3.0 Overview

This chapter is an explanation of the procedures used in this study. It provides the background information of the data source and the subjects, and clarification of sampling method, instrumentation, and data collection.

3.1 Data Source and Sampling Method

The background of the school as data source is provided below. The English teachers and the students as subjects have been described in relation to sampling methods.

3.1.1 Background of the School

The school used as data source was Thayaiwittaya school. It is a typical Islamic private school in Southern Thailand, similar to other approximately 100 schools. It is representative of the EFL classroom in Thailand because the same techniques are utilized by all EFL teachers in Thailand, irrespective of whether the schools are private or government. The school is located in 157/4 M.3, Khuanlang, Hat Yai, 90110 Songkhla. It is controlled by Institute of Private Education Committee, Ministry of Education. In 2002, it consisted of 815 students with an equal ratio of male and female students, 38 teachers and 2 administrative members of staff. It contained 21 classes, 11 ones for the lower secondary
level and 10 for the upper secondary level. The average rate of its students per class was thus approximately 39 pupils. It required the students to study 9 periods per day. Its teachers comprised 18 males and 20 females. It required each one to teach between 22-29 periods per a week.

Its recent curriculum involved the integration of Islamic and secular education. In terms of English, though the syllabus is used according to the Thai Ministry of Education’s requirement, its intensity is different due to the school curriculum’s adaptation. At the lower secondary level, there is less focus on English courses. The students are required to learn only one Fundamental English course with 2.00 credits through 4 periods, without any English elective course. At the upper secondary level, the Science stream students were also required to learn only one Fundamental English course with 2.00 credits of 4 periods. However, the Arts stream students had more English periods. They were required to take at least 2 English courses, Fundamental English and Intensive English courses, and they could choose another one namely English for English Concentration courses as an elective course every semester. Besides, all students were facilitated by language laboratory and the satellite for distance education from Klikangwon School, Phetburi, Thailand.

3.1.2 Background of the English Teachers

This school consists of four English language teachers. But only three teachers at the upper secondary level were chosen since the remaining one was teaching only at the lower secondary level. The selected English language teachers’ general background information is shown through the following table and discussion:
Table 3.1: Background Information of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Teacher</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Class Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Highest Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Professional Teaching Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Teaching of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Teaching certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Teaching certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 3.1, two of these three English teachers at Grade 10 were also teaching the lower secondary students. The difference between three teachers' teaching experience helps enrich cooperation among them. Though only one obtained the Bachelor of Arts in the teaching of English, the rest are qualified teachers with teaching certificate.

3.1.3 Background of the Students

Twenty of the 123 Grade 11 students of three classes were randomly selected by the researcher through their teacher advisors' assistance in relation to four criteria: both sexes were aged 16-18, studying in Science or Arts streams, possessed Grade 3.00 or 4.00 in the Fundamental English course, and were willing to participate in this research. These sampling methods were shown through their tables and explanation.

Table 3.2: The Sampling Methods of the Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Number of the Whole Students/Gender</th>
<th>Streams</th>
<th>Total Number/ Gender of Selected Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on Table 3.2, both sexes were selected to avoid gender bias, but there were more females than males, that is, the former totaled 14 pupils and the latter only 6. Moreover, though the total number of the two streams of students was equal, namely 10 pupils, there were more Science than Arts students if the individual classes are considered, 3 of 5/1, 7 of 5/2, and 10 of 5/3. This was because the students at 5/3, being more proficient than students in other classes at Grade 11, were due to sit for their placement test of Science, Mathematics and English at Grade 10 before being selected for the Science stream.

Table 3.3: Gender of the Students per Grades Obtained in the Fundamental English Course (2.0 Credits) between Grades 10-11 (3 semesters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Students</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade Obtained</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semester 1/2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 3.00 2.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>√    -    -    -</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-    √    -    -</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8    9    3    0</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 provided data on the Grade Point Average (GPA) of the subjects over the Fundamental English course of 3 semesters, namely semester 1/2000, semester 2/2000, and
semester 1/2001. The total CGPA of those students was 2.79 which reflected a moderate proficiency in the Fundamental English course. Moreover, for the average GPA for all 3 semesters, none of them obtained 4.00 GPA. Apparently, female students' grades were better than male students' grades. In total, they had also obtained grade 2.00. However, only one male student with grade 1.00 could be the subject because sampling students who had obtained only grade 2.00-4.00 was more difficult.

Furthermore, those students were willing to participate in this research. They wanted to improve their English competence before learning at Grade 12 and taking the University Entrance Examination.

3.2 Instrumentation

The instruments are lesson plans and worksheets, achievement test, scoring of the test namely analytical marking method, pilot interview, on-going assessment, the researcher's file for note-taking of observation and interview, naturalistic observation, teachers' questionnaire, and students' interview.

3.2.1 Lesson Plans and Worksheets (Appendix B)

Lesson plans and worksheets are the most important instruments that aim to teach the students guided narrative writing and pen-friend letter tasks. They were divided into three lessons for each task since the researcher could investigate the students' writing development to effectively train them in guided writing activities and systematically grade
them, and the students could reveal their level of fluency through writing. All six lessons contained time available, aims, skills, topics, the students' previous knowledge, material and teaching aids, and procedures consisting of presentation, practice, production, and evaluation. While both the lesson plans and worksheets were held by the researcher in the classroom, only the worksheets were distributed to all students. The worksheets were the main documents, showing the effect of the students' guided writing performance. Structurally, they contained names of activities, levels of guidance, aims, and instruction.

All steps in designing lesson plans and worksheets were revealed. Firstly, the recently introduced English syllabus for the upper secondary level was examined by considering objectives, principles and aspects of writing tasks and activities, and course evaluation. Secondly, aspects of instructions for writing in the Fundamental English course for Grade 11 was explored through supplementary books and the English teachers. Thirdly, the writing tasks in the exam paper of this course were evaluated to ascertain the possible problems faced by the students. Fourthly, narrative writing and pen-friend letter were chosen to be guided writing tasks. Next, theory and practice of guided writing activities were explored from the books in Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore. Then, the lesson plans and worksheets for two types of guided writing were designed with new material in relation to the students' communicative use and cultural background. Finally, six lesson plans and worksheets were submitted for approval of supervisor.
Structure of Lesson Plans and Worksheets

The structure of lesson plans and worksheets consists of four main aspects, namely general contents and time allocation, warm-up activities, pre-writing activities, and actual writing activities.

In general, six lessons of two guided writing tasks were structured through their identical contents and equal time. Seven periods, namely 1 period per 50 minutes were allocated for narrative writing, and eight periods for letter writing. For narrative writing, lesson 1 covered 2 periods and contained vocabulary expression, revision of grammar, and events sequencing. Lesson 2, consisted of vocabulary expression and mechanics of writing through 2 periods. Lesson 3 with 3 periods was focused on a series of pictures as guided writing activities. For letter writing, lesson 1 focused on getting ideas and revision of grammar, punctuation, linking devices, and short paragraph, all of which required 3 periods. Lesson 2 with 2 periods was focused on vocabulary items used in the form of friendly letter and getting students to become familiar with a model of pen-friend letter. Lesson 3 was based on 3 periods of guided writing activities at different levels of guidance.

Similarly, all lessons began with warm-up activities based on different functions. For narrative writing, though lesson 1 started with a normal greeting, it enabled the students to do spoken and written expression of idea encouraged by the teacher researcher. Then, lesson 2 focused on discussing the students' previous work in the last lesson so that they themselves could assess their work before practising other activities of lesson 2. In addition, revising their memory on the topics of lessons 1-2 was the function of lesson 3.
This encouraged them to use their previous knowledge to link the new accounts of various activities to be effectively trained. For the letter writing, lesson 1 focused on getting ideas through spoken communication and copy of a list of words. Moreover, though lesson 2 also emphasized on recognizing their previous work, it bridged their basic skill and the anonymous text based on the same topic and enabled them to use reading comprehension. Besides, lesson 3 also involved narrative writing, and thus by falling back on lessons 1-2 they could solve their writing problems.

Based on the product approach, six lessons were categorized into pre-writing, namely lessons 1-2 and actual writing activities, namely lesson 3. Pre-writing activities of narrative writing in two lessons functioned to strengthen the students’ writing abilities, from the level of words to short paragraphs. In lesson 1, activity 2 entitled ‘The Researcher’s Story’ focused on understanding a part of the researcher’s real life through reading comprehension, word identification and past simple tense usage. Then, note 1 ‘Linking Devices of the Researcher’s Story’ and note 2 ‘Structure of the Story’ could enable them to understand the reading text’s paragraph organization. Next, in activity 3 class composition was an exercise for their brainstorming skill for writing a new story in which the topic was chosen by them and the researcher’s story was used as a model. In lesson 2, based on their previous class composition, activity 2 ‘linking devices for paragraph’ enhanced their insight into how to write a coherent paragraph. Later, the exercises in lesson 3 namely on vocabulary practice or cloze passage with lexical and non-lexical choices aimed to develop their vocabulary strategy in word identification, to enable them to create appropriate vocabulary items without dictionary use, to experience contents of narrative writing based on the same frame of the topic namely ‘the special days in my
memory", and to point out paragraph organization of the story.

Two lessons on letter writing were meant to enrich the students' experiences in writing a paragraph that was a part of the content of the whole letter, namely 'My Hobbies or Interests'. In lesson 1, activity 2 'informal writing' required them to start practising an informal short paragraph as a whole class work initiated by the researcher. Then, note 1 about 'subject-verb agreement, linking devices, and punctuation' was on mechanics of writing with various examples, based on their previous knowledge. Moreover, activity 3 'group practice' was a continuation of activity 2, whole class short paragraph in which the shared contents and sentence structures in the first and second draft were further refined through peer-correction and the researcher's help. In lesson 2, the topic 'my hobbies' was still important for activity 2 'revision of anonymous informal texts'. It examined the students' linguistic competence in correcting the ungrammatical texts, extracts from the whole letter, with varied styles. From the group work of activity 2, the students were led to self-access learning exercise of activity 3 'introducing the form of friendly letter'. In this way, they learnt new vocabulary for this letter form to start writing a pen-friend letter. Note 2 'the sections of the form of friendly letter' explained in detail was to help them understand the use of this letter form. Besides, activity 4 'the model of pen-friend letter' required them to explore the content of each paragraph and be familiar with the correct form of the actual letter.

Actual writing activities of two tasks were more intensively and practically structured than pre-writing activities. They consisted of a lot of significant writing activities and exercise with level of content, lexical and syntactical guidance. They also exhibited
linking of the students’ perception of all pre-writing activities.

Activity 2 of narrative writing, namely guided writing activities, contained four distinctive exercises guided through a series of pictures created by the researcher. Such exercises were to strengthen the learners’ skill in writing a coherent paragraph of the story through pair work while gradually increasing the degree of difficulty.

Exercise 1 ‘Sonram’s Happy New Year Day’ was sentence combination and paragraph organization based on almost controlled and substantial guidance with syntactical choices. The story was explained through pictures and separable sentences surrounded by linking devices. Then, exercise 2 titled ‘On Mother’s Day’ with picture arrangement and paragraph organization with substantial guidance of syntax choices. Understanding an explanation of each picture and appropriately using given phrases and linking devices to organize a coherent paragraph were strategies to achieve this exercise. Exercise 3 entitled ‘My Holiday at the Beach’ was vocabulary practice, which carried substantial guidance with lexical choices. It aimed at creating vocabulary items for each blank in relation to its picture content. Later, exercise 4 ‘the Announcement Day of University Entrance Examination Results’ was oral composition and follow-up paragraph writing, filled with some guidance of lexical and syntactical choices. Though the degree of difficulty appeared in the rest of paragraph, this exercise’s familiar content concerning the upper secondary Thai learners’ life could help them.

Activity 3 ‘written production’ was constructed through little guidance with lexical and syntactical choices. It aimed to individually enable the learners to produce an in-depth
story, from planning the story from the pictures in pre-writing stage, and choosing linking devices to write a whole paragraph. This activity represented the rest of each activity in 3 lessons; it showed the extent to which students could write a narrative well.

For letter writing, activity 2 contained four exercises. As in narrative writing, such exercises were meant to train the learners in detailed content and styles of letter writing texts to cope with the written production of activity 3. Exercise 1 ‘Sentence Arrangement’, in which there was almost controlled level of guidance in content and sentence patterns had been done, challenged the learners’ strategy in organizing disordered content and sentences for each paragraph of letter form. Moreover, the dictation of exercise 2, guided through controlled level of content and structures, was to train their aural skill in identifying the letter’s missing content, read by the researcher. Then, exercise 3 titled ‘Survey of Yourself’ containing some guidance, contained the main contents of letter based on simple questions about the learners’ personal information. Furthermore, with substantial guidance, exercise 4 required filling the missing words, phrases, and sentence according to the learners’ information collected in exercise 3 and some additional contents in the blanks. This could also be another model of this letter. Finally, in activity 3 there was ‘written production’ with little guidance of content and the learners were provided details on 20 different recipients, such as their address age, gender, and hobbies. Each learner was provided with one recipient through guided content of 5 paragraphs.
3.2.2 Achievement Test (Appendix C)

The achievement test is aimed to measure the students' guided narrative and letter writing ability. It was designed in three steps. Firstly, the previous exam paper of the Fundamental English course for Grade 11 of this school, as well as objectives, test content, and scoring of the test, were explored. Then, theory of achievement test, especially of testing writing skills, was studied. Finally, the actual test of two guided writing tasks was designed with some guidance.

Description of Achievement Test

The achievement test was described through three aspects of its components, namely rubrics, part one and part two. Rubrics of the test were the first part namely the head and instruction. Firstly, head of paper contained the source of test construction, name-class-date, so that the students could differentiate this new test from their previous exam paper. Then, the instructions of the test were divided into two parts, the main instructions and instructions for each part. The former was structured with five items namely two guided writing tasks with their topic framed, scoring of the test, time allocation, and steps for submission. The latter was made up of separate parts for each task. Instructions for narrative writing appeared in six items, namely provision of title, activities, and some guidance, structure of story, and submission steps. As in former task, letter writing instructions comprised only four items with some guidance and activities.
Part One was to measure the students' narrative writing ability. A series of pictures titled 'my final examination day' was created by the researcher according to its topic frame in the worksheet, that is, 'the special days in my memory', and to the students' prior experience. They were asked to outline their ideas in the pre-writing stage before writing the actual paragraph. Guidance was in the form of the speech bubbles in each picture and vocabulary items with Thai meanings indicating their parts of speech. They were reminded of linking devices, and four aspects of structure of the story before writing the whole paragraph. Besides, self-evaluation was suggested.

Part Two required the students to write the letter in the correct form through guided content. This part was constructed according to the last activity of lesson 3, titled 'written production', and provided the background information of the specially written pen-friend; name, address, gender, and hobbies. The previous guided contents were provided with certain five short paragraphs, namely introductory paragraph and content paragraphs on topics, such as introducing yourself and your school subjects, your family, your hobbies, and ending your letter. As in narrative writing, the following pre and actual writing stage, and self-evaluation were required.

3.2.3 Scoring of the Test

3.2.3.1 Analytical Marking Method (Appendix D)

Analytical marking method was considered a useful instrument since it provided the students with feedback on how well they were getting on in the development of their
writing skills. The students' total scores were achieved by the additional scores obtained on component skills. In this study, it was structured in a separate form of lesson plans and worksheets, and the achievement test. It contained two parts, scheme of test scoring and a description of band and score. The scheme of test scoring was divided into three parts in the same table, namely component skills, total marks, and candidate's score. Beneath this table, the total score was calculated.

Each component skill carried a separate mark. The total mark of this study was of the actual score of each writing task in the previous exam paper of the Fundamental English course for Grade 11, each task being allocated a total of 10 marks. Hence, 10 marks were divided into 5 parts according to each component skill's weight. Weighting each mark for each component skill was conducted through the adaptation of ESL composition's analytical marking method (Chitravelu et al, 1995), 1 mark for handwriting, 3 marks for vocabulary and grammar, 1 for spelling, 2 for organization and layout, and 3 for content.

Rating the student's score depended on a description of band and score. This description was conducted through different ranges of marks of and detailed explanation of writing feedback. Such ranges are as following: handwriting (0-1), vocabulary and grammar (1-3), spelling, organization and layout (0.5-2), and content (1-3). Explanations for each mark were of the degree of strengths and weaknesses of each student's writing performance.
3.2.4 Pilot Interview (Appendix E)

A semi-structured pilot interview was conducted, which aimed to gather the English teachers’ feedback on the lesson plans and worksheets in relation to the students’ needs before they were used in the classroom. Those teachers were interviewed in English through the researcher’s note-taking and tape-recording.

Pilot interview was designed to gather feedback on many areas. Firstly, feedback regarding the Grade 11 English textbook used in Thayaiwittaya School was gathered. Then, the researcher studied literature on materials and methods in ELT, teaching ESL/EFL writing, research methods in language learning, particular instrumentation of semi-structured interview and pilot study. Secondly, the aspects surrounding the lesson plans and worksheets, especially with regard to students themselves, and teaching methods were studied in detail. Thirdly, the aspects which needed to be explored were selected. Later, questions were designed for a draft pilot interview, using the content from the chosen aspects. Finally, the pilot interview questions were submitted for approval of the supervisor.

Description of Pilot Interview

Pilot interview consisting of two parts, the teachers’ opinions concerning the textbook used at Grade 11 and others at upper secondary level, and the teachers’ comments on lesson plans and worksheets, and achievement test, is described as follows:
Part One aimed to assess the teachers' opinions on the usefulness of the textbooks in terms of the English instruction and functions in solving problems of writing instruction. It was divided into three sections. Section A entitled 'General Opinions Concerning the Textbook' was made up of four questions, mainly the teachers' opinions of the internal and external elements of the textbook, its contribution of lesson plans, its pedagogical exploitation, and its appropriateness for the students' English proficiency. Section B entitled 'Scope for Writing Instruction' contained five questions. Those aimed to assess the teachers' opinions on the usefulness of the textbook for writing instruction, such as its adaptation for general writing tasks, problems and solutions of the teacher's teaching and the students' learning of writing skills. Section C entitled 'Scope for Narrative Writing and Friendly Letter Tasks', was to elicit the teachers' problems in writing instructions for those two tasks through the textbooks. It contained three questions. The first question was to identify their actual problems in approaches, methods, techniques, and evaluation. The second question required them to exemplify some exercises involving two tasks in the textbooks difficult for the students. The third question aimed to elicit their opinions on alternative guided writing materials presented as a solution in items 1-2.

Part Two was to elicit the teachers' feedback on the guided writing material. It contained four sections. Section A entitled 'Learner Factors' examined various learner factors influencing the outcome of two tasks. The learner elements include their internal and external traits, and their confidence, prior learning experience, and previous cultural knowledge used for task completion. Section B namely 'Aims of 6 Lesson Plans', had one question that aimed to confirm whether the aims of two tasks were similar to any objectives of the Fundamental English course. Section C, the 'Content of Task factor', contained six
questions that aimed to investigate contents of two tasks in terms of suitability to the
learners knowledge and language use, socio-cultural bias, interest toward texts and pictures,
the topics, relevance, coherence, organization, and the range of guided writing. Section D
titled 'Methodology Factor' consisted of 17 questions. It functioned to clarify
methodological aspects behind two tasks and concerning the learners, such as activities,
exercises, instruction, teaching-learning techniques, teaching aids, time allocation, variety,
enjoyment, organization of lessons, authenticity, researcher-students relationship, and
evaluation.

3.2.5 On-Going Assessment

On-going assessment was conducted by the researcher while teaching the learners
guided writing activities. This was to monitor their progress while practising two tasks and
to diagnose their learning problems for immediate remedy. On-going assessment was
different from other instruments in that it needed to be designed as an actually separable
form. But, it was instrumented as one of the evaluation procedures. It took the form of field
-notes in the researcher's file. It appeared as the researcher's observation of the learners’
behaviors. This procedure emerged while the researcher was grading the learners after
every activity by checking their writing performance, and asking questions about
continuous problems by moving from group to group, pair to pair, and one by one for
assistance in solution, especially by explaining to them some difficult issues. After this, the
field notes on each of the students and the activity were recorded in the researcher's file.
3.2.6 The Researcher’s File for Taking Notes

It is the file used by the researcher to assess the steps of data collection, namely observing detailed activities of two tasks in lesson plans and worksheets, and collecting data from pilot interview and on-going assessment through his observation and note-taking. Aspects for observation were, for example, cooperation between the researcher and students and the students and students, effectiveness and ineffectiveness of each teaching procedure, classroom circumstance, and problems the students faced while using guided writing and the extent he could solve such problems. Observing was done all the time while teaching was in progress. However, the researcher was able to take notes of needed data while the students were performing activities in the classroom. Then, he could make notes after the class in this file. For pilot interview, while the researcher was interviewing the teachers through tape-recording, he also took some notes of some issues to be adapted in six lessons in the file. Since it was designed as a special instrument for only the researcher for conducting every step of procedures planned in data collection and lesson plans, its actual form could not be shown.

3.2.7 Naturalistic Observation Form (Appendix F)

Naturalistic observation represented naturally occurring phenomenon of classroom setting and interaction between the researcher and the learners through the observers’ views. This form was used by three observers, namely three English teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of the material taught by the researcher.
It was designed in four steps. Firstly, literature on principles of classroom observation methods and naturalistic observation in Research Methods in Language Learning, and some literature on English Teacher Training Education were studied. Then, approved lesson plans were selected with worksheets reflecting main features of classroom events. Next, a draft naturalistic observation form was designed covering selected main features from lesson plans and worksheets and according to functions of naturalistic observation methods. Finally, the actual naturalistic observation form was submitted for approval of the supervisor.

**Structure of Naturalistic Observation Form**

This form was structured through four columns, items, criterion for observation, effectiveness, and ineffectiveness. There were 17 items with varied criterion. Both effective and ineffective parts required the observers to make comments. Such criterion covered pedagogical methods regarding guided writing tasks. Based on roles of the researcher and students, all 17 criteria were constructed in three categories, the researcher, the students, and the researcher-students.

In terms of explicit role of the researcher, criteria covered in seven aspects. The first aspect, organization of the class was to generalize the extent the researcher could open, structure, and close the class well. The second aspect, the researcher’s time management conveyed how well he could handle the time for each activity. The third aspect, organization of learning group indicated his strategy in organizing learning groups in each activity. The fourth aspect, assigning tasks showed how he assigned each activity to his
students. The fifth aspect, the researcher’s explanation exhibited how well he explained the vocabulary items, content, grammar points, linking devices, punctuation, pictures, and texts to the students. It also included his supervision of his students when they faced problems. The sixth aspect, the researcher’s action zone was to prove the extent to which students were encouraged by the researcher more efficiently than others. Finally, the language used by the researcher was investigating the extent of his usage of Thai and English, and extent of code-switching.

For the apparent roles of the students, the criteria contained four aspects. The first aspect, the students’ performance on a task was to assess their strategies, procedures, and interaction patterns in completing a given task. The students’ time-on task then concerned the extent to which students, individual, pairs, and groups, could actively complete tasks on time. The next criterion was the students’ performance during pair work, focusing on the way they completed it, their response and their type of language use. Their group work was the last one, making comparison of their English and Thai use, their time-on-task manipulation, and the type of interaction.

The criterion of balancing the roles between the researcher and students consisted of six perspectives. Firstly, the researcher’s questions and the students’ responses aimed to discover the way the students responded to the researcher’s ones, and the way the researcher reinforced their answers. Then, under ‘classroom interaction’ the focus was on the researcher and the students’ interaction patterns, and student-student interaction patterns. Next, ‘new teaching activity’ was to look at classroom performance during a new activity. Later, ‘the use of teaching aids’ was to examine the researcher and students’
competence in using the worksheets, overhead projector and transparency, and whiteboard to provide this instruction. Besides, 'evaluation' emphasized how the researcher graded the students through each activity, how he assessed their written work in last activity, and how they did peer-evaluation. Finally, there was another criterion, 'other issues or your comments' to enable the observers to suggest other factors beyond those criteria which are feedback of guided writing.

3.2.8 Teachers’ Questionnaire (Appendix G)

The teachers' questionnaire focused on obtaining the teachers' suggestions and feedback after observing the classroom to improve guided writing activities and to compare between this material and their previous one. Designing the teachers' questionnaire required a study of issues surrounding suggestions and feedback of lesson plans, especially with regard to the teaching methods, selection of the pieces of information or aspects which needed to be explored, and design of a draft questionnaire, using the content from the chosen aspects.

**Structure and Use of Teachers’ Questionnaire**

The teachers’ questionnaire consisted of two parts, based on only English questions which were mainly checklist and open-ended questions. Part one involved background information about experience and methodology in teaching English and problems faced in teaching written English. It aimed to ascertain the English teachers’ teaching experience regarding writing instruction. It comprised 4 sections.
Section A, ‘Background Information’, elicited personal information needed to provide details relevant for sampling methods. It contained five items, class, gender, years of teaching English, highest academic qualification, and the professional teaching qualification. They were asked to fill in the blanks and tick in the boxes.

Section B namely ‘Methods and Techniques of teaching English’ aimed to ascertain the types of activities, exercises, and techniques used in this study. It included one item, namely ‘In your classroom, did you use the following English language activities?’ with 12 checklist items in the box, namely (1) warm-up activity, (2) students working in whole class, small group, and pair, (3) language game, (4) students’ oral presentation, (5) cloze exercise, (6) exercises in controlled and guided writing, (7) students reading aloud, (8) using pictures and other real world texts, (9) vocabulary development, (10) self-access learning, (11) student self-discovery of errors, and (12) others which required the teacher to specify.

Section C namely ‘Evaluation’ was to survey the teachers’ evaluation methods used in this study. It also had a structured item, namely ‘How can you assess your students’ tasks, homework, and assignments?’. This item had the following boxes: self-evaluation, peer-evaluation, on-going assessment, impressionistic marking method, and analytical marking method. Besides, it included an open-ended question: ‘others’ which required the teachers to specify what they meant. They could include more than one feature here.

Section D, ‘Problems in Teaching of Written English’ was to ascertain the teachers’ perception on instruction of general writing through their own methods and solutions. It
consisted of a checklist item with yes-no answer and three open-ended ones. The former was 'Have you attended any course in teaching of writing?'. The latter focused on discussion of causes of problems and real problems of writing instruction faced by the teacher and learners, and the teacher's solution of such problems; 'What are the main problems you faced when teaching written English? Why?, 'In your opinion, what are the main problems your students encounter while learning and practising written English? Why?', and 'Before your students were taught guided writing, how did you solve the problems encountered by your learners when learning of writing skills.}

Part Two titled 'Suggestions and Feedback on Guided Writing Activities' focused on the findings of the questionnaire. It aimed to glean the teachers' opinions on guided writing after their observation. It consisted of 4 items. Item 1, namely 'From your observation of six lessons, what suggestions or feedback would you like to provide in order to improve guided writing activities?'. This was to elicit the teachers' views on assessment of guided narrative writing and letter tasks for further improvement. Item 2 was 'Please compare this new material of guided writing activities with those two writing tasks based on the teachers' own material and textbook in this classroom and others at this level?'. This was to identify similarities and differences between the old and new materials. Item 3, 'Please compare this achievement test and your final exam paper which contained these two tasks' was to ascertain similarities and differences between two tests of the students' writing performance. Item 4, 'In your opinion, do you accept this new material as a part of lessons in this classroom and others at this level?' aimed to ascertain whether the teachers accepted the new material and their reasons for doing so.
3.2.9 Students’ Interview (Appendix H)

Students’ interview focused on five representatives of the students’ problems faced while using guided writing activities and this was to improve the new material.

Description and Use of Students Interview

This interview consisted of 4 question items. All questions also comprised various questions due to the interview’s flexibility. Item 1 titled ‘Before you used guided writing activities, what problems did you face while doing writing tasks, activities, exercises, and assignment in class and outside the classroom?’ This aimed to investigate the nature of the students’ problems in written English before the research was done. Their proposed problems as guided answers covered components of writing skills. These are: (i) difficulty of language and content, (ii) mechanics of writing, (iii) paragraph organization, (iv) their prior knowledge in content and language, (v) their teachers’ teaching methods, (vi) learning process of first and foreign languages, (vii) cultural background of writing texts, namely ‘misunderstanding of examples and models of writing tasks based on non-Thai culture, and, and (viii) error correction.

Item 2, ‘How could you solve your writing problems?’ was to elicit the students’ solution strategies of writing problems in item 1. The alternative answers were themselves, their friends, the teachers, and supplementary books. Item 3 titled ‘While you were using guided writing activities of two tasks, what problems did you face from lessons 1-3?’ was to identify their actual problems during the use of guided writing tasks. The problems also
included methods and techniques used in lessons, as well as negative attitudes toward the researcher's teaching method and techniques, time allocation of each activity and exercise, need for guidance, whole class, small group, pair and individual work, and the observer. Item 4 titled 'While performing the achievement test, what were your problems?' aimed at identifying their problems during the test-taking. Alternative answers they could tick consisted of 'difficulty of language', 'content and picture', 'level of guidance', 'excitement', 'readiness', 'instruction', and 'time allocation'.

Before this interview was used, five representatives of 20 students were chosen by the researcher, after they had completed the achievement test. They were selected through five criteria. Firstly, the representatives had to be the students of 5/1, 5/2, and 5/3. Secondly, they had been active participants, based on the researcher's observation and notes since the first period of lesson 1. Thirdly, they had exposure to ask the questions in each activity in Thai and English. Fourthly, they showed good progress in their writing for each activity. Finally, they were willing to be interviewed and accepted by the rest of students. When, being interviewed, such subject was asked to answer the prepared questions flexibly through the guided answers of each item and the researcher's assistance in Thai in order to express their ideas fully and discuss with the researcher meaningfully. All interviews were audio-taped.
3.3 Data Collection

Data collection including administration of instruments and experimental procedures contained various stages. Firstly, the researcher had obtained permission from the school administrator to conduct the research study, in which the students, the English teachers, classrooms, the meeting room, and the teaching aids were involved.

Then, advisors of Grade 11 students of 3 classes were asked to select 20 students out of 123 in relation to the qualifications given. After this, 3 English teachers at the upper secondary level were approached at their offices to partake in this research, in granting the researcher’s experiment through pilot interview, naturalistic observation, and questionnaire for 3 weeks based on their independent teaching periods and weekend. In this respect, six lesson plans and worksheets, and achievement test had been administered to them to be studied before the pilot interview was conducted. Then, 20 selected students talked to the researcher at the meeting room. They were requested to devote their independent learning periods and weekend to participate in this research through learning, practising, and producing two guided writing tasks they have been learning in the Fundamental English course in this semester. They were also told the advantages they could gain through this study.

Pilot interview was conducted at the beginning of the second week. Those teachers were interviewed to ascertain their criticism and evaluation of this material. All interviews were face-to-face and audio-taped in the language laboratory. Each teacher spent 2 hours in being interviewed. After having been told the questions, they were provided some time to
think and to check the material given. The researcher also took notes on this material in his file while recording all interviews. After recording features that needed to be changed in six lessons, the researcher conducted material adaptation according to the teachers’ comments and suggestions, and the appropriateness of material for this study.

Before the students were taught this adapted material, they had been asked to help the researcher to organize the classroom of 5/3 in a semi-circle arrangement with 20 tables and chairs, and 3 tables for the observers at the back of classroom. In addition, the teaching aids were prepared by the researcher. Moreover, before the teachers observed this classroom for two days, they were given sets of the naturalistic observation form and briefed on this form’s various sections.

The first lesson in narrative writing was on 9th Saturday March 2002. The students were provided with adapted worksheet of this task with three lessons. Both the researcher and the students were observed by three English teachers. On that day, they were taught only 5 periods of two lessons. Then, 12th March was the second date of lesson 3 with 2 periods of narrative writing which was a continuation of earlier one. Then, on 13th March, was the last day of the lesson with 3 periods of this task. After this, the subjects were left alone for 1 week for their final examination. From 21st-22nd March, they were taught 3 lessons of pen-friend letter writing within 10 periods, namely adapted time.

On 23rd March there was an achievement test which covered 2 periods followed by the students’ interview. In the morning before performing the test in the language laboratory, they had been required to submit their two worksheets to the researcher. While
taking the test, they were observed and helped by the researcher, and not their English teachers. The researcher’s guidance for this test was more limited than that of classroom practice. After they had finished the test, 5 representatives were chosen for the students’ interview. They were interviewed by the researcher through face-to-face interview and one-by-one pattern in the afternoon at the language laboratory. All interviews were audio-taped through Thai translated questions. This interview lasted 1 hour per student.

The third week of data collection involved administering questionnaires and the copied previous exam paper of the Fundamental English course to the teachers. Three weeks later, the researcher had obtained data and filled in the naturalistic observation form. In April, the students’ two worksheets and achievement test were assessed by the researcher.

Finally, when the new semester came, in May, the subjects and the researcher participated in the meeting room for summing up the classroom experiment and showing the students their marked guided writing tasks, namely the last activity of lesson 3 and achievement test. The researcher also explained to the subjects the students’ writing problems. After this, all students expressed their comments and feelings toward this research study.