

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Since this study included two instruments, this chapter reports the results which are divided into two headings: results from the survey questionnaires and results from the interview. The first heading consists of four subheadings, which refer to all the parts in the survey questionnaire. The last part is concerned with the comparisons between the demographic data of the samples and their opinion on the instruction in writing English in the two foundation English courses mentioned in the earlier chapters. Finally, the fourth subheading deals with the results drawn from individual interviews and a focus group.

Objective 1. To study the students' opinion towards the instruction in writing English in English foundation courses.

Table 4.1 Material

Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The writing tasks are appropriate for my ability.	443	1.00	5.00	3.6637	.76827
The topic of each task is interesting.	441	1.00	5.00	3.7506	.67850
The topics are relevant to real life situations.	443	1.00	5.00	3.9436	.69189
I need more teaching aids or material to help me write.	439	1.00	5.00	3.7517	.87577
The material was designed to eliminate whatever problems I had in writing.	441	1.00	5.00	3.6304	.84846
It is easy to follow steps in writing from the material.	441	1.00	5.00	3.5329	.77426
Valid N (listwise)	433			3.7121	.77285

According to Table 4.1, the respondents showed that their opinion on the material was at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.71$, S.D. = .77). The mean score of the statement "The topics are relevant to real life situations" was 3.94 (S.D. = .69). That became the highest mean of this category. The following are the statements in the

order of their mean scores “I need more teaching aids or material to help me write” ($\bar{X} = 3.75$, S.D. = .86); “The topic of each task is interesting” ($\bar{X} = 3.75$, S.D. = .68); “The writing tasks are appropriate for my ability” ($\bar{X} = 3.66$, S.D. = .78); “The material was designed to eliminate whatever problems I had in writing” ($\bar{X} = 3.63$, S.D. = .85); and “It is easy to follow steps in writing from the material” ($\bar{X} = 3.53$, S.D. = .77).

Table 4.2 Writing process

Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The steps of writing in the material can improve my writing skills: reading, outlining, drafting, revising and editing.	443	1.00	5.00	3.9887	.80009
The teaching method of writing in steps motivates me to write.	440	1.00	5.00	3.6705	.85539
I want my teacher to teach me from the very beginning, such as how to construct sentences, how to use conjunctions, etc.	442	1.00	5.00	4.2534	.88271
The reading passages help me to generate ideas to write.	443	2.00	5.00	4.2190	.67227
By using the outline questions, I can brainstorm useful ideas to write.	443	1.00	5.00	4.2280	.68924
Valid N (listwise)	439			4.0719	.77994

Table 4.2 shows the opinion of the respondents towards the writing process adopted in writing lessons of English I and II. All of the statements were ranked between 3.5 – 4.99 on the rating scale. The respondents, then, had the opinion at a high level ($\bar{X} = 4.07$, S.D. = .78). The last three statements, however, were ranked the highest mean in this category: “I want my teacher to teach me from the very beginning, such as how to construct sentences, how to use conjunctions, etc” ($\bar{X} = 4.25$, S.D. = .88); “By using the outline questions, I can brainstorm useful ideas to write” ($\bar{X} = 4.23$, S.D. = .69); and “The reading passages help me to generate ideas to write” ($\bar{X} = 4.22$, S.D. = .67). The rest of the statements were ranked at the fourth and fifth places: “The steps of writing in the material can improve my writing skills: reading, outlining, drafting,

revising and editing” ($\bar{X} = 3.99$, S.D. = .80); and “The teaching method of writing in steps motivates me to write” ($\bar{X} = 3.67$, S.D. = .86).

Table 4.3 Feedback

Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teachers’ feedback is clear and easy to understand.	444	1.00	5.00	3.7207	.86748
I prefer my teacher’s feedback to focus on grammar and vocabulary.	444	1.00	5.00	3.8221	.85645
I prefer my teacher’s feedback to focus on content and organisation.	444	1.00	5.00	3.9617	.77830
After my teacher’s checking, my writing skills show improvement.	444	1.00	5.00	4.0225	.78325
I prefer my teacher to explain the feedback to me face-to-face.	443	1.00	5.00	3.8871	.86714
I prefer a peer-review for my writing.	444	1.00	5.00	3.1036	.93735
Valid N (listwise)	443			3.7529	.84832

From Table 4.3, the respondents had a high level of the opinion on feedback they received from their teachers during writing lessons of English I and II ($\bar{X} = 3.75$, S.D. = .85). They showed that they agreed on nearly all statements in this category, except for the last one. The last statement “I prefer a peer-review for my writing” had the lowest mean in this category. It was at a medium level of the opinion ($\bar{X} = 3.10$, S.D. = .94). The following are the statements written from the highest to the second lowest places: “After my teacher’s checking, my writing skills show improvement” ($\bar{X} = 4.02$, S.D. = .78); “I prefer my teacher’s feedback to focus on content and organisation” ($\bar{X} = 3.96$, S.D. = .78); “I prefer my teacher to explain the feedback to me face-to-face” ($\bar{X} = 3.89$, S.D. = .87); “I prefer my teacher’s feedback to focus on grammar and vocabulary” ($\bar{X} = 3.82$, S.D. = .86); and “Teachers’ feedback is clear and easy to understand” ($\bar{X} = 3.72$, S.D. = .87).

Following are the results of the question that asked the respondents to write Number 1 – 8 (or 9) so as to put in order the items they preferred their teachers' feedback to focus on (Tables 4.45 – 4.52). The conclusion is below Table 4.52.

Table 4.4 Feedback: grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	159.00	35.81	36.89	36.89
	no 2	72.00	16.22	16.71	53.60
	no 3	67.00	15.09	15.55	69.14
	no 4	45.00	10.14	10.44	79.58
	no 5	33.00	7.43	7.66	87.24
	no 6	20.00	4.50	4.64	91.88
	no 7	11.00	2.48	2.55	94.43
	no 8	23.00	5.18	5.34	99.77
	9	1.00	.23	.23	100.00
	Total	431.00	97.07	100.00	
Missing		13.00	2.93		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.5 Feedback: vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	70.00	15.77	16.32	16.32
	no 2	98.00	22.07	22.84	39.16
	no 3	66.00	14.86	15.38	54.55
	no 4	66.00	14.86	15.38	69.93
	no 5	56.00	12.61	13.05	82.98
	no 6	35.00	7.88	8.16	91.14
	no 7	24.00	5.41	5.59	96.74
	no 8	14.00	3.15	3.26	100.00
	Total	429.00	96.62	100.00	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Missing		15.00	3.38		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.6 Feedback: organisation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	32.00	7.21	7.44	7.44
	no 2	107.00	24.10	24.88	32.33
	no 3	79.00	17.79	18.37	50.70
	no 4	65.00	14.64	15.12	65.81
	no 5	67.00	15.09	15.58	81.40
	no 6	45.00	10.14	10.47	91.86
	no 7	24.00	5.41	5.58	97.44
	no 8	11.00	2.48	2.56	100.00
	Total	430.00	96.85	100.00	
Missing		14.00	3.15		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.7 Feedback: ideas and content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	116	26.1	27.1	27.1
	no 2	33	7.4	7.7	34.8
	no 3	42	9.5	9.8	44.6
	no 4	54	12.2	12.6	57.2
	no 5	49	11.0	11.4	68.7
	no 6	51	11.5	11.9	80.6
	no 7	40	9.0	9.3	90.0
	no 8	43	9.7	10.0	100.0
	Total	428	96.4	100.0	
Missing		16	3.6		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.8 Feedback: spelling

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	3.00	.68	.70	.70
	no 2	39.00	8.78	9.13	9.84
	no 3	72.00	16.22	16.86	26.70
	no 4	61.00	13.74	14.29	40.98
	no 5	71.00	15.99	16.63	57.61
	no 6	62.00	13.96	14.52	72.13
	no 7	62.00	13.96	14.52	86.65
	no 8	57.00	12.84	13.35	100.00
	Total	427.00	96.17	100.00	
Missing		17.00	3.83		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.9 Feedback: punctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	2.00	.45	.47	.47
	no 2	4.00	.90	.94	1.41
	no 3	14.00	3.15	3.29	4.69
	no 4	28.00	6.31	6.57	11.27
	no 5	29.00	6.53	6.81	18.08
	no 6	70.00	15.77	16.43	34.51
	no 7	109.00	24.55	25.59	60.09
	no 8	170.00	38.29	39.91	100.00
	Total	426.00	95.95	100.00	
Missing		18.00	4.05		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.10 Feedback: cohesive devices

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	5.00	1.13	1.17	1.17
	no 2	10.00	2.25	2.34	3.50
	no 3	29.00	6.53	6.78	10.28
	no 4	43.00	9.68	10.05	20.33
	no 5	66.00	14.86	15.42	35.75
	no 6	80.00	18.02	18.69	54.44
	no 7	126.00	28.38	29.44	83.88
	no 8	69.00	15.54	16.12	100.00
	Total	428.00	96.40	100.00	
Missing		16.00	3.60		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.11 Feedback: idioms

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	43.00	9.68	10.05	10.05
	no 2	67.00	15.09	15.65	25.70
	no 3	62.00	13.96	14.49	40.19
	no 4	68.00	15.32	15.89	56.07
	no 5	55.00	12.39	12.85	68.93
	no 6	64.00	14.41	14.95	83.88
	no 7	32.00	7.21	7.48	91.36
	no 8	37.00	8.33	8.64	100.00
	Total	428.00	96.40	100.00	
Missing		16.00	3.60		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.4 shows that ‘grammar’ was what a majority of the respondents preferred their teachers to focus on when grading. The item was ranked number one by 35.81% of the respondents while ‘ideas and

content’ was also ranked as number one (see Table 4.7). However, only 26.1% of the respondents gave priority to the latter as the major item for feedback.

Interestingly, a majority of the respondents ranked both ‘organisation’ and ‘vocabulary’ number two at 24.1% and 22.07%, respectively (see Tables 4.5 – 4.6). This reflects that they preferred these items to be the second most important for feedback.

For the middle places of the ranking, the respondents’ opinion dispersed. A majority of each item did not reach a quarter of the respondents. The item ‘spelling’ was ranked both third and fifth by 16.22% and 15.99% of the respondents, respectively (see Table 4.8), while the item ‘idioms’ was ranked fourth by 15.32% of the respondents (see Table 4.11).

It was clear that most respondents wanted their teachers to give less feedback on the last two items: ‘cohesive devices’ and ‘punctuation.’ Ranked seventh was the item ‘cohesive devices’ by 28.38% of the respondents (see Table 4.10), and ranked eighth was the item ‘punctuation’ by 38.29% of the respondents (see Table 4.9). The last item was also ranked the eighth place by the biggest group of the majority as compared to the majority of all items.

In conclusion, the following is the order of the items the respondents preferred their teachers’ feedback to focus on: grammar (35.81%), ideas and content (26.1%), organisation (24.1%), vocabulary (22.07%), spelling (16.22%), idioms (15.32%), cohesive devices (28.38%) and punctuation (38.29%).

Other than that, a respondent ranked each of the following items number nine: length of the written essay and formality of language. These were the items they set up by themselves. A respondent also gave additional comment on the feedback made by teachers: owing to the fact that language can be written differently, all different language use should have earned marks, not only one use accepted.

Table 4.12 Number of tasks

Statement	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
A number of tasks is appropriate.	443	1.00	5.00	3.8375	.79918
I want to have more writing exercises before I start writing an essay.	420	1.00	5.00	3.5690	.92821
Valid N (listwise)	420			3.7032	.86369

Table 4.12 shows that the respondents were satisfied with the number of tasks at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.70$, S.D. = .86). The mean scores of the two statements “The number of tasks is appropriate” and “I want to have more writing exercises before I start writing an essay” were 3.84 and 3.57 (S.D. < 1), respectively.

Table 4.13 Timing

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The time given for completing each task is adequate.	442	1.00	5.00	3.7489	.86127
Setting clear deadlines is appropriate for learning.	443	1.00	5.00	4.0451	.75970
My teacher provides sufficient time for each step of the writing process.	440	1.00	5.00	3.8591	.83115
Valid N (listwise)	439			3.8843	.81737

According to Table 4.13, all of the respondents’ opinion reached a high level of the rating scale ($\bar{X} = 3.88$, S.D. = .81). The statement “Setting clear deadlines is appropriate for learning” was ranked the highest in this category ($\bar{X} = 4.05$, S.D. = .76). The second and the third places were the following statements: “My teacher provides sufficient time for each step of the writing process” ($\bar{X} = 3.86$, S.D. = .83) and “The time given for completing each task is adequate” ($\bar{X} = 3.75$, S.D. = .86).

Table 4.14 Grading

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The criteria for grading should be notified to students.	442	1.00	5.00	4.2489	.74478
It is fair for my teacher to deduct points for late work.	443	1.00	5.00	3.5643	1.04309
The points should be equally weighted among all elements: vocabulary, grammar, content and organisation.	442	1.00	5.00	3.7059	.95685
Valid N (listwise)	441			3.8397	.91490

According to Table 4.14, the respondents showed that they had a high level of satisfaction with the grading ($\bar{X} = 3.84$, S.D. = .91). The statement “the criteria for grading should be notified to students” received the highest mean in this category ($\bar{X} = 4.25$, S.D. = .74). The statement “The points should be equally weighted among all elements: vocabulary, grammar, content and organisation” was ranked the second place with the mean at 3.71 (S.D. = .96). Though they gave their opinion at a high level on the statement “It is fair for my teacher to deduct points for late work” ($\bar{X} = 3.56$, S.D. = 1.04), the mean was the lowest for this category. This was the only figure, whose S.D. was over 1.00.

Following are Tables 4.15 – 4.18 which show the weight of the points for each writing task. Those who were eligible to express their ideal weights must select 2 or 1 on the rating scale of the statement ‘The points should be equally weighted among all elements: vocabulary, grammar, content and organisation’ (see Table 4.14). That simply means they did not agree with the equal weight criteria. The conclusion of these items was written below Table 4.18.

Table 4.15 Weight: vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 pt	5.00	1.13	13.51	13.51
	1.50	1.00	.23	2.70	16.22
	2 pt	18.00	4.05	48.65	64.86
	3 pt	10.00	2.25	27.03	91.89
	4 pt	2.00	.45	5.41	97.30
	7 pt	1.00	.23	2.70	100.00
	Total	37.00	8.33	100.00	
Missing	System	407.00	91.67		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.16 Weight: grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 pt	7.00	1.58	18.92	18.92
	2 pt	17.00	3.83	45.95	64.86
	2.50	1.00	.23	2.70	67.57

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	3 pt	11.00	2.48	29.73	97.30
	4 pt	1.00	.23	2.70	100.00
	Total	37.00	8.33	100.00	
Missing	System	407.00	91.67		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.17 Weight: content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 pt	4.00	.90	10.81	10.81
	2 pt	6.00	1.35	16.22	27.03
	2.50	1.00	.23	2.70	29.73
	3 pt	14.00	3.15	37.84	67.57
	4 pt	10.00	2.25	27.03	94.59
	5 pt	1.00	.23	2.70	97.30
	6 pt	1.00	.23	2.70	100.00
	Total	37.00	8.33	100.00	
Missing	System	407.00	91.67		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.18 Weight: organisation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 pt	3.00	.68	8.11	8.11
	2 pt	16.00	3.60	43.24	51.35
	2.50	1.00	.23	2.70	54.05
	3 pt	16.00	3.60	43.24	97.30
	4 pt	1.00	.23	2.70	100.00
	Total	37.00	8.33	100.00	
Missing	System	407.00	91.67		
Total		444.00	100.00		

There were 37 respondents (8.33% of the whole) who disagreed with an equal weight for all elements of writing. Out of ten points, they reflected their ideal weights as follows: vocabulary at 2 points, grammar at 2 points, content at 3 points and organisation at 3 points. Table 4.15 shows that a majority of the 37 respondents at 4.05% chose 2 points as a weight for vocabulary. Likewise, 3.83% of the 37 respondents chose 2 points as a weight for grammar (see Table 4.16). Table 4.17 shows that a majority of the 37 respondents at 3.15% chose 3 points as a weight for content. However, there were two groups of the majority of the 37 respondents that chose both 2 and 3 points as weight for organisation (see Table 4.18). The percentage points of the respondents were both 3.6%. The researcher, however, believed that the 3 point weight was more appropriate so as to make addition of the ideal weight at ten points.

Table 4.19 Conclusion

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
After learning how to write from English I and II courses, I am confident about writing English essays.	441	1.00	5.00	3.3605	.81139
Valid N (listwise)	441				

To the final statement (see Table 4.19), the respondents gave their opinion on their confidence about writing English essays after learning writing lessons from the English I and II courses at a medium level of satisfaction ($\bar{X} = 3.36$, S.D. = .811). That means they were not sure about their confidence in writing English essays because the mean was at the middle of the rating scale.

According to Table 4.20, the last question for this part asked the respondents to express their comment about the instruction of writing in English I and II. The comments are as follows:

Table 4.20 Additional comments

Comments	Frequency
- Teachers should start with very basic grammar, vocabulary, structure for writing skills because students have different background knowledge.	16
- Writing tasks should not be graded for point. Students should have freedom to write	7

Comments	Frequency
anything. Teachers only give advice to mistakes detected. By doing so, students may be more motivated.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be more tasks for practicing writing. Teachers should also teach punctuation and transitional markers. - There should be more writing tasks because the time allotted for each task was too long. 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should mark mistakes and also inform how to correct them; otherwise, the markings will be useless. 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should give guidelines or show many example writings before having students write their essays. 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether or not the essay makes sense depends on each student, who can generate his/her own idea to write. It's better than being told what to write. 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different teachers might have graded the same writing but given totally different marks. 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers created pleasant atmosphere in the class. That motivated me to learn. - The fact that teachers had good teaching techniques made me understand better. 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers taught well focusing on grammar and vocabulary. They also discussed about everything, so it helped me understand better. - Teachers taught well but I couldn't get what they taught due to my low proficiency. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grammar points should not have been focused on because students were under pressure all the time. The written essays were not effective, accordingly. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent lesson! The points given for tasks were fair enough. The topics for writing tasks were interesting. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be more various teaching aids, such as songs. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Variety of writing tasks help elicit our ideas. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers didn't explain much. Students had to write on their own. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should spend more time elaborating on how to write. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should teach in Thai sometime. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers should not stick to only their own writing style. They should accept that different words, which have similar meanings, can be used. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should have been only two tasks for the second term because of time constraint. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some teachers should improve their method of teaching. They didn't respond to students. 	1

Comments	Frequency
How could students improve their writing?	
- Writing lessons should be taught in a separate time so that the weak students can learn and improve more.	1
- Students should be assigned to write tales based on their own imagination.	1
- It's hard to write expressions in English though I have ideas.	1
- Students should be segregated according to their level of English proficiency. By doing so, students with low ability would feel comfortable enough to ask questions when they don't understand.	1
- The task should be completed within the class time. Students should be assigned to gain information for their essay beforehand.	1
- Teachers should explain more clearly before giving assignments.	1
- Studying the writing lessons in the English I and II courses helped me improve my writing skills.	1

According to Table 4.20, a majority of the respondents preferred their teachers to begin writing lessons with teaching basic grammar, vocabulary and structure for writing skills. They reasoned that many students had different background knowledge of English. Other comments were that they preferred the writing tasks not to carry any points, citing that they might have been more motivated to write. Some also asked for more writing tasks. Noticeably, other comments were directly concerned with the teachers in terms of the way to create pleasant atmosphere while teaching, to give more example essays and to clarify mistakes to students.

Interview Another source of the findings of this study was drawn from interviews and a focus group. The interviewees responded to the open-ended questions on an interview. For the individual interviews, the researcher asked those questions. The following are their opinions on the instruction of teaching writing.

1. The writing material: The writing material referred to a handout, in which three parts of the writing exercises were included: a reading passage, exercises and questions for an outline. The students' opinions were obviously split into three groups. First, the top students agreed that the reading passages were very helpful, giving guidelines or examples for writing tasks in the next step. They also liked the steps of writing guided by the material. Second, students in the middle group of grades thought both positively and negatively about the material, saying that the directions were easy to understand. However, the overall

material was appropriate. Finally, the lower students did not really consent to the level of difficulty of the material. They said some topics were not understandable because of the confusing directions and their lack of vocabulary.

2. The length of the material: All of the students had a consensus on the length of the material, saying that a number of pages of the reading passages and the exercises were appropriate. They also agreed with a number of the writing tasks for both terms, that is, two tasks. However, some interviewees said that the exercises were not really useful because their teachers asked to skip them and rush to finish the outline questions.

3. The reading passages: Two groups of the interviewees showed two opinions of the reading passages. First, the students who were individually interviewed supported the reading passages. Their reasons included that the passages acted as helpful guidelines for their writing. They, moreover, helped students create ideas to write and provided correct structure and word choice. Some students said that the passages helped them to start writing and understand unknown words. These students reflected negative opinions against the reading passages as well. They said some students misused the passages; they simply copied what was stated on the passages in their writing assignments. The others said that some texts contained too difficult words, which made it hard for the next steps, such as reading exercises and outlining, because students had not extracted any idea from the passages. An interviewee who gained an A from the English I course gave an interesting remark on this topic, stating that the reading passages were not really helpful for practicing writing, but only for reading skills. The main reason was that students could not copy the texts. They had to create their own sentences any way.

In contrast, the interviewees from the focus group stated only one side of opinion. They did not support the reading passages for two reasons. First, the grammar and content were too difficult to understand. They could not gain anything after reading the text, and they had no idea to start their own writing, accordingly. The other reason was that some topics were not personalised enough.

4. Level of difficulty: For the level of difficulty, there seemed to be concerns over students with low English competence. Though nearly all of the interviewees felt that the level of difficulty was appropriate, they said that some weak students found the material too difficult to understand. These students, as a result, copied their classmates' work or asked someone else to complete the tasks for them. To be specific, those who got a C grade and lower grades said the writing lessons such as the English I course were easy, but those in the English II course were too difficult. They admitted that if they found a task difficult, they would seek for help from their classmates. Similarly, the top students, who got an A grade, found the lessons easy enough to understand, but expressed their concerns that it might have been too difficult for others. They added when the

topics or reading passages were difficult, these weak students could not think of ideas to write about. Some of them, therefore, tried to search for information from the Internet, but it was hard for them not to plagiarise. They gave the reason to support the opinion that these weak students might have studied English in their late years in school.

5. The process writing: The process writing refers to the steps, which were notified on the handout of the material. Students were asked to read a passage, to complete exercises, to answer questions for an outline diagram, to write a first draft, and to revise the draft marked by teachers. A hundred percent of the interviewees agreed that the process writing was effective in helping them write. The reason that received the most responses was that they would be aware their errors. This refers to the way their teachers marked their drafts and how the students reviewed the feedback marked on their papers. The other reason was that the outline questions helped students to start writing by drawing ideas and to set up an objective for the writing. On the contrary, some interviewees added that the process writing was not effective for weak students because these students had no foundation English writing skills. They did not know how to write grammatical sentences. The fact that they were taught how to generate ideas by the process writing was useless as they could not generate a sentence to begin with. Another opinion included the appropriateness of the amount of the drafts—two before submitting the final one—and the most important step in the process writing, that is, revising.

6. The focus for marking: After students completed reading exercises and answered outline questions, another step in the process writing was checking or marking from their class teachers. Students' outlines, first drafts or second drafts would be marked with comments or feedback left in red pen, so that students could correct whatever was suggested by the teachers. The question for this step was "What element do you want your teacher to focus on when marking?" These four elements consisted of (1) grammar, (2) vocabulary, (3) organisation and (4) ideas and content. Disregarding the interviewees' English I grades, the interviewees' opinions could be divided into three groups. The first group wanted their teachers to focus marking grammar and vocabulary. Some wanted to learn how to write English sentences in a formal style; the others wanted to know only how to generate grammatical sentences. On the other hand, those who were not in favour of the focus on grammar and vocabulary said that it was hard to remain accuracy on these two elements. They, then, should not have been emphasised.

Receiving similar amount of responses, the second group preferred content and ideas to be checked. They said that it was hard to generate ideas to start the writing. This element was more important than any other elements because there were no right or wrong ideas. Students, therefore, were not afraid of making mistakes concerning their ideas. The marks from content and ideas could also compensate with other mistakes

concerning grammar or vocabulary. Some interviewees, however, expressed an opposite opinions, saying that content and ideas should not have been focused on at all. The reason was that each person had different ideas. All of them should have been accepted any way.

Finally, a few interviewees preferred their teachers to focus the marking on the organisation of their essays. They wanted to make their writing sound smoother and to avoid redundancy. In contrast, some interviewees found the organisation of essays not problematic, reasoning that most students translated Thai sentences into English sentences. Their Thai sentences should have sounded smooth enough, so teachers should have corrected other elements instead. However, an interviewee in the focus group preferred to focus on all four elements.

7. Teachers' feedback: This was another topic of the interviews that all of the interviewees agreed that it was helpful to their writing skills and helped improve their writing skills. The reason that a majority of the interviewees reflected was that teachers' feedback helped them acknowledge errors concerning grammar, word choice and expressions. They became more careful about those mistakes when writing the next task because they could recognise errors they had repeatedly done. Students felt that their writing skills improved because of their capability of writing correct word choice, structure, expressions and coherence of the content. While reviewing the feedback, the students not only saw the mistakes, but they also knew how to correct them. Most teachers noted correct versions, with which students were very satisfied. However, some interviewees suggested that oral communication between teachers and students should have been conducted more among all teachers. Only some classes did this. They said that the feedback in written forms was not sufficient for students to understand what went wrong with their writing. They needed more explanation by teachers speaking face-to-face to them.

8. A number of tasks and timing: When talking about a number of tasks, all students were satisfied with the two tasks in both the English I and II courses. One student in particular gave a reason to support his/her opinion, saying that in the English I course, students, who were freshmen, needed some time to adjust themselves in a new educational system. Two tasks were appropriate for beginners like them. Likewise, in the English II course, students were required to do more work in other courses in which they had to enroll. Therefore, it was suitable to remain the amount of tasks at two.

Another point that the interviewees gave opinions for was about the timing for each step and between each task. The timeframe for each step was set up differently by the class teachers on condition that students could complete each task before major examinations. For example, the first task was to be completed before the midterm examination and the second task before the final examination. All of the interviewees were satisfied with the time teachers allotted to them for each step. Usually, they had about a week to complete

each step. They said that the deadlines for all steps were notified clearly, so it was easy to catch up. Only a few said that some teachers did not set up deadlines clearly. As a result, they could not meet the deadlines because they were not pushed hard enough to finish the tasks.

When the interviewees were asked to give an opinion on the deadlines for each task, their opinions split. This depended on their grades as well. The first group, which consisted of students with the A, C, and C+ grades, had no problem completing their tasks on time. An interviewee added that a task could be easily done in a day. The seven-day timeframe for each task was more than enough, accordingly. However, the interviewees, who gained low grades from English I, were struggling to meet deadlines. They claimed that they did not have enough time to complete the task. They had other priorities from other subjects to do as well. They usually tried to finish writing an essay a day before the deadline. One student suggested that in case of late submission of work, marks should not have been subtracted. The reason was that it was really discouraging.

9. Grading: When asked about teachers' grading or marking, the interviewees gave different opinions. Some reported that the grading criteria were not explained by their class teachers. They did not know how they earned such points, especially when they compared the grades with their classmates'. However, they seemed satisfied with the ten-point grading for each task. It was noticeable that all of the interviewees said that their teachers had the same grading standard, which was clear and fair to all students. Some even added that their teachers orally explained the grading as well.

To the question "How do you prefer the weight of the points to be for the four elements: grammar; vocabulary; content and ideas; and organisation?," the interviewees showed three different opinions. First, some interviewees preferred to put more weight on content and ideas, reasoning that there would not be right or wrong ideas since it depended on personal opinion. The second group would like teachers to weigh more points for grammar because this was the most important element, whereas the other group preferred that all elements should have been equally weighed. They said that all of them were equally important.

12. Final opinion and suggestions: Finally, the interviewees were asked if the method of teaching writing in the English I and II courses helped improve their writing skills. A majority of the interviewees said that their writing skills had improved because of the instruction in English writing in the two courses. The interviewees earning all levels of grades agreed that the process writing was effective in providing correct steps for writing. They also learned about their errors and more new words because of teachers' feedback, which pointed out grammar rules to them. They felt that they were more confident to write English texts. The writing lessons in both courses gave them an opportunity to practice writing, which they had never had before. They also knew the way to generate ideas for their writing by searching for more information from other

sources. An A student, however, was not satisfied with the instruction, saying that the writing skills had not really improved.

Though a majority of the interviewees agreed that the method of teaching writing helped improve their writing skills, they expressed concerns over students with low English competence. According to the interviewees who gained the A, C and C+ grades, this instruction in English writing was not effective for weak students who did not have any grammatical knowledge at all. They might have had some ideas on what to write about; however, the main problem was that they had no idea how to generate grammatical sentences. They asked other classmates who were better at English to complete tasks for them, accordingly.

Moreover, the focus group expressed several students' problems for the writing lessons. First, they seemed to translate Thai into English word for word. As a result, their written English sentences did not really make sense. Second, some students did not have any idea how to answer the outline questions. Finally, some students were afraid of class teachers, so a peer review might have been a solution; however, an interviewee promptly contradicted the idea, saying that not all students were confident enough to give comments to classmates. The idea of a peer review should not be encouraged at all.

To sum up, the interviewees eventually gave the following suggestions to close the interview sessions:

- After marking and leaving feedback on students' papers, teachers should once again explain face-to-face to students, so that they would know what is wrong with their writing and how to correct errors. A majority of the interviewees gave this suggestion.
- Nearly all of the interviewees suggested that at the very beginning of the courses, grammar rules or structures be taught or reviewed. Extra tutorial classes could be provided instead of teaching these in a regular class. Students with low English competence would be able to write correct sentences. Once they know of the steps in the process writing, they would not have problems writing by themselves. This would also help solve the problem of students copying others' work.
- Teachers should be friendlier to students and should speak Thai when explaining feedback because there is no point if students do not understand what the explanation is about.
- Before a task is assigned, general mistakes or most repeated errors should be presented to students.
- A glossary of new words should be concluded at the end of each reading passage.
- Teachers should conclude all correction symbols to students and all teachers should use the same symbols too.

Objective 2. To study the students' preferred teaching methods for the instruction in writing English.

Table 4.21 Text functions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	48.00	10.81	11.43	11.43
	second	49.00	11.04	11.67	23.10
	third	69.00	15.54	16.43	39.52
	fourth	76.00	17.12	18.10	57.62
	fifth	69.00	15.54	16.43	74.05
	sixth	49.00	11.04	11.67	85.71
	seventh	58.00	13.06	13.81	99.52
	eighth	2.00	.45	.48	100.00
	Total	420.00	94.59	100.00	
Missing	System	24.00	5.41		
Total		444.00	100.00		

According to Table 4.21, a majority of the respondents ranked 'Text functions' number four. The percentage points of the respondents were 17.12% while an equal percentage points at 15.54% ranked this method of teaching writing English at number three and five.

Table 4.22 Composing process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	73.00	16.44	17.22	17.22
	second	52.00	11.71	12.26	29.48
	third	65.00	14.64	15.33	44.81
	fourth	71.00	15.99	16.75	61.56
	fifth	71.00	15.99	16.75	78.30
	sixth	70.00	15.77	16.51	94.81
	seventh	21.00	4.73	4.95	99.76
	eighth	1.00	.23	.24	100.00
	Total	424.00	95.50	100.00	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Missing	System	20.00	4.50		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.22 shows that most of the respondents (16.44%) selected 'composing processes' as their most favourite method of teaching writing. An equal number of them (16.75%), however, selected it as their fourth and fifth most favourite method.

Table 4.23 Project-based writing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	11.00	2.48	2.59	2.59
	second	29.00	6.53	6.84	9.43
	third	34.00	7.66	8.02	17.45
	fourth	56.00	12.61	13.21	30.66
	fifth	72.00	16.22	16.98	47.64
	sixth	73.00	16.44	17.22	64.86
	seventh	145.00	32.66	34.20	99.06
	eighth	4.00	.90	.94	100.00
	Total	424.00	95.50	100.00	
Missing	System	20.00	4.50		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.23 shows that a majority of the respondents (32.66%) ranked 'project-based writing' seventh which was the last place. The second and the third most of the respondents ranked this method sixth and fifth respectively. The eighth place was optional if the respondents added their own method of teaching writing.

Table 4.24 Language structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	87.00	19.59	20.67	20.67
	second	77.00	17.34	18.29	38.95

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	third	67.00	15.09	15.91	54.87
	fourth	68.00	15.32	16.15	71.02
	fifth	44.00	9.91	10.45	81.47
	sixth	55.00	12.39	13.06	94.54
	seventh	23.00	5.18	5.46	100.00
	Total	421.00	94.82	100.00	
Missing	System	23.00	5.18		
Total		444.00	100.00		

According to Table 4.24, a majority of the respondents at 19.59% ranked 'language structure' number one. In addition, 17.34% of them ranked this method of teaching writing English number two.

Table 4.25 Content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	58.00	13.06	13.65	13.65
	second	85.00	19.14	20.00	33.65
	third	81.00	18.24	19.06	52.71
	fourth	62.00	13.96	14.59	67.29
	fifth	72.00	16.22	16.94	84.24
	sixth	42.00	9.46	9.88	94.12
	seventh	24.00	5.41	5.65	99.76
	eighth	1.00	.23	.24	100.00
	Total	425.00	95.72	100.00	
Missing	System	19.00	4.28		
Total		444.00	100.00		

According to Table 4.25, a majority of the respondents at 19.14% ranked 'content' number two. In addition, 18.24% of them ranked this method of teaching writing English number three.

Table 4.26 Creative expression

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	114.00	25.68	26.82	26.82
	second	56.00	12.61	13.18	40.00
	third	52.00	11.71	12.24	52.24
	fourth	34.00	7.66	8.00	60.24
	fifth	39.00	8.78	9.18	69.41
	sixth	56.00	12.61	13.18	82.59
	seventh	71.00	15.99	16.71	99.29
	eighth	3.00	.68	.71	100.00
	Total	425.00	95.72	100.00	
Missing	System	19.00	4.28		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.26 shows that a majority of the respondents (25.68%) ranked ‘creative expression’ first whereas the second most of them ranked this method seventh. This may mean that they either liked to be taught with this method or don’t like this method at all.

Table 4.27 Creative expression

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	31.00	6.98	7.31	7.31
	second	79.00	17.79	18.63	25.94
	third	56.00	12.61	13.21	39.15
	fourth	56.00	12.61	13.21	52.36
	fifth	56.00	12.61	13.21	65.57
	sixth	75.00	16.89	17.69	83.25
	seventh	68.00	15.32	16.04	99.29
	eighth	3.00	.68	.71	100.00
	Total	424.00	95.50	100.00	
Missing	System	20.00	4.50		
Total		444.00	100.00		

Table 4.27 shows that a majority of the respondents (17.79%) ranked 'genre' second. The second most of the respondents ranked this method sixth.

Table 4.28 Order of students' preferred method of being taught English writing

Ranking	Interval ranking 1		Interval ranking 2		Interval ranking 3	
	Method of teaching English writing	%	Method of teaching English writing	%	Method of teaching English writing	%
1	Creative expression (1)	25.68	Language structure (1)	19.59	Composing processes (1)	16.44
2	Content (1)	19.14	Genre (1)	17.79	Language structure (2)	17.34
3	Content (2)	18.24	Text functions (2)	15.54		
4	Text functions (1)	17.12	Composing processes (2)	15.99		
5	composing processes (2)	15.99	Text functions (2)	15.54		
6	Genre (2)	16.89	Project-based writing (2)	16.44		
7	Project-based writing (1)	32.66	Creative expression (2)	15.99		

Table 4.28 shows the conclusion of the method of teaching writing English the respondents preferred to be taught. Column 1 shows the ranking, into which the respondents put each method of teaching writing English. For the other columns, the researcher tried to illustrate the interval ranking. For example, there were three interval ranks that the majority of the respondents ranked number one: creative expression, language structure and composing processes. The percentage points referred to the number of the respondents and the numbers 1 and 2 in the parentheses referred to the most and second most respondents that chose each method. For example, most respondents ranked 'creative expression' number one whereas the second most ranked number seven.

To sum up, the ranking of the most preferred method of teaching writing was (1) creative expression, (2) language structure, (3) composing processes, (4) content, (5) genre, (6) text functions and (7) project-based writing.

Interview For the interview and the focus group, when asked about their favourite kinds of writing, the students seemed to show a majority of interests in writing journals and essays. Those who were in favour of writing journals reasoned that writing their own journals did not require too much emphasis on grammar, nor were they asked to search for information outside classrooms. All they needed to write was their own ideas. On the other hand, those who were in favour of writing essays claimed that they had been familiar with this kind of writing; therefore, it was more workable for them to practice writing essays. The preferred methods for practicing English writing included poems, advertisements and letters. The researcher noticed that nearly all of the students with the A, C, and C+ grades preferred to write journals, while the students with lower grades preferred to practice writing essays.

Objective 3. To compare the demographic data of SU first year students with their opinion towards the instruction in writing English in English foundation courses.

Table 4.29 Number of samples

		Faculty	Major	Sex	English I grade	Mid-term grade	How long have you been in an English speaking country?	When did you start studying English?	How long have you studied English in a language school?	Have you ever studied writing outside SU?
N	Valid	444	438	430	443	437	444	442	441	440
	Missing	0	6	14	1	7	0	2	3	4

Table 4.29 shows the number of the samples' responses for the first nine questions, which asked about general background of the respondents. There were 444 samples in this study; however, not all of them gave responses to all the questions. For instance, a few respondents, about 14 of them, failed to identify their sexes.

Table 4.30 Faculties

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education	139	31.3	31.31	31.3
	Engineering	305	68.7	68.69	100.0
	Total	444	100.0	100.00	

From Table 4.30, 305 students from the Faculty of Engineering were selected as samples, which accounted for 68.7% of all samples. For the Faculty of Education 139 students were selected (31.3%). The samples were selected by the simple random sampling technique from two faculties: 'Education' and 'Engineering and Industrial Technology.' The number of each faculty was not equal due to the unequal total numbers of the faculties.

Table 4.31 Majors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	32	7.21	7.32	7.32
	Social Studies	23	5.18	5.26	12.59
	Early Childhood	28	6.31	6.41	18.99
	Sport Science	7	1.58	1.60	20.59
	Psychology	28	6.31	6.41	27.00
	Education for Human Development	18	4.05	4.12	31.12
	Bioprocess Engineering	9	2.03	2.09	33.15
	Food Technology	32	7.21	7.32	40.36
	Bio Technology	19	4.28	4.32	44.64
	Industrial Engineering	13	2.93	2.97	47.57
	Mechanical Engineering	21	4.73	4.76	52.30
	Chemical Engineering	20	4.50	4.61	56.80
	Electronic	30	6.76	6.81	63.56
	Engineering Business	46	10.36	10.41	73.92
	Petro & Polymeric Materials	37	8.33	8.37	82.25
	Management Engineering & Logis	56	12.61	12.68	94.86
	Advanced Materials & Nano Technology	18	4.05	4.12	98.91
	Total	437	98.42	100.00	
Missing	System	7	1.58		100.00
Total		444	100.00		

In Table 4.31, of all majors from both the Faculties of Education and Engineering, the respondents were from seventeen majors. A majority of them (12.61%) majored in Management Engineering and Logis. The second and third most were the respondents from the Engineering Business and Petro & Polymeric Materials at 10.36% and 8.33%, respectively.

Table 4.32 Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	149	33.56	34.65	34.7
	female	277	62.39	64.42	99.1
Missing	System	18	4.05		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.32 shows the number of genders of the respondents. Most of them were female (62.39%). The rest of them were male, which accounted for 33.56%.

Table 4.33 English I grades

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A	62	13.96	14.00	14.00
	B+	46	10.36	10.38	24.38
	B	72	16.22	16.25	40.63
	C+	78	17.57	17.61	58.24
	C	81	18.24	18.28	76.52
	D+	70	15.77	15.80	92.33
	D	34	7.66	7.67	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing	System	1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.33 shows the respondents' grades in the English I course, which they earned in the previous term. A majority of the respondents gained the grades clustering in the middle of the scale, which referred to the grades B, C+ and C. A majority of the respondents (18.24%), however, had a C grade.

Table 4.34 English II mid-term grades

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	72 and higher	16	3.59	3.53	3.40
	67-71	24	5.41	5.49	8.81
	63-66	24	5.41	5.49	14.22
	58-62	50	11.26	11.44	25.48
	54-57	44	9.91	10.07	35.39
	49-53	44	9.91	10.07	45.30
	45-48	56	12.61	12.81	57.91
	lower than 45	179	40.32	40.96	98.23
	Total	437	98.42	100.00	100.00
Missing		7	1.58		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.34 shows that most of the respondents received the English II grades lower than 45 points. The figure was 179 students or 12.61%. On the other hand, the least respondents gained the top score, which was 72 points and higher. The figure was 16 students or 3.59%.

Table 4.35 How long have you ever stayed in an English-speaking country?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	430	96.85	96.85	96.8
	1-3 months	10	2.25	2.25	99.1
	7-11 months	2	.45	.45	99.5
	1 year or longer	2	.45	.45	100.0
	Total	444	100.00	100.00	

According to Table 4.35, most of the respondents at 96.85% never stayed in any English-speaking country. Only a few of them at 2.25% stayed in a country, where English was used as a native language, for a month to three months. Very few of them stayed in the country for more than 7 months.

Table 4.36 When did you start studying English?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	pre-school	30	6.76	6.79	6.8
	kindergarten	193	43.47	43.67	50.5
	grade 1	85	19.14	19.23	69.7
	grade 4	128	28.83	28.96	98.6
	Secondary	6	1.35	1.36	100.0
	Total	442	99.55	100.00	
Missing		2	.45		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.36 shows the period respondents started studying English. A majority of respondents (43.47%) started their first English lesson in school at the kindergarten level, whereas another group of most respondents at 28.83% commenced their English lesson at Grade 4 level.

Table 4.37 How long have you ever had special English classes in a language school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	208	46.85	47.17	47.2
	1-3 months	98	22.07	22.22	69.4
	4-6 months	37	8.33	8.39	77.8
	7-11 months	20	4.50	4.54	82.3
	1 year or longer	78	17.57	17.69	100.0
	Total	441	99.32	100.00	
Missing		3	.68		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.38 Have long have you ever had special English writing courses outside Silpakorn University?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	382	86.04	86.82	86.82
	1-3 months	22	4.95	5.00	91.82

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	4-6 months	5	1.13	1.14	92.95
	7-11 months	1	.23	.23	93.18
	1 year or longer	30	6.76	6.82	100.00
	Total	440	99.10	100.00	
Missing		4	.90		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.37 and Table 4.38 show the information about respondents' participation in special English courses outside Silpakorn University. Nearly half of the respondents (46.85%) said that they never took any special English classes in a language school. However, another half of them reported that they had had special English classes in various periods ranging from a month to a year. To be specific to special English writing courses in a language school, a large amount of respondents at 86.04% never took any courses. A few of them at 6.76%, however, took an English writing course for a year or longer.

Table 4.39 Problem: Ungrammatical writing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	162	36.49	37.41	37.41
	no 2	122	27.48	28.18	65.59
	no 3	69	15.54	15.94	81.52
	no 4	33	7.43	7.62	89.15
	no 5	29	6.53	6.70	95.84
	no 6	7	1.58	1.62	97.46
	no 7	5	1.13	1.15	98.61
	no 8	6	1.35	1.39	100.00
	Total	433	97.52	100.00	
Missing		11	2.48		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.40 Problem: Not knowing many words

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	180	40.54	41.47	41.47
	no 2	103	23.20	23.73	65.21
	no 3	46	10.36	10.60	75.81
	no 4	38	8.56	8.76	84.56
	no 5	26	5.86	5.99	90.55
	no 6	17	3.83	3.92	94.47
	no 7	14	3.15	3.23	97.70
	no 8	10	2.25	2.30	100.00
	Total	434	97.75	100.00	
Missing		10	2.25		
Total		444	100.00		

In the next question, respondents were asked to write Numbers 1 – 8 (or 9) to show the order of the importance of the problems they might have in writing. Remarkably, there were two problems that respondents seemed to choose as Number 1 and 2. Table 4.39 shows that 36.49% of respondents chose writing ungrammatically as their top problem. In fact, about a quarter of respondents chose this item as their second most important problem when writing English. These results corresponded well with the data from Table 4.40, where vocabulary was ranked the top problem the respondents were having. The number of 40.54 percentage points almost accounted for half of the respondents, who felt that they did not know enough words for writing English. The second place was chosen by nearly a quarter of all respondents.

Table 4.41 Problem: Unable to organise ideas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	20	4.50	4.64	4.64
	no 2	44	9.91	10.21	14.85
	no 3	54	12.16	12.53	27.38
	no 4	54	12.16	12.53	39.91
	no 5	66	14.86	15.31	55.22
	no 6	69	15.54	16.01	71.23

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	no 7	102	22.97	23.67	94.90
	no 8	21	4.73	4.87	99.77
	no 9	1	.23	.23	100.00
	Total	431	97.07	100.00	
Missing		13	2.93		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.42 Problem: Have no ideas to write

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	27	6.08	6.26	6.26
	no 2	22	4.95	5.10	11.37
	no 3	44	9.91	10.21	21.58
	no 4	39	8.78	9.05	30.63
	no 5	29	6.53	6.73	37.35
	no 6	46	10.36	10.67	48.03
	no 7	54	12.16	12.53	60.56
	no 8	167	37.61	38.75	99.30
	no 9	3	.68	.70	100.00
	Total	431	97.07	100.00	
Missing		13	2.93		
Total		444	100.00		

The rest of the problem items did not reveal remarkable results. A majority of the respondents at 22.97% (Table 4.41) ranked 'inability to organise ideas' as the seventh place, while the similar number of them ranked the same item various positions from Numbers 3 to 6. Similarly, the majority of respondents at 37.61% (Table 4.42) did not prioritise 'having no ideas to write' as their problem in writing English. Most of them ranked this problem at the low ends of Numbers 6 – 8.

Table 4.43 Problem: Misspell

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	8	1.80	1.86	1.86
	no 2	43	9.68	9.98	11.83
	no 3	75	16.89	17.40	29.23
	no 4	75	16.89	17.40	46.64
	no 5	74	16.67	17.17	63.81
	no 6	67	15.09	15.55	79.35
	no 7	53	11.94	12.30	91.65
	no 8	36	8.11	8.35	100.00
	Total	431	97.07	100.00	
Missing		13	2.93		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.44 Problem: Punctuate incorrectly

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	3	.68	.70	.70
	no 2	7	1.58	1.63	2.33
	no 3	10	2.25	2.33	4.65
	no 4	18	4.05	4.19	8.84
	no 5	45	10.14	10.47	19.30
	no 6	87	19.59	20.23	39.53
	no 7	104	23.42	24.19	63.72
	no 8	154	34.68	35.81	99.53
	no 9	2	.45	.47	100.00
	Total	430	96.85	100.00	
Missing		14	3.15		
Total		444	100.00		

The opinions of respondents dispersed for the problem 'Misspelling' (Table 4.43). About 15% of them ranked this item as the third, fourth, fifth and sixth important problem. More than half of respondents

said that they could not punctuate correctly; however, they chose this item as the least important problem at Numbers 7 and 8.

Table 4.45 Problem: Not know words or phrases for linking ideas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	4	.90	.93	.93
	no 2	33	7.43	7.64	8.56
	no 3	60	13.51	13.89	22.45
	no 4	83	18.69	19.21	41.67
	no 5	92	20.72	21.30	62.96
	no 6	78	17.57	18.06	81.02
	no 7	59	13.29	13.66	94.68
	no 8	23	5.18	5.32	100.00
	Total	432	97.30	100.00	
Missing		12	2.70		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.46 Problem: Not know idioms or expressions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no 1	29	6.53	6.71	6.71
	no 2	59	13.29	13.66	20.37
	no 3	72	16.22	16.67	37.04
	no 4	91	20.50	21.06	58.10
	no 5	73	16.44	16.90	75.00
	no 6	60	13.51	13.89	88.89
	no 7	38	8.56	8.80	97.69
	no 8	9	2.03	2.08	99.77
	no 9	1	.23	.23	100.00
	Total	432	97.30	100.00	
Missing		12	2.70		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.47 No problem in writing at all

		Frequency	Percent
Missing		444	100.00

Again, Tables 4.45 and 4.46 do not show a remarkable majority of opinions. Similar percentage points of respondents ranked the problems ‘not knowing words or phrases for linking ideas’ (or simply transitional signals) and ‘not knowing idioms or expressions’ as dispersed places ranging from Numbers 3 to 6. Finally, none of the respondents checked the last box that said ‘I had no problem in writing at all (see Table 4.47).

The next question was ‘To practice writing English, which of the following tasks do you like? There were nine writing tasks for respondents to choose by checking in boxes. The tenth box was left blank for their own ideas. Respondents could check as many boxes as they liked. Below are the tables of the results followed by the conclusive paragraph.

Table 4.48 Favourite task: Essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	152	34.23	34.31	34.31
	no	291	65.54	65.69	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.49 Favourite task: Journals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	210	47.30	47.40	47.40
	no	233	52.48	52.60	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.50 Favourite task: Letters

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	56	12.61	12.64	12.64
	no	387	87.16	87.36	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.51 Favourite task: Advertisements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	75	16.89	16.93	16.93
	no	368	82.88	83.07	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.52 Favourite task: Poems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	25	5.63	5.64	5.64
	no	418	94.14	94.36	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.53 Favourite task: Conversations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	152	34.23	34.31	34.31
	no	291	65.54	65.69	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.54 Favourite task: Editorials

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
yes	17	3.83	3.84	3.84
no	426	95.95	96.16	100.00
Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing	1	.23		
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.55 Favourite task: Plays/short stories

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
yes	61	13.74	13.77	13.77
no	382	86.04	86.23	100.00
Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing	1	.23		
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.56 Favourite task: Reports on own interesting topic (research)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
yes	131	29.50	29.57	29.57
no	312	70.27	70.43	100.00
Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing	1	.23		
Total	444	100.00		

A majority of the respondents did not choose all of the items, leaving the boxes of some items blank. The percentage points of the 'yes' box were more than 'no.' However, of all writing tasks, journals seemed to be the most favourite task for the respondents as it was selected by 47.3% (see Table 4.49). The second most

favourite tasks fell under ‘essays’ and ‘conversations’ at an equal percentage points at 34.23% (see Tables 4.48 and 4.53). On the other hand, the least favourite three writing tasks were ‘letters,’ ‘poems,’ and ‘editorials’ at 12.61%, 5.63% and 3.84% respectively (see Tables 4.50, 4.52 and 4.54).

Other than the listed writing tasks, the respondent also expressed their own favourite tasks on the blank, including ‘music and songs,’ ‘science and technology,’ ‘nature.’ The first task was tallied by the most respondents at 3; however, some of them were regarded as topics, not writing tasks. Two respondents wrote they did not like any of the listed tasks.

Following are the tables that respond to the next question: Which of the following topics do you like to write about? The respondents could choose more than one choice. The concluded results are below the last table of this question.

Table 4.57 Favourite topic: Environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	74	16.67	16.70	16.70
	no	369	83.11	83.30	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.58 Favourite topic: Hometown

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	92	20.72	20.77	20.77
	no	351	79.05	79.23	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.59 Favourite topic: Social problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	33	7.4	7.4	7.4
	no	410	92.3	92.6	100.0
	Total	443	99.8	100.0	
Missing		1	.2		
Total		444	100.0		

Table 4.60 Favourite topic: Hobbies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	151	34.0	34.1	34.1
	no	292	65.8	65.9	100.0
	Total	443	99.8	100.0	
Missing		1	.2		
Total		444	100.0		

Table 4.61 Favourite topic: Entertainment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	136	30.63	30.70	30.70
	no	307	69.14	69.30	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.62 Favourite topic: Sports

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	91	20.50	20.54	20.54
	no	352	79.28	79.46	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.63 Favourite topic: Pets

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	170	38.29	38.37
	no	273	61.49	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00
Missing		1	.23	
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.64 Favourite topic: Friends

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	169	38.06	38.15
	no	274	61.71	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00
Missing		1	.23	
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.65 Favourite topic: Food

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	147	33.11	33.18
	no	296	66.67	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00
Missing		1	.23	
Total	444	100.00		

Table 4.66 Favourite topic: Jobs

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	101	22.75	22.80

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	no	342	77.03	77.20	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.67 Favourite topic: Family

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	178	40.09	40.18	40.18
	no	265	59.68	59.82	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.68 Favourite topic: Politics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	21	4.73	4.74	4.74
	no	422	95.05	95.26	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

Table 4.69 Favourite topic: Tourist attractions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	205	46.17	46.28	46.28
	no	238	53.60	53.72	100.00
	Total	443	99.77	100.00	
Missing		1	.23		
Total		444	100.00		

More than half, or nearly all in some items, of the respondents chose ‘no’ for all of the listed topics. That meant a majority of the respondents did not select each topic as their favourite ones for writing. When the researcher took a closer look at each item, Table 4.69 on the topic of ‘tourist attractions’ showed that a nearly equal number of the respondents selected and did not select the topic at 46.17% and 53.6%, respectively. Therefore, the topic was ranked the top most favourite topic. The second and the third places included ‘family’ at 40.09% and ‘pets’ at 38.29% (see Tables 4.67 and 4.63). Conversely, the three least favourite topics were ‘environment’ at 16.67%, ‘social problems’ at 7.4% and ‘politics’ at 4.73% (see Tables 4.57, 4.59 and 4.68).

There was only one respondent that filled in the blank to express his/her own topic. The suggested topic was ‘games.’

Interview For the interview and the focus group, no matter what grade they gained for the English I course, the majority of the students preferred to practice writing about real life situations. Some of them specified that the following topics would be appropriate for them to write because it was easy to gather ideas: personal information, families, my study, pets, sports, entertainment, food, future careers and music. Some of them also reflected that the topics on the writing material were personalised and suitable for the various level of English competence of students. However, a majority of the students in the focus group gave a different point of view, saying that the topics on the writing material were not personalised enough. They suggested that students write about their own stories in a journal. By doing so, students with lower English competence would be able to practice using grammar and to generate ideas because the topic was easy enough.

Comparisons between demographic data and opinion

For this subheading, the data was analysed in order to find significant differences between the opinion on the instruction in writing English in the two foundation courses and the demographic data. The opinion was divided into seven variables: the material, writing process, feedback, a number of tasks, timing, grading and total opinion. The results are shown below.

Table 4.70 Difference between the opinion and the two faculties

Variable	Faculty	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Material	Education	139	3.75	.49	1.084	.279
	Engineering	304	3.69	.44		
Writing process	Education	139	4.16	.52	2.433*	.015

Variable	Faculty	n	Mean	SD	t	p
	Engineering	304	4.03	.52		
Feedback	Education	139	3.82	.48	1.939	.053
	Engineering	305	3.72	.52		
Number of tasks	Education	139	3.89	.68	3.737*	.000
	Engineering	304	3.63	.70		
Timing	Education	139	4.03	.72	2.943*	.003
	Engineering	304	3.82	.68		
Grading	Education	139	3.94	.61	2.384*	.018
	Engineering	304	3.79	.61		
Total	Education	139	3.92	.39	3.123*	.002
	Engineering	305	3.79	.39		

*significant level of .05

According to Table 4.70, the opinion on the instruction in writing English in the two English foundation courses was compared to the two faculties. The material and feedback variables did not show any significant differences. However, the rest of the variables did.

As for the writing process, the Education students showed that they were satisfied with the writing process at a high level ($\bar{X} = 4.16$, S.D. = .52). Likewise, the Engineering students showed their satisfaction towards this variable at a high level as well ($\bar{X} = 4.03$, S.D. = .52). There was also a significant difference in the opinion concerning the writing process at a significant level of .05 ($t=2.433$, $p=.015$).

When considering a number of tasks, the researcher found both Education and Engineering students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.89$, S.D. = .68 and $\bar{X} = 3.63$, S.D. = .70, respectively), and there was also a significant difference in the opinion concerning a number of tasks at a significant level of .05 ($t=3.737$, $p=.000$).

As for the timing variable, the t-Test statistical analysis showed that there was a difference between the opinion among the two faculties at a significant level of .05 ($t=2.943$, $p=.003$). Both Education and Engineering students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 4.03$, S.D. = .72 and $\bar{X} = 3.82$, S.D. = .68, respectively).

The students in the Faculties of Education and Engineering were highly satisfied with the grading. The mean scores were 3.94 (S.D. = .61) and 3.79 (S.D. = .61), respectively. The statistical analysis also

showed a significant difference between the opinion concerning the grading variable among the two faculties at a significant level of .05 ($t=2.384$, $p=.018$).

Finally, the total opinion on the instruction in writing English was notably different among the two faculties at a significant level of .05 ($t=3.123$, $p=.002$). Both Education and Engineering students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.92$, S.D. = .39 and $\bar{X} = 3.79$, S.D. = .39, respectively).

Table 4.71 Difference between the opinion and majors

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
Material	Between Groups	2.372	5	0.474	2.283*	.046
	Within Groups	89.373	430	0.208		
	Total	91.745	435			
Writing process	Between Groups	4.174	5	0.835	3.115*	.009
	Within Groups	115.249	430	0.268		
	Total	119.422	435			
Feedback	Between Groups	1.896	5	0.379	1.489	.192
	Within Groups	109.788	431	0.255		
	Total	111.684	436			
Number of tasks	Between Groups	10.295	5	2.059	4.260*	.001
	Within Groups	207.831	430	0.483		
	Total	218.126	435			
Timing	Between Groups	13.281	5	2.656	5.710*	0.000
	Within Groups	200.009	430	0.465		
	Total	213.290	435			
Grading	Between Groups	3.313	5	0.663	1.778	0.116
	Within Groups	160.294	430	0.373		
	Total	163.607	435			
Total	Between Groups	3.292	5	0.658	4.329*	0.001
	Within Groups	65.553	431	0.152		
	Total	68.846	436			

* significant level of .05

According to Table 4.71, the opinion of the students in different major groups showed a statistically significant difference ($F=4.329$, $p=.001$). When considering each variable, the researcher found that those major groups had a statistical difference in their opinion concerning the following variables: the material ($F=2.283$, $p=.046$), the writing process ($F=3.115$, $p=.009$), a number of tasks ($F=4.260$, $p=.001$) and timing ($F=5.710$, $p=.000$). On the other hand, the opinion concerning the feedback and grading variables did not significantly differ among major groups with $F=1.489$ and $p=.192$ for the feedback, and $F=1.778$ and $p=.116$ for grading.

For the first set of the variables, the researcher further analysed by means of the Multiple Comparisons on the LSD statistical analysis in order to seek differences among major groups.

Table 4.72 Multiple comparisons of the opinion and major groups

Variable	Major Group	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
Material	Education (Thai, Eng, social) : M1					
	Education (element, early child): M2	-0.09				
	Education (sport science) : M3	0.34	0.42*			
	Education (ed tech, ed for hu) : M4	0.24	0.33*	-0.10		
	Education (psychology) : M5	0.13	0.22	-0.20	-0.11	
	Engineering : M6	0.12	0.20*	-0.22	-0.12	-0.02
Writing process	Education (Thai, Eng, social) : M1					
	Education (element, early child): M2	0.04				
	Education (sport science) : M3	0.43*	0.39			
	Education (ed tech, ed for hu) : M4	0.35*	0.30	-0.08		
	Education (psychology) : M5	0.07	0.03	-0.36	-0.27	
	Engineering : M6	0.23*	0.18	-0.20	-0.12	0.15
Number of tasks	Education (Thai, Eng, social) : M1					
	Education (element, early child): M2	0.23				
	Education (sport science) : M3	0.59*	0.36			
	Education (ed tech, ed for hu) : M4	0.30	0.06	-0.29		
	Education (psychology) : M5	0.02	-0.21	-0.57	-0.28	
	Engineering : M6	0.39*	0.16	-0.20	0.09	0.37*
Timing	Education (Thai, Eng, social) : M1					
	Education (element, early child): M2	-0.30				

Variable	Major Group	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
	Education (sport science) : M3	0.31	0.61*			
	Education (ed tech, ed for hu) : M4	0.54*	0.84*	0.23		
	Education (psychology) : M5	-0.15	0.14	-0.46	-0.70*	
	Engineering : M6	0.21*	0.50*	-0.10	-0.34*	0.36*
Total	Education (Thai, Eng, social) : M1					
	Education (element, early child): M2	-0.06				
	Education (sport science) : M3	0.30	0.36*			
	Education (ed tech, ed for hu) : M4	0.26*	0.32*	-0.04		
	Education (psychology) : M5	0.05	0.11	-0.25	-0.21	
	Engineering : M6	0.18*	0.24*	-0.12	-0.08	0.13

* significant level of .05

According to Table 4.72, the opinion concerning the material variable had a significant difference among all of the majors both in the Faculties of Education and Engineering. Similarly, there was also a significant difference in the opinion concerning the writing process and some majors in the Faculty of Education, namely Thai, English, Social Studies, Sport Science, Educational Technology and Education for Human Development, and the majors in the Faculty of Engineering.

The opinion concerning a number of tasks was significantly different among some educational majors, namely Thai, English, Social Studies and Sport Science, and the Engineering majors. Other than that, for this variable the Psychology students had the opinion significantly different from that of the Engineering students.

As for the timing variable, the opinion of the students majoring in Thai, English and Social Studies was significantly different from the students majoring in Educational Technology and Education for Human Development and those from the Faculty of Engineering. Moreover, the opinion of the students majoring in Elementary and Early Childhood was significantly different from the students majoring in Sport Science, Educational Technology and Education for Human Development and those from the Faculty of Engineering.

The opinion concerning timing of the students majoring in Educational Technology and Education for Human Development was significantly different from the students majoring in Psychology, and those from the Faculty of Engineering. The Psychology students also showed a significant difference in their opinion concerning timing from the Engineering students.

Finally, the Thai, English and Social Studies students showed a significant difference in their total opinion from the Educational Technology and Education for Human Development students. Moreover, the Elementary and Early Childhood students showed a significant difference in their overall opinion from the Sport Science and Engineering students. The rest of them did not show any significant differences.

Table 4.73 Difference between the opinion and genders

Variable	Sex	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Material	Male	149	3.61	0.47	-3.327*	.001
	Female	276	3.77	0.45		
Writing process	Male	149	3.95	0.51	-3.862*	.000
	Female	276	4.15	0.52		
Feedback	Male	149	3.73	0.48	-0.748	.455
	Female	277	3.77	0.52		
Number of tasks	Male	149	3.64	0.68	-1.389	.166
	Female	276	3.74	0.72		
Timing	Male	149	3.77	0.73	-2.388*	.017
	Female	276	3.94	0.68		
Grading	Male	149	3.75	0.62	-2.042*	.042
	Female	276	3.88	0.61		
Total	Male	149	3.75	0.37	-3.235*	.001
	Female	277	3.88	0.41		

*significant difference of .05

According to Table 4.73, the opinion on the instruction in writing English in the two English foundation courses was compared to the gender. The feedback and number of tasks variables did not show any significant differences ($t=-0.748$, $p=.455$ and $t=-1.389$, $p=.166$, respectively). However, the rest of the variables did, details as follows:

As for the material, the male students showed that they were satisfied with the material at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.61$, S.D. = .47). Likewise, the female students showed their satisfaction towards this variable at a high level as well ($\bar{X} = 3.77$, S.D. = .45). There was also a difference in the opinion concerning the material at a significant level of .05 ($t=-3.327$, $p=.001$).

When considering the writing process, the researcher found both male and female students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.95$, S.D. = .51 and $\bar{X} = 4.15$, S.D. = .52, respectively), and there was also a difference in the opinion concerning the writing process at a significant level of .05 ($t = -3.862$, $p = .000$).

As for the timing variable, the t-Test statistical analysis showed that there was a difference between the opinion among the gender at a significant level of .05 ($t = -2.388$, $p = .017$). Both male and female students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.77$, S.D. = .73 and $\bar{X} = 3.94$, S.D. = .68, respectively).

The male and female students were highly satisfied with the grading. The mean scores were 3.75 (S.D. = .62) and 3.88 (S.D. = .61), respectively. The statistical analysis also showed a difference between the opinion concerning the grading variable among the gender at a significant level of .05 ($t = -2.042$, $p = .042$).

Finally, the total opinion on the instruction in writing English was notably different among the gender at a significant level of .05 ($t = -3.235$, $p = .001$). Both male and female students showed their satisfaction at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.75$, S.D. = .37 and $\bar{X} = 3.88$, S.D. = .41, respectively).

Table 4.74 Difference between the opinion and English I grades

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
Material	Between Groups	3.394	6	.566	2.766*	.012
	Within Groups	88.956	435	.204		
	Total	92.350	441			
Writing process	Between Groups	4.093	6	.682	2.548*	.020
	Within Groups	116.472	435	.268		
	Total	120.564	441			
Feedback	Between Groups	2.151	6	.359	1.411	.209
	Within Groups	110.807	435	.254		
	Total	112.958	441			
Number of tasks	Between Groups	2.550	6	.425	.854	.529
	Within Groups	216.342	435	.497		
	Total	218.892	441			
Timing	Between Groups	4.395	6	.733	1.506	.174
	Within Groups	211.587	435	.486		
	Total	215.982	441			
Grading	Between Groups	5.1336	6	.856	2.312*	.033

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
	Within Groups	161.065	435	.370		
	Total	166.202	441			
Total	Between Groups	2.693	6	0.449	2.929*	0.008
	Within Groups	66.807	436	0.153		
	Total	69.500	442			

*significant level of .05

According to Table 4.74, the opinion of the students in different English I grade groups showed a statistically significant difference ($F=2.929$, $p=.008$). When considering each variable, the researcher found that those grade groups had a statistical difference in their opinion concerning the following variables: the material ($F=2.766$, $p=.012$), the writing process ($F=2.548$, $p=.020$), and grading ($F=2.312$, $p=.033$).

Then, the researcher further analysed by means of the Multiple Comparisons on the LSD statistical analysis in order to seek differences among English I grade groups.

Table 4.75 Multiple comparisons of the opinion and English I grade groups

Variable	English I Grade	A	B+	B	C+	C	D+
Material	B+	-.073					
	B	-.068	.005				
	C+	-.087	-.014	-.019			
	C	.010	.083	.078	.096		
	D+	.159*	.232*	.227*	.246*	.149*	
	D	.116	.189	.184	.203*	.107	.043
Writing	B+	-.031					
	B	-.045	-.014				
	C+	-.158	.127	-.113			
	C	.110	.141	.155	.268*		
	D+	.098	.129	.143	.257*	-.011	
	D	.095	.126	.140	.254*	-.014	-.003
Grading	B+	-.066					
	B	.057	-.123				
	C+	.039	.106	-.017			

Variable	English I Grade	A	B+	B	C+	C	D+
	C	.241*	.308*	.185	.202*		
	D+	.226*	.292*	.169	.187	-.015	
	B+	-.066					
Total	B+	-.035					
	B	-.008	.027				
	C+	-.085	-.050	-.076			
	C	.089	.124	.098	.174*		
	D+	.141*	.176*	.149*	.226*	.051	
	D	.101	.136	.109	.186*	.012	-.040

According to Table 4.75, the D+ students showed that their opinion concerning the material variable had a significant difference from the A, B+, B, C+ students. Similarly, there was also a significant difference in the opinion concerning the material in the C+ students and the C, D+, D students.

The opinion concerning the writing process was significantly different between the C+ students and the C, D+, D students. The rest of them did not show any significant differences.

As for the grading variable, the C students showed that their opinion had a significant difference from the A, B+, C+ students. Other than that, the opinion of the D+ students was significantly different from that of the A, B+ students.

Finally, the D+ students showed a significant difference in their total opinion from the A, B+, B, C+, C students. Moreover, the C+ students showed a significant difference in their total opinion from the D+, D students. The rest of them did not show any significant differences.

Table 4.76 Difference between the opinion and English II mid-term grades

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
Material	Between Groups	1.768	4	0.442	2.154	0.073
	Within Groups	88.449	431	0.205		
	Total	90.217	435			
Writing process	Between Groups	2.646	4	0.662	2.459*	0.045
	Within Groups	115.976	431	0.269		

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
	Total	118.622	435			
Feedback	Between Groups	1.024	4	0.256	1.000	0.407
	Within Groups	110.507	432	0.256		
	Total	111.531	436			
Number of tasks	Between Groups	2.208	4	0.552	1.117	0.348
	Within Groups	212.918	431	0.494		
	Total	215.126	435			
Timing	Between Groups	0.873	4	0.218	0.443	0.778
	Within Groups	212.348	431	0.493		
	Total	213.221	435			
Grading	Between Groups	1.804	4	0.451	1.203	0.309
	Within Groups	161.520	431	0.375		
	Total	163.324	435			
Total	Between Groups	0.883	4	0.221	1.418	0.227
	Within Groups	67.274	432	0.156		
	Total	68.157	436			

*significant level of .05

According to Table 4.76, the total opinion of the students did not show any difference among the groups of English II mid-term grades ($F=1.203$, $p=.309$). However, only the opinion concerning the writing process showed a significant difference among the grade groups ($F=2.459$, $p=.045$).

Then, the researcher further analysed by means of the Multiple Comparisons on the LSD statistical analysis in order to seek differences among English II mid-term grade groups.

Table 4.77 Multiple comparisons of the opinion and English II mid-term grade groups

English II midterm score	< 45	45-53	54-62	63-71
45-53 points	-.159*			
54-62 points	-.128	.031		

63-71 points	-.093	.066	.035	
72 and higher	-.289*	-.131	-.162	-.197

*significant difference of .05

According to Table 4.77, the students who earned 45 points or lower showed a significant difference in the opinion concerning the writing process as compared to those with 72 points or higher. The rest of the comparisons did not show any significant differences.

Table 4.78 Difference between the opinion and periods of stay in an English-speaking country

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
Material	Between Groups	0.299	3	0.100	0.475	0.700
	Within Groups	92.095	439	0.210		
	Total	92.394	442			
Writing process	Between Groups	0.402	3	0.134	0.490	0.690
	Within Groups	120.237	439	0.274		
	Total	120.639	442			
Feedback	Between Groups	0.953	3	0.318	1.245	0.293
	Within Groups	112.349	440	0.255		
	Total	113.302	443			
Number of tasks	Between Groups	1.487	3	0.496	1.001	0.392
	Within Groups	217.489	439	0.495		
	Total	218.976	442			
Timing	Between Groups	2.926	3	0.975	2.008	0.112
	Within Groups	213.259	439	0.486		
	Total	216.185	442			
Grading	Between Groups	1.287	3	0.429	1.141	0.332
	Within Groups	165.171	439	0.376		
	Total	166.458	442			
Total	Between Groups	0.378	3	0.126	0.800	0.494
	Within Groups	69.175	440	0.157		

Variable	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
	Total	69.553	443			

According to Table 4.78, the total opinion of the students did not show any difference among the groups of different periods of stay in an English-speaking country ($F=.800, p=.494$). Likewise, each variable did not show any significant difference compared among the groups, either.

Table 4.79 Difference between the opinion and periods of taking an English course in other institutions

Variable		SS	df	MS	F	p
Material	Between Groups	0.614	3	0.205	0.985	0.399
	Within Groups	90.414	435	0.208		
	Total	91.028	438			
Writing process	Between Groups	1.898	3	0.633	2.337	0.073
	Within Groups	117.772	435	0.271		
	Total	119.670	438			
Feedback	Between Groups	0.714	3	0.238	0.932	0.425
	Within Groups	111.451	436	0.256		
	Total	112.165	439			
Number of tasks	Between Groups	2.731	3	0.910	1.841	0.139
	Within Groups	215.068	435	0.494		
	Total	217.798	438			
Timing	Between Groups	3.372	3	1.124	2.336	0.073
	Within Groups	209.266	435	0.481		
	Total	212.638	438			
Grading	Between Groups	0.190	3	0.063	0.167	0.919
	Within Groups	164.570	435	0.378		
	Total	164.759	438			
Total	Between Groups	0.591	3	0.197	1.254	0.290
	Within Groups	68.523	436	0.157		
	Total	69.114	439			

According to Table 4.79, the total opinion of the students did not show any difference among the groups of different periods of taking an English course in other institutions ($F=.800, p=.494$). All of the variables did not also show any significant difference compared among the groups as well.