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The objectives of this study are to assist Thai university students to develop their writing by using a teaching approach that focuses on the introduction of discourse within a genre approach based on the teaching and learning cycle of Feez (1998). This approach is considered suitable for an approach to teaching writing focused on discourse, because its design requires English language teachers to consider the importance of the whole text. It allows students to view texts as a whole, not in separated sentences, especially when they organise and connect ideas during writing.

The study draws on both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The quantitative approach concentrates on the development of the students’ writing by comparing the mean scores from the initial and final writings of students. Forty students were requested to complete four writing assignment during the course. The data were analysed by employing a pair sample t-test to compare initial and final scores. The
qualitative approach deals with how peer feedback helps promote reader awareness and the attitudes of students and teachers. The qualitative data were gathered by various instruments, such as questionnaires, interviews, students’ reflective writing, peer feedback, and so on.

The results of the study revealed that: 1) students can perform better in writing ability, demonstrated from the overall scores. There is significant difference (p<.05) between the overall mean score in the final assignment and the initial assignment; 2) students are concerned about how to provide sufficient information for the readers. They understand the role of the writer, which is to provide more information for the readers, and are aware of the role of the reader; 3) the use of peer feedback is beneficial for students, and it also promotes student awareness of the sense of audience; 4) The attitudes of the students and teachers were positive towards teaching that focused on discourse structure. The students found that it was useful for them, because they realised how to connect and organise cohesive text; 5) most of the teachers noted that it was beneficial to be introduced to the way of teaching writing through approach focusing on discourse structure. 6. The modified version of Feez’ cycle of teaching and learning is beneficial and support students to improve their writing through the course. 7. Portfolio assessment is an effective measure that helps students gauge their progress and allows them to see their writing improves in later drafts. 8. Students’ reflective writing helps them promote their awareness of readers during the course.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

English is not an official language in Thailand, and most Thai people do not use it much in their daily life. English skills including writing, however, are important to people in Thailand in the context of globalisation, not only in the academic sector but in the business and professional sectors. It is necessary to have English language for work and study, and to find a good job. Wongsothorn (1994) stated that in Thai higher education it is essential for students to enhance their writing because they have to adapt to the requirements of many university programmes, business and international companies in Thailand. Not only in the academic but also in the career context, students have to write essays, reports, assignment and theses in English. Despite this, Wongsothorn, Hiranburana and Chinnawongs (2003) found that the writing skills of Thai students were ‘below average’, whilst Praphal (2001, p. 4) indicated that English proficiency among Thai students was lower than that of those from other Asian countries, such as Singapore, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. It ranked eighth, on average, using TOEFL mean scores.

According to the above data, Thai students face a problem with English, particularly as they are required to write, read, and interpret information for classroom assignment or reports in English to study in tertiary academic settings. If students want to continue to study at either Thai or international universities, they have to pass a test that considers writing as one of the important skills in writing a research reports, dissertations or theses. Some way to help them improve is essential; moreover, it is
important for their future to enhance their skills, especially writing, because many companies have an English proficiency test as an appointment criterion.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Composing written English is considered a problem by Thai students (Kongpetch, 2003; Sakontawut, 2001). Teaching of writing classes in Thailand employs a product-oriented approach, despite some teachers’ preference for a process approach (Tagong, 1991; Sakontawut, 2001). Teachers assign topics for students to write about, usually for homework or in class. Students are not given the opportunity to make multiple drafts or to receive comments before submitting their writing; their submissions come back covered in red ink for deletion and suggested corrections. Students receive feedback primarily from the teachers’ comments that attempt to comment on surface features rather than on the content of the writing. Tangpermpoon (2008, p. 2) highlights the product-based approach to writing that concentrates on grammatical and syntactic forms and the activities employed, such as sentence combining and rhetorical pattern exercises. Kongpetch (2003) found that these traditional approaches are still being used to teach at university level and explains that the teaching on writing courses emphasises sentence structure, grammatical aspects, use of prepositions, conjunctions, tenses, sentence combination and so on. It can be seen in extracts from the interview with two students conducted by Kongpetch, as follows:

Mr Tana emphasizes grammar. He taught us grammatical structure at sentence level, so we know how to write sentences in English correctly. We learn about idioms and conjunction. (S1)
Mr Tana taught us about grammar, how to combine sentences and how to use conjunctions and tenses. (S2)

As can be seen from the above, product-oriented teaching is still employed, although Nunan (1991, pp. 86-87) has observed that a product approach usually involves classroom activities that use samples of text for students to imitate or adapt to produce new text. Instead, the focus is on linking sentences, and does not view the text as a whole. This leads to students having problems in writing at a paragraph level, because the teaching has tended to focus on the sentence level. Thornbury (2005, p. 6) argues that the traditional language teaching method has focused on sentences rather than texts. Shokrpour (2007) reports that EFL teachers still think that the main problem in students’ writing results from limited knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, and that this can be solved through grammar and vocabulary lessons. Her results show that errors found in the use of cohesive devices and coherence are more important than other aspects and also suggests that discoursal aspects should be emphasised in writing classes. Moreover, Widdowson (1995) points out that the meaning or discourse context needs to be the focus, rather than just grammar.

It seems that Thai teachers often view a text as a single unit. This reflects how they focus on grammatical features during writing classes. My study attempts to introduce a new perspective of viewing written text as comprising sets of whole units, not just as isolated elements (sentences). Written texts should be viewed as discourse. Sakontawut (2001) points out that the problem of writing among Thais may be caused by this discourse aspect of language; students with syntactic maturity may not be able to produce well-written essays because they do not know how to express their thoughts or organise their ideas well when writing. These discourse features of
writing, especially cohesion and coherence, are important aspects of writing quality. Moreover, assessment of writing should not only be concerned with grammatical accuracy, but also with discourse organisation.

Suwanwela (2002) suggests that Thai students may struggle in arranging and generating ideas when they study writing because of an inappropriate teaching method focused on memorisation and rote learning, while Watson Todd (2004) agrees that it is particularly inappropriate to teach using this method. Likewise, Udomyamokkul (2004, p. 12) points out that L2 writers do not have sufficient implicit understanding of rhetorical pattern and organisation of genre. Much analysis of expository writing in Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Thai has revealed that each culture uses a different rhetorical organisation of written expression from the English convention (Hinds, 1990; Ostler, 1987).

Thai students have a problem when they have to write an essay. One reason is that they usually try to translate as they write. Many errors will result, because they are not overly concerned with the constraints of turning Thai into English. According to Abdulsata (2000), many problems occur in teaching writing to Thai students. Firstly, when the teachers assign written work, they do not know how it should be phrased. They usually think in their language first, then translate the question into English and most do not notice that there are discrepancies between Thai and English. Secondly, students do not know how to organise the information properly in their written composition. Abdulsata illustrates this using the following sentence fragments (2000).
Finally, I did and surprisingly she stayed calm. didn’t speak even a word at the moment the world was dark.

The above sentences were taken from a selection on paragraph writing. As can be seen, the subject was omitted. This kind of deletion of subject is commonly found in Thai students’ writing and may result from a Thai discourse concept that normally uses the sentence boundary or full stop. Thep-Akaraphong (2001, pp. 1-2) suggests that this results from a misconception of the differing uses of discourse in Thai and English; some conceptual discrepancies between the texts can be recognised, for example the use of Thai cohesive devices that do not function in the same way as those in English. Thep-Ackrapong (2005) agrees with McDaniel (1994) that Thai writers do not realise the different rhetorical patterns between Thai and English. Without making a thesis statement at the beginning, they state the purpose of writing in the concluding paragraph, so readers may not see the point until the end. Many Thai writers do not convey topic sentences when they begin writing a paragraph, and they often begin an English essay with a rhetorical question and answer it later.

Bennui (2008) pointed out that Thai writers use a variety of cohesive markers in a paragraph of one sentence, with overly long runs using the conjunctions ‘and’, ‘when’, ‘so’, and ‘because’, as can be seen in the sentence below.

I want to have some ice cream when I work outdoor because the weather is so hot that I feel so thirsty but there is no convenient store near my workplace.

She also asserted that Thai writing contained redundancy and wordiness, as a means to motivate the reader to perceive the topic, as can be seen from the following example:
Finally, the books have answer for me when I have problems. I usually have some questions but I don’t feel serious about it because I have the books that it has the answer for me. I found the answer from it when problems in everything so it has very important for me. (Bennui, 2008)

Accordingly, it is vital for EFL teachers to ensure that learners perform successfully at both grammatical and discourse levels. Teaching writing texts should not be viewed as creating separate units but a whole, in order to convey meaning to readers. My study attempts to implement the use of a discourse structure to help students improve their writing abilities by using the teaching and learning cycles of Feez (1998), considered to be genre-based. In this study I seek to determine whether this approach can improve writing ability in the Thai university context.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to assist Thai university students to develop their writing ability by using a discourse structure in the systemic functional linguistics genre approach, using the teaching and learning cycles of Feez (1998). The second aim is to receive feedback from students and lecturers, from various perspectives, on the teaching of a discourse structure that can develop teaching methods. Lastly, the study aims to promote in students a sense of audience. The reason why awareness of audience should be a focus is that in terms of the organisation of discourse, unlike Thai texts, most English texts start with a topic sentence and place greater emphasis on coherent organisation throughout the text with an introduction, body and conclusion section (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley, 1987, Bicker & Peyasantiwong, 1988, Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Therefore, readers of Thai texts tend to read every section in
order to draw inferences about the writer’s intention or main idea, because often there will be no topic sentence, in the English sense. In addition, deciding to miss sections or skip to the conclusion is an ineffective strategy when reading Thai, as it is likely to cause the reader to miss important messages. Thai readers do not pay much attention to the final section of the text, since in most cases there is no genuine conclusion on future orientation or solution to a problem; instead, these are provided in the body of the text. During peer feedback, students would have a chance to read their friends’ assignments and gain greater awareness of the audience.

This teaching approach focuses on the use of discourse structure, concentrating on the text as a whole. It is a genre approach that can provide students with scaffolding from the teaching and learning cycles of Feez (1998) and can explain through feedback from teachers and peers a reformulation of their writing, to move through Vygotsky’s zones of proximal development. This approach is suitable for the context of teaching writing focused on discourse, because its design requires English language teachers to consider the importance of the whole text. In the process of the learning cycle, students may collaborate with friends in pairs or in group work.

The objective of the Writing Academic English course at Naresuan University is to help science students write successful paragraphs, so the NR and ESP genre approaches are not appropriate. However, they may be suitable for the less demanding elective course entitled English for Academic Purposes, which is designed for Medical and Pharmaceutical Science students, as the SFL approach provides a clear stage of instruction through the cycle of teaching proposed by Feez.
1.3 Context of the Study

This study took place at Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, Thailand. All of the subjects were Thai undergraduates in the Faculty of Sciences. They have to pass three compulsory courses in English, namely Foundations of English I, Foundations of English II and Reading Academic English, as may be noted from the curriculum table for the Bachelor of Sciences degree at Naresuan University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Year/Semester</th>
<th>Number of credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Compulsory General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Language Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Language Skills</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(001103)</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of English 1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(001111)</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of English 2</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(001112)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Academic English</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(205301)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Academic English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(205302)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other subjects..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Elective General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for Academic Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other subjects..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specific Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Core Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Major</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Compulsory</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Specific Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Elective in specific fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Professional Training or Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Free Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Curriculum for Bachelor of Sciences, Naresuan University

It is considered a typical programme for the undergraduates. The curriculum design by has to satisfy quality assurance in Thailand, and it has been approved by Faculty,
University, and the National Commission on Higher Education. Consequently, undergraduates had a basic knowledge of English grammar. The participants are students in the Faculty of Sciences at Naresuan University, and all took the Writing Academic English course in academic year 2008.

Although this course title is Writing Academic English, the content is focused on general topics with specific academic areas of interest added in as classroom assignments or homework. It prepares students for the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) to be implemented in 2015; it is important to prepare students for international business because the AEC areas of cooperation include human resources development and capacity building; recognition of professional qualifications; closer consultation on economic and financial policies; trade financing measures; enhanced infrastructure and communications connectivity; development of electronic transactions through e-ASEAN as indicated in ASEAN Economic Blueprint; integrating industries across the region to promote regional sourcing; and enhancing private sector involvement for the building of the AEC. In summary, the AEC will turn ASEAN into a region of free trade of goods, services, investment, skilled labour, and freer flow of capital. Therefore, the writing course helps students be ready for labour competition within ASEAN communities.
1.4 Key Terms

Discourse structure is defined as the set of components that help us to connect texts to convey meaning between the writers’ intention and the readers’ interpretation, through the use of cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation, as briefly described below.

Micro-structure
Micro-structure is defined as the surface level of discourse that focuses on the concept of the connection of sentences within a text, using cohesive devices to relate ideas among sentences in the text.

Macro-structure
Macro structure is defined as the concept of textual connections through the use of coherence and discourse organisation, to create a relationship and flow of related ideas and organisation throughout the text.

Cohesion
Cohesion is defined as use of devices that allow the writer to establish relationships and connect texts together within and across sentences.

Coherence
Coherence is defined as the connection of ideas in a text to create meaning, or a flow of ideas, throughout the whole text or discourse that enables readers to understand how the writers’ ideas are presented in the overall discourse.
Discourse organisation

Discourse organisation is the conventions of connecting texts or paragraphs together by using the concept of rhetorical organisation.

Awareness of audience

Awareness of audience is a perception of the writer, taking the responsibility to provide sufficient textual information in order to help readers understand the context and setting of texts.

Feez’ cycle

Feez’ cycle is a teaching and learning model of six stages: contextual building, textual modelling, joint construction of text, independent construction of text, and linking related texts.

Peer feedback

Peer feedback is from students’ classmates. Students exchange their drafts and comments on them.

Teacher feedback

Teacher feedback is the written comments on contents, organisation, grammar and so on, given on student assignments.

Portfolio

A portfolio is the collection of written assignments that reveals a student’s progress or achievement in writing.
1.5 Research Questions

One objective of the study is to help Thai university students to develop their writing ability, by employing teaching approach focusing on discourse structure through a systemic functional linguistics genre approach and to employ the teaching and learning cycles of Feez (1998). The second aim is to obtain feedback on teaching methods from students and lecturers from various perspectives of the teaching of discourse structure. Lastly, the study aims to promote students’ awareness of audience.

In order to achieve the above objectives of the study, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Do the students’ writing abilities improve after using a discourse structure on the Academic Writing course? Discourse structure in this study is defined as the components that help connect texts in discourse in order to convey meaning between the writers’ intention and the readers’ interpretation, through the use of cohesion, which may be categorised at the micro level of discourse and coherence and discourse organisation at the macro level.

1.1 Do students improve at the micro (cohesion) level? For this research question, the objective is to see how students develop ways to connect sentences within paragraphs, by employing cohesive devices to relate ideas across sentences in text throughout their writing.
1.2 Do students improve at the macro (coherence) level? This research question aims to investigate students’ writing improvement as a result of the use of coherence to connect ideas in a text, creating a meaningful flow of ideas throughout whole texts or discourse and enabling readers to understand the writer’s ideas presented in the overall texts.

1.3 Do students improve at the discourse organisational level, dealing with the conventions of connecting texts or paragraphs together using the concept of rhetorical organisation?

2. Do students develop awareness of audience, which means that as writers they take responsibility for providing sufficient information in their texts to help readers understand the context and setting of texts?

3. To what extent does peer feedback influence the sense of audience? To fulfil the aim of my study, one objective is to promote student awareness of audience. According to Hedge (2007, p. 311) this is important for students and writers.

At school it is possible for a teacher to use pair work or peer feedback to give students the opportunity to exchange and read others’ written assignments and provide comments. This exchange can reflect the interaction between reading and writing in real life. Responses to texts by readers are another important and necessary stage in the study of the development of writing. Evaluation was conducted using peer feedback during class. Peer feedback was analysed by other instruments such as
interviews and questionnaires. After peer feedback for each assignment, were students seem to be aware of a sense of audience, which is defined as the perception that the writers should have a responsibility to provide textual sufficient information in order to help readers understand the context and setting of texts?

4. What is the attitude of students towards the English Academic Writing course’s focus on discourse structure? In order to answer this research question, three instruments were employed for the analysis: interviews, questionnaires and students’ reflective writing. The results from each were analysed in more detail and shall be useful in developing a teaching approach for Thai students.

5. What is the attitude of teachers and an administrator towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure? The lecturers who were teaching on the Writing Academic English course were interviewed in order to obtain their response to a teaching approach that would focus on discourse structure. The attitudes of teachers and an administrator are essential for the study, because these contributions and comments and suggestions would benefit current and future research, because, apart from the researcher analysis, different ideas or perspectives should help develop the Writing Academic English course at Naresuan University, in order to initiate the teaching on discourse to develop the writing of the students in the near future.

6. What is the effect of the text modelling in Feez’ cycle on the quality of discourse structure in student writing?
In this study, the cycle of Feez was employed as the main model for teaching and learning as it focus on viewing texts as a whole unit, so it is a suitable model to use in this study. However, the cycle was adjusted in order to match with the objectives of the study. Thus, it is quite challenging to see how effective it would be when it was employed in classroom.

7. What is the effect of portfolio assessment on student writing?
   According to the study, portfolio is an important instrument to measure the improvement of the students writing developments, so it is interesting to know if portfolio help students improve their writing.

8. What is the effect of student reflective writing on their writing?
   The reflective writing of students is a tool which reflective how students develop their writing throughout the course which focus on the discourse structure.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study focuses on the teaching of discourse structure, unlike previous studies. Although some researchers have conducted studies using this genre approach, most of their subjects were students whose major was in English. In this study, the subjects were students from the faculty of science. The researcher aims to contribute alternative writing instruction using this approach to promote the writing ability of these students.
1.7 Organisation of the Study

This study is divided into seven chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 has given the background to the study, a statement of the problems, the research questions and the organisation of each chapter.

Chapter 2 reviews discourse structure, which comprises macro and micro structures, including a description of the importance of discourse organisation, coherence and cohesion in writing.

In Chapter 3, an overview is presented of approaches to teaching writing. The product approach is described first and followed by the contrasting rhetoric approach. Then, the process approach is reviewed and, next, the genre approach. This comprises three major orientations: systemic functional linguistics; English for specific purposes (ESP); and the North American New Rhetoric Approach (NR). Lastly, an evaluation and discussion is given of the importance of the genre approach as a teaching approach.

Chapter 4 presents the rationale for the research methods whereby qualitative and quantitative data are collected. The action research method is discussed. Each instrument is explained as follows: interviews, questionnaires, the teacher diary, reflective writing of students, students’ writing portfolios and feedback. Finally, the statistical data analysis procedure and method are described.
Chapter 5 illustrates how student reflect their writing development on through reflective writing and how portfolio assessment help students promote their writing ability and awareness of audience. The content of this chapter presents the findings from data triangulation from various instruments, students’ interviews, teacher interviews, pre and post questionnaires, students’ reflective writing.

Chapter 6 analyses and triangulates the qualitative data from the interviews, questionnaires, students’ reflections, and teacher interviews in order to answer each research questions about the attitudes of both teachers and student towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure and the effects of portfolio assessment, teaching cycle adapted from Feez and reflective writing of students in the study.

Chapter 7 discusses and concludes the study a review of the research findings for all research questions is presented. Moreover, recommendations for the further study and the limitations of the study are detailed.
Chapter 2
Discourse Structure

2.1 Introduction

Thai students have problems writing essays because they try to translate Thai (their L1) into English (L2). Many errors may be found as they are not aware of the differences between the two languages. According to Abdulsata (2000), there are many problems in teaching writing to Thai students. Firstly, when the teachers gave students a writing assignment, they are unsure of how to proceed and tend to think in their first language (Thai) then translate into English (L2). Most do not notice the discrepancies between Thai and English. Secondly, the students do not know how to organise the information properly in their written compositions. Abdulsata gives the following illustration:

* Finally, I did and I surprisingly she stayed calm. didn’t speak even a word at the moment the world was dark.

When I pointed this out, she remained surprisingly calm, silent, as if entering a mysterious world. (Abdulsata, 2000)

The above sentences appeared in exercises on paragraph writing. As can be seen, the subject was omitted in the second sentence. This kind of deletion of subject is usual in Thai students’ writing. This may result from the Thai discourse concept, which
normally has no sentence boundary marker such as a full-stop. Regarding the problem of subject omission, Thep-Akaraphong (2001, pp. 1-2) suggests that a similar problem of omitting subjects within paragraph writing results from a misconception about usage in discourse between the languages. Conceptual discrepancies exist and can be identified, for example the use of Thai cohesive devices that do not function in the same way as in English. A study by Songjiarapanit (1985) supported that of Abdulsata, stating that there is a problem when students try to translate from their first into their second language. The analysis reveals that there are two levels of error; the first is structural and the second is lexical. In addition, Ubol (1981) examined the errors in freshmen’s and third-year students’ English compositions at the Prince of Songkla University. Errors in the use of pronouns, conjunctions, adjectives and tenses were found. Kanteesan (2003) studied the development of cohesion in Thai students’ journal entries. She found in their first written journals that there was a problem linking sentences with cohesive devices. The results of the study showed that students improved in syntactic ability by using cohesive devices more correctly in their later writing.

Problems in English composition by Thai students may be divided into two levels. The first is at the micro level and concerns lexical and grammatical errors (Ferris, 1996). In other words, it can be termed a superficial problem for most ESL students. Problem such as vocabulary usage, sentence structure, incomplete sentences, cohesion and so on are considered to be at the micro level. In Thailand, in terms of textual analysis and error analysis, micro level problems have been widely studied, yet there has been little research on macro level problems and only a few studies have investigated them, but it is essential to examine both the macro and micro level
among ESL students. In particular, coherence is considered to be subjective and judgments concerning it may vary from reader to reader (Hoey, 1991). Bell (1991, p. 165) stated that coherence is usually mentioned in conjunction with cohesion in terms of the mutual connection in surface text. Coherence refers to discourse connection that does not convey meaning overtly, for readers to interpret texts as the writer intended (Yule, 1996). Therefore, two important factors need to be investigated for the study of development of writing by Thai students; they should deal with cohesion in terms of the micro, and coherence and organisation structure in terms of the macro levels of discourse.

2.2 Definitions of Terms of Discourse Structure

This study aims to define discourse structure in order to understand its meaning better. Discourse structure is defined as the components that help us to connect texts in discourse, in order to convey meaning between writers’ intention and readers’ interpretations through the use of cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation.

There are two main levels of discourse structure, namely the micro and macro levels. Micro structure is treated as the surface level of discourse, which focuses on the concept of the connection between sentences within text by employing cohesive devices to relate ideas between sentences. Cohesion itself is treated at the micro level in this study. Cohesion is defined as the surface marking links between clauses and sentences in written discourse (McCarthy, 1991).
In order to link texts together, cohesive devices, namely referents, ellipses, conjunctions, and lexical items, are used to connect sentences in texts. In other words, cohesion is defined as the devices that allow the writer to establish relationships and connect texts within and across sentences. Macro structure is defined as the concept of textual connection through the use of coherence and discourse organisation to create a relationship and flow of related ideas and organisation throughout the text.

Coherence and discourse organisation are grouped at the macro level of discourse. Discourse organisation is defined as the conventions of connecting texts together by using the concept of rhetorical organisation and cohesion (Batchman & Palmer, 1996). It is useful to know how organised texts help us to establish connections between grammatical structure and discourse organisation (Seidlhofer, 1995). Coherence is defined as the conceptual links beyond the surface text, and it is explained as the ‘properties which allow a text to be understood in a real world setting’ (Witte & Faigley, 1984). In other words, coherence in texts links relevant ideas that are logically presented in paragraphs, with main ideas prominently and clearly stated, and effectively supported throughout the texts.

According to Hatch (1992, p. 209), coherence can be developed not just by the use of scripts, speech events and rhetorical organisation; it connects texts as a unit, and sometimes refers back to a previous part or selection, to guide readers to an understanding of the messages. Therefore, coherence is defined as the connection of ideas in a text that creates meaning or flow of ideas through the whole text or discourse; it enables readers to understand the ideas the writer is presenting in the
overall discourse. In order to understand more about the importance of each aspect of discourse structure in detail, the following sections deal with the studies of cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation, respectively.

2.3 Studies of Cohesion in English

Two major studies of English cohesion were made by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the concept of cohesion deals with relations of elements within discourse. The relations are realised by cohesive devices, classified on the basis of their functions into five main groups. The following is an outline of these five classifications of cohesion in English, with some examples modified from Hatch (1992, pp. 223-227).

1. **Substitution** is the replacement of one element with another that is not a personal pronoun. Substitution can be classified into three subclasses: nominal, verbal and clausal.
   1.1 Nominal substitution. For example:
      A: Do you like this blue shirt?
      B: No, I like the yellow **one**. (one is a substitute for shirt)
   1.2 Verbal substitution. For example:
      A: Can you swim?
      B: Yes, I **can do so**. (do so substitutes for swim)
   1.3 Clausal substitution. For example:
      A: My clothes needed to be washed.
      B: Yes, they **did**. (did substitutes for needed to be washed)

2. **Ellipsis** is the omission of a word, phrase or clause. The omission is possible if we can assume the meaning from the context. Ellipses may be classified into three subclasses, namely nominal, verbal and clausal.
2.1 Nominal ellipsis. For example:
Those books are interesting. I will buy two. (books)

2.2 Verbal ellipsis. For example:
A: Are you singing?
B: No, I’m not. (singing)

2.3 Clausal ellipsis. For example:
A: Doesn’t Bob know how to use the mobile phone?
B: I will teach him how to. (use the mobile phone)

3. Reference is an item that points to another element for its interpretation.
References can be classified into three subclasses: pronominal, demonstrative and comparative references. For example:

3.1 We met John. He is my brother. (pronoun reference)
3.2 I went to John’s room. That was a dreadful place. (demonstrative reference)

Three guys approached me. The biggest guy pulled a knife on me. (comparative reference)

4. Conjunctions are elements that show us a certain meaning that presupposes the presence of other components in the discourse. They can be classified as additive, adversative, causal, temporal and continuative:

4.1 Jane went to India, and she stopped over in Bangkok on the way back home. (additive)
4.2 Cars are convenient; however, they are expensive. (adversative)
4.3 I had no car, so I hired one for my first journey. (causal)
4.4 Her father died when she was young. (temporal)
4.5 You need not apologize. After all, nobody could have known what would happen. (continuative)

5. Lexical cohesion refers to the use of a phrase or lexical items that are related in the same way to those in the earlier part of the text. Lexical cohesion can be classified into four groups: repetition, synonym, superordinate and general word. For example:
5.1 The boy is climbing the bamboo. That bamboo is not very safe.
   (repetition)

5.2 Having lost one opportunity, he won’t get a second chance.
   (synonym)

5.3 The boy is climbing the bamboo. That tree is not very safe.
   (superordinate)

5.4 The boy is climbing the bamboo. That old thing is not very safe.
   (general word)

In summary, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) theory accounts for English cohesive devices, which are classified into five major classes: substitution, ellipsis, reference, conjunction and lexical. Within each class, the cohesive device is further divided into subclasses. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, 49-81) also studied cohesion. They stated that cohesion obviously illustrates the language system of syntax that imposes organisational pattern upon the surface. In long stretches of text, there are devices to reveal sentences are linked together. These devices are classified into seven groups to create a standard of textuality (De Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981):

1. **Recurrence** is the straightforward repetition of elements or patterns in a text.

2. **Partial recurrence** is the shift of an already used element to a different part of speech, such as changing the word teacher to teaching.

3. **Parallelism** is the repetition of the structure filled with new elements.

4. **Paraphrase** is to express a message in other words.

5. **Ellipsis** is the repetition of a structure and its content by omitting some of the surface expressions.

6. **Junction** is the use of a signal to convey the relationships among events or situations in the textual world, by using four types of junctions: conjunction, disjunction, contra-junction and subordination.
7. **Pro-form** is a way to replace content by carrying elements with short holders of no independent content using pronouns and, auxiliary verbs to replace the repetition of words or phrases.

As an early theory to address questions concerning extended discourse, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesion theory is found to have some weaknesses. For example, Brown and Yule (1985, 106) state that cohesion is not sufficient to account for the quality of text. The concept of coherence or how the audience’s background knowledge and knowledge of the real world interacts with the text to a certain extent also concerns the quality of the text. Witte and Faigley (1984, p. 197) point out that a cohesive text does not always ensure text quality. For example, the following text, though very cohesive, is scarcely coherent.

1. The quarterback threw the ball toward the tight end.
2. Balls are used in many sports.
3. Most balls are spheres, but a football is ellipsoid.
4. The tight end leaped to catch the ball.

The problem with the above sentences is that the reader cannot build a ‘real-world scene’ to make sense of them (Fillmore, cited in Witte & Faigley, 1984, p. 197). Despite its weaknesses, Faigley and Witte (1984, p. 186-188) admit that Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) theory is a promising tool to analyse cohesion in a text, because it offers a thorough analysis of cohesive devices. Therefore, since the focal point of the proposed research is on the development of ESL writing among Thai students, both cohesion and coherence should be considered as important components for the study.
2.4 Studies of Cohesion in Thai

It is important to learn how texts connect within discourse by using cohesive devices, so the concept and usage of cohesion has been reviewed to determine how it works. Thai discourse structure has rarely been studied in detail and most studies have focused on small units at sentence level. Hatton (1975) began a study of deep semantic components by analysing a paragraph of standard Thai narrative. The study focused on the relation of elements at sentence level to produce a discourse unit. The analysis revealed that the use of preceding context can clarify the problem of ambiguous meaning in an isolated sentence. Likewise, Longacre (1978) studied Thai narrative discourse. Longacre (1983, 21) classified the structure of narrative discourse into seven parts, as follows: exposition, inciting moment, developing conflict, climax, dénouement, final suspense and conclusion, and he utilised a basic tagmatics concept as a framework for the discourse study. The hierarchy of grammar is discourse, paragraph, sentence, clause, phrase, and so on. All constituents make up a discourse. In the 1980s, much research was conducted by Thai researchers to examine the use of cohesion, using the frameworks of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981).

Much research has dealt with discourse structure in Thai. The work conducted by Chanawangsra (1986) has been accepted and widely employed for the analysis of discourse. She studied the cohesion system in the Thai language using both a written and spoken corpus of linguistic data including an article, an editorial, a letter, a travelogue, a report, a newsletter, and narrative texts. She found that there are six types of cohesive devices in the Thai language: reference, ellipsis, repetition,
substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Her study also suggested that, although the classifications of cohesion in Thai and English were very similar, the devices used to realise cohesion differed in the restrictions on their usage. The aim was to understand more about the Thai view of discourse, especially the use of cohesive devices to link sentences within texts, providing brief explanations and examples, because these devices play an important role in connecting text within and between sentences, and within paragraphs. A brief classification of cohesive devices is adopted from Chanawangsaa (1986), and explanations were reviewed with examples taken from Noonkhan (2003).

In her research, Chanawangsaa (1986) classified Thai cohesive devices into six groups, as follows:

1. References
Thai references are classified into three groups. Chanawangsaa (1986: 35-74):

1.1 Pronoun Reference is a word referring to a noun mentioned previously in the sentence.
หลังจากที่มาทำบ้านเสร็จ 他就去打篮球和曼尼 [Thai expression]
Tham Jarkree Mana Thum KarnBarn Set Khao Oak Pai
After Mana do homework already he then go play basketball with Manee [Thai-English transliteration]

1.2 Demonstrative Reference is an item to help the readers to identify a specific noun that has previously been mentioned.
พันซื้อรถคันใหม่ รถคันนั้นราคาแพงมาก [T.E.]
Phun Su Rod Khun Mai Rod Khun Nun Laka Phang Mark [T.L.]
Pun buy car new car that price very expensive [L.T.]
Pun bought a new car. That car is very expensive. [E.T.]

1.3 **Comparative Reference** is a comparison of one specific item to another. For example:
พระพุทธรูปที่สวยที่สุดในประเทศไทยอยู่ที่จังหวัดพิษณุโลก [T.E.]
Pra Buda Thee Suay thee Sud Nai Prathet Thai You Thee Jungwat Phitsanulok [T.L.]
Buddha image that most beautiful in Thailand is at province Phitsanulok [L.T.]
The most beautiful Buddha image in Thailand is at Phitsanulok. [E.T.]

2. **Substitution**
Chanawangsa (1986, pp. 75-82) classifies Thai substitutions into three categories.

2.1 **Nominal substitution** is the replacement of a noun by another nominal item in a sentence.
เค้กในร้านนี้น่าอร่อยทุกชิ้นเลยฉันอยากกินเค้กอันนั้นจัง [T.E.]
Cake Nai Lan Nee Nar Aroy Tug Chin Lei Chan Yark Kin Cake Aun Nee Jung [T.L.]
Cake in this bakery seem delicious all I want eat cake that [L.T.]
All cakes in this bakery seem delicious. I want to eat that one. [E.T.]

2.2 **Verbal Substitution** is the replacement of a verb by another verbal item in a sentence.
ดํากวาดห้องนอนเสร็จแล้วฉันก็ทำห้องฉันเสร็จแล้วเหมือนกัน [T.E.]
Dum Kward Hong Norn Sed Laew Chan Kor Thum Hong Chan Sed Laew Muan Kun [T.L.]
Dum has already cleaned his bedroom. I have also done mine. [L.T.]

2.3 **Clausal substitution** is the replacement of a noun by another clausal item in a sentence.
3. **Ellipsis**
Chanawangsa (1986, pp. 83-117) classifies Thai ellipses into three groups.

3.1 **Nominal ellipsis** is the deletion of a noun in the sentence. For example:

ชันไพตลาด ซื้อข้าวมาหลายอย่างเลยเพื่อมามาทำอาหารเย็น

I go market to buy food a lot for cooking dinner.

3.2 **Verbal ellipsis** is the deletion of a verb in the sentence. For example:

A: อยากกินไอศครีมไหม
A: Do you want to eat ice cream?
B: อยากกินไอศครีม
B: Yes (I do).
3.3 **Clausal ellipsis** is the deletion of a clause in a sentence. For example:

A: ดาวจะไปเชียงใหม่สัปดาห์หน้า [T.E.]
A: Daow Pai Chaing Mai Subda Nar [T.L.]
A: Daw will go Chaing Mai week next [L.T.]
A: Daw will go to Chaing Mai next week. [E.T.]
B: เธอกำหนดเที่ยว [T.E.]
B: she say you so [L.T.]
B: Did she say (so)? [E.T.]

4. **Conjunction**

According to Chanawangsa (1986, pp. 197-215), Thai conjunctions may be subcategorised into 16 types. Her classification is different from Halliday and Hasan’s. In Thai, there are many types of conjunction used to link one sentence to another.

4.1 **Additive relations** are conjunctions linking sentences when additional information is given. These conjunctions are และ (and), นอกจาก (in addition).

นอกจากแดงหล่แล้วเขายังรวยอีกด้วย [T.E.]
Nork Jark Dang Laew Khao Yung Roi Eeak Duay [T.L.]
In addition Dang handsome he also rich [L.T.]
Dang is handsome. In addition, he is very rich. [E.T.]

4.2 **Enumerative relations** are conjunctions such as ประการแรก (first), ประการที่สอง (second) used to show the order of information joining sentences. For example:

วิธีการทำไข่เจียว ประการแรก ใส่น้ำมันในกระทะก่อน [T.E.]
Wee Karn thum Kai Jaew Prakarn Leak Sai Nammun Nai Krata Korn [T.L.]
Process make an omelet first put oil in pan before [L.T.]
In the process of making an omelet, first the oil should be put in the pan [E.T.]
4.3 **Alternative relations** are conjunctive items used to give alternatives in a sentence. Two alternatives are available namely: หรือ and หรือว่า, which both mean ‘or’.

เธอจะไปดูหนังกับฉัน หรือเธอจะไปว่ายน้ำกับน้องอยู่

You will go see movie with me or you will go swim with Noi

4.4 **Comparative relations** are conjunctive items used to compare the following sentence with the previous one. They are นั่นก็เหมือนกัน (in the same way), ราวกับ (as if) และเหมือนกัน (like). For example:

Tom act as if he were a star.

4.5 **Contrastive relations** are conjunctive elements used to reveal a contrast to the information that has just been given. The following examples of contrastive conjunctions are ขณะที่ (whereas), แต่ (but), แต่ถ้าว่า, แต่...ก็, แต่ว่า (on the contrary). For example:

Somsak works hard whereas his brother is very lazy.

4.6 **Concessive relations** are conjunctive elements used to illustrate contrast in the following information. These contrastive elements
are แม้ ถึงกระนั้น แม้ว่า ถึงแม้ว่า แม้ว, which have the same meaning as even though, nevertheless, although and despite. For example:

มาลีไม่มีความสุขแม้ว่าจะมีเงินมากมายจากธุรกิจส่วนตัว

Malee Mai Mee Kwarm Sook Mae Wa Ther Mee Ngern Mark Mai Jark

Malee no have happy even though she has money a lot from business private

Malee does not feel happy even though she has a lot of money from her business.

4.7 **Exemplificatory relations** are conjunctions used to provide examples of what has been mentioned earlier. These conjunctions include เช่น (for example), ตัวอย่าง เช่น (such as), or ตัวอย่าง เช่น (for instance). Examples are:

กานซื้อผลไม้มาหลายอย่าง เช่น องุ่น ส้ม กก้วย และมะละกอ

Karn Sue Phonlamai Mar Lai Yang Chen Argun Som Kroy

Kan buy fruit many kind such as grape, orange and papaya.

Kan bought many fruits, such as grapes, oranges and papaya.

4.8 **Reformulatory relations** are conjunctions used to show reformulation to what has been previously mentioned, such as คือ (namely). For example:

ประเทศไทยมีพรมแดนติดต่อกับประเทศสี่ประเทศ คือ พม่า ลาว คัมภีร์ และมาเลเซีย

Prathet Thai Mee promdan Thid thor Phuan barn See Phrather Kher

Thailand has border close to neighbour four country namely Burma Lao Cambodia and Malaysia.

Thailand is surrounded by four neighbours, namely Burma, Lao, Cambodia and Malaysia.

4.9 **Causal relations** are conjunctions used to reveal the cause of the preceding statement, such as เพราะ (because) and เนื่องจาก (for). For example:
4.10 **Relations of purpose** are conjunctive elements used to indicate the purpose of the previous information. These conjunctions are เพื่อ and เพื่อว่า, which are equivalent to *in order that* in English. For example:

**T.E.**

Dang Tong Chai Wayla Mark Khwa Nee Phue Wa ja Dai Toad Sorp Khuang Ngon yang Ra Eed

**T.L.**

Dang need time more in order that he check engine carefully

**E.T.**

Dang needed more time in order that he could check the engine carefully.

4.11 **Relations of result** are conjunctive elements used to reveal the result of the information given beforehand. Examples of these conjunctions are จึง, ดังนั้น, เพราะฉะนั้น, เพราะฉะนั้น....จึง, which have the same meaning as *therefore*, *as a result*, *so*, or *as a consequence*. For example:

**T.E.**

วันนี้อากาศร้อนมากในตอนกลางวัน ดังนั้น ฉันจึงลงไปเล่นน้ำในแม่น้ำ

**T.L.**

Today weather hot very in afternoon so I decide go swim in river

**E.T.**

Today, the weather is very hot in the afternoon, so I have decided to go swimming in the river.

4.12 **Conditional relations** are conjunctions used to show the condition of what has been stated earlier. These items are expressed by ถ้า, หาก, หากว่า, ถ้าหากว่า, which convey the same meaning as *if* or *on condition that*. For example:
If you allow Peter to come to the party tonight, I will not talk to you anymore.

4.13 **Inferential relations** are conjunctive items used to specify the information inferred at the beginning of the statement. These conjunctive items are ถ้าอย่างนั้น การอนุญาตให้ ถ้าต้องการ ถ้าต้องทัน. All these words can be defined as if so. For example:

 arma
I finished my dinner. They being the case, let's relax by going to see a movie.

4.14 **Temporal relations** are items used to illustrate time related to the previous statement. The temporal items are: แล้ว, หลังจากนี้, เหมือน (then), หลังจากนั้น, ต่อมา (after that), ประมาณ, ประมาณต่อมา (soon after).

I finished my dinner. Then I went to sleep.

4.15 **Transitional relations** are conjunctions used to link one statement to another without any meaning. These conjunctions are employed in order to change or insert a new topic or viewpoint into a new statement. They are แล้ว, ดังนั้น, ดังนั้น, which means by the way. For example:
A: ต้องทำงานให้เสร็จ

A: Chan Tong thum Ngarn Hai sed

A: I have to work finish

A: I have to finish my work.

B: แล้วจะกลับบ้านกี่โมง

B: Laew Ja Krab Barn Kee Mong

B: By the way will return home what time

B: By the way, when will you return home?

4.16 **Continuative relations** are conjunctions used to connect two parts of a text together without conveying any specific relation. The two conjunctive items ซึ่ง and ก็ mean which or that come under this category. For example:

เขาทำงานหนักเป็นสิ่งที่ดีซึ่งเจ้านายทุกคนชอบพนักงานแบบนี้

He works hard is thing good which boss all love staff like this

As well as the cohesive devices described above, other studies deal with discourse. Ngampradit (1998) examined cohesion in scripted and non-scripted television news reports from Thai television broadcasting channel 3, 5, 7 and 9. The results showed that four cohesive devices were used: reference, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Ellipsis was used more frequently in non-scripted news, while substitution was used much more frequently in scripted news. Kanoksin (1989) studied the structure of Thai expository discourse. The results showed that cohesive devices were used to link together the plot of the story and grammatical features to produce unified and coherent discourse. She indicated that theme markers were composed of ordinal
numbers, topicalisation, demonstrative markers, and repetition, which she also suggested that these devices helped tie elements together in Thai coherent thought.

Chearanai (1991) studied subsequent nominal references between Thai and English. The findings showed that both languages employed repetition, ellipsis, synonyms, superordinates, hyponyms and general words as cohesive devices. She also found that repetition was often used in Thai text, while pronoun references were used in English.

In addition, study conducted by Theppreeda (1998) aimed to explore natural characteristics in the use of cohesive devices and cohesive patterns in Thai and English and establish similarities and differences in the use of cohesion in English and Thai short stories. The results revealed that both Thai and English writers preferred to use references, and substitutions were the least used of the five kinds of cohesive device. This study also found that differences in the use of some cohesive devices resulted from the differences in certain grammatical features between English and Thai, such as omission of the subject in Thai, or the obligation to have an item preceding most common nouns in English such as ‘a’, ‘an’ or ‘the’, whilst Kalayajitkoson (2000) analysed five types of cohesive devices in text. Her aim was to examine cohesion in *Klon Nirad*, written by Suntorn Phu. She found that the cohesive devices frequently used were nominal ellipsis, synonyms and personal pronoun reference. Kinship terms, positions and personal names were the most frequently used.

Plitaporn (2001) studied the language in the travelogue of Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirintorn (five travel books). The objectives of the study were
to examine the structure of topic markers, sub-topic markers, punctuation and cohesion. The findings revealed that ellipses were the most frequently used. Furthermore, the results of the study conducted by Noonkhan (2003) revealed that there are discrepancies between Thai texts and their English counterparts in terms of types of cohesive devices. In Thai text, ellipsis and repetition are more frequently used than the English counterparts.

The previous studies reviewed many aspects of cohesion in Thai. Researchers concentrated on how cohesive devices are used, and employed different sources in their studies, such as short stories, news scripts and travel books. The results showed that some cohesive devices were used frequently in Thai language, for instance, ellipsis and repetition. The studies have related merits derived from cohesion analysis, and some important insights concerning the use of cohesive devices and the writing process may be drawn from these studies and provide good guidelines for this study. Whilst most of the research employed textual analysis, there are few studies exploring how to apply the use of cohesive devices to develop the writing of students in the classroom, so it is quite challenging to experiment with it.

2.5 Studies on Coherence

In this part, the concept of coherence in EFL writing is described with related research. As an early theory to address questions concerning extended discourse, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesion theory is found to have some weaknesses. For example, Brown and Yule (1985, p. 106) state that cohesion is not sufficient to account for the quality of text. The concept of coherence or how the audience’s
background knowledge and knowledge of the real world interacts with the text also contributes to a certain degree to the quality of the text. Witte and Faigley (1984, p. 197) point out that a cohesive text does not always ensure text quality. Similarly, Thornbury (2005, p. 36) suggests that in order to make a text coherent, there are two essential factors of coherence: the micro and the macro level. Thornbury explains that cohesion and coherence do not function independently. Cohesion is a surface feature of texts, while coherence results from the interaction between the reader and the text. In order to make texts easy to follow, cohesive devices are used intentionally by writers. He described the way to approach coherence as follows:

The issue of coherence is usually approached from two perspectives: the micro-level and the macro-level. At the micro level, readers have certain expectations of how the proposition of a sentence is likely to be developed in the sentence or sentences that follow it. When these expectations are met, the immediate text will seem coherent. At a macro-level, coherence is enhanced if the reader can easily discern what the text is about, the text is organised in the way that answers the reader’s likely question, and the text is organised in a way that is familiar to the reader. (p. 36)

The second error is at the macro level. This level includes the macro structure of discourse or rhetorical patterns. Johns (1990, p. 219) suggested that the macro level, which deals with the conventions of written discourse, can lead to problems in ESL writing. Although students have some experience at high school, they still face a writing problem and many students do not present their topic sentence; moreover, they have a problem with the use of signal words that link the train of thought for the reader through the text. Hirose (2003) also pointed out that most EFL students usually favour specific to generic rhetorical organisation. Many students are not aware of this difference in structure, so they cannot generate and develop their ideas to create the coherence when they try to write logically.
This idea is supported by Hinds (1990). He found that there are two types of rhetorical patterns, namely the inductive and the deductive style of writing. Furthermore, coherence can be divided into two groups: internal text coherence and internal reader coherence (Grabe & Kaplan, 1990). Lee (2002) defined the term ‘coherence’ as an abstract term in written discourse that is used to measure the quality of the writing. It refers not only to sentence level connection, but paragraph unity.

Many researchers are interested in studying the problem of coherence in the writing of students, to investigate how EFL students develop their writing ability to fulfil the expectations of English native speakers comprising the audience. In Thailand, micro level problems are widely studied, but there is little research at the macro level, especially in the coherence aspect. However, it is insufficient to study only the macro level problem. It is essential to examine both macro and micro levels of the writing problem among ESL students.

The concept of coherence has been studied by many researchers. According to De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), coherence is one of the seven standards of texuality. Coherence refers to the conceptual links beyond the surface text, explained as ‘properties which allow a text to be understood in a real world setting’ (Witte & Faigley 1984). Thus, if we want to analyse coherence, the context and the readers are important factors to consider, because readers have to read the texts and understand the message from the texts through the given context.
Thep-Ackrapong (2001) also studied coherence of the texts. She found that coherence shifts might occur due to different concepts in Thai and English. Without appropriate knowledge of the text, a reader might misinterpret it. She summarised that the mismatch in coherence between Thai and English could also be explained under the umbrella term, ‘cultural concepts’. It can be said that there are different concepts concerning coherence regarding rhetorical patterns and the authority of text. She added that ideas can be loosely organised in Thai text; moreover, readers have to take responsibility to make sense of the text.

Coherence was defined by Lee (2002) as ‘the relationships that link the ideas in a text to create meaning.’ Not only does this refer to the connection at sentence level, but it contributes to the unity of the overall discourse. Grabe and Kaplan have a similar idea to Witte and Faigley. Grabe and Kaplan classified coherence into two types, as internal text coherence and internal reader coherence. Internal text coherence is also known as the formal property of the text. Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978) stated that coherence is the propositions of microstructures to form the macrostructure of the text, in order to produce overall global coherence in the text. Thus, coherence is based on the surface structure, which comprises cohesion and information structure. It means that the text itself can explain the meaning of to what a text refers. Internal reader coherence focuses on the role of the reader to the text. Readers can use their world knowledge and knowledge from the text structure to understand its meaning. The important point is the interaction of the readers’ knowledge and the text, which has an important role in text coherence. It means that readers can understand the ideas of the writer through the overall discourse meaning of the text, so they can analyse the text whether coherent or not. For example,
Life with Stephen, who as you know is nine, is just great. For Christmas he got chainsaw from his grandmother. I am wondering how much the new floor will cost me. (Enkvist, 1990, p. 17)

This example demonstrates that readers understand the meaning of these sentences, although they have to interpret from the text that Stephen will destroy the new floor with his new chainsaw.

In conclusion, coherence can be classified into two types: internal textual coherence and internal reader coherence. Internal textual coherence is formed of microstructures producing a macro structure of overall global coherence. From this viewpoint, coherence can be explained as internal to the text (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). To view coherence in terms of being internal to the reader, the reader is considered as playing a significant role in understanding the overall meaning of the text. In this case, coherence depends on the relationship between the reader’s understanding and the writer’s intentions, in order to recognise the meaning of the text (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

As can be seen from the following, little research has been conducted by Thai researchers in terms of coherence. Most have focused on cohesion and the structure of discourse. A study by Theppreeda (1998) aimed to explore natural characteristics in the use of cohesive devices and cohesive patterns in Thai and English, and establish similarities and differences in the use of cohesion in English and Thai short stories. The results of this research revealed that both Thai and English writers preferred to use references, but substitutions were the least used among the five kinds of cohesive device.
This study also found that differences in the use of some cohesive devices resulted from differences in certain grammatical features between English and Thai, such as omission of the subject in Thai or the obligation to have an item preceding most common nouns, whilst Kalayajitkoson (2000) analysed five types of cohesive devices in *Klon Nirad*, by Suntorn Phu. She found that the cohesive devices frequently used were nominal ellipses, synonyms, and personal pronoun references. Kinship terms, positions and personal names were the most frequently used. Plitaporn (2001) studied the language in five travel books to examine the structure of topic markers, sub-topic markers, punctuation and cohesion and revealed that ellipses were the most frequently used. Furthermore, the results of the study conducted by Noonkhan (2003) revealed that in Thai text, ellipsis and repetition are more frequently used than in English.

Therefore, it is this main objective of the research to deal with the development of writing by Thai students by focusing on the micro (cohesion) and macro (coherence and discourse organisation) structure of discourse. It seems that teaching writing in Thailand focuses more on grammatical accuracy, and does not view text as whole unit that, to the readers, has to be linked to convey meaning through the concept of discourse structure.

### 2.6 Studies of the Organisational Structure of Discourse

Bickner and Peyasantiwong (1988) used contrastive rhetorical analysis to identify significant differences between English and Thai texts on the same topic written by high school students in the US and Thailand. The findings showed that Thai writers
give more space to defining terms and describing details, rarely including a conclusion, and they like to adopt a more impersonal and formal way of writing. Corbett (2003, p. 70) commented that Asian writing was ‘vague and unwilling to commit to the opinion’.

Indrasutra (1988) also made a comparative study of American and Thai high school narrative texts. The results revealed that action verbs and fewer mental descriptions were characteristic of American writers, whilst more verbs relating to mental states were used as a way to reveal thoughts by Thai writers (p. 218). At this point, it can be seen that Thai and English writers use different ways to express ideas. In contrast to Thai texts, in English the topic sentence can normally be found at the beginning, and following sentences are written to support and produce coherent organisation in the text. Sudajit-apa (2008) pointed to the importance of understanding the different discourse structure between Thai and English, as Thai texts were not presented in a similar way to English. English texts reveal the organisation structure systematically (introduction, body and conclusion sections, respectively) (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley, 1987; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Sudajit-apa (2008) states that ‘the readers of a Thai text tend to read every section in order to draw inferences of the writer’s intention or main idea, since in many instances there will be no topic sentence in the English sense.’ Unlike English texts, the last section of the Thai texts is seldom seen as an important part because the conclusion is not found there. The important parts of message are in the body of the texts. Moreover, she asserted that the text organisation in term of discourse is different. For instance, in conventional Thai texts it is not necessary show the precise topic sentence as it can be identified, especially in long paragraphs, and there is no clear conclusion in those paragraphs. It seems that Thai
texts use a ‘stream of consciousness’ style of writing. The different organisation of texts in discourse between L1 and L2 may prevent Thai from producing and managing the information they want to convey to the readers, despite achieving L1 literacy skills (Sudajit-apasiri, 2008).

As can be seen from the previous review of cohesive devices used in Thai, there are other studies dealing with the discourse. Ngampradit (1998) examined cohesion in scripted and non-scripted television news that showed four cohesive devices of reference, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Ellipsis was used more frequently in non-scripted news, while substitution was used much more frequently in scripted news. Kanoksin (1989) studied the structure of Thai expository discourse. The results showed that cohesive devices were used to link together the plot of the story and grammatical features to produce unified and coherent discourse. She indicated that theme markers were composed of ordinal numbers, topicalisation, demonstrative markers, and repetition, and she suggested that these devices helped tie elements in Thai expository discourse into a coherent thought. Furthermore, Chearanai (1991) studied subsequent nominal reference in Thai and English and found that both languages employed repetition, ellipsis, synonyms, superordinates, hyponyms and general words as cohesive devices. She also found that repetition was used frequently in Thai text, and pronoun references in English.

There are different concepts of structure of discourse between Thai and English. An important point that can help the students achieve in writing is the emphasis of the use of appropriate discourse structure in English, especially in paragraph writing Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 61). The benefit of exploring discourse organisation in texts as part
of instruction is to raise students’ awareness of the ways in which information is presented. Employing the organisation structure of discourse is essential to managing the information appropriately. It helps writers produce effective texts that convey the desired message to readers.

2.7 Genre and Discourse

According to Swales (1990), genre is defined as “a class of communicative events, the member of which share some sets of communicative purposes which are recognised by the expert members of discourse community”. For writing, genre reminds writers to follow the rules to organise messages properly in order to help readers understand, follow overall ideas and recognise the writers’ purposes. In short, genre in EFL aims to convey linguistics messages to achieve communicative purposes. Thus, writers, texts, and readers are considered essential in term of discourse community in genre-based approach. Genre pedagogy based on Hallidayan functional linguists focus on broad discourse organisation patterns, such as narratives, recounts, arguments, expositions which are viewed as elemental genres (Martin, 1992). These kinds of genres can be combined to produce a more complex text in our daily life as it can be seen in the newspapers that there are several elemental genres in newspaper. In genre-based to teaching writing, readers are considered important because the process of writing aims to produce texts for the readers to read and recognise the message from the writer. According to Hinds(1987), English academic text is more explicit about structures and purposes compared to Chinese, Japanese, Thai and Korean because these language tend to let the readers find out what the writers want to say. The ways to organise ideas and structure texts are different in each language. For this reason, writing in English seems to be difficult for non native speakers. For
English, it is the writers’ responsibility to be clear about what they want to readers to know. The notion of discourse community is important because the writers should organise ideas and join texts appropriately in order to communicate with the readers. Thus, for non native writers, it is important to pay attention to the readers and do not let the readers find out the meaning of the texts themselves. It is the writer duty to provide sufficient information. Using genre in EFL writing class aims to help students to learn how to structure their discourse in order to use in different purposes and settings. Therefore, it is important to find a suitable approach for writing instruction. The following chapter presents background of teaching approaches used in classroom writing and the evaluation of why genre approach is suitable for the study provided.

2.8 Conclusion

These research studies reviewed many aspects of discourse, especially cohesion, coherence and organisation structure in both English and Thai. Researchers have concentrated on how the structure of discourse is used in Thai texts compared to English and have employed different sources in their studies such as poetry, short stories, news scripts, and travelogues. Results show that some cohesive devices such as ellipsis and repetition are often used in the Thai language. These studies could contribute enormously to the current research, in the sense that they shed light on discourse structure. Some important insights concerning the use of discourse structure actually help students to understand this aspect of writing and managing the information. The texts may effectively communicate in English by discourse
connectivity through cohesion, coherence and organisation, to enhance students’ writing ability.
Chapter 3
Teaching and Learning Second Language Writing

This chapter reviews the approaches to teaching and learning second language writing. The approaches are classified into four main groups. The product approach is reviewed first, followed by the process approach and the contrastive rhetoric approach. Lastly, the genre approach is illustrated. The purpose is to obtain an overview of each approach and to understand benefits and potential drawbacks. It may assist the researcher to discover appropriate and suitable methods for applying the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure.

Before overviewing the approaches to writing, the relationship between cohesion, coherence and audience awareness is briefly reviewed in order to see how important each is in promoting the teaching of writing through discourse structure. The issues of cohesion, coherence and audience awareness are the main focuses of the study. Coherence can be defined as the general overall interrelation of texts or the continuity of meaning in the context, while cohesion refers to the surface structure of texts or the continuity of words and sentence structure. Cohesion alone is not enough for the interpretation of discourse; the interpretation of discourse should consider both cohesion and coherence.

In addition, audience is important because the interaction between text and background knowledge of the reader is vital. Reading comprehension does not rely on linguistics; the general knowledge a reader brings to the text is also important. It will enhance writing awareness through the reading experience of needing sufficient
information for the text to be comprehensible. Therefore, it is important to find a suitable approach that focuses on these aspects of cohesion, coherence, and audience awareness. The following section deals with the various approaches to teaching writing, but the genre approach is selected as the main approach for this research as it provides the main focus on discourse structure. However, some aspects from the other approaches were adopted in the study such as imitation of rhetorical organisation as a model in writing, and the process instruction steps on pre-writing, acquiring ideas, beginning to plan, drafting and revision of the whole text.

3.1 An Overview of Second Language Writing Approaches

Writing is considered to be the most difficult skill for second language learners to acquire. Learners as writers require various kinds of knowledge, such as content knowledge, context knowledge, language system knowledge and writing process knowledge (Tribble, 2003, p.43). As regards the content knowledge, writers should have background knowledge in the area they want to write about, plus context knowledge to deal with situations, and awareness of the relationship between writer and readers. In addition, language system knowledge is considered as an essential aspect, because writers should have both lexical and grammatical knowledge to produce their work, whilst the methodology for collecting and presenting effective ideas in writing is essential to the writing process. It seems that a wide range of knowledge is needed to complete written work. This may call into question the approach to the writing that is useful or appropriate for learners and so approaches to teaching second language writing are reviewed to understand the specific characteristics of each.
3.2 The Product Approach

According to John (1997, p. 7), the product approach is ‘acquired through direct practice… it is focused on the production of perfect, formally organised language patterns and discourses’. This approach is considered to be teacher centered; the teacher is an expert person whom students have to believe and obey; he or she soothes the students, who take on a passive role. Hairston (1982) and Raimes (1983) argue that the product approach should not be viewed as simply linear:

Contrary to what many text books advise, writers do not follow a neat sequence of planning, organizing, writing and then revising. For while a writer’s product - the finished essay, story, or novel - is presented in lines, the process that produces it is not linear at all. Instead, it is recursive.

(Raimes 1985, p. 229)

It seems that many teachers emphasise grammatical competence over discourse competence, ie the knowledge and ability to produce and understand cohesively and coherently linked texts (Manajitt, 2008). Sangboon (2004) examined the teaching practice of English teachers at Thai university level where traditional teaching approaches and techniques, with their personal beliefs and experience, are still employed, such as the still-prevalent controlled exercises. Nunan (1991) also stated that learning by imitating was thought of as being at sentence level, because here the structure is relevant, whereas imitation in the product approach is inappropriate in the light of language learning pedagogy, especially at discourse level.
This research attempts to break with the traditional approach that focuses on the grammatical and syntactic aspects of teaching writing by recommending the genre approach. This provides a wider view and helps students promote and achieve writing ability, not only in grammatical competence but also in discourse and sociolinguistic competence (that deals with the use of language in an appropriate context).

3.3 The Contrastive Rhetoric Approach

According to Connor (2004, p. 1), contrastive rhetoric is a study examining the similarities and differences in writing across cultures. The study of contrastive rhetoric began in the 1960s with Robert Kaplan. This area of study has had a significant impact on the teaching of writing in both English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL). In second-language acquisition, the contrastive rhetoric approach is an area of research into problems in writing encountered by second-language writers. It attempts to distinguish and compare the rhetorical strategies of the first language in order to explain second language writing (Connor, 1996, p. 5).

Kaplan (1996) examined the paragraph organisation of ESL students’ writing and identified five systems of paragraph development in English, Semitic, Oriental, Romance and Russian. He explained that Anglo-European writing employs a linear system, while Oriental writing, including Chinese, Thai and Korean, uses an indirect way and starts from the end of the line.
Although Kaplan’s perspective of contrastive rhetoric has been criticised for ignoring the linguistic and cultural differences in each language, it contributed a modification of the rhetorical differences that may result from the various conventions of writing in each culture. This reminds writers to be aware of cross-cultural and linguistic differences. To understand these differences, both teachers and students help to highlight some aspects of difficulty faced by L2 writers (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Likewise, Leki (1991) and Reid (1993) recommended that there are many ways to employ contrastive rhetoric in the writing classroom, such as comparing and contrasting L1 and L2 rhetorical patterns, to make students aware of how differently the two texts are organised. Teachers can prevent cultural misunderstandings of writing preference, and help students to the realisation that there may be interference by cultural and rhetorical patterns in their native language.

My study provides a good opportunity to employ the contributions of this research, as it is important to understand the various conventions of each language in order to help students to produce effective writing. Often, the organisation in texts differs; moreover, textual linking devices also differ. As regards the study of contrast rhetoric

Figure 3.1 Kaplan’s diagram of rhetorical pattern (Connor, 2001)
in Thailand, much research has investigated comparisons between Thai and English texts, for instance by Chanawangsa (1986), Kanoksin (1989), Ngampradit (1998), Theppreeda, (1998), Kalayajitkoson (2000), Plitaporn (2001), Chuangsuvanich (2002), Noonkhan (2003) and Kanteesan (2003). Most of these researchers indicate that there are differences between Thai and English in the organisation and use of cohesive devices in linking texts. The research contributes greatly to my study, especially in terms of the organisation and the connecting text; it is a reminder how differently Thai and English texts are arranged, thus useful in terms of understanding Thai students’ writing, which experiences interference from their native language. It is a good chance to make students aware of the differences between the two languages. Understanding these differences can prevent students from misunderstanding the organisation of writing in English and avoid this interference from the cultural and rhetorical patterns of their first language, as Leki (1991) and Reid (1993) suggest.

### 3.4 The Process Approach

According to Zamel (1982), the process approach to writing instruction is based on studies of how writers produce texts. Normally, the process approach to instruction focuses on pre-writing, acquiring ideas, beginning to plan, drafting and revision of the whole text. Furthermore, this kind of instruction is devoted to looking at the overall content, rearranging the organisation or considering whether there is enough detail provided in the written text. Vessakosol (1989) studied a teaching model based on process writing for Thai students at higher education level. The course content focused on four content areas: linguistic knowledge, rhetoric knowledge,
communication skills and the writing process. The results of the study revealed a positive effect on students’ writing ability, in terms of encouraging the students to manage ideas during writing.

Moving away from concentration on the written product-oriented approach, the process approach focuses on how learners manage to process writing, instead of devoting time to grammatical and syntactic forms. The aim of process writing is to teach learners that successful writing focuses more on generating ideas, structuring those ideas, drafting and revising, instead of concentrating on the idea that writing is a simple way of practising grammar to learn how to write.

The process approach was not universally employed by teachers; Reid (1984) argued that it did not address some aspects, for instance schemata development, in producing written discourse, the requirements of particular writing tasks and individual variation in writing condition. Hyland (2003) criticised it as ambiguous pedagogy that ignored
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the social dimension and undermined the teacher’s role. For second language writing, some researchers argued that, even though the process approach is a suitable guiding procedure for writing instruction in past research, this approach can be considered as a wholly individual learner process. It seems that ‘the writing process is an abstract, internal process, and writing is a discovery-type activity, wherein what was being discovered is often at least partly ‘the self’. Kent (1999), Tobin (1994) and Bazerman (1980) agree that the process approach has a drawback because it is more student-centred and open to chance. It develops students’ abilities and emphasises the rhetorical aspects of writing through process strategies. Other disadvantages concern the assumption that all types of writing employ the same procedures every time for every writer, and ignore the provision of linguistic guidance to assist learners to write successfully (Badger and White, 2000). Bizzell (1982) states that process instruction fails to give adequate emphasis to the conventions of different academic discourse that would help prepare students for different types of academic writing at the tertiary level.

3.5 The Genre Approach

According to Hyland (2004, p. 24), the genre approaches to writing are defined as writing instruction that focuses on the achievement of an idea in text, revealing the awareness of context by both readers and writers. Tribble (2003) asserts that communication is not achieved if the reader cannot identify the purpose of each written text, so the genre approach is considered as a social activity to give an opportunity of interaction among writers, texts and readers. According to Hasan (1996), the genre approach provides learners with the most effective way to employ
both cultural and linguistic resources and a clear understanding of the rhetoric of texts and a metalanguage. Teachers can also help students analyse texts and understand by using texts as tools to compare and deconstruct to show the underlying assumptions and characteristics.

The genre approaches contain different perspectives in terms of the theoretical frameworks and pedagogies, and can be classified into three main groups: the Systemic Functional Linguistics approach (SFL), the New Rhetoric approach (NR) and the English for Specific Purposes approach (ESP). The ESP approach focuses specifically on the communicative events of discourse communities that have similar broad aims and social purposes (Swales, 1990). The NR approach concentrates on the use of rhetorical features between text types and situation in context, instead of analysing textual elements. A comparison of three approaches including ESP and Australian genre research provides useful guidelines for presenting these features in classrooms, and gives EFL/ESL teachers insights into the linguistic features of written texts. In contrast, the NR approach yields insights into academic and professional contexts. Table 3.1 reveals the specific characteristic of each approach.
Table 3.1 The perspective of genre (Hyland, 2004, p. 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Primary Focus</th>
<th>Intellectual Roots</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
<th>Educational Context</th>
<th>Samples Genres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Discourse structure and features</td>
<td>Systemic linguistics</td>
<td>Vygotsky (ZPD) teaching learning cycle</td>
<td>L1 schools, adult migrants</td>
<td>Narrative, reports, recounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Social purposes, context</td>
<td>Post-structure</td>
<td>Heuristics, general formats</td>
<td>L1 university composition</td>
<td>Political beliefs, patents, medical records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Discourse structure and features</td>
<td>SFL, CLT, pragmatics</td>
<td>Consciousness raising, needs analysis</td>
<td>Occupational and academic training</td>
<td>Articles, memos, sales letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section explains each type of genre-based approach.

### 3.5.1 The North American New Rhetoric Approach (NR)

The New Rhetoric (NR) approach focuses on the rhetorical theory and composition study that apply to writing English from L1 principals. NR views genre as a guiding rhetorical strategy, not a linguistic structure (Hyland, 2004). Johns (2003) describes it as the study of rhetorical theory, and the studies as compositions in the perspective of English as L1. According to Bekenkotter and Huckin (1995), NR studies concentrate on the rhetorical structures that can be employed in suitable conditions.
According to Hyland (2004), NR emphasises ‘the socially constructed nature of genre that has helped unpack some of the complex relations between text and context and the ways that one reshapes the other, but New Rhetoric underlines the fact that literacy is not the monolithic competence it is often perceived to be’; and ‘its contribution to L2 writing instruction has been minimal.’ Kroll (2003, p. 209) also comments on its insignificant contribution to classroom instruction/ Because texts using this approach are not authentic, teachers cannot make students understand the wide variety possible. Bazerman (1998) indicated that the NR approach focuses on aspects of negotiating or evaluating genre in the workplace rather than the classroom.

### 3.5.2 The English for Specific Purposes Approach (ESP)

Hyon (1996) states that in academic and professional settings ESP researchers have been interested in genre as a tool for teaching spoken and written language to non-native speakers (Bhatia, 1993; Flowerdew, 1993; Hopkins and Dudley-Evans, 1988; Swales, 1990). They have framed genre as oral and written text types, as shown by their formal properties and communicative purposes within a social and cultural context. The best-known approach to the analysis and teaching of professional and academic discourse is probably the by leader of genre and move analysis, Swales. His concept of discourse analysis is widely used by researchers and teachers (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). He states (Swales, 1990) that the concept of genre is based on a study of the constituent parts or moving structures of text, representing the writer's communicative purpose and defines it as follows:
A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains the choice of content and style (Swales 1990, p. 58).

Swales developed his framework to help university students who were non-native speakers of English and his concept of move analysis has been implemented in many situations from around the world (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). Swales took an interest in genre analysis because it was particularly beneficial in the field of applied linguistics and teaching English for Academic Purposes.

In order to describe various texts and rhetorical organisation patterns in a variety of academic disciplines and genres, Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) studied the material in Master of Science dissertations. Thompson (1994) studied movie reviews and Samraj (2002) university lectures. Bhatia (1993) headed ESP research in English and business and technology in Singapore, while similar kinds of research were also proposed by Flowerdew (1993) in English for professionals in Hong Kong. Eggin and Martin (1997) defined genre theory as a means of differentiating how texts are similar and dissimilar, and for what reason. Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) suggested genre analysis provides useful information about the nature of different text types used in teaching pedagogy.

In short, the ESP genre approach focuses on the general rhetorical organisation within academic and professional texts. Moreover, a number of ESP studies look at sentence level linguistic features that are prominent in particular types of texts, such as the use

However, some researchers argue that the ESP genre approach to academic writing is not monolithic. Hall and Hewings (2001) make comments on the ESP genre, saying that this approach tends to be a preferred way of writing in particular disciplines, and suggest that it would be better to assist students to develop an awareness of the general significance of certain characteristics of writing in particular genres, such as text organisation patterns or grammatical points, and they should be provided with analyses of how the texts are employed. Finally, Kroll (2003) questions whether ‘teachers can teach certain general concepts, skills or understandings that can be introduced in composition classes of novice students’.

3.5.3 The Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach (SFL)

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) originated in a study by Michael Halliday (Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1989). Hyland (2004, 25) states that Halliday’s linguistic framework is a set of systems for creating meanings in social contexts, and is far broader than most linguistic theories. Christie (1991) gave an overview of the SFL approach as follows:

A text is understood as functioning in a context, where context is said to operate at two levels: at the level of register, where field (social activity), tenor (interpersonal relationships among people using language) and mode (the part played by language in building communication) all have consequences for the choices made by the linguistic system; at the level of genre, where social purpose in using language, it also has consequences for the linguistic choice made. For any given instance of language, a genre is selected (be that a report, a narrative, a trade encounter etc.) and particular choices are
made with respect to field, tenor, mode, all of which are realized in language choices. (p. 142)

Burns (2001) stated that the SFL genre-based approach investigates the surface text by following the schematic structure of the text and analyses the register variables: field, tenor and mode, considered to be the inner structure of the texts. Dong and Wu (2009) assert that schematic structure is useful because it helps to manage the overall structure of texts and help students learn to cope with different types of texts.

The SFL genre-based approach was first developed in Australia, with three assumptions. Firstly, learning language is viewed as a social activity. The outcome occurs from the collaboration between teacher and the student and between students and their classmates. Secondly, learning occurs more effectively with the explicit teaching approach in order to meet student expectation, so the SFL genre-based approach developed a dynamic pedagogy for language teaching that aims to provide students with explicit knowledge about language without ignoring the value of the social interaction between teacher and students, and between students. The process of learning language is comprised of levels of development as scaffolding, based on Vygotsky (1934/1978) who emphasised that learning is a collaboration between teacher and student. Teachers can help students to develop their learning level in the performance.

According to Vygotsky, researchers have applied his ideas to develop their own studies. Hammond (1992) presented the wheel of teaching and learning cycle with three phases: modelling, joining and negotiating texts and independent construction of texts. In 1994, SFL genre-based teaching and learning model were developed by
Knapp and Watkins. The process comprises three stages, the first stage focusing on the connection between language writing and students’ experiential knowledge. In the second stage, students have a chance to explore the generic structure of particular texts. The last stage focuses on grammatical aspects of writing. In 1998, Feez developed the cycle of teaching and learning that comprises five stages: contextual building, textual modelling and deconstruction, completed with construction of the text, independent construction of text and the linking of related texts.

According to Paltridge (2004), in the genre approach, ‘teaching writing focuses on teaching particular genres that students need control of in order to succeed in particular settings including a focus on language and discourse features of the texts, as well as the context’. Johns (2003) points out that the SFL approach is a framework with a clear development and a description of the principle of genre, linguistic and organisational aspects of method analysis (Halliday, 1985; Vygotsky, 1934/1978). In addition, the teaching and learning cycle can make for clear concepts in teaching and organising classroom; researchers may modify the cycle to suit the classroom context. Callaghan and Noble (1993) describe SFL as providing a curriculum of genre for the classroom in clearly ordered steps each goal. The first step is the introduction of a model of text that tries to help students to understand the social purpose of text through the use of a schematic structure and linguistic features. Then, the teacher and students help connect to the text by reading, managing, arranging and combining information. Lastly, students select the topic and write their own text in that genre.

According to the language learning approach proposed by Feez (1998), the learning perspective of texts can help students in both knowledge and skills when dealing with
both spoken and written texts in each social context. It also explains the learning process as a step by step scaffolding development, as in Figure 3.3 below. This method was applied by Vygotsky (1934/1978) and Bruner (1986), and is widely used in primary, secondary and tertiary education in Australia. Feez’ cycle of teaching and learning comprises five stages: contextual building, textual modelling and deconstruction, completed with construction of the text, independent construction of text and the linking of related texts.

![Figure 3.3 The teaching and learning cycle (Feez, 1998, p. 28)](image)

However, I would argue that there should be one more stage, namely a textual reader response to fulfill the aims of my study because, in terms of the organisation of discourse, unlike Thai texts most English texts start with a topic sentence and place greater emphasis on coherent organisation throughout the text with an introduction, body and conclusion section (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley, 1987; Bicker & Peyasantiwong, 1988; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Therefore, readers of Thai texts tend to read every section in order to draw inferences about the writer’s intention or main idea, because often there will be no topic sentence in the English sense. In addition, deciding to skip sections or jump to the conclusion will be an ineffective strategy, as it
is likely to make the reader miss important messages. Moreover, Thai readers do not pay much attention to the final section of the text, since in most cases there is no genuine conclusion with future orientation or solutions to a problem, as these are provided in the body of the text instead.

According to Hedge (2007, p. 311), it is important to help students and writers to develop a sense of audience. At school, it is possible for the teacher to use pair work or peer feedback to give an opportunity for students to exchange written assignments and provide comments. The exchange can reflect the interaction of reading and writing in real life. The response to a text by readers is another important stage that needs focus in the study of development of writing, as can be seen in Figure 3.4, below. Notion of textual reader response should be added in the teaching and learning stages in the text based approach. Figure 3.4, adapted from Feez and Joyce (1998), adds one stage: *textual reader response*.

![Figure 3.4 Teaching and learning stages/cycle (adapted from Feez & Joyce, 1998)](image-url)
Figure 3.4 presents each of Feez’ (1998) teaching and learning stages. An authentic model of a type of text is introduced and studied at the context building stage. This brings students into the situation in a social context. The text in advertisements for products describes a vacuum cleaner, for instance, using words such as small, light, weight, price, and so on. During this stage, students can learn about different types of text. The second stage is textual modelling, where students investigate structural patterns and the language features of models and compare to other types of text.

Here, the teacher introduces appropriate texts. Learners pay attention to structure and the language features of the models. At the stage of joint construction of text, teachers reduce their contribution because students begin to contribute to the construction of whole examples of types of text, moving closer to controlling the text independently.

The fourth stage is independent construction of text. At this stage, students independently draft whole texts. Hinds (1990) analysed expository paragraph writing in Japanese, Thai, Chinese, and Korean and concluded that these languages organise text information from the specific to the general. The characteristics of such students’ writing are a lack of both focus and organisation, and they are hard for English readers to understand, so the next stage is designed to help increase the paragraph discourse structure in appropriate ways to help students become more aware of the organisation of their text. At this stage, I would propose adding an additional stage, *textual reader response*, where students exchange their written texts and read and respond to their colleagues’ text to check continuity, and avoid native Thai ways of presenting ideas. Linking related texts is the last stage in helping students to compare different types of text.
The following information provides some guideline activities for each of the teaching and learning stages of Feez (1998).

There are various implications of this approach for writing. First, it helps students build awareness of discourse organisation and view written discourse results ranging from a combination of small units of meaning to longer, clearly written text. Secondly, it helps students to identify their writing needs on the relevant topic. It is beneficial for teachers and students to survey their writing needs in the relevant categories. Students can work independently, applying skills learnt from the teaching and learning cycle.

### 3.6 Classroom Teaching of Discourse Structure

As can be seen from previous sections, there are many approaches to EFL writing such as product approach, process approach, and genre approach. Each makes a contribution to this study, which aims to find new ways to help Thai students develop their writing ability through the use of discourse structure. The discourse structure is the focus of this study because previous work has revealed that many Thai researchers have tended to focus on grammar rather than work at the level of discourse. The structure of discourse allows students to view texts as a whole, not as separate units. They have to concentrate on how to connect texts in their writing, so I think that this helps them improve their writing by applying knowledge of cohesion, coherence, and discourse organisation as vital elements of text.
This study attempted to find a suitable approach for teaching writing to Thai university students. The SFL genre approach based on work by Feez (1998) was considered suitable for the teaching approach because it focuses on the discourse level in writing. This served the purpose of this study by viewing a text as a whole unit and helping students to be more concerned with connecting and organising their writing to be effective than grammar. Secondly, the teaching cycle presented by Feez is considered useful and flexible scaffolding for both teachers and students by giving students a step by step process of learning to help them understand texts. Furthermore, teachers can make plans of teaching and activities following each stage of Feez’ cycle and take full responsibility from the start to provide explicit knowledge and guidance to develop the written texts, then slowly withdraw their support by the end of each stage when students are writing on their own (Hyland, 2008). Lastly, the genre approach is appropriate for this study because it focuses on the achievement of an idea in text, revealing an awareness of context by both readers and writers that can help to answer the second research question.

This study also aims to enhance the reader’s awareness of audience. This is felt to be imperative (see the discussion on pp. 48–49) The genre approach to writing instruction views writing as a communication between writers and readers within a specific context, so this teaching method concentrates on how to use language to accomplish this communication through coherent and purposeful writing, not just writing what one wants to write. Normally, students take the part of writers, but this study takes the opportunity of allowing them to be readers, too. A student will learn much from reading their peers’ writing from the perspective of a reader as it reminds them to provide sufficient information: sometimes writers are mistaken in thinking...
they have provided enough. The way to help students promote an awareness of audience is to employ peer feedback on various aspects such as grammar, content and organisation.

In conclusion, the approach used in this study is the SFL genre approach based on Feez’ (1998) cycle, adjusted by adding *textual reader response* to help students to view texts from the point of view of both writer and reader during writing. This serves the objective of the study by focusing on the texts as a whole and providing both teachers and students with process of teaching and learning in stages to guide the learners to understand how to produce text.

However, this study did not ignore the advantages of other approaches and ideas from the process approach were also employed during pre-writing, as can be seen below at the stage of independent construction of text in the teaching of the discourse structure in the classroom. This process was also blended with the teaching and learning cycle of Feez. Students need to do pre-writing and outlining, getting ideas, beginning to plan, drafting and revising the whole text, and also had the opportunity to analyse the rhetorical organisation of the texts provided by the teacher. The reason for inserting the process of writing into the cycle is to try to balance the two approaches. While the process approach focuses on the writing and thinking process, the genre approach concentrates on the social aspect of the final product. To bring the process approach into the cycle may help students support and help their peers to improve their writing to achieve a finished text. Moreover, the contrastive rhetoric approach contributes in terms of allowing students to see the various conventions of textual organisation. The
ideas of rhetorical patterns may be used for students to see and analyse the contrasting rhetorical organisation of texts at the stage of textual modelling.

The following section illustrates how the teaching approach used in the classroom week by week to enable students to develop their writing through the use of discourse structure.

3.6.1 The Teaching of Discourse Structure Through the Learning Stages in my Classroom

Week 1: Introduction

The students were introduced and the objectives of the course, course syllabus, and course evaluation explained at the beginning of the class. After that, the students were asked to do the questionnaire. Then, we had a discussion about what a good piece of writing is. The students had opportunities to express their opinions about what a good piece of writing should be. In class, the students are requested to write a one-page story about themselves. This activity is aimed at the students’ ability and their process of writing. Next, it was explained how the class would be taught. Students were introduced to the terms of discourse structure. What does it mean? What are cohesion, coherence, and discourse organisation? How important are these elements in writing? The aim of explaining discourse structure terms is to understand the elements that connect texts. For example, the students were provided with an example of good and bad text. They had a chance to compare the texts regarding organisation, the use of cohesive devices, and the flow of the ideas throughout the text.
Week 2: Contextual building and Textual Modelling Stage

Students were introduced to descriptive writing. The first stage of the use of the Feez’ teaching and learning cycle (1998) was employed. For the contextual building stage, examples of room descriptions were given for students with questions such as ‘who is writing this room description? Who are the readers?, What is the objective of this description?. Asking these questions help students see the purpose and situation. Students had the opportunity to talk to their friends and discuss with them the purpose of describing places. In addition, they identified the rooms, furniture, objects and learnt the vocabulary.

There was class discussion of why we might want to write a description of place and the purpose of such text, such as to sell a room, find some roommates or just describe it for pleasure. At this stage, the role of the teacher is to initiate and guide students to understand the purpose, audience and context.

The second stage of textual modelling was introduced to students. At this stage, students can learn from the text model and compare it with the models of descriptions. They had to analyse the samples provided by the teacher to see the key features and variations on descriptive paragraphs. Students had the opportunity to see how important discourse structure is and were provided with different organisations of descriptive paragraph to help them see various kinds of textual organisation. Moreover, students had to identify description and analyse how the text is organised, then do group activities highlighting the lexical chain relating to stages or topics, circling the cohesive devices (conjunctions). The teacher facilitates and might ask students to rearrange the order of information or reorganise scrambled text. Students
also had to develop their grammar such as the use of prepositional phrases of place in their description, and had vocabulary lists of descriptive adjectives and nouns. At this stage, the teachers acted as an instructor to guide and control students in the use of paragraph patterns and models in classroom tasks and activities.

**Week 3: Joint Construction of the Text and Independent Construction of the Text**

At this stage, students learned to how to construct texts from the models provided by the teacher during the activities. They had to identify which sentences did not fit the texts and rearrange them to produce a coherent result. The students had opportunities to explore the discourse structure through paragraph construction to see how the texts connect by cohesive devices and how to organise the texts. At this stage, the teacher guides and supports students to construct the text. In addition, skeleton texts with clues for students to complete were introduced to prepare them for their own writing. The teacher paid attention to help students to jointly produce texts from the examples to prepare and advise them about the topic they had chosen. The students were also trained to produce their writing through a writing process focused on outlining, drafting and editing.

After students had learnt to produce texts, they attained the stage of independent construction of text and wrote on their own. The teacher provided topics, but if they wanted to write other subjects they were allowed to do so after consulting the teacher. At this stage, students prepared an outline before writing, then began to write in class. The teacher guided and monitored them during a brainstorming and outlining process. The students were asked to finish their first draft before the next class. Then, the
teacher suggested them for their first draft. At this stage, the teacher acted as an observer and assessor of students’ writing plans and drafts, discussing when the students produced texts independently.

**Week 4: Textual Reader Responses and Linking Related Texts**

At this stage, students exchanged their first drafts with their peers to read and give comments. This stage allowed students to view their friends’ writing from the perspective of a reader. This proofreading aimed to help students become aware of the audience whilst they are in the role of a reader, compared to previous stages when they had the role of being the writer. Students carried out peer feedback with a sheet provided by the teacher (see Appendix 5, adapted from Alice Oshima & Ann Hogue, 2007). This aimed to help students focus on proofreading important points of grammar, vocabulary, paragraph organisation, discourse structure, and so on. During this stage, the teacher helped and supported peer feedback in case there were arguments. The students went back to correct their drafts and submitted it with peer feedback to the teacher at the next class at the end of the week. The teacher acted as observer and assessor to help students during their peer review, and to help polish their drafts.

After students submitted their first draft, all their writing was evaluated and returned. At the beginning of the class, errors and important points of grammar, vocabulary, paragraph organisation and the use of cohesive devices often found in students’ writing were put on the projector. Then, all the points were discussed and explained in order to help the students make progress in their writing. Students received
feedback from the teachers and had a chance to clarify any ambiguous points. After that, they had to revise their first drafts and submit the final draft within the week.

Week 5: Linking Related Texts

At the stage of linking related texts, students were introduced to use of the genre in other situations, such as describing experiments in the laboratory, or use of the same content with different purposes, such as making a complaint at a place where they stayed or requesting a new apartment, and so on.

At the end of the description chapter, all students were asked to write their reflections about the teaching and learning throughout the four weeks and submit them at the next class. In order to see how teaching was conducted, the following example of how discourse structure was employed in classroom was provided:

Example of a Lesson Focusing on Discourse Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable students to write description of place they went on holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discuss different uses of written description, e.g. tourist information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- build vocabulary for describing places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- study the structure of a short description of a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- learn to organise and categorise information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- study grammatical features using prepositional phrases, connecting clauses, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher:
- prepare material for context building, text modeling, from sources such as the internet, the library, and encyclopedias about places

The Teaching of Discourse Structure and Learning Stages in my Classroom.

**Context Building**

At the stage of context building, an authentic model of text type will be introduced and studied. This will bring students into a situation in a social context, for example exploring advertising texts. Advertisements for products – describing a product such as a vacuum cleaner: size, weight, price, and so on. During the context building stage, students can learn about contrasting types of text.

- Bring a picture of a city or place where they went on holiday
- Talk to friends and discuss with the purpose of describing places and sharing feelings
- Identify the places, names, objects and describe their features using vocabulary lists
- Join a whole-class discussion of why we might want to write a description of a place or set the purpose of the text.

**Textual Modelling**

At the textual modelling stage, students had opportunities to investigate the structural patterns and language features of the model and compare with other examples of text type. At this stage, the teacher introduces texts appropriate to the context and learners need to pay attention to the structure and language features of the models.
The teacher needs to:

- Find text models (descriptions) as examples
- Develop activities to employ cloze or substitution of cohesive devices such as ‘and’, ‘also’
- Develop knowledge of clauses of grammar and prepositional phrases of place, by jumbling groups of phrases and clauses and having students rearrange them using the relation of information order (given and new information).

Students need to:

- Name stages and compare with the models of descriptions
- Identify description and analyse how the text is organised
- Highlight in groups the lexical chain relating to stages or topics
- Circle the cohesive devices (conjunctions)

**Joint Construction of Text**

Students begin to contribute to the construction of whole examples of text type at the stage of joint construction of text. Teachers reduce their contribution as students’ move closer to controlling the text themselves.

Teachers need to:

- Use the whiteboard to construct text (referring to the model)
- Prepare students for the writing process focusing outlining, drafting, editing
- Prepare skeleton texts with clues for students to learn how to construct texts
Students need to:

➢ Compare draft texts to models and discuss with friends

**Independent Construction of Text**

At the stage of independent construction, students work on their own, writing drafts of whole texts.

Students need to:

➢ Put into context their own drafts (descriptive work as class assignment or homework)

➢ Students proofread and edit drafts

➢ Students and teachers assess drafts (for further suggestions).

**Textual Reader Responses**

Students exchange texts and read them at the stage of textual reader responses, and provide feedback on their peers’ texts to check for textual continuity.

Students need to:

➢ Carry out the peer feedback

➢ Read their peers’ drafts and give comments

➢ Review the comments and decide whether or not to follow them up

➢ Submit the drafts.
Linking Related Texts

During this stage of linking related texts, students compare types of text in different fields, and may find other types used in the same field.

- Students compare and contrast written descriptions with other text types, for example recount, compare the purpose, and context stages and language features.

All details of the teaching approach used in this study were explained in earlier sections. Feez’ teaching and learning cycle is considered a useful and clear path to writing because it allows students to learn step by step while the teacher supports and guides them through the process until they can produce their own text. Hyland (2008, p. 558) also supports the use of the Feez’ teaching and learning cycle (1998). Each stage provides teachers and students with clear knowledge and guided practice while teachers can gradually reduce their support until the students can write on their own. In addition, the cycle is quite flexible and allows students to commence at any stage, depending on their existing knowledge. The students can use the cycle as scaffolding, with the teacher supporting them.

3.6.2 Conclusion

This chapter reviews various EFL teaching writing approaches to justify the approach employed in this study. The SFL genre approach was selected for the following reasons. First, the teaching focuses on the use of discourse structure to help Thai students enhance their writing by concentrating on the text as a whole. Secondly, this
approach provides students with scaffolding and explanation from feedback from teachers and peers with a view to reformulating their writing through the zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). In the process of the learning cycle, students collaborate with colleagues in pairs or groups. Thirdly, the objective of the Writing Academic English course at Naresuan University is to help science students achieve paragraph writing. Whilst they may be suitable for elective courses in English for Academic Purposes for Medical and Pharmaceutical Science students, NR and ESP approaches would not be appropriate to the objectives of this Writing Academic English course. Finally, the SFL approach provided clear stages of instruction through the cycle of teaching proposed by Feez. In order to achieve the goal of the research, the teaching and learning model adapted from Feez (1998) is employed to develop the writing ability of students by focusing on the whole text. This approach is suitable for teaching writing focusing on discourse, because its design requires English language teachers to consider the importance of a whole text.
Chapter 4
Methodology

In this chapter, the main research method relating to action research is presented. A rationale of both qualitative and quantitative is provided, as both methods were used. Qualitative methods including instruments such as questionnaires, interviews, reflective writing were used alongside statistical analysis by using the modified multiple traits rating score scheme of Liz-Hamp Lyons (1991) as a measure of the students’ writing development. My research aimed to use the teaching of writing that focuses on discourse structure. First, I will start by reviewing the research questions, the participants in the study and the instruction of English composition. The model for employing discourse structure through text-based instruction is briefly explained to support my ideas on employing it in classroom. Next, the research instruments will be discussed, as follow: portfolios, questionnaires, interview, diary and students’ reflective writing. All these tools were used to answer the following research questions, as briefly illustrated.

In this study many research instruments were employed for each research question. Table 3.2 shows the data collected by these instruments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected Data</th>
<th>Amount of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ audio records (approximately 40 mins)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ audio records (approximately 30 mins)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator’s audio record (approximately 40 mins)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the semester</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the semester</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher diary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students’ feedback</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students’ reflections</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students’ assignment portfolios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive writing assignments</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative writing assignments</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison and contrast writing assignments</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause and effect writing assignment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Data collection in the study

As can be seen from the above research instruments, some were used to answer more than one research question to help to analyse the data from various perspectives.

For the first research question, students’ assignment portfolios were used in analysis in order to see how the students improved in writing ability over the period of time. There were four assignments from different genres: a descriptive writing assignment, a narrative writing assignment, a comparison and contrast writing assignment, and a cause and effect writing assignment. The scores for each assignment were graded by two workers who rated them. For this study, the inter-rating method was used because it is less time consuming to grade the students’ writing. The modified multiple traits
scheme of Hamp-Lyons and Henning (1991) was used and the marking was carried out by two independent workers. They evaluated the subjects’ in their first and second drafts and were, respectively, a native speaker and a Thai lecturer who had been teaching on English courses in Thai universities for more than two years. They have experienced in marking written essays by Thai students.

1. Do the students’ writing abilities improve after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure throughout the Academic Writing course? The answer to this first research question can be seen from a comparison of the first assignments and the final assignments. The results were compared in order to see how the students developed their writing during the course.

1.1 Do the students improve in terms of micro (cohesion) level? The answer to this research question was evaluated by comparison of the multiple trait scores students obtained from the first and the final assignments, focusing on the use of cohesive devices to relate the ideas across sentences in the text throughout their writing by using cohesive devices appropriately.

1.2 Do the students improve in terms of macro (coherence) level? The answer to this research question can be obtained from comparison of the multiple trait scores of the students obtained from the first and the final assignments focusing on the use of coherence to connect the ideas in the text, thus creating meaning or the flow of ideas throughout the whole texts or discourse, which enable readers to understand the writer’s ideas as presented in the overall texts.
1.2 Do the students improve in terms of discourse organisation level? The answer to this research question was obtained from the results of the assignments by comparing the multiple trait scores of the students focusing on the conventions of connecting texts or paragraphs together, by using the concept of the rhetorical organisation in discourse.

2. To what extent does peer feedback help the students become aware of the sense of audience? Peer feedback, reflective writing of the students, the students’ interview, questionnaires, and teachers’ notes were used in analysis in order to answer this research question. This determined how the students increased their awareness of a sense of audience; it refers to the perception that the writers should develop responsibility for providing adequate information in their texts to help the readers understand the context and setting of texts.

3. What is the attitude of students towards the *English Academic Writing* course, which focuses on discourse structure? In order to answer this research question, three instruments were employed to answer this research question: interviews, questionnaires, and students’ reflective writing were used for the analysis. The multiple perspectives from each instrument allowed the researcher to determine what the students’ attitudes were towards the teaching methods, useful for the future development of the course. This will allow the researcher to change or adjust the teaching approach to fit the Thai university student learning environment. The answers to this research questions could be obtained from various instruments.
4. What are the attitudes of teachers and administrators towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure? The lecturers who taught the Writing Academic English course were interviewed in order to obtain their response to the teaching approaches which focus on discourse structure. Do they have any suggestions and comments that could be beneficial in the development of the Writing Academic English course? Their suggestions and comments were considered essential to the study, because the researcher could see various perspectives towards the teaching approach used by the teacher colleagues. This is vital for the development of the study in the future. In addition, the administrator was also interviewed in order to determine how she thought whether this teaching approach could be implemented in the future, to help the students develop their writing skills. This could be a good way to inform the administration as to the benefits of a teaching approach that tries to develop to enhance students’ writing ability in the future and allow the researcher to answer her question about the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure of discourse structure on the Writing Academic English course. The recommendations from both lecturers and administrator are useful for the researcher in developing the teaching approach, by considering their recommend in various perspectives, in order to find a suitable teaching approach for the students.

5. What is the effect of using the modified version of Feez’ cycle on the quality of discourse structure in student writing? In this study, the cycle of Feez was employed as the main model for teaching and learning as it focus on viewing texts as a whole unit, so it is a suitable model to use in this study. However, the cycle
was adjusted in order to match the objectives of the study. Thus, it is quite challenging to see how effective it would be when it was employed in classroom.

6. What is the effect of portfolio assessment on student writing? According to the study, the portfolio is an important instrument to measure the improvement of students’ writing development, so it is interesting to find out how they help.

7. What is the effect of student reflective writing on their writing development? The reflective writing of students is a tool that reflects how students develop their writing throughout the course focusing on the discourse structure.

4.1 Research Methods

4.1.1 Action Research

According to Watts, action research is a process in which participants examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully (1985, p. 118). The aims of action research are to create the practical improvement, innovation, and change or development of social practice, and practitioners’ better understanding of their practices. Action research is the process of systematic collection and analysis of data in order to make changes and improvement in order to solve problems (Wallace, 1998); Ferrance (2000) suggests that it makes opportunities for teachers who want to see change or improvement in the problems they identify within the context of their workplaces. Richards (2003, p. 24) summarised its purposes according to two scholars of action research, as follows:
There are two essential aims of action research: to improve and to involve. Action research aims at improvement in three areas: firstly, improvement in practice; secondly, the improvement in understanding of the practice by its practitioner; and thirdly, the improvement the situation in which the practice takes place. The aim of involvement stands shoulder to shoulder with the aim of improvement. (Carr and Kemmis 1986, p. 165)

McNiff (1996) also supports the idea that action research is a process that allows researchers to develop insights into their field. This kind of research can be explained as a review of current practice or the aspects that researchers want to improve or try out. The process can be modified from the start of the plan, and it will be evaluated and modified until it is satisfactory. In Thailand, the Ministry of Education has promoted the classroom action research at all levels, where teachers as researchers have more authority to create the language curriculum (cited in Soonthornroj, 2006). Pasongporn (2004, p. 2) also found that teachers’ knowledge can develop from his or her action research in class. This idea is also supported by McNiff and Whitehead (2002, p. 83) that researchers should feel their own potential, and have a positive power of belief in their own capacity to improve the quality of their teaching. Elyildirim and Ashton (2006, p. 4) suggest that action research can improve the current teaching situation in terms of boosting teachers’ professional development, teacher training and presenting to and institutional evidence for the need to change. I believe that action research can allow me to investigate the problem of students’ writing and develop a method to help them improve, so I would like to investigate and examine during the Writing Academic English course during one semester. This
approach can help me, as a teacher, to reflect on ways to solve the problems in my own class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Steps of Action Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Reflecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Revising the plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1  Key concepts of action research  (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988)

To understand more about the action research cycle, examples are adapted from Nunan:

**Cycle 1**

**Step 1:** Problem identification – Students have a problem at discourse level. Plan to help them by focusing on discourse structure.

**Step 2:** Preliminary investigation – Teaching approach focusing on discourse structure was employed in class.

**Step 3:** Preliminary investigation and observation – Investigating and checking how students improve their writing in students’ assignments, reflective writing and peer feedback.
**Step 4:** Reflection – Get students involved in learning reflection and feedback analysis.

**Cycle 2**

**Step 1:** Identification of follow-up

Adjustment and revision of the process of teaching from the students reflection and observations from teacher diary.

---

**Figure 4.1 Simple Action Research (MacIsaac, 1995)**

Fraenkel (2008) suggests that action research has many advantages. Firstly, this method can be employed in educational institutions at almost every level to
distinguish problems in classrooms or schools. Secondly, action research helps teachers and administrators to be more professionally competent by undertaking research themselves to help them understand the real situation. Thirdly, action research assists teachers in identifying and solving problems in a systematic way. Lastly, action research carried out by teachers creates research-oriented individuals within their institutions.

On the other hand, Nunan and Curtis (2001, pp. 141-143) point out some drawbacks, as follows. The teacher may not have enough technical skill or knowledge to conduct the research. Secondly, it seems that conducting action research can impede the teaching and teachers many not have the time to do it. Bailey (1998, p. 94) points out that action research is a method that lacks the variable control of experimental research, and participants are not chosen randomly. The results of the study may not able to be generalised. Although action research has both advantages and disadvantages, it is a more applicable method than the experimental because it does not require training in statistical skill analysis. Lier (1994, p. 36) suggests that ‘action research leads to a re-evaluation of our reality and the goals of teachers, of students’ needs and aspirations and ‘of the contextual (social, institutional, political, etc.) constraints and resources that facilitate or inhibit our work’.

4.1.2 The Significance of Action Research

Action research was employed in this study because it can help explore the improvement in students’ writing by allowing me to find the way to investigate and solve the problems in students’ writing in Thai universities. My aim is to improve the
teaching experience and this research may help me understand how to help students develop their writing in the Thai university context. It is a good opportunity to develop my own way of teaching writing in order to do so. The concept of cycle of action research involves planning, acting and observing, reflection and revision that would allow me to develop teaching focusing on discourse structure, because action research is a dynamic tool that can allow researchers to adjust their plans and discover the problems during implementation in their context. O’Hanllon (2006) suggests that action research helps researchers find the evidence through the research and investigation, apply theories during planning and action and then reflect and discuss the interpretation. In my workplace, it is a good opportunity to attempt as a fresh option a new method of teaching writing based on discourse structure. I should like to see my method adopted, and institutions may agree to use the same method. They may adopt or adapt my implementation work for further writing instruction.

4.1.3 Steps in Action Research in this Study

1. Identification of problem area

Students have problems in writing English composition. This may result from the traditional teaching approach that focuses on sentence level and grammatical correctness. The method of composition in class is primarily product-oriented. The teachers assign topics for the students to write about, usually as homework or during class. Students are given the opportunity neither to prepare multiple drafts nor to receive comments. After they submit their text, the students receive feedback primarily from the teacher. The teacher often comments on superficial features rather than on the content of the writing. In addition, students may not be aware of their
responsibility as writers. They usually write what they want, without concern for readers.

2. Gathering data

There are many ways to collect data, such as interviews, diaries, questionnaires, portfolios, journals, and so on. In my study, portfolios (students’ writing assignment) were the main source that helped me assess the improvement in the students’ writing. Semi-structured interviews were used with the teachers who lectured on the Writing Academic English course. Five teachers were interviewed (all of whom were from Naresuan University). The aim of the interviews was to discover their attitudes towards a method focusing on discourse structure and investigate what their opinions towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. It would be a good opportunity to listen to the critical viewpoints of colleagues who teach Writing Academic English course in the same department. The questions were concerned with three main aspects: the methods of teaching, discourse structure, assessment and feedback. The questions were about the teaching methods that they use in their classes, for example, and whether they were concerned with discourse when they taught. Did they give students feedback and how many drafts did they ask the students to write? Did they emphasise only the sentence level? What were the obstacles for them in helping students develop their writing? Did they think that teaching writing for students by focusing on the use of discourse structure would be helpful or not? Questionnaires (or interviews) were another tool in this study and were distributed first at the beginning of the course and next at the end of the semester. The aim of the questionnaire was to investigate the point of view of students towards writing instruction focusing on discourse structure, whether they thought it was helpful for
them or not, whether there were any suggestions or comments on this method of teaching

3. **Interpretation of data**

Data analysis was conducted on the assignments of students using the statistical method of pair-sample t-test. For the qualitative data analysis, interviews and questionnaires were analysed and important aspects noted and classified.

4. **Acting on evidence**

Once the data had been collected and current literature reviewed, I considered whether some changes would make it difficult to decide which action was responsible for the outcomes as the new techniques were being implemented.

5. **Evaluation of the results**

The effects of the study after employing discourse structure in the *Writing Academic English* classroom were assessed. The students’ assignment portfolio allowed researchers and raters to evaluate the improvement of students’ writing in three main levels: the micro-level, the macro-level, and discourse organisation. The evaluation scheme of Hamp-Lyons (1991) was implemented as it contains suitable measurement scales for discourse structure. As regards the qualitative data, the interviews, questionnaires, student’s journal were then analysed and triangulated.

This chapter describes the research methods. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are discussed. According to Uwe (1998, pp. 6-7), qualitative research has some essential characteristics. Firstly, it uses many approaches and methods that lead
researchers to explore and develop their study from various perspectives. Secondly, researchers can state their opinions, feelings and impressions through the observation. Data interpretation also reflects different viewpoints, due to the different subjective perspectives and social backgrounds of the participants. In addition, Gibbs (2006, p. 2) describes the qualitative approach as focusing on the interpretative philosophy, which gives researchers the opportunity to view their study from a holistic aspect. Qualitative research takes flexible forms. Richards (2003, p. 10) sets out the characteristics of qualitative methods as being the study of humans in natural settings in ordinary contexts, to understand the meaning of their behaviour, mostly focusing on a small number of participants, and using various methods to investigate the different aspects.

Quantitative research focuses on the quantitative methods in order to discover the facts of social phenomena without individual subjective judgment (Nunan, 2006). Bell (2005, p. 7) explains it as a method that gives an opportunity for researchers to study facts and relationships to generate possible conclusions. By contrast, qualitative approaches aim to understand the perceptions of individuals and realise insights rather than using statistics as tools to identify judgments in order to interpret the results of the study.

Using quantitative approaches may not create an equal environment, for participants cannot be set equally, especially when doing experiments involving test-taking, because there are other factors that may influence the participants that cannot be ignored by researchers (social or individual factors). Qualitative approaches can be a good option to take these factors into account. Nunan (2006, p. 4) suggests that a
qualitative approach is concerned with the understanding of human behaviour from ‘the actor’s own frame of reference’.

The choice of using qualitative or quantitative approach depends on the particular context and the type of information needed, because each approach has its own weaknesses and strengths. Johnson and Onwuegbuize (2004, pp. 14-15) explain why both approaches can be valid. Both qualitative and quantitative are useful. The purpose of selecting a particular approach depends on the aims to and purposes of the study. This study aims to help students improve their writing ability by measuring in a quantitative way and to understand thoroughly the problems of the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure by interviewing teachers and students. On the other hand, the ideal is to eliminate the weak points of both methods and increase their strengths in combination. Darlington and Scott (2002, p. 121) propose that there is a rationale for researchers to make a choice. Researchers may want to corroborate or look for the convergence in different approaches, by using one method to help develop the other. Besides, the inspiration for selecting both methods comes from the need to clarify one method by employing the other.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches are employed in this study. For qualitative and quantitative approach, both of them are useful methods. I had experience in doing a small-scale study of Thai students’ problems in the use of English articles (a, an and the) using qualitative methods. Although the statistical data reveal that many Thais have this problem, there is no clear explanation. The best way to understand is to employ a qualitative method together with a quantitative method. In my suggestion for further study, an interview method should be employed to study
this problem of using English articles, because some students obtained very low scores, and statistical analysis could not give exact answers to this question. Therefore, the combination of the two research methods helps increase the credibility of the research results.

For the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure, qualitative and quantitative approach are taken because the qualitative method can provide an opportunity to explore and try to understand students’ behaviour, and establish what they think about the teaching approach I used in class. Moreover, my colleagues teaching Writing Academic English have a chance to discuss the approaches used in the study. They were interviewed and commented on the teaching approach used in this study as well.

Apart from the quantitative data from the students’ assignment portfolio, qualitative data were also collected in order to widen the perspective toward the teaching focusing on discourse structure in the Writing Academic English classroom.

In conclusion, we cannot say which the better approach than the others is. The researchers themselves have to choose which is suitable for their study and which can help them deal with the research questions. However, it is also possible to combine qualitative with quantitative methods to investigate a research problem in depth, in order to understand the problems that may arise when combining the two methods.

4.2 Triangulation of Research Instruments

According to Cohen et al. (2005, p. 112), triangulation is ‘the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behavior.’ Mackey
and Grass (2005, p. 181) suggest that multiple perspectives on data collection are necessary for much research, including action research, in order to obtain the same research results. In addition, they advocate employing triangulation in second language writing, that researchers may supplement the study by gathering data from methods such as interviews, questionnaires, diaries, group discussion and so on.

Phillips and Carr (2006, p. 71) define triangulation as a tool in qualitative research methods to process the rich and various kinds of data collecting to make it more credible. It is better to collect and investigate multiple perspectives in order to clearly answer instead of partially understand the data received (Ellsworth, 1997; Haraway, 1996; Richardson, 2003). The aim of the triangulation method is to obtain various perspectives from different instruments, to collect as much information on the strengths and weaknesses of the research participants. Brown (2002, p. 242) also supports the triangulation method to enhance the credibility in the qualitative research and categorised it into seven types (2002, p. 244):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Triangulation</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Examples of Triangulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data triangulation</td>
<td>Multiple sources</td>
<td>Collection of data by using multiple sources: students, teachers and administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation triangulation</td>
<td>Multiple researchers</td>
<td>Collection of data by using at least two researchers in the same research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory triangulation</td>
<td>Multiple frameworks</td>
<td>Collection of data by using error analysis, discourse analysis and behaviour analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodological triangulation | Multiple procedures for data collecting | Collecting data by using various procedures: interview, diary and questionnaire
Interdisciplinary triangulation | Multiple discipline | Collection of data by using three views from three perspectives psychology, education and second language study
Time triangulation | Multiple occasions of data collecting | Collection of data at the beginning, middle and the end of the course
Location triangulation | Multiple locations of data collecting | Collection of data from three different universities.

Table 4.2 Summary of seven types of triangulation

In this study, the methodological and data triangulation were employed by using multiple data sources such as interview, questionnaire, student reflective writing and so on in order to strengthen the reliability and support the statistical data analysis.

4.3 Participants in the Study

All of the subjects were Thai undergraduates in the Faculty of Sciences in the third year at Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, Thailand. They were studying Biological Sciences and all were full-time students, and had to take this course for three hours per week. All in all, the Writing Academic English course lasted 16 weeks. The number of the subjects was approximately forty. The language used in the classroom is Thai, because the students were not English majors. Most of them were considered as pre-intermediate, according to the University testing measurement. All subjects had had formal English education with basic English grammar in high school. In addition, they had passed the national entrance examination. English is one of the compulsory
tests before entering university. Moreover, they have to pass three compulsory courses of English: *Foundations of English I*, *Foundations of English II*, and *Reading Academic English*. Consequently, they had fundamental knowledge of English grammar. In those courses, students are familiar with a short paragraph narrative writing.

Each participant was given an informed consent form indicating that they were not required to participate and, if they did participate, they could withdraw from the study at any time. All students will be asked to sign the form and participate fully. Pseudonyms were used for students so as not to reveal their identities.

### 4.4 Interviews

In this study, interviews were used in order to answer Research Questions 2, 3 and 4. This is a common data collection method with the objective of obtaining information about the attitudes of students towards the *English Academic Writing* course that focussed on the discourse structure and the attitudes of teachers and administrator towards teaching focusing on discourse structure. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 273) suggest that this instrument could allow researchers to respond to move backwards and forwards in time to reconstruct the past, interpret the present and predict the future. In addition, the interview is a useful instrument that can help researchers obtain the facts from interviewees, retrieve the explanations, access their beliefs and discover their feelings and motivations (Silverman, pp. 92-93).

Dörnyei (2007) classified interviews into three types: structured interviews, semi-structure interviews, and unstructured interviews. Structured interview involve ‘pre-
prepared, elaborate interview guides which containing a list of questions to be covered closely with every interviewees’. Kumar (2005, p. 126) points out that the advantage of the structured interview is the benefits that the data obtained is systematically collected and that this assists researchers should comparison of data be needed. However, Merriam (1998) argues that there is a limitation, because the interviewer may not obtain a participant’s viewpoint and an understanding of the information received during the interview, whilst Dörnyei (2007) also points out a drawback in that there is little flexibility and opportunity for spontaneous and varied kinds of response from the research participants, because the researcher must focus on the answers, responding to the coding scheme set beforehand.

Semi-structured interviews are especially employed for applied linguistics studies. McDonough and McDonough (1997, p. 183) suggest that researchers and participants have greater flexibility in arranging the questions and following up with further questions in order to gather more information related to the research interests. In short, the semi-structured interviews comprise questions on topics researchers want to investigate, but the questions are more flexible. This method helps researchers to develop new aspects and topics from interviewees. Moreover, interviewees provide an opportunity for them to initiate their own responses, rather than following the pre-set conceptions of researchers.

Thirdly, Merriam (1998) suggests that unstructured interviews can be conducted with freedom, since there are no prepared questions; the researcher may not know enough about the phenomenon to ask relevant questions. There are no preset questions. This
type of interview requires a skilled researcher to manage the flexibility in questions and answers.

In this study, the semi-structured interview is employed because the research objective of the study is to explore the attitudes of students towards the English Academic Writing course, focusing on discourse structure, as well as the attitudes of teachers and administrators towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. Discourse structure of discourse structure. They are used to discover in-depth perspectives, opinions, and emotions towards the use of discourse structure through the text based instruction. The method was selected because it would provide many opportunities to obtain detailed information from the interviewees and reveal useful information about my teaching focusing on discourse structure in detail. Semi-structured interview questions are flexible and open-ended. This will allow the interviewees to insert new ideas or interesting aspects from the conversation into the interview. The interviews in my research were divided into two groups: students and teachers and administrators. The time for each interview was approximately 45 to 60 minutes. Each interview was audio recorded with the interviewee’s permission. The interviews are in the native Thai language for students and teachers. The interviews took place in an open area in the Faculty of Humanities Building. The data analysis was classified according to interesting aspects such as peer feedback, portfolio assessment, the teaching approach’s promotion of discourse structure in writing course, and answering the research questions.
4.5 Questionnaires

One instrument in this study is the questionnaire. The reason for using this as a tool is to investigate the attitudes of the students towards the teaching that focuses on discourse structure. This instrument would help to find out the attitudes of students towards the *English Academic Writing* course, focusing on discourse structure. Research Question 2. This would provide the attitudes of the students towards the use of discourse structure in teaching. It would help indicate what most students thought about this method of the instruction in both pre-teaching and post-teaching. In addition, it would help instructors develop an appropriate writing course for the Thai university context. The questionnaires were used at the start and the end of the course. The purpose of giving questionnaires to students at the beginning of the *Writing Academic English* course is to ask general ideas about their writing, and is the rationale for using questionnaires twice.

Brown (2001, p. 6) defined questionnaires as ‘any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers’. According to Dörnyei (2007, p. 102), questionnaires can yield three types of data about the respondent, as follows:

- *Actual questions* are used to find out certain facts about the respondents, such as demographic characteristics (age, gender, education level, and race), residential location, marital status and so on.
• **Behavioral questions** are employed to find out what the respondents are doing or have done in the past. It may focus on actions, life style, habits and personal history.

• **Attitudinal questions** are used to find out what people think, covering attitudes, opinion, beliefs, interests and values.

In this study, the attitudinal questions about the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure were used in order to discover the answer to Research Question 2 on the attitudes of students towards discourse structure. Hyland (2007, p. 63) also points out that questionnaires are a kind of instruments of data collection useful to elicit information on students’ personal goals, attitudes and backgrounds, but it is important to construct the questions carefully to avoid ambiguity, and researchers should be aware of the balance between collecting sufficient data and not overburdening respondents. For this study, all the students on the course were asked to fill in the consent form given in the appendix. Then they were asked to complete the questionnaire at the beginning of the course in order to obtain background information about the students and their attitudes towards the studying English writing, for example, the most important point about writing. The data from the questionnaires will help me understand the perceptions of students towards the English composition writing and help me develop my study.

The students were also asked to fill in the questionnaire at the end of the course, in order to see their viewpoints then. The second questionnaire contained the same questions with some new ones were added, but there were no choices provided. The
researcher aimed to see what students really thought and answered by themselves without prompts. Then, the results of the first and second questionnaires were compared.
4.6 Teacher Diary

Nunan suggested that there are many important introspective instruments in language research, such as diaries, logs and journals (1992, p. 118). The aims of using diaries in this study are to make notes during each lesson about lectures, activities and students’ reactions during the implementation in each class, so that it can remind the researcher of what happened after implementation and how they assisted during the class.

According to McKernan (1996, p. 84), a diary is an important tool in action research because it is a personal document that records events that can help teachers to record students’ thoughts, progress, changes, and process development in class. As well as their advantages in researching classroom and teacher processes over time,

McDonough and McDonough (1997: p. 121) say, ‘Indeed the theme of change over time and the sense of writing about a process is one that resonates directly with the use of diaries in educational research’ while Dörnyei (2007, p. 156) points out many strong points in using a diary. Firstly, it helps researchers unobtrusively to access a way of tapping into areas of people lives that are otherwise inaccessible. Secondly, diaries help researchers to elicit participants’ own descriptions and interpretations of events and behaviours. Thirdly, researchers can receive ongoing background information, which is an important point in clarifying ambiguous aspects. Lastly, providing a self-report by using a diary helps decrease inaccuracy in the memory of researchers, keeping the important aspects in a systematic way, so it is subsequently easy to retrieve and recount events afterwards.

McKernan (1996, p. 86) concludes that the key points to remember in keeping a diary to reflect, describe and evaluate daily encounters, are as follows:
• Keep a diary regularly. Since it is a running account of facts, anecdotes and thoughts, these may quickly be forgotten if left for completion later on.

• Entries should be dated and cross-referenced to other entries where relevant. Recording the dates and time of entries will place events in a clearer context of sequence. The human memory often lets one down, so try to link similar themes, concepts and recurrences through a system of cross-reference is essential.

• Diaries should record both facts and interpretative accounts. The first task is to describe what actually happens after this has been done, offering some analysis and interpretation in analytical notes.

In this study, employing a diary helped to document my own classroom observation as a history reminder, so was helpful to evaluate my teaching procedures, intentions, outcomes, or the unexpected effects during the instruction period. The data from a diary provided me with insightful interpretation of what happened in class and how the students responded to the teaching methods.

4.7 Reflective Writing

According to Yancey (1998), reflective writing by students is viewed as one of the most important features of portfolios. Reflection is defined as ‘the dialectical process by which we develop and achieve, first, specific goals for learning; second, strategies for reaching those goals; and third, means of determining whether or not we have met
those goals or other goals’ (Yancey, 1998, p. 6). Reflective writing refers to writing in which students reflect on their effort, progress, and their multiple written products are important components of portfolios. Reflections are considered as a part of the process of learning. Beveridge (1997, p. 33) says reflection ‘juxtaposes two dictionary of definition of word “reflect” to produce a deeper understanding’. She finds that the word ‘reflect’ means to mediate, think back or ponder and also to create an image. Moreover, Johns (1997, p. 134) suggests that students can be encouraged to think about ‘their representation of their writing task and texts and how students use strategies in performing the tasks. Therefore, she concludes that reflection is the process of thinking back, to place themselves again into the learning situation, in order to form the image of experience. In this study, the students were asked to write reflection on the text they produced. This will help them to be aware of the use of discourse structure in their writing, which is focused on cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation of their written text.

The aim of reflective writing is to provide a documented record of students’ progression over 16 weeks of the teaching focusing on discourse structure. The objective is to explore the perceptions and explore the personal aspect of development as individual learner. These will include class issues, learning activities, and lecture attended during the implementation of the module of text based teaching cycle.

In this study, students were asked to reflect on the text they produced on various aspects concerning discourse structure. The students had twenty minutes for the reflective writing on questions set by the researcher. This helped them to reflect on their opinions on the use of discourse structure in their writing, which focused on
cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation of their text. The aim of the reflection was to provide a documented record of the students’ progress over 15 weeks of the teaching focusing on discourse structure. The objective was to explore perceptions and personal aspects of development as individual learners. These included class issues, learning activities, and lectures during the implementation of the Feez’ module of text-based teaching cycle.

4.8 Portfolios

The use of portfolio assessment in the students’ learning has become an optional method of evaluation for students at various levels in education (Camp, 1996). Traditional assessment tended to focus on the limited purposes for learning and may have led to the separation of learning, teaching and assessment, but the method of using portfolios has helped to connect them by placing the emphasis on both students’ achievement and improvement (Teirney, Carter and Desai, 1991). Hamp-Lyons (1991) supports the use of portfolios for ESL students. It is an appropriate measure to use for non-native speakers, because they can be employed to reflect, in a broader sense of what students can do. Hyland (2007) also support the use of portfolios for genre-based writing teaching because it provides a multiple measurement for students’ writing ability. Moreover, Jones (1992) suggests that ESL students assessed by portfolio achieved results in the next course that were better than or comparable to those achieved by native English speakers assessed on the Writing Assessment Test (WAT), using a holistic grading timed impromptu essay.

Yayli (2011) stated that the use of portfolios in the genre approach would help her to investigate the textual and rhetorical analysis of each text from the students’ first to
the final draft, and she also added that the multiple-genre portfolios would be useful for students as well. Some researchers (Hamp-Lyons, 1996; Koelsch and Trumbull, 1996) advocate the use of portfolios with non-native English speaking students, because their use includes multiple samples of different types of student work, and it also gives a context for understanding student performance. One important aspect is that portfolios can eliminate the time pressure in writing tests, which has been suggested to discriminate against nonnative students (Hamp-Lyons, 1996; Hamp-Lyons and Condon, 2000). Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000) noted that ESL students had more time to revise, and they were motivated to focus on ideas and text structure as well as correct their language.

4.8.1 Definition of a Portfolio

According to Paulson, Paulson and Meyer (1991), a portfolio can be defined as ‘a purposeful collection of student works that exhibit to the student (and/or others) the students effort and progress or achievement in a given area.’ In addition, McCullan et al. (2003) describe a portfolio as a student’s collection of evidence reflecting their learning process, achievement and competence levels of development. In short, a portfolio is a systematic collection of student products that are collected over time and reveal a student's developmental status and progress.

Boonruangrat (1995) supports the idea that using portfolios is a proper way to measure student learning, as this method can be viewed as a tool for reflective thinking and support critical analytical skills. At the same time, it provides students with a good opportunity for self-directed learning. Portfolios can be employed as a
writing assessment for many purposes, and there are various uses of portfolios under evaluation. However, the definition of portfolio suitable for the purpose of using them in my research is that proposed by Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000). They described nine characteristics of portfolios, as follows:

1. A portfolio is a collection of written works, rather than a single writing sample.
2. It enables the writer to display a range of writing performances in different genres and for the different audiences and purposes.
3. A portfolio possesses context richness insofar as it closely reflects the learning situation and demonstrates what the writer has accomplished in that context.
4. An important characteristic of most portfolio programmes is delayed evaluation, giving the students both the opportunity and motivation to revise written product before a final evaluation is given.
5. A portfolio generally involves selection of pieces to be included in the portfolio, usually by the student with some guidance from the instructor.
6. Delayed evaluation and selection offer opportunities for student centered control, in that students can select which pieces best fulfil the established evaluation criteria and can revise them in to their portfolios.
7. A portfolio usually involves reflection and self-assessment, in that those students must reflect on their work in deciding how to arrange the portfolio, and are frequently asked to write a reflective essay about their development as writers and how the pieces in the portfolio represent their development.
8. A portfolio can provide a means for measuring growth as regards the specific parameters, such as linguistic accuracy or the ability to organise and develop an argument.
9. Portfolios provide a means for measuring the development over time in ways that neither the teacher nor the student may have anticipated.

(Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000)
These characteristics appear to fit the objective of my study, to investigate and help students develop their writing ability through the framework of discourse structure that focuses on the use of cohesion, coherence, organisation structure, and so on. The subjects are university students from the faculty of science. According to their study background, they usually have difficulty in writing English. The portfolio method of assessment will give them a good opportunity to revise their written products before a final evaluation is given. Moreover, students have the opportunity for self-assessment, because they have to revise their writing, so they have to investigate their errors and correct them. Unlike quizzes or tests, the students have the opportunity to correct their errors or mistakes. It is good to learn from their mistakes, so that next time the same kind of error may occur less frequently, because they will take greater care in performing their tasks.

4.8.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Portfolios

Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000) suggest that a portfolio is beneficial as a pedagogical tool because the students can review their writing from multiple draft revisions, peer review and reflective writing. Brown and Hudson (1998) also recommend that portfolios can reveal more individual data on each student’s writing progress; furthermore, the teacher has a chance to assist them in their weak points of writing. According to Song and August (2002), they can help and support the extensive writing revision, which can be used to measure the progress over a period of time. It encourages students to take more responsibility for their own writing assignments. ESL students benefit from the fact that portfolios emphasise reflection and self-evaluation, for these will help develop awareness of the processes and
strategies that can be used in their writing. This point is essential for ESL students who may not be aware of the discourse structure framework and rhetorical convention. Moreover, Hamp-Lyons (1996) points out that, with the use of portfolios, L2 writers do not face the disadvantage of time constraints or weakness in one particular aspect, such as limited vocabulary. Furthermore, Brown and Hudson (1998) state that the five advantages of using portfolio assessment are design and decision, time consuming logistics, interpretation, reliability and validity.

On the other hand, Grabe and Kaplan (1996, p. 417) point out that the variety of tasks in itself may cause problems in assignments with different teachers. White (1994, p. 127) states that it is more difficult to give a score for portfolios of writing rather than single assignments, due to the reliability of raters on each occasion. It is difficult to create an equivalent grade among raters. Weiser (1992) earlier identified another problem in using portfolios in that teachers have difficulty in adjusting grades for students. The evaluation system with which the students are familiar places great focus on grades and they are accustomed to having grades to motivate, threaten or reassure them (Weiser, 1992). According to Hu and Grove (1999), many may feel uncomfortable about their performance if their work is not graded, especially true of non-native English speakers from different cultures. Students may worry about two main points. Firstly, they may be anxious about their writing in a second language, and a grade seems necessary to give reassurance. Secondly, ESL students from Asian countries are used to intense competition for education, and grading seems objective so they may suffer when work is not graded. More specifically the advantages or disadvantages of using portfolios are illustrated in detailed in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They represent programme goal</td>
<td>1. Procedures lead to heavy workload for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They reflect progress over time, genres, and conditions</td>
<td>2. It may encourage the teaching of portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There are more broader and more comprehensive and fair than exam</td>
<td>3. It is difficult to compare tasks set by different teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They are closely related to teaching and students’ abilities</td>
<td>4. It is difficult to assign a single grade to a varied collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students see portfolios as a record of progress</td>
<td>5. Problems of reliability across raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. They focus on multi-drafting, feedback and revision etc.</td>
<td>6. Problem with plagiarism or outside assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. They allows different selection and assessment criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students reflect on their improvement and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assignments build on each other and show genre sets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3 Some potential advantages and disadvantages of portfolios (Hyland, 2007, p. 236)**

In short, although the use of portfolios for writing instruction and assessment was examined and investigated to some extent, there was a very little research available on how ESL students respond to writing portfolios (Hamp-Lyons, 1996). However, the use of portfolios eliminates time pressure in writing, and students can devote more time to obtaining help with correcting their language errors. Portfolio assessment may be able to help ESL students from the disadvantages of pressure during timed writing.
4.9 Feedback on ESL Writing

The aims of using feedback in this study are to improve students’ written product of and control the process of writing. In addition, it can help identify their errors. The definition of feedback is defined by Flower (1979) as the suggestions, comments or questions of a reader given to the work of a writer, whilst Keh (1990) defined this term as ‘the input from the reader to the writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision.’ The aim of giving feedback is to support students’ writing development and to teach them a particular point of disciplinary content. Moreover, the feedback guides the students to improve their writing composition (Coffin, 2003). According to Keh (1990, pp. 295-303), there are three types of feedback: peer feedback, conferencing feedback and teacher feedback. She also explains about the contribution of feedback in improving the students’ writing ability. Likewise, Lynch (1996, p. 155) recommends that learners should receive various kinds of feedback in order to assist them in their writing composition, and the teachers should not rely on one specific technique. It is necessary to understand how the three kinds of feedback work. Therefore, the following section will deal with the three types of feedback respectively.

4.9.1 Peer Feedback

Peer feedback from the cognitive perspective can be seen as a developmental process that allows writers to discuss their texts and others’ interpretations of them. Piaget believed that cooperation among peers supports the exchange of opinions and discussion. This will encourage critical ideas among friends in the development of thinking. It seems that generations of educators have been influenced by Piaget’s
cognitive theory. McCormick and Pressley (1997) advises that Piaget’s theory comprises ways to help and encourage change for students, as follows:

- Diagnosing students’ current developmental stages so that developmentally-appropriate assignments and instruction are given.
- Designing instruction so that students are active participants in their own learning. Constructing learning environments conductive to exploration by students.
- Making students aware of conflicts between their approaches to problems and the features of the problems. Probing questions should be asked. Presenting counter examples and pointing out inconsistencies that may lead to disequilibrium.
- Reducing adult power as much as possible. Fostering collaboration with peers who have mutual interest.
- Encouraging children to think in their own ways. Analysing students’ errors to gain a better understanding of their thought processes.

(McCormick & Pressley, 1997, pp. 160-161)

As can be seen from McCormick and Pressley’s (1997) recommendation of Piaget’s cognitive theory, it is clear that peer feedback encourages students to think and cooperate with their colleagues in learning. In addition, Keh (1990) suggests that there are many advantages of peer feedback. Firstly, time saving is a benefit, because students can help each other to check their task before submitting the assignment. However, in this case the advantage is likely to be limited to those students with at least average proficiency. Secondly, it will create a greater sense of the audience among students. They have a chance to read their colleagues’ writing and provide comments and this promotes a sense of critical thinking among students. Finally, it promotes awareness among students that writing is for others, a benefit which
students can obtain from peer feedback. They will develop their writing with a purpose and do it more carefully, and not just write as much about it as possible. Chaudrin (1984, pp. 2-3) holds similar views to Keh and points out that the level of learners’ development and interest increases with the peer feedback method; moreover, it provides learners with a chance to gain response from audiences apart from the teacher. They also learn to read and respond critically to each other’s comments before revision. The peer feedback process creates social support among their colleagues. According to Hyland (2007, p. 184) one important consideration of peer feedback is the audience that students need to address, so a particular text is suitable to each discourse community. Therefore, students should produce not only understandable texts for their audiences but produce accurate and acceptable work.

Dheram (1995, p. 165) reflects her idea about peer feedback in two points. The first is that peer feedback helps students be aware of their writing from a reader-based perspective. It encourages them to accept readers other than the teachers. In addition, this kind of feedback could assist in building awareness of using a macro-structure focusing on coherence to produce an effective text. The readers can understand the meaning of the text that the writer produces. The students can have a chance to read the written work of their colleagues and give comments. Although there are many advantages to using peer feedback, Partridge (1981) investigates how students respond to peer feedback compared to teacher feedback. The opinion is positive, but there is still some doubt about the credibility of peer feedback. However, the aim of my research the aim of using peer feedback is to promote self-awareness and create a sense of responsibility.
As can be seen from the literature review above, peer feedback is an important instrument that helped answer this research question on the extent to which peer feedback helps the students become aware of the sense of audience. Peer feedback is a robust way to support the students to have opportunity to play a role of reader, so they had to read and comment on their friends’ writing. This process of peer feedback promotes the sense of audience awareness. As they took the role of the readers, they had to think about their friends’ writing. At the same time, they had opportunities to think about their own written work and how to provide enough information and organise it appropriately. This will initiate them into being more aware of how much information they should provide for the readers as Hyland (2007, p. 184) suggested that students begin to consider what audience need to know for texts they wrote. In this study, the students had a peer feedback editing guideline which was adapted from Oshima (2007) (Appendix 5) to suggest to them which points to focus on. This helps researchers to see how students notice the essential points such as grammatical structure, coherence, the connection of texts, organisation of the paragraph and so on, as indicated on the peer feedback sheet. During the session, students selected their peer themselves and they had to read each other’s written assignments throughout the course.

4.9.2 Conferencing Feedback

The benefit of this type of feedback is the interaction between teachers and students, so it is quite easy for students to ask teachers to explain the points or problems that they do not understand. In this situation, the students may forget the evaluator role of the teachers, and the teachers play the role of the learners’ supporter who can help
them deal with their problems during their writing. Moreover, students can have the opportunity to discuss among themselves about their assignments, and they have a chance to get feedback from their colleagues as well. However, in my experience, students follow their teachers’ comments rather than their friends, but at least it can promote awareness when they are writing their assignments. Partridge (1981) and Leki (1990) revealed that students still question the credibility and the accuracy of peer feedback. A positive view of conferencing is given by Keh (1990) who states that most students agree that the most important aspect they receive from the conference feedback is that the procedure helps create the awareness of significant areas of writing such as word selection, organisation, grammar and the reader role. Lastly, conferencing encourages students to be more confident in their writing.

During peer feedback, students had a chance to ask the teacher to settle some arguments on writing. At this stage, teacher acted as an advisor to help discuss and find a suitable solution to the points students raised. Conferencing feedback here aimed to support students during peer review, especially when they disagreed on some aspect that they need to clarify, so the teacher help them answer those aspects.

4.9.3 Written Feedback

This is the most popular type of feedback used by teachers. The students considered this kind of feedback useful, because it offered them good suggestions for revision of their written work. However, most teachers are worried about whether the students read their comments or not and whether they can understand or not. Nevertheless, this problem can be solved by the way teacher distinguishing the points in their comments
clearly to the students. Keh (1990) suggests that students review the teachers’ comments, because they know what is wrong with their writing and how to improve their writing. They try to implement the recommendations from the written feedback. Many studies regarding teacher’s written feedback on L2 writing have examined students’ (not teachers’) both use of and preference for different types of feedback (Enginarlar (1993) and Goldstein (2001). Studies examining students’ use of feedback have demonstrated that, although several scholars have argued that feedback is not helpful (students still believe that it is and use this feedback to improve not only their L2 writing, but L2 grammar as well (Ferris, 1995 and Hyland, 1998).

In addition, studies examining students’ perceptions of and preferences for types of feedback have demonstrated that students have strong opinions on both the amount and type of feedback given by their teachers. For example, Cohen (1987) examined students in various university language classes who completed surveys on the amount and the effectiveness of teacher-written feedback. The results of this study indicate that students felt that teachers do and should focus their feedback on local issues (such as grammar and mechanics) more than global writing issues (such as ideas, content and organisation).

Written feedback was given by the teacher in order to give students comments on their writing after they did their peer feedback. The students were graded by the teacher (researcher) by using the criteria adapted from Hamp-Lyons and Henning that focus on coherence of ideas, transitional connectivity, organisation, linguistics accuracy, linguistics appropriacy, interest, and so on.
In short, these three types of feedback, peer feedback, conferencing feedback and written feedback are useful for students, especially if we look at these kinds of feedback from the student-centred view. Written comments can assist the students by pinpointing their specific problems in their writing whilst the conferencing would help them to gain more confidence during the process of writing, and peer feedback promotes a sense of readers’ awareness and the awareness of the overall grammatical, lexical and discoursal levels.

4.10 Students’ Written Assignments

In this study, students were requested to write four assignments: descriptive, narrative, cause and effect, and comparative text and keep them as their portfolios. Their assignments related to text types in each chapter. In each assignment, they selected topics provided by the teachers; if students did not choose the topics provided, they had to come and discuss with the teacher individually after classroom in order to make sure that suitable topics were chosen.

The grading criteria were told to students at the beginning of the course. Students had opportunities to do two written drafts before they submitted their final draft. Their first drafts were commented and corrected by their friends. The feedback forms were provided and they had to comment on and provide some evidence on the form provided. Students had to submit their first drafts along with the peer feedback sheet each time. The reason for asking them to submit both written assignments and feedback is because the teacher could check the understanding of students towards their friend’s written work and allow the teacher to investigate how effective was the
feedback the students provided. After they received their feedback from their friend, they had the chance to correct and organise their texts before submitting it.

4.11 Statistical Data Analysis Procedures and Methods

The students writing portfolios were graded by two raters. In order to assess the improvement in their writing, the modified multiple traits scheme of Hamp-Lyons and Henning; 1991 is used, as follows:

1. Communicative quality - dealing with the ability to communicate with readers.
2. Interest - dealing with the creativity and interest of the writing to readers.
3. Referencing - dealing with the illustration of suitable examples.
4. Organisation - dealing with the display of logical organisation structure.
5. Coherence - dealing with how prominently and clearly main ideas are stated, with complete and effective support.
7. Linguistic appropriacy - dealing with suitable grammatical and lexical usage.
8. Transitional connection - dealing with the linkage of ideas and messages.

Most of the scales were proposed by Hamp-Lyons and Henning, but one of them was modified, which is the coherence scale. In addition, the transitional connection was added to achieve the purposes of the study that deals with the connection of texts within discourse. However, the modification of the scale ‘transitional connection’ was adapted from the Michigan English Language Assessment Battery or MELAB, a standardised test used to evaluate proficiency in understanding, writing and speaking.
the English language. It is designed for adults whose first language is not English, and is often used as a university admission criterion to judge whether applicants are sufficiently fluent to follow an English language study programme at university level.

Although the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure focuses on the three scheme organisation, coherence and transitional connection, the other scales such as linguistic accuracy, linguistic appropriacy and interest are not ignored; these are also emphasised in order to help the students improve their writing. The overall scores were graded, while the three aspects (organisation, coherence and transitional connection) were also discussed separately.

4.12 Rationale for the Multiple Trait Scoring Method

Barkaoui (2007, p. 87) explains that the multiple trait scoring involves assigning multiple subscores to individual traits or dimensions (e.g. language, organisation) and the summing of those subscores to arrive at an overall score. Although there are some arguments about the validity and reliability of the multiple trait method compared to a holistic scoring scheme, Hamp-Lyons (1991, p. 1995) suggests that the validity and reliability of the multiple trait scheme is higher than for the holistic scoring scheme, which is suitable for first language scoring; moreover, Weigle (2007, p. 121) agrees that the multiple trait scheme is suitable for L2 writers, and this scheme is also used to compare information for placement or instruction, but it is a time consuming procedure. In addition, Archibald (2001, p. 159) also suggests that the multiple traits scheme ‘allows a focus on textual features that have been a target in classroom
instruction,’ while Bacha (2001) states that multiple trait scoring ‘provide more information on students’ performance in different components of the writing skills.’ In my study, the multiple trait scoring was used to evaluate the improvement in the students’ writing because this rating scheme is suitable for second language learners, and one of its characteristics is that it can highlight the writing performance of the students from scoring. Moreover, this scheme allows researchers to investigate the textual feature at the discourse level.

4.13 Scoring Methods

Hamp-Lyons (1991) suggests that there may be a question about the reliability of the judgment, although it can be accepted that a piece of writing should be assessed as a whole, so the score shows what a good piece of writing is. There are two ways to solve these problems. The first one is to employ the multiple grading method, and the second is to use an inter-rating method. For this study, the inter rating method is used, because it takes less time to grade the students’ writing by two independent raters.

The scoring scheme of ratings was explained to the raters. In order to ensure the inter rater reliability in the assessment there was training. The raters were informed about the objectives, the procedures and the expected outcomes. Then, the scoring scheme was discussed. The seven sub-scales of multiple trait scores that are communicative quality, interest, referencing, organisation, argumentation, linguistic accuracy, and linguistic appropriacy would be discussed. I attempted to set an agreement for the rating as follows: 1. the raters should agree on the scoring scheme 2. The writing components were the focus rather than the length of the writing 3. The essay should
be read twice before rating. In addition, the inter-rater reliability of the scores was computed between the scores given by the two raters. The reliability analysis in this study showed that the scored graded by the two raters were consistent when the Alpha (Cronbach) was considered high at 0.998.

4.14 Justifications for Using Paired Samples t-test

According toMuijs (2008, p. 85), paired samples t-tests are ‘a typed of test used when the comparison is between matched samples (e.g. pre-test-post-test). This method allows researchers to compare the mean scores of t-test is used to compare two sets of data within a group. However, paired t-test concentrate on the performance within groups, which is used to compare the performance before treatment and their performance after the treatment (MacKey & Gass, 2005). Fraenkel (2008, p. 236) states that this measurement can be used ‘whether or not there are significant differences between the means of the two groups’. The method is different from a paired samples t-test while ANOVA can compare more than two sets of data. In summary, the variation within or between each of the groups is compared and analysed statistically. In this study, the scores for students writing were divided into two groups (initial and final assignment), because two assignments of them were interventions and in each intervention, students had to hand in their writing assignments. Therefore, the use of a paired samples t-test is necessary to compare the mean score of the writing of students in order to see the improvement of their writing at the beginning compared to the end of the semester.
In short, this chapter has explained the importance of both the qualitative and quantitative methods employed in this study. The overview of the qualitative methods was illustrated in detail for the action research method, together with all instruments used in the study, such as interviews, questionnaires, reflective writing, students’ portfolios and so on. For the quantitative part, the scoring method and the statistical pair samples t-test measurement were explained. Both methods will enable the researcher to look at the data from various perspectives from the scores, comments from teachers and students in order to help shape the study into an effective tool.
Chapter 5

Analysis of Students’ Assignments and Feedback

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first presents the analysis of the study as obtained from the scores of the students’ writing assignments. SPSS was used for the analysis of the data collected and the paired sample t-test technique was used to determine whether there were any differences between the scores between the initial and the final assignments. In addition, the analysis dealt with three aspects: first, the overall scores in the students’ first assignment were compared with the final writing assignment; second, the students’ first and final assignments in terms of transitional connection, coherence and discourse organisation; and lastly a comparison between the first and the final assignment, dealing with the transitional connection, coherence and discourse organisation.

The second part deals with how peer feedback promotes the students to be aware of the sense of audience and how peer feedback influence and promote sense of audience is the last part in this chapter.

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following research questions were addressed.

1. Do the students’ writing abilities improve after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure throughout the Academic Writing course? Discourse structure in this study is defined as the components that help to connect texts in discourse in order to convey the meaning between writers’ intentions and the readers’ interpretations through the use of cohesion, which is categorised at the
micro level of discourse, and coherence and discourse organisation are classified as macro level of discourse.

1.1. Do the students improve at the micro (cohesion) level? For this research question, the objective is to measure how the students develop in connecting sentences within paragraphs by employing cohesive devices to relate the ideas among sentences in the text throughout their writing by using cohesive devices appropriately.

1.2. Do the students improve at the macro (coherence) level? This research question aimed to investigate the students’ writing improvement with the use of coherence to connect ideas in texts, and create meaning or the flow of ideas throughout the whole texts or discourse which enable readers to understand the writer’s ideas presented in overall texts.

1.3. Do the students improve at the discourse organisation level and deal with the conventions of connecting texts or paragraphs together by using the concept of rhetorical organisation?

2. Do the students develop awareness of a sense of audience, which is referred to as a perception that the writers should have a responsibility to provide sufficient information in the texts they produce in order to help the readers to understand the context and setting of texts?

3. To what extent does peer feedback influence the awareness of a sense of audience? After the peer feedback for each assignment, did the students provide
enough information of the texts they produce in order to help the readers understand of texts they produce?

5.1 The Improvement in Writing Ability after the Teaching Approach Focusing on Discourse Structure

5.1.1 Paired Sample T-test for Overall Scores from Initial and Final Assignments

The paired sample t-tests were conducted in order to analyse and determine whether students were able to improve their writing ability during the course. The results were revealed in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 TOTAL 4 – TOTAL 1</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Comparison of the overall score for the initial and final assignments

Table 5.1 shows a significant difference (p<.05) between overall mean scores in the initial and the final assignment, revealing that students can improve their writing during the period of a course by focusing on the discourse structure.

Not only did the scores reveal that students improve their writing, but peer feedback showed that most of them now had more understanding of how to respond to their friends’ writing, including the grammatical aspects, organisation of paragraphs and content. Many students were keen to exchange their comments and during peer
feedback sessions asked me to clarify points that they had discussed. They felt they needed clarity on grammatical aspects, general content, the organisation of paragraphs and so on. As can be seen from one of the comments made by Amnart about Jintana’s writing below, it seemed that students developed ability by doing peer feedback.

A Car and a Bicycle

Driving a car is different from riding a bicycle. First, both transportations have a different wheel. A car has four wheels, yet a bicycle has two wheels. Second, both transportations has a different cost. A car is expensive, but a bicycle is cheap. Third, both transportations has a different speed. A car has more speed than a bicycle. Fourth, both transportations are different in a number of seats. A car has a seat four maximum, yet a bicycle has a maximum seat for two. A car has not wet rain, yet a bicycle has wet rain.

(Excerpt from Jintana’s assignment)

Amnart’s comments were that Jintana was confused in presenting and arranging her ideas comparing a car and bicycle. She only provided lists of differences between them. The flow of the topic was not good. In addition, she omitted the word ‘have’ in a sentence.

While Jintana commented on Kanokporn’s writing, she stated that it was well organised and easy to understand and follow. She also provided useful examples in her writing, however there were some subject verb agreements that needed to be corrected.
The Causes of Water Pollution

What are the causes of water pollution? Who are the culprits of water pollution? One major cause of water pollution causes serious environmental and health problems. The pollutants come from chemical and industrial processes. When factories and manufacturers pour their chemicals and toxic wastes directly into streams and rivers, the water becomes poisonous, and the quantity of oxygen levels decrease and lead to the death of many aquatic animals. Another cause of water pollution is from pesticides. Farm pesticides poison aquatic plants and animals. Animals manure, chemical fertilizers, phosphate detergent pollute water by supplying excessive nutrients. This pollution is known as ‘Eutrophication’.

(Excerpt from Kanokporn’s assignment)

By the end of the course, most students developed their writing ability quite well, as can be seen from the examples above. Students noticed and provided useful comments in terms of discourse structure, grammatical structure, contents and so on. Students became more active participants than at the beginning of the course by providing comments and arguing with their friends about various aspects.

From the students’ viewpoint, it can be seen that teaching writing that focuses on the discourse structure is an appropriate way to overcome the problems. Indeed, it is necessary to focus more on how students organise and structure ideas during their writing, not just concentrate on grammatical aspects as in the past.

In addition, the students’ reflective writing reveals writing improvement. It could be seen that many students had similar problems in connecting their ideas to fit into the paragraph at the beginning of the class. Many students made the following reflection:
Kanokporn stated that she had a problem with linking her ideas during writing. Similar to Sufa, she recognised that she had a difficulty in connecting sentences within the paragraph. However, the two students also pointed out that after learning and practising with models of the paragraphs given by the teacher. They soon realised that there are many ways to connect ideas or sentences together, in order to produce a meaningful and coherent paragraph.

The above perspectives make the same important point regarding problems in organising their writing. Most thought that planning or outlining what they wanted to write was important because it would help them to focus on the topic they want to write. The outline reminded them to focus on the main point and try to connect the supporting details appropriate for each main point they wanted to present. The view of students towards the problem of organising texts showed that they had noted the problem, reflected on it, and come up with ways of solving the problem.

5.1.2 Paired T-test for Organisation, Coherence, and Transitional Connection Bands Scores from Initial and Final Assignments

The three traits of organisation, coherence, and transitional connection were analysed by the paired sample t-tests, in order to determine the extent of improvement in students as a result of the course. Table 5.2 presents the scores for the three traits.

The mean scores for the three traits of organisation, coherence, and transitional connection were analysed. The organisation trait increased significantly (p<.05), as can be seen from the table, but the coherence and the transitional connection were not significantly different between the initial and final assignment. However, the mean scores reveals that students had improved from the period of teaching that focused on discourse structure, as can be seen from Figure 5.1 below.
Table 5.2 Comparison of organisation, coherence, and transitional connection scores of the initial and final assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>ORG4 - ORG1</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>2.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>COH4 - COH1</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>TRANS4 - TRANS1</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the figure illustrates the initial and final mean scores and the overall scores for the three traits. It can be clearly seen that students improved in writing ability in all aspects, especially the overall scores and the scores for paragraph...
organisation that increased significantly in the final assignment compared with the initial assignment, although the coherence and transitional connection are not significantly different.

Since the main focus of the study is on using genre approach focused on the discourse structure, the results of the scores for the coherence, and the transitional connection traits are not significantly different, the problems that may hinder the improvement of the students in these two traits will be covered in the discussion and conclusion chapter. The next part aims to answer the second research question as to whether or not students developed awareness of a sense of audience, and obtained multiple perspectives.

5.2 Awareness of the Audience from Peer Feedback

Research question number 2 concerns the extent to which peer feedback helps the students become aware of a sense of audience. This section aims to answer this question, which focuses on awareness of the audience when you are a writer. Many researchers support the idea that the use of peer feedback helps promote a sense of awareness among readers, especially when they take the role of writers. This study aims to initiate awareness in students of their role as both writers and readers, and at the same time encourages them when they write to take responsibility for the reader.

Keh (1990) suggests that there are many advantages to peer feedback. First, it is time saving, because students can help each other to check their work before submitting their assignments, but limited in this case to students of higher proficiency. Secondly,
it would create a greater sense of audience among students. They have a chance to read their colleagues’ writing and give comments on it; it also promotes critical thinking among them. The idea of using peer feedback to support awareness of audience is supported by many researchers, as can be seen in Chapter 4. Therefore, students should not only produce accurate and acceptable texts but texts that their audience can understand. In order to answer the research question, the following analysis presents views on awareness of the audience by the students, using various research instruments.

5.2.1 Paired T-test for Communicative Quality Bands Scores from Initial and Final Assignments

The communicative quality trait was analysed by the paired sample t-tests, in order to determine the extent of improvement in students in term of the satisfaction of the communication between writers and readers. This score implied that the awareness of audience either increased, or was not compared to the beginning of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC - CC4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 The comparison of the communicative quality scores for the initial and final assignments

Table 5.3 shows a significant difference (p<.05) between mean scores in the initial and the final assignment which focus on the communicative quality. As in Table 5.3, the results revealed that students can improve their writing in term of communicative
quality. As the scores revealed that the communicative quality of students improved, it supports the conclusion that students tended to enhance their writing ability to communicate with the readers from that at the beginning of the course, because their writing displays an ability to communicate in such a way that it gives a reader satisfaction. The communicative quality score shows development of the students in terms of promoting a sense of audience throughout the Writing Academic English course.

5.2.2 Awareness of Audience from Peer Feedback at the Beginning of the Course

At the beginning of the course, all students were asked to fill in a questionnaire in order to gather views on the teaching and learning writing in general. The purpose was to determine what the students thought about writing in English, what their problems were, and what aspects were they most concerned about before the start of the class.

One of the many questions concerned the most important elements for good writing. This helped determine to what students paid most attention. There are various aspects the students considered essential to help them to produce a good piece of writing, and how they need the teacher to support them and in what aspects, here categorised into four groups as follows.

Most students were concerned that grammatical knowledge was such an important element. Vocabulary was also essential, in most students’ view. Students agreed that
the way to arrange or organise their ideas appropriately to produce a paragraph was an aspect that most was important; other points were how to manage the order of their ideas and understanding the topic they wanted to write about. From their answers, they were not concerned with any sense of audience at the beginning of the course.

Regarding the question on the aspects of writing students wanted the teacher to focus on in teaching, most agreed that grammatical aspects were their first priority at the beginning of the course, and they wanted the teacher to focus on teaching them to improve their writing. Secondly, the use of vocabulary and how to bring their ideas together to produce a good piece of writing were aspects of concern. As can be seen from students’ answers to the two questions at the beginning of the course, most gave attention to grammar and vocabulary. Only one referred to awareness of the audience, a student who stated that it is important to produce a writing that is easy for readers to understand. It seems that most were focusing on the view that good writers should be good at grammar and vocabulary, and did not recognise how important was a writer’s awareness of the audience and how to manage their information during writing to help the readers understand. Therefore, it is important to expand their views on the readers’ expectations and what they want when reading a story. The following section provides information on awareness of the audience from peer feedback at the end of the course. It reveals development of the students in terms of promoting a sense of audience throughout the course from various instruments such as reflective writing, students’ writing excerpts, and so on.
5.2.2 Awareness of Audiences from Peer Feedback at the End of the Course

In order to see clearly the improvement and awareness of the audience from the students, the following paragraph illustrates examples of students’ responses during peer feedback. The awareness slowly emerged from the beginning to the end of the course.

In the process of peer feedback, students had opportunities to read their colleagues’ writing. Many students reflected on the point of awareness of audience as follows. Sirinapha found that after doing peer feedback she was more concerned with how to organise her texts effectively in order to help the readers understand. Sometimes she had not given sufficient detail because she assumed that the readers already know. Furthermore, Wilaiwan suggested a point that writers should not ignore: they should not assume that readers know everything the writers do, and should provide more information or details for the readers to connect their overall ideas. In addition, Chadanai observed that writing clarification differs from speaking. If someone has not understood what you said, a repeat can be sought immediately, but in writing the readers cannot ask. Therefore, reading colleagues’ writing prompted him to be aware of the need to supply readers with sufficient information to understand what the writer wants to communicate.

The results from students’ reflective writing showed that, after peer feedback, students had increased their awareness of readers. They understood that the role of the writer is to provide sufficient information for the readers, compared to the start of the course when most of them wrote what they wanted. As can be seen from the
above reflections, many students attempted to provide more information because they had experienced this at first hand, as readers of the first drafts from their colleagues. Many times they found that the readers needed more detail. Finally, they noted the most important role of the writer is to produce understandable texts for readers.

Most of the students agreed that the process of peer feedback was useful in ways such as having the chance to exchange ideas on the content of each other’s writing; moreover, and the opportunity to apply grammatical knowledge during peer feedback. In addition, they examined the paragraph organisation of their colleagues, as testified by the following interview transcripts of Student 1 and Student 2.

Student 1: I think peer feedback is useful because it allow me to read and explore my friend’s writing. I try to read once to understand the content. I found that some of their writing was difficult to understand which might arise from the lack of organisation or the lack of important information I need to know. Then, it reminds me of what I should write in order to help readers understand, not just write what I want to.

Student 2: I found that my friend’s writing was hard to understand at the beginning. During the peer feedback, we discussed and asked her to add some information in order to help me understand more of her writing. After reviewing my friend’s writing, I thought that the responsibility of the writer is not just to write what he or she wants to but to provide enough detail and organise it to present their ideas for readers to understand.

Like the student interviews, reflective writing by the students revealed that the use of peer feedback was useful to students. It encouraged the students to concentrate more on many aspects of writing, such as paragraph organisation, the grammatical points, and to be more concerned with giving readers enough detail to understand the
message. From a student’s viewpoint, Chadkamon suggested that peer feedback was useful, first because it gave students a chance to proofread their writing and correct errors before submitting it to teachers and, secondly, as it was quite challenging to receive comments from colleagues as to whether or not they had understood the written work. Lack of understanding may indicate an ineffective organisation. He had a second opportunity to revise his text. On the same point, Vorada suggested that peer feedback helped her be concerned about her own errors, such as grammatical points, and understanding the content of work by friends. It reminded her of how important it is to produce effective writing, geared to the readers’ understanding. She also asserted that sometimes writers thought the reader knew the details. It is important to give readers sufficient that they understand her text. In short, the students suggested that it is a suitable idea to have peer feedback in class. Here, the teacher can help reconcile any disagreements about errors.

The questionnaire revealed that most students favoured peer feedback, especially for giving an opportunity to correct a basic errors or mistakes in their first draft. Many students agreed that peer feedback is useful. First, it gave the students a chance to proofread their writing and correct some errors before submitting it to teachers, and secondly it was quite challenge to receive the comments from friend whether he or she understand his written work or not.

Regarding teacher feedback, most students found it very beneficial in helping them develop their writing during the course. Many agreed that the teacher’s comments provided more detail than peer feedback that indicates just basic errors such as spelling, vocabulary, grammatical errors, and so on.
In short, the students suggested that it is appropriate to do peer feedback in class, because here the teacher can help them justify problems when two students have an argument about errors. Many students found that doing the peer feedback allowed them to read their others’ writing and be more aware in producing their own texts to be understood by readers.

In reflective writing, many students noticed that it was important for writers to create effective text. Natawee suggested that well organised texts would help readers to follow, so the writers should organise their ideas logically in order to convey messages to the readers. The readers might be confused if texts were not arranged orderly. Regarding writer responsibility, Jintana suggested that it is essential to organise the writing clearly, with sufficient information to enable the readers to understand what the writer wishes to communicate. The ideas should be linked smoothly, and presented in a way readers can understand.

Excerpts from Jintana’s writing show that she tried to give examples for readers in her second draft in order to present with clarity:

There are three main reasons for air pollution problem. Industrialization is the first reason for air pollution. It results in a number of greenhouse gases and other waste products. There gasses are released by burning fuels. The second reason is the population growth.... (first draft)

There are three main reasons for air pollution problem. Industrialization is the first reasons for air pollution. It results in a number of greenhouse gases and other waste products, such as, chlorofluorocarbon, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen.
oxide, arsenic, lead, and mercury. These gases are released by burning fuels.

The second reason is the population growth.... (second draft)

*Jintana* is aware of her readership, and that she needs to provide some examples of waste gas as, in her second draft, examples of pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, chlorofluorocarbon, and so on were included. This supports the idea proposed in her reflective writing, that to be a good writer, readers should be provided with well organised writing with enough detail.

*Sophittra* asserted that the responsibility of the writer is to produce clear ideas throughout the writing to convey the message to readers. It is important to plan and outline ideas before writing. This will help the writer to organise and connect the ideas well enough for the reader to understand it, and not just write.

The above viewpoints testify that students are aware of the responsibility of writer towards readership. Most noted the importance of presenting their writing for easy understanding by the readers. This can be achieved through organising and arranging their ideas clearly in order to help the readers to understand what the writings are about. If this is compared to the situation as the beginning of the course, most of them were not aware how to make the readers understand their writing. This reveals a development of the students’ attitudes towards writer responsibility. They now sought to create understandable writing for the readers and were more aware of the quality of their writing.

Reflective writing revealed that peer feedback was useful for students. It also encouraged students to concentrate more on aspects of their writing such as paragraph
organisation, grammatical points and concern to provide readers with enough detail.

From a student’s viewpoint, Suntorn recommended that the process of peer feedback was helpful because it allowed him to do proofread before the submission of the assignment. He had an opportunity to focus on the contents of their friends’ writing as well.

On the same point, Vorada also suggested that peer feedback helped her learn to be concerned with errors made by herself such as grammatical points, the understanding the content of colleagues’ written work. This reminded her how important it was to produce effective writing if the readers were to understand it. She also asserted that sometimes the writer thought the readers know the details, but really it was not.

Providing sufficient information for readers is important. Her second draft added more detail that she thought would help the readers understand more in her writing, as follows:

My first favorite is Park Yeh-Eun. She was born on May 26, 1989. She is a very pretty, cute, and sexy girl. She has a wonderful shape, and she has long light brown hair… (first draft)

My first favorite is Park Yeh-Eun. She is in the Wonder Girl band. She was born on May 26, 1989 in Korea. She is a very pretty, cute, and sexy girl. She has a wonderful shape, and she has long light brown hair… (second draft)

The above excerpts from Vorada’s writing show that after revision of her first draft, more information gives readers the picture of the Korean singer in the ‘Wonder Girl’ band. In the first draft, she had omitted the existence and name of the band. This information she thought was important background for the readers because they may not know who Park Yeh-Eun is, and added the brand and the nationality of its singer.
On the same aspect of peer feedback from the students’ interview, most agreed that the process of peer feedback is useful in many ways such as having a chance to exchange ideas on the content for each other’s writing and to apply their grammatical knowledge. As can be seen from various research instruments such as students’ reflective writing, and students’ interviews, the use of peer feedback is helpful for students to promote their writing ability, and helps the students become aware of their responsibility to produce effective writing for the readers to understand because they have a chance to take two roles: one as a writer and the other role as a reader during the peer feedback.

In conclusion, from the perspectives of various instruments used in the study, peer feedback-assisted students become aware of the audience in their writing. Firstly, most had thought that the readers should have understood what they had written but, after the peer review session, found that they had often forgotten to give information essential for readers to understand the whole picture. The idea of peer feedback is supported by Dheram (1995, 165), who makes two points. The first is that it enables students to become aware of their writing from the perspective of reader-oriented text. It encourages students to accept readers other than their teachers. In addition, this kind of feedback would promote the awareness of using a discourse structure that focuses on coherence to produce an effective text. The readers can understand the meaning of the text. Students have the opportunity to read the written work of their colleagues and comment. Students’ reflective writing also shows that peer feedback helps students to become more concerned with how to organise the text effectively for the readers to understand. Again, the students said they often failed to give enough detail because they assumed that readers knew what they were writing about. Therefore, the use of peer feedback enhanced students’ awareness of the audience.
Not only did they play the role of the writer during the *Writing Academic English* course, but they also took the reader role, reminding them as writers who had to provide essential information and organise it appropriately.

### 5.3 The Role of Peer Feedback in Influencing and Promoting a Sense of Audience

As can be seen in the previous section, the students increased their awareness of the audience during the course. This section illustrates how peer feedback plays an important role in supporting the students to promote a sense of audience from various perspectives.

In the process of peer feedback, students had opportunities to read their colleagues’ writing. Many students reflected on awareness of audiences, as follows.

*Somkit* suggested that to assume that the readers know everything is not a good way during writing, but it is important to provide as many details for readers to help them understand the overall ideas of texts. *Thanee* also had a similar view. It is necessary to produce each piece of writing for the readers to understand. He asserted that a good piece of writing should provide clear message to communicate between the writers to the readers.

*Natee* found that at the beginning of the course, he thought that readers might know about what he wrote, but the readers did not as he expected and he did not give
enough detail for the topic he wrote. After doing peer feedback, he tried to provide more details.

In addition, Chadanai recommended that writing is different from speaking. If someone does not understand what you said, he can ask immediately, but for writing the readers cannot ask the writer. Therefore, reading friends’ writing activated him to be aware to provide readers enough information to understand what the writer wants to communicate.

After doing the peer feedback, the students increased their awareness of their readers. They understood that the role of the writer is to provide enough information for the readers, compared with at the beginning of the course most of them wrote what they wanted. Finally, they noticed the important role of the writers is to produce understandable texts for the readers.

In summary, this chapter aims to answer the first three research questions. According to the first research question, the results revealed that the students’ writing abilities improved after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. The overall mean scores in the final and initial assignments of students revealed that there is significant difference. The scores of organisation, coherence and transitional connection showed that their writing abilities also improved, but only the organisation significantly improved.

For the second research question, the results of the study showed that students tend to develop awareness of a sense of audience at the end of the course. Finally, the findings of the study revealed that peer feedback helps students promoted the
awareness of audience because they took only the role of a writer but also the role of a reader.
Chapter 6
Analysis of Attitudes of Teachers and Students Towards the Teaching Approach

This chapter describes the various aspects of the results of a study based on research instruments, such as teacher interviews, student interviews, reflective writing of the students, questionnaires and so on. This is to answer research questions number 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 about teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the use of discourse structure in teaching writing on the English Academic Writing course, the effect of using the adapted Feez’ cycle of teaching and learning, the effect of using portfolio assessment and reflective writing of students.

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following research questions were addressed.

4. What was the attitude of students towards an English Academic Writing course that focused on discourse structure? In order to answer this research question, three instruments were employed to answer this research question. Interview, questionnaires and students’ reflective writing were used for the analysis.

5. What was the attitude of teachers and the administrator towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure? The lecturers who taught on the Writing Academic English course were interviewed in order to gather responses to a teaching approach that focused on discourse structure.
6. What is the effect of using modified Feez’ cycle on the quality of discourse structure in students’ writing?

7. What is the effect of portfolio assessment on students’ writing?

8. What is the effect of student reflective writing on their writing development?

6.1 The Attitudes of Students Towards the English Academic Writing Course that Focused on Discourse Structure

It is important to gather the responses from the students, because this study aims to implement a new method of teaching writing based on the genre approach. Knowing the attitudes of students is essential if they are to understand the methods being implemented and to obtain their response towards teaching writing in a way that focuses on discourse structure. Interviews were employed as a study instrument.

One objective of this study is to implement the genre approach in teaching writing, in order to help students develop their writing ability by focusing on discourse structure. It is necessary to discover of both teachers and students attitudes towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure of discourse structure to obtain their views on employing new methods and persuade them to participate. This helped to broaden the researcher’s view of the teaching methods implemented in the classroom. Their suggestions and comments helped fill some gaps that the researcher may not have seen. In order to gather useful viewpoints from teacher colleagues and students, the interesting topics during the interview were divided into two main aspects, as follows:
6.1.1 The Importance of Discourse Structure

According to the interviews, most of the students felt that the important aspects of writing are grammatical knowledge and vocabulary. Few of them saw how the text were organised or connected the texts together facilitated the readers’ understanding but, at the end of the course, their views toward the writing changed. They were not only aware how to organise texts within paragraphs, but acquired both grammatical and vocabulary skills to create an effective texts, as can be seen from the interview transcripts below.

Student 1: I think after studying I learnt that apart from the vocabulary and grammatical aspects, the organisation of the writing is important because it’s not enough to know grammar and vocabulary in order to produce a good written assignment. We should know how to arrange the ideas and arrange our ideas into an understandable writing.

Student 3: Before studying this course, I think two important things which can help me write well are vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. After studying this course, I noticed that the way we connect the idea of the writing is also important. This may result from the different way to present the idea between Thai and English.

Student 4: I think most Thai students may face the difficulty when they have to connect all the ideas in to their writing. I had a difficulty in producing my writing at the beginning of the course, but the teaching which allowed me to see the model of a paragraph as an example of the organisation of writing in various texts helped me understand the structure of writing.

As can be seen from the perspectives of students towards the importance of discourse structure, the important aspects that students found difficult was connecting ideas
during writing and first language interference. In addition, students were more concerned about discourse structure to help them organise their writing and achieve coherence.

Twenty five students recommended that it was important for writers to organise their writing properly. It would be easy for readers to understand the information throughout the writing. The use of conjunction is also important, because it allows readers to understand the relations between the information. In addition, chronological order is important. The unity of paragraphs is a key aspect, as well, so supporting details should be well organised with suitable connectors to create smooth paragraphs. The details provided should support the theme of the writing.

Students also found that the use of conjunctions is essential, because these devices can help readers to connect information logically within the paragraph. This can be a signpost to help readers understand the relationships within the content of writing. Most of them agreed that the way of organising writing is important, because readers can understand paragraphs if they are well organised.

However, in order to support students’ acknowledgement of the importance of discourse structure, the learning cycle played an important role in helping them to understand and employ it to achieve accuracy in their writing, so the next aspect for the discussion is the cycle of teaching and learning.
6.1.2 Peer Feedback

Thirty students agreed that the process of peer feedback was useful in many ways; they had the chance to exchange ideas on the content of each other’s writing. Moreover, they had the chance to apply their grammatical knowledge during peer feedback. They also reviewed the paragraph organisation of their colleagues, as can be seen from the following interview transcripts for Student 1 and for Student 2.

**Student 1:** I think peer feedback is useful because it allow me to read and explore my friends’ writing. I try to read once to understand the content and then come back to check his grammatical errors and it gave me a chance to see the development of the paragraph of my friend, how it connects together fluently or not.

**Student 2:** At first, I think it is difficult for me to give the feedback to my friend, but after the teacher gave me a feedback form, I think it will be more helpful because I can find the important points to investigate my friend’s writing during peer feedback. Before studying this course, I think that vocabulary and grammatical points would be checked during peer feedback.

Compared to students’ interviews, students’ reflective writing revealed that the use of peer feedback was useful. First, it gave students the chance to proofread their writing and correct errors before submitting to teachers, and secondly it was quite challenging to receive the comments from friends as to whether or not the written work was understandable. Failure to understand might suggest a second chance to rearrange the writing. This may result from the ineffective organisation of his writing. Sutee also suggested that he learned to correct his own errors for grammatical aspects, He had an opportunity to understand the content his friend written text. The process
of peer feedback reminds him to be aware of texts he produced because he had to make sure that the readers understand what he wrote. Many times the writer thought the readers know the details already, but they do not. Therefore, it is the writer duty to provide sufficient information for the readers.

In the questionnaires, thirty students suggested that peer feedback is useful. During peer feedback, students had the chance to correct basic errors or mistakes in the first draft. Many students agreed that peer feedback was useful. First, it gave students a chance to proofread their writing and correct some errors before submitting it to teachers, and second it is quite challenge to receive the comments from friend if he or she understand his written work or not. If his friend does not understand his writing, it may result from the ineffective organisation of his writing.

As regards the teacher feedback, most all students found it very useful to help them develop their writing during the course. Many students agreed that the teacher’s comments provided them with more detail compared to the peer feedback, which can provide them just basic corrections such as spelling, vocabulary, grammatical errors and so on.

In short, the students also suggested that it is a good idea to do peer feedback in class because the teacher can be the referee and judge when two students have an arguments about errors found during the peer feedback. Many students found that doing the peer feedback allowed them to read their friends’ writing and be more aware when producing their own text to be understandable for readers.
6.2 The Attitudes of Teachers Towards the English Academic Writing Course that Focused on Discourse Structure

From the literature review, the teaching of writing in Thailand mostly focuses on grammatical aspects, as suggested in the previous chapter. The traditional method of teaching writing is still being used in class, as found in previous studies. However, it is very interesting to know how methods of teaching writing are really used by teachers and how they respond to the teaching method focused on discourse structure that I tried to implement. It is important for my study to obtain their responses because my aims is to implement a new method of teaching writing based on the genre approach for undergraduate students in the Faculty of Sciences at Naresuan University. The attitudes of my teacher colleagues who have been teaching writing at Naresuan University are essential to the study. Before the interview, all the teachers had a short discussion about how they taught writing. After that, they were given a brief explanation of genre-based teaching approach by the researchers and also had a presentation of Feez’ teaching and learning cycle, with explanation of each stage before the three interview days. I obtained various perspectives from my colleagues before proposing it in the near future. Their views are valuable for me to receive suggestions and comments about what I tried to implement on the Writing Academic English course.

6.2.1 The Importance of Discourse Structure

Both teachers and students found that a genre-based teaching approach focusing on discourse structure was useful teaching writing for Thai university to students.
However, they commented on various aspects of the genre based approach such as the teaching cycle employed in the classroom.

When the first teacher T1 was interviewed, she suggested that Thai students had problems not only with grammatical aspects, but also how to organise ideas in their writing. She also stated that it is important to help students to learn to organise the structure within paragraphs. The following statement summarises her view about the discourse structure.

I think Thai students have problems in writing in three main aspects. They do not have enough vocabulary and their knowledge of grammar is quite limited. In addition, one more important point that we could not ignore is the way they organise the ideas during their writing. Even though many students are good at grammar and have sufficient vocabulary, but many of them still have the problem in writing. They could not arrange the paragraph in a logical way. This may result from the way students think in Thai and translate into English directly. {18.45- 22.00 Sec}

As can be seen, T1 noted that one of the problems is how to organise text within writing. She supported a method to assist students in improving their ability to organise the text in writing.

T2 suggested a similar viewpoint on grammatical aspects and understanding of text organisation within the paragraphs, but had a different idea about helping students to develop their writing ability, as can be seen from transcript below:

I have been teaching writing for 15 years. The problem of writing of Thai students result from insufficient of grammatical knowledge and the student do not know how to connect the ideas of their writing, so I try to help them connect the idea of writing by teaching them on the process of writing, and I also emphasise the students that the introduction, the body and the conclusion are the three main parts in writing in a paragraph. I concentrate my teaching on both grammatical aspects and the writing process of the students. {6.10-8.00 sec}
The interview scripts above show that T2 also found a problem with students unable to connect or organise the ideas to flow smoothly within the paragraph.

From the teachers’ viewpoints on the importance of discourse structure, the important point is a difficulty in connecting ideas during writing and first language interference. In addition, they were concerned about how students could understand discourse structure well enough to help them organise their writing and make their ideas more coherent.

6.2.2 Peer Feedback

Many teachers were not quite sure whether peer feedback would be a success with students, as expressed in the interviewees below.

**Teacher 1**: I rarely use peer feedback because students have insufficient knowledge to correct their friends work; moreover, they do not believe in the ability of their friends in terms of checking grammar and other aspects of writing in English. They trust their teachers rather than their friend. They may not pay attention much to peer feedback, compared to teacher feedback. {8.00 sec}

**Teacher 2**: I think it is a useful way to help students learn to correct errors from other students, but I am not sure in their ability to correct their friends’ writing. I mean they can do it, but not quite well, especially the students who have insufficient knowledge.

**Teacher 3**: I think that students may see peer feedback as only error correction and many times they ignore to look at the overall structure of the paragraph. They do not often dare to comment on their friends because Thai traditional beliefs rarely allow them to criticise or comment directly to other people. They may not want to make their friends lose their face.
However, some teachers thought that it was quite a useful way to have students learn to correct their friends’ writing, but with teacher guidance on how to do it.

**Teacher 4:** I think peer feedback is useful for students. I often assign the students to do peer feedback in a group of four. Every student has to print out 3 copies of their first draft in order to exchange for their friends in a group to do a peer feedback if they have not finished in class, they have to do it as a homework and submit them afterward. As a teacher, I believe that my students can do peer feedback, but the outcome may be satisfied to some extent. However, it is worth for students to learn to read other students’ writing and try to help correct each other work. {7.10-8.51 sec}

The fourth teacher pointed strongly to peer feedback, which she believed is helpful for students, while others seemed reluctant to use it, because they were worried about the ability of the students to do such work. Many teachers seemed worried about its viability, and some teachers disagreed with the idea because the teachers should initiate students’ exploration of their friends’ writing to learn to correct some errors both contents and grammatical aspects. At the same time, students saw that peer feedback was helpful in allowing them to practise grammatical knowledge. Some were unsure how to begin giving feedback to their friends; they thought the peer feedback form helped them to see the points that they should concentrate on.

Students and teachers also agreed that the use of discourse structure approach in teaching writing is an interesting alternative. Students found it was useful to introduce them to a way of how to write through the use of a genre approach compared with earlier approaches focused on grammatical aspects. This approach allowed them to learn how to organise texts in a systematic way. They had a good attitude towards the use of discourse structure, as shown in previous sections. At the same time, most of the teachers supported the use of genre approach focusing on the discourse structure; they also commented on some aspects, such as the teaching load
of teachers, the number of the students, and the ability of students, as factors that may hinder implementation.

6.3 The Effect of Using Modified Feez’ Cycle on the Quality of Discourse Structure in Students’ Writing

Many students have suggested that Feez’ teaching and learning cycle is a helpful process and informs them how to write in a systematic way. Most students found that the model of texts that the teacher presented was a helpful guide in understanding how to organise text within a paragraph.

In the view of students, the use of Feez’ teaching cycle is useful. One teacher, however, argued that there may be difficulties in the textual modelling stage. The teachers needed to make sure that all the steps could be clearly presented to students while both the interviews and the reflective writing of the students revealed that the cycle was beneficial, because it allowed them to develop a model and steps to write systematically as can be seen from the viewpoints of Amnart. His ideas also support the use of the textual modelling stage, because it provides students with guidelines on how to organise a paragraph. Chaddanai suggested that the learning cycle was beneficial, because it provided him with a step-by-step approach to the writing process. He also stated that, at the beginning of the course, he was not sure how to start his writing.

The opinions of the students about the teaching and learning cycle of Feez were positive. Most of them found that it was useful to apply them in their process of writing. It helped them to see how to produce writing in a systematic way, so they
could employ this cycle as the scaffolding for their own writing. Compared with the beginning of the course, they showed a development in writing by employing the cycle.

In terms of the benefit of paragraph modelling, most of the students found it was essential for them to produce their own texts. Wannisa pointed out that the paragraph model helped her to see how effective text could be, so she could apply it as her own model before writing. She also noticed that there are various ways to produce interesting writing for readers, while Jenjira suggested that she could learn from the model paragraph in terms of how paragraphs were organised and adapt it to her own writing. She also noted that there are various ways to present ideas within paragraphs, such as the use of point-to-point or block organisation.

In addition, Sukrit suggested that the paragraph model can be beneficial as he found that there are different ways of connecting text together to produce the same story, as can be seen from the exercise on rearranging a narrative paragraph. Many students could tell the same story in a different order, but keeping the same details. Amnart suggested that the paragraph model was useful, yet with one problem in its lack of preparation for structuring or organising the paragraphs. Most students usually ignore this point. He also suggested that it would be useful if everyone could learn from the model paragraph given by the teacher.

In short, model paragraphs are necessary for students. Prior to instruction, students usually think that there is just one way to organise their writing and can learn different ways to produce a paragraph by using the same sentences, but in a different order. As can be seen from the above, the students reflected that there are various ways to
organise their writing in order to make the readers understand and to make their writing interesting.

From students’ interview, they thought that Feez’ teaching cycle is a helpful in allowing them to learn how to write in a systematic way. Most students found that the cycle of Feez that the teacher presented represented good guidance in helping them to understand how to organise the text in paragraphs.

**Student 4:** I think that process of teaching by giving model examples of paragraph writing was quite helpful although at the beginning I was not quite familiar with it. I understood more when I had to explore the texts given by the teacher to emphasise on how paragraph could connect together.

**Student 1:** The steps of teaching benefited me, because I got the idea of how to produce written work successfully and learn how to write in a systematic way. Before studying this class, I just write and focus more on the grammatical point rather than focusing on how to organise the writing in an effective way.

Feez’ teaching cycle is useful in the view of teachers, but one teacher argued that there may be a difficulty in the textual modelling stage. Those who teach have to explain the process and make sure teaching can be clearly presented to students while students found that the cycle is beneficial, because it allowed them to have see a model and follow the steps systematically.

From the questionnaire, most students found that the model of the texts which the teacher presents to them is a guidance to help them understand the way in organising the texts within the paragraph in steps by steps. Many students found it is useful to use the models of paragraph in writing because these models allow them to see how the paragraph is organised. Some students found that there are many ways to link the text together to produce the same story as can be seen from exercise of rearranging
the narrative paragraph model. There are different ways for them to tell the same story with the different order to present the same story with various details. They also found that the learning cycle is beneficial for them in order to help them learn to write step by step compared to the past experiences. However, some students wanted the instructors to provide them more examples of the paragraph model, so they can have more examples or them to be their guidance.

From the teachers’ interviews, although Feez’ stages or cycle of teaching and learning were felt useful, some lecturers commented on its suitability for non-English major students. When the first teacher (T1) was interviewed, she expressed her view that one stage of the teaching cycle would be appropriate for Thai students, but she was not sure whether the students could adopt the cycle at every stage.

I think the teaching cycle of Feez is a good start to help students enhance more knowledge and link the ideas together. It seems a systematic process, but I am not quite sure in the stage of textual modelling whether the students can identify and investigate the structural pattern and language features of the model and compare the model with other examples of text type because they do not have enough knowledge on paragraph structure. [20.12-22.09]

As can be seen above, she recommended for the textual modelling stage that the teachers should provide enough general knowledge of paragraph structure in order to achieve at this stage.

Teacher 1 (T1) pointed out there may be difficulty at the textual modelling stage.

Teacher 3 (T3) observed that students may have difficulty in managing their idea within a paragraph:

I focus on the how to organise paragraph and do not pay much attention to the grammatical aspects because if I focus on grammar, it makes the students feel
uncomfortable when they try to write. However, I do not ignore it. I try to put some grammatical points that most students have made to discuss in class. I think the stage of linking the construction in the text is very important, because it helps the students be aware of how to connect their idea properly, and then they have to combine their grammatical knowledge to produce an effective text for the reader. However, I am quite worried about the text organisation and narrow down the scope of their idea and expand their ideas in a logical way. {2.300-4.36 sec}

She also recommended that the teaching cycle of Feez is a useful tool, but teachers should make sure that students can follow up and understand each stage clearly.

As can be seen from various instruments, the findings revealed that the modified Feez’ teaching and learning cycle is useful from both students and teachers, but some teachers wonder how well the students might do at the textual modeling stage.

6.4 The Effect of Portfolio Assessment on Students’ Writing

In order to measure students’ development of writing after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure in class, portfolios, a collection of written assignments, were gathered to help teachers measure progress in students’ writing, and the students themselves could also take a stock of it throughout the semester. The students’ reflections, teachers’ interviews and students’ interviews revealed that portfolio assessment initiates the continuation of the development of writing throughout the course that focuses on the discourse structure.

Regarding the students’ reflective writing, most supported the use of portfolios for various reasons. First, students could see improvement in their writing. Nakarin stated that it was a useful tool to help him improve his writing ability, because he could later revise his errors and compare the first with the second draft, while
Chatkamon pointed out that portfolio assessment encouraged him to pay more attention to his weak points during the writing, and gave him a chance to correct his errors, unlike doing a test. Secondly, comments from the teacher and colleagues were valuable, because students have to look back at comments in order to revise their writing. Sunee suggested that a portfolio motivated her to look back over what she had written and find the errors she had made and then correct them. This helped her to learn from her mistakes and remind her not to make them again. Comparing portfolios to tests, portfolios are better way of assessment for her because the writing assignment is worth revising, while tests do not give her the chance to see her mistakes and correct them.

Most students found that the use of portfolio was effective in allowing them to see the development and correct mistakes they had been making throughout the course. Moreover, multiple drafts also reminded them about their mistakes, so they tried not to make the same mistake again. In contrast to the single draft or tests, they thought that it is quite useful because they could not have a chance to correct their mistakes. Portfolios allowed them to learn from mistakes.

In addition, in the interviews all teachers agreed that in order to assess the development of the writing of the students after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure in class, the portfolio of written work helps teachers to measure students’ development of writing over the semester of study. It is a useful method of assessment involving self-assessment by students, and students know how the pieces in the portfolio represent their development. It is a useful method if the number of the students in class is not too great. They believed that it could help students focus on their work provided that numbers were small, as in the transcript below:
**Teacher 1:** I think portfolios are useful for students. They can collect their work and see improvement in their writing ability during the course. However, in the practical way, if the classroom size is big, it may cause problems for the teachers themselves, because it may increase a lot of time and effort in checking students’ writing. In addition, it may decrease the number of writing assignments in the students. In case of a big class, the teacher may ask students to do just two writing assignments in one semester, which will decrease the chance of students to practice their writing skill.

**Teacher 4:** I believe that student portfolios are useful. They help the students to compare how well they write with the beginning of the course, but one difficulty that many teachers face is the amount of the students in class. I had experience in teaching in a large class. It was not easy to help all students achieve their writing, because I did not have time to talk and discuss deeply about some aspects in teaching. I asked them to do group work and make a group discussion. One thing we cannot deny is that teachers will get a heavy work load to check and grade the students’ assignments.

The above viewpoints showed that although they thought the use of portfolios was beneficial for students, for teachers, it was fine for small classes, but normally there are 30-40 students in each class. This may present the difficulties in using portfolios for writing classes. This problem can be solved by giving them at least two writing assignments per semester.

From the viewpoints of students, the use of portfolios for assessment is very useful. They found that the use of portfolios benefited them in various aspects. For example, during the course they had a chance to revise their writing, and this process allowed them to understand and see the errors that they had made. This helped to remind them to avoid the similar mistakes in the future. In addition, they could see the development in their work through the portfolios, after a first piece of writing being disappointing.

**Student 1:** A portfolio is beneficial in writing because it is a collection of my work. I can see how my writing improves from the beginning of the class to the end of the semester. Through the course, I found less of the teacher’s red
pen in my writing. This way of assessment is better than just taking a writing exam. If I compare doing the writing exam to doing the portfolio, I feel that the writing exam is less useful because the time is restricted and I cannot see how to develop my writing.

**Student 3:** I think portfolio is a useful way to help me develop my writing because it give me a second chance to rewrite and check my mistakes compared to way the teacher in high school does. It allows me to learn from those errors in order to do better writing.

The use of portfolios was felt by both teachers and students to be a useful tool to assess students’ writing, because it allowed the students to review and correct their errors, and they could see an improvement in their writing over the course. This useful tool of assessment assists the process of teaching focused on discourse structure. It allows the students to rearrange or re-organise their written work after the first draft. However, most teachers were worried about the use of portfolio assessment in the case of large class sizes, because they could not take care of all students and the teachers themselves had higher workload in checking students’ assignments.

The data obtained from both teachers and students interview were beneficial in helping promote the use of discourse structure and develop the approach to use in Thai classrooms. The data from both teachers and students provided valuable suggestions towards the approach. However, at the same time some obstacles arose during the class, and they are also important to be considered in order to help improve the teaching by using the genre approach focusing on discourse structure.

### 6.5 The Effect of Student Reflective Writing on their Writing?

This section describes data from students’ reflective writing to reveal opinions about the teaching that focuses on discourse structure. Students can use pieces from their
reflective writing for professional portfolio entries, in learning journals or logs or workbooks. Reflective writing is beneficial for many reasons. First, students can reflect on the teaching procedure, assignments, classroom activities, and content of the course. As a result of reflection a variety of outcomes could be expected, for example, the development of a theory, formulation of a plan of action, or a decision about some uncertainty. The outcomes would be a result of some problem-solving activities. In addition, students may have become emotionally involved, which may have led to self-development and knowledge. Finally, reflection might well provide material for further reflection, and most importantly, lead to learning and perhaps, reflection on the process of learning, (Moon, 1999). Therefore, the use of students’ reflective writing is an essential instrument in this study, because it echoes the learners’ voice about whole class teaching and learning, which can be used to reflect on how effective is the use of discourse structure in the writing class, so the teacher can see the drawbacks and develop a better way of teaching appropriate for them.

The following paragraphs reveal the results of reflective writing of students in various aspects in order to help answer the research questions.

In this study, students were asked to reflect on the text they produced in various aspects concerning discourse structure. The students had twenty minutes for the reflective writing on questions set by the researcher. This helped them to consider their opinions on the use of discourse structure in their writing, which focused on cohesion, coherence and discourse organisation of their written text. The aim of the reflection was to provide a documented record of the students’ progress over 15 weeks of using the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. The objective was to explore perceptions and personal aspects of development as individual
learners. These included class issues, learning activities and lectures during the implementation of Feez’ module of text-based teaching cycle.

The information below answers and supports the three research questions. The students’ reflective writing provides essential information to support how improvement occurs during the using the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure from the students’ viewpoints. The effect of employing students’ reflection can be divided into five aspects, as follows:

First, for the problem of paragraph organisation, it could be seen from the beginning of the course that many students had similar problems in connecting their ideas to fit into paragraphs. Many students made the following reflection: Cahdanai advised that he sometimes confused the way to organise the paragraph in English, and he thought it might be caused by the differences way of organisation between Thai and English. Amnart asserted that one problem was the lack of preparation in structuring or organising paragraphs. He, like most students, was not practised on this point. He also suggested that it would be useful if everyone could learn from the model paragraph given by the teacher.

From the students’ viewpoints, it can be seen that teaching writing focusing on the discourse structure is an appropriate way to overcome the problem, and it is necessary to focus more on how students organise and structure ideas during their writing, not just on grammatical aspects, as in the past.

Secondly, in the reflective writing many students found that they had a problem in organising their writing. Wannisa found that her problem resulted from the lack of
management of ideas before writing, so it did not convey the meaning clearly, while 
Sunsunee found that she also had this problem, but pointed out that the focus of her 
topic was important. At the beginning of the course, she found that her writing was 
too broad, without focus on important aspects. Irin asserted that the main reason for 
the problem in organising the ideas was that she did not plan or organise her outline in 
advance. A writer should organise his ideas before writing, and develop them to 
follow the outline set out at the beginning. The important factor is that a writer 
should not stray from the topic. Sopittra had a similar viewpoint to Irin. She 
supported the view that writing without planning and organisation of the topic with 
supporting details could lead to the production of confused writing, which could make 
it hard for readers to understand what the writer was seeking to communicate. 
Therefore, it is important to have an outline before writing and try to arrange the ideas 
with orderly logic. The main problem is that many people think and start writing 
without planning. Chamaiporn proposed a way to solve the problem of organising 
writing, namely to write the details roughly, and then try to delete or add connected 
points to support the topic before beginning the first draft.

The above viewpoints of students revealed the same important point regarding 
problems in organising their writing. Most thought that planning or outlining what 
they wanted to write was important, because it would help them to focus on the topic 
they want to write. The outline reminded them to focus on the main points and try to 
connect the supporting details appropriate for each that they wanted to present. The 
viewpoints of students towards the problem of organising texts showed that they had 
noted the problem, reflected on it and come up with ways of solving the problem.
Thirdly, many students noted that it was an important aspect of a writer’s responsibility to create effective writing. As can be seen from Sirinapha’s viewpoint, it is important for the writers to produce text that is easy for readers to follow, and it is also necessary for the writers to arrange their ideas in an orderly way to show what they want the reader to know. The most important thing is not to make the readers confused by their writing. As regards writer responsibility, Jintana suggested that it is essential to organise the writing clearly, in order to help the readers see what the writer is trying to say. The ideas should be linked together smoothly and presented in an easy way for readers to understand. According to Tawee, responsibility of the writer is very important in order to organise clear ideas for the readers, so it is necessary to do an outline which can helps arrange ideas to present to the readers with sufficient information.

As can be seen from the above viewpoints, students are aware of the responsibility of the writer towards the readers. Most of them noted that it is important for writers to present their writing for easy understanding for readers, by organising and arranging their ideas clearly in order to help readers understand what the subject is about. In comparison, at the start of the course most students seemed not to be aware of how to make the readers understand their writing. They just wrote at will. This showed a development in students’ views towards writer responsibility, to produce comprehensible writing for readers and be more aware of the quality of their writing.

Fourthly, in the process of peer feedback, students had opportunities to read their colleagues’ writing, and students reflected on the point of awareness of audience as follows.
Kai found that he usually failed to provide detail because he assumed the readers were knowledgeable after he did peer feedback in class he was more concerned about the organization of his texts in order to help reader understand what he wrote.

Nakarin noted a similar view among colleagues. He understood that each piece of writing was produced for other readers to understand. He asserted that a good piece of writing should provide a clear message to communicate between writers and readers in order to understand the meaning through the writing. Therefore, reading colleagues’ writing made him aware of the need to provide readers with sufficient information to understand what the writer wants to communicate.

The results of reflective writing showed, that after peer feedback, students increased their awareness of readers. They understood the role of the writer, which is to provide sufficient information for the readers, compared to at the start of the course when most were not aware. As can be seen from the above reflection, many students attempted to provide more information so that readers understand what the message is about. Finally, most of them noticed that the important role of writers is to produce understandable texts for their readers.

Lastly, students reflected on the important of discourse markers. Many students found that discourse markers play an important role in helping them to organise their writing effectively. Supansa suggested that the discourse markers are necessary devices to connect ideas or sentences within and between paragraphs, whilst Nakarin found that they can help writers to link each related sentence or pieces of information together in order to sequence the order of events logically and avoid the confusion for the readers. Supansa also noted that discourse markers helped create the continuity in writing by signalling to the readers the relationship to previous information. They
clarify the reasoning point, showing contrast points or giving examples. Moreover, 
Nirada found that the use of discourse markers was essential because they are devices 
that connected ideas throughout the writing. These markers allow the readers to see 
not only the continuity of the previous information, but the related information for 
future and following topics.

Most of the students recommended that it is important for the writer to organise their 
writing properly. It will be easy for the readers to understand the information 
throughout the writing. The use of conjunctions is also important because this will 
allow the reader to understand the relation between the information and connect 
information logically within the paragraph. This can be a signpost helping readers 
know the relationship among the contents during writing. In addition, the time order 
of the story is important. The writer should arrange the details chronologically. The 
unity of the paragraph is important as well, so the supporting details should be well 
organised with suitable connectors in order to create a smooth paragraph. The details 
provided should support the theme the writing.

As can be seen from the students’ reflections, students reflected on various aspects 
during the course such as the problem of paragraph organisation, reader awareness, 
writer responsibility, and so on. They revealed that doing reflective writing help 
students promote the critical thinking during the process of writing because they had 
the opportunity to think and reflect on the various points occurring during each 
assignment. Thus, students’ reflective writing is an important factor that helps 
students develops their writing ability during the Writing Academic English course.
6.6 Conclusion

In short, this chapter aims to answer five research questions about the attitudes of students, teachers and administrator towards the implementation of genre approach focusing on discourse structure, the effect of using Feez’ cycle on the quality of discourse structure in students’ writing, the effect of portfolio assessment on students’ writing, the effect of student reflective writing on their writing development. Both teachers and students had positive attitudes towards this teaching approach. At the same time, the administrator agreed that this is a good alternative way to teach writing compared to previous approaches. At the same time, the teaching and learning cycle adapted from Feez is considered useful for both teachers and students as it provides step by step guidelines for them. Portfolio assessment is an effective tool to help students develop their writing ability because they had to keep their assignments and rewrite them in order to see their progress of their work. Moreover, students have an opportunity to develop their writing during the revisions of each draft. Lastly, the reflective writing of the students helps promote reader awareness because they had opportunity to reflect on what they did during the class and what might be the problem.
Chapter 7
Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to summarise the main points in order to answer each research question, and subsequently to discuss interesting aspects and problems during the implementation of the research. Recommendations for future study, implications of the study for the teacher, and limitations of the study are finally presented. Firstly, the following section summarises the answers to each research question.

7.1 Research question 1: Did the students’ writing abilities improve after using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure throughout the English Academic Writing course?

The results of the study revealed that the students performed better in their writing, demonstrated by the scores compared with the initial and the final assignments. The students’ writing ability improved throughout the course, as can be seen from the Table 6.1 in Chapter 6. There was a significant difference (p<.05) between the overall mean score for the final and the initial assignments of the students. In addition, the three aspects focused on during the course are transitional connection, coherence, and discourse organisation. The results revealed that the students were able to improve all three aspects, but only discourse organisation improved significantly at (p < .05) as indicated in Table 6.2 in Chapter 6. However, pre-
writing data was not collected before the teaching approach that focuses on the
discourse structure, so the results of pair sample t-test revealed that some aspects
(coherence and transitional connection) improved, but not significantly. Therefore,
using the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure through the genre
approach on the English Academic Writing course is an effective approach that helps
students to improve their writing ability, as it provided students scaffolding
throughout the writing process.

7.2 Research question 2: Did the students develop a sense of awareness of audience?

After doing the peer feedback, the students increased their awareness towards readers.
They understood better the role of the writer, which was to provide enough
information for the readers compared to the beginning of the course when most of
them just wrote what they wanted. As shown in comment from Jintana on
Kanokporn’s writing in Chapter 5.1 that she should provide more examples for
readers. During peer feedback, students took the role of a reader, and they took
responsibility to read and give comments on their friends' writing. Their reflections
revealed that many students tried to give extra information, because they now realised
that writers sometimes mistakenly thought that readers knew what they were writing
about. Finally, they noted that the important role of writers is to produce
understandable texts for readers.

The results of the study revealed that the students were aware of the responsibility of
the writers towards readers. Students noted that it was important for writers to present
their writing in a way that was easy to understand for the readers, by organising and
arranging their ideas clearly to help the readers to connect what the writing is about. Students tended not to be aware of how to make readers understand their writing at the beginning of the course. They just wrote what they wanted to. During the course, their awareness increased, because they had had a chance to read their friends’ writing and discuss it in class. This showed the development of students’ taking care of readers. This can be seen from their viewpoint towards the writer responsibility to create understandable texts for the readers while they were also more aware of the reader understanding to their writing.

7.3 Research question 3: To what extent did peer feedback influence this?

Results from the reflective writing of students also revealed that the use of peer feedback was useful for students, and it helped promote student awareness of a sense of audience. It also encouraged the students to concentrate more on many aspects of writing such as, paragraph organisation, grammatical points, and concern to provide the readers with sufficient detail in order to help them understand their written work. As can be seen from the draft in Chapter 5.1, students were aware of their responsibility towards the readers. Amnart advised his friend that her writing made him confused, because she had not organised her ideas well. Most of them noted that it was important for writers to present their writing for easy comprehension for readers by organising and arranging their ideas. At the beginning of course, most of them had seemed not to be aware how to make readers understand their writing. However, in this study two types of feedback were used in order to help students improve their writing abilities. The effect of each type of feedback is difficult to separate because the researcher aimed to raise the awareness of students by using peer
feedback, but forgot to think that teacher feedback also help students improve their writing ability and raise reader awareness.

This reveals a development of the students’ attitudes toward the writer responsibility. They saw the need to create understandable writing for the readers, and they were also more aware of the quality of their writing.

7.4 Research question 4: What was the attitude of students towards the *English Academic Writing* course that focused on discourse structure?

The attitude of students was positive. Although at the start of the course most student viewed grammatical knowledge and vocabulary as the important aspects, later on they found that it is essential to know and understand how texts are organised and how to connect texts together to make readers understand. Positive attitudes were obviously presented in both interviews and questionnaires. Moreover, after studying on the course, their viewpoint towards the writing changed, as can be seen from the end of the course questionnaires. Most of them found that not only were grammar and vocabulary important, but paying attention to how to link texts to produce a piece of writing for readers to understand. In addition, in the interviews the students revealed that this course had helped them to learn how to produce a coherent text.

7.5 Research question 5: What was the attitude of teachers and the administrator towards the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure?

The teachers agreed that using the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure in teaching writing in the classroom was an interesting approach. Most advocated the
use of a genre approach, as opposed to the product or process approaches often used in writing classes. The genre approach allowed them to learn how to organise texts in a systematic way. They had a good attitude towards the use of discourse structure as reviewed in Chapter 7. Most teachers also supported the use of a genre approach that focused on the discourse structure; however, they commented on some aspects, such as the ability of students, as factors that might hinder the achievement of the implementation, especially with non-English majors. On this point, this study proved that using the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure through a genre approach could be effective with science students. In addition, there were comments concerning the teaching load of teachers and the numbers of students in the class. For the viewpoint of the administrator, she also found that running a new approach for teaching the English Academic Writing class is quite a challenging task. She supported the current study, and she hoped that this research could help students improve their writing ability. She advised me to observe closely and adjust the teaching in order to fit the Thai context.

7.6 Research question 6: What is the effect of using the modified version of Feez’ cycle on the quality of discourse structure in students’ writing?

The students reflected that the use the modified version of Feez’ cycle is beneficial, although at the beginning of the semester they had to take some time to understand the whole idea. Firstly, the cycle provided students with step by step guidance for their writing. Secondly, students pointed that the paragraph model is useful because it allowed them to see different ways to organise texts, as can be seen in Appendix 10. They arranged the storyline in many ways by telling the same story in a different
chronological order. They also noticed that there are various ways to organise a text and it should be arranged in a logical order to help the readers understand.

**7.7 Research question 7:** What is the effect of portfolio assessment on students’ writing?

According to the results of the study, portfolio assessment of students’ writing is considered useful because it allows students to see the development of their writing through the course. They have opportunities to revise their drafts and learn from their mistakes. This assessment also reflects their writing progress over time, so they can see their weak points that need to be improved. In addition, they have an opportunity to practice their writing ability. They have to prepare two drafts before submitting the work. Although portfolio assessment is beneficial, there are some disadvantages from a teacher’s point of view. For example, if there are many students in the class, it will be a nightmare for teachers because it means that there is a heavy workload. The teachers have insufficient time to give feedback to students.

**7.8 Research question 8:** What is the effect of student reflective writing on their writing development?

In the students’ reflections, they echoed their views on the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. They wrote about the problem noted at the beginning of their course that they had no idea how to begin to structure texts or organise them in an appropriate way. Employing the modified version of Feez’ cycle gave them the confidence to write.
They also reflected that they had learned how to start writing with a purpose by making an outline before writing, which can help them focus on the points. In addition, they tended to increase their awareness of audience in terms of providing sufficient information for readers, not just writing what they want to. These viewpoints of students showed that reflective writing started students thinking critically about the important aspects they think might be the problem during each assignment. This promotes development of writing ability in class because they notice what their problems are during the process of writing, such as the way to organise texts, the communication between writers and readers, and how to begin their writing in systematic ways. Thus, student reflection has a major effect on students’ writing development.

7.6 Discussion

This section discusses interesting and problematic issues in order to find reasonable explanations for some aspects concerning the focus of the study. Various aspects concerning students’ development of their writing ability were raised during the course and the problems that emerged after the course are presented in order to help improve students’ writing in the future. These aspects are discussed below.

7.6.1 Students’ Writing Ability

As can be seen from the result of the students’ scores from the initial and final assignments, the students were able to write better according to overall scores. However, there are two aspects: the use of transitional connection and coherence. The scores from the initial and the final assignments were not significantly different. The use of transitional connection and coherence seems difficult for the students in
some ways. As can be seen from one of the comments made by Amnart about Jintana’s writing in Chapter 5, Jintana seemed to have a problem in connecting ideas in her writing. He suggested that she should rearrange her writing, not merely list the differences and similarities between a car and a bicycle.

Similar problems with cohesion and coherence were found by other researchers (Castro, 2004; Fan, Hsu & Yang, 2006). These problems include the overuse of cohesive devices, pronoun shift, run-on sentences, and so on. Thep-Ackrapong (2001) conducted research about coherence in Thai texts. She found that coherence shifts may occur because of differences between Thai and English. In addition, several students had no awareness of this difference to permit them to generate and develop their ideas to create coherent texts in logical writing. Hinds (1990) supported this idea. Without appropriate knowledge of a text, the reader might misinterpret it.

In summary, the mismatch in coherence between Thai and English can be explained in terms of cultural concepts. It can be said that there are different concepts of coherence regarding the rhetorical patterns and the authority of text. This is a factor that may cause difficulties for students in their writing. Moreover, the results of Hind’s study showed Thai students had a problem producing coherent writing to meet the expectations of native English speakers, who comprise the audience.

In terms of transitional connections or the use of cohesive devices, students may face a problem with repetition of words. Kanoksin’s (1989) study of the structure of Thai discourse reveals that cohesive devices are used to link texts together in order to make unified and coherent discourse. She suggests that the cohesive markers often used
may lead to repetition, and explained that in Thai discourse these devices are often used to connect the text. In addition, Noonkhan (2003) reveals that there are discrepancies between Thai texts and their English counterparts in terms of types of cohesive devices. The two main types of cohesive device often employed by Thai are ellipsis and repetition. These two are more frequently used than the English counterparts. The discrepancy between the two languages, English and Thai, may lead to students to use a Thai mode of discourse in their writing. They tend to employ repetition in their writing.

Thep-Ackrapong (2001) also found discrepancies between Thai and English texts in terms of the use of cohesive devices. Thai frequently omits pronouns or repetition of words, while English does not. Thus, it is necessary to beware of this kind of pronoun shift between two languages. For this point, it is necessary for teachers to raise awareness and give guidelines about this difference between the languages.

7.6.2 The Teaching Approach Focusing on Discourse Structure

According to the results of the study, the use of genre approach during the teaching of discourse structure is useful for students, as can be seen from this improvement from in overall scores. Students can achieve and improve their writing ability to some extent. The genre approach has proved to be a robust teaching pedagogy. Compared to the product approach, teaching writing is seen as a way of learning by imitation at a sentence level. At this level the structure is somehow relevant, but imitation and the product approach are not appropriate in the light of recent pedagogy, especially at discourse level (Nunan, 1991).
In second language writing, some researchers have argued that, even though the process approach was the suitable guiding procedure for writing instruction in the past, it can be considered as a wholly individual learner process. It appears ‘the writing process is an abstract, internal process’, and writing is a discovery-type activity, where what is being discovered is often at least partly ‘the self’ (Kent, 1999; Tobin, 1994).

Hyland (2003) criticises the process approach as ambiguous pedagogy, ignoring the social dimension and undermining the teacher’s role. Regarding the importance of discourse structure, it can be seen from the teacher’s viewpoint that the important points are the difficulty in connecting ideas during writing and first language interference. In addition, they are more concerned about how well students understand discourse structure, in order to help them organise their writing and make all ideas more coherent. Hyland (2004, p. 24) goes on to say that the genre approach to writing was defined as writing instruction focused on the realisation of ideas in texts revealing the awareness of context for both readers and writers. Tribble (2003, p. 37) also asserts that communication is not achieved if the reader cannot identify the purpose of each written text.

The genre approach is considered as a social activity to give a chance for interaction among writers, texts, and readers. Moreover, teachers can help students to analyse and understand by using texts as tools to compare, deconstruct, and to show the underlying assumptions and characteristics. The use of the genre approach is beneficial for students in many ways. In the process of the learning cycle, students
collaborate with friends in pair or in group work. The objective of the Writing Academic English course for science students at Naresuan University is to help students achieve paragraph writing, so NR and ESP would not be suitable. They may be suitable for the elective course, English for Academic Purposes, which is designed for Medical and Pharmaceutical Science students. Finally, the SFL approach provided a clear stages of instruction through the cycle of teaching proposed by Feez.

However, in the view of students, the use of the genre approach with the teaching cycle of Feez is useful. One teacher argued that there may be a difficulty in the textual modelling stage. The teachers have to make sure all the steps of teaching can be clearly presented to students, while students have found that the learning cycle is beneficial because it allows them to have a model and steps for writing. The teachers have to make sure that all the steps of teaching can be clearly presented to students, while reflection writing of the students supported the students’ interviews in the aspects of the beneficial of teaching cycle that allow them to follow a model and steps to writing systematically.

As can be seen from the viewpoints of students and teachers, they agree that the use of discourse structure in teaching writing is an interesting alternative. The students found it was useful to be introduced to a way of teaching how to write through the genre approach compared to previous approaches that focused on grammatical aspects. This approach allowed them to learn how to organise texts in a systematic way. They had a good attitude towards the use of discourse structure, as reviewed earlier. Although most of the teachers supported the use of the genre approach focusing on the discourse structure, they also commented on some aspects such as the
teaching load of teachers, the number of students, and the ability of students, as factors that may hinder the achievement of the implementation.

7.6.3 The Teaching Model

Most students found that the model of the texts that the teacher had presented to them was a good guide to understanding how to organise texts in paragraphs. Responses to the questionnaire showed they found the step-by-step procedure useful in the models in paragraph writing, because it allowed them to see how paragraphs are organised. Some students found that there are many ways to link text together to produce the same story, as can be seen from the exercise on rearranging a narrative paragraph. There were different ways for them to tell the same story in a different order, to present the same story with various details. They also found that the learning cycles were beneficial and helped them learn to write step-by-step, compared to their past experience.

The teaching and learning stage of Feez and Joyce was employed; however, there are some interesting points for each stage needed to be discussed after implementation in Thai university context.
In contextual building, an authentic text type is introduced and studied. This brings students into a real situation in the social context. For example, they explore advertising text in product advertisements – describing a product such as an ‘I-Pod’ as small, lightweight, cheap, and so on. In the context building stage, students can learn different text types. At this stage, students found it very useful to be given background information on what they were going to discover.

The second stage is textual modeling, where students investigate the structural pattern and language features of the model and compare it with other examples of text type. At this stage, the teacher introduces texts suitable in the context. Learners should pay attention to the structure and language features of the models. At the third stage of joint construction of the text, students began to contribute to the construction of whole examples of text type, and teachers tended to reduce their contribution as students move closer to controlling the text independently. Most of the students found that a
paragraph model was very useful. It allowed them to see how paragraphs should be organised. In addition, many students requested more examples of models of paragraphs because they thought it would help them to understand more about paragraph organisation. I also did as the students requested, but also provided them with homework exercises because of time limitations in class.

The fourth stage was independent construction of text. At this stage, students worked independently with the text, writing tasks as drafts with whole texts. In this stage, the students could apply the model they had learned in the previous stage, which is textual modelling. However, at the beginning of the course the students seemed to work quite slowly and often organised their writing in a Thai way. Most of them grew to understand more in following chapters. Some of the students seemed to produce writing based on the text model, but only after an explanation of the paragraph organisation and examples of textual arrangement. Students understood and noted that there are many ways to produce writing, not just one, as they had thought. Hinds (1990) undertook expository paragraph writing analysis for the Japanese, Thai, Chinese, and Korean languages. He concluded that those languages organised text information from specific to general. The characteristic of their writing is that it is unfocused and disorganised, which is hard for English readers to understand. The next stage is designed to help decrease the organising paragraph discourse structure in suitable ways and aims to help students become aware of the need to organise their texts.

At this stage, I suggested adding a textual reader response, where students exchange their written texts to read and respond to their colleagues’ text in order to help each
other check the textual continuity, and help each other to avoid using native Thai ways of presenting ideas, as described above. According to students’ interviews, this is a useful process, because it allowed them to read and comment on their friends’ writing, although it seemed difficult at the beginning of the course because few wanted to make their friends ‘lose face’. However, they later understood that this was a good chance to help each other to correct not only the grammatical errors, but the organisation of their writing.

The students revealed an ability and effort to respond to their friends, several times arguing over issues, and asking the teacher to clarify the organisation of paragraph and other grammatical aspects. In contrast to teachers in the interviews, they seemed unwilling to believe that students could undertake peer feedback as well as the English major students, but indicates that, although they are not English majors, they could provide beneficial recommendations for their friends. According to both questionnaires and interviews, the students suggested that awareness of the responsibility of the writer become important only after they had a chance to read their friends’ writing,. In order to make readers or audience to understand what the writer wanted to say, the writer had to organise their text comprehensibly. At this stage, the students took on the role of readers of their friends’ writing and gave recommendations.

Linking related texts is the last stage, helping students to compare the text types in different fields. The paragraph model was necessary for students. They could learn from the models how they could organise the text. As in the paragraph model presented in class, students could see different ways to produce paragraphs by using
the same sentences in a different order. Most tended to think that there was just one way, but found that there are various ways to make readers understand and render their writing interesting.

However, some students wanted the instructor to provide them with more examples, paragraph model and explanation, as guidance. One teacher recommended that the teaching cycle of Feez is a useful tool, but that she would make sure that students could follow up each stage and clearly understand. However, most students showed that they were able to follow each stage during the course.

7.6.4 Feedback and Awareness of Sense of Audience

Hedge (2007, p. 311) maintains that it is important to help students (or writers) to develop a sense of audience. It is possible for teachers to use pair work or peer feedback to give opportunities for students to exchange and read their written assignments with comments. The exchange reflects the interaction between reading and writing in real life. Response to texts by readers is another important stage that needs to be focused on for the study of development in writing. In this study, most students responded in questionnaires that peer feedback is useful. First, it gave students a chance to proofread their writing and correct errors before submitting it to teachers, and secondly it is quite challenging to receive the comments from friends, whether or not they understand the written work. If a friend does not understand a piece of writing, it may be its ineffective organisation. As can be seen from various research instruments such as students’ reflective writing and interviews, peer feedback is helpful for students to promote their writing ability. Moreover, it
helps the students become aware of their responsibility to produce an effective piece of writing for the readers to understand what they wrote, because they have a chance to take two roles: as a writer and as a reader during peer feedback. Keh (1990) suggested that the use of peer feedback could help promote a greater sense of audience among students. They have a chance to read their friends’ writing and give comments, and it also promotes the sense of critical thinking.

Finally, promoting awareness of students writing is a benefit that students can obtain from peer feedback. They can perform their task with a purpose, and do it more carefully, not just writing as much as possible. Furthermore, Dheram (1995, p. 165) supports the idea of employing peer feedback. The first point is that peer feedback helps students become aware of writing from a reader-based perspective. It encourages them to accept readers’ opinions other than the teacher’s. In addition, this kind of feedback promotes the awareness of using a macro structure that focuses on coherence to produce an effective text. This is supported by students’ views in the interview and reflective writing, that many of them found that peer feedback allows them to read their friends’ writing and be more aware of producing their own texts to be understood by the readers. Although most students agreed that peer feedback is useful, teacher feedback is necessary too, because helps them to develop their writing during the course.

Many students agreed that the teacher’s comments provide them with more detail than peer feedback, which just gives basic errors such as spelling, vocabulary, grammatical errors, and so on. The students also suggested that it is a good idea to do peer
feedback in class, because the teacher can support and judge when two students argue over errors.

Many teachers seemed worried about students’ ability to give feedback to their friends, and some teachers disagreed with the idea because teachers should lead the students to explore with their friends how to correct both content and grammatical errors. At the same time, students see the peer feedback helpful to let them practice grammatical knowledge, but are also unsure how to begin giving feedback to their friends. They think a peer feedback form helps them to see the points they should concentrate on.

7.6.5 Attitudes of Teachers Towards Teaching

According to the interviews, most teachers had positive views on the teaching focused on discourse structure, although some seemed reluctant to employ it. It was a good start to receive a response from them, because this study tried to help the students enhance their writing ability, so their suggestions and recommendation were beneficial. My study aims to discover a way of teaching writing to help Thai university students improve their English writing ability. This study has tried to develop a tentative writing approach to fit the Thai university context.

According to controversial perspectives between teachers and students, teachers presumably often notice that their students might be unable to do the peer feedback well. Nonetheless, it is useful for the students if the guidelines are provided for them,
so they can observe which points are important to investigate. The use of guidelines for peer feedback can alleviate teachers’ worry over its implementation.

The second point applies to Feez’ cycle of teaching. One teacher wondered if science students would be able to understand and apply it to their writing process. Although she agreed that the teaching cycle of Feez is a good start to help students enhance knowledge of how to link the ideas together, she considered it a systematic process, and was not quite sure about the textual modelling stage. She said students could not identify and investigate the structural patterns and language features of the model and compare them with other examples of text types, because they lacked sufficient knowledge of the paragraph structure.

Another teacher also advised that students may have difficulties in managing their idea within paragraphs. She suggested that the stage of joint construction of text is important because it would help the students be aware of how to connect their ideas properly and then combine their grammatical knowledge to produce effective texts for readers. However, she was concerned about text organisation and narrowing down the scope of their ideas and expanding them in a logical way. She recommended that focusing on the how to organise paragraphs is important, and not paying too much attention to grammatical aspects. If she focused on grammar, it made the students feel uncomfortable when they try to write. However, she insisted that grammar is important. The vital point of the implementation is to give students enough time at each stage; however, at the beginning of the course, students seemed to work through the stages slowly. They tended to do better as they went through the cycle of
learning. The results of this study revealed that the teaching approach is applicable in the Thai university context.

7.7 Implication of the Study

The results of the study revealed that the using teaching approach focusing on discourse structure based on the systemic functional linguistics is an effective approach in the Thai university context, and helps students improve their writing abilities. The study focuses on the discourse structure that allows students to view texts as a whole unit. The findings imply that the teaching and learning methods adapted from Feez (1998) provide and explicit instruction, because each stage of the teaching and learning not only provides guidelines for the teachers but offers students step-by-step guidance in learning to write systematically in the following stages: building the context, modelling and constructing the text, joint construction of the text, independent construction of the text, linking related texts.

However, some obstacles were found during the study. For example, students needed more examples during the textual modeling at the beginning of the course, for which I as a researcher did not expect to need to spend time explaining and providing. I did so as their homework. In addition, after two months, the students seemed to be responding to the adapted Feez’ teaching and learning cycle rather faster than at the beginning of the semester. If I had an opportunity to do Feez’ cycle again, I should combine a textual reader response with independent construction of the text, because during this stage students can also help each other to comment on their friends’ writing.
In addition, the teaching and learning cycle is considered flexible. It can be adjusted to fit the context of teaching. In this study, a stage was added into the cycle to raise the awareness of audience in the writers, through the use of peer feedback. The results of the study showed that the awareness of audience increased because the students were concerned about how to provide sufficient information for the readers.

Therefore, a genre-based approach focusing on the discourse structure employed in this study contributes to the explicit teaching and learning model based on the Thai university context. This study provides a concrete way to teach second language writing that should benefit ESL writing courses, especially in a higher educational context in Thailand.

7.8 Limitations of the Study

1. Classes experienced cancellations during graduation and the New Year break that limited time during the second semester. However, the researchers attempted to catch up in order to achieve the required period indicated by the university.

2. The length of the study should be longer, in order to see how students develop their writing ability and employ their knowledge of writing focusing on discourse structure in the next writing course.

3. This study constitutes action research, focusing on one class to present a local context as an action research. The results of the study may not be
generalised. However, this method can be employ at almost every level in educational institutions to distinguish problems in specific contexts.

7.9 Recommendation for Future Study

This research is an attempt to use the discourse structure approach through the use of genre approach based on systemic functional linguistics, to help Thai students improve their writing abilities. However, it raises the following recommendations for future study.

1. Action research was employed in order to develop suitable teaching English for academic writing for Thai students, based on the systemic functional linguistics genre approach. It would be more beneficial to try to implement the other approaches focusing on the discourse such as English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and the process-genre approach compared to the approach I used.

2. The experimental research should be implemented in order to provide generalisable results, because it will provide wider views between two teaching approaches. It would be beneficial to compare the different genre approaches such as process approach and the ESP genre approach.

3. A case study approach should be used in order to see and understand how individual cases respond to the teaching approach, because this method allows researchers to understand deeply about the students’ writing, case by case,
while this research intended to investigate the overall improvement of students’ writing during through the teaching approach focusing on discourse structure. For example, the researcher can discuss a specific topic with participants and receive more details. If the researcher is interested in the topic of coherence, he can obtain information from various perspectives by interviewing students about their writing assignment in depth. This research method allows researchers to explore each issue deeply to find a suitable solution.

4. In this study, although the scores of students’ writing on coherence improved, it is not a significant improvement. For future study, a study of coherence in writing should be conducted to assist and enhance students’ writing ability and understand how to produce coherent texts with a suitable teaching approach, as there are few studies in the Thai language that focus on the importance of coherence in English academic writing. Most focus on the use of cohesion and textual analysis.

5. Although the topics assigned to students in this study are general genres such as narrative, descriptive, comparison and so on, students are required to apply their writing to academic topics such as how to use a microscope to investigate cells. They can apply their knowledge after finishing this course. Whilst this study dealt with a Thai university context, Feez’ teaching approach can be applied to English academic writing classes in other faculties such as medical sciences, engineering or in higher education institutions in Thailand. However, the teachers should use or adapt it to fit their classroom context.
6. As this research was conducted by a teacher as a researcher, cooperative teaching with teacher colleagues would be beneficial to students’ writing ability because they may look for a wider view in term of effective teaching. Alternatively, there should be an observer during the study to evaluate teaching focusing on the discourse structure.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Data Collection

Research title: EFL writing development among Thai university students

Do students benefit from the use of discourse structure to develop their writing?

Date: 13 Oct 2008 – 10 March 2009

Duration: 14 Weeks

Number of hours/weeks: 3-hour classes per week

Research site: English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University, Thailand

Research participants: Students enrolled on the Writing Academic English course

Research methods: Interviews, students’ portfolios, questionnaires, students’ reflections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Implement research Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>1-10 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Preparation Week:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collecting related document e.g. course syllabus, teaching material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Arranging appointment with teachers &amp; administrator for the interviews and giving them the consent forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-17 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-24 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Unit 1 Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contextual building &amp; textual Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27-31 Oct 2008</td>
<td>join construction of text &amp; independent construction of text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-7 Nov 2008</td>
<td>Linking related texts &amp; <em>textual reader responses</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting students’ portfolios (first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | 10-14 Nov 2008 | **Unit 2 Narrative**  
Context Building & textual Modelling | Students’ reflective writing and peer feedback |
| 6 | 17- 21 Nov 2008 | Join construction of the text & independent construction of the text | |
| 7 | 24-28 Nov 2008 | Linking related texts &  
textual reader responses | Collect students’ portfolios (second assignment)  
Students’ reflective writing and peer feedback |
| *** | 1- 5 Dec 2008 | **Mid-term Examination Week** | **Interviewing teachers and administrators (30-45 minutes/person)** |
| *** | 8-12 Dec 2008 | **Semester break for National Sports Week, Graduation Days &** | **Interviewing teachers and administrators (30-45 minutes/person)** |
| *** | 15-19 Dec 2008 | New Year |  |
| *** | 22-26 Dec 2008 | Adjust Research Cycle |  |
| *** | 29 Dec 2008 – 2 Jan 2009 |   |  |
| 8 | 5- 9 Jan 2009 | **Unit 3 Compare & Contrast**  
Context building & textual modelling |  |
| 9 | 12-16 Jan 2009 | Join construction of the text & independent construction of the text |  |
| 10 | 19-23 Jan 2009 | Linking related texts &  
textual reader responses | Collecting students’ portfolios (third |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11| 26-30 Jan 2009 | **Unit 4 Cause-Effect**  
Context building & textual modelling |
| 12| 2-6 Feb 2009   | Join construction of the text & independent construction of the text         |
| 13| 9-13 Feb 2009  | Linking related texts & *textual reader responses*                          |
| 14| 16-20 Feb 2009 | Post-writing                                                               |
| ***| 23-27 Feb 2009 | **Final Examination Week**                                                 |
Appendix 2: The Cover Letter

Dear Colleagues,

I am a research student at the University of Southampton in the United Kingdom. The research topic of my PhD thesis is *EFL writing development among Thai university students. Do students benefit from the use of discourse structure to develop their writing?* It would be appreciated if you could respond to the following questionnaires and participate in an interview. The data collected are for the research purposes, but your details will remain confidential. However, you have the right to withdraw from this project at any time. (e-mail kn906@soton.ac.uk)

---

**Informed Consent Form**

EFL writing development among Thai university students Do students benefit from the use of discourse structure to develop their writing?

I have read the relevant information. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it, and any questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent voluntarily to participate in this research and understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

Print Name of Participant__________________
Signature of Participant__________________
Date______________________________
Day/month/year
Following analysis, the results of the study will be sent to you by e-mail. If you would like to be informed of the result of this study, please write your e-mail address in the space provided below. If not required, please leave it blank.

Your e-mail ________________________________

Can I contact you if I have further queries about the test that you have done?

Yes___  No___

Thank you very much for your help and support with my study.

Yours Sincerely,
Khampee Noonkhan
PhD Candidate (Applied linguistics)
School of Humanities
University of Southampton
Appendix 3: Students’ Interview questions

Feedback concerning teachers
1. How do you feel about teacher feedback?
2. What do you get from teacher feedback?
3. What do you like about teacher feedback?
4. What do you not like about teacher feedback?
5. How is teacher feedback important to you?
6. What do you need from teacher feedback?
7. Did you find any changes or development in your writing from teacher feedback?
8. How is teacher feedback important for you?
9. Do you think that your writing improve after the course?
10. Do you have any suggestion for teacher to help improve teacher feedback?

Peer Feedback
1. How do you feel about peer feedback?
2. What do you get from peer feedback?
3. What do you like about peer feedback?
4. What do you not like about peer feedback?
5. How is peer feedback important to you?
6. Did you revise your work according to your colleagues’ recommendations?
7. Do you think peer feedback was helpful or not?
8. What do you get from reading your colleagues’ work?
9. Does it help you to become aware of readers when writing?
10. Which types of feedback do you think are important?

Discourse Structure
1. Do you think it is useful to learn discourse structure?
2. In terms of writing, are you aware of discourse structure in writing?
3. What do you think about the text based teaching model?
4. Did you have any problems with continuity of ideas within paragraphs in your writing before implementation of discourse structure? Does the teaching of discourse structure help you to be more confident in writing? How?
5. Do you have any problems with connections in sentences within paragraphs? Do you feel you improved in connecting sentences within paragraphs effectively?
6. How important is the organisation structure in writing? Please explain
7. Are there any issues that you want to discuss?

**Assessment**

1. Have you had any experience of portfolio assessment?
2. What do you think about portfolio assessment?
3. Compared to tests, which form of assessment will help you develop your ability in writing? Why?
4. Are there any problems with the use of portfolios?

**Overall Idea about the course**

1. Do you think that your writing ability improved during the course and what do you think about the teaching that focused on using discourse structure compare to your previous experience?
Appendix 4: Teacher Interview

1. How long have you been teaching English?

2. Do you have experience in teaching on the Writing Academic English course? For how long?

3. Could you briefly explain what you teach on this course? Which approach or method do you use or what do you focus when teaching?

4. What do you think are the most important aspects to focus on during the course?

5. What is the main problem that prevents Thai students from being good writers?

6. What difficulties do you face when teaching on this course?

7. Do you begin teaching with combining sentences?

8. How much attention do you pay to the way sentences are linked in a paragraph writing (cohesion)?

9. Do you think cohesive devices are helpful when writing?

10. How much attention do you pay to connection of ideas (coherence) in their writing?

11. How much attention do you pay to organisation and paragraph structure in writing?

12. Do you emphasize the text as a whole unit?
13. What is your opinion about the implementation of a discourse structure that focuses on text as a whole unit linkage between sentences (fluency across sentences), flow of ideas, and organisational structure?

14. Do you think it is useful or not?

15. Do you employ peer feedback in your class? Is it helpful for students? Why?

16. How do you give your feedback for students during the course? Would you tell me specific aspects that you usually focus and emphasised?

17. What do you think about portfolio assessment?

18. How do you think about Feez’ cycle of teaching and learning? Are there any problems if we implement it in classrooms?
Appendix 5: Peer Editing Worksheet 1

Chapter 1 Descriptive Paragraph
(adapted from Oshima and Hogue, 2006)

Peer Editor: ______________________________ID
Number_____________________
Writer:_______________________________
Date_________________________

Format
1. My friend’s paragraph is in the correct format (centered title, first line indented, double-spaced). Yes □ No □

Content and Organisation
2. What does the writer describe in the paragraph?

________________________________________________________________________

3. Does the paragraph begin with a topic sentence? Yes □ No □
   Copy the topic sentence here:
   __________________________________________________________

4. Does the writer use spatial order and descriptive adjectives to describe places, people or objects in the paragraph organisation? Yes □ No □
   What is the order (front to back, bottom to top, near to far, right to left)
   __________________________________________________________

5. Does the writer give specific details using descriptive adjective to describe places, people or objects to help you see the places or people he or she describes? Write three of the details.
   a.___________________________________________________________________
   b.___________________________________________________________________
   c.___________________________________________________________________

6. Does the paragraph have a concluding sentence? Yes □ No □
   Copy that sentence here:
   ________________________________________________________
Cohesion and Coherence
7. Are there any linking words (coordinate conjunctions, pronouns, prepositions, etc) used in the paragraph? Yes □ No □
8. Are the sentences in the paragraph connected correctly with linking words (coordinate conjunctions, pronouns, prepositions, etc)? If you find any mistakes, give some examples.
9. Are there any difficulties for you to understand your colleagues’ paragraph when you read it? If you answer yes, please explain. Yes □ No □
10. Are there any sentences that are off the topic? If your answer is yes, write them here and underline them in the paragraph written by your friend.

Punctuation, Capitalization and Spelling
11. My friend puts a full stop after every sentence Yes □ No □
12. My friend puts comma in his or her compound sentences Yes □ No □
13. Look for compound sentences. Check to make sure each compound sentence has a comma before the coordinate conjunction. Make a note of any missing commas.
14. Look for the use of commas as the indication of series and introduction. Check to make sure each comma is used appropriately.
15. My friend uses capital letters correctly. Yes □ No □
16. I found spelling mistakes in my friend’s work Yes □ No □

Grammar and Sentence Structure
17. I checked my friend’s paragraph for fragments. Yes □ No □
18. The sentence structure is varied by using prepositional phrases at the beginning of the sentences (copy one sentence). Yes □ No □
19. My friend wrote _____(number) compound sentences.

Personal Grammar Trouble Spots
20. I checked my friend’s paragraph for (verbs, tenses, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, etc.) Yes □ No □
21. In your opinion, what is the best feature of this paragraph? In other words, what is the writer’s best writing skill?
Appendix 6: Student’s Reflection

Student’s Reflection 1

Name______________________________ ID
Number___________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________
1. นิสิตมีความคิดเห็นอย่างไรกับการประเมินผลโดยใช้แฟ้มสะสมงานแทนการใช้แบบทดสอบอย่างเดียว

2. นิสิตมีความคิดเห็นอย่างไรกับการประเมินผลงานเขียนของนิสิตโดยให้มีโอกาสในการปรับแก้ไขงาน first draft ก่อนส่ง final draft นิสิตคิดว่าวิธีการนี้มีข้อดีหรือข้อเสียอย่างไร

3. นิสิตคิดว่าการได้รับ feedback และ comment จากอาจารย์เป็นประโยชน์กับการพัฒนาการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษอย่างไร และนิสิตอยากให้อาจารยก่อน final draft ให้นิสิตได้อ่านและข้อเสนอแนะเมื่ออาจารย์ให้ feedback นิสิตคิดว่าแบบนี้มีประโยชน์อย่างไร

4. นิสิตคิดว่าการตรวจงานของเพื่อนและ feedback จากเพื่อนที่จะส่งมีประโยชน์อย่างไร การอ่านงานของเพื่อนช่วยให้เกิดการเข้าใจความสำคัญของตัวเองหรือไม่

5. นิสิตคิดว่าการเข้าใจความสำคัญของการจัดเรียงความคิด (ideation) ในการเขียน paragraph มีความสำคัญอย่างไรหรือไม่ หรือไม่

6. นิสิตคิดว่าการใช้แบบตัวอย่าง (Model) ของรูปแบบ Paragraph มีประโยชน์ในการสร้างความเข้าใจเพื่อการนำไปใช้ในงานเขียนของนิสิตอย่างไร
7. นิสิตคิดว่าการเชื่อมโยงข้อความในงานเขียนมีความสำคัญอย่างไร

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

8. นิสิตพบปัญหาอะไรบ้างจากการเรียน Describing Place and People (บทเรียนงานกิจกรรม)

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

9. นิสิตพบปัญหาอะไรบ้างจากการเขียนงานชิ้นแรก

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

10. นิสิตเรียนรู้อะไรบ้าง หลังจากเรียนจบบทเรียนการเขียน Describing Place and People

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 7: Questionnaires

Name ______________________________________
Age ________________________________________
Faculty______________________________________
Major_______________________________________

1. How long have you been studying English?
   _____ Years   _____ Months   Comment __________

2. How do you categorize yourself according to English Writing proficiency?
   Excellent Good Fair Poor

3. What aspects do you think prevent you from being a good writer?

4. What is the most important aspect for you in writing in English? Please give a rank order below.
   ___ organisation
   ___ grammar
   ___ idea
   ___ vocabulary
   ___ spelling

5. What are characteristics of a good piece of writing in your opinion?

6. Which areas are the most important to you when writing in English?

Least important / most important
   ___ Communicative Quality  1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Interestingness         1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Referencing            1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Organisation           1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Argumentation          1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Linguistic accuracy    1  2  3  4  5
   ___ Linguistic appropriacy 1  2  3  4  5

7. Which aspects of writing do you want the teacher to focus in teaching?
ชื่อ ____________________________________________

อายุ ____________________________________________

คณะ ____________________________________________

วิชาเอก ____________________________________________

1. คุณเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมากี่ปีแล้ว
   _____ ปี _____เดือน อื่นๆ ___________

2. คุณคิดว่าความสามารถในการเขียนของคุณอยู่ในระดับใด
   _____ดีเยี่ยม _____ดี _____ปานกลาง _____ต่ำ

3. คุณคิดว่าอะไรที่เป็นอุปสรรคที่ทำให้คุณไม่สามารถเขียนภาษาอังกฤษได้ดี
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

4. สิ่งที่สำคัญที่สุดสำหรับคุณในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษคืออะไร  กรุณาเรียงลำดับความสำคัญจากมากไปน้อย
   (มาก --- น้อย)
   ______ การเรียงเรียงลำดับข้อความ (organisation)
   ______ ไวยากรณ์ (grammar)
   ______ ความคิด (ideas)
   ______ คำศัพท์ (vocabulary)
   ______ การสะกดคำ (spelling)
5. ในความคิดของคุณ คุณสมบัติของงานเขียนภาษาอังกฤษที่คุณมีอยู่ประกอบอะไรบ้าง

6. ในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษสิ่งสำคัญที่ควรคำนึงถึงได้แก่

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>หัวข้อสุด มากที่สุด</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>คุณภาพในการสื่อสาร</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ความน่าสนใจ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>การจับขยายความและยกตัวอย่าง</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>การจัดเรียงข้อความ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ความละเอียดตามหลักไวยากรณ์</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ความเหมาะสมตามหลักภาษา</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>การเชื่อมโยงข้อความ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. จากประสบการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษที่ผ่านมาของคุณ อาจารย์ผู้สอนจะสอนโดยเน้นในหัวข้อใดเป็นพิเศษ

8. คุณต้องการให้อาจารย์ผู้สอน สอนโดยเน้นในหัวข้อใดเป็นพิเศษในการสอนการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อช่วยให้คุณพัฒนาการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษให้มีประสิทธิภาพมากขึ้น
Questionnaire

1. What aspects do you think prevent you from being a good writer?

2. What aspects do you think prevent you from being a good writer?

3. How do cohesive devices help link texts together?

4. What are the factors that help readers understand what writers are talking about?

5. What is the most important aspect for you in writing in English? Please give the rank order below.

6. Which areas are the most important to you when writing in English?

7. Do you have any problems applying paragraph models during writing?

8. What are benefits of teacher feedback? What are benefits of peer feedback?

9. On which aspects of writing do you want the teacher to focus when teaching?

10. How is your writing improved at the end of Academic Writing English course?
## Appendix 8: The Experimental Communicative Profile Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative Quality</th>
<th>Interestingness</th>
<th>Referencing</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Coherence of Ideas</th>
<th>Linguistic Accuracy</th>
<th>Linguistic Appropriacy</th>
<th>Transitional Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 The writing displays an ability to communicate in a way that gives a reader full satisfaction.</td>
<td>The writing shows high creativity and novelty, fully engaging the reader.</td>
<td>The writing shows abundant use of illustrations and examples displaying cultural awareness.</td>
<td>The writing displays completely logical organisational structure enabling the message to be followed effortlessly.</td>
<td>Relevant ideas are logically presented in an interesting way, with main ideas prominently and clearly stated, with complete effective supporting material.</td>
<td>The reader sees no errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</td>
<td>There is an ability to manipulate the linguistic system with complete appropriacy.</td>
<td>The writing shows sophisticated transitions connecting main ideas within a paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The writing displays an ability to communicate without causing the reader any difficulties.</td>
<td>The writing shows novelty and creativity, sustaining interest throughout.</td>
<td>The writing makes frequent use of examples suited to the reader.</td>
<td>The writing displays logical organisational structure that enables the message to be followed easily.</td>
<td>Good range of relevant ideas are clearly expressed with main ideas highlighted, effective and good supporting material.</td>
<td>The reader sees no significant errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</td>
<td>There is an ability to manipulate the linguistic system appropriately.</td>
<td>The writing shows effective and good control of transitions connecting ideas within a paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The writing displays an ability to communicate although there is occasional strain for the reader.</td>
<td>The writing has frequent novel ideas that evoke reader interest and attention.</td>
<td>The writing offers many examples that are suited to the reader.</td>
<td>The writing displays good organisational structure that enables the message to be followed.</td>
<td>Good range and progression of ideas are well presented and supported and arranged with adequately relevant supporting material.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of but not troubled by occasional errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</td>
<td>There are minor illustrations to the ability to manipulate the linguistic system appropriately which do not intrude on the reader.</td>
<td>The writing shows adequately and smoothly connected ideas within a paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The writing displays an ability to communicate although there is occasional strain for the reader.</td>
<td>The writing occasionally shows interesting ideas that attract reader attention.</td>
<td>The writing makes use of examples although the particular example used may not be suited culturally appropriate.</td>
<td>The writing is organised well enough for the message to be followed throughout.</td>
<td>Moderate range of ideas are presented and generally arranged with some supporting ideas, but it may be occasionally difficult for the reader to distinguish main ideas from supporting material; main ideas may not be supported; their relevance may be dubious.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar only occasionally.</td>
<td>There is limited ability to manipulate the linguistic system appropriately, but this intrudes only occasionally.</td>
<td>The writing reveals generally adequately connected ideas, but is occasionally awkward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The writing displays an ability to communicate although there is often strain for the reader.</td>
<td>The writing occasionally provides new information but little of it is interesting.</td>
<td>The writing makes use of explanations of examples.</td>
<td>The writing is made informative enough for the message to be followed most of the time.</td>
<td>Ideas are presented, but may lack of relevance clarity, consistency, or supporting statements.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar that intrude frequently.</td>
<td>There is limited ability to manipulate the linguistic system, which intrudes frequently.</td>
<td>The writing displays some connection of ideas, but some connections may be missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The writing displays an ability to communicate, which puts a strain for the reader throughout.</td>
<td>The writing is routine in the major part of its content with little new information.</td>
<td>The writing contains fragmented examples or allusions that assist few readers.</td>
<td>The writing lacks a clear organisational structure and the message is difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Limited range of logical ideas is presented and supported. The ideas may contain irrelevant information.</td>
<td>The reader finds the control of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar inadequate.</td>
<td>There is inability to manipulate the linguistic system appropriately, which causes severe strain for the reader.</td>
<td>There is a Limited range of connection of ideas and connections are often missing. The same transitional devices may be oversized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The writing does not display an ability to communicate although meaning comes through spasmodically.</td>
<td>The writing is dull and uninteresting for most readers.</td>
<td>The writing has no discernible organisational structure and the message cannot be followed.</td>
<td>Ideas are inadequately presented, and the reader is provided with incomplete or unclear supporting information.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of primarily of gross inadequacies of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</td>
<td>There is little or no sense of linguistic system appropriacy, although there is evidence of sentence structure.</td>
<td>There are few connections of ideas, and limited use of transitional devices.</td>
<td>Few connections of ideas, and limited use of transitional devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The writing displays no ability to communicate.</td>
<td>The writing is completely void of interesting content.</td>
<td>The writing provides no examples whatever.</td>
<td>No organisational structure or message is recognizable.</td>
<td>Few ideas are apparently developed. A meaning comes with little relevant idea to the text; it is ambiguous.</td>
<td>The reader sees no evidence of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</td>
<td>There is no sense of linguistic appropriacy.</td>
<td>The writing lacks transitions or displays no transitional connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A true non writer who has not produced any assessable strings of English writing. An answer that is wholly or almost wholly copied from input text or task is in this category.

0 This rating should be used only when a candidate did not attempt or attempt this part of the test in anyway.

Adapted from Hamp-Lyons (1991)
Appendix 9: Course Syllabus

Course Title: Writing Academic English (205302) Semester 2 / 2008-2009

Section 7
Tue 15.00-16.50 Room Q5208 & Thu 8.00-8.50 Room Qs 2201

Instructor: Khampee Noonkhan (คัมภีร์ นูนคาน)
Office: HU 1301
Phone number: 261000 ext 2081
Email Address: khampeen@nu.ac.th

Course Description
Practising efficient writing of academic texts for further study or work.

Course Objectives
By the end of the course, students will be able to:

1. produce effective paragraph writing
2. apply the knowledge of grammatical features to basic paragraphs
3. write different types of paragraphs in academic English style

Schedule & Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-17 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-24 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Unit 1 Descriptive Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context Building &amp; Textual Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27-31 Oct 2008</td>
<td>Joint construction of the text &amp; independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-7 Nov 2008</td>
<td>Linking related texts &amp; textual reader responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collect students’ first assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-14 Nov 2008</td>
<td>Unit 2 Narrative Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context Building &amp; Textual Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17-21 Nov 2008</td>
<td>Join construction of the text &amp; Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24-28 Nov 2008</td>
<td>Linking related texts &amp; textual reader responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collect students’ second assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>1-5 Dec 2008</td>
<td>Midterm Examination Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-9 Jan 2009</td>
<td>Unit 3 Compare &amp; Contrast Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-16 Jan 2009</td>
<td>Joint construction of the text &amp; independent construction of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19-23 Jan 2009</td>
<td>Linking related texts &amp; Textual reader response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collecting students’ third assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26-30 Jan 2009</td>
<td>Unit 4 Causes &amp; Effect Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual Building &amp; Textual Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-6 Feb 2009</td>
<td>Joint construction of the text &amp; independent construction of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9-13 Feb 2009</td>
<td>Linking related texts &amp; textual reader responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collecting students’ fourth assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16-20 Feb 2009</td>
<td>Post-writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>23-27 Feb 2009</td>
<td>Final Examination Week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-44</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Scheme**

- Assignments: 50%
- After Unit Quizzes: 10%
- Midterm Exam: 20%
- Final Exam: 20%

**Course Book:** Introduction to Academic Writing, Third Edition Level 3 by Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue

If a student is absent for more than 20% of class, he or she will not be allowed to take the final exam.
Possible answers:

- Frank work up. (c) He heard a noise. (i) He switched on the light. (a). He got out of bed. (o) He put on his dressing gown. (j) He opened the bedroom door. (h) He went downstairs. (m) He listened at the door. (n) He opened the door. (f) He saw a cat outside the window. (g) He went upstairs. (b) He took off his dressing gown. (e) He got into bed. (d) He switched off the light. (k) He went to sleep. (l)
My hometown and my college town have several things in common. First, both are small rural communities. For example, my hometown, Gridlock, has a population of only about 10,000 people. Similarly, my college town, Subnormal, consists of about 11,000 local residents. This population swells to 15,000 people when the college students are attending classes. A second way in which these two towns are similar is that they are both located in rural areas. Gridlock is surrounded by many acres of farmland which is devoted mainly to growing corn and soybeans. In the same way, Subnormal lies in the center of farmland which is used to raise hogs and cattle. Thirdly, these towns are similar in that they contain college campuses. Gridlock, for example, is home to Neutron College, which is famous for its Agricultural Economics program as well as for its annual Corn-Watching Festival. Likewise, the town of Subnormal boasts the beautiful campus of Quark College, which is well known for its Agricultural Engineering department and also for its yearly Hog-Calling Contest.
Comparison Paragraph -- Organized by Subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC SENTENCE</th>
<th>My hometown and college town are similar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOPIC #1:</td>
<td>GRIDLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAILS ABOUT GRIDLOCK:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gridlock is a small town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o It has about 10,000 people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gridlock is in a rural area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o It is surrounded by many acres of farmland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o This farmland is devoted to growing corn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The land is also used to grow soybeans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gridlock is home to Neutron College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o This college is famous for its Agricultural Economics program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o It is also famous for its annual Corn-Watching Festival.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUBTOPIC#2: | SUBNORMAL                                      |
| DETAILS ABOUT SUBNORMAL: |                                      |
| • Subnormal is a small town.               |                                      |
|   o Subnormal has about 4000 college students. |                                      |
|   o It has about 11,000 local residents.   |                                      |
| • Subnormal is in a rural area.            |                                      |
|   o Subnormal is in the center of land used for raising hogs. |                                      |
|   o This land is also used to raise cattle. |                                      |
| • Subnormal contains Quark College.        |                                      |
|   o This campus is famous for its Agricultural Engineering department. |                                      |
|   o It is also famous for its yearly Hog-Calling Contest. |                                      |

(source: [http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/fwalters/compcont.html](http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/fwalters/compcont.html))

My hometown and my college town are similar in several ways. First, my hometown, Gridlock, is a small town. It has a population of only about 10,000 people. Located in a rural area, Gridlock is surrounded by many acres of farmland which are devoted mainly to growing corn and soybeans. Gridlock also contains a college campus, Neutron College, which is famous for its Agricultural Economics program as well as for its annual Corn-Watching Festival. As for my college town, Subnormal, it too is small, having a population of about 11,000 local residents, which swells to 15,000 people when students from the nearby college are attending classes. Like Gridlock, Subnormal lies in the center of farmland which is used to raise hogs and cattle. Finally, Subnormal is similar to Gridlock in that it also boasts a beautiful college campus, called Quark College. This college is well known for its Agricultural Engineering department and also for its yearly Hog-Calling Contest.
Appendix 11: Examples of Students’ Writing

My Neighborhood

In my neighborhood, there are many places such as a public park, a temple, a supermarket, restaurants, a university, and a bus station. Around my house is in another areas. There is a public park across the street. There are a lot of tree in the public park. There is a playground near a pond there children playing with friends. Next to the public park near the river, there is a medium sized temple. The pagoda is high and beautiful, so you can see a pagoda from far away. Across the temple is near the bus station, and there are many drugstores in the supermarket. You can find foods from here. The bus station is near the supermarket, and when you go in you can see many people in here. Next to the bus station is a university, and I study there every week. Behind the university is a dormitory. There are several kinds of flowers in front of a dormitory. Next to the dormitory is a restaurant, there are a lot of tables. Near a restaurant is the apartment. Inside the apartment, there are many rooms in here. Around the apartment is beautiful by many flowers. There is a hospital near the apartment. There are a lot of doctors in the hospital. There is a department store next to the hospital, and the bank stand beside it. Next to the bank, there is a post office. You can send a letter from here. Across the post office, there is a police station. Inside the police station, there are a lot of prisoners in here. Near the police station, there is a big sized zoo. Inside the zoo, there are a several kinds of animals in a zoo.

The think that my impresses from my neighborhood is I can go jogging in the public park, and I can go to the temple to make a merit. Finally, I like my neighborhood because all places are clean.
Koh Chang Trip

I and friends went to Koh Chang. Begin I ridden in a bus from Naresuan University to bus station. Afterthat, I ridden in a bus from bus station to Trat province. During the fravel, a bus had an accident. I waited for hour two in front of Suwannapoom airport. I arrived at Trat province at 5.30 p.m.. Next morning, I sat a boat to Koh Chang. I enjoyed sat a bot because it good air and the cool breeze. So I full cheerful. I was very excited to because this was the first time. I sat a bot. When I aarive at an island, I live at Sangaroon Bunggalo. Thereafter, I went to the beach. I see squids on the beach, and I saw littie shells on a stone, but I saw the sea anemone us well because it is the rainy season. Thereafter, I swam in the sea water. In the evening, I saw the sun fulling it is orange and round. Next day, I drove a motorcycle around an island. I saw schools, temples, and fisherman villages. The roads are very dangerous driving because the road were narrow, and it had a sharp. After I went home, I really enjoyed Koh Chang I enjoyed this trip so much, and I felt very happy.

Travel in Tak Province

Tak is one province in Thailand, and it has the beautiful natural. I live in Tak. Tak has a lot of tourist attraction. There is a big river named Ping river, and have fresh air. Tak is border links with the myanma. There is a river Moey, and there are places selling goods. I bought the bag for my friend, and decorations. I meet several foreigners, and I took a photograph with him. After that, I sat a harbor, for I went to the Myanmar. I went to travel for feeling with the culture in this place. Then I sat a harbor for come to Tak. On a New Year holiday, I celebrated New Year at Tak. I saw beautiful lights, and see the show, and I went shopping with my mother. After that, I have a meal with my
mother. Next day, I went to pay respect to the Buddha image. After that, I went to waterfall, and it is very beautiful, and it has seen the nice scenery, so it took a photograph. There is a dam which is the biggest in the country, and this place is relax for the people.

In conclusion, Tak then is attractive for travel, and it is a beautiful province, and I love Tak province.

A Car And A Bicycle

Driving a car is different from riding a bicycle. First, both transportations have a different wheel. A car has four wheels, yet a bicycle has two wheels. Second, both transportations has a different cost. A car is expensive, but a bicycle is cheap. Third, both transportations has a different speed. A car has more speed than a bicycle. Fourth, both transportations are different in a number of seats. A car has a seat four maximum, yet a bicycle has a maximum seat for two. Then, both transportations has a different air-conditioner.

A car has air-conditioner, yet a bicycle has fresh air. After that, both transportation has a different pollution. A car causes pollution, but a bicycle not pollution. Next, both transportations has a different size. A car has big size, but a bicycle has small size. Then, both transportations has a different rain. A car has not wet rain, yet a bicycle has wet rain. Finally, both transportations consumes a different fuel. A car consumes oil, but a bicycle do not. A bicycle is an environmental friendly transportation.

I choose a bicycle because not pollution and environmental.
The Causes of Water Pollution

What are the causes of water pollution? Who are the culprits of water pollution? One major cause of water pollution causes serious environmental and health problems. The pollutants come from chemical and industrial processes. When factories and manufacturers pour their chemicals and toxic wastes directly into streams and rivers, the water becomes poisonous, and the quantity of oxygen levels decrease and lead to the death of many aquatic animals.

Another cause of water pollution is from pesticides. Farm pesticides poison aquatic plants and animals. Animals manure, chemical fertilizers, phosphate detergent pollute water by supplying excessive nutrients. This pollution is known as Eutrophication. In addition, it helps decrease the amount of oxygen levels too. Water is also being polluted by garbage specifically plastics substances. Plastics that have broken down into tiny pieces may be eaten by sea creatures and may cause their death. One more cause of water pollution is sewage coming from each household. Most developing countries have strict regulation for sewage disposal. The danger results from the broken sewage pipes gets, and the waste contaminates the drinking water. When this happens, the breakage will lead to some diseases that can be collected quietly in consumers. The last cause of water pollution is produced by personal care and household products such as shampoo, lotion, moisturizer, and the other products cause the water pollution. These products also increase the waste water to contaminate the streams, river, and lakes.

In short, if we are aware of the reasons why the water is polluted, they can help decrease this problem. Thus, they can solve these problem and protect the environment in the world.