หยิก) I’m very happy take cross in class. by the way in freedom I have to see the movie and sometime I tour ต่างจังหวัด and I like drive a car on myself

For the third assignment, describing a place, these students had a chance to read from the other materials before writing the first draft, therefore, their ideas were more complicated. They had to think about their favorite place, what made it their favorite, and what information they would include in their essay. However, the teacher told them to search for any information about a place and made sure that they had information about the location, climate, population, and interesting spots because those were information that they had to write in the examination. So, the low-English proficiency students tended to cut and paste the information from what they read. As a result, they had more details when they wrote this essay.

For the fourth assignment, the students wrote about their past experience. They tried to give details on how they learned English and what they felt about it. Their ideas were complicated and they had difficulty choosing English words due to their limited vocabulary. They switched to Thai language. The excerpt below shows that Tit switched to Thai language when he talked about what he thought about his experience.
In Year One, I was study in Eng I. There are some thing to learn [literary mean ‘like’ but he wanted to say ‘it seems’] I started from 0 to 1 [literary mean ‘new’ but he wanted to say ‘again or started all over again’] Because I study มา from ป.1 to ม.6, I never [because I did not understand what I learned from grades first to twelfth.] At Entrance [examination], I ทำข้อสอบมาได้ 45 คะแนน [For entrance examination, I just guessed the answers and I got 45 points.]

For the fifth assignment, the low English proficiency students had more complicated ideas when they wrote about their impressive stories. This may be because for this assignment, the teacher prepared them more before asking them to write their first draft at home. She asked them to find an impressive story either in Thai or in English. She told them to highlight the part that showed emotion such as sadness or fun. Later she asked them to critique the story their peer brought. Then she discussed with the students about the language the writers used to show their emotion, such as verb, adjectives, and how it worked for the audience. As a result, when the students wrote their first draft they presented the logical and complicated ideas with details about their experience. However, Fuada and Wat did not show much improvement in terms of complicated ideas but they did show that they integrated what they learned from the former assignments in the fifth assignment. Wat described the place he felt impressed while he narrated his story about his trip to that place. He gave his opinions about that place as well. Tit was the one who showed much improvement when he wrote the fifth assignment. The excerpt below shows how Tit narrated his story with logical and elaborate ideas by using cause and effect transition such as ‘because’. He told the reader what he did after he left home clearly.

When I was seven years old, I left out home alone because I didn’t want to go to school. My father and mother weren’t know that. I left home at 5.00 a.m. Everybody in my family were sleeping. I had a big bag and 500 B money in my pocket. I walked to the bus stop and randomly catched the bus. I didn’t know where the bus go. I sat beside the window and enjoyed the view outside. I didn’t fear anything because I was a little boy. I went to so many places, which I didn’t know. I went to the market and department store. It was a big adventure. A man looked at me surprisingly, they didn’t look at my parents.
Similarly, the intermediate English students presented the simple ideas in their first and second assignment. However, they had more details besides their personal information, such as their name, age, what they studied, their family, and their hobby. They added information like their appearance, their future, their feeling, and their experience about this university. Their ideas were more complicated when they wrote about their past experience and their impressive experience. They described more about their feeling. Some students like Kit switched to Thai when they expressed the complicated and abstract ideas. The fifth assignment show how much these students improve in terms of content. They expressed ideas logically, and had details to support their ideas.

Like the other students, high English proficiency students presented simple ideas when they described themselves and their friend in the first and the second assignment. Their ideas were about who they were. The details included general personal information as well as their family and their interest or hobbies. It seems to me that this might be a format that they learned from school when they were asked to introduce themselves. They give information that they thought the teacher expected. In this group, Su seemed to be the strong writer. Her first assignment had more ideas and details which were different from the others, such as introducing her hometown and its interesting spots.

For the third assignment, describing a place, this group had more ideas on how to present the place. Besides information about the place, they added why they liked that place, why they chose to write about that place, what they wanted to do, or where they wanted to visit. The content of their forth and fifth assignments were also logical and complicated. They presented their story with sufficient and vivid information. Their ideas had unity and they presented the main idea in their paragraph. For example, Su started her story with “My impressive story was
happened when I studied in primary school (Pratom 6) at Aroonpradit School in Petchburi.” Her opening sentence gave enough details for the reader to know when and where this story happened, and what kind of story they expected to read. She ended her story with happy result, “I received a certificate and the money 4,000 baht. And this is my impressive experience that I will remember it forever.”

In summary, after the students practiced writing more frequently, their ideas were more complicated in the fourth and fifth assignments. They generated more ideas. Since they read from outside materials, they added more details in their stories. However, the low proficiency students had problems when they wanted to express the complicated ideas. They switched into Thai to solve this problem. Unlike this group, the high English proficiency presented their complicated ideas logically with good organization.

Craft

Craft, in general, refers to an art or skill in doing something. In writing, craft is part of the writing process. Craft is the stage when the writer drafts, revises, and edits for their final product. The writer generates the ideas and put them in a written form. In doing so, the writer organizes their ideas, uses different writing techniques or styles, and language to create and convey his/her story to the audience. In this section, I will discuss the students’ writing development in terms of organization of stories, writing techniques or styles, and the use of language.

Organization

The students’ writing showed the improvement of organization. In general, their organization gradually improved from the first assignment to the fifth assignment. The low-English proficient students showed huge improvement in their first draft of the fifth assignment except Fuada who still struggled with it when he wrote the first draft of the fifth assignment. But after receiving peers’ feedback, Fuada showed much improvement in his third draft. For the first
draft of the first assignment, the students’ writing was not well organized. They switched their information back and forth. For example, Wat started from his personal information (name and age), then his education (university and major), then turned to his personal information again (where he lived), and then abruptly moved to talk about his hobbies, and ended with personal information (birthday) and his hope. Tit had the similar organization in his first draft of the first assignment. He started with his personal information to education, then switched to his personal information, and ended his essay with his hobbies. For the second assignment, the organization of their essay was better.

Wat, during the first interview, told me that he learned from his first assignment how confusing his essay was. The teacher pointed it out to him. When he read the teacher’s feedback and reread his essay, he agreed that he confused the readers by abruptly presented different ideas and information. However, when viewing his first draft of the second assignment, he did not show much improvement of organization in this piece. Unlike Wat, Tit’s second assignment was better organized. He separated the information into three short paragraphs. He focused on the routines: during the day, in the evening, and on weekends. Similar to Tit, Fuada described his friend’s routine from getting up in the morning to going to bed. It seems to me that the students lacked the knowledge of a paragraph concept or essay format. Although during the interview they mentioned the format of essay (introduction, body, and conclusion), they did not show this understanding in their essay. It is possible that their writing was just a paragraph essay. Therefore, they were not aware of the essay pattern.

Moreover, the students’ writing did not show the paragraph pattern (topic sentence, supporting details, and conclusion). This relates to how Thai students write a descriptive essay in Thai. They have introduction but it will not straight forward. They may end the story or
paragraph by telling the future hope like Wat did which may not be a conclusion sentence of the paragraph but for Thai writing it is acceptable. We call it a personal style of ending. The following is Wat’s first draft of the first assignment. He ended his story with his hope.

My name is (name). I 22 years old. I study at K. University. My faculty of Engineering. I come from Nakronphanom. I stay at nhamwongwasn cord apartment. It opposite K. University in ngamwongwan Rd. I like play guitar and watch Television in free time. And I like football but I don’t like bas. My birthday is 10th June 1981. I help to graduate in this year.

For the opening for introducing someone like friend, The students started with “Her/his name is (name).” This may be strange way to establish a topic for native-English speakers but for Thai people, this is quite acceptable. I think the students may imitate the pattern from the essay of introducing yourself when they opened their essay with “My name is (name). Another possible explanation is that they might transfer Thai style of writing to English writing. We can begin our story with the pronoun like “Her name is … She is …”, and we probably end the essay by telling her name or maybe the writer herself.

The intermediate and high English proficiency students showed better organization in their writing. They presented ideas smoothly and pretty well organized since the first assignment. However, similar to the low English proficiency students, for the first two assignments they used the similar opening statement. Unlike those students, the intermediate and high English proficiency sometimes showed their knowledge of paragraph concept such as providing topic sentence, details that supported the topic sentence. For example, Nok started her assignment like this: “Finland is my favourite country.” Then she provided details about this country to support her first sentence. Kit in his fifth assignment started his story as “This is my sad story.” Then he narrated his story chronologically and logically. And he ended his story with “That day I felt very sad.” The high English proficiency students appeared to use appropriate transitional devices and vocabulary to make their story well organized and smooth. For example, Nini wrote:
When I was 10 years old, I came to Bangkok with my father. It was the first time that I came to Bangkok by plane. I was glad when I known that I was going to Bangkok by plane.…

About ten minutes later, and air hostess explained how to use a parachute. Then she … I was very tired, so I went to bed early.…

A day later, my father and I went to visit many interesting places in Bangkok such as … Although it passed many years, I still remember it well.

Nini used complex sentences such as adverb clauses and adjective clauses to show the connection of the events (when, although, that). Similar to Nini, Tanya and Su showed the knowledge of paragraph and essay concept by having opening and closing sentences and used transitional devices to make the organization better. For example, Tanya began her essay about place as: “I know Korea long time but I don’t know that “what is interesting thing in Korea?” I saw many beautiful places, lifestyle from television so I would like to find data about Korea. Tanya began the third assignment as: “I selected to write about Japan because it is interesting country.” They gave good opening to this piece while other students tended to write this piece as a report without good organization but with a lot of information they gathered from the materials they read. Their opening statements made their essay interesting and got attention from the audience.

As I mentioned above, the fifth assignment showed huge improvement of the students’ writing. Before they wrote this piece, the teacher provided them many tasks in order to prepare them for their writing. She started with an oral discussion of their impressive life experiences. Then, she asked them, as homework, to find a story that expressed emotions, such as sad stories, jokes or funny stories, and love. She gave some directions for this task including highlighting the words or language reflecting the feeling or emotion, finding the meaning of unknown words, telling why they thought it was funny, sad, or happy. In class, she randomly read the students’ stories and asked them to critique the story. For example, when she read a sad story, she asked if
it was sad, what made it sad. She then asked the students to read their peers’ stories and gave their feedback on the stories they read. She, then, elicited the language from the story based on the students’ ideas and showed them how these language choice and structure reflected the feeling. She also explained the use of dialogue in the story and the present and past tense when narrating the story. For their homework, she asked the students to retell the stories they read in their own words or to write their own stories about an impressive experience. The students chose to write their own stories. Since they were well prepared and taught how a writer uses language to express their emotion, the students learned and tried those techniques (using dialogue, some emotional verbs and adjectives) in their own stories. Moreover, they worked on their pieces at home so they had more time to generate their ideas, to organize their information and to revise their piece. That is why this piece showed huge improvement in organization. Their journal on how they wrote this writing assignment confirmed that they applied what they learned in class from the reading materials and struggled in selecting which story to tell, in translating it from a Thai draft or outline into the English version, in organizing their ideas to make it smooth and logical, and in choosing the right words and tenses to express their ideas. For example, Fuada wrote his story in Thai first and then translated it into English. The following excerpts from the students’ journals showed that they spent time crafting this piece and tried the techniques, vocabulary and grammar structures (tenses and complex sentence) they learned when they wrote this piece.

Since last Tuesday, I have learned some [English] vocabulary and interesting English article. It’s fun and I felt happy in learning. Although I might not write well, I had an opportunity to try and write which was better than not doing anything. (Pat)

I wrote this piece based on my past experience. Before writing this piece, I read some books about how to use past simple tense and how to organize the story. Then, I started writing this story. The problem was I was confused with past simple form of verbs…(Tit).
… I recalled my past experience that I would write about. Then, I wrote it in Thai first. I wrote everything that I could recall. After that, I read the whole story and reorganized the sentences or added [some more details]. When I got a draft, I started to write in English. There were some problems. [That] is, I could not translated some Thai sentences into English if I wanted to keep the exact meaning. So, I changed the sentences. Using my own language may make the sentences ungrammatical but I think this piece of writing is better than the last ones because [I] had more time to think and had time to organize my story. … (Sara)

Before writing this piece, [I] had to recall my impressive experience. I recalled when, where, and how it happened. Then I tried to write it in English. It’s difficult to write in English because I thought in Thai. I could not translate some sentences in English. I decided not to have those sentences.… (Nok)

I spent much time to write this piece. First, it took much time for me to decide what I would write about. At first, I wrote another story, but I could not finish it. I changed the story to this one. I drafted it in Thai and then translated it into English. I spent much time for some sentences. I didn’t know how to write them in English. … For grammar, I used some verbs but I was not sure if I used them right or not. (Su)

According to my observation and the students’ journals, the students in this class learned more about organization when they wrote about their impressive experience. The teacher prepared them well in order to create this piece of writing. With the preparation and exposure to authentic materials, the students showed huge improvement in how they narrated their story; they had the opening statements, and closing sentence. They also used the language patterns to make their story smooth.

**Style**

The students in this class develop their own style and also learned some writing techniques such as the use of dialogue to narrate their stories, the use of verbs and adjective to express their feeling. Mainly, they had personal writing styles in their description and their narration. Except for the third assignment writing, they used “I” in their stories which revealed their voice in their essays. Their personal style gradually developed and can be vividly seen in the fifth assignment. Many students including low English proficiency students tried a new writing technique— including dialogue—to write personal narrative which made this piece more interesting and
lively. The following are the excerpts showing how they used the dialogues to reflect their voice in the fifth assignment.

In the evening, while I was walking along the road, the policeman came to talk to me and asked me “who is coming with you.” I answered “I come alone.” He took me to the Bangkhen Police station… I just only said :I don’t know” I stayed there until late night…. (Tit)

This is my sad story. It began while I’m freshy In the days the phone rang. “Hello!” I said. “Bank! This is your uncle. Please give me says with your mother”… My mother told me “Your grandmother pose to a hospital.”… (Kit)

…. I told my mother “I would like to play the Space Mountain”. … When I and my mother came out, we sat on a chair. My father asked me “Is it fun?” I answered “Yes”. My mother blamed me but I laughed… (Tanya)

**Word choice**

The students in this class tended to have a problem with word choice. They had limited English vocabulary particularly the low-English proficiency students. From the first assignment to the fifth assignment, from time to time, they showed they had hard time to find the right or appropriate English words for their ideas. Although they learned more vocabulary as Wat and Tit said in the interview and in Tit’s journal and in their revision, when they wrote a new essay, especially about the elaborate topics, this problem reoccurred. The students also had difficulty when they wrote about abstract ideas such as emotion, or learning. Sometimes, they could not translate their ideas into English, they chose to use Thai in their first drafts, and then used a Thai-English dictionary to help them when they revised their drafts. Frequently, in class, the students used Thai-English dictionaries (electronic dictionaries) when they had a problem about vocabulary. However, when they used the dictionary, they got only English words and they tended to use those words ungrammatical or inappropriate words in the context. For example, Tit and Fuada struggled with word choice and sometimes he chose to use Thai when he talked about the purpose of his study and his ability in learning English:
I’m happy for study in English writing because it make I funny for learn….At the time I study very hard เพื่อจะจบการศึกษาในปีนี้. I don’t ถนัดภาษาEnglish. [My translation: I studied very hard in order to graduate this year. I am not good at (literary means ‘keen on or expert’) English.] (Tit)

... by the way in freedom I have to see the movie and sometime I tour ต่างจังหวัด [I travel, or I went to the countryside] and I like drive a car on myself. (Fuada)

The intermediate and high English proficiency students had this problem when they wrote about a complicated topic or when they expressed their feelings. The also switched to use Thai when they could not translate their ideas into English for their first drafts. However, the high English proficiency students tended to make fewer errors on word choice. It was probably because they wrote about themselves and their experience, or they chose to write their essays based on the knowledge of vocabulary they had. They appeared to have sufficient knowledge of vocabulary to express their ideas.

… Next I learned the grammar. I read the nation junior [English newspaper for students] and listened a tape จับใจความประโยค [to get the main idea or for comprehension] but I don’t like it…. (Kit)

…I am alone because my friend can’t add this section. If I drop I am afraid, I will tired [be retired] next term. (Sara)

…And I like very much, because I can write everything I think and don’t scare about grammar. And it don’t make me serious, when I am serious, I can’t write….

… But my teacher was quite fix about grammar. (Sara)

… I am joyful but sometimes easy to angry…. (Tanya)

After practicing writing more frequently along with the teacher’s guidance particularly for the fifth assignment, the students in this class developed their writing skills such as organization, and tried a new writing technique they learned when they wrote. They also learned new vocabulary when they translated Thai words into English by using dictionaries. However, the students still had a problem with word choices especially when they wrote an elaborate story.
Language

In this section, language includes grammar and sentence structure. The students in this class had basic writing skills in English. They had knowledge of simple sentence structure (Subject, verb and object or modifiers) However, they produced some errors when they wrote the first assignment. The teacher decided to emphasize the basic sentence structure because the students tended to write incomplete sentences. She discussed with students the pattern of a simple sentence to make the students aware of the sentence structure when they wrote. Sometimes the students forgot to put a period after a sentence. It is because Thai language does not use the period to indicate a complete sentence. It appeared to be a run-on sentence for the native English readers. According to the students’ writing samples, there were four major grammatical errors: verb phrases, subject-verb agreement, determiners and preposition, and sentence structure (see Table 6-3). Verb phrases include improper use of tenses, incorrect use of infinitive or present participle, and deletion of auxiliaries. The students, although they had basic skills of English, they appeared to produce a lot of errors when they wrote in English in their first drafts.

The major problem that the students in this class had was related to verb phrase. They perceived that tense usage was their problem when they wrote in English. This problem appeared in their writing particularly in the forth and fifth assignments which tested the knowledge of tenses. For the first three assignments which did not aim to test the use of tenses, the students made fewer errors on verb phrase. Viewing only the fourth and the fifth assignments, the students in all groups produced fewer errors on verb phrase.

Subject-verb agreement and determiners along with preposition tended to be another main problem for the low English proficiency students. The second assignment, which tested the knowledge of subject-verb agreement, showed that they made a lot of errors on these types of
errors (12 and 13 errors respectively). For the intermediate proficiency students, the determiner and preposition usage were their second problem. They made more errors in the last two assignments. It is probably that they wrote longer and the topics of the assignments were more complicated than the first three assignments. Unlike the other two groups, the high English proficiency students made fewer errors in subject-verb agreement, determiners and prepositions. For sentence structure, the students in all groups made fewer errors in their fifth assignment.

In conclusion, the students in this class had some basic writing skills in English at the beginning of the semester. Through practice writing, peer-responses, and revision, they learned how to organize a paragraph, some writing techniques such as using dialogue, and sentence structure i.e. simple, complex, and compound sentences. They tried what they learned in class in their writing although they made some mistakes. They tried to use transitional devices and connectors (i.e. after, when, first, then, because, and although). The fifth assignment showed that the students made fewer errors; they were aware of the use of tenses as they reflected in their journal; they paid attention to the organization of their ideas to make their story smooth; and they tried a new technique. In addition, their knowledge of vocabulary increased due to they made fewer errors on spelling and word choices.

**Summary**

In general, the students liked this writing class and felt that practice writing more frequently helped them improve their basic writing skills. They became more familiar with English writing and did not feel stressful when they were asked to write in English. Their attitude towards English and writing in English changed. They felt more confident and proud of their writing. Their essays were better organized and they tried to use some grammar and sentence structures, such as adjective clause and past tense, in their essays although they might make some errors. They learned from the errors they made. They also learned from their peer’s
feedback particularly for the fifth assignment. Their fifth assignment showed much improvement in organization, the style of writing (personal narration), the use of transitional devices, and the use of dialogue in this piece. However, some students felt that sometimes revising the same piece more than twice was boring. They did not know how to revise if the teacher did not give them the feedback. The teacher only gave them the feedbacks for the final draft. During the revision, the teacher used question-answer sessions and peer-responses to help them revise and learn about grammar. However, they did not have much to revise based on their peer’s feedback. What they did for their second draft was adding details, deleting some information, and correcting grammatical errors. They felt that the teacher did not give sufficient lectures on grammar that they needed for writing and for the test.
## Table 6-1 The length of students’ writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># W</td>
<td># S</td>
<td># W</td>
<td># S</td>
<td># W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tit</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fuada</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kit</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sara</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nok</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tanya</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nini</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Su</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- A1-5 = Assignments 1-5
- # W = Number of words
- # S = Number of sentences
- Group 1 = Low English proficiency students
- Group 2 = Intermediate English proficiency students
- Group 3 = High English proficiency students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Simple and basic ideas</td>
<td>Simple and basic ideas</td>
<td>Simple and basic ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- name, age</td>
<td>- name, age, family</td>
<td>- name, age, family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- education i.e. major</td>
<td>- education i.e. major</td>
<td>- education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- hobbies</td>
<td>- hobbies</td>
<td>- hobbies, interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- appearance</td>
<td>- appearance</td>
<td>- experience, future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>Complicated ideas</td>
<td>Complicated ideas</td>
<td>Complicated ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- details on place i.e. location, population, weather, interesting spots</td>
<td>- details on place i.e. location, population, weather, interesting spots</td>
<td>- reason to write about this place - things they wanted to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>Complicated ideas</td>
<td>Complicated ideas</td>
<td>Logical and complicated ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- describe events</td>
<td>- describe events</td>
<td>- describe events - give supporting details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- use Thai to express complicated ideas or abstract words.</td>
<td>- use Thai to express complicated ideas or abstract words</td>
<td>- give supporting details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>More complicated ideas (Except Fuada)</td>
<td>More complicated ideas</td>
<td>Logical and complicated ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- narrate impressive event</td>
<td>- narrate impressive event</td>
<td>- have opening statement and conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- give information i.e. places, feelings, scenes</td>
<td>- give supporting details</td>
<td>- give supporting details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
A1-5 = Assignments 1-5
Group 1 = Low English proficiency students
Group 2 = Intermediate English proficiency students
Group 3 = High English proficiency students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical errors</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verb phrase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S-V agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determiners and prepositions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sentence structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verb phrase</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S-V agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determiners and prepositions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sentence structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verb phrase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S-V agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determiners and prepositions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sentence structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- A1-5 = Assignments 1-5
- Group 1 = Low English proficiency students
- Group 2 = Intermediate English proficiency students
- Group 3 = High English proficiency student
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CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

One conclusion should now be incontestable. The numerous recommendations of the “process”-centered approaches to writing instructions as superior to the “product”-centered approaches are not very useful. Everyone teaches the process of writing, but everyone does not teach the same process. The test of one’s competence as a composition instructor, …, resides in being able to recognize and justify the version of the process being taught, complete with all of its significance for the student.

Berlin, 1982, p. 777

This study aimed to explore an English writing classroom in which the Thai teacher adopted a new process writing instruction to her class. The study focused on the students’ perception on the instruction that they experienced in this class. Chapter 4 described the classroom setting and the activities the teacher employed to help her students learn to write in English. Chapters 5 and 6 discussed the students’ behaviors and responses to this writing class and their developments in terms of writers and writing improvement. As Berlin (1982) concluded his article about L1 composition pedagogical theories, to suggest which approach is superior to another is not useful because no one teaches the same approach in the same way. The way to evaluate the success of the teaching is to look at how the teacher teaches and employs the significant components of the approach for the students.

In this chapter I summarize the findings related to writing development and second language acquisition, and sociocultural influences based on the innovative writing instruction and the students’ responses which were discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. From the findings, I arrive at the major conclusions on how this new process writing instruction may support students’ understanding of writing as a process, the impact of this instruction on the students’ writing ability, and frustration as well as the factors, such as sociocultural factors, affecting their learning to write and their interaction while engaging in the process writing activities. Additionally, this
chapter concludes with theoretical implications, relevant implications for practice, and suggestions for future research questions.

Ms. B’s Writing Class and the Process Approach

According to Berlin (1982), all pedagogical approaches in L1 share four elements of the composing process: the writer, the reader (audience), reality and truth, and language. In order to understand the writing instruction used in this class and the students’ responses, this section will discuss the approach in the teaching of writing that the teacher (Ms. B) implemented in this writing class using Berlin’s elements of the composing process and the approaches to composition theory: the process approach, the interactive approach, and the social constructionist approach (Johns, 1990; Reid, 1993). The constraints for implementing the new writing approach will also be addressed.

Ms. B believed in the process approach which she studied and experienced. However, she realized that her writing class was not for native English speakers (L1) but for non-native English speakers (L2 learners). Moreover, her students learned English as a foreign language (EFL) which was different from English as a second language (ESL) in that students were rarely exposed to English outside the classroom. In order to implement the process approach in her writing class, Ms. B adapted and adopted some techniques of the process approach in her writing class. Instead of implementing the writing workshop, she selected some strategies that, in her opinion, were important and would help her students learn to write and improve their writing in English. The approach she used will be discussed based on the basic approaches presented by Johns (1990) and Reid (1993): the process approach, the interactive approach, and the social constructionist approach. Berlin’s (1982) four elements will be used as the organization for the presentation of the strengths and weaknesses in her approach.
The Writers

Johns (1990) referred to Faigley (1986) when she grouped the process camp into two groups: the expressivists and the cognitivists. According to Johns, these two groups look at the writer as the important component in the theory. However, the expressivists emphasize the writer’s voice, whereas the cognitivists focus on the writer’s mental process—“a thinking and problem-solving process” (Reid, 1993, p. 260). The interactivists look at the writer’s role as “interactant” (Johns, 1990, p. 27). According to interactivists’ view, writers create the text through a dialogue with the readers. For the social constructionists’ view, writing is a social act taking place in a social context. The writer, in this view, is not the person who creates or discovers the truth or knowledge, on the other hand, the writer is the person who is shaped by the discourse community. In other words, the writer’s text or knowledge is the result from the internalization and transformation of social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978).

When we look at the writer as an element of the composition process, Ms. B’s writing approach leaned toward the expressive view. She emphasized the students’ as creators of texts. She encouraged them to express their thoughts and opinions. She designed the classroom activities such as free writing, journal writing, and drafting to promote writing fluency and the writing act. She allowed the students to use their native language (Thai) when needed. Revising gave the students chances to practice writing more frequently. In her class the students interacted with the teacher mostly in question-answer (Q-A) sessions. Normally, the teacher played an important role in the Q-A session by asking the students questions related to their writing assignments, and encouraging the students to ask questions. Ms. B did not focus on the writer’s mental process of thinking. She let the students write on their own. The students rarely interacted with each other, even in peer-response. For peer-response, the students mainly read their peers’ work and wrote the feedback. On a few occasions that the teacher asked the writers to read the
feedback they received and to write comments about their peers’ feedback. Some students had a chance to ask their peers about the feedbacks they received. Ms. B did not build the writers’ community to encourage social interaction. In general, this writing class focused on the writer and their writing act. The teacher promoted the students’ voice in their writing which was supported by the course assignments. The students expressed their ideas and voice through personal writing essays such as introducing themselves and their impressive experience.

The Audience

In the process camp, the expressivists do not give much role to the audience. Because the writer is the one who creates and discovers the truth or knowledge and transforms it into the written text, the audience is just the one who helps the writer remove errors (Berlin, 1982). Moreover, the expresivists view the audience as the one the writer creates in the form of the purposes for the text (Johns, 1990). The cognitivists view the audience as more complicated than the expressivists. For the cognitivists, successful writers have to understand and develop the sense of the audience when they write. The writers should be aware of the readers’ interest and expectation (Johns, 1990). The cognitivists’ view of the audience is closer to the interactive approach. For the interactive approach, the audience is viewed as important as the writer. They both have responsibility in creating a coherent text. The last group, the social constructionists also view the audience as an important element of composing text. The readers are part of the discourse community. With their knowledge of writing (i.e. the conventions of writing, the expectation), the readers can accept or reject the written text.

The students in this study did not pay much attention to audience when they wrote. Although Ms. B let the students have peer-response, it seemed that the writers were the most important element in the writing process. The writers made the decision to accept or reject the peers’ feedback. The only benefit of the audience in this class was when the readers corrected the
grammar and sentence structure or when they corrected the writers’ errors. This concept of the audience is parallel to the expressivists’ view of the audience. Ms. B did not encourage the readers to dialogue with the writers when they responded to the writing. She did not explain to the students how the constructive feedback would help the writer improve their writing. She only encouraged the students to give positive feedback for the first drafts, and paid attention to grammar and sentence structure in the second and the third drafts.

**Reality and Truth**

In terms of reality and truth, in the process approach camp, both expressivists and cognitivists view the truth as the knowledge the writer creates. It is the internal process in the writer’s mind. For this approach, “all good writing is personal, whether it be an abstract essay, or a private letter” (Miller and Judy, 1978, p. 12 cited in Berlin, 1982, p. 772). On the contrary, the interactivists view the truth as the communication between the writers and the readers. The writers create coherent texts to appeal to and convince their reader audience. For the social constructionists, the truth is viewed as the meaning constructed, and interpreted by the members of the community (writers and readers)

In this writing class, the writing products were viewed as personal texts because of the nature of the course assignments, which were mainly personal essays. The teacher also encouraged the students to learn language from their own writing. She had the students do independent writing in class. The students in this class developed a sense of the ownership via writing by expressing their ideas and telling their stories. They wrote in their own voices. They only needed help from the teacher and their peers for language such as spelling, vocabulary, grammar and sentence structures. In general, the teacher supported the students as they tried to express themselves via personal writing.
The Language Component

The last element in composition theory is language. For the process approach, both expressivists and cognitivists, who focus on writers and writing process, view that the writers will learn language from their texts or the content about which they write. The writers use their own language ability (prior knowledge) to create their own content and to communicate with the readers (Berlin, 1982, Johns, 1990). For the view of interactivists, the writers must produce the appropriate language in anticipation of the audience, and at the same time the readers have to acknowledge the writers’ language. The social constructionists view language as “prior to truth and determines what shapes the truth can take” (Berlin, 1982, p. 775). Berlin added, “Structure and language are a part of the formation of meaning, are at the center of the discovery of truth” (1982, p. 776). Language is part of the discourse community and the writers in that community use the language to create meaning. For ESL/EFL writers this may be difficult because they are not familiar with the language and the use of the language of a discourse community (of target language).

In this writing class, Ms. B tended to treat language in the social constructionists’ view and in the view of the process approach. She realized the language as the students’ prior knowledge and, at the same time, they could learn from their writing. She allowed the students to create their texts by using their language ability, not imitating the paragraph models in the course textbook. Meanwhile, she also realized that English was not the native language for her students. Therefore, when writing, the students might encounter difficulty in using English. The way she solved this problem was that she taught the students grammar and sentence structures according to the students’ errors and the course syllabus. She did not give the lectures; on the other hand, she used the question-answer session of her class as a place to teach grammar. The way she handled the students’ language difficulty tended to lean toward the traditional approach because
she explained the grammar at the discrete points or sentence level, rather than at the discourse level.

In general, according to the four elements of the composing process and the approach to composition theory, Ms. B’s writing approach was close to the expressivists’ and cognitivists’ view. She focused on the writers rather than the other elements. Although she allowed the students to have an audience via peer-response, the students perceived the audience as the ones who helped them correct errors rather than the ones who helped them create their texts. The writers are the creators of the text. For language, Ms. B combined the process approach and the traditional approach. She explained the grammar and sentence structures that the students needed for their writing assignments. The next part will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of her approach as well as the constraints affecting her approach.

**Strengths Compared to Traditional Teaching**

Although Ms. B did not fully implement the writing workshop, she tried to implement some strategies or activities from the process approach as discussed above. The strengths of her approach compared to the traditional teaching that the students are used to are: 1) the opportunities for writing practices, 2) building the sense of ownership, and 3) promoting the positive attitude toward writing.

The more frequently the students write, the more they learn and acquire knowledge and language. In the traditional teaching, the students did not have much chance to practice writing. They wrote only one draft for each assignment. The students were provided a model paragraph or essay to imitate. The teacher gave lectures of the language and vocabulary they needed for their writing. Through the traditional approach, the students did not create their own stories, but they wrote the stories to meet the teacher’s expectation. They did not learn from their writing. Krashen (1995) compared two hypotheses, “study hypothesis” and “problem-solving hypothesis”
The “study hypothesis” claims that the students “learn new facts and concepts by deliberate study, by trying to learn” whereas the “problem-solving hypothesis” view learning “as a by-product of trying to solve problem” (p. 347). Krashen disagrees with the study hypothesis and found that the students learn through the process of problem solving rather than direct instruction. To let the students write more frequently is the way to let the students learn through their process of writing (thinking and problem-solving). The students not only learn to write, but they also learn language from their stories and the errors they create.

Allowing the students to express themselves freely through free writing builds their sense of ownership. In the traditional classroom, the students do not have a sense of ownership because they do not write what they want to or about things that they really care. Giving students freedom to write what they want and what they are interested in helps create their ownership in their writing (Fu, 2000). Although Ms. B did not let them choose their topics for writing, she allowed them to write what they wanted and how they wanted under the general topics which were related to their personal experience. The students do know what to write if the teachers give them a chance to think and choose their own stories. The freedom to write what they want also helps the learners think, learn, and search for relevant, reasonable, and meaningful information to support their ideas (Fu, 2000). Through free writing, students learn to take responsibility for their writing and learning. They will learn skills that they need in a meaningful way, and then, become independent (Five, 1992). Moreover, a sense of ownership may be more important for Thai students with low English proficiency. They have low motivation to learn English, and think that they cannot achieve. Through free writing, the teachers encourage them to write what they are good at, what they know well. They will be proud of their work and would like to share it with their peers.
Ms. B allowed the students to write freely and practice writing more frequently. She built
the friendly atmosphere with less stress on grammar correction. Krashen (1995) argues that
pleasant activities such as free reading are good for language acquisition and cognitive
development. In writing class, free writing is a pleasant activity which enhances the students to
learn language and how to write. Through thinking and problem-solving while writing, the
students are enjoyable and feel engaged in the activities. With the less-stress atmosphere and
have more opportunities to write and rewrite, the students’ attitude towards writing particularly
writing in English changed. They felt that writing was not that difficult as they used to fear. They
learned a new concept of writing as multiple drafts. They could rewrite and learn from their
mistakes. Unlike the traditional classroom where the students’ writing are corrected and they are
expected to produce only free-error writing for the first draft, the students felt stressful and
forced to learn language. According to Krashen’s (1995) input hypothesis and problem-solving
hypothesis, learning is the natural state which will occur when the learning is enjoyable. The
problem-solving that enhance the students to engage in the activity or task pleasantly is an
important condition for learning language and for cognitive development to take place.

In Ms. B’s class the students learn by hands on, practicing writing. They had chances to
engage in activities including writing, and peer-response which allowed them to think and solve
the problem by themselves. They felt that they could write and create their own stories. They felt
proud of themselves. Finally, they changed their attitude about writing in that writing was not so
difficult for them to accomplish and writing could be messy before it was the complete one.

Weaknesses of Ms. B’s Approach

As mentioned in the beginning of this section that Ms. B approach was based on the
expressive and cognitive view; therefore, she rarely promoted the interaction among the students
and the sense of the audience. Without interaction among the students, they did not build the
community of learners or the writers’ community. She did not help the students through their process of writing. According to social constructionists’ view like Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD), with the assistance of the capable person, such as the teacher and their peers, the learners will learn and move on to the next level.

Like special education and ESL students, Thai students do not have a chance to become part of any learning community. They never share their work with the others. Thai students do not realize that their friends can help them solve learning problem such as writing. Although Ms. B allowed the students to share their writing with their peers, she did not encourage them to interact, asking questions while sharing their writing in the peer-response activity. Most of the time the students chose to share their writing to their friends in their own group. The students did not have much chance to share their writing to the whole class or to get feedbacks from more than one reader. Only for a few times that the teacher chose the readers for the students or asked the students to have more than one reader. According to Graves (1983, cited in Wansart, 1990), to build the community of writers needs the setting including “a) daily sustained writing time, b) individual writing conferences between students, and c) sharing of both work-in-progress and published pieces with the whole class” (p. 83). In Ms. B class the students had daily time for writing (about 25-40 minutes). However, she did not have individual writing conference between students nor sharing work-in-progress and final pieces with the whole class. In fact, sometimes she read some of the students’ work in class, but her purposes of reading was not to share their writing but to read the students’ feedbacks or comments about their works. The students never knew who the writers of those pieces or comments were.

Another weakness in Ms. B’s approach is that she did not really promote the sense of the audience. According to Berlin (1982), audience is one of the elements of composing process.
The students should be aware of the audience not only as the one who helps correct their errors, but also the one who shares and helps them build their stories. The students should have the audience in mind when they write their stories in order to make their story readable and coherent with the audience’s expectation. The responses from the audience help the students for developing their ideas, for revision, and for evaluation (Fu, 2000). The audience helps the learners develop and organize their thoughts and make their stories more interesting, more reasonable, and more readable.

Finally, Ms. B did not promote the students’ ZPD as much as she could. She tried to promote the students to learn and writing independently. She allowed the students to expose reading materials when they searched for their stories, and she allowed the students to make mistakes while writing drafts. However, she forgot that for EFL learners, like the young writers, they needed the capable person to help them move on to their next zone. Without the assistance of the teacher or the capable peers, the students will struggle by themselves while they discover their process of writing. Particularly within a short period (15 weeks), the students will not be able to fully succeed as writers without the teacher’s help because writing and learning to write takes time.

It seems that the way Ms. B implemented the process writing contributes to the growth of the students as writers. Ms. B emphasized the activities she employed instead of the process of writing. Calkins (1994) comments that the problem of adapting the writing workshop to suit the students is, “the teacher has abandoned the writing workshop. He is putting his students through “writing process exercises” rather than helping them to write with purpose and self-investment” (p. 166). Ms. B did not help her students go through the process of writing. She just introduced
the activities of process writing and let the students work on their own before giving the feedbacks after they were done.

**Constraints for Implementing Writing Process Approach**

To implement a new approach to EFL students, the teachers have to encounter the constraints such as time, space, students, school system, and the teachers themselves, and they have to adapt the activities to suit their students’ needs (Peyton et al, 1994). Similar to Peyton et al., Ms. B had to adapt the approach into her class because of the constraints including the curriculum, the class size, the students’ English proficiency, and the teacher’s experience in writing workshops.

As mentioned early in this section that Ms. B could not have free writing or give students’ choice of topic due to the curriculum and course syllabus. This writing class was designed by the coordinator in order to be an elective course for the students whose major was not English at this university. The purpose of this writing course was “to develop elementary writing skills by placing a strong emphasis on written production” (Sweetapple, 2003, p. ii). The students were expected to write two to three paragraphs in response to the language functions such as describing people and place, narrating. In order to prepare the students for the tests, Ms. B decided to give the students prompts for writing assignments. Moreover, she put emphasis on the grammar and sentence structures that were part of the main focus of this course. Although she did not give lectures on grammar, she asked the students to check grammatical errors when they read their peers’ works and in question-answer sessions, she mainly discussed about grammar and sentence structures based on the students’ errors and the grammar points in the course textbook.

Another constraint that the teacher in this study had is the class size. The large class size (41 students) made it difficult for Ms. B to read and grade all students’ drafts. It took much time...
for her to read and grade the students’ works. She returned the students’ writing assignments quite late and, even though they understood this situation, some students complained about this. They wanted to read the teacher’s feedbacks before they wrote the final draft or before they started the new assignment. However, Ms. B could not make it to meet the students’ expectations. She confessed that she had too much workload with this number of the students. The class size did affect the quality and quantity of the feedbacks the teacher give to the students. In order to make this approach work more effectively, the teacher should take the class size into account. With a large class size, Ms. B could not help individual student much. In addition, to make the feedbacks useful, the teacher should give feedbacks during the writing process, not at the end (Krashen, 1984). The teacher should organize his/her class to have time for giving feedbacks during the writing process.

**Students’ language proficiency** is another constraint that affects the implementing of the new approach. EFL students rarely expose to English outside the classroom and they do not have much opportunity to practice writing in English. When they have to write in English, the students, particularly the ones who are trained in the traditional approach, will focus on grammar and sentence structures rather than crafting and the content. With limitation of their language proficiency such as word choice and grammar, EFL students may not develop effective skills in peer response and revision. In this writing class, the students believed that their English proficiency was their obstacle that made them not able to give useful feedbacks particularly on grammar and sentence structures. With this constraint, Ms. B decided to focus on grammar and sentence structures when she asked the students to revise their second and third drafts. This led the students more emphasize on checking grammatical errors rather than the content and organization when they revise and read their peers’ writing. The writing process approach or
writing workshops do not ignore grammar and language usage (Krashen, 2004). In the process approach the teacher allow the students to discover their writing process by practicing writing and various activities, meanwhile, the students will learn language while they learn to write. To help ESL/EFL students, the teacher can use mini lessons for teaching grammar. With explicit and direct explanation, the students will feel more comfortable to learn grammar. At the same time the teacher can use mini lessons to teach the students knowledge of English writing to help them develop the sense of the audience (readers’ expectation) when they write their story.

Finally, the teachers’ background and experience in the new approach also plays an important role in implementing the new approach. As Murray (1985) entitled his book “A writer teaches writing”, it is important for the teachers to learn to write and become writers themselves in order to teach their students to write. For writing instruction, the teachers have to have background and experience of the approach they use or want to implement. Not only have the theories underlying the approach, but the teachers have to learn about the practices of that approach in the classrooms. For ESL/EFL teachers it is more important to study about the practices of that approach in ESL/EFL classes as well. In this study, although Ms. B had educational background in composition theories and had experiences in process writing, she was not trained to teach writing. She did not have experience of conferences. Therefore, she did not introduce this activity in her writing class. Ms. B did not explicitly teach and show the students how to revise and give feedback through conferences. Calkins (1994) suggests, “In order for young writers to learn to ask such questions of themselves, teachers and peers need to ask them of young writers. Teacher-student and peer conference, then, are at the heart of teaching writing” (p. 223). Similar to the young writers, EFL students like those in this study should have gain more benefits from peer response and revision if the teacher had shown them how to respond and
revise via conferences. With clear understanding of the approach as well as effective adjustments and modifications to suit the students’ need and the teaching context, it is possible to implement the process approach and make it works for ESL/EFL students (Lo, 1996; Pennington and Cheung, 1995).

The Teacher Could Do Better Under the Constraints

Although there are some constraints for implementing the new approach in this writing class, the teacher could do better by trying to implement the full process approach or writing workshop in her class. In other words, she should not only introduce the strategies or activities of the process approach, but what she could do is to show the students how to write and revise via the conferences. At the same time, she could use mini lesson to help the students learn language, grammar and structures, and the convention of writing.

The class size and the curriculum may hinder the implementing of the new approach like the process approach as Ms. B encountered. However, the teacher could organize her writing workshop and make it work better as it could be for the 15-week course. Graves in Calkins (1994) said that a good writing workshop has to be well organized and he admired Calkins’ class because she did organize her class very well. Her children knew the process of her instructions and could expect what they would do when they came to class. I do believe that with well organization, the teacher could implement the essential elements of writing workshop including a sense of community, response, freedom and time, ownership, and support. In order to build the community of learners, response, and support, conferences and peer-response are the strategies.

For freedom and time, Ms. B already showed that it is possible to provide the students freedom and time to write under the constraints. However, only time for writing is not enough for the growth of the writers. The teacher must provide them time to help them while they are writing. Individual and group conferences can solve this problem.
Teachers can create the supportive community by giving supportive and constructive response (Five, 1992). Five encourages her students to support their classmates by giving positive and constructive comments in response to their writing work. While they are conferring, students will “respect and listen to the comments of the special needs children made in response to the writing of their peers” (p. 180). Via conferences, students will learn to give supportive response and benefit from the response they receive from each other. Townsend & Fu (1998) emphasize a safe environment that will encourage ESL students to enter the new language learning community. Social support networks will help ESL students “to take risks necessary for [their] learning” (p. 200).

The supportive response will help Thai students who receive response mainly from the teacher feel safe and confident to share their writing. Most traditional responses are grammatical correction, not much on content. Additionally, teachers respond on product, not process. This kind of response is not supportive or constructive for EFL students. On the contrary, the traditional response will discourage them to take necessary risks for their learning. Writing process approach encourages teachers to have conferences with students and to give supportive and constructive responses on their in-progress writing or to help them get their topic to get started. Teacher-student conferences will be a model for peer conferences (Graves, 1983; and Calkins, 1994). Conferences will also be the safe places for Thai students to experiment expressing their ideas and English. The teacher can devote at least 15 minutes for conferring with individual and then encourage them to have peer conferences. Within 15 minutes, the students will be able to learn how to respond to their peers’ writing and then they can practice conferring with their peers.
However, the peer conference and sharing their work is a new concept for Thai students. Graves (1983) says, “Some students need help (especially if older and new to sharing) to see that they have materials worth sharing with others” (p. 28). With teacher’s help by giving specific and actual language and supportive response while conferring, students will learn to revise their work and become confident to share their work. The teacher probably demonstrates conferring during mini-lesson first to give the students some time to observe how the teacher confers their peer before encouraging them to go to their peer. The teacher should encourage the good students to help the low-proficiency students.

This section discussed writing instruction that Ms. B adapted from the process approach, or writing workshops. Her writing approach was based on the expressivists and cognitivists’ view. However, she did not fully and mechanically implement the key components or strategies used in writing workshop such as conferences in this writing class due to the constraints such as English proficiency of the students, the curriculum, class size, and her experience of the process approach. What she did not do when she introduced the activities (prewriting, free writing, peer response, revision, and editing) was that she did not guide the students and help them learn to write by demonstrating each activity. In other words, the students did not have a model to learn how to write, how to give useful and constructive feedbacks, and how to revise and edit their stories. Finally, what Ms. B could do better under the constraints is to organize and implement the writing workshop in her writing class. With the large number of the students, the teachers who want to implement the new approach have to well prepare and well organize the strategies and activities they will use in their class especially for the short course. The teacher should try individual conferences (teacher-student and peer conference/response). With the model from the teacher, the students will learn how to respond and to revise their stories effectively.
The experience from Ms. B’s writing class suggests that, compared to other constraints, the teacher’s knowledge of the teaching approach (theories and practices), in addition to the students’ background, plays a significant role in implementing an innovative writing instruction. The teacher will adapt and apply the new approach more effectively to the students if s/he understands and is aware of the theories and pedagogies underpinning the approach.

When the teachers implement a new approach or activities, it is important to evaluate how the new approach works with the students. Students’ responses are the main and direct reflections for the teacher to learn how well they apply the new approach and what the constraints they need to take into account (Leki, 2001). The following sections present the conclusions suggested by the data on the students’ response in terms of the growth of the students demonstrated as writers which attributed to the new teaching approach and the frustrations that they encountered.

Writing Practices

The students’ experience in writing process activities, such as free writing, revision, and peer-response, as well as their cultural background plays an important role in conceptual change about writing as a process. The way we think and learn develops through and is shaped by the activities in which we engage (Vygotsky, 1978). Engaging in various activities allows the students to explore their process of writing and learn how to write. The contributions of writing practices that the students experienced in this writing class are grouped into three areas: view of writing, psychological improvement, and writing development.

View of Writing as a Process

Murray (1997) said, “…when we teach composition we are not teaching a product, we are teaching a process” (p. 3). He added that the process that the teachers should teach is “the process of discovery through language. It is the process of exploration of what we know and
what we feel about what we know through language.” (p. 4) Although Ms. B did not implement the writing workshop in her class, she adapts some key components of writing workshop and with her intention of introducing the students to writing as a process, her writing class was successful at a certain degree. Through the process of writing, the students begin to view writing as a process by moving from correctness to expressionist.

Theoretically, the process approach focuses on learners and process of composing (Zamel 1976, 1982; Flower and Hayes, 1981). The instructional activities in this approach are designed to help the students express their ideas fluently and help them craft and revise their drafts. The students are encouraged to explore their writing process and the topic they write through practicing writing and revising. Writing is a recursive process, not a linear one (Emig, 1971; Zamel, 1982; Raimes, 1085). As being trained in a traditional writing class which focuses on accuracy, EFL learners like Thai students tend to have a concept of writing as the first error-free writing. In other words, they write only one draft and want that draft to be perfect without any grammatical errors. The students in this study also had this concept of writing when they first entered this class. They thought that their first and final draft had to be error-free. This concept of writing made the students feel stressful when they wrote. Moreover, while they were writing, they were not aware of the process of writing and revising in their head. Until they experienced this writing class which they were encouraged to write multiple drafts for each assignment, the students realized that writing was not the product of learning grammar and sentence structures. Through the writing activities, such as free writing, revision, and peer-response, the students in this study learned the new concept of writing. While free writing allows the students to express themselves freely and to practice writing without stress, interacting with peers through peer-response helps them learn to write and aware of the audience. They learned that writing was the
expressive and creative process and was multiple drafting, not the first free-error draft, and writing could start with messy work. Through the process of writing and practices, the students became writers who explored their ideas through language while they were writing. This experience of the students suggests the conclusion that the students’ view of writing seems influenced by the writing practices in which they participate.

**Students Move from Feeling of Discomfort to Comfort**

According to the expressive view, writing is a process of discovery and self-expression (Elbow, 1973, 1981; Perl, 1979; and Murray, 1985). Through exploring and discovering, the students should enjoy writing task at school. In fact, writing is taught based on the format of examination (Li, 1996). Under the stressful atmosphere in which writing is a means for testing grammar and sentence structures, the students find writing is difficult and feel fear to write because they are afraid to make errors. Without help from the teacher and their peers during writing, the students hardly learn to write and develop their writing skills. This stressful atmosphere leads to the students’ negative attitude towards English writing. The students in this study had negative attitude towards writing in English when they first attended this writing class. They were afraid to write in English. However, after the teacher allowed the students to practice more frequently without concerning with language correction while they were producing their drafts, the students felt more relaxed and more confident to write in English. The emphasis on writing process and self-expression made the students in this study develop positive attitude towards English and writing in English. Therefore, the affective filter is low (Krashen, 1982). After the second month, the students in this study found that they felt comfortable to write in English and they enjoyed writing more. Moreover, allowing the students to use Thai in their drafts helped the students with limited English feel less frustrated and express their thoughts and emotion easily (Fu and Matoush, 2006). Through the process approach, the students’ attitude
towards English writing improved. They began to enjoy writing more and feel less frustrated and less stressful when they learn to write through the process approach. In other words, the students moved from feeling of discomfort to comfort during the semester as they gained experience with process writing. The students’ experience in this writing class asserts that meaningful writing practices, especially free writing, help lower the affective filter. The low affective filter helps learners to learn and acquire second language successfully (Krashen, 1982, 1988).

**Students Feel Confident in Their Ability to Write**

After engaging in the writing class that creates a stress-free environment that promotes social discourse, the students feel confident in their ability to write. The stress-free environment lowers the students’ affective filters (Krashen, 1982). The students, particularly the low proficiency students, such as Fuada, Pat, and Wat, grew and felt confident in their writing. They were proud of themselves when they produced a full page of writing. They felt that they could write in English after practicing more frequently. Besides free writing, participating in peer-response provides students the sociocultural practices of the community. The social discourse provides students a safe and support environment to explore and to practice so that they can make a transition from novices to experts (Vygotsky, 1978). In the support environment or social discourse, students feel safe to take risks and learn from their mistakes. As a result, students grow as confident writers.

**Writing Development**

Many educators and researchers found that teaching writing through the process approach enhances the students’ writing skills and language ability (Graves, 1983, 1994; Calkins, 1994; Zamel, 1982, 1983; Raimes, 1983, 1994, 1996; Fu, 2000; Chaisuriya, 2003). In this study, in order to confirm the students’ perception on their writing development, their writing works were analyzed. Overall, the students exhibited growth in terms of surface features, spelling and length,
which implies that, through process writing practices, their fluency in writing improves. However, the findings reveal that the students hardly develop crafting (organization, style and word choices). For language usage, there was the mixed result.

After going through a lot of practices in writing, the students in this study showed that they wrote more fluently. They wrote longer and had less spelling errors. The possible explanation for their development is that through writing, the students learned to express themselves freely and at the same time developed vocabulary. When they had the problem about spelling and new vocabulary, they used dictionaries to help them. With this strategy, the students made fewer errors on their spelling in the next drafts and in the next assignment. Fu (2000) states that when the learners are allowed to express themselves freely, such as through free writing, they can write more. Like Graves (1994), Murray (1985) and Fu (2000), Calkins (1994) says, “writing matters the most when it is personal” (p. 14). Although the students in this study could not choose their topic to write, they could choose their own style of writing and their language in their drafts. With general topics given, the students were still allowed to express their thoughts freely and this made them write longer. In addition, the topics given for this writing course were related to personal experiences such as introducing yourself and past experience; they wrote personal stories and they could choose which information or experiences they wanted to convey to the readers. As a result, they wrote better and longer.

According to the students’ writing work, the students did not show much improvement in terms of crafting (organization, writing style, and word choices). One of the possible reasons is related to their educational background or lack of the knowledge of English writing which I will discuss in details in the section of factors affecting the students’ writing development. Another possible reason that the students did not show much progress in organization is that all writing
assignments they did were personal style writing. There were only two genres of writing: description and narration. The students did not practice other types of writing. Therefore, they were not aware of the organization of English writing when they wrote. When they described their stories, they tended to organize their stories chronologically. For essay format and paragraph pattern, the students particularly the low English proficiency did not show the knowledge of the paragraph format. The high English proficiency sometimes did have paragraph format (opening and closing statements). In addition, the teacher did not emphasize the organization. The students focused only on their content and language. The only writing that showed the students’ development in crafting was the fifth assignment. The students showed improvement in organization and writing technique (using dialogues in their writing) when they revised their drafts. This is because of much writing practice as well as receiving useful feedback from their peers, finally in the fifth assignment; they showed much improvement on writing overall.

For language, the students’ development was not consistent. They tended to make grammatical mistakes when the topic was complex. And each assignment did not test the same grammatical structures; it was hard to trace the students’ development in terms of language. For each unit, the students learned new grammar and sentence structures. The students made new grammatical errors when they wrote a new story. However, the students became aware of some grammatical structures such as subject-verb agreement, and the forms of verbs in past tense. The explanation for their language development can be related to their English proficiency (Cumming, 1989; Kubota, 1998; and Sasaki & Hirose, 1996) which will be discussed in the factors affecting the students’ writing performance.
In general, what have been achieved during 15-week writing course is found in the students’ attitude and writing perception, and in their writing development. First, the students’ attitude towards writing in English improved. They were not afraid to write and try new language or writing strategies in their writing. Their perception of writing changed. They perceived that writing is multiple drafting and the first draft is not necessary to be the complete draft. This perception helped the students learn to write without pressure and fear of language correction.

In addition, the students’ writing improves at a certain level. Mainly, the students in this study developed their writing skills at a surface level rather than the higher level, such as organization. Moreover, their knowledge of English language did not show much improvement. The students still made similar grammatical errors when they wrote a new topic. This suggests that the teachers should also pay attention in students writing development and the knowledge of English language when they implement the new approach that focuses on the process of writing.

It is important for the students particularly ESL/EFL students to learn both how to write as a process and how to use language to produce the acceptable text (Raimes, 1996). Similarly, Cahyono (2002) and Tsang and Wong (2000) argue that in writing workshops with emphasis on students’ expression and creation, the teacher should also provide the students the knowledge of linguistic aspects of writing in order to enhance their writing ability.

**Cultural and Instructional Frustrations**

Importing an innovative instruction, particularly the one from the western academic setting, to the ESL/EFL setting may lead to the culturally and socially sanctioned basis of teaching and learning (Edge, 1996). We learn a foreign language to communicate with the native speakers of the target language. Since language is part of a culture and vice versa, language and culture cannot be separated from each other (Chowdhury, 2003). According to Hall (1997), we use language to practice culture. Teaching and learning is embedded and is shaped by culture;
therefore, the teacher should be aware of cultural issues in their pedagogical practices. In fact, culture is often neglected or mostly overlooked in the language classroom (Damen, 1987). Besides teachers’ professional, social and cultural identities involve in their pedagogical practices. To implement a new teaching approach or pedagogy in EFL situation, teachers have to understand the mismatch and an unobtrusive assimilation of the two cultures (Chowdhury, 2003) so that they can help students reduce or overcome cultural and instructional frustration as teachers infuse innovative writing instruction into the existing curriculum.

To expose to an innovative writing instruction, the students in this study experienced frustrations due to the mismatch, the cross-road, and lack of knowledge. The students had to struggle with the tension or contradiction caused by sociocultural influences although they felt comfortable with this writing class.

**Cross-roads: Thinker versus Examination**

As mentioned above that the exist curriculum and syllabus is one of the constraints that the teacher and the students encountered. The conflict between the nature of the curriculum and the new writing instruction can cause students cultural and instructional frustration. The students in this study experienced this frustration while they engaged in the activities, such as free writing, peer-response and revision. The curriculum is compatible with the product-based approach, whereas the new writing instruction is based on process-based approach. The conflict occurs when the students are trained to think and express their ideas freely, but they have to pass the examination that emphasizes the grammar and sentence structure.

Although the teacher somehow prepared the students to deal with the grammar part of the examination, the students felt frustrated when they have to choose between the grade and their growth in writing. After the students took the midterm examination, they began to concentrate more on linguistic features when they revised and gave feedbacks to their peers. The
examination reminded the students the real situation they had to face. The students were not sure that training to be a creative thinker only would help them pass the examination and get the better grade. Although they enjoyed this writing class and believed that they learn to write through the practices, they also wanted to pass the examination. Therefore, they felt insecure if the teacher rarely taught grammar and let them work more on the exercises in the textbook. This tension hinders the students’ cognitive growth and development. In this cross-road, the students need the teacher to help them go through the transition from inexperienced to experts and overcome the frustration.

Mismatch between Curriculum Instruction and Assessment

As discussed above, the mismatch between curriculum instruction and assessment causes the students’ frustration. According to the curriculum, writing is seen as grammar instruction. The controlled composition, correction of the product, and correct form are emphasized. On the contrary, process writing instruction gives emphasis to expression of ideas and creative process of writing. EFL students who are introduced to process writing have to confront the contradiction of the assessment which is compatible with product method. In this writing class the students felt that they were not sufficiently equipped for this type of assessment. After the midterm examination, the students paid more attention to grammar instruction. This mismatch may not be so crucial when compared to other constraints and obstacles in implementing an innovative writing instruction; however, it makes the students be afraid to move on to the next stage of becoming experts. They were caught between the product and process methods. To help the students cross over this difficulty and to reduce this tension, the teacher needs to cooperate with other teachers, the coordinator, and the administrator to make the assessment more compatible with the process writing instruction.
Mismatch with Cultural Norms

Chowdhury (2003) discusses the problems associated with the implementation of western teaching techniques. One of them is the incompatibility of imported pedagogies and the local needs and culture. The mismatch between the imported techniques and the local understanding and culture norms may limit the success in implementing imported teaching techniques in foreign language learning, such as in Asian EFL countries (Li, 1998).

The culture in Thailand is one that has a long traditional of unconditional obedience to authority which can be seen both in the family and in the education system. The teacher is seen as a source of knowledge. The teacher delivers the knowledge without any concession. In Thailand hierarchy determines the nature of teacher-students interaction. The students should pay respect to the teacher who is the authoritarian provider of knowledge in the classroom. The process writing which is student-centered and emphasizes the independent learning is incompatible with the product-based and teacher-centered tradition (Liu, 1998; Zhenhui, 2000).

Mismatch between the new writing instruction and cultural norms plays an important role in the way the students participate in the process writing activities, particularly peer-response and question-answer sessions. The students are afraid to give critical and constructive feedbacks because they are not used to giving comments or feedbacks. Besides, because they believe that only the teacher can give the correct and useful feedbacks, the students are not confident to give feedbacks especially on grammar. Moreover, due to their sociocultural background, the students are not confident in peers. Therefore, they are not able to create community of learners and writers. Cultural constraints inhibit the students’ growth in transmission from dependent learners to independent learners.
Factors Affecting EFL learners’ Writing Development

The findings from the interview and students’ writing assignments show that the students had difficulty in developing their writing skills. Many studies in teaching ESL/EFL writing show that the factors affecting the students’ writing development include second language (L2) proficiency (Cumming, 1989, 1994; Kubota, 1998; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), lack of knowledge of L2 writing or developmental factors (Mohan & Lo, 1985; Kim, 1983; Carson, 1982; Phongsuwan, 1996), and cross culture (Carson, 1994; Kaplan, 1996; Voges, 2001; Thongrin, 2002). The results of this study reveal that these factors hinder or delay the students’ writing development when they learn to write in this EFL class.

L2 Proficiency

Cumming (1989, 1994), Kubota (1998), and Sasaki and Hirose (1996) found that L2 proficiency has influence on the quality of writing. They argue that the students with low English proficiency skills such as knowledge of vocabulary and syntactic control tend to produce low quality of English text in organization, producing simple text and sentence structures (Kubota, 1998; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). Consistent with these studies, Aungpredathep (1989) found that the students with more proficiency in L2 wrote more fluently and longer text with the clearer and stronger sense of audience, compared with the lower proficiency students. The results from the interviews and the students’ writing works in this study confirm that L2 proficiency has influence on students’ writing development particularly for the low English proficiency.

The students in this study reported that their difficulty in English writing was their English proficiency. The most difficulties in their English proficiency that they encountered were grammar and vocabulary. The students found that they had a hard time to find the right English words for their thoughts when they transferred their thought into written text in English. They blamed their limited repertoire of English vocabulary. Moreover, they found that grammar
especially the use of tenses was their problem when they wrote their stories. Without sufficiency understanding and control in the L2, the students applied English rules incompletely in their English texts and produce grammatical errors in their writing (Kubota, 1998). The students in this study tended to misuse the rule of English when they wrote. With limitation of exposure to English materials, the students’ vocabulary was limited. Using dictionary to find English words does not help the students to provide the right words when they express their complicate thoughts in English.

To help EFL learners improve their writing skills, the teachers have to provide them sufficient English materials in order to increase their exposure to authentic materials and gain more understanding on how English is used in the written texts. With teacher’s assistance in explanation and analysis of the use of English in the texts, EFL learners will learn English through writing.

Lack of Knowledge in English Writing

Mohan and Lo (1985) argue that the lack of knowledge in English writing which is one of the factor affecting L2 writing ability is related to the students’ educational experience (developmental factors). They argue that the way ESL/EFL write in English is related to the way they were taught in English classroom. Most English instructions in Asia such as Thailand, Japan, Korea, and China, are grammar-based and focus on sentence level rather than discourse level (Kim, 1983; Mohan & Lo, 1985; Phongsuwan, 1996). Writing in these classrooms is treated as the reinforcement of grammar practice. The students in these countries rarely expose to the English written texts and they are not taught to develop logical argument and logical organization when they write in English. These two aspects are important for English writing. Without being taught how to organize their thoughts logically and limitation of writing practice,
EFL students tend not to develop their higher skills in writing such as organization to meet the expectation of English writing.

The students in this study had similar problem when they learn to write in English in this class. According to their educational background, they rarely exposed to English materials and they were not taught English writing skills. Although in this writing class the students had more chances to practice writing, again the teacher did not teach them the composing process, and writing strategies. The lack of knowledge in English writing hinders the students to develop their writing skills to the higher level. The students improve only the surface level and also produce simple texts. They are not aware of the logical organization of their thoughts. For EFL writing instruction, the teacher should learn the students’ educational background and how they were taught in English classroom in order to understand their difficulties. In addition, the teachers should teach EFL students the composing process and English writing skills so that they will be able to develop their writing ability to meet the English readers’ expectation.

Cross-culture

More studies (Carson, 1994; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999; Ramanathan & Kaplan; Kennedy, 2000; Voges, 2001; Thongrin, 2002) reveal that culture has influence in learning to write in second language. Cross culture has an impact on ESL/EFL students’ writing difficulties and on the way they cope with these difficulties. The influence of cross culture is also found in this study. While the students learn to write in English through the new approach, they had to encounter the cultural difference which had an impact on the way they responded to their peers’ writing and the way they participated in question-answer section.

Kennedy (2000) states that Thai culture promotes students’ passivity. She added, “[t]he Thai culture is remarkably deferential to people in authority roles and it is very difficult for most Thai to speak out in the presence of an authority” (p. 78). As a result, Thai students tend to be
passive and rarely engage in critical thinking. In this writing classroom, the culture aspect has an impact on the way the students participate in Q-A sessions. The students, particularly those in the back of the room, did not speak out to the teacher because it was considered rude. They unlikely shared their opinions unless the teacher asked them to, or unless they were confident that their opinions were worth to share. This concept also impacts the way the students responded to their peers’ writing. Because they were trained to trust and respect the teacher as the expert, the students were afraid to give their feedback especially in terms of grammatical errors. On one hand, they believed that only the teacher could correct their mistakes; on the other, they thought that their English proficiency was limited, compared to the teacher, and they did not believe that their peers could correct their mistakes. With this concept, the students gained less benefit from peer responses.

Another cultural concept that tended to play an important role in leaning to write of the students in this study is “khrung jai” (to be considerate). Thongrin (2002) discusses this concept in her study that Thai students were reluctant to give their feedbacks which they thought they might impose upon their peers’ feeling. As a result, they gave short and general feedbacks and they felt that they did not gain much benefit from their peers’ feedbacks. After Thongrin explained to them the purpose of peer response and how their feedbacks could help their peers revise their work, the students felt less frustrated when they gave the feedbacks to their peers and they learned to give sincere and constructive feedbacks which helped both the writers and the readers learned to revise their work better. The students in this study felt frustrated too when they had to give feedbacks to their peers. Some of them felt that they did not want to give harsh feedbacks to their peers who they did not know well because of “khrung jai” and did not want to hurt their feeling.
Unfortunately, the teacher in this study was not aware of the cross-cultural impact on the students when they learned to write and engaged in the activities in this class. Teachers should pay more attention when they introduce a new approach that may cause the cross-cultural issue to their students. The way to help the students overcome the cross culture is that the teachers have to explain to the students the purpose of the activities and how they can engage in those activities. For example, like Thongrin (2002), when teachers introduce peer response to Thai students, they should explain the purpose and how the students will gain the benefits from sincere and constructive feedbacks. Clear explanation will reduce the students’ frustration and help them develop the strategies to cope with the difficulties caused.

To implement a new approach to EFL students like Thai students, there are some factors affecting the students’ writing development and the way they engage in the new activities. According to this study, the factors that have influence on the students learning to write are second language proficiency, lack of the knowledge of writing in English, and cross culture. In order to help the students overcome these hindrances, the teacher should provide the students with sufficient assistance in language and writing skills as well as help them adapt themselves and overcome their frustrations by giving them clear explanation about the new approach. With the teachers’ assistance, the implement of a new approach like the process approach to EFL students can be successful.

In conclusion, this study suggests that it is possible to implement the new writing approach like the process approach in EFL contexts. The teacher can make it work by giving explicit and extensive instruction when they introduce a new approach and new activities. Through writing instruction that focus on the learner, the students can learn how to write with the concept of writing as a process, they can develop their writing skills to higher level if the teachers help them
learn and overcome the factors affecting their writing ability. In addition, to make the most benefit out of the teaching instruction, the writing lessons should provide the learners both knowledge of English writing (linguistic knowledge, discourse structure, and writing strategies) and the process of writing (how to write and revise their work). Finally, teachers should be aware of cultural differences that exist between the target culture and the local culture so that they can help their students overcome the mismatch with the cultural norms.

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study show that it is possible to implement the new writing approach like the process approach into EFL classrooms. However, the teachers need to adapt and adjust the instruction to meet the students’ needs and to recognize the local constraints. In order to implement the new approach more successful, I present the implications for ESL/EFL writing classes.

First, it was evident that the students in this writing class had positive responses to this writing instruction and they found that their writing develop when they had more opportunities to write. Therefore, it is important for the ESL/EFL teacher to provide the students opportunities to practice writing more frequently. Moreover, the teacher should promote free writing or with general prompts for the students to express themselves freely and are willing to write more. With freedom to choose their own topic or their own stories, EFL students felt that they did not write just for the course assignment, but they write for themselves.

Second, ESL/EFL teachers should provide explicit instruction in writing strategies and activities they introduce to the students. With clear instruction, the students will be able to develop their writing skills and engage in the activities more effectively. Without the clear instruction, the students may find the activities such as peer response and revision not much helpful for their writing development due to the obstacles they have such as L2 proficiency.
Third, for developing effective skills of revising and peer response, the students should be trained of how to perform these activities and understand concepts of these activities including the purpose and the benefits they will gain when they employ these activities. The teachers should be modeling how to give constructive feedbacks, how to ask questions, and how to revise their works. Along with modeling, the students should be provided assistance while they are writing. Conferring is a strategy that the teachers can use to help the students learn how to solve the problem while they are writing.

Fourth, the students should be prepared for writing lessons in both knowledge of English writing and the process of writing. It was evident that the students in this writing class did not develop their writing skills as much as they should because of the impact of L2 proficiency and the lack of knowledge of English writing. Therefore, promoting only process of writing is not sufficient to help ESL/EFL students learn and develop their writing ability. Mini lessons can be used to provide the students linguistic knowledge and writing strategies along with practicing writing.

Finally, from the results of the study for ESL/EFL composition theory, another element that I think the teachers and educators should take into account are cultural constraints or cultural differences. Culture is not only referred as the social or educational culture, but it includes the contrastive rhetoric or the convention of L2 writing that may affect the way the students learn to write in L2. I adapt Berlin’s four elements for teaching L1 composition by including the fifth element for approaches to teaching L2 composition (see Figure 7-1). ESL/EFL students and the teacher need to be aware the impacts of the students’ culture to the students’ writing development. Reducing cross cultural hindrance will help the students improve their writing skills more easily and effectively. With explicitly explanation how the cross culture affects their
writing ability and their engagement in writing activities like peer response, the students will find their ways to cope with this constraint.

![Diagram of L2 composition approaches](image)

**Recommendations for Further Studies**

Since this study only focused on one teacher and her writing class, it cannot be generalized that it will be successful when ESL/EFL teachers implement or apply an innovative approach in their English writing classes due to several factors, such as L2 proficiency, teacher’s background in that approach, and students’ educational background. It is worthwhile for ESL/EFL teaching
and learning to further explore in this area to fill the gap of teaching writing in ESL/EFL classrooms.

First for Thai educators and researchers, it is worthwhile to conduct the similar study in order to explore how the other Thai teachers implement the innovative approach in their writing class and how successful they are in terms of students’ perceptions and their English writing ability.

Second, it is interesting and will provide full understanding in ESL/EFL writing instruction if the researchers will also investigate the students’ process of writing and revising, and the teachers’ perception of the implementation of process writing approach in order to gain the better understanding how a new writing approach affects the students’ growth as writers and their writing development.

Third, for teacher training programs, it will be beneficial for both the teachers and the program administrators to conduct the study exploring the follow-up project with the school teachers who are trained by the innovative approach to see how they implement the new approach and what the constraints or hindrances they have when they implement it in their classes. The results from the study will provide the program administrators with information to develop the program and to help the teachers solve the problem if they have so that they will be able to adapt and adjust their teaching instruction to suit the students’ need and the teaching context.

Fourth, if this new approach is possible to help Thai students learn to write in English (L2), it should help Thai students learn to write and develop their writing skills in Thai which is their first language. It is worthwhile to use this writing approach to teach Thai writing or other L1 writing in order to explore how it would impact on their L2 writing development.
According to teacher’s constraints, Ms. B did not implement the writing workshop in her writing class. Samway (2006) states,

Although students are exposed to writing experience, often associated with a writing workshop (e.g. drafting and revising), none of the teachers had established a writing workshop and they did not incorporate minilessons, conferences, or authors’ chairs, and students rarely had choice over what they would write about. In fact, many writing assignments were aligned with the state test, which emphasized a five-paragraph essay (p. 159).

It is interesting to implement the writing workshop in my writing class with the similar teaching context and environment to that of Ms. B and to do the research in order to explore how I can adapt this approach to suit my students’ background and their needs as well as to help them learn to write and become writers. It will be worthwhile if it is possible to implement a writing workshop in EFL setting. The information we will gain will help us as teachers and researchers understand the constraints affecting the way teachers implement an innovative writing instruction, and how to help the teachers adapt their teaching instruction and style to promote writing workshops in EFL writing instruction.

Although this study did not plan to evaluate the students’ writing product, the findings reveal that the students’ writing improves in some aspects at some degree. It will be worthwhile to study the improvement of students’ writing product such as linguistic features, organization, and style of writing when they experience the process writing approach. Pre-and post-test as well as the students’ assignments should be used to investigate the growth of their writing ability.

Finally, in this present study, sociocultural aspects play a crucial role in the way the students participate in writing activities and interact with their peers when they engage in peer-response. Further studies, particularly in ESL/EFL settings, should take into consideration the role of sociocultural influences on implementation of innovative teaching techniques, such as process writing approach. More advanced research on how sociocultural factors affecting
achievement in implementing the imported pedagogies and how teachers and students involve in the transmission of culture should be investigated. The information from these further studies will provide valuable information to fill the gap about ESL/EFL composition approaches.

**Summary**

This study aimed to explore the writing classroom where the teacher implemented or adapted an innovative approach in her writing class. The study focused on the students’ responses to this writing instruction. The impacts of writing instructions on the students’ writing development were also investigated. This chapter presented the main conclusion of the findings found in this study. Firstly, the writing instruction of this writing class was discussed to provide understanding how the teacher implemented the new approach, what the constraints she had when she implemented it, and what the teacher could do better under the constraints. The second part concluded the main findings from the students’ responses. The main conclusions included: 1) writing practices, 2) writing development, 3) cultural and instructional frustrations, and 4) the factors affecting EFL learners’ writing development. This chapter ended with the implications for practices and the recommendations for further studies.
APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

Project Title:
The study of Experience of Thai Teachers and their Students in English Writing Classroom where Process Writing Is Implemented

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:
The purpose of this study is to investigate how Thai students and the teachers experience and learn to write in English classroom where process writing is implemented. The study focuses on how the students perceive and respond on writing process approach. Also, the experience of the teachers who introduce this approach in their English writing classroom will be explored. The study will focus on how they experience and respond on the implementation of process writing approach.

What you will be asked to do in the study:
You will be observed in an English writing class. You may be asked for an interview about how you learn to write in English and how you perceive the process writing approach used in your classroom. You may be asked to provide your writing for making a copy and being used as one source of data collection.

Time required:
The observation will depend on the class schedule. The interview should be completed in about 45 minutes, but may last longer depending on how much details you wish to convey.

Risks:
No more than minimal risk.

Benefits/Compensation:
There are no anticipated benefits from participation. There will be no compensation for participation. Participation or non-participation will have no effect on your grade in the class.

Confidentiality:
With your permission, the interview will be audio taped. A researcher will transcribe the tape, and all person identifiers will be removed. Your identity will be confidential to extent provided by law. Only the researcher and the supervisor or this study will have access the transcript of my interview, and copies of your writing. Some of what you say and part of your writing may be
quoted in reports, term papers, a dissertation, or other publications, but you will never be identified by name.

**Voluntary participation:**

Participation is completed voluntary. You can refuse to answer any questions.

**Right to withdraw from the study:**

You can withdraw your consent and participation in the study at any time without consequence.

**Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:**

Researcher: Jiraporn Dhanarattigannon  
304 Diamond Village, Apt. # 6  
Gainesville, FL 32603  
Telephone: (352) 846-5817  
Email: ji@ufl.edu

Or 86/2 Chalermsook 5 k.  
Chorakhebua, Ladprao, Bangkok 10230  
Thailand  
Telephone: (662) 570-6829  
Email: jiraporndh@hotmail.com

My supervisor is Danling Fu, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
University of Florida  
Tel: (352) 392-9191 x 240  
Email: danlingfu@coe.ufl.edu

**Whom to contact about your rights in the study:**

UFIRB Office, PO Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250:  
Phone: (352) 392-0433

**Agreement:**

I have read and understand the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Principal Investigator: ______________________________ Date: __________________
APPENDIX B
GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Students Interview Question Guide (First Interview)

1. Please tell me about your writing experience both in writing in Thai and in English. How were you taught to write both in Thai and in English?

2. Have you written anything at home, not for class assignments? If so, what did you write?

3. How would you describe yourself as a writer?

4. What makes you feel frustrated when you write, particularly in English?

5. What kinds of difficulty or obstacles do you experience when you write in English?

6. What is the best essay you have written? What makes it the best?

7. What is the worst essay you have written? What makes it the worst?

8. Who is/was your favorite writing teacher? What makes her/him your favorite?

9. In your opinion, what is a good writing?

10. What is your purpose or goal for taking this writing class?

11. What do you think about this English writing class in general?
Students Interview Question Guide (Second Interview)

1. What do you think about the mid-term test?

2. In your opinion, what is the relationship between the teaching/learning of writing and the mid-term test?

3. What are the activities employed in this writing class? Could you describe them?

4. So far, what do you think of the activities in this class? (purpose, understanding, engagement, like or dislike)
   a) free style writing 
   b) question-answer, orally and written
   c) journal writing 
   d) peer-response, peer-editing
   e) revising 
   f) editing
   g) reflective writing

5. Are there any activities used in this class that you like? What are they? Please describe what it is that you like about them?

6. Are there any activities used in this class that you dislike? What are they? Please explain why you dislike them?

7. Compared with other writing classes that you taken before, what makes this class different from the former ones?

8. In this class, what have had impacts on your writing skills or performance? (benefits, obstacles, confusion or frustration)

9. Since the first day, what have you changed especially in terms of learning to write and your writing performance?

10. How does this class fulfill your expectation that you had before taking this course?

11. So far, what would you like the teacher to do or improve in terms of teaching this class?
Students Interview Question Guide (Third Interview)

1. What do you think about the final examination?

2. Based on your experiences in this class, what did you apply to your writing for the test?

3. What do you think about the interaction between the teacher and the students in this class?

4. Did you participate in any activities in this class? If you did, how? If not, why not?

5. Please describe your writing process in this class.

6. Did you use Thai in your writing? If you did, how often and why? If not, why not?

7. What do you think about group work?

8. What do you think about exchanging your work with your peer?

9. What do you think or feel when the teacher orally read the students’ story in the class?

10. In your opinion, what is the role of the teacher and the students in this writing class?
    Please explain.

11. What changes do you perceive in yourself particularly in terms of writing ability as a result of participating in this writing class?

12. In your opinion, what should a writing class be to help the students improve their writing skills?

13. What do you think of this writing class? (Strengths, weaknesses, things you like the teacher to do or improve in terms of teaching this class, applications to the learners and to other writing class)

14. What are your last words about this class?
**Teachers Interview Question Guide (First Interview)**

1. Please tell me your personal, educational and teaching background.
2. Could you tell me about your experience teaching writing?
3. How do your teaching beliefs about writing affect your teaching instruction?
4. How does your education in a western country affect your beliefs?
5. What are your conceptions about teaching and learning, particularly in term of language learning?
6. What are your conceptions about teaching writing?
7. What is good writing?
8. Are you a writer yourself? If so, what kinds of writing do you do?. And what kinds of difficulties do you experience when you write?

**Teachers Interview Question Guide (Second Interview)**

1. How have you planned for each class?
2. Why do you limit the scope of the student’s question?
3. Are there any difficulties or obstacles you encounter when you use this teaching approach? Please identify them and explain why you think they are obstacles?
4. What student feedback have you gotten for this writing class, particularly in terms of process approach/activities?
5. Please describe the students, and your perception of students’ background in writing. How are the students doing in class? How do they respond to your teaching approach?
APPENDIX C
PERSONAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire has two main parts: personal background and writing background. Please fill out the following blanks. You can answer in Thai or in English if you feel comfortable.

I. Personal Background

1. First name: ______________________ Last name: ____________________________
   Age: ___________ Sex:   Male [        ]   Female [        ]
   Place of birth: ____________________ Native language: _______________________
   Other language(s) that you know: __________________________________________

2. School Year: _________ Major: ___________________________________________
   Minor: ___________________ Department/Faculty: ___________________________
   University: _________________________ GPA: _____________________________
   Grade of English: ________ Expected grade in the current English class: _______

3. How many years have you studied English as a foreign language?
   ______________________________________________________________________

   How many periods/hours per week did you study English at school or university?
   ______________________________________________________________________

   How many English courses are you taking this semester? What are they?
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
4. Besides at school, where have you studied English? (You can choose more than one answer)
   ____ At private English school/institute. How often? _______________________
   ____ At home (by yourself). How often? _______________________

5. Do you like to read? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   How often do you read per week? _______________________

What kinds of books or texts do you read?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of texts</th>
<th>How often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ Textbooks written in Thai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Textbooks written in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Thai newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ English newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Thai novels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ English novels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Thai magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ English magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Research journals (Thai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Research journals (English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Cartoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Others. Please identify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________
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II. Writing

A. Writing at home

1. Do you like to write (both in Thai and in English)?

[ ] Yes in ___________________________  [ ] No

How often do you write per week or per month?

____________________________________________________________________

2. What kind of text do you write?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of texts</th>
<th>Thai/Eng</th>
<th>How often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ a list</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ an assignment/paper</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a poem</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a diary/journal</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a short answer</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a story</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a novel</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ a cartoon</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ others. Please identify.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
<td>T/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please describe your experience in writing. How have you been taught to write both in Thai and in English?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

4. Please describe/identify any difficulties or obstacles you have experienced when you write:

- in Thai: ______________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________

- in English:  ___________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________
  _____________________________________________________________________

5. What is good writing according to your knowledge and understanding?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
6. Who is your favorite writing teacher? Please explain why she/he is your favorite?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

7. If you are going to write a story, an essay, or an assignment, what is your writing process?

Please describe how you write from the beginning until you finish it.
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

☺ Thank you for your cooperation ☺
APPENDIX D
SAMPLE OF FIELD NOTE SHEET

**FIELD NOTES**
Ms. B 1/2004
May 31, 2004 – 17 October 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Notes</th>
<th>Personal Notes/Comments</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
SAMPLE OF DOMAIN ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

1. Semantic Relationship: ______________________________________

2. Form: ____________________________________________________

3. Example: _________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural questions: _____________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural questions: _____________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural questions: _____________________________________________________
APPENDIX F
STUDENTS’ WRITING SAMPLES

First Drafts

Low English Proficiency Students

Wat’s writing:

June 1, 2004

My name is (name). I 22 years old. I study at Kasetsart University. My faculty of Engineering. I come from Nakronphanom. I stay at nhamwongvasn cord apartment. It opposite Kasetsart University in ngamwongwan Rd. I like play guitar and watch Television in free time. And I like football but I don’t like bas. My birthday is 10\textsuperscript{th} June 1981. I holp to graduate in this year. (66 words, 7 lines)

June 28, 2004

Khanchai. He is my friend, because he studies in faculty of Engineering. He gets up at 7.30 a.m. He studies at 9.00 am until 16.30 p.m. He likes sport at all but he likes most football and I think he sleep less, because ____ ____ _____ is football Europe in Potugade. He is quiet. Oh! at night in free time is ____ He reads a cartoon book and listen to the radio. (72 words, 7 lines) ( ‘___’ indicates the word that was not readable.)

July 6, 2004

JAPAN

Introduction to Japan. Japan have total area 377835 sqkm. Japan includes Bonin Islands, Daito Shoto Minami-jima and Voteno Islands. Japan have water area 3091 sqkm. Japan slightly smaller than California. Japan have 127,214,499 people. Generation 10-14 years 14.4%, 15-64 years: 67% and over than 64 years 18.6%. location of Japan is Eastern Asia, island chain between the North Pacific Ocean and the Sea of Japan, east of the Korean Peninsula. Natural in Japan have negligible mineral resources, fish and many dormant and some active volcanoes about 1500 and have a lot hazards seismic occurrences every year. Climate of Japan various from tropical in south to cool temperate in north. Most Japanese like to eat sushi every time. Highest point of Japan at Fuji Mountain about 3,776 M. =>ญี่ปุ่นมีต้นไม้ประจำชาติคือ ดอกซากุระ ซึ่งเป็นต้นไม้ที่สวยงามมากเมื่อมันออกดอก และเป็นประเทศที่มีต้นไม้ที่สวยงามมากเพราะเป็นประเทศ ประเทศญี่ปุ่นเจ้าเชื้อเรียงการตกปลาและญี่ปุ่นก็เป็นประเทศที่มีเอกลักษณ์ทางด้านอาหารตัวแสวงอาหารคือ ซูชิ กิโมโน และมีนักรบคือพวกซามูไร (The last part was written in Thai. Translation: Japan’s national flower is Sagura (Cherry Blossom) which is very beautiful when it blooms. And it has a lot of coastal area because Japan is a group of islands. Japan has a reputation for fishing and its unique artifact is a beautiful national dress called Kimono. Also, Japan has warriors called Samurai.) (249 words, 25 lines)

August 19, 2004
Back in seventeen years ago. I studied at Nakaephadungratchagitjharern school, Nakae Nakhonphanom. I had many friends when I was young. I have ever been cry when my mother hit me because I did not go to school. When I studied in M.4. I love beautiful girl so much but I broken heart when I saw she walking with her boyfriend. That I studied very hard for Entrance Examination. But had one subject I did not understand very much was English although I love it. 3 years later I could study in water resources Engineering. My life was changing very much. Because I met many people and many friends. They were very nice for me. But someone I felt so good in my mind. Ann she beautiful girl and she help me everything she could. So I will make everything for her too. (142 words, 14 lines)

August 31, 2004

Last year, I went to Changmai with my friends. Chaing Mai was a large city in north of Thailand. There are also famous tourist sites when I reached Chaing Mai has cold weather. The weather about 10°C. I thought weather was good for me because I loved cold weather. In first day I and my friends went to Doi Intanon. It was highest mountain of Thailand and then I went to market in Chaing Mai. We started shopping food and silk for took it to our family and then. We relaxed in this town for went back home in the morning. Then we went home by train but train was late but I did not serious because this trip is so good for me. (124 words, 12 lines)

Tit’s writing:

June 1, 2004

My name is (name). I’m born in เชียงราย I’m study at Faculty of Engineering. I’m a senair I like to play football. At time I study very hards เพื่อจะจบการศึกษาในปีนี้. I don’t ถนัดภาษา English. But I try to study English Because English is สำคัญใน life ประจําวัน. I live in Bangkok with My Father and Mother. I don’t have brother and sisther. I’m very happy in Major water resources Engineering. My hobby is playing football and listen to the music and sometime I play snooker. (97 words, 9 lines)

June 22, 2004

Nattawee is a student. He studies in the Faculty of Engineering. He often gets up at 7.00 a.m. or 10.30 a.m. because in the week he studies in the morning 3 day and studies in the afternoon 2 day.

When he finish studies, he usually plays football with your friends. Next he goes to home. he has dinner at 7.30 p.m. after that he usually watches television or plays computer game. Finally, He goes to bed in the midnight.

On Saturday and Sunday He usually goes to see a movie and shopping with my friend. (95 words, 10 lines)
July 6, 2004

China has area 9,596,960 sq km. The National name is Zhonghua Remmin Gongheguo. The China’s President is Hu Jintao. China’s total population was estimated at 1,298,847,624 with a density of 351 people per square mile. The capital is Beijing city. China’s language is Chinese, Mandarin, also local dialects. The Religious in China is Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism. The Natural resources in China is coal, iron ore, petroleum, natural gas, mercury, tin, tungsten, antimony, manganese aluminum and hydropower. The major trading partners with China is U.S., Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Germany

Beijing is the nation’s political, economic, cultural and educational center. (103 words, 14 lines)

August 3, 2004

Past Experience

I hated to lean in English. Because It’s hard. In M1-M6 I never happy for learn English I unkonw vocabulary and grammar. It’s สับสนวุนวาย. At Year One I started at Eng I. I past by study 1 เทอม, Eng II, I drop 1 ครั้ง and past in ครั้งที่ 2. I past Eng II at summer year Two. I very study hard. for English but It don’t help for my English well. Now I try to study in English Writing I and I think English is essential for my life. I’m very happy for study in English writing because it makı I funny for learn.

In Year One, I was study in Eng I. There are some thing to learn เหมือน I started from 0 to 1 ใหม่. Because เทอมมา from ป 1 to ม 6, I never รู้เรื่องอะไรเลย. At Entrance, ทําข้อสอบมั่วไดมา 45 คะแนน

I study Eng I with อ.บุษบา she teach ความรู้พื้นฐาน and she teach ไม่กดดัน ทำให้พอมีความรู้ขึ้นมา บ้าง

In Eng II my teacher เปลี่ยนไป สอนเน้น grammar and vocab so I จึง drop and ลงใหม่ในเทอม ถัดไป I get D+ in English II (212 words, 18 lines)

August 19, 2004

When I was seven years old, I left out of home alone because I didn’t want to go to school. My father and mother weren’t know that. I left my home at 5.00 a.m. Everybody in my family were sleeping. I had a big bag and 500 B money in my pocket. I walked to the bus stop and randomly catched the bus. I didn’t know where the bus go. I sat beside the window and enjoyed the view outside. I didn’t fear anything because I was a little boy. I went to so many places, which I didn’t know. I went to the market and department store. It was a big adventure. A man looked at me surprisingly, they didn’t look my parents.

In the evening, while I was walking along the road, the policeman came to talk to me and asked me “who is coming with you”. I answered “I come alone” He took me to the Bangkhen Police Station and gave me something to eat. He asked me where is my home. I just only said “I
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don’t know” I stayed there untill late night. My mother came to see me and brang me home. She didn’t say anything, but I felt guilty. I will not did anything like this again.

This story is the bad thing that I did, when I was young. (227 words, 22 lines)

**Fuada’s writing:**

*June 1, 2004*

Hello, My name is (name). Surname _____. Now I leanning in Engineering Faculty at 5 year. My nickname is “Benz”, but My friend tell to me “Ylck” (หยิก) I’m very happy take cross in class. by the way in freedom I have to see the movie and sometime I tour ต่างจังหวัด and I like drive a car on myself (60 words, 6 lines)

*June 22, 2004*

In the morning’s day, he go to study. he get up at 8.00 am. but he study in afternoon he get up at 11.00 am. he usually take motorbike to class in a herry. After he finish the class in the morning then he have a breakfast before he study English from 11.00 am. untill 12.30 pm. and he has freetime to 4.00 pm. So he go his room at 10.p.m. for watch television and he take his homework. he go to sleeps at 2.00 a.m. (86 words, 8 lines)

*July 6, 2004*

Hong kong is interesting city. because it is เศรษฐกิจพื้นที่ Economic, Island, with shops selling currous, clothing, accessories and more. อีกทั้ง Hong kong ีมีชื่อเสียงด้าน Chinese foods. เพื่อนจาก more 96 percent of the population is Chinese. In Kowloon you can พบกับสิ่งต่าง่ายางมากมาย Chiang Hiseasons is winter, is dry ans cool, with an average temperature of 17°C, but it sometime has snows. Hong kong Island has a combined area is 2,916 square kilometers, of which 1,004 square kilometers are land. The main land is hilly. Now, Hong kong has no forests and very little in the way of natural fauna and flora. (109 words, 11 lines)

*August 3, 2004*

Past Experience

I were studied English since ชั้นอนุบาล. It’s start ภาษาอังกฤษ A-Z and learned to easy a vocabulary. On ชั้นประถม, I learned a sentence for example “this is a book.” But I don’t like it. So ไม่ตั้งใจเรียน. เมื่อขึ้นชั้นมัธยม I were studied to pass a day. and ฉันกลับมาคิดไดเมื่อเขามหาวิทยาลัยว่า ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นสิ่ง สำคัญ จึงอยากจะเรียนให้รู้เรื่อง เพื่อนำไปใช้ในอนาคต

I starts studied English in Kasatsard U. at Froundasion English I. I studied english together with friend’s major. My teacher is very nice woman but she sometime is cruel teacher but I have no fear because she’s pretty and I pass Eng I มหาวิทยาลัยสุข (128 words, 11 lines)
August 19, 2004

Dear Editor

Last Wednesday while I was doing my homework, my high school friend, Pat, called me. She told me that there was a party on Friday night because she would taken further her study in Australia and another friend Nut also was going to Japan. I felt very glad to hear my friend’s good news and I was a bit excited to meet all my old friends. Our party was held at Yatika on … Road. I went to buy some presents at Siam Square on the following day. After choosing the best presents for my two friends, I went back home by BTS (the sky train). On the train I met a very cute girl. I noticed that she had no company, so it would be my good opportunity to ask her number. I ignored my destination in order to get off the same station as her. Everything seemed to go on plan until her boy friend walked straight to her from the opposite side. Then they got off together and left me alone on train. I got so disappointed and found out the truth of an old saying “Don’t believe what you see” (196 words, 19 lines)

Intermediate Group

Kit’s writing:

June 1, 2004

Hello. I’m (name). I’m 18 years old. I study in Faculty of Fisheries. Major is Biology. I’m studying in Kasetsart University in second years. I was born in 1985. My birthday is September 11th. My house is in Bangkok. I’m single child. I studied at Mattayomwatmakutkasat school in high school. My hobby is swimming, play game and reading. I wish I will graduate in 4 years. And after I graduate I want to be Aquaculture breeder. I want to travel around the world for explorer the fish. That’s my dream. I have my friend who came from a same school to study Kasetsart University. My friend study in Faculty of Forestry. Another people study in Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Agriculture. I like watch the football. I cheer Liverpool and Real Madrid. But in Euro 2004 I cheer France to the champion. (143 words, 15 lines)

June 22, 2004

Hello! My friend name is Yutharpoom Keartumsom. His nickname is Yuth. His birthday is on May 8th 1989. He studies in the Faculty of Forestry. He comes from the same school. He has two sisters and one brother. His first sister works in Australia. Another sister works about law, but his brother is a student. His hobby is play trombone, play keybroad and listen the music. Everyday he gets up at 6 o’clock and takes a bath. Then he has breakfast. Next, he leaves his home at 6.30 a.m. He arrives university at 7.30 a.m. He starts study at 8 o’clock and finishes at 4 o’clock. In the evening he sometimes has dinner with his friend at Bar Mai. On Tuesday and Thursday evening he plays music at the family music, and on Wednesday he goes to wildlife club. Then he comes home at 8 o’clock. Next, he takes a bath and does his homework. After he finishes do his homework and reads the book. Finally he goes to bed at 11.30 p.m. That is his daily rountines. (178 words, 17 lines)
Switzerland

Switzerland is in west central Europe. It is covered by the Alps. Switzerland is one of the most mountainous countries of Europe, and are famous for visitor is the Matterhorn in Zermatt. Switzerland is famous for its many lakes, particularly those of the Alpine region, where the most important include Lake Geneva, Lake of Constance, Lake of Lugano and Lake Maggiore. On the plateau and lower valleys of Switzerland a temperate climate prevails with a mean annual temperature. The peaks of most mountain are snow-covered throughout the year. Especially in the Alps the bise, a cold northerly wind, predominates in the winter, and the foehn, a warm dry southeasterly wind, predominated during the rest of the year. The capital city is Bern, with a population. The Swiss people as a whole are mainly of Alpine, Nordic and Slavic or Diravic descent. The official languages of Switzerland are German, French, Italian and Romansh. But the most commonly spoken language is Schwyzertütsch (Swiss German). However, German is the language of many theater, motion picture and television product. (175 words, 20 lines)

Past Experience

First I started wrote A,B, C and spelled it at the nursery school. Next The teacher taught the vocabulary and gave me to spell and wrote it. When I’m pratom 1, I learned verb and sentence. I began wrote a sentence. Next I learned the grammar. I read the nation junior and listened a tape to จับใจความประโยค but I didn’t like it. I started learned the hard vocabulary, the many sentence and grammar ต่างๆที่สูงขึ้น

I started studied English II. I studied with new my friend. First I think English II harded but I started studied, I changed idea because the teacher teached enjoyable. I feeled enjoyable when I studied. But I was serious when I exam. I feeled I can’t make it. When ผลสอบออกมา I happy with my score. My teacher opened the tape and gave the student จับใจความ. I listened ไม่ค่อย รู้เรื่อง but I ก็แปลได้บางประโยค. The teacher gave his experience มาสอนผสมกับบทเรียนที่เรียนอยู่ Sometimes he spoke joke. I feel happy. (181 words, 17 lines)

This is my sad story. It began while I’m freshy In the days the phone rang. “Hello!” I said. “Bank! This is your uncle. Please give me says with your mother” uncle said. I send this telephone to my mother. After my mother said with my uncle. My mother told me “Your grandmother pose to a hospital.” At night my mother packed bag to visited her grandmother. In the morning she traveled by a train but I didn’t. Because I had the final exam. I felt terrible. After my mother visited her. She told me “Grandmother is better.” I felt happy. At night the phone rang. The uncle called to my mother. He said “Mother is coma.” My mother traveled again. I worried her condition. Soon my mother called to me. She said “Grandmother dead” I felt surprise after she told me. That day I felt very sad. (148 words, 14 lines)
Tanya’s writing:

June 1, 2004

My name is (name). My nickname is Eaw. I don’t have any brother or sister. I am 18 years old. I lived in Bangkok since I was young. I live with my mother and my father. I am joyful but sometimes easy to angry. I love Thai food very much especially “Tom Yum Kung”. Pop music is my favorite kinds of music. Now I am studying in Kasetsart University. I have studied in Kasetsart two years. My faculty is Economics. I want to be an Economist. My hobby is watching television, listen to radio, play computer. I have a dog. I love it very much. Its name is Romio. I love to sing a song with my friends when I have free time because it makes me so happy. I love to play tennis too. This is myself. (138 words, 13 lines)

June 22, 2004

Introduce your friend

Her name is Thaninee Chansuwan. She has two sisters and one brother. Now she studies in the faculty of Economics at Kasetsart University. She lives at Dormitory, which it’s far. So she must get up at six o’clock to study. She goes to the university by motorcycle because she has class at eight o’clock. She has lunch at Bar Mai, after that she will go to the library. When she backs her dormitory, she does her homework and watching television. Then she has dinner. She always reads books, listen to the radio before goes to bed. She likes watche television, listen to the radio for her free time. A singer in her heart is “Buachompoo Ford”. She likes to travel in Thailand. She used to be guide, but now she would like to be an Economist. In the future, maybe she is a Lawyer because she is going to study Law at Ramkhamhang university. (154 words, 15 lines)

July 6, 2004

I know Korea long time but I don’t know that “what is interesting thing in Korea?” I saw many beautiful places, lifestyle from television so I would like to find data about Korea. Korea is located on peninsula. It was a varied terrain, mountainous, river so Korea called that Land decorated with golden embroidery. The peninsula has been divided two part, the Republic of Korea in South and another North Korea. In South Korea, Han and Naktong rivers are responsible for lifestyle. About climate, Korea has summer, winter, spring and autumn. In summer, It has hot and long and in June, July and August have heaviest rains. In winter starts in November and lasts in March, but in winter North Korea is get severe more than South. About population, Korea success in family planning campaigns. In urban has many population and has many man power too. About places to visit, Korea has many places to visit such as Kanghwado Island. Kanghwado Island is Korea’s fifth largest island and rich in history and beautiful natural. Folk village is a traditional village. (180 words, 19 lines)
Past Experience

When I was a Matthayom student, I love to study English very much. I studied with a kind teacher. I like to answer her question. When I was a Matthayom 4 student, I must learn English with a foreign teacher. I was afraid of him. I didn’t like when he asked some question because I don’t understand. Since then, I don’t like English any more. I played with my friends when I was studying in class. When I had a test, I could not make it.

Since then, I tried to study and attention in English class. I think, The foreign teacher was a kind man. Since then, I felt good in English the same my first time.

When I was a Pratom student, I was very happy in English class. My teacher is very nice. She liked to teach with a game. It made me love to study. I had special study with her before I went back home. The student must have a story to tell our friends in English every day. I sometimes told my friends about my lifestyle, my background etc. I was very happy because I like to share my experience with my friend.

August 19, 2004

I went to Dremworld with my parents when I was in grade 7. That was the first time to go Dreamworld. We went by taxi. We arrived at Dreamworld in the afternoon. My father bought three tickets. After that we had lunch. I saw many clowns, waterfall, I told my mother “I would like to play the Space Mountain”. The Space Mountain is a kind of trains. I invited my mother and my father but my father didn’t play. I went in with my mother. A woman said “It looks like the sky, full of star”. We sat in the Space Mountain. “It mays run slowly” I said with my mother. Then the Space Mountain started running It was dark. I saw a lot of star. It was very beautiful. The Space Mountain ran up and down on the railway. Then it speed up. It ran fastly. My mother and I screamed loudly. The Space Mountain rotated. I didn’t see anything because I closed my eyes all the time. When I and my mother came out, we sat on a chair. My father asked me “Is it fun?” I answered “Yes”. My mother blamed me but I laughed. I never saw my mother screamed loudly like that. It was very fun.

Nini’s writing:

June 1, 2004

Introduce myself

My name is (name). I’m 19 years old. I’m studying at Kasetsart University. I’m studying Economics. My hometown is in Narathiwat. I have two sisters and one brother. My parents are shopkeepers but I want to be an Economist. Now I stay at dormitory. When I miss my parents, I will call them, watch TV or listen to the radio. I like pop music. My favorite singer is Buachomphoo Ford. She is pretty and sing a song very well. I like travelling very much. I want to go to Chiang Mai because it’s beautiful and there are many places.
June 22, 2004

Introduce my friend

Her name is Tanyasiri Jiratrakulmahasarn. Her nickname is Eaw. She is 18 years old. She doesn’t have sister and brother. She was born in Prae. Now she lives in Bangkok because her parents moved to live in Bangkok. She is studying in the faculty of Economics. Her major is Agricultural Economics. She must gets up early because she has class at 8 a.m. everyday. In the afternoon, she usually reads books, newspapers and magazines at the library. She comes back home at 4 p.m. Then she takes a shower and prepare dinner. Her hobby is collecting card phone. In her free time, she likes listening to the radio and playing tennis with her cousins. She has two dogs and she loves it very much. (125 words, 13 lines)

July 6, 2004

Australia

Australia is an island continent. It’s the world’s sixth-largest country. It has four seasons; summer, autumn, winter and spring. Australia’s population is about 18 million. The most populous states are New South Wales and Victoria. There are many interesting places to visit in Australia such as Blue Mountains, Jenolan Caves, Tamworth, Canberra, Parliament House, National Gallery of Australia and Kangaroo Island.

I want to go to Australia because it has many interesting places. I want to got to Kangaroo Island very much because it has many animals. I want to see kangaroos, koalas, dolphins and penguins. If I saw them, I would take photograph with them. I will visit Blue Mountains. It’s beautiful and cover with hazy. Although I want to learn languages in Australia. (125 words, 15 lines)

August 3, 2004

Past Experience

I started study English in Prathom 5 at Ban Sungaigo-lok School. I was excited when I started study English. My teacher is a kind man and I was enjoy. I like ทื่องศัพท์ and my teacher usually told us to write vocabulary. He sometimes divided us 3 or 4 groups to play games. When I studied in Mattayom 1, I join in English Camp. It was a new experience for me. There are many exchange students from Australia join in too. We are enjoy and do many activities.

I study English in Prathom 5 at Ban Sungaigo-lok School. My teacher’s name is Mr. Rassamee Mahamad. He is Muslim but he teach English very well. He is kind so I’m enjoy when I study English. He teach grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening and writing. He sometimes teach us to sing a song and play games such as crossword and dictation. It’s fun and don’t be serious. When I don’t understand he always explains until I know and understand. (167 words, 16 lines)
When I was 10 years old, I came to Bangkok with my father. It was the first time that I came to Bangkok by plane. I was glad when I known that I was going to Bangkok by plane. We got on the plane at the Had-Yai airport. When the plan flew in the sky, I was excited. “I’m a bird because I can fly.” I said. “How do you feel?” My father asked. ‘It’s very exciting.” I answered.

About ten minutes later, an air hostess explained how to use a parachute. Then she served food and drink. “She has a beautiful smile.” I said with my father. It took about one hour and half to fly from Had-Yai to Bangkok. When my father and I got off the plane, we went to my uncle’s home by bus. I was very tired, so I went to bed early.

A day later, my father and I went to visit many interesting places in Bangkok such as Wat Prakaew, Sanam Luang, Victory of Monument and Dusit Zoo. There are many kinds of animals at Dusit Zoo such as hippopotamus, bird, monkey, giraffe and zebra. I took photographs because I would show them to my mother and my sisters. Although it passed many years, I still remember it well. (216 words, 21 lines)

High English Proficiency Group

Sara’s writing:

June 1, 2004

My name is (name). My nickname is Earng. I am studying in Faculty of Humanities. My major is Thai. I come from Benchamatheputit Petchburi. My parents have three children, two girls and one boy, I am the first. When I am in here, I am staying at dormitory near the university. Now I am studying in English class. I meet many people but I don’t know “Who are they?” Sure! They are students. I am alone because my friend can’t add this section. If I drop I am afraid, I will tired next term. I feel happy when I study in this University Oh! I forgot. My teacher tells me introduce myself. I look like Chinese girl. My hair is black. I am quite shorts. I am cheerful when I am with my friends. I hate the lizard very much, its tail looks like the snake. I like eating an ice-cream very much because it is cool. I like shopping too. When I have a free-time, I like listening to the radio. It makes me to relax. I like green color, it shows the natural and the symbol of Kasetsart University. (191 words, 17 lines)

June 22, 2004

Her name is Lalisa Wannathim. She is nineteen years old. Her family have got five persons and they live in Pathumtanee. She likes football club very much. She studies in Faculty of Economics at Kasetsart University. Now she is the second years. She leaves home early morning because her house is so far. When it has the traffic jam, she always reads some books on the bus. When she arrives home. First, she takes a bath after that has dinner. Then she does her homework in her room. She likes to watch television for relax herself. Sometimes her brother tells her to teach his homework. It’s time to go to her room. Finally, she goes to bed and has a good dream. (122 words, 13 lines)
July 6, 2004

TURKEY

Turkey is an interesting country in the world. I think, it is a good country. Turkey is on the continent of Europe. It has seven river basins. Turkey has many regions and has different climates. The climates are cool, rainy winters and hot, dry summer. The precipitation is depending on location. The Black Sea coast receives the most of rainfall but the eastern past of that coast receives rainfall throughout the year. The temperature in the mountain is how and dry in Summer, so cool in Winter. The mountain of Turkey are inhospitable. During spring and autumn are sudden hot and cold occur. The climate in the Black Sea area is wet, warm and humid. Turkey’s population are 66.8 million. Istanbul has the largest population. Istanbul is the city of Turkey. It is an interesting place and attractive the people to visit. It has a beautiful sea and a beautiful basin. (151 words, 15 lines)

August 3, 2004

I studied English since I was in Pratom five. First time I enjoy studying very much. I thought, it was not difficult. I began study “A B C D…, What is your name? How are you?” It was easy. But my teacher was quite fix about grammar. It made me serious about it and scared when I wrote. When I was in Mathayom, I often wrote. I thought, it was difficult more than Pratom. I began describe about everything around me, added the information. It was different from Pratom. But my teacher was still fix about grammar. I did not like. I liked free style writing. It made me confident. Although, it mistaked.

In English Class, I like an English teacher. She teach different from the other teachers. The most of teacher quite fix grammar when the student writes. But she teaches easily. She opens the chance to write and don’t care about grammar. The students can write about everythings or free style writing. And I like very much, because I can write everything I think and don’t scare about grammar. And it don’t make me serious, when I am serious, I can’t write. The teacher is important for the student. This teacher makes me more confident in English writing. I feel happy when I study. (217 words, 23 lines)

August 19, 2004

The impression in my love (or not)

At first my attitude about love was not good. I had a bad popy love. It was in my primary time. I was in Pratom six. I liked a boy who was my friend in the same class and he liked me too. He took care me. He bought a necklace to me. I bought some gifts to him. We were happy until I told my mom that I had love. My mom did not angry me but she said. “You were young and you should concentrate in education, you could be friend with him.” I loved my mom more than him. I decided to tell him that I would be friend. After that, I did not talk with him and I felt, I feared love and I did not love anybody. My second love was in high-school. I studied in Mathayom five. I liked a man who was my senior at my school. He was a students’ chairman. I worked at
students’ constitution too. So, I could close him up. He did not know about my feeling but the bad dream was coming. My senior knew from someone (I did not know until this day). He changed his behavior. He looked down me when he was with his friends. It made me sad. My teacher told me. “In this world had a lot of good guys.” That time, my love was changed to be hate. I told myself, I would like the guys from the inside. I would keep some good things in my mind. Love was a beautiful thing. In the other hands, it was a bad thing. And I wanted to thank you for two men. They made me know about love. “Thank you.” (287 words, 25 lines)

Nok’s writing:

June 1, 2004

My name is (name). I am study in faculty of Business Administration at Kasetsart University. I am study in second years. My family have four members. I have a brother. His name is Jim.

I stay at home with my parent. My home is at Saphanmai, Bangkok. I have a dog. It’s name is Io. I like listening to the radio and watching television. My hobby is playing with my dog and collect stamps.

I used to study in faculty of Science for 1 year but I don’t like so I am study in faculty of Business Administration major Management.

I am a kind person. (105 words, 12 lines)

June 22, 2004

My friend is Nuttaporn Junjareon. Her nickname is Fe. She has long black hair and brown eyes. She is quite tall and thin than me. She is shy and impatient person. She has a sister and a brother. Her sister is older than her. Her brother is younger than her. Her father is a lecturer. She used to study at Kasetsart University Laboratory School because her house is near Kasetsart University.

Now she is a second-year student in the faculty of Business Administration. She always gets up at 6:30 a.m. and she always goes to the university by car with her father. She usually has breakfast at Kasetsart’s canteen. She likes the cat. She feeds her cats after she comes home. She has dinner with her family and takes a shower. Next she does her homework and watched TV. Her favorite programme is Drama. Finally she goes to bed at eleven o’clock in the evening.

In spare time, she goes to shopping at Central with her friends. (167 words, 18 lines)

July 6, 2004

Finland is my favourite country. There are glaciers and lakes. It is a beautiful country. Finland is the northernmost country on the European continent. It shares borders with Sweden, Norway and Soviet Union. Finland’s geography were glaciers. The glaciers were the country’s surface about 10,000 years ago.

The winter is the longest season in Finland. Finland southern of the country are snow-covered about 3 months of the year and the northern about 7 months. The Atlantic Ocean to the west modify the climate of the country.
The population of Finland is approximately 5,200,000. Finland is the sixth largest country in Europe. The most people live in urban areas. Women on average outlive men in Finland.

Lapland is interesting place, that land of midnight sun and the Northern Lights. (128 words, 16 lines)

August 3, 2004

Past Experience

I studied English since I was 8 years old. My teacher is kind so I like to learn English. When I was 12 years old I studied in sound lab. I was very excited because my teacher is American. He can’t speak Thai. Sometimes I didn’t understand that he spoke. There were 60 students in classroom. My American teacher was kind but he gave a lot of assignments. I studied in sound lab twice a week. I didn’t like to learn English in sound lab because I didn’t like to listen to English tape and I didn’t like speak English.

When I was M.1 I studied with American teacher in sound lab. There were about sixty students in their class. My teacher opened English song and gave papers to students wrote English song. Occasionally he สั่งให้แบ่งกลุ่ม 4-5 groups and sang English song in front of the class. He didn’t strick grammar so I and my friend happy to studied with him. (163 words, 17 lines)

August 19, 2004

When I was fourteen years old. I went to Chiang Mai with my family. We went and returned by train. We leaved home on Wednesday morning and arrived Chiang Mai on Wednesday evening. We traveled by train for a long time but we were happy. It was October and the weather was cold. We stayed in hotel for three days. Father’s friend lived in village near the hotel. He had a restaurant and he was a guide for us. We had dinner at the restaurant every evening.

First day, we went to Doi Inthanon. When we arrived the top of hill, we had clogged ears. The weather was very cold and there was fog. Second day, we went to Doi Tung. Doi Tung is in Chiang Rai. We liked it because it was very beautiful. There were many flowers and we took a photograph to remember it. That night we had shopping at Night Bazaar. There were many shops. The price was expensive but we bought a lot of things. Third day we went to waterfall. It was beautiful. The water was cold and clear.

We had to return to Bangkok on Saturday evening and arrived home on Sunday morning. It was a wonderful trip for me. Chiang Mai was a beautiful town I had seen. (216 words, 23 lines)

Su’s writing:

June 1, 2004

Introduction myself
My name is _____. You can call me “Toon”. I’m 19 years old. I study in Economics Faculty. My major is Agricultural of Economics. I live in Navachon Apartment with my friend. My apartment is on Ngamwongwan Road. In my spare time I like to watch TV and listen to radio. Sometimes I go shopping with my friends. I have one brother. My brother study in Engineer Faculty at Suranaree University. I live in Bangkok but my hometown in Phetchaburi. I graduated in primary school at Aroonmradit School and finished high school at Prommanusorn School. Phetchaburi is near Bangkok. My province has many traveling place such as Cha-am beach, Kangkajan National Park, Ramrajchnivach Palace, Water fall. My father is a government officer and my mother is a housewife. They is very kind with me and my friend. Sometimes they punish me when I stubborn. I have class at 8 a.m. everyday but it isn’t a problem because I use the time about only 10 minute. (165 words, 18 lines)

June 22, 2004

Introduce my friend

My friend is Haruethai Janerithnunth. Her nickname is A. She is 19 years old. She has 2 brothers. She is the oldest sister. Her father is a general manager. Her mother is a housewife. Now, she studies at Kasetsart university in Faculty of Economics. Her major is Agricultural of Economics. In the future she wants to be a good economist. She has classes at 8 a.m. everyday. Someday she finished classes at 11.30 am. Someday she finishes classes at 4 pm. She goes to the university by skytrain and shuttle bus. She uses the time about 2 hours for journey. In her freetimes, she likes to watch TV, read a book and serf the internet. Her favorite star is Ann Thongprasom. Her favourite food is “Tom Yum Kung”, “Crab Fried Rice”, “Som Tum” and “Rotee Mataba”. (136 words, 14 lines)

July 6, 2004

I selected to write about Japan because it is interesting country. I like it. Japan is a small country. It consists of several thousands of islands. Islands that is famous such as Hokkaido, Shikoku and Honshu. There are many volcanos and earthquakes in Japan that can’t find another country. I think it is afraid and spectacular. Japan has 4 seasons (winter, summer, rainfall, typhoons) Almost the whole population is Japanese. Japanese respects Shinto and Buddhist religion. In Japan has interesting places to visit such as Himeji Castle, Tokyo DisneySea, Kagoshima, Mt. Fuji, Miho Museum, Kasai Rinkai Koen, Shirokawago and Miyajima. Each places are spectacular. There are beautiful views. It is worthwhile to visit. I think if I have some money I will go there sure. Japan is a technological town. It has modern innovation. (134 words, 15 lines)

August 3, 2004

Past Experience

I start study English since I was 3 years old. First, My English teacher taught me about A, B, C …, Z. My teacher sang a ABC song which it was easy to remember. When I studied in primary school, I studied about easy vocabulary and grammar such as a cat, a dog, a cup. That time I think it was easy and fun. I liked it. But, when I studied in high school, I didn’t understand
why English was difficulty. My teacher gave difficult English homework. I did it for long time. I had a teacher. She is Miss Pikul. She is a kind English teacher. She taught me about vocabulary, which she taught it with song. Sometimes, she taught it with games. In my high school had some exchange students. I was enjoyable for speaking with them.

When I studied in primary school, I liked to learn English because I thought it was easy and fun. But, when I studied in high school, I didn’t understand why English was difficult. I think I was silly for English in my class. That time, my class room had some intelligent students. They could speak, read, write and listen very good, which I wasn’t that. My English teacher, which taught me, stricted in grammar, vocabulary and all about English. I feel afraid with it. (223 words, 23 lines)

August 19, 2004

My impressive story was happened when I studied in primary school (Pratom 6) at Aroonpradit School in Petchaburi. I was chosen to be a deligate of school for Thai Speech Competition at Kanjananukhro School in Kanjanaburi. That time I was scary very much because I afraid to lose in this competition. However I was lucky because I received a reward. Afterwards, I had to prepare for a big competition at Phraharuathaiconvan School in Bangkok again. My teacher trained me hard. I had to speak about science and technology which was a new information so I was tried very much. Finally, the day of competition reached. That day there were many competitions which all competitions spoke very well. I was the 16th person for speaking. When everybody finished for speech, they were excited very much, me too. Then the important time reached, the reward was announced until last reward for the winner. I told my mother and my teacher to go home. My mum said “OK”. While I was standing up, I heard someone called my name from the stage “The winner is _____”, I wondered about that sound in a minute before I walked to the stage. I received a certificate and the money 4,000 baht. And this my impressive experience that I will remember it forever. (217 words, 23 lines)

Wan’s writing:

June 1, 2004

Hello My name is ______. My nickname is Took-ta. I’m studying in faculty of Education. My Major is Business Education. I’m studying in years two. I’m living with my family at 685 Krunthonbuti Road Klongsan Bangkok. I have one sister and one brother. I’m come from Chinorotwittayalai School Bangkoko School Bangkok. In Summer I and my family went to Nakornsrtiammarat to visited my grandmother. When I have a time I like to reading a book and listen to the radio. My hobby is collecting stamp. I’m cheerful. I like to eat noodle, apple and chocolate. I come to Kasetsart University by BTS sky train. My favourite color is Blue. In future I want to be a Business Women. But now I hope to study happyness.

June 22, 2004

Her name is Thitiporn Adipornphisut. Her nickname is Book. She is my friend. She is 19 years old and come from Nonthaburi. She is a single child. She studies in Faculty of Education.
On Monday she usually gets up at 6.00 a.m. and takes a bath. She always goes to Kasetsart university about 6.30 a.m. She often goes to Bar-Mai to have breakfast. She likes to eat her spicy soup, noodles, and rice with curry. She has classes from 9.00 a.m. until 4.00 p.m. She has English class twice a week. Next she always comes back home by bus. On Saturday she always gets up late because she doesn’t go to the university. She has a cat, it’s name Browny in her home. Her sister and she usually go to The Mall together. She likes to read cartoon books when she has free time. In the future she wants to have an own business. Her motto is “Time and Tide is no return”.

July 6, 2004

New Zealand

New Zealand is my favorite nation because it consists of two main islands, The North Island and the south Island. There are the most beautiful Islands for me. In a country have beautiful lake and bush forests. The North Island also have a few volcanoes still active. This country have steaming mud pools and spectacular geysers, I want to visit them very much. New Zealand have many mountains. An interesting places in and around Auckland is variety. Such as Rangitoto Island, it is a feature of Auckland’s inner harbour. It have the volcanic fireworks that Maori tribes to call is “SKY OF BLOOD”. Take the ferry from Downtown Auckland. It have many mountains, The summits of Mount Victoria or North Head for 360° views. Mount Eden, Mount Hobson and Mount St. John are dormant volcanic cones offering commanding views of the citypack a picnic and walk up. New Zealand has largely a temperate climate. The seasons are off course the reverse of the Northern Hemisphere with the warmest and coldest. Most of the 3.7 million New Zealanders are of British origin about 14% claim descent from the indigenous Maori population. They are Polynesian origin about 85% of New Zealand’ population lives in urban areas because it have the service.

August 3, 2004

I started to learn English when I studied in Prathom 1. When I started English class I was very happy because I liked to read English book but I didn’t to write English. In Mathayom I studies English writing, speaking and listening. My teacher told me to read Student weekly every day. When I have freetime I went to Eric room, a library English in my school. I liked to listen to the music, a conversation in English. I played a cross word game with my friend. In Mathayom 4 my teacher told me to read vocabulary. In my house I read Student weekly with my aunt every Sunday. He told me English in important for everybody now. In the feature I want to speaking English very well, because จะได้คุยกับชาวต่างชาติได้เข้าใจมากขึ้น.

In Mathayom 4 I studied English with my teacher her name is Sutipee. She speak English very well. In my class my teacher told me to spoke or read English follow her. Student must have student weekly in class every day. She ให้ read and translated or สรุป the topic to read. I have English homework every day. On Monday I have to read vocabulary because my teacher to me to ที่จะ write and wrote vocabulary ตามคำบอก before I started the class. My friend and I have to said Hello or Good morning with my teacher. When I finished the class I have to said goodbye. My teacher spoke is “See me next time goodbye” everybody in the class just to said “bye bye.” I was very happy I studied in my class but I don’t happy when my exercise was very hard.
My past experience in Matthayom 6

In high school, U studied at Chinorотwitтayalai school. In Matthayom 6 my life changed very much. I had to read a book and studied very hard because I prepared to entrance. I wanted to get a place in the faculty I like. On Monday to Friday I studied in my school. In the evening of Monday, Wednesday and Friday, I have extra classes in Thai and Social science. I attended math class on Saturday. And on Sunday I studied English with my uncle at my uncle’s house. Every night I read a book from 9:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. I was very tired. In August, I had an accident on my right eyebrow at my school. It made me stay home for a week. I was worried about my entrance exam but I had my relaxtion. I listened to the music, watched television and went to Central with my friends. Finally my dream came true. I get a seat in faculty of Education at Kasetsart University. I’m very happy and all my tire was gone.

Sample of Multiple Drafts

Jai’s first assignment

First draft:

My name is (name). My nickname is Nuch but my friend call me Duang. I’m female. My birthday 15 October 1984. I’m 19 years old. I’m studying in Education Faculty at Kasetsart University. I’m tall 157 cm. and weight 44 kg. I playing Petanque. I like sport very much. I have two sisters. Her name is Nid and Noi. I educated from Sriayudthaya School. I lived in Bangkok. I like shopping. I like to go to eat noodles, pizza, hamburgers and cake. I don’t like milk and dessert. Future I would like to be a teacher. I love dog. My home have seven dogs and a cat. I like to watching TV and go to the cinema. I go to the cinema every weeks.

Second draft:

Hello! My name is (name). My nickname is ‘Nuch’. I am nineteen years old. I am studying in Faculty of Education at Kasetsart University. My major is Physical Education. I lived in Bangkok since I was born. Now I staying at the University dormitory. I graduated from Sriayudthaya school. I have a short hair and short. My family have five peoples. I have two sisters. They are studying at Ramkhomhang University. They are twenty years old. They are twins. My hobby is listening to the radio, watching television, playing games, go to the movies, go to shopping and playing Petanque. Do you know Petanque? Petanque which come from France, is a kind of sport. I love to go to the movies at Major, Central and The Mall Ngamwongwan. I go to the movies every weeks. I like to go to shopping at MBK and Jatujak market. If I have a free time I will read a pocketbook and cartoon. I want to be a teacher because I like teaching and My ambition is to be teach at Kasetsart University or others school.

Third draft:

Hello! My name is (name). My nickname is “Nuch”. I am nineteen years old. I have short, brown hairs. I am a sportsman. I am studying in Faculty of Education at Kasetsart
University. My major is Physical Education. I lived in Bangkok since I was born. Now I staying at the University dormitory. I graduated from Sriayudthaya School. There are five peoples in my family. I have two sisters. They are twins. They are studying in Ramkhamhang University. They are twenty years old. My hobby is listen to the radio, watching television, playing petanque. Do you know petanque? Petanque which come from France, is a kind of sport. I love to go to the movies at Major, Central and The Mall Ngamwongwan. I go to the movies every weeks. I like to go to shopping at MBK and Jatujak market. If I have a free time I will read a pocketbook and cartoon. I love to raise animals. My home have seven dogs, a cat, a fish and twenty mice. I want to be a teacher because I like teaching and My ambition is to be teach at Kasetsart University or others school in Bangkok.

Four draft:

My Routines

I am (name). I always get up at six o’clock because I study from eight o’clock until five o’clock in the evening. Next I take a shower and dress. Then I usually go to Bar Mai at seven o’clock and I have a breakfast. I often have noodles. In the afternoon if I have a free time I will go to sleep at dormitory. In the evening I sometimes go to jogging and play sport. I have dinner with my boyfriend at Bar Mai at seven o’clock. Then we go to shopping at Tops supermarket. At nine o’clock I do my homework and read a book. Finally I go to bed at eleven o’clock.

Final draft:

Hello! My name is (name). My nickname is Nuch. I am nineteen years old. I have short, brown hairs. I am a sportsman. I always jogging and play sport in the evening. I am studying in Faculty of Education at Kasetsart University. My major is Physical Education. There are five people in my family. I have father, mother and two sisters. My sisters are twins. They are very nice. They are studying in Ramkhamhang University. They are twenty years old. I live in Bangkok. Now I am staying at the Kasetsart dormitory so I haven’t to get up early. I always get up at six o’clock because I study from eight o’clock until five o’clock in the evening. Next, I take a shower and dress. Then I usually go to Bar Mai at seven o’clock and I have a breakfast. I often have noodles. In the afternoon If I have a free time I will go to sleep at dormitory. In the evening I sometimes watch television and read a cartoon. I have dinner with my boyfriend at Bar Mai or Central at seven o’clock. At nine o’clock I do my homework and read a book. Finally I go to bed at eleven o’clock. At the weekend I always go to shopping at MBK and Jatujak market. I buy some clothes and shoes. I sometimes go to the movies at Major, Central and The Mall Ngamwongwan. I always go home on Friday because I miss my family and my pets. I love pets so my home has seven dogs, a cat, a fish and twenty hamsters. I want to be a Veterinary medicine but now I want to be a teacher at Kasetsart University or others school in Bangkok.

Jai’s First draft of the second assignment:

My friend is Sunanta Thipimol. Her nickname is Toon. She is nineteen years old. She is studying in Faculty of Economics at Kasetsart University. Her major is Agricultural Economics. She likes Economics. She was born in Petchaburi but now she is staying at Navachon Apartment in
Bangkok. There are four people in her family. She has father, mother and brother. Her father is a government officer. Her mother is a housewife. They are very kind. Her brother is twenty-two years old. He is studying in Faculty of Engineering at Suranaree University. She graduated high school from Prommanusorn School. She live in Navachon Apartment with her friend. Her friend is studying in Faculty of Fishery. She always gets up at six o’clock because she like watching television in the morning. Then she takes a shower and dresses about seven o’clock. Next she has a breakfast. She usually has some breads and a glass of milk. She studys from eight o’clock until four o’clock in the evening. In the evening she goes jogging with her friend. At the weekend she likes to go to the movies, go to shopping and listen to radio. In the future, She want to be a good economist.
## APPENDIX G
### CONTENT OF THE COURSE SYLLABUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Grammar / Structure</th>
<th>Expression / Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERSONAL INFORMATION</td>
<td>Question forms (What/Where/When/How)</td>
<td>What is your name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where were you born?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When were you born?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How tall are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- yourself, friend</td>
<td>I live in Bangkok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Punctuation (period, capitals)</td>
<td>She lives in Bangkok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Verb forms (present simple: 3rd person singular versus 1st person singular)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family</td>
<td>Subject/Verb agreement with countable and uncountable nouns</td>
<td>- My sister is a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Occupation</td>
<td>Question forms</td>
<td>- There are six people in our family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interests</td>
<td>Definite/indefinite article (a, an, the)</td>
<td>Where do you study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is your major?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What year are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are your interests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He is a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He is in the English Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESCENDING ROUTINES:</td>
<td>Tense: present simple Preposition of time</td>
<td>He gets up at six o’clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time expressions</td>
<td>She works from seven until nine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question forms</td>
<td>Midnight, New Year’s Day, December, 1995, tomorrow, yesterday, next month, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td>What time/when does he get up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbs of frequency</td>
<td>First, second, next, finally, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>always → never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DESCRIBING PEOPLE:</td>
<td>Ordering adjectives in a series (length / size + kind / shape + shade / colour)</td>
<td>She has short brown hair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He has a long bushy black beard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- personal information</td>
<td></td>
<td>She has soft brown skin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Grammar / Structure</td>
<td>Expression / Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary: (nouns) eyelashes, eyebrows, moustache etc. (adjectives) calm, kind, shy, polite, sophisticated, confident, talkative, friendly, loud, unfriendly, moody, impolite etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- clothing</td>
<td>Nouns – count / non-count (a pair of …)</td>
<td>shorts, trousers, jeans, sandals, shoes, blouse, skirt, long-sleeved, short-sleeved etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 DESCRIBING PLACES:</td>
<td>Prepositions of location</td>
<td>near, above, next to, in front of, behind etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- House</td>
<td>There is / There are</td>
<td>There is a vase next to … Nouns - kitchenware, furniture, shelf, cupboard, sofa, armchairs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kitchen</td>
<td>Question forms</td>
<td>Where is the television?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sitting room</td>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td>There is a / one…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are two…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Buildings</td>
<td>Description + Location (adjective modifiers)</td>
<td>Khon Kaen is a large city in the northeast of Thailand. MBK is a large shopping centre next to Siam Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand is a hot country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Country</td>
<td>Verb: is / has</td>
<td>Thailand has hot weather. Vocabulary: cool, cloudy, humid, windy etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Grammar / Structure</td>
<td>Expression / Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DESCRIBING PAST EXPERIENCES:</td>
<td>Compound sentences (and, but, so) Use of the comma Consequences Past simple tense</td>
<td>We went to the beach and had a great time. We went to the beach, but the weather was terrible. I broke my leg, so I could not work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DESCRIBING SCENES:</td>
<td>Present simple (facts) versus present continuous (temporary situation, actions happening at the moment of speaking)</td>
<td>It is lunchtime. I am having a great time in Sydney. I am sitting in a café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COMPOSITION (NARRATIVE):</td>
<td>Complex sentences - Adjective clauses Punctuation – use of the comma (restrictive, non-restrictive clauses) Past simple / past continuous (completed actions / actions over a period of time) - Adverbial clauses</td>
<td>Who, Which / That, Where, Whose I left school when I was fifteen. I was studying from 9.00 to 11.00. WHEN – when, while, whenever, before, after, since, until WHY – as, so that, since, because ON WHAT CONDITION – unless, although, if HOW – as if, as though Punctuation – use of comma If clauses – first conditional Past simple / past continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
SAMPLES OF SUPPLEMENTARY EXERCISES

ENGLISH WRITING I
Revision Worksheet

Unit 4

1) Make compound sentences using and, but, or so.

1. I like basketball. My brother likes tennis.

___________________________________________________________________

2. I went to Siam Square. Afterwards, I went to the World Trade Centre.

___________________________________________________________________

3. I heard a noise outside. I did not open the door.

___________________________________________________________________

4. I did not see ‘Rambo.’ My roommate did.

___________________________________________________________________

5. I called my girlfriend. She was not at home. I knew she was still at the university.

___________________________________________________________________

6. I felt ill. I went to see the doctor. He prescribed a lot of medicine.

___________________________________________________________________


___________________________________________________________________

8. I studied hard. I could not do the mid-term exam. I dropped the course.

___________________________________________________________________

2) Complete these sentences in your own words. (Use a comma where necessary.)

1. It rained hard all day so ____________________________________________

2. I ran into the house and ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________
3. She could not unlock the car so __________________________________________

4. I like my teacher but ________________________________________________

5. He did not feel well but ______________________________________________

3) Write out the questions to the following statements.

1. ____________________________?
   When I was young, I lived in a small house in Rayong.

2. ____________________________?
   I went to school by ‘songtaew.’

3. ____________________________?
   I went to school with my sister.

4. ____________________________?
   It took half an hour to get there.

5. ____________________________?
   I used to play sport after school.

6. ____________________________?
   I enjoyed it. (school)

7. ____________________________?
   No, I did not. (pass the entrance exam)

8. ____________________________?
   Now I work in a restaurant.
1) Rewrite the following passage using either present simple or present continuous. Where there is a double line (//), use a conjunction. Also, supply the articles.

It / be / hot day // I / be / at / swimming pool at Kasetsart University. I can see / lifeguard who / teach / some young children to swim. He / laugh / with / children // they / not laugh. They / look / afraid. Some teenagers / sit / near / pool // smoke / cigarettes. I can also see / beautiful girl with her friend. They / dive / into / pool. I keep watching her // she / not see / me!

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2) Each of the sentences below has a mistake. Correct the mistake.

1. I am seeing a snake under that bed.

2. Some of those girls is talking too loudly.

3. At the moment I eat lunch.

4. I went to Major Cineplex, so I did not see a film.
5. I don’t like durian, and my brother does.

6. I want to go home, but it rains.

7. We went to Ayudhaya and were having a great time.

8. Are you liking this novel?

9. Jude is sleeping, but Tim is hearing some music.

10. I go to the police and told them about the robbery.

3) Put in a / an or the.

When Jack first started his job in Sony, he stayed in ______ factory hostel. ______ hostel only served breakfast, so Jack had lunch in _____ canteen at work. When he finished work, he usually went to _____ cheap self-service restaurant for his evening meal.

He didn’t enjoy living in _____ hostel very much, so he decided to find _____ flat to rent. He soon found one just outside Bristol. It was quite ____ nig flat on ____ top floor of ______ house owned by Chester Curtis. Because _____ rent was more than he could afford, and there were two bedrooms, Jack decided to find someone to share _____ flat with him. One morning he put _____ advertisement in _____ local newsagent’s window.

The same day, _____ young student called Paul Blake went to _____ newsagent to buy _____ paper. When he saw _____ advertisement, he telephoned Jack immediately and asked permission to come and see _____ flat.
ENGLISH WRITING I
Revision Worksheet

Unit 6

1) Put the verbs into the correct form. (Past Simple, Past Continuous)

1. I _______ (see) Ann at the party last night and she ________ (wear) a red dress.
2. How fast ________ (you / drive) when the accident ________ (happen)?
3. When I last ________ (see) Alan, he ________ (try) to find a job in London.
4. I ________ (walk) home when I ________ (meet) Dave.
5. I ________ (have) a shower when somebody ________ (knock) at the door.
6. My wife ________ (talk) on the phone when I ________ (fall) asleep.
7. I ________ (listen) to the radio when the storm _________. (begin)
8. When Karen ________ (arrive) we ________ (have) dinner.
9. I ________ (walk) along the street when I ________ (hear) footsteps behind me.
10. The accident ________ (happen) when I ________ (cross) the road.

2) Join the following sentence groups using either adverbial or adjective clauses. Rewrite the paragraph.

I booked into a hotel.
The hotel was near a river.

I had a shower.
I went to look around the town.

I was walking along a road.
A man called to me.
I had never seen the man before.

Then he apologized to me.
He made a mistake.

He thought I was his brother.
He had not seen his brother for 20 years.
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