Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.0 Overview

The review of literature is discussed under three main headings, that is, the approaches, techniques, and evaluation approach and methods used in guided writing activities. These headings will be described in details according to the methodology used by previous researchers. Moreover, some aspects which have been adapted from such methodology for the current study will be highlighted.

The terms ‘approach’, ‘method’, and ‘technique’ have interchangeably been used. Indeed, they are different. ‘Approach’ refers to different theories about the nature of language and how language is learned while ‘method’ involved different ways of teaching language, and the technique concerned different kinds of classroom activity (Richard et al, 1992). However, this also shows the hierarchical relation of these terms. ‘Approach’ is the umbrella term that controls the method that controls the technique. Hence, ‘the approach’ is related to the methods and certain theories in a language classroom. ‘The method’ concerns techniques behind the teaching-learning procedures of the selected theory, such as the roles and behaviors of the teacher and learners, subject-matter and linguistic objectives, sequencing, as well as materials. ‘The techniques’ are specific activities, or exercises of the selected method. These terms function to describe the pedagogy used in the language classroom.
The framework of this chapter is displayed below.

2.1 **EFL Teaching-Learning Methodology Used in Thai Schools** consist of

2.1.1 Grammar Translation Method

2.1.2 The Communicative Approach

2.2 **Approaches Used in Guided Writing Activities** are

2.2.1 The Model Approach

2.2.2 The Outline Approach

2.3 **The Techniques Used in Guided Writing Activities** comprise

2.3.1 Copying

2.3.2 Dictation

2.3.3 A Series of Pictures

2.4 **The Evaluation Approach and Methods Used in Guided writing Activities** contain

2.4.1 On-Going Assessment

2.4.2 Self-Evaluation

2.4.3 Peer-Evaluation

2.4.4 Analytical Marking Method
2.1 EFL Teaching-Learning Methodology Used in Thai Schools

Grammar translation method and the communicative approach are the main EFL methodology used in Thai schools.

2.1.1 Grammar Translation Method

Despite the requirement of communicative language teaching (CLT), this study needs to use the grammar translation method (GTM). Thai students rarely use English for everyday communication, and only in the classroom, so their listening and speaking skills in English are weaker than reading and writing skills (Krairussamee, 1984). Moreover, they have been familiar with aspects of writing that consist of grammar points and vocabulary items, and usually rely on translation skills rather than communicative writing. There are two aspects of GTM in writing instruction according to this study, the focus of exercises on grammar and vocabulary analysis through the teacher’s translation in the native language, and on the integration of reading-writing skills.

Firstly, the grammar translation method centralizes writing activities and there is analysis of structures and vocabulary items through the teacher’s translation in L1. This relates to the view of Angwattakul (1992) that if the Thai learners had learnt grammar and rules of exception, as well as meaning of vocabulary items of English in their mother tongue, they would understand the content of what they were learning and could use it well. In this respect, Thai learners will certainly understand the content of reading texts if they are taught grammar rules and vocabulary items of such texts in Thai. However, only the more proficient Thai students can use such rules to construct sentences correctly.
Rivers (1968) and Mohd Azam (2000) observe that only the better EFL learners are
motivated to learn writing skills through being taught the memorization of varieties of
vocabulary items and sentence structures, as well as activities about grammar practice, and
these learners could write sentences accurately. Moreover, if they were taught writing skills
in the first language, they would comprehend the teachers’ explanation explicitly. The
teacher’s translation of grammar rules and vocabulary items used for writing exercise in
mother tongue also facilitated better instruction. On the one hand, from the perspectives of
the three authors, the less proficient learners will face difficulty when using this method.
For example, learning and practising activities about grammar and vocabulary items
through the teacher’s Thai explanation will result in ‘Thai interference in English
sentences’. This is because Thai learners may not be able to differentiate English sentences
from Thai sentences. Hence, the researcher’s guided writing classroom was based on
bilingual instruction. The researcher tried to switch from Thai to English and English to
Thai when explaining grammar rules of reading texts, and requested the learners to do so
during pair and group work in order to facilitate better understanding.

Secondly, reading and writing skills are used as integrated activities in the grammar
translation method. In the writing classroom, the students were required to construct the
sentences, using the new vocabulary items and grammar points they had learnt from the
reading texts explained by the teacher in L1. Furthermore, in the composition, they were
given the topic or could choose topics relevant to the reading texts. Then, they had to write
a paragraph, using the reading texts as the model (Angwattanakul, 1992). In this regard,
this method provides guidance of the teacher and the reading texts. The teacher’s
translation of the lexical and structural elements of the texts will help the students
understand the texts' linguistic organization. Indeed, the EFL students may be able to construct sentences only by using such a model. However, they were not able to construct paragraphs because understanding only lexical and structural elements of the texts was insufficient knowledge to construct the paragraph.

The grammar translation method is more useful when used to train the students at the sentence level than the paragraph or essay level. Through this method, the students were taught to write different kinds of sentences and were expected to write their own sentences, but were not guided to observe how the sentences were located in a variety of textual and contextual settings (Morais, 2000). This means if the students are taught through GTM, their writing ability is confined to only the sentence level. It is difficult to enable them to write a paragraph communicatively since GTM does not focus on the students' linguistic and communicative competence of writing skills. However, this study used the integration of GTM and CLT. After the students had been trained at the sentence level, they were guided to structure a paragraph rhetorically through a set of linking devices and were reminded to follow the chronological order and reading models as well as the researcher's explanation.

The views of Rivers (1968), Angwattanakul (1992) and Mohd Azam (2000) on writing exercises about grammar and vocabulary practice via the teacher's translation in L1 are useful to only the better EFL students. However, these views are adapted to this study; bilingual instruction is used more than only Thai. In the view of Angwattanakul (1992), GTM does not guide the students to write the paragraph level, so this study tries to adapt the view of Morais (2000) by integrating GTM and CLT to push the students to face
'the paragraph level'.

2.1.2 The Communicative Approach

The communicative approach is used in this study due to the fact that it is a requirement in Thai schools. The guided writing approach is thus aimed to bridge the gap between GTM and CLT in Thai schools. The students are taught writing skills beyond 'grammaticality'; they are guided to learn good writing with purpose and audience, as well as text organization.

Firstly, the concepts of 'purpose' and 'audience' are the main part of 'communicative writing'. Their effectiveness depends on the teacher's control. In this way, Sharwood-Smith (1974) said the teacher had to encourage the student to communicate something to the reader by choosing particular words and patterns that would best suit his or her authentic purpose and audience. Likewise, Arapoff (1970) suggested that the teacher had to determine the purpose of writing if he or she wanted the students to have the same explicit purpose. With this strategy, it would be easier to teach them the higher stages of writing skills. These views are adapted to this study. The students were reminded of the purposes of letter writing, namely making a new friend for friendship and practising written English. In narrative writing, they were told to write a story about their experiences based on a series of pictures. In fact, they were given recipients for only pen-friend letters. Hence, their audience of narrative writing could be the researcher and their purpose could be achieving good results. However, the researcher had always encouraged them to write a narrative as in 'telling a story through pictures to their old friend'.
Where ‘authenticity’ is concerned, the teacher’s guidance in purpose and audience of the students’ writing is problematic. The speaker could communicate to the listener immediately and actively since the listener could also respond to the speaker spontaneously through gesture or interruption. On the other hand, the writer could easily lose sight of the reader because he or she is invisible. Hence, the teacher should be strict about emphasizing the rhetorical features and mechanics of writing, such as focusing on the role of punctuation, margins and general spacing to avoid redundancy, and to convey meaning. Moreover, the teacher should provide the students with a communicative goal of writing to enhance their motivation in learning of writing, such as the goal set in the problem-solving activity (Sharwood-Smith, 1974). In the present study, the authentic audience and communicative purpose of the letter writing are imperfect. In the worksheet, lesson 3 (Appendix B) and the achievement test (Appendix C) the students were given 20 specially written audiences. However, in the test, one authentic pen-friend, an excerpt from the English magazine in Thailand, was later adapted. Though they were controlled by the same audience and purpose, this letter did not reflect the real writing interaction between the writer and reader. In fact, this study aims to train the students to understand communicating their letter to the pen-friend so that they can further use in their real life via email or letters. As a result, the problem-solving activity in this letter, such as in correspondence was not provided.

Secondly, teaching the text organization can also lead students to achieve a communicative goal of writing. Using GTM, the teacher taught only grammar points of text; the sentence was an independent unit of grammar, such as texts in drill exercises. The teacher felt confident in focusing on the grammar of the text when teaching of writing rather than on teaching of rhetoric for the communicative text. The teacher should thus shift
the levels of control in written texts from controlled to some control to uncontrolled writing activities in order to familiarize the students on the way the text is coherently organized (Sharwood-Smith, 1976). In the current study, lesson 2 (Appendix B) is about letter writing and the communicative text as a part of the letter’s content was taught. The students in groups were guided to identify the linguistic and communicative weaknesses of the texts, such as weaknesses in grammar, vocabulary items, and content and paragraph organization.

The views of Sharwood-Smith (1974) and Arapoof (1970) on teacher guidance in audience and purpose for communicative goal of writing are used in both guided narrative and letter writing. Next, the argument of Sharwood-Smith (1974) on the unauthentic audience and purpose of writing, compared to speaking is admitted. But, this guided narrative and letter writing is the guideline to further authenticity. Lastly, the suggestion of Sharwood-Smith (1976) on teaching rhetoric for ‘communicative text’ has also been implemented, namely the students were asked to make understanding this letter text’s linguistic and rhetorical elements.

2.2 Approaches Used in Guided Writing Activities

The guided writing approach in this study is the eclectic approach. It is a mixture of different approaches, methods and techniques. Indeed, the term ‘guided writing approach’ is based on ‘the guided approach to the teaching of written English composition’ used by Tongue et al. (1976) to design a manual of instructional material for writing course, namely ‘Controlled and Guided Writing Composition’ as a guide to Singaporean primary students and other ESL/EFL students in Asia. The researcher has thus created the guided writing
approach in connection with GTM and the communicative approach, the model and outline approaches, and certain techniques and evaluation methods.

GTM by itself is too narrow in instruction for developing the students’ writing beyond the sentence level. Likewise, the communicative approach by itself is quite complicated for leading the students to produce writing for communicative use in the society. Both are necessary for the real development of the EFL students’ writing ability through ‘levels of guidance’. The students need to be taken through the levels of guidance for their linguistic fluency and strengths to develop into good cognitive skills for writing. GTM can help them develop ‘accuracy’ while the communicative approach aims to develop competence of ‘usage’. As a result, the fluency developed through the guided writing approach will bridge the gap between accuracy and usage. The guided writing approach is thus a combination of GTM and CLT, and the main alternative approach used in this study.

The guided writing approach is an effective technique for enhancing writing skills in an ESL/EFL context. This approach aims to assist the students by giving the framework for a wide range of controlled to guided writing activities based on instructional and teacher guidance so that the students are able to practise writing tasks at more and more difficult levels. The concept of ‘levels of guidance’ thus plays the vital role in this approach.

The guided writing material of this study has mainly been adapted from five levels of guidance used by Tongue et al. (1976). These levels are: (i) almost control, (ii) substantial guidance, (iii) some guidance, (iv) a little guidance and (v) almost free. These levels refer to the subsequent guidance in grammar points and vocabulary items used by the
teacher to help the students make a decision on what to say and how to say it in their writing.

2.2.0.1 Almost Controlled Level is not completely controlled, but it provides about 80% of guidance for the writing task. For example, it is a set of substitution tables containing correct grammatical sentences or lexical items to be chosen by the students in relation to the content. Due to the guidance, this level results in few errors on the students' writing, so the students will be motivated to learn other activities. There were no substitution tables in this study, but almost controlled activity in narrative writing, lesson 2, exercise 1 of activity 2 (Appendix B, p.229), provided the choices of the series of pictures, the sentence patterns, and linking devices for the students to combine these sentences according to the story.

2.2.0.2 Substantial Guidance Level provides approximately 60% of choices for the writing task. In other words, the students are required to make decisions on the lexical and syntactic choices when practising substantial guided writing exercises rather than almost controlled exercises. This level is found in, for example, blank-filling exercise with the assistance of pictures and speech bubbles. In fact, this exercise is to investigate the students' vocabulary competence through understanding the story. It is also found in exercises about rearranging and matching jumbled sentences through the series of pictures given, that is, it is aimed to diagnose the students' syntactic competence. These two examples are adapted to this guided narrative writing. In lesson 3 (Appendix B), activity 2, exercise 2 titled 'On Mother's Day' (pp.238-240), the students were asked to sequence the pictures of this story in order to compose them in a paragraph through the phrases, chronological order, and linking devices given. In exercise 3, namely 'My Holiday at the
Beach’ (pp.241-243), the students were asked to understand the series of pictures before filling the words for completing the story.

2.2.0.3 Some Guidance Level provides the partial choices of writing task, approximately 50%. It is supposed that the students’ structure and vocabulary skills have developed, so some choices are reduced. For instance, it is found in blank-filling exercises, especially in letter writing, without the assistance given. In other words, it requires the students to complete the letter by filling the words or phrases in relation to the content of the letter. In this way, the students do not use their own information to fill in the blank; they have to complete the content of the letter by other writers. Exercises with some guidance in this study are found in letter writing, exercise 4 of activity 2 in lesson 3 (Appendix B, pp.273-274). The students were required to give the missing words, phrases and sentences based on their own information to complete the letter. In narrative writing, activity 2 of lesson 3, exercise 4 titled ‘the Announcement Day of University Entrance Examination Results’ (pp.244-246), the students were asked to orally narrate the story through pair work before writing a paragraph. Such paragraph was the follow-up writing with the introductory sentence given.

2.2.0.4 A Little Guidance refers to the slightly guided writing activity with about 40% of choices given. It is to enable the students to integrate their insight into a lot of controlled to guided writing activities they have practised to create their own work. In this study, both the last activity in lesson 3 of the worksheet, and the achievement test of narrative and letter writing tasks are designed as ‘a little guided writing activities’. In narrative writing, the guidance was given through the series of pictures with some speech bubbles, pre-writing
activity for the students’ ideas generated for each picture, and some relevant linking devices and chronological order so that the students could produce a paragraph on this story. However, in the test, this task did not provide chronological order and linking devices since the students were required to create the new linking devices. In letter writing’s worksheet, the guidance was given through the background information of pen-friends and the guided content for each paragraph. However, in the test, pre-writing stage for each paragraph of such guided content was also given.

2.2.0.5 Almost Free Level provides a few choices of writing task, about 20%; the students have to make decisions on the content, vocabulary items, and sentence structures in their writing rather than use some guidance. This level requires the students to be independent on the choices in order to deal with free writing task. However, a little guidance depends on the instructions, which are not straightforward as in the previous guided level. Examples are exercises about replying the letter or narrative writing in the form of problem-solving of the situation in the story. This level has not been adapted to this study because it is difficult for the EFL Thai secondary students. They still need more linguistic guidance to be able to develop their thoughts.

Though almost free level is not used, other four levels of guidance are the better basic framework used to design this guided writing material than using the textbook for Grade 11 students in this school, which is full of only some guidance and almost free exercise and based on grammaticality as writing ability and non-Thai cultural content. In other words, this approach makes this writing material easy for the students rather than the textbook. This is related to the effectiveness of this approach used by Edwards (1975) to
design ‘A Guided Composition Program for Form I Children in Guyana’ in order to solve the students’ problems in writing a story. He found that the English textbook could not help the students to generate their own ideas for writing tasks. This was because its writing exercises were based on only grammar practice and these students used linguistic twilight between semi-English and Creole, not standard English. Hence, he utilized this approach to overcome such problems since it provided composite frames containing the grammatical forms, structural patterns, and vocabulary items, as well as enabled the students to write vicariously. This resulted in the students’ interest in writing through the guided composition frames efficiently. In this regard, the levels of guidance or composite frame in structural and lexical patterns of this approach are the main assistance for Thai and Guyana students.

The levels of guidance are the main factor to be considered by the teacher when designing the guided writing material. If he or she utilizes the exercises in which levels of guidance in language patterns suit the students’ needs, level, culture, and linguistic competence, the students’ writing ability will develop. On the other hand, if he or she ignores this factor, the students will encounter many writing problems. Hence, they will not be motivated to learn other subsequent writing activities. In this way, Rutter (1989) claimed that some guided writing activity of the fill-in-the blanks type, an excerpt of the authentic story which was liberally sprinkled with dashes, was designed for only the native English learners. It thus presented difficulties for the EFL learners who needed more guidance since many of the dashes had not been omitted. This problem could be overcome by putting more meat on the skeleton as shown below:
The previous exercise (for only native English learners)

___ every fire station ___ always ___ firemen ready ___ go out ___ at once ___ if ___ need ___ one night ___ telephone ___ ring.

The new exercise for EFL learners

**Instructions**: Fill in the following guided composition. Note that some of the words are in parentheses; these can be omitted. All underlined verbs must be conjugated.

Every fire station always ___ have ___ firemen ___ (be) ready ___ go out at once if ___ (be) ___ need. One night ___ telephone ___ ring.

(Rutter, 1989: 21)

The EFL learners may be unable to carry out the previous exercise due to linguistic incompetence. They have to understand the entire story with blanks by analyzing the written discourse of the text before creating appropriate words. They thus spend too much time trying to make sense of the meaning. As a result, the levels of guidance in the new exercise can help them. However, while the instructions in this new exercise make the task clearer, the choices of vocabulary can still be simplified. In other words, the EFL students will not make senses of the terms ‘parentheses’ and ‘conjugated’. The teacher should thus simplify the instructions by explaining to them these two words in L1 or changing them in the new words or sentences, for example, ‘Note that some of the words in the brackets can be omitted. All underlined verbs must be combined.’ The teacher should also give them other examples before they are asked to perform this exercise. Evidently, the simplification of guided writing exercises is an alternative method considered by the researcher to make the levels of guidance in the writing task suitable for Thai students’ writing ability. In this
study, all materials from the ESL textbooks for Malaysian students have been simplified in relation to the EFL Thai secondary students' linguistic competence and cultural background, so the instructions of exercises as in the observation of Rutter (1989:21) are not found.

To achieve the development of the students' writing ability through the guided writing approach, not only the simplification of the writing exercise for increasing the levels of guidance is considered in this study, but also the usage of models and outlines of writing tasks are also used to lead the students from writing sentence level to paragraph level efficiently. The models and outlines are parts of choices used by the EFL teacher to enhance the students' writing skills at every level of guidance. Indeed, they are used as the tool in pre-writing stage of the product approach. In other words, because the product approach begins with pre-writing stage and ends with actual writing stage, the teacher guides the students on elements of the good model writing to adapt for their own writing, or he or she gives them the outline to frame what they want to say in their writing. On the one hand, Brown (1994) said in the product approach, the teacher did not help the students explore the meaning as they were writing and did not help them build the strategies of pre-writing, drafting and rewriting. This shows that the usage of model and outline in the guided writing activity is to reach the final product of writing. This also indicates that the product approach is a part of the guided writing approach. This means when designing or simplifying the materials for levels of guidance, the teacher regularly uses a variety of writing exercises in which layout is the model or outline of good writing for the students to complete, such as blanking-filling or rearranging of letter writing, or cloze passage of narrative writing. Moreover, the teacher still encourages the students to bear in mind through such exercises what the final written product should be. To clearly understand the
model approach and outline approach adapted to this study, they are discussed below.

2.2.1 The Model Approach

The model approach or prose-model approach was intended to enable the students to produce written work by studying examples of good writing by famous writers in which the topic and methods of organization were similar (Kelly, 1984). In other words, the relevant examples of the good writing are 'the models' or 'the choices of guidance' used to acquaint the students with 'what their own final product should be' before producing their own writing. In this respect, the teacher facilitates the methods used by the students to study 'the model writing'. While reading the model writing, the students are guided to think and analyze how the content, grammar points, vocabulary items, mechanics, and paragraph of the model are together formed. Then, they can adapt this method to formulate their own writing. This shows that the model approach is adapted to the guided writing approach.

The adaptation of the model approach to this guided writing material is based on two choices of models, authentic and specially written model presented by Watson (1982). Watson said the authentic model was too difficult for the ESL/EFL elementary students since it required them to elicit their knowledge of accepted convention, namely lexical, grammatical, organizational, and graphic of the model writing to perform their own writing. The specially written model was thus more appropriate for them since it was designed or simplified by the teacher or material writer for the students with particular communicative use and cultural background by providing maximum support, and syntactic and rhetorical choices. In this way, the authentic model, the so-called good writing, seems to reflect the
wide gap between the model writer and ESL/EFL students. If the EFL teacher employs the authentic model of narrative writing by the native English speaking students from the textbook, the EFL students will face difficulty in linguistic, stylistic, and cultural elements of the model while studying it. Hence, the specially written model is more useful for their writing ability because its linguistic and cultural elements have been controlled by the teacher. As a result, the specially written model will be more appropriate than authentic model for the guided writing approach in the EFL context.

In this study, there are mostly specially written models. In narrative writing, lesson 1 (Appendix B, p.225), the researcher's story titled 'my first day in the new school' was the specially written model based on the real life of the researcher. Other cloze passages of story writing, excerpts from the ESL writing textbooks in Malaysia, were adapted to the EFL context in Thailand. Likewise, in letter writing, lesson 2, activity 4 entitled 'the model of pen-friend letter' (p.267) was adapted from the ESL textbook for Malaysian secondary students. Moreover, in exercise 2 of activity 2 (p.271), partial dictation was the letter model written by the researcher.

Despite the model approach's advantages to the material design of this study, a shortcoming is also considered. The model did not give the students an opportunity to develop the actual writing skill, but only developing reading skills since it probably contained linguistic elements, which they needed for their work. The model could thus lead to imitation, and could possibly stultify the model writer rather than enhance their creativity (Christensen, 1993). This claim is related to only the average students of this study, especially in the letter writing. However, the good students will perform their writing
creatively. In fact, the model is one of guidance used for the students' language practice of narrative writing, but the real guidance is a series of pictures used for measuring the students' written product. Furthermore, this study realizes that by using the model approach, the improved reading skills will enhance the students' writing skills because they assist them to think and analyze the model writing.

The observation of Watson (1982) on authentic and specially written models is mainly used to design the model-based guided writing activities. Apparently, there are more specially written models than authentic models in this study because the simplicity of materials to the students' writing ability is firstly considered.

2.2.2 The Outline Approach

The outline approach aims to enable the students to perform a good piece of writing by giving the plan or outline of the content and language patterns of a certain topic in pre-writing stage for the students' roughly formed ideas before actual writing performance.

The outline approach is different from the model approach. While the outline approach provides the subsequent main points or structure of 'what the final written product should be', the model approach provides the whole form with details of 'what the final written product should be'. In this way, the outline of writing provides the partial guidance, that is, it requires the students to deeply think to shape their own content and language in the frame given. Meanwhile, the model writing provides the full choices; the students can visualize, read, and analyze many linguistic options of the model. As a result,
the outline approach challenges the students to explore their ideas and language rather than the model approach.

The outline approach provides the students with cognitive skills rather than the model approach; however, the integration of both will be advantageous to the students. This integration is adapted from the observation of Frank (1976) which is used for guided writing in the speaking and writing stages, especially from pre-to actual writing stage. The procedures were: (i) in class discussion or speaking stage, the pre-writing focused on one point of an outline (ii) while the students were struggling to express the content, the teacher wrote the structural and lexical items as guidance on the board (iii) the teacher wrote their ideas in sentences and paragraphs on the board, and (iv) the students were helped to evaluate the paragraphs on the board in the pair work, and asked to individually produce the whole paragraph based on the same topic, but with different content using the outline as a guide.

Similarly, in this guided writing material, firstly, after the students had learnt the passage titled 'the researcher's story' and its structure as the first example of the outline of 'narrative writing' in the frames of the title, introduction, main events, and conclusion, they were asked to perform 'class composition' using the outline of such a story as a guide. Then, the researcher provoked all the students to orally express their ideas on the voted topic through the list of main events. In other words, while they were expressing the main events in Thai, the researcher wrote them in English sentences on the board. Finally, they were asked to help the researcher to modify and sequence the events, as well as organize the paragraph on the board. This application would help reinforce the development of the
students from learning of writing through guidance in the model and outline. Besides, it would enhance the students’ cognitive skills from generalizing and elaborating on the points to integrate and organize their ideas and language.

Not only the combination of the outline and model approaches is conducted, but also the individual outline approach is used in the final activity of lesson 3 in the worksheet (Appendix B) and in the achievement test (Appendix C) of this study. In narrative writing, the students were given pre-writing stage for generating their rough ideas for each picture. In letter writing, they were given the main points of the guided content for each short paragraph of the pen-friend letter in pre-writing stage. Examples were: (i) introductory paragraph, (ii) introducing yourself and study, (iii) about your family, (iv) about your hobbies/interests, and (v) ending your letter. This guidance in the outline will enrich the students’ actual writing ability.

In spite of advantages of the outline approach, certain disadvantages are also presented. Taylor (1981:7) claimed ‘writing’ here was not a straightforward outline writing process. In addition, no research studies on the composing process supported this approach that ‘writing is simply a process of filling in a prepared outline and rewriting only involves correcting grammar and usage’. This implies that the process approach results in good writing rather than merely using the outline approach. However, the concept ‘good writing’ of the outline approach in this study is less important than ‘ability to write’. The researcher believes that using the outline approach in conjunction with the model approach, and other guidance, such as a series of pictures will facilitate the students to write meaningfully. As in other language skills, writing is a developmental skill, so the EFL secondary students
need more time to develop maturity to produce 'good writing'. Consequently, the outline approach is the basic framework for the EFL students to develop good writing skills through the process approach.

In short, the suggestion of Frank (1976) on using the outline approach in guided writing is mainly adapted to the outline and model-based guided narrative writing activity, and to the outline-based pre-writing stage of narrative and letter writing.

Levels of guidance of Tongue et al. (1976) have greatly contributed to the guided writing material design. From almost control to almost free level via various ways of guidance has been adapted to the controlled and guided narrative and letter writing activities for the outcome of the students' writing. Those ways of guidance include the model and outline-based writing exercises leading the students to perform the final written product.

The grammar translation method and communicative approach which have no levels of guidance for writing exercises are the rationale for employing the guided writing approach providing the greater instruction on the development of the EFL students' writing ability. However, these are the theories used to implement guided writing in the classroom.

2.3 The Techniques Used in Guided Writing Activities

The three main techniques employed in this study, copying, dictation, and a series of pictures, are subsequently discussed.
2.3.1 Copying

Copying is a technique used in the range of controlled to guided writing activities. Copying is related to 'almost controlled level', that is, copying is a partial activity used in 'almost controlled writing'. Indeed, copying is the main technique of 'controlled composition' while 'almost controlled' is the primary level of 'guided composition'.

The copying technique is used in this study since it was the writing exercise that is so arranged that students could not make any errors and they would feel confident to practise other activities (Tongue et al, 1976). This technique is appropriate for the EFL Thai secondary students. As the simplest writing activity, it can be used to warm up the students' linguistic competence so that they will be motivated to perform other guided writing activities.

Not only the view of Tongue et al. (1976), but also that of Scott (1996) reflects the reason for implementing the copying technique in this study. Scott (1996) said 'copying' provided the teacher with the opportunity to reinforce the language to be presented through oral or reading patterns. It was also a good strategy to ask the students to read quietly to themselves when copying words. This helped them to see the connection between the written and spoken words. For this, copying was used to enhance the students' speaking, reading, and writing skills. Though 'reading quietly' is not used in the copying exercise in this study, the 'reading aloud' is used. In narrative writing, lesson 1, activity 1 titled 'warm-up activity' (Appendix B, p.225), all the students were asked to express their ideas on the topic 'the special days in my memory', then the researcher wrote down the list of such
topics on the board. After this, they were randomly asked to read aloud the list of those topics, and copy them into their worksheet. This technique assisted the researcher to see the connection between the written and spoken words of the students' ideas.

Besides words, copying of sentences and paragraphs is also conducted, adapting the observation of K. Porte (1995). Copying was used as the strategy to enhance writing skills among unskillful EFL Spanish undergraduates. These students were asked to copy the text with complicated language patterns from one source, the textbook or the board, in order to ensure that the information was correctly recorded in a safe place. Although this strategy was considered very simple for remedying difficulties faced by the poor EFL student writers, the result revealed that they still made errors in morphological elements of words, such as misspelling, punctuation, and capitalization mismatches due to time constraint, and their Spanish and English handwriting confusion. Likewise, in letter writing lesson 2, activity 2 (Appendix B, p.261), the students were cooperated with the researcher in composing a short paragraph on the voted topic on 'my hobbies', then they were asked to copy the short paragraph on the board into their worksheet. However, this short paragraph did not have complicated language patterns as in the study of K. Porte (1995) because it was also derived from the students' ideas. Moreover, though there were only misspelling and capitalization errors when the researcher checked some students' copied work, the students did not have any confusion of Thai and English handwriting because of the difference between Thai and English writing system. Evidently, copying of sentences and paragraph is believed to reinforce Thai students' writing ability.
In this study, the copying technique is used to develop the students’ controlled writing ability from words to paragraph level. The view of Scott (1996) on copying of words is appropriate to Thai secondary students who need to enhance their fluency and accuracy of idea expression before writing sentences. The view of K. Porte (1995) on copying of sentences and paragraphs is also used to enrich the students’ close attention to details of a paragraph, such as morphological elements of words and grammar points of sentences while copying.

2.3.2 Dictation

As in copying, dictation is widely used as a technique in controlled writing activities. Both require the students to repeat language patterns in writing exercises in order to achieve accuracy. However, both have different ways of repetition. In copying, the students repeat what they have seen. Meanwhile, in dictation, they repeat what they have heard. In other words, while copying language patterns from a certain source, the students can visualize such patterns; dictation requires the students’ memory and aural skills to achieve written skills. In short, copying shows the relation between ‘eyes’ or reading and ‘hand’ or writing, but dictation reflects the connection between ‘ears’ or listening and ‘hand’ or writing. Hence, for the EFL students, dictation seems to be more difficult than copying. This is because their listening comprehension in English is weaker than their reading comprehension. As a result, dictation of this study is the so-called partial dictation, in which reading skills are used to reinforce the students’ aural-writing skills.
Partial dictation was a combination of dictation and cloze procedure. All the materials were presented in an audio way, such as tape-recording of the natural spoken discourse of the teacher, and a part was in a printed form or the missing text. The activity required the students to write down the missing text what they had heard from the recording tape. It could be conducted several times. Moreover, while students were listening to the tape, the teacher could pause at any point of the deleted text so that they could easily understand the auditory form (Oller, 1979). For this, the usage of 'cloze procedure' indicates the assistance of reading comprehension to the students while they are listening to the recording-tape. In other words, at least the students can understand some conceptual meanings and grammar points of the missing text while identifying what they have heard. Moreover, this dictation provided more guidance than ordinary dictation. Using the auditory form instead of the teacher's reading helps the students understand the phonological elements accurately. In ordinary dictation, the teacher may be tired reading the passage several times, so he may not help some students with listening problems. Hence, partial dictation can solve the students' aural problems better than ordinary dictation.

Partial dictation of this study is used in the pen-friend letter, lesson 2, activity 2, exercise 2 (Appendix B, p.271). The recording tape based on the researcher's accurate reading in English will be easier for Thai students than the native English reader. This is a contrast to the argument of Kromkool (1983). It was difficult to have Thai teachers who could speak or read English passage as fluently as the native speakers so that the students could effectively listen to it. In other words, the English passage read by Thai teachers might be inaccurate for the students to understand and fill in the blanks well. This view reflects the reality of EFL planning in Thailand, focusing on only the native English accents.
However, this partial dictation was the EFL material based on the Thai context, trying to solve Thai students’ aural-writing problems. Moreover, it was conducted in the language laboratory, so the students would not have listening problems and would fill in the blanks well.

This partial dictation is structured by adapting the observation of Oller (1979). Thai students will have the effective aural-writing skills if they are taught this dictation in the language laboratory. The suggestion of Kromkool (1983) on using this dictation based on native English reader will further be conducted after they have been familiar with Thai teacher’s English reading.

2.3.3 A Series of Pictures

Copying is used in both narrative and letter writing and dictation is used in only the letter writing while a series of pictures is employed only in narrative writing, lesson 3 of the worksheet and achievement test. A series of pictures meant a series of three to nine pictures, depicting logical or continuous actions, situations, thoughts, or scenes in the frame of sketches or drawing (Breitkreuz, 1972). In other words, it is a set of consecutive pictures presenting a certain story with characters, events, and settings. In this study, there are between six and nine pictures drawn by the researcher. It is considered a technique of the guided writing because it provides guidance in the visuals and speech bubbles that will help the students to make decisions on language and ideas for their narrative writing.
The three relevant steps of the series of picture technique observed by Breikreuz (1972): oral presentation, guided language practice, and guided composition, are mainly adapted for this study. Firstly, the oral presentation required the students to express their explicit actions, and ideas in the pictures in their own words. They were helped by the teacher to use lexical items in the context of the pictures. Then, they were together asked to orally narrate the whole story through the pictures without the teacher’s help. This stage builds the students’ confidence in using vocabulary skills for telling the picture story. In this regard, in activity 2, exercise 4, namely ‘the announcement day of university entrance examination results’ (Appendix B, pp.244-246), the researcher firstly asked the students in pairs to look at 6 pictures in order to elicit their insight into each picture. Though speech bubbles were given in some pictures, the students were still asked to express some relevant vocabulary items. Each pair would give different words in the same situation for ‘a variety of vocabulary usage’. Though they expressed the words in Thai, the researcher translated them in English on the board. However, the whole class was asked to together do ‘oral composition’ through the researcher’s help in English due to their limited oral skills in English. In other words, the researcher roughly interpreted the oral composition, not translating it on the board, in order to prevent the students from copying the researcher’s language patterns.

Moreover, guided language practice required the teacher to help the students practise sentence structures and grammar points relevant to the pictures so that they were able to write the story. Its effectiveness depended on the students’ vocabulary skills in constructing sentences. At this point, the teacher simplified the sentence structure describing the pictures by providing some activity, such as changing the verb in the title or
in the first sentence from present to past. The students were, however, required to use different structures, which the teacher provided while narrating the picture story. This stage will enable the students to structure sentences creatively and not imitating the teacher’s language patterns. In this study, the researcher’s syntactic guidance to the students is different from this observation. In fact, exercise 4 was the follow-up writing-based activity (Appendix B, pp.244-246), after the oral composition, the students were given the introductory sentence from picture 1 in their worksheet. In this way, they were asked to understand this sentence pattern’s grammar points and content. This would be the guideline for the subsequent pictures of the whole story. Indeed, this exercise was the last but one exercise of ‘written practice’ before individual written production. The students had previously been trained in ‘sentence structures’ through various controlled to guided writing activities, so the researcher did not provide other syntactic activities. However, while each pair was working without using a dictionary, the researcher extensively assisted as much as he could.

The guided composition stage meant the teacher could help the students narrate the picture story through a range of controlled to guided writing activities after they had practised the previous stages. After they had orally narrated the story based on the pictures, they had to write their own work with similar content but different syntactic and lexical elements. In this study, the students’ written performance on stage 2 is taken into consideration. If each pair’s writing reflected errors on grammar points, vocabulary items, content organization, and paragraph organization, the researcher would remedy the pair’s linguistic incompetence again.
In the view of Breitkreuz (1972), the teacher’s linguistic guidance should enable the students to effectively write the actual narrative. Likewise, the researcher’s linguistic guidance while using the series of pictures technique will also enable the subjects to perform the guided narrative writing well. However, there is a shortcoming of using this technique. The students’ writing performance was controlled by lexical items and content in the context of a series of pictures. Moreover, such pictures selected provided content decreasing the students’ creativity. Some pictures’ meaning that conveyed the negative behaviors of the characters might influence their perspectives (Smithies, 1972). For this, from the three stages adapted to this study, the series of pictures reflect the effective technique used to help the students frame the story in their own language patterns. Without this technique, the EFL students will struggle imagining the content of a story based on their experience due to linguistic inability; they are not mature enough to write a story without using guidance in pictures. Moreover, utilizing a series of pictures can increase the students’ creativity. All the students have different views on the same series of pictures, so they will produce language patterns differently. The researcher can thus realize a variety of the students’ creativity. Finally, the negative behaviors of the characters in the selected series of pictures are less important than the students’ sub-consciousness. For example, if they are writing a narrative based on the series of pictures titled ‘Thai teenagers and drugs’, it is not easy for them to behave as in the characters of this story. The upper secondary school students can consider the negative behaviors of characters. In contrast, most of the teachers will select a series of pictures depicting the positive behaviors of characters in order to encourage the students to follow. In this study, the series of pictures were based on the content conveying Thai teenage students’ values and morality, such as saving the people’s lives. However, the pictures, namely ‘the day of skipping class’, and ‘copying
examination' were guided to the students to realize the effects of the negative behaviors of
the characters.

The suggestion of Breitkreuz (1972) on the three stages of using the series of
pictures is adapted to this study. Thai students should be helped through words expression
in English by the teacher's translation for 'the oral narrative stage'. They should also be
assisted to build the strategy of creating sentences for 'the guided language practice stage'.
If they are fluent in those two stages, they will be able to do 'the guided narrative
composition' well.

The goals of copying and dictation are fluency and accuracy of language patterns
while the goal of the series of pictures is creativity of story writing. However, all are the
specific techniques used to implement 'the levels of guidance' in the guided writing
classroom procedures.

2.4 Evaluation Approach and Methods Used in Guided Writing Activities

In this study, only on-going assessment is the evaluation approach while self-evaluation,
peer-evaluation and analytical marking method are evaluation methods.

2.4.1 On-Going Assessment

On-going assessment is an approach to evaluation of the learners' language learning
ability. It involved the process of gathering and integrating information about learners from
various sources to help the teacher understand the students’ progress in learning language skills (Puhl, 1997). This means it is a concept of classroom assessment that intends to develop the full potential of the teacher and learners. It also refers to the broad term of evaluation types that can be conducted through different evaluation methods, such as self-evaluation, peer-evaluation or test. Hence, in this study, it is one of on-going evaluation procedures used by the researcher to investigate the development of the students’ writing abilities while learning guided writing activities in pre-writing stage.

On-going assessment in this guided writing activity mainly reflects the views of Puhl (1997). This assessment could help rectify the problems of mismatches between tests and classroom activities among the students, and reduce their confusion and frustration. Before mid-term and final examination, the teacher could continuously assess the students through pre and post-test of each lesson. Likewise, before teaching new writing activities, the teacher had to ensure that the students had understood the previous ones properly. If they had some writing problems, the teacher had to help them so that they could effectively learn and practise the subsequent writing activities. As a result, Puhl (1997) examined these benefits of on-going assessment in the ESL writing classroom.

The study of Puhl (1997) on on-going assessment of writing instruction examined six devices, namely teacher observation, interview, the learner profiles, reflective responses, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation. Her sample was the ESL tertiary level students, aged 19, in a writing course in South Africa. The rationale was that those students misunderstood the real goal of this writing course. They asked the typical question, ‘What do I have to do to pass?’ to the teacher in the first period; they concentrated on how they could get good
results. This study thus aimed to enable the students to understand how to achieve the real
goal of this course, namely how to develop their writing skills. The methods used were self-
assessment, peer-assessment and lecture assessment while the devices used were portfolio,
and reflective statement. Firstly, the students were asked to produce a piece of a narrative
writing based on the truth of their life. Later, they were helped to choose their topics, to
critique the story model, and to learn aspects of English narrative writing. After having
finished their first draft, they were asked to fill out a self-assessment sheet consisting of a
check-list of yes-no questions and open-ended questions through the teacher’s guidance.
After this, they were asked to rewrite their draft based on the self-assessment. Then, they
exchanged their second draft with their peer’s ones. Next, they filled out a peer assessment
from commenting on the title, introduction, and conclusion of their peer’s second draft. The
teacher also grouped them to conduct oral peer-feedback. Likewise, they had to rewrite
their final draft based on the peer-assessment.

From the study of Puhl (1997), the six devices are related to those used in on-going
assessment in this guided writing activity. Researcher observation was firstly used to assess
the researcher procedures’ progress and to elicit the students’ insight into each writing
activity through the students’ non-verbal response and the students-researcher participation.
Moreover, during the interview, the researcher asked the questions to the students, one by
one, pair by pair, small group, and whole class about the problems they face in order to
immediately remedy them. Furthermore, learner profiles were a collection of the students’
worksheets that exhibited the effect of their writing progress. Besides, reflective responses
were naturalistic observation form employed by the English teachers of this school to
assess the methodology being used by the researcher in the guided writing classroom.
Finally, there were no self and peer assessment sheets in this study but the researcher’s provision of criteria for self-evaluation and of guided questions for peer-evaluation. Indeed, the methodology of on-going assessment used by Puhl (1997) is based on the process approach that is absent in this study. However, peer-evaluation is partly involved, especially in the communicative approach with two ways of writing assessment. As in the study of Puhl (1997) study, on-going assessment of this study shifts the role of the researcher from the controller to the facilitator while using peer-evaluation. The researcher’s on-going assessment will thus enhance the students’ self-awareness of their writing improvement.

Puhl (1997) positively views the concept of on-going assessment while Chittravelu et al. (1995) argues with it. Some learning processes of writing skills could not be assessed through a formal test. These were: a student’s dedication in completing writing task, his concentration on learning of writing, the meaningful connections between what he learnt formally about writing in school and what he needed to do in his real life, the kind of strategies he employed in learning writing skills, and his opinion concerning learning of writing. Those learning activities could be assessed only through the teacher’s on-going assessment. For this, not only this study’s on-going assessment was aimed to diagnose the students’ continuous writing problems in each activity by asking questions for immediate remedy, but also the researcher observed the students’ strategies for completing writing exercises, reactions and opinions concerning each activity while they were performing tasks, and he took notes on those aspects in his file. Hence, this difficulty of using on-going assessment can be overcome by the researcher’s observation and the students’ cooperation.
The study of Puhl (1997) on on-going assessment in the ESL writing classroom is employed as one of the EFL guided writing classroom procedures through the researcher observation as well as self-evaluation and peer-evaluation. The data of the students’ progress of writing ability is recorded in the researcher’s file.

2.4.2 Self-Evaluation

While on-going assessment is the approach to evaluation, self-evaluation is an evaluation method. In the study of Puhl (1997), self-evaluation is one of methods used in on-going assessment of the ESL writing instruction. Self-evaluation concerns many relevant terms, such as self-correction, self-assessment, and self-feedback. These referred to the process of language learning, especially writing skills, in which the individual students were able to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of their writing before it was submitted, by employing the individual strategy, the teacher’s guidance or peer assistance (Makino, 1993). In this study, only the researcher’s guidance is used to help the students who regularly ignore self-evaluation due to the belief that the final written product is perfect work.

Self-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance is adapted from the observation of Makino (1993), Sungtong et al. (2000), and Scott (1996). Firstly, Makino investigated the extent to which teacher guidance could help 62 Japanese college students correct their errors in EFL compositions. They were given the test of translating 23 Japanese sentences into English within one hour. The written data consisted of learner errors in 9 English grammatical morphemes, article, auxiliary, copula, regular past, irregular past, possessive, plural, progressive, and third person singular. Then, they were given three photocopies of
each of the answer sheets containing the teacher's cues to self-correct their writing. In the first copy, they were asked to identify their written errors on the sheets without the teacher guidance. In the second copy, they were asked to find the errors and correct them through 'x' marks in front of any ungrammatical sentences. The third copy was returned with teacher cues indicating whether the grammar errors had been made by underlining. They also had to correct their errors again. The findings showed that the students could use their linguistic competence to correct their written errors, even without the teacher cues. However, the teacher cues would enhance their ability in correcting their errors if they were used since they provided a chance to reflect on the structural form of their writing.

The study of Makino (1993) is considered because Thai students are more familiar with self-evaluating grammatical errors than other errors. Likewise, there are also the researcher's cues for the students' self-evaluation of grammatical errors in this study. For example, in narrative writing, past simple and past continuous tenses were focused on. In letter writing, only present simple tense was emphasized. However, the method of the researcher guidance is different from the method of Makino (1993). The students were reminded of such grammar points before the answers of each exercise were replied. Moreover, in the final activity of lesson 3 in the worksheet (Appendix B, pp.247-250 and pp.275-278), they were given flexible time to correct their grammar errors. In this way, the researcher would move from student to student for greater guidance on problems while correcting their work. Not only grammar points, but also other errors, such as vocabulary items, content according to the pictures, paragraph organization, and the letter form were criteria of self-evaluation guided by the researcher.
Besides linguistic and rhetorical elements, the researcher's guided questions are also the vital guidance for self-evaluation in this study. Such guided questions are adapted from the observation of Sungtong et al. (2000). Those questions relevant to this study are below:

(i) How long had your writing been finished?
(ii) To what extend had you improved your writing after evaluating the first draft?
(iii) What were problems on this process?
(iv) What were strengths and weaknesses of your writing?
(v) What strategies did you employ for further writing improvement?

The first three questions are straightforward for the students while the rest require the students' insight into their writing and the researcher's extensive help. Those questions were used in the final activity of lesson 3 (Appendix B, 247-250) in the worksheet of narrative and letter writing. Totally they will help the students self-evaluate their writing confidently and creatively.

Apart from guided questions, some aspects of self-evaluation with the teacher's guidance for communicative writing instruction suggested by Scott (1996) is finally considered. Firstly, the teacher could guide the individual students in describing various aspects of their writing, such as goal of the content, the audience, rhetorical strategies, and the role of the student writer. After this, they could judge those aspects. In this way, the teacher should negotiate with the students on setting the goal of the writing before evaluating it. Finally, they needed some guidance in selecting the kinds of revision that meet their needs, namely adding, modifying, deleting, rewording or reorganizing. This guidance is the process-writing based self-evaluation, but it is partly used in this study. In letter writing, the background information of the recipient was given in the worksheet and
test for the students' self-study, but communicative goal was continuously set down by the researcher. Moreover, in revision of content, the researcher guided the students in the strategy to build 'the impression' of their recipient. For example, in introductory paragraph, the student writers should express their friendly feelings. In ending letter, they should ask some general questions relevant to the background of themselves to their recipient, such as 'what is your school's name?' or 'what is your favorite food?', or they should provide some statements showing the friendship, such as 'Hopefully we will be pen-friend forever'.

The study of Makino (1993) on the teacher guidance on the Japanese students' self-correction of grammatical errors is used as a guideline for Thai students' self-evaluation of writing through grammar points, content, and paragraph organization. The guided questions of Soungtong et al. (2000) are the basic instrument used to lead the students to the process-based self-evaluation. Likewise, the suggestion of Scott (1996) on the communicative and process-based self-evaluation is partially used in this guided letter writing.

2.4.3 Peer Evaluation

As in self-evaluation, peer evaluation involves many relevant terms, such as peer-correction, peer-feedback, and pair correction. Only pair correction requires only two participants while the others require two or more than two participants. Peer-evaluation and self-evaluation aim to evaluate the values and limitations of the students' writing in order to be improved before being submitted. However, it differs from self-evaluation. Peer-evaluation required the individual student and his peers to be cooperative in assessing their writing. Each student could investigate how his peers view his writing for further
improvement. The peers could be authentic audiences for each other to comment on written work. This led to an intimate atmosphere as the peers understood each other’s problems (Fong, 1993). Hence, peer-evaluation will enrich the students’ writing improvement more than self-evaluation due to the nature of the learning process with more than two evaluators.

Peer-evaluation is used in this study because of the insufficient usage of self-evaluation and the teacher evaluation. Thai students ignore self-evaluation since they want to write as fast as possible and are not confident to individually assess their writing, even through the teacher guidance. Moreover, the teacher evaluation does not enhance the students’ communicative thinking of evaluation. Hence, peer-evaluation reflecting more the students’ intimacy than being alone or controlled by the teacher will be a better alternative evaluation method that can enrich the students’ writing improvement than self-evaluation and the teacher evaluation. This rationale reflects the view of Hongrittipun (1990). She discussed the benefits of peer-feedback in improving the students’ writing proficiency. She referred to Teo (1986) who investigated the effects of peer correction on Thai university students at King Mongkut Institute of Technology, Bangkok, through subsequent writing, as well as their ability to self-correct and their attitudes. Though the results did not show a significant effect of peer correction on improving the students’ subsequent writing, her study revealed a significantly greater effect of peer correction on reinforcing the learners’ ability to self-correction than teacher correction. This shows that ‘peer-evaluation’ should be employed in the EFL writing classroom in Thailand due to the betterment of the students’ self-evaluation than the teacher evaluation.
As in Hongrittipun (1990), Grabe et al. (1996) also reveals the benefit of peer-evaluation to the ESL/EFL writing classroom. Using peer-evaluation in this classroom led to changes in the role of the teacher. In the teacher-centred approach, the teacher was the audience and evaluator of the students’ writing. This stifled the teacher’s effectiveness of teaching writing because it was time-consuming and tiring to assess all the students’ written work. On the other hand, the learner-centred approach suited ‘peer-evaluation’ in the writing class. The peers became the audience and evaluator of writing, but the teacher helped the students with problems while they were peer evaluating writing or providing them with guidelines before peer-evaluation. Likewise, peer-evaluation in the guided writing approach is related to the learner-centred approach. The researcher plays more the role in the facilitator of the students’ peer-evaluation than the teacher evaluator.

Peer-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance has mainly been adapted from the suggestion of Fong (1993). She referred to Hafernìk (1983) that guidance should be given to students before they started evaluating their peer’s writing. Such guidance was: (i) the teacher should explain to the students clearly the reason for using peer-evaluation, (ii) he or she should give them activities which led to peer-evaluation exercises and specific guidelines to undertake it, and (iii) he or she should guide them to discuss their peers’ comments and suggestion, as well as rewrite their work based on them. Evidently, this guidance will enable the students to peer-evaluate written work efficiently.

In this study, the students seldom peer-evaluated written work through the teacher’s guidance. The researcher had thus explained to them the reason, specific guidance and the stages before conducting the actual peer-evaluation. In narrative writing, lesson 3, activity 2,
exercise 4 titled 'the announcement day of university entrance examination results' (Appendix B, pp.244-246), after the students had submitted their pair work on transparencies to the researcher, the researcher showed each pair’s work on overhead projector, and asked at least other two pairs to comment on a pair’s work through the researcher’s guidance and correction. Firstly, the reason for using peer-evaluation in this exercise was to enhance the students’ comment on their peers’ writing for further improvement. In this way, the researcher had motivated the students to be confident while commenting on other peers’ work through some statements, such as ‘the researcher would help everyone while he or she was commenting’, ‘there were no correct or incorrect comments’, ‘each pair could brainstorm for each other’, and ‘Thai language was allowed’. Secondly, specific guidance was the researcher’s guided questions, such as ‘do you think this writing provides the content in relation to each picture?’, ‘how about grammar points, spelling, linking devices, and paragraph organization of this writing?’, and ‘do you like this writing? and why?’. These simple questions are to prompt the students to think while reading one pair’s writing on the overhead. Besides, the stages were: (i) each pair had to comment on different statement with the same ideas, (ii) after 2-3 pairs had finished commenting on one pair’s work, the researcher asked the questions to this pair, such as ‘do you agree or disagree with your errors? and why?’ (iii) the researcher summarized strengths and weaknesses of this pair’s work, then asked one to rewrite into the worksheet for the researcher’s correction. Briefly, the main method of this peer-evaluation is the researcher’s guided questions that will widen the students’ views on written work of themselves and their peers, and will increase the class involvement.
The suggestion of Fong (1993) on conducting peer-evaluation with the teacher’s guidance helps the researcher guide the students through the reason and stages for using this method. This suggestion also includes the view of Grabe et al. (1996) on the role of the teacher as a facilitator, which is found in this study.

2.4.4 Analytical Marking Method

Peer-evaluation is the learner evaluation, but analytical marking method is the teacher evaluation. While the teacher is the facilitator of the students’ peer-evaluation, the researcher is the main evaluator marking the students’ writing analytically.

The concept of analytical marking method in this study is based on the observation of Astika (1993) and Mousavi (1999). It was a scoring method of a student’s composition depending on a marking scheme the evaluator or the teacher drew up. Such scheme involved analysis of component skills with each mark, and a student’s total score. Component skills were the vital part of the marking scheme. It was the separation of various features of a composition according to the appropriateness of the objectives of the writing part of the classroom. For example, content, logical development of ideas, organization, language use, grammar, vocabulary, and style were widely used as component skills in the ESL/EFL writing classroom. For this, the concept of analytical marking method is ‘how the students’ writing is separately graded through each composition skill’. In this study, content, vocabulary and grammar, organization and layout, spelling, and handwriting are the selected features of component skills. In this way, ‘the logical development of ideas’ can be assessed through ‘content’. Moreover, ‘language use
and style’ can be rated through ‘vocabulary and grammar, spelling, and handwriting’. Finally, organization is consistent with ‘layout’. Such features of this study have been adapted from the criteria used in the objectives of writing part of Fundamental English course for Grade 11 students in this school.

The various features of component skills of analytical marking method result in the detailed feedback of the students’ writing. After the students’ writing had been rated through this method, their marked performance was an indicator of which component skills they need to remedy (Heaton, 1988). In other words, such detailed feedback reflects strengths and weaknesses of each component skill of the students’ written performance in relation to the total mark. For example, their writing may show the effective content component, but ineffective paragraph organization. Similarly, Astika (1993) viewed that this method could show in which component skills used in certain writing task the student had the greater performance than other skills. She thus employed this technique to assess 210 foreign undergraduates at the University of Hawaii. This assessment was based on the component skills of the ESL composition profile with different weighted points, content (30 points), organization (20 points), vocabulary (20 points), language use (25 points), and mechanics (5 points). The results showed that their vocabulary skill was better than other skills. Hence, the component skill with the maximum weighted points does not reflect on the students’ writing ability of such skill. The benefits of analytical marking method observed by Heaton (1988) and Astika (1993) are considered. This method is appropriate to Thai students with English incompetence. Their written performance may reflect all weak skills, so the remedy can be conducted through the detailed feedback of this method.
Using analytical marking method, the teacher must concentrate on each composition skill of the students’ writing, not looking at the whole written text, especially communicative goal. This shortcoming can be overcome by employing ‘impressionistic marking method’ as a supplementary method. In this way, Chitravelu et al. (1995) suggested a combination of the impressionistic and analytical marking methods. Firstly, the rater started with reading the composition quickly and gives it overall mark. Then, she read it more slowly to award marks for each component skill. Next, she compared the marks given impressionistically with those given analytically. She could use the second marking to adjust her first impression or adjust the mark she had given to each component part in her second marking in order to maintain her impressionistic mark. She had to remember that the mark she gave had to truly reflect the students’ actual writing performance. Indeed, this procedure is rather time-consuming and troublesome if a teacher has to mark 100-200 scripts. However, it will help the teacher deeply understand the factors of weak skills of the students’ writing. In this study, there are only 20 students. Only narrative and letter writing tasks in the final activity of lesson 3 in the worksheet and in the test were marked through this method. Firstly, impressionistic marking method was used in pre-writing and actual writing stage generally. The researcher marked the students’ writing in his mind. Then, he read the students’ writing slowly to be marked analytically. The total mark from analytical method would be the main mark due to the aim of this study; impressionistic marking method will help the researcher assess the students’ writing thoroughly.

The final drawback of analytical marking method is being subjective. Though Heaton (1988) viewed that component skills of this method provided the detailed feedback of the students’ writing, he also said such component skills as criteria were drawn up
according to the individual rater's decision, not the standard component skills for certain levels of students. For example, at the elementary level, the rater might be more interested in grammar and vocabulary as criteria than fluency, so she decided to omit fluency as one if important component skills though it was also important. On the one hand, the standard total score and component skills were used in this study. The total score was set up according to that of the writing part in the final exam paper of Fundamental English course for Grade 11 students of this school; 10 marks. The component skills were adapted from the ESL composition profile in the Malaysian context. The weighted scoring points were reasonable: vocabulary and grammar (3 marks), content (3 marks), organization and layout (2 marks), spelling (1 mark), and handwriting (1 mark). They contained content, linguistic and rhetorical elements. Hence, analytical marking method of this study is not subjective.

The observation of Mousavi (1999) and Astika (1993) on the description and usage of analytical marking method is used to structure the analytical marking method form, the scoring of the test in this study. Besides, the procedure of marking the students' writing analytically and impressionistically is adapted from the suggestion of Chitravelu et al. (1995). In fact, this procedure is appropriate for only the small classroom as in this study.

In this study, self-evaluation, peer-evaluation and analytical marking method are the main evaluation methods used to achieve the on-going assessment approach for the quality of the students' guided writing.
2.5 Conclusion

All approaches, methods and techniques discussed have been utilized in the guided writing classroom. Firstly, the grammar translation method is used in bilingual instruction since Thai students have limited aural-oral skills in English. It is also found in sentence and vocabulary practice since the students need ‘accuracy and fluency’ before writing paragraphs. Then, the communicative approach is used to teach the letter writing due to the concept of authentic audience and communicative purpose of writing skills in cooperation with other language skills. Next, the guided writing approach is used as the main implementation of the guided writing material design and instruction due to the concept of ‘levels of guidance’ that intends to develop the students’ cognitive skills through linguistic guidance. Later, the product approach is found in pre and actual writing stages in the worksheet and test since those stages are a kind of guidance that is more suitable for the EFL students’ writing ability than ‘post-writing stage’. In this way, the model approach is used to familiarize the students with what the final product should be since it provides activities about reading, thinking, and analyzing for ‘writing’. Thai students whose reading skills are better than other skills are suitable for this approach. Besides, the outline approach providing the frame that requires the students’ thinking skills is used to enable the students to be a good planner who can expand the main points to detail written work.

For the techniques, copying is the easiest activity requiring ‘accuracy’, so it is used in warm-up activity of the two tasks to motivate the students to learn other activities. Later, partial dictation is the modern dictation that reading skills can assist the students’ aural-writing skills, thus it is found in letter writing, activity 2, lesson 2 (Appendix B, p.269).
Moreover, a series of pictures is the visual guidance with cultural content, and is the requirement of the English syllabus of this school, so it is used as the main guidance in narrative writing.

For the evaluation approach and methods, on-going assessment provides the dynamic classroom evaluation and the progress of the teacher and learners, so it is used as one of methods in answering the research question 2 ‘what problems do the learners face while using guided writing activities?’. Self-evaluation provides the students’ self-awareness of writing improvement and is ignored by them, thus it is used with the researcher’s guidance in every activity. Peer-evaluation reflects the practice of critical thinking process for writing improvement with an intimate atmosphere, and has seldom been used by the students, so it is used with the researcher’s guided questions. Since analytical marking method provides the detailed feedback of each component skill of the students’ writing and it is a new evaluation method for this school, it is used as the main scoring method of the students’ guided narrative and letter writing in the worksheet and test.

On the other hand, there are some relevant approaches that have not been discussed. The content approach, a part of the product approach, reflects that guidance in ‘content’ has been provided in choices of language and ideas in the guided writing approach. Moreover, the process approach, especially post writing stage, is complicated for the EFL secondary students, but it is partially found in peer-evaluation.