Chapter Four

Presentation and Analysis of Data

4.0 Overview

The data was presented and analyzed according to the research questions.

(1) What are the strengths and weaknesses of using guided writing activities?

The findings from an evaluation of the English textbooks, pilot interview, and naturalistic observation would be used to triangulate the data obtained from the students’ guided writing.

(2) What problems do the learners face while using guided writing activities?

The findings from on-going assessment would be used to triangulate the data from student’s interview.

(3) What suggestions and feedback are provided by the teachers in order to improve guided writing activities?

Only the findings from the teachers’ questionnaire would be discussed.

4.1 Research Question 1 “What Are the Strengths and Weaknesses of Using Guided Writing Activities?”

This research question was answered through a wide range of findings from the following.

4.1.1 The Findings of Pre-Experimentation
4.1.2 The Findings of Actual Experimentation

4.1.3 The Findings of Post-Experimentation

4.1.4 Triangulation of those three frameworks of the findings

4.1.1 The Findings of Pre-Experimentation

The findings of pre-experimentation were firstly based on the teachers' evaluation of the English textbooks used in Thai secondary education, highlighting weaknesses of the recent textbook used in this school. Secondly, it was based on their comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the guided writing material before the actual experimentation.

4.1.1.1 An Evaluation of the English Textbooks Used in Thai Secondary Education

A. Weaknesses of the Recent Textbook Used for the Upper Secondary Students in the School

The English textbooks used in Thai schools are inappropriate for the learning of writing skills, reflecting the cultural norms, social standards, needs, and linguistic and communicative competences of the students.

Blueprint Book II for Fundamental English course 013-014 of Grade 11, written by Brian Abbs and Ingrid Freebrian, was the book which was used for evaluation. This book, which costs 80 baht, was published by Thai Wattana Panich Publication in the
Firstly, this book reflected the cultural norms of the western society. It basically related to the view of Harmer (2001: 6) that 'many popular UK and US produced texts, were too parochial, too culture specific, so the students in different parts of the world had to struggle not only with an unfamiliar language, but also with culturally alien content'. This showed that since the EFL context is centered on the cultural norms and values of the native English speakers, it led to the students' problems in understanding the content-based texts and applying them for their communicative use in Thai society. Apparently, this textbook was full of writing texts based on the native English culture. An example of this is reflected in the writing task of Unit 1 which required the students to write a letter to a friend in Britain or the USA through the model. This exercise was problematic as the Thai students were unfamiliar with such people's culture and way of life. Hence, they could not identify with the content in the context of Thai culture. The model of this letter writing also reflected setting, character, and language use unfamiliar to Thai students. The names of places in Australia, Britain and Munich, such as a flat near the center of Munich, a Japanese company in Munich, and a beer festival were generally unknown to Thai students. The language use was also based on foreign experiences, for instance 'you ever eat real frankfurters?, I drink a lot of beer, and we (not get home) until after midnight'. Thai students did not know what 'frankfurters' were. Moreover, the behavior of this letter writer was inappropriate for the Muslim Thai students, as in Muslim culture behavior such as drinking alcohol and returning home after midnight would be frowned upon. Those factors
from the written texts resulted in Thai students' difficulties in understanding the model's content, and hence they would have difficulty in formulating an appropriate reply.

The above example indicates that the Thai Ministry of Education chose this book without realizing the inappropriateness of the task content as it reflected a culture unfamiliar to the Thai students. In fact, this book was based on western cultural norms which are not familiar or acceptable in a Thai socio-cultural setting (Atlan, 1995). The solution of this problem was suggested by Peng (1997: 44) that 'if English is an Asian language, learners and users of English must be firmly grounded in the culture, tradition, and values of Asians'. Thai and other Asian learners of English have to be taught with materials and textbooks based on their own culture, values, and beliefs so that they could acquire written English and other skills more easily. They could understand a foreign language more easily if the context of learning was in a familiar setting. Instead of ordering the books from England, the Thai Ministry of Education could consider ordering books from other sources, such as Malaysia, which is culturally more similar.

The foreign nature of social standards in the English textbook has been discussed. This notion of learning English in Thailand and other EFL countries referred to the standard variety of English as the best standard of good English; the native-English standard. However, Parsithratsint (1997) said both Standard British and American English had equal status and were both included in any standard English dictionary and grammar books. But 'Standard Thai English' was a problematic term since Thais would never be able to use good English as compared to other native speakers from Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, and other native contexts or ESL contexts, such as India and Singapore.
Hence, the social standards of the English textbooks in Thai education were inevitably based on the British or American standard since the EFL planning focused more on the native speaker than the standard Thai English accents.

This textbook was the legacy of the Standard British English source recommended by the Thai Ministry of Education, so there were many disadvantages for Thai upper secondary students. The textbook’s components concerned the view of Broughton (1997: 77) that ‘ELT course books in Thailand have been dominated for too long by the commercial interests and profit margins of western publishers. Such writings are characterized by western culture-bound use of idiom and reference. It is in no way a suitable model for Thai students’. In Fluency units 6-10, the instruction of writing tasks was ‘You are in Edinburgh. Write a letter to an English-speaking friend’. The students were also given guided contents ‘tell your friend (i) that you have moved from the Cowgate Tourist Hostel and are now working at the Highland Hotel, (ii) how this happened, (iii) what the job is like, (iv) what festival performance you have seen, and (v) when you are going back home’. Although they had been trained in reading, the excerpt about this situation and the tasks were designed for the foreign students in Britain who understood the situation, events, and places referred to in this activity. Hence, this writing task was structured for those familiar with the social context familiar to the British students and it was to develop those students’ writing ability through the integrated approach so that they could use it in British society. This approach was difficult for Thai secondary students, especially when it concerned speaking skills. As a result, this standard British English writing activity was beyond Thai students’ writing ability in English.
To overcome the social background of the English textbook in the Thai context, a crucial question was 'if the native English speaker is not used as the norm for correctness, how do Thais go about setting standards for what is acceptable usage and what is not?' (Broughton, 1997: 76). In other words, if there was the English textbook in the Thai context, how would Thai teachers and learners of English, including the Ministry of Education confirm the quality and standard of English textbooks written by Thai authors. This could be solved by International Corpus of English (ICE), a project to survey the use and variety of English on a world-wide basis, coordinated by Professor Sydney Greenbaum of University College, London. ICE would be a unique record of English in all its current varieties, recently lexical and grammatical resources of English from 300 spoken and 200 written texts of 20 countries (Broughton, 1997). He also suggested sources as the social standard for Thai learners and users of English. Firstly, a source of the acceptable standard of spoken English, interview and news bulletin was the broadcasts in English on Radio Thailand everyday. The material and textbook writers should thus select the tapes of these broadcasts as excellent language learning source, especially in listening and speaking activities. Besides, some good models for reading activities could be, for example, a collection of short stories, namely 'The Dream' written by Kuruvin Boon-Long which won the first prize in the UNESCOOPEN annual short story competition in 1995. Finally, reading and writing texts could be taken from the English newspapers in Thailand such as Bangkok Post and The Nation, and journals published by Thais which are in standard Thai English usage (Prasithrathsint, 1997).

There also appeared to be weaknesses of the level and needs of the students in the Blueprint book. The contents of some units were inappropriate for Grade 11 Thai students,
so they did not meet their needs. In unit 15, namely ‘Past Activities’, the student was required to imagine he or she was camping outside Marseilles in the South-East of France and to write a letter to a friend, explaining what happened and why he or she was coming home early. They were guided by the reading text of this story, grammar points about past continuous tense, and guided contents of three paragraphs. They were prepared for this writing task through pair work on the grammar point activity, but this writing task required them to do narrative writing in the form of friendly letter. Indeed, the instructional objectives required them to write the individual narrative or friendly letter in its form. This task also related to CLT writing; it was categorized as ‘problem-solving task’. However, it was irrelevant to Thai students’ needs. As the simulation activity was based on foreign background, it resulted in the inability of the students to perform well due to lack of adequate understanding.

The main weakness of this textbook was its inappropriateness for the linguistic and communicative competence of Thai students. Linguistic competence refers to the student writers’ knowledge in language elements necessary for organizing the written product, that is, vocabulary items, grammar points, and sentence structures, and rhetorical pattern or organizational skills. Communicative competence of the writing task involves the students’ ability in conveying the correct content in their message to an authentic audience. Hence, the weakness of linguistic competence was the extent to which the writing tasks in the textbook required the use of linguistic elements of writing skills which were beyond Thai students’ writing ability. The weakness of communicative competence involved the extent to which writing tasks did not provide the students with the necessary information about authentic audience and communicative purpose.
Unit 26 reflected weaknesses of both linguistic and communicative competence. The students were required to write a short description of a famous sports personality in their country. They were provided with some guidance, such as the reading model, grammar point about question tags, and guided content of three paragraphs. However, there were other guided activities, such as analyzing reading texts and sentence completion with limited vocabulary items provided about people’s personality and characteristics which reflected insufficient lexical assistance for the students’ effective writing. In addition, they were not given the audience and purpose for this writing task. This limitation resulted in the inability of the students to relate this writing task for their communicative use in real life.

To summarize, Blueprint Book II had the weaknesses of not being suitable for the cultural norms, social standards, the level and linguistic needs of the students, resulting in Thai upper secondary students’ poor writing abilities. Such weaknesses may emerge in other textbooks based on the native English context. This has led to problems during the teaching of writing and other skills to Thai and other EFL students. Nowadays, ESL textbooks for primary and secondary students have been produced in countries, such as Singapore and Malaysia. But there are still no EFL textbooks in the Thai context for the resolution of such weaknesses. If Thai students learn English through an EFL or even ESL textbook, such weaknesses may be overcome.

B. The English Teachers’ Opinion Concerning the Textbook

The English teachers’ opinions concerning the textbooks will be discussed in three aspects, namely general opinions, scope for writing instruction, and scope for narrative
writing and friendly letter.

'General opinions concerning the textbooks' meant the comments of the teachers on internal and external aspects of Blueprint Book II for Grade 11 students, and World Class Book for Grade 10, written by Michael Harris and David Mover. The primary factor was the presentation of the textbooks. The teachers agreed that the textbooks' covers were interesting and colorful and the pictures and other non-linear texts within the textbooks would attract the students. Likewise, the language use of the books was not too complicated for the students. The books contained simple vocabulary items and sentence structures, and clear instructions. However, the content of Blueprint did not have elements of modern science and technology necessary for the students' advanced study, especially the reading and writing texts which were not updated for Thai students in this century. Moreover, the others viewed that in some chapters of World Class, contents of conversation, reading, and writing activities were irrelevant to the objectives of this course. There was only grammar points of every chapter related to such objectives, but provided general accounts.

The assistance of the textbooks for lesson planning was another factor. Two teachers agreed that World Class book did not help them produce an interesting lesson plan since the contents and activities of the book were irrelevant to the objectives. Similarly, another teacher said Blueprint book could only partly help him plan the lesson, 60 percent of the time he used other supplementary books. Hence, due to little assistance of the textbooks for the lesson planning, the teachers had to employ other books to fulfill the objectives.
Thirdly, making use of the textbooks and other books in the classroom was discussed. All teachers agreed that the textbooks were mainly used for classroom activities, but 50 percent of classroom activities were based on other books as well. There were other materials from many sources in which language, contents and activities related to the objectives and classroom activities were conducted by means of worksheets, charts, and pictures. Furthermore, the teachers had to explain in Thai to the students how to perform activities since the other textbooks did not contain self-instructional material.

There was consensus among the teachers that the textbooks were inappropriate for the students’ language abilities. Due to the students’ poor English background, the teachers worked hard in adapting the activities to the students’ linguistic ability. However, only listening activities were very difficult to adapt since the students were unfamiliar with the English speech patterns. Moreover, the teachers had to utilize all activities in the textbook due to insufficient guidance and the students had the uncreative habit of copying the language and content patterns of the textbook.

‘Scope for writing instruction’ involved the views of the teachers on the writing instruction through the textbooks. The need for adapting the textbooks for the writing activities was firstly discussed. Blueprint book provided a lot of writing tasks and activities, but the British background required the teacher to adapt them to a great extent. For this book, the teacher used Thai pictures in narrative writing, the Thai audiences from English magazines in Thailand in the friendly letter writing activities, and the teacher’s writing as model of the journal writing activity. Besides, the contents of the narrative writing tasks in Blueprint were adult learner-oriented, so the teacher adapted them according to the
teenage learners’ level. Likewise, though World Class book was not based on native English cultural background but on the global knowledge of many countries, it had only descriptive writing tasks about animals without guidance. Hence, it also demanded the teachers to adapt supplementary sources to design other writing tasks.

The problems the teachers faced while using the textbooks for teaching writing activities are also discussed here. Firstly, teaching suggestions were too general. But the teachers were not strict on the format of the textbook since they also used other books. Secondly, an explanation of grammar points was absent, so the students were required to work out the rules individually. However, they did not do it well due to linguistic incompetence. Thirdly, mechanics of writing, such as linking devices and punctuation were not found in World Class book. Fourthly, the letter writing texts appeared in only models, and there were no clear instructions on how to write or to teach, nor were the relevant grammar points found. Finally, it was difficult to encourage the students to exploit Blue Print book as they liked copying linguistic elements from the textbook and their friends’ work rather than creating their own sentences or paragraphs.

The teachers similarly solved those problems by employing other supplementary materials. They did so by producing worksheets or charts about the components of letter writing, by explaining to the students how to write and what grammar points to bear in mind, and by comparing Thai and English letter writing texts.

In the teachers’ views, the learners also faced the problems while using the textbook for writing practice. Though they were required to memorize vocabulary items from the
textbook every week, they failed to use them in context for writing activities. Moreover, they used the same words as the textbook, not new ones from other sources. Furthermore, they had their own ideas, but they seldom tried to generate their own content in the writing task. They were also taught grammar points and sentence structures through the textbook, but their writing was still ungrammatical, especially with regard to tenses and parts of speech. These language problems of writing were a result of the students' own lack of competence rather than any fault of the textbook.

The teachers used different approaches to solve those problems of the students. One corrected her students' linguistic errors and conducted extra tuition for all students before the mid-term and final examinations. The other asked the students to avoid copying the language and content patterns from the textbook and their friends' work. Another investigated the original writer because all students' work showed similar writing performance, so he forced the rest to rewrite, using their own ideas and language. Though the teachers attempted to understand and solve the students' problems in using the textbook for writing practice, the students did not follow the instructions of their teachers. There were a few students whose writing skills were improved after the teachers' assistance.

The scope for narrative writing and friendly letter writing tasks in the textbooks is the final focus of this evaluation. This refers to the teachers' opinion concerning the instructions for two important writing tasks through the textbooks. Three aspects were the teachers' problems in carrying out methods, evaluation, approaches, and techniques, the students' inability in writing, and the teachers' suggestions on alternative solutions to all problems.
The problems faced while using the textbooks to teach narrative and friendly letter writing tasks concerned methods, evaluation, approaches, and techniques. For methods, despite the requirement of CLT for writing activities through the textbook, the teachers had to use GTM due to the students' poor aural and oral skills in English. GTM was based on bilingual instruction, but Thai was more frequently used than English. Hence, the students only understood English sentences in Thai. Besides, some could not write any English sentences, so the teacher had to teach all the students the basic skills. Then, the textbooks lacked clear criteria for assessing writing skills, so the teachers often decided to have their own criteria. Three of them had similar criteria, vocabulary items, content, grammatical correctness, and form or organization. They did not have any problem about techniques. They found that the communicative approach to teaching pen-friend letter writing in Blueprint book focused on native English audiences. However, they were afraid that the students were not confident to write a letter to the native pen pal due to limited linguistic ability, so they asked them to write a letter to their friends in other schools in Thailand.

Moreover, the students had fewer problems in performing narrative, letter writing or other writing tasks due to the teacher's simplification of tasks. However, they struggled with a series of unseen pictures based on non-Thai culture, derived from other sources.

Finally, there was a need for a new English textbook with a range of controlled to guided writing activities based on materials relevant to the Thai context. The teachers believe that the students can perform writing tasks better if they are guided from easy to difficult activities. The students would also understand written texts better if they were based on Thai cultural content. They would thus be motivated to write for their everyday.
life and other communicative uses. Then, they were facilitated by the teacher’s guidance when faced with problems while performing writing tasks. Besides, one suggested that the English textbooks for Thai students should not focus on only Thai context or only native English, but should include cultural content from other western or eastern nations to provide Thai students insights on how other people world wide learn and use English.

The weaknesses of the recent textbooks for Grade 11 students at this school and the English teachers’ opinions concerning the textbooks used have to be considered when evaluating English textbooks. Blueprint book’s writing instructions were beyond the students’ writing abilities though guidance was provided, and World Class book provided too general guidance for writing instruction.

4.1.1.2 The Teachers’ Comments on the Guided Writing Material

A. The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Guided Writing Material before the Actual Experimentation

The strengths and weaknesses of the guided writing material before the experiment discuss four aspects, learner factor, aims of six lesson plans, the content of task factor, and methodology factor.

According to the teachers, this material was appropriate to the gender, level, and age of the students, and was suitable only for those with average and good English background. Then, the learning style, especially group work, appealed to the students due to the
brainstorming skill. Though the concept of ‘Happy New Year Day’ in narrative writing was basically foreign to Muslim culture, it focused more on ‘the enjoyment and exposure of a student, and his relationship’ than the invitation to participate in this ceremony. These students of Islamic education could consider this activity appropriate. Besides, it helped broaden their perspectives about ‘the universality in Thai society’.

The confidence of the students in carrying out the two tasks was the second aspect of learner factor mentioned. The teachers attributed such confidence to the students’ preparation and insights into classroom activities, and the teacher’s assistance. Next, one teacher suggested that the pictures should be colorful to appeal to the students. Another teacher said the students had sufficient prior learning experiences in English and the skills and strategies to accomplish the two tasks. Arts and Science stream students had different English competence, but this material was considered generally suitable for all the students’ competence in English. Besides, the two tasks were familiar to the students. For example, the content of pictures in ‘The Day of Skipping Class’ was familiar to the students since the behavior of ‘skipping class’ has become popular in Thai teenage sub-culture.

Secondly, the aims of the six lesson plans were very clear, specified, and related to the objectives of this English course. Thirdly, the teachers commented on the suitability of language use of the two tasks to the level of the students. Most of the vocabulary items, such as some items about feelings and actions were familiar as they were relevant to Thai students’ everyday life though there were these unfamiliar words among them. The researcher should thus have illustrated to the students the use of such vocabulary items through actual examples. In addition, the material on past and present simple tenses, and
reported speech were difficult, so the researcher should have simplified them.

In general, the content reflected the strength of this material. The teachers said the content of this material did not reflect socio-cultural bias, but insights into Thai teenage subculture. In addition, activities based on letter writing texts and a series of pictures were interesting. The picture titled ‘My Holiday on the Beach’ highlighted the local Thai scenario of Songkhla province, especially Samila beach and mermaid statue. The content also promoted Thai culture and human global values, such as saving other people’s lives. The two task topics for narrative writing, ‘the Special Days in My Memory’, and ‘My Hobbies/Interests’ for the letter writing, were related to the students’ lives. Then, their contents were relevant, coherent, and organized. Besides, they were sequenced from easier to more difficult, controlled to guided, and comprehension to production. This enabled the students to develop their writing abilities.

The methodology involved activities for warm-up, pre-writing, and guided writing activities. The teachers felt that using other skills, not writing, for the warm-up activity could encourage the students to express their ideas. Pre and guided writing contained integrated language skills. Another comment was that this material contained various exercises; familiar to control to guided level with one right to many possible right answers, and could be used at various levels, whole class, small group, pair, and individual. However, lesson 2, activity 3 of narrative writing, titled ‘cloze passage without vocabulary choices’ (Appendix B), was rather complex, so it would be time-consuming, though the students were allowed to discuss in small groups. The teachers remarked that the researcher should have guided them in this exercise to develop the strategy of vocabulary in context.
Though the aims of the exercises and instructions were clear and consistent, they should have been explained to the students in Thai. The instructions in the worksheet for the last activity of lesson 3, and the test were simple and straightforward, so the students understood them in the test in English without the researcher’s Thai explanation. However, the length of this material was quite inappropriate, as the series of pictures had many stages, so it caused boredom. The researcher should thus have shortened each stage.

The teaching-learning techniques used were an additional factor to consider. Firstly, in pair and small group work, the students preferred matching their pair and groups independently, so the researcher’s matching was better. But each group should consist of an equal number of the students from three classes. Besides, for the researcher’s counting and matching technique, some female students were not comfortable if working among some unfamiliar males, thus the researcher should encourage them to make friends in small group work. However, the students did not face gender bias in group work because at least the male students of class 5/3 could participate in the female group well. Secondly, for the student presentation, they preferred presenting the work in groups rather than individually due to lack of self-confidence, and linguistic incompetence. As a result, the researcher should help them during the individual presentation. Thirdly, for the second composition, the teachers suggested that the researcher should be careful about the students’ copying of others in group composition. Then, the oral composition should be more conducted in groups or pairs than individually. Next, the researcher had to ensure that all the students participated in class composition. Fourthly, the teachers suggested that for dictation the researcher’s reading did not enrich the students’ writing skills, so it should be done through tape-recording in the language laboratory involving several rewinding sessions to ensure
the students’ understanding. Moreover, the students were not in favor of reading aloud due to worries about mispronunciation, but it was quite appropriate due to the brevity of the reading text and the researcher’s correction. In addition, self-access learning in letter writing was a new technique, so they appeared worried about it at first due to unfamiliarity. Hence, it was commented that the researcher should brief them about it and give them response after completion. Lastly, ‘the researcher’s story’ as the model of narrative writing was the creative technique that enabled them to enjoy the reading and writing activity.

The teachers also suggested other teaching-learning techniques to consider. First, for the teaching aids, white board and pens, and Nation Junior magazine were appropriately used for the students, and the worksheet was also clear. However, transparency and overhead projector had seldom been used by them. At first they were afraid about the individual presentation in front of their friends, the researcher, and the observers. If they were allowed to do it in pair or small group, they would have performed better.

The second observation was the time allocated for each activity, namely 15 periods for two tasks, was insufficient. Both tasks needed more than 15 periods. The researcher had to control the time properly to prevent the students from wasting time. But, the time for each activity should relate to each student’s learning progress since there were both fast and slow students in this study. Third, the students played the roles well, namely the presenter, evaluator, receiver, and thinker. However, the negotiator should be assisted by the researcher. This material also required a variety of skills; integration of listening and speaking, reading, writing, and translating. But the researcher should help them in speaking skills extensively. Finally, the students’ enjoyment of using this material depended on the
classroom atmosphere, such as balancing the roles between the good and average students, and the researcher-student relationship, the student-student cooperation, the researcher’s language game, and rewards as the motivation.

There appeared to be the strengths of other teaching-learning techniques. Every step of the six lessons was clear. Conversely, lessons 1-3 were linked, particularly through the warm-up activity in which the researcher revised the previous lessons. Moreover, these six lessons were prepared for the researcher to teach and the students to learn; this material had clearly identified the roles of researcher and learners for each lesson. The researcher also tried to ensure that the students were involved in every lesson through questions for each activity. This would be more effective if the researcher had a variety of questions, and checked verbal and non-verbal responses of the students.

The authenticity of this material should be considered. In letter writing, there were not authentic recipients in the last activity of lesson 3 and the achievement test. Moreover, as a series of pictures was created by the researcher, not the standard pictures taken from various sources, its content was related to Thai students’ real life.

The teachers viewed that the nature of the relationship between the researcher and students depended on the actual classroom atmosphere, namely how well the researcher treated the students. In terms of self-evaluation, they believed that the students usually checked only spelling due to absence of other criteria. They did not like self-evaluation due to the belief that the first draft was perfect writing. In fact, self-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance in language, content, and rhetoric was appropriate. Likewise, peer-
evaluation was difficult since the students seldom commented on their peers’ writing due to fear. However, peer-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance could help them extensively. Then, the achievement test’s contents were appropriate for them. The guided content and writing stages were relevant to those of the last activity of lesson 3 in the worksheets. For on-going assessment, the students did not naturally reveal their problems to the researcher for discussion due to adequate insights into the content. But, on-going assessment with the researcher’s linguistic assistance enhanced their confidence and solved their writing problems. Finally, the teachers said the effectiveness of analytical marking could be judged after the total scores of the students’ writings had been revealed.

From the teachers’ comments on this material before the experimentation, the researcher found that there were some aspects reflecting the explicit strengths of this material, namely the aims of six lesson plans, the contents of the two tasks without socio-cultural bias, and the activities in 3 lessons in a systematic way from easier to more difficult, controlled to guided writing and comprehension to production.

B. Material Adaptation (Appendix I)

Material adaptation refers to the changes which were made with respect to comments made by the teachers with regards to the appropriateness of the materials and techniques involved in this study.

Firstly, time allocation was adapted. Initially, six lessons were allocated for 15 periods, 7 for narrative writing and 8 for letter writing. Then, it was changed; both two tasks
were equally allocated for 10 periods. For narrative writing, in lesson 1, the time was shifted from 2 periods to 3 periods as during the first period of the actual experimentation the students and researcher needed to be more familiar with each other. Moreover, this lesson had 3 activities which took a long time to ascertain the students’ progress. In lesson 3, the time was shifted to 5 periods from 3 periods because 2 periods would be wasted in the grading stage of activity 2, namely ‘Guided Writing Activities’, which was done by pair work. For pen-friend letter, in lesson 1, 2 periods became 3 periods due to the researcher’s time management of many activities, such as class composition of activity 2, and explanation to the students note 1. In lesson 2, 2 periods were increased to 3 periods since this lesson had 4 activities. The researcher also faced difficulty in linking activity 2 ‘correction of three texts’, namely extracts of the letter writing, and activity 3 ‘introduction of friendly letter form in self-access learning’, for the students’ understanding of the whole contents of friendly letter in activity 4, namely the model of this letter writing task. In lesson 3, the time for only dictation was changed to 4 periods from 3 periods since it was conducted in the language laboratory and its grading stages were based on transparency and overhead projector, which were unfamiliar to the students.

Secondly, the motivation and challenge of the material reflected in the students’ commitment to paint five series of pictures in activities 2 and 3 of narrative writing, lesson 3, in their own worksheet. For this, the researcher’s painted pictures in his file were shown as an example. This adaptation aimed at reinforcing the students’ creativity and imagination and entertaining them while producing written work.
Likewise, the language game led to the greater enjoyment of the material. Word by word, was added in the letter task. In this game, a student was asked to start with one word. Then, the next student nearby had to create the new word in which the first letter was the same letter of the previous student’s final letter of word. This was continuously conducted until all could practice their vocabulary skills. This technique was to entertain them and to prompt their spontaneous vocabulary creation without dictionary.

Thirdly, for learning group organization, how to match a pair for 4 exercises of activity 2 of lesson 3 in narrative writing was specified because criteria for organizing the learning group or pair in this lesson plan was ambiguous, and the instruction for this exercise in the worksheet was generally stated as ‘work with your partner’. Hence, the new criterion was ‘the students were asked to draw a ticket in the raffle for two times, the first for exercises 1-2, and the second for exercises 3-4. This showed the continuity of the students’ working with the same pair. This also led to greater rapport with their partners.

Moreover, dictation was shifted from ‘listen to the researcher’ to ‘listen to the cassette-tape’ or partial dictation. This would enhance the students’ aural skills in order to identify certain words well because they were dictated in the language laboratory through the researcher’s accurate English reading.

In addition, the authentic recipient for the letter in the achievement test was changed from the specially written one. It was an excerpt from the genuine pen pal column of ‘Student Weekly’, the English magazine in Thailand. This would enable the students to send the letter to their real pen pal.
Finally, grading methods were changed. In narrative writing, activity 3 of lesson 2, item 6 listed in lesson plan “After the students have finished written work, they are asked to present their answers, the other group has to respond them based on the researcher’s correction” was shifted to “After they have finished their work, they are asked to present their answers by writing on the board in which columns for 5 groups were drawn out. After this, each group’s answers on the board were comparatively investigated, all groups helped the researcher give correct answers through each group’s oral translation of 2 sentences. Then, 5 groups were required to explain why they choose certain words for a blank”. This was because this activity focused on vocabulary skills. The students’ lexical problems should be overcome by understanding the content of story through general translating, then by internalizing their vocabulary strategies through discussing their chosen words. This reinforced their insight into the story.

In letter writing, because ‘partial dictation’ was conducted in the language laboratory, the grading method was also changed. Item 7 listed in lesson plan “After all pairs have finished their work, they are required to give the answer to the researcher’s response. That is to say, while one person is writing the answer on the board, the other person of this pair has to read that word aloud. Other pairs have to correct it through the researcher’s confirmation” became “After they have finished the dictation, the researcher rewinds the tape, 1 time for each sentence. Then, he randomly asks the pair to read the answers, the whole text, aloud. In other words, while one of the pair is reading a sentence containing answers aloud, the other person has to spell his or her chosen words. Other pairs must correct it through the researcher’s confirmation on the transparency of the correction dictation”. This adaptation was to enable the students to develop their listening-speaking
and writing skills together.

4.1.2 The Findings of Actual Experimentation

The findings of the actual experimentation discuss the strengths and weaknesses of methodologies used while using guided writing activities through three observers, namely the three English teachers. They discuss three categories of 17 criteria; the explicit roles of the researcher, the apparent roles of the students, and the balancing roles of the researcher and students.

The explicit roles of the researcher had in-depth claims. Firstly, for organization of the class, in narrative writing, while opening the lesson, the researcher encouraged the students, greeting with simple questions to be familiar with them. Then, using the researcher’s story resulted in the students’ enjoyment of reading and writing. However, they did not respond to the researcher’s questions in English because they did not understand his spoken English. They also lacked confidence to speak English due to worry about errors and losing face, so the researcher switched from English to Thai several times. However, the researcher’s structure and closure of this lesson was effective. When the students were provided with the worksheet, they were not left to concentrate on only the details of the worksheet, but were asked to follow the researcher’s suggestion on how to use the worksheet beneficially. Furthermore, the researcher’s clarification of the students’ problems and revision of the lesson enriched their understanding.
In letter writing, organization of the lesson, though the researcher used different questions to motivate the students' ideas and some could respond to his questions in simple English, this opening lesson was slow. The majority of the students did not understand the researcher's spoken English, so he used more Thai than English. The students also generated their ideas slowly, so the researcher had to help everyone in expressing ideas. Likewise, though the researcher structured the lesson by allowing the students to work in small groups and this motivated them to cooperatively compose a short paragraph, some focused more on copying the content generated by all groups on the board into their worksheet than paying attention to the researcher's explanation. However, as in narrative writing, closing the lesson by revising the lesson and helping the students with problems still resulted in developing their writing skills.

Secondly, the researcher's time management of the two tasks was quite similar. The teachers said the researcher could appropriately manage the time for each activity and exercise. However, in the narrative writing, he seemed to rush through the last lesson in order to keep to the adapted time allocation in lesson plan. But in letter writing, he seemed to take a long time for the last lesson since he solved each student's writing problems.

Thirdly, organization of learning group of the two tasks was efficient. The researcher's matching and the students' counting and independent matching for pair and small groups resulted in all the students' satisfaction in their own group composition and effective interaction. Fourthly, the researcher's assigning the task to the students was effective in that the researcher noticed much non-verbal communication among the students after they had been assigned the task. If some complained about the difficulty of some
exercises, the researcher would explain to the students immediately.

Moreover, for the researcher's explanation, vocabulary, content, and grammar in narrative and letter writing were well explained. Though the students were confused with new vocabulary items in lesson 1 of the two tasks, this problem was not found in lessons 2 and 3 due to the researcher's explanation about the strategy for vocabulary creation. In the class composition, the researcher's explanation of content in Thai and English enabled them to cooperate with the researcher. Then, after they had individually read note 1 about grammar and linking devices, the researcher revised it again. Moreover, even without the researcher's explanation about a series of pictures, they could orally narrate the story since such pictures were not complicated. However, the researcher did not explain and revise punctuation in note 1 in narrative writing well because he assumed that the students had sufficient background in punctuation. However, they made errors about usage of comma in complex sentences. Similarly, for the letter writing texts, the researcher failed to show the links of the three texts, which were excerpts of letter writing, and the whole content of letter gathering the students to be involved in the new activity namely exploring the form of letter. The effect was that the students did not understand the connection between the new and previous activity based on the same letter writing texts.

Later, for the researcher's action zone of the two tasks, the researcher reacted with all the students equally, calling them by their name and walking to them for friendly cooperation. In addition, for the language used by the researcher, in narrative writing, the researcher spoke English well, but the students could not follow it due to unfamiliarity with his speech patterns. Then, he switched from Thai to English and English to Thai
appropriately, but unnaturally because he was worried about Thai interference in English speech patterns. In letter writing, the researcher spoke English slower, but he switched from Thai to English and English to Thai better than in narrative writing since he understood the students' aural-oral ability and their previous reaction to him. However, he used more Thai than English.

The apparent roles of the students could be divided into four types, the students' performance on each activity, their time on task, their performance on pair work, and on group work. First, for the students' performance on the narrative writing, they had no strategy to create vocabulary items in 'the cloze passage with vocabulary choices' due to unfamiliarity with this exercise. However, they could perform partial dictation in letter writing well because they had vocabulary learning strategy. They could guess the words for each blank before listening to the cassette-tape.

Second, the students' time on task reflected shortcomings. For narrative writing, in lessons 2-3, they took long time since these lessons had a large number of small groups and pair works. In letter writing, they did so in only lesson 3 since it was more difficult than lessons 1-2.

Third, for the students' performance during pair work, in narrative writing, only the average students in some pairs struggled with the strategy to complete the work, so they copied other pairs. However, in letter writing, they did not copy others since the researcher's assistance was more extensive. Then, for the students' performance on group work of the two tasks, they spent too much time to discuss the task, and the good
students seemed to play more roles in work performance than other members.

The balancing roles of the researcher and students consisted of five criteria, the researcher’s questions and the students’ response, classroom interaction, the use of teaching aids, classroom performance during a new activity, and evaluation. Firstly, in narrative writing, the researcher tried to motivate the students with questions about the problems they faced for each activity. He was very polite; addressing ‘thank you’ and ‘very good’ to a student who was brave to ask him the questions. But, they responded to the researcher through only short answers, not discussion due to fear of interaction in English. In letter writing, they could respond to the researcher’s questions better than in narrative writing since they were quite comfortable with him.

Later, for classroom interaction, in narrative writing, the students did not interact with the researcher in lesson 1 since they had not understood their own roles and the researcher’s. However, they could interact with each other in small groups since the researcher did not control them. Moreover, they could do with the researcher in lessons 2-3 communicatively since they needed his extensive help. In letter writing, they understood the extent of the researcher’s role from controller to facilitator, so they could give some comments and asking the questions for help.

Next, for the use of teaching aids, the students could use the worksheets, and white board and pens well. But they were quite afraid of the presentation of written work through the overhead projector and transparency.
Then, classroom performance during a new activity of the two tasks was similar. Only in lesson 3, individual work, all students seemed to be bored and tired with new activity because they had learnt many activities. The researcher thus tried to refresh their readiness with flexible time allocation.

Finally, evaluation of two tasks remained similar. The researcher could grade the students’ writing abilities for each activity and exercise appropriately. However, peer-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance was not achieved due to the new assessment and the students’ fear of commenting on their peer’s writing.

The findings of the actual experimentation revealed that the common strengths of methodologies used in the two tasks were closing the lesson, organization of learning group, and the researcher’s assigning the task. However, the common weaknesses of methodologies were opening of the lesson, the students’ time on task, classroom performance during a new activity, and peer and self-evaluation.

4.1.3 The Findings of Post-Experimentation

The findings of post-experimentation discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the students’ guided writing abilities in the worksheets and achievement test. These findings were presented on two aspects, quantitative and qualitative data.
4.1.3.1 Quantitative Data

Quantitative Data dealt with a presentation of the total scores of the students’ two guided writing tasks marked through analytical marking method on descriptive statistics, such as measures of central tendency. Those scores, an indicator of the development of the students’ writing abilities from the worksheet to the achievement test, were displayed through the tables and discussion.

Table 4.1: The Total Scores of the Students’ Guided Narrative Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score in the worksheet: 10 marks (Appendix B)</th>
<th>Score in the achievement test: 10 marks (Appendix C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 127 | 122.5
Mean | 6.35 | 6.125
Median | 7 | 6
Mode | 8 | 6

Based on table 4.1, the mean of the 20 students’ narrative writing in the worksheet and test valued 6.35 and 6.125 marks reflecting their moderate writing skill. But, they could perform this task in the worksheet better than in the test. Then, the score range in the
worksheet and test was similarly wide, 4.5-8 and 4-8 marks, the large gap between those with highest and lowest score. However, only one failed in the worksheet while three students failed in the test. Later, the mode in the worksheet was higher than in the test, 8 and 6 marks. Next, the median in the worksheet was still higher than in the test, 7 and 6. These implied their writing performance in the worksheet was better than in the test since in the worksheet they were allowed to perform this task in classroom, using the previous activities as models, and consulting their friends and the researcher. But, in the test they had to perform as in the real final examination with the researcher’s little guidance.

### Table 4.2: The Total Scores of the Students’ Guided Pen-Friend Letter Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score in the worksheet: 10 marks (Appendix B)</th>
<th>Score in the achievement test: 10 marks (Appendix C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 151                                           | 145.5                                             |
| Mean    | 7.55                                          | 7.275                                             |
| Median  | 7.5                                           | 7.5                                               |
| Mode    | 7.5                                           | 8.5                                               |

Based on table 4.2, the whole performance of the students in letter writing in the worksheet was more balanced than in the test. The equal score of mean, median, and mode in the worksheet, 7.5 marks, showed that their letter writing ability was not varied; the
score range was 6-9 marks. Meanwhile, the different scores of mean, median, and mode in the test exhibited that their writing ability was more varied; the score range in the test was wider than in the worksheet, 5-8.5 marks. This also showed the wide gap of the students with highest and lowest score. But, such score range was satisfactory since nobody failed in the worksheet and test. Besides, the development of their writing abilities from the worksheet to the test was little lower; some students’ score in the test had increased while some had decreased a little due to the structure of this letter itself. The guided content in the worksheet and test was similar, so they seemed to perform this task better than narrative writing, in which the content of a series of pictures in the worksheet and test was different.

4.1.3.2 Qualitative Data

Qualitative data focused on discussion of some areas indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the students’ guided narrative and pen-friend letter writing abilities in the worksheet and achievement test through excerpts of their writing.

A. The Strengths of Guided Narrative Writing Ability

There appeared to be four common areas reflecting the strengths of the students’ guided narrative writing in the worksheet and achievement test, content, paragraph organization, grammatical structures, and vocabulary usage.

(1) Content: Three aspects reflected the effectiveness of content, namely the content relevant to a series of pictures, an elaboration of the content, and characterization of the
story.

(1.1) ‘The content relevant to a series of pictures’ referred to the narrative writing in which content was correctly and appropriately constructed in relation to all guided pictures. This showed that the students could link main idea, details, characters’ actions, and setting according to the main events and situations in all pictures communicatively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 1 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1: At Khuanlang had good school where name was Khuanlangwittaya school. Every morning, Oil and his friends usually came to the school early. One day, they went to school but didn’t come to school. Then, they thought to tour at Hadyai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2: When they change cloth finish and put it under the three, they took a tuk-tuk to Hadyai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3: Then, they went to Diana Department store. When, they arrived there, they were so glind and thought to do this day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4: So, they saw the cinema at fifth floor and they saw Diana 2 was Jan Dara together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 5: After this, they went to Hadyai Plaza. They bought many things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 6: In the afternoon, they went to Big C Department store. While they bought some things, they were so funny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 7: Suddenly, Oil met his teacher there. He was frightened and wanted to run quickly but his teacher said ‘Don’t run way’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 8: Before they went home, his teacher spoke to them ‘I will punish you tomorrow’. So, they were so sorry and sad with they did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 9: In the next morning, his teacher hit them in front of all students who study in this school. Finally, Oil and his friends promise didn’t again. And it was bad example because it was not good. After that, they diligent to study and good boy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 1, though this writing contained a great deal of language problems, the content was clearly relevant to each guided picture and the theme of the story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 2 (the Achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1: In the morning on Monday. Today it is first day of final examination. A teacher control final examination in the classroom 5/3, which students doing English test. And the teacher spenk louder ‘Don’t copy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2: While Kowit copy test from Suda, Suda told he ‘Quick!’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3: Suddenly, the teacher saw them, she spoke ‘Don’t do it again’. They felt sorry and speak ‘We are so sorry.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4: Afer that, Kowit and Kanda again. He spoke ‘please tell me answers, but Kanda did not told and spoke louder ‘Teacher! He wants to copy mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 5: Kowit very frightened and he spoke ‘I’m so sorry again’. The teacher very upset and spoke ‘I have to kick you out’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 6: So, the teacher pull Kowit from out classroom. Next time, he thought he don’t it again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 2, it was also full of linguistic problems, but its content was relevant to the main events of all pictures in which Kowit was the main copier of the examination
1.2) ‘An elaboration of content’ referred to the main point which was supported with details from the pictures and the students’ additional creation. This led to the lively and reasonable content. It also showed how well the students understood the story.

Extract 3 (the achievement test)
Picture 1: Today is one Final English Examination Day of 5/3. The teacher is going to the room. She gives English test and speaks ‘Don’t copy’. After that she turns to write on the board. Pictures 5-6: The teacher is very angry and speak to Suchart ‘I have to kick you out’. Although all students will say ‘sorry’ to her, the teacher pulls Suchart to go out. Then, she spoke for all students to don’t do it ‘Don’t copy’.

Based on extract 3, the expanded content in picture 1 was of the teacher’s movement to support the background information about the reason why the teacher was very strict and the students preferred copying. The pictures 5-6 reflected the contents elaborated on the feeling and interaction between the teacher and the copying student, the climax of the story.

1.3) ‘Characterization of the story’ meant the feelings, actions, and names of the characters were provided of the story. This helped portray the characterization in relation to the situations of the story.

Extract 4 (the worksheet)
1. Suwit, Kowit, Somchai, came to school in the morning too.
2. John, Deng, and Dan thought to skipping class.

In relation to extract 4, these were Thai and English names, well-known to these students. This helped them identify the action and feeling of each character easily. In this way, new sentence patterns regarding the main character’s actions and feelings were shown.

Extract 5
‘While Suwit walked at Big C, he met his teacher. He was frightened and shouted ‘Oh! My teacher’.

Based on extract 5, the words ‘met, frightened, and shouted’ indicated the important roles played by ‘Suwit’ in this situation. Besides, another student portrayed the character’s action and feeling by creating the new speech bubbles, for example ‘When they arrived
Diana Department Store, Big told his friends about moving pictures ‘Oh! Good idea’. This exhibited the inner feelings of the main character to his two friends. This also implied that the student tried to create the additional content according to the guided pictures.

(2) **Paragraph Organization:** The effectiveness of paragraph organization consisted of components of composition, and appropriate use of linking devices and chronological order.

(2.1) **Components of composition** or structure of the story referred to the paragraph in which title, introduction, content, and conclusion were correctly given.

```
Extract 6 (the achievement test)
Final English Examination of 5/3 Room (title)
Every time of English examination, the students complained ‘it is very difficult’ (introduction).
Today is on final English examination day of 5/3. The teacher is going to the room. She gives
English test and speaks ‘Don’t copy!’ ....(content). From this event, Suchart can’t pass in English.
He was very sad and think ‘Oneself is one help’ (conclusion).
```

With reference to extract 6, the title was correctly capitalized. In the introduction, the speech bubble ‘it is very difficult’ was the main cause of the students’ copying during examination. Then, the content was organized orderly. Later, this conclusion highlighted the effect of habit of copying and the main character’s self-realization through the Thai motto.

(2.2) **The appropriate use of linking devices and chronological orders** involved how well the students could use these rhetorical patterns to communicate the message from the story.

```
Extract 7 (the Achievement test)
While the students copying the teacher saw the students copying. She told the students’ ‘Don’t
do it again’. The student said ‘I’m so sorry’. But after that the boy tried copy and said with the
the girl. ....Finally the teacher felt very upset.
```
Based on extract 7, this student tried to narrate the story in correct sequence, using linking devices 'while, but, and' and time linkers, such as 'after that' and 'finally' to achieve the organization of the paragraph.

(3) Grammatical Structures: Two aspects of effectiveness of grammatical structures in the students’ narrative writing were found; the proper use of past tense, and few incorrect grammatical structures.

(3.1) ‘The proper use of past tense’ which was the discipline of narrative writing involved some written work with correct past simple, and past continuous tense.

Extract 8 (the worksheet)
They arrived at the Diana Department store, near Prince of Songkla University. They were walking around. After that they decided to watch ‘Jan Dara’ movie at Diana 2.

According to extract 11, though some little linguistic problems were found, these past tense verbs showed the students’ attempt to achieve the discipline of the narrative writing.

(3.2) Few incorrect grammatical structures: Almost all students made grammatical errors in lessons 1-2 despite the researcher’s immediate remedy. This problem thus remained in their narrative writing in lesson 3 and the test. However, some written work had few incorrect grammatical structures.

Extract 9 (the achievement test)
1. Last week, it was final examination of M.5/3 students. There were a lot of students in the room. And there were control teacher.
2. She was controller of final examination in Madhayom 5/3. She didn’t like bad students. While she wrote information in the blackboard, Suda was copy exam of her friend.

With regard to extract 9, in item 1, this student could construct English sentences, but he or she was confused about ‘there was/were’ with the singular or plural noun. Then, the
preposition 'in' showed Thai interference in English sentence. In item 2, the predicate 'was copy' indicated the student's confusion of verb-be and verb-do. However, the overall sentence construction contained few examples of incorrect grammar.

(4) **Vocabulary Usage:** The strengths of vocabulary usage were of the appropriate use of guided vocabulary items, new vocabulary creation, and the Thai lexical transfer in English sentences.

(4.1) 'The appropriate use of guided vocabulary items' meant some written work implied the students' exploitation of guided vocabulary items with Thai meaning and parts of speech given in the test appropriately and contextually. In fact, these lexical items were the key words of this story, but they were quite new for the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the morning the teacher was controlling final examination M.5/3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. She was controller of final examination in Madhanyom M.5/3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A teacher controlled final examination in the classroom M.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 10, the students could expand the use of those guided vocabulary items according to their parts of speech and the context of the story.

(4.2) 'New vocabulary creation' concerned the students' creation of the simple vocabulary items, not found in the worksheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 11 (the Achievement Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They changed the uniform and wore T-shirts. While they shopping at Big C, they met the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. While they shopping, they meet headmaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 11, these new words were taken from the students' prior experiences of vocabulary items in their classrooms. This also promoted their linguistic originality.
(4.3) 'The Thai lexical transfer in English sentences' referred to the lexical items from Thai which were used in English sentence construction. This was a part of the interlanguage learners' strategies aimed to serve the acculturative function of transferred features from Thai to English and to portray Thai socio-cultural belief and values through English linguistic elements. This was considered as the use of creativity in Thai-English lexicon of the student writers rather than as errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 12 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This class Ajarn Pennapa is controller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. She was controller of final examination in Madthayomsueka 5/3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to extract 12, in item 1, 'Ajarn', Thai title, means 'teacher'. It conveyed this student’s respect of the teacher’s role in Thai society through narrative writing in English. This sentence would be inappropriate if 'the teacher Pennapa' was written through direct translation. Similarly, in item 2, the Thai loan noun 'Mathayomsueka 5/3' was transferred due to this student’s realization of the Thai value. This student seemed to be more familiar with this loaned phrase than with 'Grade 11/3 classroom'.

(5) Mechanics of Writing: Only the appropriate use of guided speech bubbles represented the strength of mechanics of writing. It covered the reported speech transformation from the guided speech bubble, and the new speech bubble creation.

(5.1) 'The reported speech transformation from the guided speech bubble' referred to some written work in which the guided direct speech bubble, was transformed to direct speech correctly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 13 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunee told the control teacher that Somsak wanted to copy she (hers). The control teacher felt upset and she told he (him) that she had to kick he (him) out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on extract 13, though the use of pronouns was incorrect, this student tried to construct the reported sentences to achieve the function of 'the story telling'.

(5.2) ‘New speech bubble creation’ involved the new or adapted speech bubble created by the students in order to fulfill the feeling or action of the characters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 14 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The boy said 'please tell me answers'. The girl said 'I don't tell'. But she tells the teacher 'He wants to copy mine.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 14, the new speech bubble reflected two characters’ interaction and conflict. This led to the realistic utterance in this setting.

B. The Weaknesses of Guided Narrative Writing Ability

The weaknesses of the students’ guided narrative writing in the worksheet and achievement test contained four common areas namely, content, paragraph organization, grammatical structures, and mechanics of writing.

(1) Content: The weakness of content was filled with three aspects, some content irrelevant to the guided pictures, insufficient elaboration, and absence of names of characters.

(1.1) ‘Some contents irrelevant to the guided pictures’ referred to some the content which was not related to all the guided pictures since the students did not understand the details and underlying meaning of the pictures.
Based on extract 15, only one student used the word 'taxi' in the whole story despite the guided pictures with the word 'tuk-tuk' on the transportation. Using 'taxi' implied the ignorance of the sociolinguistic meaning of 'tuk-tuk', the unique minibus in Thailand.

(1.2) 'Insufficient elaboration' was meant the content of narrative writing was not supported by the details of each guided picture and of the students’ additional creation.

According to extract 16, in picture 2, the content was too short to understand how the main character, 'male student', not female student, employed the strategy to copy his friend’s answers. In picture 3, the content was too general to understand the feelings and interaction among female and male students, and the teacher. For picture 5, the content indicated this student’s misunderstanding of the function of 'catch'. Indeed, it should be ‘the male student was caught by the teacher because he copied answers of his friends several times’.

(1.3) ‘An absence of names of the characters’ related to the unclear elaboration on the content. Though the content for some written work was supported by description of the feelings and interaction of the characters, the names of main characters was absent. This was not incorrect, but the characterization of the story was not complete.
With regard to extract 17, using the word ‘teacher’ without certain name was allowed
due to the presence of only one ‘teacher’. However, if the name of the teacher was given, the
sociolinguistic meaning would be clear. Then, the names of boy and girl students should be
specified to understand their characterization easily.

(2) Paragraph Organization: The weakness of paragraph organization included incorrect
form of paragraph, and lack of some components of paragraph.

(2.1) ‘Incorrect form of paragraph’ involved narrative writing which was not organized in
a paragraph. There were at least three short paragraphs which were a good basis for the
essay’s component, but it was not related to this study, focusing on a paragraph. In fact, the
students had been practising only one paragraph for narrative writing, but this problem was
caused by the students’ confusion about the letter writing focusing on 5 short paragraphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 18 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the morning on last Monday, there were three boys and they didn’t went to school. (introduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of them went to find a taxi. Then, they rode taxi to Diana Department Store .... (content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And next morning, they were hitting in the classroom and they were so sorry. (conclusion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to extract 18, the story was not united in a paragraph. Separate
introduction, content, and conclusion indicated an incorrect form of a paragraph.

(2.2) ‘Lack of some components of a paragraph’ referred to some writing, which was
meaningful but incoherent; as title, introduction, and certain aspects of content were absent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 19 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom M. 5/3, today is final examination, subject English. The teacher is a controller...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next, teacher pull Somchai go out the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on extract 19, this student ignored the title since he or she misunderstood the head of this page, namely ‘Your Paragraph’ as the title. Indeed, there was the reminding of ‘actual writing stage’ after ‘pre-writing’.

**3) Grammatical Structures:** There were four aspects of the weakness of grammatical structures, Thai interference of English sentences, verb and tense usage, phrase, and clause.

**3.1 ‘Thai interference in English sentences’** concerned some English sentences that were influenced by Thai structures. The interlanguage was basically one of the errors made by the learner, namely direct Thai translation in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 20 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This evening makes Rung and his friends shy and will not skipping class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When they change clothes finish, they are sitting the Tuk-Tuk car go to Hadyai city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 20, in item 1, the student had the problem in combining positive and negative forms for a sentence, ‘make’ and ‘will not’, when he or she still wanted to use the phrasal verb ‘skipping class’. In fact, the sentence ‘this event makes Rung and his friends will not skip (ping) class was ungrammatical and had Thai sense. Note that this sense in English should be ‘This event makes (made) Rung and his friends shy and attend a class. In item 2, this sentence was based on word arrangement in Thai structure. The verb ‘finish’ in Thai was ‘the adverb of time’. Moreover, ‘sitting’ in Thai can be used without the preposition ‘in’. Then, using car seemed redundant in English, but it was modified by Tuk-Tuk in Thai. Similarly, the verb ‘go’ could be used in Thai sense. This sentence should thus be ‘when they finished changing their clothes, they took a tuk-tuk to Hadyai city.’
(3.2) 'Verb and tense usage' referred to the errors of tense and time because Thai has no
inflected verb-form of the functions of present, past, and future time as in English.

(3.2.1) Past tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 21 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students answer 'I'm so sorry'. And the teacher went to write on the board again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 21, past tense is the general usage in narrative writing, but this
writing and past simple tense.

(3.2.2) Verb-do and verb-be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 22 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They were went to Diana Theater. They were went to movie. Jan Dara.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to extract 22, this student was confused with the structure of past
simple and past continuous tense, so he or she mixed verb-be and verb-do together.

(3.3) Clause concerned some sentences, which were constructed with incorrect clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 23 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are three boys and they didn’t go to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. While, Suwit walked at Big C. He met his teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 23, in item 1, this student had no strategy to use 'relative clause', so
he or she combined two sentences through the conjunction 'and'. In fact, this should be
'there are (were) three boys who did not go to school.' In item 2, the student was confused
with using 'comma' and 'past continuous tense' for the dependent clause with 'while' in
order to combine 'independent clause' with past simple tense. Hence, this sentence should be
'while Suwit was walking at Big C, he met his teacher.'
(4) **Mechanics of Writing**: There were two aspects of the weakness of mechanics of writing, capitalization and misspelling.

(4.1) **Capitalization** involved the letters, which were not appropriately capitalized. Capitalization is one of rules in written English, but it was not found in Thai.

*Extract 24 (the achievement test)*

1. Somesuk felt sorry but It is a Last time.
2. She caught and pulled the boy out of Examination room.

According to extract 24, these words should not be capitalized due to being in the middle of a sentence.

(4.2) **Misspelling** consisted of two categories: misspelling due to faulty sound perception, and misspelling due to carelessness.

(4.2.1) **Misspelling due to faulty sound perception**

*Extract 25*

1. Skipping, admited, loud (loud), change (change), and dresses (the worksheet).
2. Sow, decled, sudenly, fightheaded, finaly, exited, and casroom (the achievement test).

(4.2.2) **Misspelling due to carelessness**

*Extract 26*

1. Freinds and stor.
2. afried, fell (felt), befor, cathed, examinasion, subject, and tryed.
C. The Strengths of Guided Pen-Friend Letter Writing Ability

There were three common areas indicating the strengths of the students' guided pen-friend letter writing ability in the worksheet and test; content, grammatical structures, and style of writing.

(1) **Content**: As in narrative writing, the effectiveness of content in letter writing consisted of two perspectives; the content relevant to the guided content, and an elaboration of content.

(1.1) *The content relevant to the guided content* involved written work in which content was related to that guided in five paragraphs of the letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 27 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I saw your name and address in the pen pal column of the magazine. I want to be your pen pal. Let me introduce myself (introduction paragraph).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My name is Nattaya and my nick name is Nai. I'm 17 years old. My birth day is 8 July. I live with my parents at Hadyai. I am a Grade I student of Thayawitaya school (introducing yourself and study).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father is gardener and my mother is fruit seller at the market. I have 2 sisters and 3 brothers. And I have grandmother. She is 70 years old (about your family).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My hobbies are reading a book, watching TV and shopping. I like watching TV because I think it is fun and relax. And I like shopping because I want to buy something I want (about your hobbies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some questions for you. What is your school's name? What are your hobbies? I hope you will be my pen pal. I look forward to hearing from you (ending the letter).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to extract 27, it reflected the content relevant to the five guided paragraphs. Such content was adapted from that in previous controlled to guided letter writing activities.

(1.2) *An elaboration of content* referred to the elaboration of the content of each short paragraph in order to convince the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 28 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My name is Sukanya Hanman or Sa. I'm seventeen years old. My birth day is on 21 August. I'm Grade I at Thayawitaya school. My favorite subjects are Thai, English, and I not good Mathematics because it is difficult very much.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Based on extract 28, the content had in-depth details to support the paragraph 'about yourself and study'. It contained this student's birthday, level of study, and the cause of Mathematics being her unfavorable subject.

(2) Grammatical Structures

Only 'a few incorrect sentences' represented the strength of grammatical structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 29 (the worksheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My hobby is listening to the radio because it is relax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I'm studying at Thayaikwittaya school. My favorite subjects are Chemistry and Malay language subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 29, in item 1, there was only the problem about 'adjective'. This student misunderstood that 'relax' was the adjective. In item 2, the word 'subject' showed redundancy. However, both items reflected a few incorrect grammatical sentences.

(3) Style of Writing: Indeed, all guided letter writing in the worksheet and test was full of the adopted content and sentence patterns of the models in previous activities in the worksheets. However, some written work highlighted the students' own style or new self-expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 30 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nice to meet you. I saw your name and address in student weekly magazine. I feel excite with this letter. Because it is first my letter. And I think that you also excite with it. And I want to be your pen pal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I free, I like watching television. My hobby is reading cartoon book because it is very fun. Do you have hobby?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to extract 30, though item 1 had some ungrammatical sentences, it contained the colloquial style of opening letter. This student linked the friendly tone and the feeling of 'excitement' to greet the audience. Likewise, in item 2, the additional question was to bridge the relationship of the letter writer and the audience through this content.
(4) **Vocabulary Usage:** Only new vocabulary creation represented the strength of vocabulary usage. As in narrative writing, some letter writing exhibited that the students created vocabulary items from their experience to construct the sentence grammatically and contextually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 31 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I’m interested in designer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my family, my mother is gardener. But my father passed away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I used to receive letter from pen-friend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on extract 31, the words ‘designer, passed away, and receive’ were not taught in this guided writing classroom. These illustrated the students’ prior learning of these items.

(5) **The Form of Friendly Letter:** The effectiveness of the form of friendly letter referred to the sections of letter form which were correctly placed, namely the head, greeting, opening, body, ending, and closing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 32 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dear Jinnapa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Banhan, Bangklan, 90110 Songkhla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerely, Hiiyah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 32, though the form of friendly letter was easy, the correct form showed the student’s realization of the format of the letter.

**D. The Weaknesses of Guided Pen-Friend Letter Writing Ability**

There were five areas of the weaknesses of the students’ guided letter writing; content, incorrect form, grammatical structures, style of writing, and mechanics of writing.
(1) **Content:** The weakness of content consisted of three perspectives, the combination of two paragraphs in a paragraph, an absence of some contents, and insufficient elaboration.

(1.1) ‘**The combination of two paragraphs in a paragraph**’ concerned two related content frameworks of some letter writings that were combined in a paragraph, especially in paragraphs 2-3, and paragraphs 4-5.

```
Extract 33 (the worksheet)
My name is Fareeda Kammurak or Fa. I'm 18 years old. Now I'm studying at Thayaiwittaya School. My favorite subject is English because it is very funny. My parents are farmer. I have two brother. I don't have sister.
```

Referring to extract 33, it showed the combination of paragraphs 2 and 3. The first four sentences were related to the guided contents of paragraph 2, ‘about yourself and your study’; focusing on only the student’s personal life. But they were followed by the information about the student’s family from guidance in paragraph 3.

(1.2) ‘**Insufficient elaboration**’ meant the content of some letter writing was related to guidance, but it provided short and unclear details.

```
Extract 34 (the achievement test)
My name is Ladds. I am seventy years old. I studying at Thayaiwittaya school. My favorite subject is Thai.
```

Based on extract 34, this student’s details on nickname, level of study, and the reason of her favorite subject were not given.

(2) **Incorrect Form of Letter** was divided into two aspects, the influence of Thai letter form and incorrect source.
(2.1) 'The influence of Thai letter form' referred to some points of the form of Thai letter which influenced the students' English letter.

According to extract 35, the English abbreviations were transliterated from Thai, 'T' from 'Tambon' or sub-district, 'A' from 'Amphure' or district, and 'J' from 'Jangwat' or province. However, 'M' from 'Moo Tee' or the number of village was more widely used in Thailand than those three abbreviations due to inappropriateness in English.

(2.2) 'Incorrect reference' was the content showing incorrect source of the student's pen pal. The reference of pen pal was a part of this letter. In the achievement test, the reference was 'Students Weekly' magazine, but some students created a new source.

In relation to extract 36, this weakness was a result of the students' carelessness of the requirement. This implied that they did not use the guidance in the audience's information thoroughly.

(3) Grammatical Structures: The weakness of grammatical structures had four aspects: the Thai interference in English sentences, subject-verb agreement, clause, and article.

(3.1) Thai interference in English sentences
According to extract 37, in item 1, the preposition ‘in’ or /naj/ was used for ‘days’ in Thai. Then, the phrasal verb ‘go to tour’ was the direct Thai translation from ‘take a trip’. In fact, the meaning of ‘take’ was not directly ‘go’ or /paj/, so the student did not consider it. Besides, ‘making’ or ‘make’ food conveyed the verb ‘cook’ in Thai. In fact, ‘make’ or /tam/ could be interchanged with ‘cook’ or /pruŋ/ in Thai due to synonym. In item 2, the verb ‘have’ or /miː/ in Thai conveyed the student’s possession of age. In this way, the verb ‘am’ was not found in this Thai structure; this structure would be only ‘I (have) 18 years old’.

(3.2) Subject-verb agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 38 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My favorite subject are English and Mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have two brother.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In extract 38, is the omission of ‘s’ for plural noun. The students did not put particle suffixes ‘-s’ (or -es) for such plural nouns because there was no distinction between singular and plural forms in Thai (Smyth, 1987).

(3.3) Clause referred to some complex sentences in which clauses were incorrectly performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 39 (the achievement test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My father is merchant and mother is too. We don’t meet everyday. Because I stay in the dormitory with my sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I have free time, I like watch television.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to extract 39, in item 1, the coordination ‘because’ was not used to combine the dependent clause and the second sentence which was independent clause since the student misunderstood that ‘because’ was also ‘the chronological order’, such as ‘firstly and finally’. But in item 2, the student seemed unaware of ‘comma’ for this complex sentence because this punctuation mark was not found in Thai (Smyth, 1987).
(3.4) Article was caused by Thai structure. Thai students ignored article /a/ and /the/ because there is no ‘article’ in Thai. Hence, they did not use it correctly (Indrasuta, 1988).

![Extract 40 (the worksheet)]

1. My father is gardener and my mother is fruit seller at the market.
2. I am student at Thayawi Wittaya school.

In relation to extract 40, these should be available for the article ‘a’.

(4) Style: As in narrative writing, the weakness of style in letter writing involved the same content and sentence patterns adopted or adapted from the models in the worksheet.

![Extract 41]

1. I’m sure when you get this letter, you will be very surprised. I see your address in the student weekly. Let me tell about myself.
2. I have some questions for you. Do you have sister or brother? What is your school’s name? I hope you will be my pen-friend.

These two paragraphs from extract 41 were the same content and sentence pattern copied from the models. Apparently, there were more letters which were copied styles of model than there were the creative letters.

(5) Mechanics of Writing consisted of three aspects, capitalization, misspelling and question marks.

(5.1) Capitalization: as in narrative writing, the ineffectiveness of using capitalization was caused more by the students’ carelessness than their ignorance of rules.

![Extract 42 (the worksheet)]

1. But I’m not good at mathematics.
2. I’m interested in drawing and cooking thai food.

Referring to extract 42, the students always made an error in capitalization of proper nouns since they were more familiar with the capitalization of ‘English’ than ‘Thai’ and other subjects written in English.
(5.2) Misspelling referred to two aspects, namely misspelling due to faulty sound perception and due to carelessness as in narrative writing.

(5.2.1) Misspelling due to faulty sound perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badminton, interested, ran (want), reduce (introduce), magazine, surprise, relax, pen, pan, pen pot, and field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples from extract 43 were due to the students’ poor aural-oral, and writing skills in English and the influence of Thai phonological elements. The word ‘relax’ showed that though /l/ exists in Thai, it presented a problem to many Thai speakers even in Thai, and so they often substituted it with /l/. This is the case when speaking or writing in English.

(5.2.2) Misspelling due to carelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batting, plece, late, pares, sencerly, fell (feel), and garde.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5.3) Question marks involved the absence of the question marks for the interrogative sentence in ending the letter, being found in the worksheet and test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have some questions for you. Do you have sister or brother. What is your school’s name.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to extract 45, the absence of question marks was because perhaps the students were not sure of punctuation usage.

Overall, the aspects reflecting the strengths and weaknesses of the students’ two guided writing activities in the worksheet and test seem to overlap. In narrative writing, such strengths and weaknesses were based on similar areas, content, paragraph organization, grammatical structures, and mechanics of writing. But, only vocabulary usage was found in the strength. Likewise, in letter writing, such strengths and weaknesses had four common
areas, namely content, grammatical structures, style, and the letter form. But only vocabulary usage reflected the strength and mechanics of writing reflected the weakness. However, though vocabulary usage was of only the strengths of two guided writing, the students’ vocabulary skills in narrative writing were more improved than in letter writing.

4.1.4 Summary of Research Question 1

The summary of the strengths and weaknesses of using guided writing activities was taken from the triangulation of the findings from the pre, actual, and post-experimentation.

The strengths contained 7 areas as below.

(1) The motivation and challenge: The three teachers accepted that the cover of Blueprint book II and World Class book were interesting and colorful. Pictures and other non-linear texts were fantastic and attracted the students. This was related to the material adaptation of guided writing. The researcher committed the students to paint all pictures in lessons 2-3 in narrative writing in order to motivate and challenge their creativity.

(2) Communicative approach: The teachers adapted the communicative approach in the textbook. The students were required to write a letter to their Thai friends in other schools instead of native English friends due to worry about their linguistic incompetence. Similarly, in this guided writing material adaptation, only the authentic Thai audience in the achievement test was changed from the specially written audience. Though the students did not send this letter, this was the basic training for ‘the actual written communication’.
(3) The passage, namely ‘the researcher’s story’: The teachers adapted the writing tasks in Blueprint book, using ‘the teacher’s writing’ as model of journal writing. Likewise, from naturalistic observation, they accepted that the passage ‘the researcher’s story’ as model of narrative writing was the creative technique to make the students enjoy reading and writing.

(4) Time allocation: The researcher had adapted time allocation according to those teachers’ suggestions. From naturalistic observation, they agreed that the researcher managed the time allocated in lesson plan for all activities in narrative writing flexibly.

(5) Learning group organization: The researcher’s specified criteria for matching a pair for 4 exercises of activity 2 in narrative writing, lesson 3 were efficient. From naturalistic observation, the teachers said in the two tasks the researcher matched the students for learning group and pair by counting, independent matching, and drawing a ticket in the raffle well. The students were also satisfied with such criteria and they interacted with each other communicatively.

(6) A series of pictures: The teachers agreed that a series of pictures required the students’ cultural knowledge to generate the content of writing. Some pictures conveyed the local Thai scenario of Songkhla province. Likewise, from naturalistic observation, they said without the researcher’s explanation of pictures in lessons 2-3 the students could orally narrate the story since such contents were relevant to Thai teenage students’ life. Moreover, the researcher realized that the students generated the content relevant to the guided pictures, elaborate on the content in an interesting way, and name the characters in authentic Thai style.
(7) The students' vocabulary development: The teachers revealed that since the students had limited vocabulary items, they liked to copy the vocabulary from the textbook and did not expand the use of new vocabulary items from the teachers' guidance. However, their vocabulary skills developed through this study. From naturalistic observation, they claimed that the students were quite confused with some unfamiliar vocabulary items in passages in narrative writing, but in lessons 2-3 this problem was small. The researcher also agreed with this strength. From the students' guided narrative writing in the test, they could contextually expand the use of guided lexical items, create some new vocabulary items, and use Thai lexical transfer or creativity in Thai-English lexicons.

The weaknesses consisted of 9 aspects.

(1) The chronic language and content problems of the students: The teachers revealed that the students seldom tried to generate their own content and had a lot of ungrammatical sentences when using the textbook. Such problems were a result of their limited English competence rather than any fault of the textbooks. The researcher also found that such chronic problems still emerged in their guided narrative and letter writing in the worksheet and test, and in addition the content was also irrelevant to the pictures.

(2) Grammar translation method (GTM): The teachers needed to use GTM instead of CLT for the writing instruction due to the students' limited aural-oral skills in English. This resulted in their written English ability through direct Thai translation. Similarly, from naturalistic observation, they said the researcher's GTM in letter writing was also focused more on Thai than English due to the students' demand; the researcher did not code-switch two languages well because the students' aural-oral incompetence remained. They also used
very few spoken English in pair and small group work. This resulted in Thai interference in English sentences in their guided narrative and letter writing.

(3) The students’ lack of originality: The teachers claimed the students had inadequate basic English skills and lacked creative thinking, so they liked to copy the language and content patterns of the writing tasks in the textbook and of their friends. This weakness still arose while using guided writing. From naturalistic observation, they agreed that while performing pair work, some average students copied the language patterns of their peers that were good students. The researcher realized this as the style of the students’ guided letter in the worksheet and achievement test was similar to that in the models of previous guided writing activities in the worksheet. This meant they still adopted the content and language patterns, especially in the introductory and ending paragraph.

(4) The Influence of Thai letter in English letter: The teachers said a comparison of Thai and English letter texts resulted in the influences of Thai letter-writing format in the English letter. Though the students were taught the correct form of the English letter in lesson 2, their guided letter writing in the worksheet and test was still influenced by the Thai letter, such as comma and the abbreviations translated from Thai for the address.

(5) The students’ lack of grammar improvement: One teacher tried to overcome grammar errors of the students’ writing by correcting them and conducting extra tuition, but they did not utilize the teacher’s help. There were a few students whose writing skills and grammar points were improved after that teacher’s assistance. Similarly, though the researcher helped the students’ problems through explanation and revision about grammar points, nobody
could write the two guided writing pieces grammatically.

(6) **Punctuation**: From naturalistic observation, the teachers claimed the researcher did not explain punctuation in narrative writing well due to his assumption that the students had sufficient knowledge to understand it in the notes individually. But this resulted in punctuation errors in their guided narrative and letter writing, particularly ‘the use of comma for clause and complex sentences’.

(7) **Time allocation**: The researcher’s adapted time allocation also led to insufficient time for the students to complete the letter writing in lesson 3.

(8) **Self-evaluation**: The teachers viewed that though self-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance in language, content, and rhetoric was appropriate, the students did not like it due to the belief that the first draft was perfect. Likewise, from naturalistic observation, they agreed that few students realized that it was not perfect. Hence, the researcher found that this resulted in the students’ guided writing with misspelling.

(9) **Peer-evaluation**: The teachers claimed that peer-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance in questions about issues was difficult for the students since they feared to comment on their peers’ writing. Similarly, though the researcher attempted to guide them with questions, few students had critical thinking skills.
4.2 Research Question 2 "What Problems Do the Learners Face While Using Guided Writing Activities?"

The findings from on-going assessment and students' interview were triangulated for the summary of the problems the learners faced while using guided writing activities.

4.2.1 Presentation and Analysis of Data from On-Going Assessment

A. Narrative Writing Task

The students' problems, causes, and solutions while using guided narrative writing from lessons 1-3 (Appendix B, p. 219) will be explained in the following section.

In lesson 1, for activity 2 (pp. 225-226), the students attempted to understand the passage, namely 'the researcher's story', in Thai. Firstly, they did not understand some unfamiliar words and complex sentences. Then, they struggled to interpret a phrasal verb, namely 'took', from 'Then, I took a bus to Koh Yo, Songkhla'. In Thai, they could identify 'sit' or 'stand' in the bus, but in English the phrase 'took a bus' included all actions of the bus passengers in general. Hence, the researcher explained to them this phrasal verb, giving some examples, such as 'took a train'. The researcher also revised some complex sentences, such as the uses of 'while' and 'when', from 'While I was introducing myself to other students, I was very excited and trembling' and 'I was still excited when I interacted with my new friends' through past simple and past continuous tense.
In note 2 (p. 227), the students did not know the significance and usage of the components of ‘Structure of the Story’, title, introduction, content, and conclusion. Hence, the differences of Thai and English paragraph or story were explained to them, such as the use of the capital letter when writing the title of a story in English, which was not found in Thai story or paragraph.

In lesson 2, for activity 2 (pp. 229-230), the students confronted the problem about paragraph organization. They had previously learnt some linking devices and chronological order in isolation, not in paragraph organization. They were then given an explanation on the importance of such rhetorical elements in Thai and asked to help the researcher to put them in the paragraph they had done in ‘class composition’. For activity 3, all the students accepted that exercise 2 (p. 232) was very difficult, especially the meaning of some words in the passage, grammar points of each sentence, and strategies of vocabulary creation. Consequently, the solution was the researcher and learners’ cooperative translation of the content and the researcher’s explanation of grammar points.

Lesson 3 was full of problems. In activity 1 (p. 223), namely ‘Warm-Up’, the researcher attempted to help the students recall what they had learnt in lessons 1 and 2 in order to link their understanding of those previous lessons and to the new activities of lesson 3. However, they forgot the topic of this narrative writing task titled ‘The Special Days in My Memory’. The researcher thus helped them by asking them to generally revise lessons 1 and 2. This was caused by two factors. The first was the students’ lack of memorization of the lesson in the classroom and their lack of revision. Another was their confusion of the main topic of the narrative writing task due to many activities regarding
‘The Special Days in My Memory’, such as ‘My First Day in the New School’ from the researcher’s story, and ‘My Aidilfitri Day’ from class composition in lesson 1.

In activity 2, exercise 4 (pp. 244-246), two main problems were observed, namely the students’ presentation at the grading stage and their writing problem. In the former, there was lack of the students’ eye contact with the audience while presenting their work through the use of transparencies, and secondly their handwriting on the transparencies was too small. These were solved by the researcher’s reminder to them. Another problem was the unclear explanation of their work due to their anxiety about mispronunciation, so the researcher allowed them to read their work naturally and he corrected their pronunciation after the presentation. Finally, some students feared to peer-evaluate their friends’ work. Hence, the researcher guided them on some aspects of content in their peers’ writing, then randomly asked them to ask the questions.

The latter showed the students’ chronic writing problems. This exercise was the follow-up writing activity with some guidance of pictures, speech bubbles, and the introduction. The students were not fluent in vocabulary creativity since the use of Thai-English dictionary was not allowed. In addition, they made errors in the usage of verb-tense agreement and used direct Thai translation of English for sentence construction. Such problems were complicated for the researcher’s immediate remedy because it depended more on the student’s development of linguistic and writing abilities.

Finally, activity 3 of lesson 3 (pp. 247-250) indicated the students’ language and self-evaluation problems. Because this activity provided less guidance for the task and from
the researcher than in previous activities, the students still faced typical problems about vocabulary creation, sentence construction, and paragraph organization. Firstly, the researcher did not explain any new vocabulary items they asked, but instead encouraged them to use the simple words they knew. However, some still copied and asked the good students certain vocabulary items. Secondly, the solution to the problem of sentence construction was that they were asked to check the previous activities that the researcher had explained especially the corrected English sentences.

Moreover, the problem of self-evaluation was more a result of the students’ rush than lack of guidance. The researcher had been reminding them of self-evaluation by correcting content, language, and paragraph organization from the beginning of class to the end. However, their writing reflected many language errors because they rushed to complete it. In fact, the researcher found that they had previously been reminded of this evaluation by their teachers, but they always forgot because they liked to write as fast as they could. Consequently, the solution depended on the students’ realization of the importance of self-evaluation.

In brief, ‘language’ is still the most chronic problem of the student while using guided narrative writing. Other problems were self-evaluation and peer-evaluation.

B. Pen-Friend Letter Writing

The learners’ problems while using guided letter writing activities of 3 lessons were solved. In lesson 1, for activity 2 (p. 257), the learners faced the problem of not being
cooperative thinkers. All were supposed to cooperate with the researcher in composing a short paragraph on two chosen topics regarding ‘My Hobbies’. However, the researcher noticed that the students were concerned with copying the short paragraph he demonstrated than helping him express the whole ideas. This implied that the learners were more followers than creators as they were worried about committing errors in front of the other 19 students. The researcher solved this problem by randomly asking them to create their ideas. However, due to time constraints if anyone could not do so, the researcher created ideas.

In activity 3 (p. 260), they used the southern Thai dialect, not standard Thai and English code switching suggested by the researcher due to intimacy. They seldom spoke English among themselves unless the researcher controlled due to unfamiliarity and difficulties in articulation. This resulted in Thai interference in English sentences in their short paragraph. This was solved by the researcher’s extensive guidance to produce correct English sentences. Moreover, self or peer-evaluation was still ignored. Though some groups could revise their work by only checking spelling, they were not confident to reconstruct new sentences. Hence, self and peer-evaluation with the researcher’s guidance in language, content, and paragraph organization was provided. Finally, using the short paragraph of activity 2 as a model resulted in all the groups’ writing containing the same content as in the model. The researcher’s intention was to investigate some groups’ creation of content and language patterns by adapting the model. However, this intention was not achieved since it degraded the learners’ linguistic originality, and paragraph organization. This problem was difficult to solve there and then since the learners were not mature enough to create their own styles. Hence, the best solution was to keep in touch with their writing abilities in the subsequent activities.
In lesson 2, for activity 3 (pp. 263-264), namely the form of friendly letters, two problems were apparent. After studying the weaknesses of the short paragraphs, it was found that the students were not ready to face the form of letter due to two factors, the researcher's methodology, and the learners' learning process. Firstly, the strategy the researcher employed to introduce this new activity was to ask the learners to guess the source of the short paragraphs or excerpts about 'my hobbies'. Nobody could guess the pen-friend letter was the source; this strategy was too difficult for them because they had practiced only one short paragraph about 'my hobbies', a part of the content of the letter. Secondly, they had forgotten the format of two previous writing tasks while negotiating with the researcher in pre-experimentation. This also showed that most of them did not notice that the styles of those short paragraphs about 'my hobbies' were different from other formal writings. They did not analyze question marks and the pronouns 'you' and 'I' appearing in those short paragraphs. The solution was thus that the researcher explained to them the contents of lessons 1-2, activity 2, the reasons those short paragraphs about 'my hobbies' were used to introduce lesson 2, activity 3, titled the form of letter, again. In addition, for self-access learning, they only had the problem with the meanings of vocabulary items, which were the sections of this letter. For example, they used 'opening-greeting' sections and 'closing-ending' sections interchangeably due to the influence of Thai letter form. The answer key and each score's explanation, as well as the researcher's summary were thus the solution.

In lesson 3, the learners' problems appeared only in activity 2. In exercise 1 (pp. 268-269), rearranging sentences in the organized letter, the learners struggled while interpreting 20 disordered sentences due to less experience of sentence analysis; they had practiced it through only one model of pen-friend letter in activity 4 of lesson 2 (p. 267).
Moreover, the five short paragraphs in this activity were similar to those of the model, but the style was quite different. In addition, the learners were not confident to start certain sentences. Another problem was that some sentences were awkwardly constructed due to direct translation from Thai. Besides, their strategy for this exercise was to revise the form of letter, the model, and short paragraphs on ‘my hobbies’ in the previous activities. But those activities/exercises’ sentence patterns revised were different from those of this exercise. Finally, though they could complete this exercise, they still made errors in mixing up some sentence patterns in the opening and ending paragraphs. The best solution was the researcher’s detailed explanation on the correct sentence arrangement for this exercise.

In conclusion, the students’ problems when using guided letter writing activities were similar yet different from those in narrative writing. Similarly, there was Thai interference in English sentences. It is evident that they had copied the researcher’s original language and content patterns.

4.2.2 Presentation and Analysis of Data from Students’ Interview

The findings from the students’ interview were divided into two aspects: problems and solutions before and while using guided writing activities.

4.2.2.1 Problems and Solutions before Using Guided Writing Activities

Before using guided writing activities, five representatives of the students had faced four main problems. First of all, they faced difficulties of language and content, as well as
problems caused by the students’ previous knowledge in content and language. In the former, they seemed to be creating vocabulary items rather than using grammar points and generating content because they had not been taught the correct vocabulary learning strategies at the primary and lower secondary level. Likewise, the latter indicated that some students were dissatisfied with teaching methods of content and language used by their recent teachers. In fact, the students themselves understood their linguistic incompetence better than their earlier teachers understood them, so they needed to help from their teachers to remedy their linguistic problems.

Second, the students’ knowledge of writing skills covered the problems in mechanics of writing and paragraph organization. Both problems had rarely been attended to in classroom activities at the upper secondary level. The mechanics of writing was not actually difficult for their self-study because it had already been learnt at the lower secondary level. But, paragraph organization was too complicated for their self-study. Indeed, they had written a paragraph incoherently because they had never been taught ‘how to organize a paragraph’, except rearranging and combining sentences in a paragraph.

Third, the different learning processes of Thai and English led to the students’ written English problems. The students understood that thinking and writing in Thai could help them produce written work easily. In fact, this resulted in certain awkward structures, such as Thai interference in English sentences because of differences between Thai and English structure.

Finally, perceptions in the writing instruction involved problems about motivation in writing, the teacher’s teaching methods, the students’ misunderstanding of models of writing
tasks based on non-Thai content, and review of errors. The students did not have much motivation to write in English due to little use for written English in the university entrance examination and their daily life. Then, the focus of their teachers on GTM implied their attempt to motivate the students to initiate their own sentences but the students preferred using similar sentence patterns from the textbook and the teacher’s demonstration due to their worry about errors. Moreover, because the textbook was based on the native English context, the students often misunderstand examples and models of writing tasks. However, some teachers used Thai pictures and models in Thai context but the content was irrelevant to these students’ level. Finally, the review of errors showed that they were more a result of the students’ habits than the teacher’s teaching. Their teachers always reminded them of self-correction in the classroom and during examination, but they did not practise it.

There were four ways whereby the students could solve problems about writing skills, namely the students themselves, their friends, teachers, and supplementary books. Firstly, it was not easy for them to judge some ambiguous issues about writing skills individually due to the risk of using their judgment in the examination. Secondly, they always consulted with their friends more about vocabulary item and grammar points than content. This was also risky since they probably copied their friends’ content and language patterns. Thirdly, almost all students feared to ask their teachers questions about unclear issues due to worry about their linguistic incompetence and insufficient information for discussion. However, as there were only three English teachers at the upper secondary level of this school, the teachers’ time constraint was thus the main reason for insufficient supervision. Finally, all the students had the university entrance examination preparation books. But these books contained more tests and explanations for test-taking strategies than
the lessons for training them in writing skills. Besides, though grammar books could overcome their writing problems, in linking devices, it was also risky because the students would probably copy sentence patterns exemplified for each linking device.

4.2.2.2 Problems While Using Guided Writing Activities

(1) Problems While Using Guided Writing in the Worksheets

A. Narrative Writing

Using guided narrative writing in all lessons presented certain problems. In lesson 1, for activity 2 (pp. 225-226), one student did not know the meaning of all vocabulary items while transforming them in the past-tense verbs. Indeed, the words to be transformed were taken from those in the passage, namely 'the researcher's story', but this student was careless while the researcher and whole class cooperatively explained the whole content of this story.

In activity 3 (p. 228), two students faced the problems in the structure of the story. Both agreed that the introduction was the most difficult part of a paragraph because it required them to start sentences having the entire content. Moreover, one student had difficulty in generating ideas for the events. Another said concluding was more difficult than generating content in that it needed insights into the introduction and content. Hence, though they understood the structure of the story outlined in notes, they could not individually construct the introduction, content, and conclusion in relation to this outline easily because they were not fluent enough to practise this structure of story.
In lesson 2, for activity 3, Exercise 2 (p. 232) or cloze passage without lexical choices presented problems. Two students said working in small groups did not relieve its complication since they seldom created the vocabulary items in cloze passages. The other understood the story with missing words and could create the vocabulary only in Thai. The three students viewed that mostly students could not recall vocabulary items according to the story though some blanks were suitable for simple words. These were caused by the task and the students themselves. The students did not fully understand the sentence for each blank and could not link the whole written discourse and content coherently. Besides, they seldom practised this kind of exercise because it rarely appeared in their examination and university entrance examination.

In lesson 3, two students confronted the problem in activity 3 (p. 247). They could not integrate the linguistic guidance of the writing task from the pictures and the researcher’s help due to linguistic incompetence. Besides, these students added that this was their first attempt at learning how to write coherently, so they were not fluent enough to create their own style with other linking devices. Moreover, they disliked the pair work in lesson 2 since each student had to generate a great deal of ideas. Finally, the time allocation was not balanced. Some students said the grading stage was trivialized, so it was time-consuming. Time allotted for small group work was also too short, so some groups' writing performance was not satisfactory.
B. Pen-Friend Letter Writing

The students’ problems while using guided pen-friend letter writing activities were less than those in narrative writing. In lesson 2, activity 3, (pp. 263-264) namely ‘introducing the form of friendly letter’, the problem concerned the wrong usage of vocabulary items and the sections of this letter form. One student was confused with the meaning of vocabulary items, so she labeled the sections of the letter wrongly. The others used the Thai letter format hence making errors in the closing and ending sections. The rest knew the meaning of ‘greeting’ but did not understand how to greet in English letters. Evidently, these were caused by the influence of Thai letter.

In lesson 3, all representatives of the students agreed that all 20 students had difficulty in completing exercise 1 of activity 2 (pp. 268-269) titled ‘Rearranging Sentences’. Three students were confused with the sentence pattern, namely ‘I look forward to hearing from you’, because they seldom used it to end their letters in English. In fact, the meaning of this sentence was not complicated, but it was a very new sentence pattern and beyond these students’ writing ability. Another student observed that this exercise had in-depth content and sentences, so it was difficult to rearrange them in the organized paragraph. Moreover, another student said they took a long time to complete it. These problems were thus due to the complication of task and the students’ inability to analyze the strategy used. Indeed, the cause of those problems was also related to activity 4 of lesson 2 (p. 267), namely ‘the model of pen-friend letter’. The students had just read and understood the content and sentence patterns for five paragraphs of the model, and had not rearranged them in the organized paragraph; they had less practice analyzing each paragraph of the pen-friend
letter. Though the content of exercise 1 was similar to those of the model; 'introductory paragraph, introducing yourself and your study, about your family, about your hobbies/interests, and ending your letter', their sentences and writing styles were different. They did not have strategies to analyze the new sentences with the new vocabulary items in the same content of the model. Finally, the rest mixed up the arrangement of the sentences in the opening and ending paragraphs because some sentences, such as the ending 'Hopefully you can be my pen-pal' and the opening sentence 'I want to be your pen-pal' for opening had similar meaning. This was caused by their ignorance of the meaning and usage of the word 'hopefully' and the role and position of 'I' and 'you'.

Furthermore, one student said lesson 3, activity 2 (pp.268-269), provided the distinctive style of pen-friend letter with new content and sentence patterns, so the students struggled to produce the style as in that of the model in each exercise. Another said that this pen-friend letter was too restricted in terms of content for each paragraph. They had to follow the content frame rather than create it. These problems showed that guidance in content and sentence patterns of this letter, which is derived from the textbook and the books about the ESL writing instruction, was unknown among the EFL students. These students had been familiar with producing written work through the use of a model or doing free writing rather than using guidance. Besides, the rest said it was difficult for 3-4 students to work on letter writing cooperatively since each one had his or her own ideas to communicate to one's recipient. Therefore, they preferred the individual work for letter writing.

In summary, two main problems the students faced while using guided letter writing activities were the confusion in mixing up the sections of English letter form due to influence
by the Thai letter form, and the inability to rearrange sentences with new writing styles in the organized letter. Besides, they were not worried about the task performance while being observed by three English teachers because they were acquainted with them and they were not outsiders or native English teachers.

(2) Problems While Using Guided Writing Activities in the Achievement Test
(Referring to Appendix C, page 279)

A. Narrative Writing

Only two students revealed the problems. First, the guided vocabulary items with Thai meaning given presented problems. Though the parts of speech were also specified, she did not know how to construct sentences with these lexical items. This was probably caused more by the students' linguistic incompetence than the lack of guidance of task. This student was confused about the subject and predicate parts of a sentence and she faced difficulty in expression of ideas for each sentence, so she arranged the words in the sentence in incorrect positions. Another problem was Thai interference in English sentence construction due to the process of interlanguage.

In addition, all five students did not face problems in content, speech bubbles, and sentence patterns from the guidance in the pictures. In this test, four students understood the event in a series of pictures easily since it was based on Thai teenage students' real life, but they had to analyze it at a deeper level in the previous examination so it went beyond their capabilities. Consequently, they could generate their ideas and construct sentences for this
narrative writing better than the previous one. Moreover, the rest of the students did not face difficulty in interpreting speech bubbles. She could perform this story writing without guided speech bubbles because she could guess the whole meaning of the contents from each picture. She also believed that all 20 students could write this story well because they had experienced the same situation on the examination day as was presented in this story.

B. Pen-Friend Letter Writing

The problems of using guided letter writing activities in the achievement test were absent due to many reasons. All the students said this letter was easier than that used in the former examination. This letter provided the frames of content for each paragraph, so they could arrange their ideas and sentence patterns systematically. The previous letter had only provided them with general instruction and not the outline for generating the content, so they fell back on the content and form of Thai friendly letter resulting in interference.

Besides, they were not as depressed as in their real final examination. They accepted that the atmosphere of this test was different from that in the real examination because of the score. They had to pass the real examination with a good grade. However, they also had to complete this test due to their commitment. Moreover, they were ready for this test without in-depth revision due to the practice of 6 lessons in the classroom. Furthermore, they understood more than 60 percent of this English instruction without the researcher’s Thai explanation because such instruction was similar to that in lesson 3, activity 3 in the worksheet. Finally, they could complete their two tasks within 100 minutes.
4.2.3 Summary of Research Question 2

When the findings from on-going assessment were used to triangulate the data form students’ interview, some common areas about the students’ problems while using guided writing activities were found.

A. Narrative Writing

In narrative writing, such common areas appeared in three lessons. In lesson 1, for activity 2, namely ‘the researcher’s story’, though only one of 5 representatives of the students faced difficulties about the meanings of some unseen words while transforming the past-simple verbs, the researcher had also noticed that many students spent too much time to finish their reading due to less reading experiences, the Thai linguistic influence, and inability to use contextual clues. In students’ interview, the problems of pre-using guided writing activities were mainly the difficulties of language and content in performing writing tasks due to their poor vocabulary learning strategy. Hence, this problem still emerged while they were using guided writing.

Note 2 and activity 3 presented related problems. Five students revealed different problems while constructing title, introduction, content, and conclusion, through the researcher’s help, and using only the researcher’s story as a model and note 2, namely ‘structure of the story’ as an outline. Such assistance was insufficient to enable them to write the class composition in English according to the researcher’s expectation, so they used Thai stories as models and outlines. This relates to the problems found in on-going assessment.
The students were confused with the usage of those components of ‘structure of the story’ when compared to that of Thai stories, particularly capitalization of title, which was not found in Thai. This implied that they needed to study a lot of English model stories. Hence, the passage and its structure or ‘the researcher’s story’, which were only one model and outline of the story writing in English, was new for the students when producing class composition. There was language interference in terms of the usage of Thai story structure.

In lesson 2, exercise 2, the common problems were based on the linguistic elements of the cloze passage and the linguistic incompetence of the students. Firstly, this cloze passage did not provide any vocabulary choices, so the students had to analyze the written discourse of the whole passage in order to fill in words grammatically and contextually. Finally, there was Thai interference of English vocabulary items, as well as the students’ memorization and insufficient knowledge about contextual clues for vocabulary creation and sentence analysis. These were caused by non-lexical choices and the students’ unfamiliarity with this exercise.

Finally, for lesson 3, activity 3, while helping the students’ problems in person, the researcher realized that their chronic linguistic problems in pre-using guided writing, that is, vocabulary creation, sentence construction, and paragraph organization, still emerged in the last activity. Such problems were more a result of the students’ linguistic barriers than a result of little linguistic guidance of the task by the researcher. This also indicated the weakness of the researcher’s grading of each activity. Though the researcher solved such problems, some students hardly tried to create their own ideas and sentence construction. In the same vein, two representatives said they could not integrate the linguistic guidance of the
pictures to structure sentences and organize a paragraph due to linguistic incompetence. Therefore, some students' chronic linguistic problems had been fossilized form pre to post-using guided writing activities.

B. Pen-Friend Letter Writing

The common areas of the students' problems in using guided letter writing were apparent only in lessons 2 and 3. In lesson 2, only activity 3, 'introducing the form of friendly letter' showed that they faced problems in understanding the meaning of vocabulary items, which referred to sections of this letter, and this was revealed while labeling them. The researcher knew that most of them mixed up the labeling of 'opening-greeting' and 'closing-ending' sections. Similarly, three representatives made errors in closing and ending, and did not understand the usage of the greeting section of the English friendly letter. Those common problems were caused by the influence of Thai letters. Moreover, though having learnt the English friendly letter before this study, they understood the Thai letter form better than that of English letters. This implied that they compared English and Thai letter forms while performing this activity. In fact, the sections of a Thai letter were quite similar to those in English, with only the position of the date in Thai being placed in the middle of the letter. Furthermore, they misunderstood that 'the opening of the letter' was the first section referring to the recipient while 'greeting' was the first paragraph containing the statement about making a new friend. Likewise, the meanings of closing and ending in Thai were synonymous, so this semantic problem interfered in their writing. All problems were thus due to the students' ignorance of the vocabulary's meaning in each paragraph of the letter.
For lesson 3, only the exercise in activity 2 titled 'rearranging sentences' presented common problems. While grading this exercise, the researcher found that most of the students interpreted 20 sentences wrongly and hence rearranged them wrongly in the letter form. They arranged some sentences for opening and closing paragraphs interchangeably, especially 'hopefully you can be my pen pal' and 'I want to be your pen pal' due to similar meaning in Thai. Likewise, three students were unsure about the meaning and usage of the sentence 'I look forward to hearing from you'. The rest claimed that this exercise had complicated content and sentences, so they took a long time to complete it. All these common problems were caused by the task itself and the students' insufficient strategy for analysis. Firstly, though this exercise was 'almost controlled', it was full of new sentences and writing styles requiring the students to analyze. Indeed, the content of these new sentences were still similar to that of five paragraphs of this letter as the model in activity 4 of lesson 2. However, they had experience in reading and analyzing only one model with the researcher's help. Secondly, they did not seem to be able to brainstorm to analyze such new sentences despite working in small groups. In the sentence 'I look forward to hearing from you', the students found that only 'forward' was a new word. But the functions of 'I' and 'You' were not difficult to guess. Similarly, the sentences 'you can be my pen pal' and 'I want to be your pen pal' were based on the similar sense of the functions of 'you-my pen pal' and 'I-your pen pal'. This led to their confusion. Though the proper Thai meaning of 'hopefully' was difficult for them, it was the key word or sense that could differentiate between those two sentences' functions.
4.3 Research Question 3 ‘What Suggestions Are Provided by the Teachers in Order to Improve Guided Writing Activities?’

4.3.1 Presentation and Analysis of Data from Teachers’ Questionnaire

The findings from Part I of the teachers’ questionnaire were a summary of three English teachers’ methodology of teaching writing before observing this guided writing instruction. Part II an exposition of the teachers’ suggestions and feedback on guided writing activities after observing this instruction highlighted this research question.

The finding from part I was shown through the tables and discussion below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher</th>
<th>Warmup activity</th>
<th>whole class, small group, and pair work language game</th>
<th>students’ oral presentation</th>
<th>controlled and guided writing exercises</th>
<th>Student reading aloud</th>
<th>using picture and other real world texts</th>
<th>vocabulary development</th>
<th>Self-access learning</th>
<th>student self-discovery of errors</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 4.3, warm-up activity, students’ working in whole class, small group and pairs, students’ oral presentation, using pictures and other real world texts, and vocabulary development had been conducted by all teachers. Next, students’ reading and self-discovery of errors, and pre-test were used by only two teachers. However, language games, controlled and guided writing exercises, and self-access learning were rarely used. In this way, the use of controlled and guided writing exercises is the new approach to them.
Table 4.4: Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Peer-Evaluation</th>
<th>On-going Assessment</th>
<th>Impressionistic Marking Method</th>
<th>Analytical Marking Method</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4.4, such evaluation methods had been less used by the teachers than methods and techniques of teaching English. Only two teachers used self-evaluation and on-going assessment. However, peer-evaluation, using impressionistic and analytical marking methods were rarely used. This indicated that the analytical marking method that was conducted was a new evaluation method as in controlled and guided writing exercises.

Besides, all the teachers had attended a course in teaching of writing for the university curriculum or special seminars or workshops conducted by the regional education department of Songkhla province. But, they still faced many problems in their real writing instruction. Such problems including main problems they faced, main problems their learners faced, and their solutions for the problems of writing instruction are discussed below.

Table 4.5: Problems in Teaching of Written English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Teacher</th>
<th>Main Problems Faced by the Teacher</th>
<th>Main Problems Faced by the Learners in the Teacher’s View</th>
<th>The Teacher’s Solution of the Writing Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The students could not write sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Vocabulary Creation</td>
<td>- Let them use a dictionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary memorization activity was set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The students did not understand grammar structure and meanings of vocabulary items.</td>
<td>They did not know how to start writing words and sentences levels.</td>
<td>- Grammar point was explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Examples of sentences were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How to write a sentence was taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Help them correct their own sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>- Textbooks’ writing tasks were difficult to teach - Explaining to the students grammar points was time-consuming.</td>
<td>- They were not interested in writing skills. - They had the copying habit.</td>
<td>- Try to understand their English background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How to write words to sentences was taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- They were allowed to write what they were interested in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 4.5, the teachers viewed that their learners’ inability in writing a sentence was their problems when teaching written English since their learners had poor knowledge in English vocabulary and grammar skills which were considered the most important elements for writing instruction. Distinctively, only one teacher faced difficulty in writing tasks in the textbook. Hence, the teachers’ problems were based more on their learners’ learning process of writing and linguistic ability than their own material or teaching methods. Moreover, their learners’ problems were the poor grammar skills, vocabulary creation, dislike of writing skills, and habit of copying since they seldom used English in their daily life, and lacked motivation and guidance when writing. Besides, they tried to employ many ways to solve their learners’ writing problems, but such linguistic based solutions were insufficient.

Part II discussed four aspects relevant to ‘Suggestions and Feedback on Guided Writing Activities’; Suggestions or feedback for improving guided writing activities’; a comparison of this guided writing material and the teachers’ previous material and textbooks, a comparison of this test and the teachers’ pervious final exam paper, and an acceptance of this new material as a part of lessons in this classroom and others at this level.

(1) Suggestions or Feedback for Improving Guided Writing Activities

A. Narrative Writing Task

The three teachers suggested the different aspects for improving guided narrative writing tasks. Firstly, the number of pictures for a series should be increased to at least 10
pictures for a series, so that the students would have sufficient content to elaborate on. This teacher viewed that 6-9 pictures were insufficient to provide an insight into a story to achieve their actual writing ability. Indeed, this suggested number was too large for the EFL upper secondary students to write an organized story. However, this should be considered. From the findings of research question 1, only a minority of the students could express their ideas in greater detail through each picture magnificently, but the majority seemed to arrange the single subsequent situations, not elaborating on the feelings and actions of the characters. Hence, the number of pictures for the series should vary, considering the theme of a story and the students’ interest.

Secondly, the length of the rubrics of some activities in the worksheet should be reduced, otherwise the students would be bored before completing the task. In fact, the narrative worksheet, including letter writing, was quite new for this teacher. The rubrics for each activity of two tasks consisted of topic, number and title of activity, aim, instructions with various stages, and content of activity. Such rubrics were given as the students’ learning stages for their writing outcome. However, this feedback should be recognized. It was accepted that instructions of some activities, such as exercise 1 of activity 2, lesson 2 contained four steps, so the researcher should shorten those steps in order to help the students understand them better than their self-reading.

The final teacher viewed that some average students could work among the good students in pairs and small groups well, but not during individual work. They wasted too much time compared to the good students since the researcher’s linguistic assistance for them was insufficient. Hence, the researcher should extensively assist them in their
individual work. Indeed, the researcher gave extensive individual help to the students for both tasks. He kept track of the progress of the good and average students’ writing skills all the time. However, such individual activity was more complicated than the previous activities or exercises due to its little guidance. Moreover, the researcher could not explain to all the students sentence construction and the detailed content of the story as deeply as in the previous ones because this activity evaluated the students’ guided writing. Besides, the good students were more confident to ask questions about their problems than the average ones. Furthermore, the researcher tried to prompt some quiet average students through linguistic assistance, but they were fearful of discussing with the researcher due to worry about their insufficient insights into content and sentence construction. However, this suggestion was also accepted. The researcher found that the written work of some average students showed low scores and revealed a lot of linguistic problems although their previous written performance was satisfactory. This was caused by the researcher’s time constraint and careless solution for previous activities. Though the researcher checked all the students’ writing progress from their worksheets and explained difficult issues to those who asked questions, this did not mean that all the students clearly understood and could work well on the subsequent activities. Perhaps some average students copied their good friends’ writing without the researcher noticing in the classroom. To summarize, the suggestion was that the researcher keep in touch with the average students through every activity of 3 lessons of narrative writing, otherwise their chronic linguistic problems would be fossilized and would arise frequently in the actual writing.
B. Pen-Friend Letter Writing

First of all, the students should be given authentic recipients from Thailand’s neighboring countries so that they could correspond with their actual pen-friends. This implied the setbacks in using authentic recipients for guided letter writing. Indeed, this task contained more of the specially written recipients, 20 names in the actual writing activity of lesson 3, than the authentic recipients, only one name in the achievement test based on only Thai background. Moreover, this guided letter writing did not present the actual written communication. In fact, this task aimed to train the students to write informal letters so that they could further produce authentic pen-friend letter individually via letters or emails. However, communication via the pen-friend letter had not been included in this study because the priority in relation to the objective of this English course was the letter sender. This suggestion could be taken up by other researchers since replying the letter could reinforce the students’ letter writing ability. Besides, using authentic pen-friends from neighboring Thailand could enhance two neighboring friends’ cultural relations rather than using the ones from western countries.

Second, a teacher commented on the use of partial dictation in the language laboratory. She felt that the researcher’s dictation to the students through his accurate English reading in the recorded tape was appropriate for this classroom because the students had a few problems with aural skills. However, they still needed to listen to the native English reader during the actual English practice. This feedback implied restrictions on the discipline of EFL listening skills in the recent syllabus in confining to the native English speaker rather than Thai speakers of English. Actually, this partial dictation was to
strengthen the listening skills for improving the writing skills in the Thai context. This suggestion did not downgrade this task, but it could help Thai students to develop their aural and writing skills through standard native English readers if possible.

The final teacher demanded teaching with the use of an envelope. After the students could produce this authentic letter, they should understand where and how the address was placed on the envelope. That the students had experienced writing and sending Thai letters did not mean they could label the English envelopes correctly. Hence, if they want to send a letter to their foreign pen-friend, an authentic air-mail letter form with stamp attached should be taught. Besides teaching them how to write the address, the teacher should give them the name of the receiver with correct capitalization in the correct position of the envelope. In addition, the researcher should show and explain to them an example of the authentic pen-friend letter in its sealed envelope had been replied by the actual pen-pal.

(2) A Comparison of this New Material of Guided Writing Activities and Those Teachers’ Previous Material and Textbook.

A comparison of the two tasks of this material based on guided writing activities and those of the teachers based on their own material and textbook presented the expected result. Firstly, one said the writing activities of the two tasks of his previous material were less varied and guided than those of this new material. For example, two models and their exercises from the textbook and supplementary books had been taught before the students were committed to pair or individual writing assignment. This was due to time constraints in developing the new material for these two tasks; there were also other writing tasks and
language skills to be acquired. Meanwhile, the two tasks of this new material had presented detailed teaching steps and many subsequent controlled to guided writing activities using the background of the Thai teenage sub-culture. With such assistance, the students could improve their writing ability better than when they were taught with the previous material.

Secondly, a teacher referred to the outstanding point of this material and her own material for this comparison. In her own material, a series of pictures and the form of letter were presented in flow-charts instead of through worksheets because there were more students in her class for this subject and they understood the visual material better with guidance than through their own reading. But such flow-charts were not employed in this new material. However, her own worksheets for these two tasks were not designed with a range of controlled and guided writing activities, but contained only some models and exercises based on non-Thai teenage sub-culture, taken from other books. Hence, the worksheets for this new material represented a better tool for EFL writing instruction in the Thai context.

Finally, the main difference between this new material and the teacher's own material was the detailed instructions or guidance from the task and the researcher. For her material, there was more teacher guidance than linguistic guidance. She had helped her students with linguistic problems through detailed explanation while they were practising these two writing tasks through the textbook. However, the linguistic help of the tasks themselves from the textbook and her adapted supplementary materials were less than those of this new material. She admitted that it was difficult to find an English textbook containing a range of controlled to guided writing activities based on the Thai cultural context.
(3) A Comparison of this Test and the Teachers’ Final Exam Papers

The teachers favored the achievement test of this study over their final exam papers. One teacher commented on the writing stages and scoring criterion in this test. In this teacher’s previous final exam paper, only space for the actual writing stage was given, so the students produced only their first writing draft with a lot of errors and unrefined content. But this test provided them with space for pre-writing and actual writing stages, including note-papers. Hence, they could produce at least 2 drafts of writing. For scoring criterion, 10 marks for each task pinpointed in the previous exam paper also appeared in this test. The scoring criterion of 10 marks in the former examination was not revealed to the students. Though the scoring criterion ‘Analytical Marking Method’ was not attached to this test, it was shown and explained to the students before their test-taking. Besides, the students’ writing performance marked through this criterion was also distributed to them for their comments. As a result, the writing stages and scoring criterion for this test were more detailed than the criteria used in the teacher’s previous exam paper.

Another teacher mentioned the format and method for designing her previous exam paper and this test. In her exam paper, these two writing tasks demanded other language skills. Moreover, the instructions for each writing task were not in detail because the length of pages was specified for each skill in relation to the test content pinpointed in the objectives, and the students had understood the procedures for those two tasks’ completion in the classroom. While this test focused on measurement of the students’ actual writing abilities, the former examination aimed at the students’ achievement for each objective of writing skills. The detailed instruction and pages for pre and actual writing stages of this test
were thus provided. Indeed, the previous exam paper was designed according to the objectives of this English course, in which linguistic guidance of test content, and pre and actual writing stages were not clearly identified. But this test had more explicit linguistic guidance and two writing stages as shown in the worksheets' last activity of lesson 3.

The rest of the teachers added that the former exam paper was designed according to the objective for the writing component in the English syllabus, while this test was designed not only in relevance to the objective of this course, but with focus on upgrading the students' writing proficiency. In the syllabus, theory and practice of a range of controlled to guided writing activities and the content of the writing tasks based on material in the Thai context were generally explained. Besides, the models of exam paper based on such guided writing were not shown. These were the causes of the difficulty in designing the previous test. Hence, this teacher considered this test a new format for the writing test in this school.

(4) An Acceptance of this New Material as a Part of Lessons in this Classroom and Other Classes at this Level

In the teachers' opinion, they accepted this new material as a part of lessons in this classroom and others at this level. One said he had been seeking this kind of material for a long time. Indeed, the teachers should develop their material focusing on each language skill as in this guided writing. However, most of the English teachers at this school faced time constraint, so this material could only be a part of the lessons of this classroom. Other two teachers had similar reasons. One said this material was easy for the teacher to teach and for the learners to learn since its content was based on Thai students' culture. All elements of
this material could be developed for the self-instructional material for teaching of EFL writing in Thailand. Similarly, the rest said the main advantage of this material was the range of controlled to guided writing activities that promoted the step-by-step learning of writing skills. Besides, it enriched the students' vocabulary and grammar skills and strategies

4.3.2 Summary of Research Question 3

Though the three teachers had initially perceived the teaching methods and techniques, and evaluation methods used in this guided writing classroom, and solved their students' writing problems through their language treatment, they still needed 'guided writing activities' as an alternative solution. After naturalistic observation, they suggested that for the narrative writing the researcher should increase the number of pictures in the picture series for the students' clearer understanding of the story. They also suggested improving the rubrics according to the length of pages, and extensively assisting the average students in this way. For letter writing, the researcher should give the students authentic pens-pals from neighboring countries for their actual correspondence. Partial dictation by a native English speaker should be used as well as authentic envelopes. Moreover, compared to their own material for these two tasks, they agreed that 'the range of controlled to guided writing activities based on Thai teenage sub-culture and the detailed linguistic contribution of the tasks and the researcher' was the uniqueness of this material. Likewise, this achievement test was different from their previous final exam paper in that the latter contained pre-writing and actual writing stages with little linguistic guidance to measure the students' real writing abilities. Finally, they suggested this new material be utilized as a part of lessons in this classroom and others at this level.
4.4 Conclusion

This study had achieved three frameworks of the findings. Firstly, the strengths of using guided writing activities involved motivation and challenge presented by this material, the use of a more communicative element in letter writing, the researcher's improved story technique, the researcher's time management in narrative writing, learning group organization for the two tasks, the series of pictures with cultural content, and the students' lexical development in narrative writing. However, the weaknesses were the chronic linguistic problems of the students, the need to use the grammar translation method, the students' lack of originality and grammar improvement, the influence of Thai letter form in English letters, the researcher's lack of explanation of punctuation rules, his time management in letter writing, and the lack of adequate self and peer-evaluation. The students also faced some problems about meanings of unfamiliar vocabulary items and complex sentences, Thai interference while reading English story and constructing sentences, the influence of Thai story structure in English stories, and inability to integrate guidance of the task and the researcher's guidance while using guided narrative writing. They also faced the influence of Thai letter form in English letter while using guided letter writing. Finally, the teachers had suggested that the researcher should increase the number of the picture series, improve the length of rubrics of the worksheet, and assist the individual average students extensively for narrative writing. For letter writing, the researcher should provide authentic pen-friends from neighboring countries, use native English readers for partial dictation, and include the use of envelopes for the letter-writing activity.