Content list available at http://ijltr.urmia.ac.ir

Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research

Urmia University

The Effect of Combined Peer-Teacher Feedback on Thai Students' Writing Accuracy

Thi Thuy Loan Nguyen [a, *]

[a] *Kalasin University, Thailand*

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, language errors are viewed as indicators of learners' existing knowledge of the target language. Several studies have thus been conducted on the types and sources of these errors in order to help learners effectively acquire language skills. This is not an exception in Thailand where students' English writing has been reported to be a chronic problem. However, there has been little research on the ways to help Thai students improve their English writing skills. Adopting the combined peer-teacher feedback model developed by Nguyen (2017, 2018) and employing a survey and a focus group semi-structured interview, this study reports on how this feedback model helped reduce Thai university students' writing errors and how they responded to each error for the improvement of their writing accuracy. In addition to confirming the effectiveness of this feedback model in assisting Thai students, the study also discussed their evaluations of each error difficulty level, their revision strategies and the frequencies of their accurate corrections. The results of this study are therefore expected to shed more light on how to help Thai students overcome their English writing difficulties, reduce their writing errors and improve their writing skills. Furthermore, the study is hoped to partly reflect how in-service teachers tailor teaching approaches and materials to enhance the writing ability of EFL learners.

Keywords: error correction; writing difficulties; writing accuracy; peer-teacher feedback; EFL writing; Thai students

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 20 Apr. 2018 **Revised version received:** 15 May 2018

Accepted: 18 June 2018 **Available online:** 1 July 2018

* Corresponding author: Division of English, Faculty of Education, Kalasin University, Thailand
Email address: thuyloancailay@gmail.com

Introduction

Writing in English is considered to be one of the most complicated skills to master, especially for EFL learners as it requires both their competence in various areas of the target language and their ability to communicate their thoughts by using appropriate language and communicative strategies (Hyland, 2003; Richards & Renandya, 2002). Of the three elements of writing, namely content, organization and language, the last seems to be the most problematic issue for EFL writers. According to Silva (1993) and Weigle (2002), their limited linguistic knowledge is the cause of ineffective writing. In fact, due to the complex nature of English writing and their limited linguistic knowledge, EFL learners' errors are inevitable regardless of even a long period of English study (James, 1998; Wee, Sim, & Jusoff, 2009). Although errors were the undesirable problems that teachers tried to prevent, they are now considered as indicators of the learning progress in which learners use various strategies to learn a new language and to test their hypotheses about the systematic rules of the target language (Brown, 2007). Several studies have thus investigated the types and sources of errors made by EFL learners in order to assist them to successfully acquire English writing skills (Abushihab, EL-Omari, & Tobat, 2011; Camilleri, 2004; Chan, 2004; Khanlarzadeh & Nemati, 2016; Kim, 2001; Liu, 2013; Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007; Zheng & Park, 2013). Besides different frequencies of grammatical, lexical, semantic and mechanical errors EFL learners make, most studies indicated that the two main sources of their writing errors are inter-lingual and intralingual interferences. The former refers to learners' native language (L1) interference when they encounter with a new language as they tend to consciously or unconsciously carry over the existing knowledge of their L1 to the performance of the target language (Ellis, 2008). Intralingual interferences, on the other hand, refer to developmental sources of errors, such as overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules and false analogy of language equivalence. In short, it is the result of learners' incomplete knowledge of the target language (Ellis, 2008; Ferris, 2002).

In Thailand, English is taught as a foreign language, and Thai students have been reported to have chronic writing problems as writing is not systematically taught as a subject (Chamcharatsri, 2010; Pawapatcharaudom, 2007; Puengpipattrakul, 2013; Srichanyachon, 2011). Most previous error-analysis studies of English writing have shown that the main source of Thai students' errors is inter-lingual interference (Bennui, 2008; Hengwichitkul, 2006; Hinnon, 2014; Phuket & Othman, 2015). In fact, in his study of errors in paragraph writing caused by the transfer of the subjects' L1 (Thai), Bennui (2008) found that Thai language negatively influenced the subjects' writing at all lexical, syntactic and discourse levels. In particular, Thai students were found to literally translate Thai words into English, to borrow Thai language structures of word order, subject-verb agreement and noun determiners and to employ Thai cultural knowledge and Thai language styles in their English written discourse. Similarly, Phuket and Othman (2015) found many types of L1 interference errors in narrative essays written by Thai undergraduate students, respectively, and their most frequently committed errors were punctuation, articles, subject-verb agreement, spelling, capitalization, and fragment, respectively. Sattayatham and Honsa (2007) claimed that besides inter-lingual and intralingual inferences, Thai learners' limited knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary and carelessness contributed to the low quality of their writing. Similar to EFL students from other countries (Wu & Garzar, 2014), the research on Thai students' writing in English indicated that Thai learners were confused or did not have complete knowledge about the rules of the target language, leading to their faulty application. Furthermore, omitting (e.g. *I want to buy car.* instead of *I want to buy a car.*) and adding (e.g. *I have a dinner.* instead of *I have dinner.*) were found to be two strategies which show that they applied Thai language rules when writing English sentences. Regarding writing organization errors, only one study conducted by Sattayatham and Rattanapinyowong (2008) in English paragraph writing classes of the first year medical students from four medical schools at a Thai university was found. Their top four errors of paragraph writing revealed in the study were 1) no transitional words to link their ideas among the sentences, 2) lack of organization, 3) no introduction, and 4) no conclusion.

Although these studies have offered insightful understanding about the types and causes of errors committed by Thai learners, there tends to be a dearth of research on how to help them overcome their difficulties and improve their English writing. In fact, besides general recommendations to solve Thai EFL learners' problems of grammatical errors given in the reviewed studies (Bennui, 2008; Hinnon, 2014), few appropriate remedial lessons and materials have been developed to help Thai learners with the identified errors in their culturally based English learning and teaching context. In studying the effective ways to provide written feedback, Wongsothorn (1994) found that direct feedback with explanations and examples for improvement helped improve Thai students' writing. However, Boonpattanaporn (2008) argued that instructors' mere reading of students' texts, indicating errors and giving feedback, might not be sufficient to help students improve their writing ability. In her study of Thai university students' implementation of the self-assessment program in writing, Honsa (2013) found that self-assessing their own writing improved students' writing ability.

In an attempt to help Thai university students improve their writing, Nguyen (2017, 2018) developed a combined peer-teacher feedback model based on Rollinson's (2005) suggestions for conducting peer feedback in her paragraph writing classes. In her model, students were first familiarized with the basic components of an academic paragraph (topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence) in the first five weeks of a 14-week semester through a genre-based approach. In the last nine weeks of the semester, the implementation of feedback activities on students' writing of seven paragraphs on seven different topics was conducted in class. Following Rollinson' recommendation (2005) on the effectiveness of feedback implementation, the training on the benefits of peer feedback and appropriate attitudes in peer feedback activities and non-threatening practice was provided. After the training, due to the large-size class and time constraint, three drafts (which were written at home) for each writing assignment were checked. The first draft was checked by their three peers and the writer, first independently and then in a consensus group for clarifications and suggestions for revision, using the responding guidelines (Appendix A) and correction symbols (Appendix C). Their second and third drafts were checked by the teacher at home using the same guidelines and correction symbols. When they submitted their second and third drafts, a summary of their responses including explanations for their choice of not incorporating any suggested comment was required (Appendix B). Generally, the class procedures in the last nine weeks were (a) follow-up activities (returning students' last assignment, asking them to read the comments and ask friends or teacher for suggestions or clarifications of coded errors, summarizing commonly-made mistakes, and explaining the comments to those who asked for help) (45 minutes), (b) peer feedback on the new writing (1 hour), and (c) lessons in the book and preparation for the following writing topic (45 minutes).

Nguyen's (2017, 2018) findings indicated the success of this combined feedback model in terms of students' positive attitudes towards the model, the usefulness of peer comments, high percentages of feedback incorporations and the high overall writing scores. Additionally, despite their reported passive learning styles and entrenched teacher-centered pedagogies, these Thai university students were found to actively participate and engage in this interactive learning activity and consequently to improve their English writing. However, these two studies did not report on how this group of Thai undergraduate students improved their English writing and reduced their linguistic errors over several writings and across drafts. Therefore, the current study plans to fill in this gap. In particular, this study will first validate the effectiveness of this feedback model by adopting it to teach another group of Thai students at the same setting and then explore how the students fixed each error, how difficult each error was to them and what strategies they employed to respond to each. Hence, the research questions posited for the study were 1) Does this combined peer-teacher feedback model still work with another group of Thai students?; 2) How does this feedback model help the students reduce their writing errors?; and 3) How do this group of students respond to each error in this feedback model? The results of this study are thus

expected to shed more light on the effectiveness of the combined peer-teacher feedback in improving Thai students' writing reported by Nguyen (2017, 2018). Furthermore, this study would be likely to help find out particular and effective ways to help Thai students overcome their English writing difficulties, to reduce the errors influenced by their L1 and to assist them in acculturating themselves into new linguistic forms without depending on their L1. Finally, the study is hoped to partly show how in-service teachers modify teaching approaches and materials to improve the writing ability of EFL learners.

Method

Context and participants

This study was conducted in a paragraph writing class of 48 English major students who met once a week for a 14-week semester with 150 minutes each at a small university in Thailand. The participants' English proficiency level was upper-elementary or pre-intermediate. The English curriculum at this university has three obligatory writing courses, namely Writing 1 (paragraph writing), Writing 2 (short compositions) and Writing 3 (five paragraph essays). These courses are taught in three successive terms of fourteen weeks, starting from the third year of students' study. For Writing 1, the book - *Writers at Work - From Sentence to Paragraph* by Laurie Blass and Deborah Gordon, 1st Edition, 2010 - was selected as the course book. This book consists of ten chapters with ten different writing topics, and the target vocabulary and grammatical points for each topic are also presented in each chapter. Although the objective of this course is to help students develop their skill in writing an academic paragraph, very little information about paragraph writing is given in this book. That is why the chair of the English division at this university supported the teachers' curriculum innovation to improve students' writing abilities.

Procedures

Adopting the feedback model developed by Nguyen (2017, 2018), the researcher taught the students the basic components of an academic paragraph in the first five weeks of the course. From weeks 6 to 14, the students were asked to write seven complete paragraphs (W1-W7) of 150 words each for seven topics chosen from the course book (i.e. 1. All about me, 2. Daily activities, 3. Your family, 4. Your favorite book/movie/TV show (choose 1), 5. Your idol, 6. Your future plans and 7. Your memorable trip) at home. In class, the students were first trained to provide comprehensive coded feedback on their friends' writing, using the guidelines (covering all writing aspects, namely format, organization & content, and language & mechanics) (Appendix A) and error codes for Thai students' common errors which were documented in the literature (Bennui, 2008; Hinnon, 2014; Phuket & Othman, 2015; Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007) (Appendix C). Their first drafts were checked in class by three peers and the writer while the teacher checked their second and third drafts using the same guidelines and symbols at home. To help the teacher develop appropriate remedial lessons for each writing, a tally sheet (Table 2) which was developed from the given guidelines and codes (Appendices A & C, respectively) was employed to record error frequencies by type in each draft and assignment (three drafts for each writing). These lessons were taught in the 45-minute follow-up activities which aimed to assist the students with their errors at the beginning of each class during the experiment period (weeks 6-14). Similar to Nguyen's (2017, 2018) strategy, peers' comments and writers' revisions were graded with a deduction of 1% from their summative score for irresponsible comments and ignoring the given feedback.

The frequencies of each error in the tally were calculated and examined per draft and per assignment at the end of the course to explore whether or not and how this teaching innovation

helps Thai students reduce their errors over the course. The total numbers of each error type were also compared with those from their final test taken two weeks after the course ended to study the long-term effect of this instructional model. In order to learn about how these students responded to each error, at the end of the course, a survey on the difficulty levels of each error, what strategies they employed to fix each error and their evaluation of the revisions (Table 3) was conducted with the whole class and a focus group semi-structured interview was conducted with twenty volunteering students.

Results

The answers to the three research questions are respectively presented in this section, and their detailed discussion is provided in the Discussion section.

General effectiveness of the combined peer-teacher feedback model

Although this combined feedback model was employed to teach a new group of Thai students, its effectiveness was consistent with what was reported in Nguyen (2017, 2018). In fact, despite being known with the passive learning styles and entrenched in teacher-centered pedagogies (Chamcharatsri, 2010; Kewara & Prabjandee, 2018; McDonough, 2004; Root, 2016), the students in this study also showed positive attitudes towards and active engagement in the feedback activities. Furthermore, this study found a steady and remarkable reduction in errors made by these students over seven writings (Table 1). With almost a quarter of the total errors (23.3%) committed in their first writing (W1), only 9.1% was found in W6-7. Additionally, the percentages of their wrong corrections went down steadily from 4.2% to 1.7% in W1 and W7, respectively.

Table 1
Percentages of Error Revisions in Each Writing

	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	Total
Accurate	19.1	15.9	10.2	10.5	10.3	7.3	7.4	80.7
Inaccurate	4.2	3.7	3.2	2.4	2.3	1.8	1.7	19.3
Total	23.3	19.6	13.4	12.9	12.6	9.1	9.1	100

How this feedback model helped students reduce their writing errors

Table 2 shows the frequencies of the students' errors per type for each draft of their seven writings (three drafts each) and those found in their final test two weeks after the end of the course. Besides assisting the teacher in providing remedial grammar lessons, the data in this table were used to study how this feedback model helped these students improve their writing. Similar to previous works on Thai students' writing errors (Bennui, 2008; Hengwichitkul, 2006; Hinnon, 2014; Phuket & Othman, 2015), the current study found unnecessary words (X), wrong words (WW), punctuation (P), missing words (^), sentence fragments (SF), capitalization (C), tenses (T) and unclear expressions (?) to be the most frequent, respectively. Furthermore, there was a steady decrease in the total numbers of errors over seven writings by these Thai students (Table 2), which resulted from the steady fall in the frequencies of almost all errors recorded in the study. However, a closer look at the total numbers of errors across drafts showed that these students were getting worse after receiving their peers' feedback because the frequencies of errors in the second drafts (except those in W6-7) were always higher than those in the first drafts. Nevertheless, the higher numbers of errors in the second drafts checked by their teacher simply indicated that students could not identify all errors in their peers' writings due to their limited

Table 2
Error Types across Drafts in Seven Writings

Error types	W1			W2			W3			W4			W5			W6			W7			Total	Final
	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3	D1	D2	D3		
Format																							
Title	29	18	5	2	3	0	3	4	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	76	0
Indenting	6	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0
Organization & Content																							
Top	34	30	11	14	10	5	18	9	3	9	2	1	5	3	0	8	2	1	8	3	0	176	1
Sup.	27	6	0	6	4	3	3	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	1	1	6	0	71	0
Con	26	13	6	12	5	3	15	6	2	4	2	4	3	4	4	5	2	2	6	0	0	124	0
C-U	4	2	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0
Language & mechanics																							
T	44	36	41	24	14	25	15	7	1	9	10	6	7	19	3	6	5	3	79	19	11	384	14
VF	8	40	25	4	12	6	1	6	2	4	16	4	6	18	10	1	15	14	7	22	21	242	19
VA	5	9	6	8	42	29	16	10	6	10	16	24	20	22	19	16	6	1	2	1	1	269	6
A/P	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	2	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0
N	12	18	15	15	14	15	15	15	13	8	14	9	12	6	5	17	10	7	10	1	1	232	22
Pre	4	5	7	2	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3	5	1	3	3	54	8
WW	60	77	34	44	56	42	40	29	32	45	31	47	46	44	19	31	25	15	28	14	8	767	27
WF	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	10	2
WO	3	7	3	3	0	0	5	2	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	33	3
Art	4	1	3	10	5	4	10	0	1	6	2	0	5	2	5	10	4	0	6	1	0	79	0
L	3	27	15	1	36	24	1	11	13	4	16	5	2	7	10	2	4	5	3	9	12	210	0
SP	13	6	2	3	3	2	3	5	0	0	6	2	4	2	1	3	2	3	2	4	0	66	30
P	35	30	40	27	42	39	28	31	24	28	17	11	38	23	28	25	19	8	14	23	14	542	16
C	83	42	20	22	30	21	21	10	8	16	19	8	19	21	8	12	15	10	21	8	5	419	14
X	55	46	44	54	99	78	51	45	38	38	53	28	33	46	20	26	31	17	21	33	9	867	24
A	18	18	11	28	65	41	21	45	10	18	28	9	16	66	6	36	15	12	21	20	11	515	36
SF	9	63	27	26	26	4	12	42	35	8	45	36	9	21	4	22	25	14	11	19	12	480	21
RO	17	5	1	12	2	0	4	0	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	49	0
?	11	31	21	9	18	13	9	23	15	15	28	21	10	37	26	9	20	13	6	21	14	360	2
Total	515	532	339	337	495	358	294	300	206	240	341	224	233	354	174	240	208	133	244	210	124	6072	245
	1386(23.3%)			1190(19.6%)			801(13.4%)			771(12.9%)			762(12.6%)			581(9.1%)			581(9.1%)				

**W = Writing; D = draft*

knowledge of the target language and of its writing rhetorical conventions, as claimed by Hu (2005) in his peer feedback study on Chinese students.

Unlike those in W1 to W5, the first drafts of W6-7 were recorded with more errors than the second drafts which were checked by the teacher. This difference could be explained by the students' increased knowledge of writing and assessment criteria in reviewing their peers' writings over a certain period of time, as claimed by Lee, Mak, and Burns (2016), and such knowledge would lead to their better ability to self-edit. In fact, this improvement could also be seen in their writing at the final test, with more than two times fewer errors committed as compared with those in W6-7, two out of their seven writings with the lowest error frequencies (245 & 581 instances, respectively). Furthermore, a steady fall and lower frequencies of most errors in the third drafts, as compared to those in the second drafts (Table 2) though both were checked by the teacher, tended to indicate that this combined feedback model helped these EFL students' writing accuracy to a considerable extent.

How these students responded to each error

Table 3 shows the findings on the students' reports on the error difficulty levels, how they fixed each error and the frequencies of their correct revisions. While the difficulty levels and the frequencies of their accurate revisions required only one answer, the revision strategies allowed them to select more than one option (by myself, consulting with the teacher, and/or consulting with friends) because through peer review and follow-up activities in the class, they were encouraged to ask friends and/or the teacher for clarifications and suggestions for their error corrections. The bold numbers indicate the most frequently selected option in each error type and surveyed category. For example, the bold numbers 78.7, 80.9 and 76.6 in the format error showed that *easy*, *myself* and *usually* were selected the most from three surveyed categories (difficulty levels, revision strategies and frequencies of valid revisions, respectively).

Table 3
Students' Reports on Error-Difficulty Levels, Revision Strategies and Valid Revisions

	Difficulty levels (%)			Revision strategies (%)			Frequencies of valid revisions (%)		
	Easy	*Average*	*Difficult*	*Myself*	*Teacher*	*Friends*	*Usually*	*Sometimes*	*Hardly*
Format									
Title	78.7	8.5	12.7	80.9	38.3	25.5	76.6	23.4	0
Indenting	78.7	8.5	12.7	80.9	38.3	25.5	76.6	23.4	0
Content & Organization									
Topic	38.3	40.4	21.3	61.7	68.1	57.4	63.8	34	2.1
Supporting	23.3	46.8	31.9	44.7	72.3	36.2	68	29.9	2.1
Concluding	34	36.2	29.8	57.4	74.5	53.2	61.7	36.2	2.1
Coherence & Unity	27.7	34	38.3	46.8	76.6	44.7	56.4	36.2	2.1
Language & Mechanics									
T	51.1	34	14.9	76	70.2	70.2	59.6	40.4	0
VF	29.8	48.9	21.3	42.6	78.7	57.4	59.6	36.1	4.3
VA	29.8	42.6	25.6	44.7	80.9	57.4	48.9	46.8	4.3
A/P	38.3	34	27.7	46.8	80.9	34	80.9	17	2.1
N	68.1	23.4	8.5	80.9	55.3	36.2	68	27.7	4.3
Prep	72.4	19.1	8.5	68.1	66	40.4	76.6	21.3	2.1
WW	24	32	44	59.6	74.5	57.4	40.4	42.6	17
WF	29.8	38.3	31.9	34	72.3	31.9	76.6	21.3	2.1
WO	40.4	31.9	27.7	38.3	74.5	27.7	70.2	23.4	6.4
Art	70.3	17	12.7	70.2	66	42.6	74.5	23.4	2.1

L	46.8	31.9	21.3	61.7	72.3	38.3	65.3	34.7	0
SP	61.7	14.9	23.4	67.4	56	36.2	59.6	38.4	0
P	77.5	21.3	2.1	76.6	48.9	27.7	54.7	34.7	10.6
C	93.6	4.3	2.1	87.2	44.7	23.4	68	27.7	4.3
X	78.8	17	4.2	80.9	46.8	29.8	51	27.7	21.3
ʌ	40.4	42.6	17.1	68.1	70.2	42.6	51	34	14.9
SF	2.1	19.1	78.7	46.8	74.5	53.2	34	44.7	21.3
RO	34	36.2	29.8	36.2	80.9	31.9	61.7	31.9	6.4
?	17	29.8	53.2	53.2	72.3	29.8	49	40.4	10.6

In general, these students showed that they employed all revision strategies in their error corrections, but their preference to consult with the teacher was the most prominent. Although most students reported that they *usually* fixed the errors correctly, there are differences in the way they managed to reduce the errors, and the difficulty level of each error tended to guide them in dealing with each (Table 3).

First, it would be surprising to know that fixing the linguistic errors which were reported to be influenced by their L1 was *easy* to more than 50% of these Thai learners. As seen in Table 3, capitalization errors (C) were considered to be the easiest, followed by unnecessary words (X), punctuation (P), preposition (Prep), articles (Art), numbers (N), spelling (SP) and tenses (T), ranging from 93.6% to 51.1% of 48 surveyed students. Furthermore, different from what Hinnon (2014) reviewed, these Thai students found the format errors easy to fix, and most of them (80.9%) preferred to self-edit them with a high frequency of accuracy (76.6%). As revealed in the interview, the students fixed these errors without any difficulty because there are precise rules for them to follow. Therefore, when the teacher explained the rules and their different uses in the target language, they further checked how to use them at home and got them fixed by themselves. In fact, although these students preferred the teacher's assistance for most of their committed errors, self-revisions were found to be the most frequently used strategy for these reported *easy* errors (Table 3). In addition, more than half of the students stated that their self-revisions for these errors were *usually* accurate.

Unlike these grammatical, lexical and format errors, these EFL students found fixing content and organization errors more difficult, and nearly 75% of them turned to the teacher for their revisions. This difficulty is caused by the different rhetorical patterns between English and Thai (Sattayatham & Rattanapinyowong, 2008), and this difference accounted for their preference to consult the teacher due to her more reliable knowledge as revealed in the interview. As can be seen in Table 2, their frequently committed errors in this category were topic and concluding sentences which were found to have no focus and more than two sentences, respectively. As reported by the students, the omission of the focus in the topic sentence would motivate the reader to read their writing further to discover the writing focus, and a long conclusion in Thai language is believed to make the writing beautiful. While around a third of the students reported not always to revise them effectively, the rest frequently got these two errors fixed correctly (63.8% & 61.7%, respectively).

For the other errors most frequently rated as *average*, namely verb forms (VF), verb agreement (VA), word forms (WF), missing words (^), and run-on (RO), consulting with the teacher was also their preference and their revisions were also reported to be *usually* accurate by a majority of the students. Because of their clear-cut rules, (VF), (VA), and (WF) were reported to be corrected in the similar way of fixing the *easy* error group. Furthermore, a closer look at the difficulty levels rated for these errors revealed that there was a small difference in the percentages of students who considered them as *easy* and *average*. For example, 34% & 36.2%, and 40.4% & 42.6% of the students rated (RO) and (^) as *easy* and *average*, respectively. This would indicate that these errors were not so difficult for most of the students. As identified in Bennui (2008), Thai learners'

typical (RO) errors were due to their use of various cohesion markers in one sentence, making it overly long, and the (^) errors resulted from the absence of noun determiners in Thai language. In checking the students' drafts, it was found that omitting connectors and then turning their (RO) into simple sentences were commonly used to fix the (RO) errors. For the (^) errors, in contrast, they asked the teacher for the missing words and added them into their sentences. Although these strategies assisted their current writing accuracy, they would be ineffective for them to develop their writing skills and achieve the intended communicative purposes of more complex writing. Hence, there should be more practice exercises to raise these students' awareness of different rhetorical functions of each structure in the target language.

The last group of errors which were reported to be *difficult* by the students included sentence fragments (SF), unclear expressions (?), wrong words (WW) and coherence and unity, and the first two errors were considered as the most challenging to more than half of the students (78.7% & 53.2%, respectively). As seen in Table 2, (WW), (SF) and (?) were committed with high frequencies by these students (767, 480, and 360 instances, respectively), but only 11 instances were found in coherence and unity. Although the students reported consulting with the teacher as their preferred revision strategy for these errors, the frequencies of their valid revisions were low. In fact, except for coherence and unity, more than half of the students infrequently fixed these errors correctly.

Two cases of (SF) found in this study were the absence of the subject and the main verb in a sentence. As explained by previous authors (Bennui, 2008), literal translation of Thai structures was the cause of this error. Similarly, as revealed in the interview with the students beside their insufficiency of vocabulary, the errors in (WW) were mostly caused by their direct translation from Thai words. While (?) were reported to be influenced by the redundancy styles/wordiness of Thai writing (Phuket & Othman, 2015), the rhetorical patterns of the paragraph in Thai with many short paragraphs of one or two sentences resulted in these students' coherence and cohesion errors (Bennui, 2008). The differences between Thai and English writing conventions could account for these students' rating these four errors the most difficult and lead to the low frequencies of their valid revisions.

Discussion

In Nguyen's (2017, 2018) study, despite the large class, their low level of English proficiency, and their inexperience in groupwork the combined peer-teacher feedback model was effective in engaging Thai students being reported to have culturally embedded "passive" learning styles (Root, 2016). In the current study, the success of this feedback model was found in improving Thai students' writing accuracy. In particular, the frequent remedial mini-grammar lessons, the tally, and the teacher's feedback following their peers' were reported to bring a steady and remarkable reduction in errors made by these students over seven writings. As stated by previous researchers (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hartshorn & Evans, 2012; Kamalian & Lashkarian, 2014), feedback paired with immediate, timely, constant and meaningful mini-lessons help develop EFL students' linguistic accuracy. Ferris (2002) also confirms the effectiveness of consistent provisions of feedback paired with mini-lessons which build students' knowledge over the course of semester. In particular, she claims that learners whose errors are frequently corrected are engaged in more profound form of language processing when they self-edit their writing, resulting in more long-term growth in accuracy. As revealed in the interview with these students, their writing was improved because of the regular follow-up activities and the teacher's regular checking their writings. This process was reported to help them gradually update and consolidate their English knowledge, leading to their better subsequent drafts. In summary, these students' increased

knowledge through consistent remedial grammar lessons paired with their commonly made mistakes in the follow-up activities was found to account for their writing improvement over several writings and across different drafts.

Furthermore, in the interview with them it was known that besides the mini-grammar lessons, these students liked the tally (the error frequency chart) and expected to use them again in their Writing 2 class. In fact, they claimed the mini-lessons addressed their most recent errors right after they received the feedback, resulting in their understanding of what they were about to review while the tally helped them keep tracks of their own error patterns, leading to their greater responsibility for the improvement of their own writing. The statement by these Thai students was similar to that of their Iranian counterparts in Kamalian and Lashkarian (2014) who believed that the tally raised their awareness of the most frequent error types and assisted them in overcoming their linguistic weaknesses. In addition to the remedial lessons and the tally, the repetition of these two teaching techniques in the continuous cycle over an extended period of time was also reported to facilitate these Thai students' writing progress. Finally, the finding on the smaller number of errors identified by peers in the first draft than those in the second drafts found by the teacher tended to suggest that teachers' feedback following peer review is a necessary backup for students' missing identifications of errors and thus serves as a complimentary role in enhancing the effectiveness of the peer review process. Indeed, as reported in the interviews with the students in this study and those in Nguyen (2017), this combined peer-teacher feedback model not only reduced their pressure but also maintained their enthusiasm in writing and doing peer review because they knew that their writing and comments would be checked and verified by the teacher, respectively.

Regarding these students' response to each identified error, consulting with the teacher was found to be their preferred strategy for fixing errors of all difficulty levels. This partly reflected the commonly held belief by Asian students, as claimed by Hu (2005), that their teacher is the only source of knowledge. Moreover, the interlingual errors with precise rules for references namely, (C), (X), (P), (Prep), (Art), (N), (SP), (T), (VF), (VA) and (WF) were considered *easy* for these EFL students to correct when they were explicitly instructed and given with sufficient revision time. Different from these grammatical, lexical and format errors, these Thai students found fixing content and organization errors more difficult due to the different rhetorical patterns between English and Thai (Sattayatham & Rattanapinyowong, 2008). Although the genre-based lessons on how to compose each part of an academic paragraph could help them overcome this L1 interference problem, the finding also suggested that frequent and continuous practice with teachers' close observation and guidance would be necessary for EFL students to achieve the required writing conventions of the target language. Finally, the study found that the errors influenced by these students' L1 writing styles ((SF), (?), (WW) and coherence and unity) were the most challenging for them to enhance their English writing. The major reason for this was that these students did not understand the nature of these errors despite their consultations with reference sources, friends and the teacher. Moreover, they believed that their ideas were best expressed and structured in comparison with those in their L1, leading to their confusion in correcting them. This finding is likely to show that EFL students hold a wrong perception that languages are constructed in the same way, and they tend to rely on their L1 to simplify the process of learning the target language. It is therefore necessary to explicitly teach EFL students the similarities and differences between the two languages.

Conclusion

This case study was conducted to investigate how the combined peer-teacher feedback model developed by Nguyen (2017, 2018) helped Thai university students improve their English writing

accuracy in a 14-week paragraph writing class. The results indicated that this teaching approach was effective to help these Thai students reduce their errors over several writings. Additionally, the tally, the frequent remedial mini-grammar lessons with explanations, clarifications and negotiations with the teacher and the teacher's feedback following peers' were found to mainly contribute to this improvement. Furthermore, despite their preference to consult with the teacher, these students' revision strategies were guided by the difficulty levels of errors. However, the errors influenced by their L1 writing styles and the different rhetorical patterns between English and Thai were found to be the most challenging to them, resulting in their frequent incorrect revisions.

As claimed by Ellis (2009, p. 106), there is no "corrective feedback recipe" for all settings, there is a great need to adjust the type of feedback offered to learners to suit their existing knowledge of the target language and learning styles in specific institutional, classroom and task contexts. In fact, the effectiveness of any teaching method involves various contributing factors, such as students' proficiency levels of English, their educational and cultural backgrounds, teachers' expertise and most importantly the specific learning and teaching contexts. As stated by Hyland and Wong (2013), for the effectiveness of any innovative pedagogy, it is imperative to have the supportive environment from the school as well as other community members. Burns, Westmacott, and Ferrer (2016) and Lee et al. (2016) also state that despite the teachers' relevant subject knowledge, their attempts will be impeded by the unsupportive environment of the school because supportive and stimulating conditions are necessary to foster real change in practice.

Although the study was conducted with a small group of students in Thailand and in a 14-week semester at the same setting as Nguyen's (2017, 2018), it showed the considerable effectiveness of this instructional model in helping this group of Thai students reduce their commonly committed errors in English writing. However, a replication of this study in other educational contexts in Thailand and in other countries where students have similar writing problems is recommended before generalizing its findings. Further research with Thai students in other educational settings both in Thailand and overseas on the rating of difficulty levels of their commonly reported errors in English writing is also needed in order to provide them with appropriate feedback strategies.

References

Abushihab, I., EL-Omari, A. H., & Tobat, M. (2011). An analysis of written grammatical errors of Arab learners of English as a foreign language at Alzaytoonah Private University of Jordan. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 20*(4), 543-552.

Bennui, P. (2008). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal Of ELT Research, 4*, 72-102.

Boonpattanaporn, P. (2008). Comparative study of English essay writing strategies and difficulties as perceived by English major students: A case study of students in the school of humanities. *The University of The Thai Chamber of Commerce Academic Journal, 28*(2), 76-90.

Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Burns, A., Westmacott, A., & Ferrer, A. H. (2016). Initiating an action research programme for university EFL teachers: Early experiences and responses. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 55-73.

Camilleri, G. (2004). Negative transfer in Maltese students' writing in English. *Journal of Maltese Education Research, 2*(1), 3-12.

Chamcharatsri, P. B. (2010). On teaching writing in Thailand. *Writing on the Edge, 21*(1), 18-26.

Chan, A. Y. W. (2004). Syntactic transfer: Evidence from the interlanguage of Hong Kong Chinese ESL learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(1), 56-74. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00218.x

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.): Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107. doi:10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184. doi:10.1016/s1060-3743(01)00039-x

Hartshorn, K. J., & Evans, N. W. (2012). The differential effects of comprehensive corrective feedback on L2 writing accuracy. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching, 3*(2), 217-248.

Hengwichitkul, L. (2006). *An analysis of errors in English abstracts translated by Thai university graduate students.* (M.A.), Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Hinnon, A. (2014). Common errors in English writing and suggested solutions of Thai university students. มนุษยศาสตร์ สังคมศาสตร์, *31*(2), 165-180.

Honsa, S. (2013). Self-assessment in EFL writing: A study of intermediate EFL students at a Thai university. *Voices in Asia, 1*(1), 34-57.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 321-342.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Wong, L. L. C. (2013). *Innovation and change in English language education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Essex: Pearson.

Kamalian, A., & Lashkarian, A. (2014). The effect of dynamic written corrective feedback on Iranian elementary learners' writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3*(5), 47-56.

Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2018). CLIL teacher professional development for content teachers in Thailand. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 93-108.

Khanlarzadeh, M., & Nemati, M. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of EFL students: An improvement over previous unfocused designs. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(2), 55-68.

Kim, S. (2001). An error analysis of college students' writing: Is that really Konglish? . *Studies in Modern Grammar, 25*, 159-174.

Lee, I., Mak, P., & Burns, A. (2016). EFL teachers' attempts at feedback innovation in the writing classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(2), 248-269.

Liu, M. (2013). An investigation of syntactic errors in Chinese undergraduate EFL learners' compositions: A cohort study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 2*, 182-191.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System, 32*, 207–224.

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2017). A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 15-24.

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2018). Implementing peer-feedback in paragraph-writing classes at a Thai university. In S. M. Anwaruddin (Ed.), *Knowledge mobilization in TESOL: Connecting research and practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-14). Leiden: Brill.

Pawapatcharaudom, R. (2007). *An investigation of Thai students' English problems on their learning strategies in the international program.* (M.A.), Mahidol University, Bangkok.

Phuket, P. R. N., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(32), 99-106.

Puengpipattrakul, W. (2013). Assessment of Thai EFF undergraduates' writing competence through integrated feedback *Journal of Institutional Research in South East Asia, 11*(1), 5-27.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30. doi:10.1093/elt/cci003

Root, S. (2016). Understanding Thai culture: Exploring the effect of academic stress in students' learning orientation. *ASEAN Journal of Management & Innovation, 3*(2), 44-58.

Sattayatham, A., & Honsa, S. (2007). Medical students' most frequent errors at Mahidol University, Thailand. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*, 170-194.

Sattayatham, A., & Rattanapinyowong, P. (2008). Analysis of errors in paragraph writing in English by first year medical students from the four medical schools at Mahidol University. *Silpakorn University International Journal, 8*, 17-38.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 657-677. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587400

Srichanyachon, N. (2011). A comparative study of three revision methods in EFL writing. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning, 8*(9), 1-8.

Wee, R., Sim, J., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Verb-form errors in EAP writing. *Educational Research and Reviews, 5*, 16-23.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wongsothorn, A. (1994). An investigation of students' writing improvement through various types of teachers' intervention. In M. L. Tickoo (Ed.), *Research in reading and writing: A Southeast Asian collection* (pp. 118-125). Singapore: RELC.

Wu, H., & Garzar, E. V. (2014). Types and attributes of English writing errors in the EFL context-A study of error analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*(6), 1256-1262. doi:https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.6.1256-1262

Zheng, C., & Park, T. (2013). An analysis of errors in English writing made by Chinese and Korean university students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(8), 1342-1351. doi:https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.8.1342-1351

Thi Thuy Loan Nguyen (Ph.D.) is a lecturer at Division of English, Faculty of Education, Kalasin University, Thailand. Her research interests include genre analysis, English written discourse, second language writing instruction and research, academic writing, ESL, ESP, professional writing with genre-based approach, citations and reporting verbs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PARAGRAPH CHECKLIST

Format

1. Is there a title and is it capitalized correctly?

2. Is the first line of the paragraph indented?

Organization and content

1. Is there a clear, focused topic sentence and controlling idea?

2. Is there any sentence that is not related to the topic and the controlling idea?

3. Is the paragraph organized in a logical way (for example, time order, steps in a process, reasons, effects, etc.)?

4. Are there transitional words or phrases to help the reader know when a new support statement is going to be discussed?

5. Is there a concluding sentence? Is there a final comment? Does it fit the paragraph?

Language and mechanics

1. Is the paragraph free of grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors? (Refer to "***Correction Key***")

2. Is there a variety of sentence structures?

3. Is there an effort to make the topic interesting and informative?

APPENDIX B: RESPONSE SUMMARY

Part 1: Summary

Reported items	Format	Organization & Content	Language & Mechanics
Number of mistakes			
Number of mistakes corrected			
Number of mistakes left uncorrected			
Rationale for not correcting the mistakes			

Part 2: Responses

Errors	→	**Corrections**
Ex:		
1. (N) student	→	student**s**

APPENDIX C: CORRECTION CODES

SYMBOLS	MEANINGS	EXAMPLES
		T
T	tense	She studying at SUT next year.
		VF
VF	verb form	We like eat in the dining room.
		VA
VA	verb/subject agreement	He like listening to music.

A/P	active/ passive voice	A/P They were read many books.
N	number (singular/plural / uncountable)	N He lived in New Zealand for two year. N She makes a lot of moneys.
Prep	preposition	Prep He lived on Canada for two years.
WW	wrong word (vocabulary)	WW I like hearing to music.
WF	word form (part of speech)	WF There are many steps in the produce of sugar.
WO	word order	WO Always I listen to music on the bus.
Art	article	Art They like going to ʌ library.
L	linking word & reference	L Then they ate. L They bought it. Then they read it.
SP	spelling	SP The wether is too hot for me.
P	punctuation	P They read many books -
C	capitalization	C I love japanese food.
X	unnecessary word	x My mum she is my idol.
ʌ	word missing	I bought ʌ new car.
SF	sentence fragment	SF When I was ten. We moved to London.
RO	run-on sentence	RO I finished shopping at Robinsons I discovered that my keys were locked in the car.
?	unclear expression	