

Effects of Integrated Feedback on Academic Writing Achievement

Eason Yamalee

Department of English, Faculty of Education
Rattana Bundit University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Supong Tangkiengsirisin

Language Institute, Thammasat University
Thaprachan Campus, Bangkok, Thailand.

Abstract

This study examined the effects of integrated feedback on students' writing achievement. Then, it further investigated the attitude of student towards the implementation of integrated feedback on writing. Twenty students from one class were used as a sample group (intact group) to participate in this study. So the convenience sampling was used to select the participants. Research instruments consisted of integrated feedback model, pretest and posttest, and semi-structure interview questions. The participants did the pretest at the first week of the study. Later on, they were required to write four paragraph writing tasks and all of them were assessed and given feedback. Then they were required to do posttest on week 14. The following week was reserved for in-depth interview. The writing achievement of students was analyzed by Wilcoxon-Signed Rank Test. Week 15 was reserved for interviewing and the results were analyzed by content analysis. The results demonstrated that students improved their writing after they cooperated with the integrated feedback approach. Interviewing results revealed that they had positive attitude towards implementing integrated feedback in improving their writing skill.

Keywords: Integrated feedback, Paragraph writing, Writing achievement and Writing skill

Cite as: Yamalee, E., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2019). Effects of Integrated Feedback on Academic Writing Achievement. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (3) 250-270.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.17>

Introduction

Writing is one of the most important skills for everyone since it can be used to express opinions and thoughts; however, this skill is considered to be the most complicated language skills since it requires a complex process, including generating ideas, communicating in diverse and appropriate context. The ability to write well can have such a great impact on our life including the impact on effective communication and career development (Currier, 2008). However, teaching English writing in Thailand still relies heavily on a product-oriented approach, although some language instructors prefer a process-oriented approach (Tagong, 1991; Sakontawut, 2003). This proposed idea corroborates Susser (1994) to the point that even though in theory the process-oriented approach to teaching writing is accepted, its practical usage of this method is not commonly used. This is because many writing classes still rely on an old-fashioned method of teaching writing (product-oriented approach and its emphasis on form), as Tagong (1991) stresses that many Thai EFL instructors still think that students' writing problem has emerged from insufficient knowledge of grammar and vocabulary; therefore, lessons also need to be focused on both grammar and vocabulary lessons. Pawapatcharaudom (2007) states that there are four main areas of writing problems for Thai students including (1) being unable to write within limited time, (2) being unable to compose an academic paper through the use of English, (3) being unable to utilize the grammar rules in writing and (4) being unable to develop an appropriate structure in content. Another important problem may arise from students' delayed exposure of English writing because Thai students are exposed to writing at a later stage in their education and some are even introduced to formal writing when they study at the tertiary level (Tangkiengsirisin, 2010). However, assessing writing task cannot be based on grammatical issues solely, so many elements involved with writing need to be taken into consideration. Sakontawut (2003) stresses that even Thai students understand the rule of syntax, they still cannot construct proper writing task because they do not know how to express their thoughts in text and they encounter the problem of organizing ideas. First language interference errors need to be explored seriously for Thai learners since they normally think that writing is simple and they just translate from their mother tongue language to English. Sattayatham and Ratanapinyowong's study (2008) shows that top four errors of the format of paragraph writing include no transitional words, lack of organization, no introduction and no conclusion. Another important issue that needs to be taken into consideration is effective feedback. Providing feedback helps to improve students' writing ability because if teacher does not provide any comments, the students will revise in a consistently narrow way and will perceive that there is no need to revise the substances of the texts (Leki: 1992, Raimes: 1983, Ferris, 1995 and Baghzou, 2014). The logic behind the surface of feedback concept is that many teachers often misread students' text, make arbitrary corrections, provide vague prescriptions, or respond to text as fixed and final products (Zamel, 1985). However, to fulfill the job of providing feedback effectively is not a simple task because when students read feedback given by their instructors, they are often confused. Moreover, Truscott (1996) emphasizes that providing feedback especially in grammatical parts is really harmful for students and teacher should avoid such practice.

Despite some drawbacks of certain types of feedback provided in writing, Zamel (1985) explains that English instructors should implement new techniques of providing feedback such as teacher-student conferencing since it acts as two-way interaction between a teacher and a student to negotiate meaning and facilitate the latter understands of the message. Such knowledge is

beneficial for instructor's consideration on whether or not using integrated feedback in English writing lesson would hinder or help students. Another point is that many teachers continue to wonder about effectiveness of certain approaches of how the process writing, providing feedback, and revision actually enhance students to write and become autonomous learners in order to construct their knowledge in writing. From such explanation, it can be implied that further studies are really significant to explore and seek empirical evidence about certain type of feedback that might improve students' writing. Therefore, this study raises two research questions: (1) what effects does integrated feedback have on students' academic writing achievement? and (2) what are students' attitudes towards the implementation of integrated feedback on writing?

Literature Review

Feedback in L2 Writing

Feedback is significant in second language writing because it allows each language learner to look and study in more detail about their mistakes, which rarely happen in normal classroom condition. Hyland (2004) explains that feedback itself emphasizes the writing process because it helps the learners to realize their writing through the process of re-writing. Generally, feedback in second language writing is related to certain forms including form feedback, content-based feedback, teacher-student conferencing and peer feedback. Form feedback can be classified as direct and indirect corrective feedback. Direct corrective feedback occurs when the teacher notices the errors produced by the students, the correct form is provided from the teacher (Ferris, 1995; Lalande, 1982). On the other hand, indirect corrective feedback occurs when the teacher just indicates the errors by underlining, highlighting, or coding them and later on students correct the errors by themselves (Guenette, 2007). Nevertheless, many writing instructors do not have certain conclusion about the best type of feedback to improve their students' grammatical accuracy (Leki, 1990; Susser, 1994 and Reid 1994). The next one is called "content-based feedback". Providing content-based feedback is not so simple for English teachers to master in a short period since this type of feedback requires teacher not just provide it on the surface level but it must be judged on the depth or the quality of work, often against criteria that either explicit (for example, rubric scoring criteria) or it may be examined through the depth of information (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). In addition, when feedback is provided for the meaning level especially in term of ideas, thus it enhances more revision in both the L1 and L2 contexts (Hillocks, 1982; Ziv, 1984). When students see the text specific comment from their teacher, it leads them to revise more and it can affect their writing positively (Ferris, 1997; Kepner 1991). Another feedback type called "teacher-student conferencing" which means teacher discusses the written task with the student. In such practice, feedback is provided on student writing through face-to-face conferencing (Ferris, 2002). McCarthy (1992) states that teacher-student conferencing means to check the student written tasks and it enhances the opportunities for negotiation of meaning and clear understanding of a text through dialogue. Brookhart (2008) classifies teacher-student conferencing into two types which include in-class student conferencing and out-of-class conferencing. The last one is peer feedback, which was existed and recognized from their peers developed from first language (L1) process classes and it has become prominent alternative to teacher-based forms of response in English as a second language (ESL) contexts. Peer feedback can be explained as peer review, peer response or peer editing and it has been defined as the use of learners as sources of information and interaction for each other in the way that learners take part and realize in their roles and responsibilities in which it is normally operationalized by a trained teacher, tutor or editor through

the process of commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing (Liu & Hansen, 2002).

Identifying the best approach of providing feedback remains an essential component of the ESL and English as a foreign language (EFL) academic writing classroom; however, there is no best approach of providing feedback (Winer, 1992). Providing many types of feedback is significant to students because the fundamental of learning philosophy lies upon the notion that the learning process, which is normally comprised with a teaching intervention or facilitating action and a student response. Giving feedback itself can also be classified under the concept of facilitating action. Therefore, integrated feedback is provided about an aspect of student's response. It can be explained that teacher needs to include opportunities in the classroom environment for eliciting student thinking and understanding. In addition to normal steps of learning writing, questioning and discussion can give such a valuable insight into student progress and solve the misunderstanding problem about their writing (Heitink, Van der Kleij, Veldkamp, Schildkamp & Kippers, 2016). Williams (2003) and Mahmoud (2006) explain that integrated feedback can be existed in numerous forms, and this come from many methods (ways) of providing feedback, which normally with the same paper from different sources or different paper by using not the same source. The studies done by Song (1998), Gonzalez (2010) and Ongphet (2013) reveal that after the students received integrated feedback from teacher they gained higher scores in improving their writing ability. The interesting point is that when this topic is reviewed in a Thai situational context, there is only one study done by Ongphet (2013), which had the main purpose for studying English writing ability through incorporating with different types of corrective feedback and teacher-student conferencing for upper-secondary school students. So far there has been no research in Thailand that has focused on the use of integrated feedback (written feedback, teacher-student conference and indirect corrective feedback) to enhance the writing proficiency for English major students at the tertiary level of education. Consequently, this study needs to study further about integrated feedback by constructing the model of integrated feedback by adapting from the previous studies.

Methodology

This section presents the participants, research instruments, and data collection procedure of the study.

Participants

The university being studied was one private university in Bangkok where the researcher has been working. The population were 60 second-year undergraduate English major students in the Faculty of Education. Twenty students from one class were used as a sample group (intact group) to participate as the researcher was assigned by the department and faculty to teach only one group of students; therefore, the sampling technique used was convenience sampling. In this study, there were four male and sixteen female students. Their age ranges from 19 to 21 years old. All students in this group were required to take the subject entitled "Paragraph Writing", which is considered as compulsory subject.

Research Instruments

1. Integrated Feedback Model (IF Model)

The integrated feedback model was developed by the researcher. The purpose of developing this model was to provide feedback on student writing with more effectiveness. The model was validated by three experts using the IOC index. In this study, it focuses on the teacher's feedback on paragraph writing; the integrated feedback was implemented by teachers through both written feedback and teacher-student conferencing for the improvement of content and grammar. Drafts need to be checked during the writing process as this is part of an ongoing assessment before a final piece of writing is produced and evaluated. The first draft of each student's written task was marked mainly on the content by the teacher. This was done by writing comments in English on each student's written task in the forms of phrases, sentences or questions to suggest some ways to improve unclear or unrelated text. However, before asking each student to take back his/her task for revision, teacher-student conferencing would take place for each individual student after the first draft has been marked. During this process, Thai was used instead of English to facilitate student's written task. Later on the students would produce the second draft. For the second draft, grammatical errors would be checked only through providing indirect corrective feedback using codes. Before this stage, therefore, the teacher would distribute and explain the codes that would be used for the checking of the second draft, in which it was distributed from the first period of the experimental process. The explanation was done after students have received the code manual so that they would be able to interpret and understand the coded feedback later. The code manual provides a list of possible grammatical errors with their codes or symbols followed by examples of corrections (See Appendix A). Once the students saw the grammatical errors, they had to correct them and later on they would need to submit the third draft (final draft) for evaluation. The final draft of each student would be evaluated based on both content and grammatical aspects simultaneously. Teacher-student conferencing would take place after written content-based feedback was provided on students' first drafts. This type of feedback will enhance more understanding for students when they do not understand the texts written by teacher and if the teacher does not write the explanation clearly, the student can take this opportunity to ask for some clarification. Furthermore, according to Zamel (1985), responding in conferences is much better than providing feedback on writing only as the teacher can interact dynamically with students to understand the intent of the message.

2. Pre- and Post-Tests, and Score Rubrics

Paragraph writing tests to be used as pre- and posttests were developed by the researcher. The purpose of the tests was to measure the students' paragraph writing ability before and after the integrated feedback instruction. The paragraph writing mode for both the pretest and posttest in this study were the same. Before the administration, both tests were checked and validated by three experts using IOC index. Subsequently, the researcher had to try out the test papers to verify the reliability of the test with a group of students who were not the main participants in the actual experiment but these students had almost the same characteristics as those in the sample group. Then the interrater reliability was calculated through the use of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. The inter-raters reliability that is closer to 1.0 indicates greater correlation (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). In this case, the correlation coefficient showed the value of .981 for pre-test stage of pilot and it also pointed out the value of .951 at the post-test stage of pilot. The topic for these two tests (pretest and posttest), a cause and effect paragraph was assigned to the sample group as

this topic falls under an expository paragraph and the students had to spend half of their regular semester in writing expository texts. The topic was “The effects of not getting enough sleep”. In fact, they had to study and practice writing four types of paragraphs according to the course syllabus in the course entitled “Paragraph Writing”. These four types of paragraphs included compare/contrast paragraph, cause and effect paragraph, narrative paragraph and descriptive paragraph. Analytical score rubrics by Paulus (1999) was adapted for the suitability of this study. Paulus’s rubric score was quite appropriate for this study because when evaluating a paragraph, various aspects such as grammar, the writer’s ideas, organization, and content should be taken into consideration. Although Paulus’s rubric score was initially created for the evaluation of a persuasive essay, the steps for organizing any kind of paragraph are the same in terms of organizing ideas, commencing each paragraph with a topic sentence followed by supporting sentences and a concluding sentence. There were five levels for assessing each aspect of students writing, which included organization, development, coherence, structure and mechanics. The maximum score that each student would receive for this assessment tool with adapted rubric scoring was 25 marks (See Appendix B). However, before the adapted rubric scoring was used for checking the writing achievement of the participants in this study, it was validated by three expert using IOC index.

3. Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Semi-structured interview questions were given to six students who participated in this study at the end of the implementation of integrated feedback. The semi-structure interviews were conducted with six students who really wanted to participate voluntarily. However, six students including 5 females and 1 male were decided to take part in the interview sessions because in-depth interview was a major role in this part; therefore, it was difficult to handle by conducting interview with all students in the sample group. In addition, six students were represented based on almost as real proportion of the sample group (16 females and four males). After explaining about confidential part and the importance of obtaining data in the interview process, six students who were willing to participate in the interview process read and signed the consent form. This was in line with the ethical aspect in conducting qualitative research because the participants should be made aware of their right to refuse participation and they also should be realized of where and how long their data would be stored and interpreted (Crow et al. 2006). A semi-structured interview was implemented because it promoted a discussion and further questions. This process was performed in the way of individual face-to-face in-depth interview. The reason that the interview was carried out by asking the students to participate voluntarily is because this method matches with the concept of “enabling participants” in recruiting the participants. The reason behind this is that teachers and researchers who work at the higher institutions always face with the dilemma of how to recruit research participants; therefore, a common way of recruitment strategy is advertising. In fact such method can be a proper way of recruiting the participants who may not have previously involved in qualitative research. In addition, such practice did not even force the participants to involve in this research but it depends on their willingness which is an important part of ethical issue in conducting qualitative research (Halej, 2017). The interview questions were constructed and adapted based on the study done by Covill (1996), and Leung (2008). After that they were validated by three experts using IOC index. All interview questions were conducted in Thai to help the students understand the questions; therefore, they would have more confidence in answering them. The interview session lasted around 30 minutes for each participant and all responses were tape-recorded. Subsequently, the data from interview were

analyzed by using content analysis (inductive approach). According to Thomas (2003), inductive approach of content analysis enhances researcher to find significant themes gained from raw data, without limiting oneself by structured methodologies. Such approach is comprised of the following steps: reading of text, identification text segment, labelling the text to create categories, reducing overlap and redundancy among the categories, and creating a model incorporating most important categories.

Data Collection Procedure

This study was conducted using a one-group design to compare and measure the degree of change occurring as a result of providing integrated feedback in paragraph writing class. The outcomes of this experimental design demonstrated in terms of academic writing achievement. The students were required to take a pretest by writing a paragraph of 150 words at the beginning of the semester within 30 minutes. The participants had to start their paragraph with topic sentence followed by supporting sentences and concluding sentence. During the regular classes within 14 weeks of the semester, the teacher would assign four individual tasks by asking them to write paragraphs. These four topics of paragraph were as 1) The life during high school and university, 2) Problems of buying goods online, 3) My journey on last summer, and 4) A wonderful person. Then they would receive integrated feedback, which includes content-based feedback followed by teacher-student conferencing for the first draft. However, for the second draft, they would receive only indirect coded feedback for their grammatical errors. After that, they needed to look back to their errors for both content and grammatical parts from the previous drafts and then prepare to submit their final draft (draft 3). At the end of week 14, the students took posttest on paragraph writing and then the results of their posttest were compared with pretest results on their writing achievement. During the time of writing and re-writing three drafts for each writing task within the time of experimental process, they would have opportunity to write and revise their assigned paragraph outside class for 3 days and they had to submit their draft before the time of studying for the next period (subsequent week) so that the instructor could have enough time to assess their writing and return to them upon next lesson. After that on the week 15, six students who were willing to participate in individual interview provided the information about their attitude towards the implementation of integrated feedback (in-depth interview).

Findings

Results of Research Question 1

To answer the first research question, the adapted analytical score rubrics (Paulus, 1999) were used to assess students' tests. There were five elements to evaluate each participant's writing achievement, including organization, development, coherence, structure, and mechanics. The maximum score of each element is five marks; therefore, the highest score of each paper that each student can obtain is 25 marks. The results would be analyzed by using non-parametric statistical analysis, which was Wilcoxon-Signed Rank Test, because the sample size was less than 30 (Newing, 2011). However, before the statistical analysis was calculated to investigate the academic writing ability during the real treatment process and in order to prevent any subjective issues incurring during the marking all writing papers, the solution to solve this problem was done by inviting another rater apart from the researcher and let him assessed the students' papers from analytical rubric score. This was done by selecting 4 papers from both pretest and posttest randomly (20% of all papers in each session of the test) and then they were calculated the inter-

raters reliability by using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient or Spearman's rho. At pretest stage, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (Spearman's rho) was 1.000 and it also revealed the value as .949 at the post-test phase. This could be explained that the two raters were in good agreement with each other. In addition, even though during at the post-test stage the result of correlation dropped down to .949, it still signified that two raters agreed with each other on most points when evaluating the test papers based on analytical rubric scores. This again really confirms that the reliability level is significant and the scores obtained by two raters are reliable (Weir, 2005). The result of students' academic writing achievement is showed in Table 1.

Table 1

Pre-Test and Post-Test Result of Writing Achievement by Using Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test Ranks

		Number of students	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Post-Test- Pre-Test	Negative Ranks	0a	.00	.00
	Positive Ranks	19b	10.00	190.00
	Ties	1c		
	Total	20		

a. post-test < pre-test

b. post-test > pre-test

c. post-test = pre-test

Test Statistics

	Post-Test – Pre-Test
Z	-3.832
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

**p < .01

a. Based on negative ranks

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

According to Table 1, it shows the comparison of writing achievement between pretest and posttest through the treatment of integrated feedback. The test was done through the use of Nonparametric test (Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test). The Z value is -3.832 and P value (2-tailed) is .000 which is less than .01. This indicates that after the experimental treatment through Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, the writing achievement was different in statistical significance at .01 level. From the results, when looking in more details of scores between pretest and posttest of each participant, it can be explained that all of them improved their content as observed through rubric scoring in three aspects, which include organization, development, and coherence. The mean score of pretest was 11.20; whereas it increased to 17.05 for posttest. However, when looking at the structure and mechanic parts, the results of posttest slightly improved as compared with pretest (See Appendix C).

Results of Research Question 2

There were seven questions that each of the participants had to respond for the interview session. Subsequently, the interviews were later transcribed in a light of salient themes and patterns based on inductive analysis (Gibbs, 2007).

- 1) Do you think that integrated feedback (IF) is beneficial for your improvement of English writing? If yes or no how does it affect your English writing?

All the student interviewees agree that integrated feedback is really helpful for developing their writing skills. The reason is that they had many chances to write more than one time. In fact, they are happy with writing and it is a new approach of learning to write English; for example student 1 stated: *I think that this is the first time for me in learning to write since you have to write many drafts and it acts as a way of revision, before learning with this method I just wrote only one time, and I was not able to understand in more details.* However, there are some challenging parts of this model in terms of interpretation of written feedback from both content and form (grammar); for example student 4 expressed: *Giving integrated feedback is sometimes difficult for instructor to handle and it also requires a lot of effort for students to understand what the messages being written from instructor.*

- 2) How do you feel with the amount of written feedback provided by your teacher for the organization and development part?

All of the students do not mind about the amount of written feedback, and they do not even care about the length of sentences written by their teacher. They feel that it is reasonable for providing written feedback in more detail so that they can understand better, for example student 5 mentioned: *I think that it is appropriate for me when the teacher provided feedback by writing to make me understand about organization and development part.* Nevertheless, some students still confuse especially the writing in the development part, since this is the biggest part of paragraph's component including major and minor supporting sentences; for example student 1 said: *For me, well in fact I think when you provided feedback in both organization and content part, it was considered to be a good way to improve my writing. However, there were certain times that I encountered some difficulties when I read what you wrote because I thought that I have already written it clearly in my assignment.*

- 3) What is your view on teacher-student conferencing?

All of the student interviewees have positive view about teacher-student conferencing because they think that providing feedback only in the form of written feedback is not sufficient. All of them reported that they understand their errors better especially in content part. For this question, none of them have negative attitude towards the implementation of teacher-student conferencing, and they said that this practice acts as a two ways communication; for example student 5 mentioned: *I think that it is a wonderful way when teacher call on each student to discuss unclear parts of their written task because I can clarify what I want to interpret and explain.* In addition, some of them added certain interesting point when they reported about language barrier during the time of communication with the teacher. This is because they were allowed to speak Thai to discuss and explain unclear points with their teacher and at the same time their teacher also did not speak English during the conference; for example student 3 said: *The most important thing*

that I really love this method is because you spoke the same language as me and I could exchange my idea which is easier than speaking English.

4) Is it helpful for you in term of improving your English structure when teacher just provides only coded feedback and lets you correct your grammatical errors by yourself?

All of the student interviewees reported that it is good and beneficial when they received coded feedback from teacher. At least they have such a great opportunity to revise their grammatical errors and it is better than providing students with the right answer by correcting the errors directly; for example student 4 said: *I think that it is helpful for me because I could spend my time to find the answer by comparing or learning from coded manual that you gave me at the first period in this semester. Trust me, if teacher only provides the correct grammar immediately, students will never learn anything.* On the other hand, this method is very challenging for them especially in term of code interpretation as many of them consider themselves as weak in grammar. In fact, some parts of grammar are quite difficult to understand such as the complexity of tenses and types of sentences; for example student 2 said: *Well even though when I looked back to the coded manual, I still encountered such a hard time to correct some grammatical errors this is because I know that my knowledge about grammar is limited. If I really do not know how to interpret the codes this will make me sometimes frustrated.*

5) Among the three kinds of feedback given by your teacher (content-based feedback, teacher-student conferencing and coded indirect written feedback), which one do you prefer best and why?

All of the student interviewees answered without hesitation that the best kind of feedback is teacher-student conferencing. They mentioned that this way of giving feedback is very clear and no language barrier of communication; for example student 5 expressed: *The most wonderful type of feedback that I really like is teacher-student conferencing because I am not only receiving feedback from you in one direction but it acts as two ways communication.* To emphasize more details about explanation mentioned earlier, some of the students even claimed that this is such an innovative in learning English writing; for example student 4 mentioned: *I think that you are the first teacher who implements this method for me. When I was in my junior and senior high school, none of my teachers practiced this with me.* Even though all of them responded with positive attitude towards teacher-student conferencing, there was something that they pinpointed during the interview. One of them said that it was a challenging part due to the time constraint in class and this is one factor that teacher has to cope and plan it ahead; for example student 3 said: *For me, I think that it is acceptable to sit and listen to the comment just 7-8 minutes but for some of my classmates, they want more conferencing even though you already explained in Thai.*

6) Have you ever had any negative attitudes while writing or rewriting some drafts after you receive feedback from your teacher? If yes or no what are they?

All of the interviewees responded to this question as they do not reject about the way of rewrite or correct their errors in writing again. They know that they are weak in writing before taking this course but they scare when they look what the teacher wrote; for example student 2

expressed: *In fact I do not mind about writing many drafts but when you assign us to write for each topic what I worry is whether I would pass all the works when they are evaluated at the end of the third draft. In addition, when I saw the red pen written by you as commenting on content part, I felt sad and shock. However, when I received many kinds of feedback from you along the semester somehow nearly the end of this course I start to like this subject.* The point mentioned earlier can be supported by the comment from some students. This frustrating point can be existed when they have nothing in my mind about how to write properly before taking this subject; for example student 5 said: *Initially, I was a lazy and the first thing that came into my mind was "would this be effective in teaching writing?" However, when I did my subsequent tasks, my mind has changed because I started to know that my works have been continuously improved.*

7) When you do not understand the feedback from your teacher (either written feedback or teacher-student conferencing) how would you respond on it?

Most of the students are worried when they do not understand the feedback especially the part of grammar, but they are not worried much about content-based feedback. Some of them said that they need to find ways to solve this problem which can be done through reading books, asking the information from friends or teacher; for example student 3 mentioned: *Well at the very beginning of the course it was quite discouraged when I did not understand feedback and I think that the best way to solve the problem is I would prefer to ask teacher. For me, the most challenging part is when I have to interpret all codes and correct my grammatical errors.* Apart from that, some of them respond that when they could correct their errors through revision and study more especially in grammatical part they would be happy. Therefore, their demotivation would finally be alleviated; for example student 6 expressed: *You know when I was able to correct it and got it right after study the codes, this would make me proud and my tension would be diminished.*

Discussion

The outcome of writing improvement through the use of integrated feedback in this study is in line with Zamel (1985), Song (1998) and Baghzou (2014). This can be due to the reason that pointing out grammatical errors and commenting on content and organization in the same draft can be harmful to students because it can lead them to be confused. This point can be explained further that the students in this study would have gone to the process of planning, revising their error in content with the supporting from teacher-student conferencing and then the next draft would be checked their grammatical errors separately. In addition, the findings of this study regarding teacher-student conferencing enhances students' writing performance in content part are in line with with the study of Leung (2008), Ongphet (2013) and Perez-Amurao (2014) because conferencing enhances the students to be participated and this allows teacher to realize exactly what the student understands, and he/she does not understand. The second reason is teacher-student conferencing acts as "a positive, encouraging, and collaborative" pattern of communication between a teacher and student in facilitating students on revising, editing, and enjoying in writing their tasks. For the part of grammatical accuracy, though Truscott (1996) argues that grammar correction or providing feedback in forms is harmful, the findings of this study contradict his statement. This is because the outcome of students' posttest in this study confirms that the corrective feedback is beneficial to students, and it also leads to slightly improvement of the students' writing accuracy.

Turning to the findings of interview questions through content analysis, the outcomes point out that the participants had motivation to write paragraphs along the course, in spite of facing many times of writing and correcting drafts. All of the participants expressed their idea that providing integrated feedback is really helpful for developing their writing skill. The interviewees did not mind about the length of feedback being written in term of content and they felt that it is reasonable for teachers to write clearly so that they could be able to understand better and they realize the process of writing even better. This aligns with Currier (2008) who explains that writing can be inferred as the expression of thoughts, desires and emotions which requires skills, practices rather than knowledge. Their expression also is line with Raimes (1983) in the point that grammar is not the only thing that needs to be assessed in writing. For teacher-student conferencing, all of them were satisfied with it since they realized that it is not sufficient for them to fully understand feedback by reading comment only and no language barrier existed during conferencing since Thai was the primary element for communication. Their ideas corroborate Sommers (1982), Knoblauch and Brannon (1981), and Leung (2008) as teacher-student conferencing is considered not one way communication but in fact two ways communication so that both parties (teacher and students) can clarify unclear written text and it enhances negotiation of meaning. For the part of grammatical errors, all of them stated that it is beneficial when they received written corrective feedback with code because they could use this chance to revise their errors and it allowed them to gain more cognitive engagement because they had to correct their errors by themselves. The finding also aligns with Gramai (2005), who indicates that most students in ESL and EFL context still expect proper feedback from their English teachers. The findings also confirm that students do believe that they are satisfied with feedback and they also appreciate error-feedback. Their attitude about benefit of indirect feedback with code is congruent with Sheen's idea (2010) that metalinguistic feedback enhances noticing and understanding simultaneously. On the other hand, they reported also that code feedback is challenging especially in term of interpretation as Zamel (1985), Sommers (1992), and Conners and Lunsford (1993) stress that some types of corrective feedback could be confusing and it is ineffective because students could not understand. Williams and Burden (1997) point out interesting part as students' motivation or demotivation can be arisen from the nature and amount of feedback.

Conclusion

The results obtained above show that it is really worth providing integrated feedback which the students perceive positively because they have realized about writing process and the steps of IF model still enhance their metacognitive ability too. According to them, they believe that it is the innovation in learning about writing for second language that is why they perceived it to be beneficial. Therefore, the integrated feedback is considered to be one of the useful methods in developing their writing skills. However, there are some drawbacks that need to be mindful about this study. First of all, the study context was performed in one-group pretest-posttest design to low or intermediate English proficiency levels. Moreover, the choice of selection for all the participants was due to practical reason since the researcher was assigned to teach this course only one group. Secondly, the duration of conducting this research was only 15 weeks thus such duration of conducting might not be enough because the participants had to enroll in other subjects in the subsequent semester. Therefore, the finding about writing achievement could not be explored in long run.

Recommendations for Further Study

The points mentioned earlier about some limitations should be taken into consideration carefully. First of all, the control group should be involved so that the effectiveness of integrated feedback model could be compared with the traditional method of providing feedback in writing. Secondly, the integrated feedback model should be conducted with a bigger size of sample so that generalizability can be achieved. Lastly, some qualitative approaches such as observation might be implemented in investigating certain behaviours towards the attitude of the participants during the time of teacher-student conferencing; therefore, this may add value in exploring about students' attitude.

About the Authors:

Eason Yamalee has a Bachelor's degree in Business and Commerce and a Master's degree in Teaching English. He has taught English in Thailand for more than five years. His research interests include feedback in second language, second language acquisition, and autonomous learning.

Supong Tangkiengsirisin, Ph.D. is Associate Professor in Applied Linguistics at the Language Institute, Thammasat University, where he currently serves as Director. His areas of interest include second language writing, written discourse analysis, and English for specific purposes (ESP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4540-8478>

References

- Baghzou, S. (2014) *A Model of Feedback Made on Students' Writing Case study: "Second Year Students at the University Centre of Khenchela"*. Thesis in Doctorate Degree, Universite Mohamed Khider.
- Bitchner, J & Ferris D. (2012). *Written Corrective in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York, Routledge.
- Bloom, L.Z. (1985). Anxious writers in context: Graduate School and beyond. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write* (pp. 119-133). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*, Virginia, ASCD.
- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 5-32.
- Connors, R., & Lunsford, A. (1993) Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication*, 44, 200–223. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358839>
- Covill, A.E. (1996). *Students' Revision Practices and Attitudes in Response to Surface-Related Feedback as Compare to Content-Related Feedback on Their Writing*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Crow G, Wiles R, Health S and Charles V (2006) Research ethics and data quality: the implications of informed consent, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2: 83-95.
- Currier, D. (2008). Essay on the importance of writing-need feedback please. *Asian EFL Journal*. 80, 183-199.
- Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A user-Friendly Guided for Social Scientist*. London: Routledge.

- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to the teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Freedman, S. W., & Sperlberg, M. (1985). Written language acquisition: The role of response and the writing conference. In S. W. Freedman (Ed.), *The acquisition of written language: Response and revision* (pp. 106-130). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analysis Qualitative Data*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Gliem J.A. & Gliem R.R. (2003) Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales. 2003 Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, Columbus, 82-88.
- Gonzalez, E.F. (2010). Impact of Teacher/Student Conferencing and Teacher Written Feedback on EFL Revision. *Mextesol Journal*. 64 (1).
- Grami, G.M. (2005). The Effect of Teachers Written Feedback on ESL Students' Perception: A Study in a Saudi ESL University-Level Context: *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Science*. 2 (E-Journal).
- Guenetter, D. (2007) Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16. 40-53.
- Halej, J. (2017). *Ethics in primary research (focus groups, interviews and surveys)*. Equality Challenge Unit.
- Hassan, B.A.(2001). The relationship of writing apprehension and self-esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL University students. *Mansouna Faculty of Education Journal*. Retrieved on December 12th, 2018 from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED459671.pdf>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback, *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Heitink, M., Van der Kleij, F., Veldkamp, B, Schildkamp, K & Kippers, W. (2016), 'A systematic review of prerequisites for implementing assessment for learning in classroom practice', *Educational Research Review*, 17, 50-62.
- Hillocks, G. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment and revision in teaching the composing process. *Research in the Teaching of English* 16, 261-278.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Karakaya, I. & vd Ulper, H. (2001). Yazma kaygusu Olceginin gelistrilmesi ve yazma kaygusmm.
- Kepner, C.G. (1991). An experiment in the relationships of types of written feedback to the development of second-language skills. *Modern Language Journal* 75, 303-313.
- Knoblauch, C.H. & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher Commentary on Student Writing: The State of the Art. *Freshman English News*, 10(2), p1-4.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lalande, J.F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: an experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL Writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH:

- Boynton/Cook, Heineman.
- Leung, A.S.P (2008). *Teacher-Student Conferencing: Implication for Teaching L2 Writing*. Thesis of Doctoral of Education, University of Leicester.
- Liu, J., & J. Hansen. (2002). *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2011). Teacher written feedback in EFL Yemen context: A qualitative case study of students' reactions and utilizations (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Universiti Sains Malaysia. Malaysia.
- Mahmoud, A. (2006). Coded corrective feedback: In search of compromise. *TESL Reporter*, 33 (2), 10-17.
- McCarthy, M. (1992). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Newing, H. (2011). *Conducting Research in Conservation (Social science methods and practice)*. New York: Routledge.
- Ongphet, K (2013). *Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback Incorporating with Teacher-Student Conferencing on Upper Secondary School Students' English Writing Ability*. Thesis, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University.
- Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 265-289.
- Pawapatcharandom, R. (2007). *An investigation of Thai students' English problems on their learning strategies in the international programme*. Bangkok: MA Thesis, Mahidol University.
- Perez-Amurao, A.L. (2014). The Value of Feedback and Conferencing in the Process Approach to Writing for Filipino and Thai Students in Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis. *TESOL International Journal*. 9(2).
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: the myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 273-293.
- Sakontawut, N. (2003). Functional sentence perspective and second language composition: A study of revision process in a writing workshop for Thai college students. *Ph.D dissertation*, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Sattayatham, A. & Rarranapinyowong, 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.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential Effects on Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in the ESL Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32 (2) p203-234.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to Student Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 148-156.
- Song, M.J. (1998). Relationship between types of written feedback and development of English writing skills. *English Teaching*. 53: 135-156.
- Susser, B. (1994). Process approach in ESL/EFL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(1): 31-47.
- Tagong, K. (1991). Revising Strategies for Thai Students: Text-level changes in essays written in Thailand English. *Doctoral dissertation*, Illinois State University, Illinois.
- Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2010). Enhancing Cohesion in Second Language Writing: A Study of Thai Graduate Students Expository Compositions. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(7), 33-48.
- Thomas, D.R. (2003). "A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative

- Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2).
- Tighe, M.A. (1987). Reducing Writing Apprehension in English Classes. *The Educational Resources Information Center ERIC*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (6th, Louisville, KY, March 26-28, 1987).
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against correction in L2 writing classes, *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Weir, J.P. (2005). Quantifying Test-Retest Reliability Using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient and the SEM. *Journal of Strength and Condition Research*. 19 (1), 231-240.
- Williams, J.G. (2003). Providing Feedback on ESL Student's Written Assignments. Retrieved from <http://itels.org/Techniques/Williams-Feedback.html>
- Williams, M., and Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers*, Cambridge.
- Winer, L. (1992). Spinach to chocolate: changing awareness and attitudes in ESL writing teachers. *TESOL Quarterly* 17, 165-187.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to students' writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.
- Ziv, N.S. (1984). The effect of teacher comments on the writing of four college freshman. In R. Beach & L. S. Bridwell (Eds.), *New Directions in Composition Research* (pp. 362-380). New York: Guilford Press.

APPENDIX A

Code Manual

Descriptions: This manual is comprised of common symbols that the English lecturer will use to indicate errors in your writing so that you will use these symbols as a guideline and improve your grammatical errors.

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
P	Punctuation	P I live <u>work</u> , and go to school in Bangkok.	I live, work, and go to school in Bangkok.
=	Capitalization Needed	The chao phraya ===== river is the river in Thailand.	The Chao Phraya river is the river in Thailand.
VT	Verb Tense	VT I never <u>work</u> as a cashier unit I got a job there.	I never worked as a cashier until I got a job there.
SV	Subject-verb Agreement	SV The manager <u>work</u> hard.	The manager works hard. *This is just one correct tense that can be used. However it also depends upon the time of action, conjugate accordingly.
TS	Tense Shift	After I went to the restaurant, TS I <u>eat</u> the pancake over there.	After I went to the restaurant, I ate the pancake over there.
∩	Close Space	Every <u>body</u> enjoys the party.	Everybody enjoys the party.
☆	Space Needed	☆ Going <u>to</u> watch movie is really interesting.	Going to watch movie is really interesting.
SP	Spelling	SP The manager is going to the airport right now.	The manager is going to the airport right now.

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
		The <u>maneger</u> is going to the airport right now.	
PL	Plural	PL The <u>Apple</u> are the most nutritious fruit.	Apples are the most nutritious fruit.
∅	Unnecessary Word	∅ The student <u>she</u> studies all night for her mid-term examination.	The student studies all night for her mid-term examination.
○	Missing Word	○ Please do <u>not me</u> that question anymore.	Please do not ask me that question anymore.
WF	Wrong Word Form	WF She is really <u>interesting</u> in learning Mathematics.	She is really interested in learning Mathematics.
WW	Wrong Word	The food is delicious. WW <u>Besides</u> , the restaurant is always crowded.	The food is delicious. Therefore, the restaurant is always crowded.
~	Wrong Word Order	~ Saturday <u>always is</u> our busiest day.	Saturday is always our busiest day.
PN	Pronoun Reference Error	I saw a white dog on last Friday. PN <u>They</u> are beautiful.	I saw a white dog on last Friday. It is beautiful.
RO	Run-on (Fused Sentence)	RO We got some <u>gas then</u> we headed off to Minnesota.	We got some gas and then we headed off to Minnesota.
CS	Comma Splice	CS Sarah is a hard worker, <u>she is</u> employee of the year.	Sarah is a hard worker, she is employee of the year.
Frag	Fragment (Sentence Fragment)	Frag <u>If I left an hour earlier than usual.</u>	If I left an hour earlier than usual, I would be able to avoid rush hour.
T	Transitional Needed	The university library has many great services. T The Writing Center helps students improve their writing.	The university library has many great services. For example, the Writing Center helps students improve their writing.
S	Subject Needed	S <u>Is</u> open from 7 p.m. until the last customer leaves.	The shop is open from 7 p.m. until the last customer leaves.
V	Verb Needed	V The employees <u>on</u> time and work hard.	The employees are on time and work hard.
Prep.	Preposition Needed	Prep The game will be started <u>7</u> p.m.	The game will be started at 7 p.m.
Conj.	Conjunction Needed	The garlic shrimp, fried clams, Conj <u>broiled</u> lobster are the most popular dishes.	The garlic shrimp, fried clams and broiled lobster are the most popular dishes.

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
Art.	Article Needed	Art Dinners expect <u>glass</u> of water when they first sit down at Art table.	Dinners expect a glass of water when they first sit down at the table.
//	Faulty Parallelism	He enjoys reading books, riding his bicycle and <u>to go to Florida</u> .	He enjoys reading books, riding his bicycle and going to Florida.
Coll.	Slang/Colloquialism	Coll. I am going <u>2</u> the restaurant right now.	I am going to the restaurant right now.
Syn.	Syntax	I to the stadium with Syn. Matthew <u>went</u> .	I went to the stadium with Matthew.

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
Rep.	Repetitive	This error occurs, often times, when a writer repeats the same idea, words or concepts.	Take out repetitive material and revise accordingly.
???	Confusing Passage	Ideas are not clear to the reader.	Rewrite and revise it again.

APPENDIX B

Paragraph Rubric Score (Adapted from Paulus, 1999)

	Organization	Development	Cohesion	Structure	Mechanics
1	No organization; no ideas of topic and no unity of writing.	Written texts do not support with any details or related to the assigned topic or writing.	Ideas disorganized or unconnected. Not coherent ideas.	No attempt or use only simple sentences with serious errors.	A lot of errors in spellings, punctuation, and capitalization
2	Some forms of organization might exist in writing, but the ideas still confused and lack of focus.	Insufficient details to support the topic. Lack of related examples and may be inappropriate evidence.	Shows some consistency of ideas, but still have limit use of transitional words. Still uses some parts of personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns with errors along the written task.	Emphasis on using simple structure with certain problems in sentence construction, tense, number, word order, prepositions, fragment and run-ons.	Paragraph format still exist but present with frequent errors in spelling, capitalization, and certain punctuations.
3	Present clear introduction, supporting sentences and conclusion of the paragraph but it still loosely	Some examples are related to the topic; while there are still some points of the written task are	Some relating ideas exist between/within groups of ideas in which it belongs to the paragraph.	Attempt to use some complex structures but still have some causes and sentences in	Occasional errors still exist in punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. Sometime

	Organization	Development	Cohesion	Structure	Mechanics
	organized with limited supported.	underdeveloped or too generalized.	Shows more use of transitional words.	non-English standard pattern. Non English patterns may occasionally inhibit meaning.	present with successful attempts at sophistication pattern such as semi-colons, colon
4	Present with topic sentence at the beginning of paragraph clearly with somehow show creativity along the topic. The points along the paragraph still expressed in certain manners of the written task.	Each point of statement supported with some relevant examples. All important points relate to each other. The written task shows clear logical of ideas and convincing progression of ideas.	Clear purpose and focus. Relevant ideas to the topic. More of cohesive devices being used to elaborate and link ideas all together with other sentences in the paragraph but these still are not appropriate with times or irrelevant part.	Meaning generally can be found in certain paragraphs. Still have some minor problems in tense, word order/function, pronouns, preposition. Some sentences still have obscured meaning.	Occasional mistakes in sophisticated punctuation with clear meaning, but still have few errors in spelling mistake.
5	Unified with highly presented information with clear sense of ordering the ideas. Starting the paragraph with topic sentence unified with clear position statement, content of writing goes in line with the topic along with logical progression.	Each point is developed with specific details. Show concrete logical of ideas with appropriate supporting examples. The supporting ideas answer all the topic of each statement completely.	Clear cohesive device to link ideas for supporting the topic. Use transitional devices for creating and enhancing more understanding for reader.	Fluent expression of using language especially in constructing complex sentences. Few errors of structures in terms of tense, word order, article, pronoun. Language tends to be like native with non-English pattern does not exist.	Very few errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization with almost appropriate native like standard pattern.

APPENDIX C**Results of Pre-Test and Post-Test**

Student	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores
1	Organization	3	10	Organization	3	16
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	1		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	3	

Student	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores
2	Organization	1	8	Organization	3	17
	Development	2		Development	3	
	Coherence	1		Coherence	4	
	Structure	1		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	4	
3	Organization	2	10	Organization	4	15
	Development	1		Development	2	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	3	
4	Organization	3	15	Organization	5	23
	Development	3		Development	5	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	4	
	Structure	3		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	4		Mechanics	5	
5	Organization	2	11	Organization	2	12
	Development	2		Development	3	
	Coherence	3		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	2	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	2	
6	Organization	3	12	Organization	3	17
	Development	3		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	4	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	3	
7	Organization	2	14	Organization	5	22
	Development	3		Development	5	
	Coherence	3		Coherence	4	
	Structure	2		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	4	
8	Organization	2	11	Organization	4	18
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	4	
9	Organization	3	12	Organization	3	17
	Development	2		Development	3	
	Coherence	3		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	4	
10	Organization	2	11	Organization	3	16
	Development	2		Development	3	
	Coherence	3		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	4	
11	Organization	3	11	Organization	3	11
	Development	2		Development	2	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	1	
	Structure	1		Structure	2	

Student	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores	Element of Assessment	Scores Earned	Total Scores
12	Mechanics	3	11	Mechanics	3	12
	Organization	2		Organization	2	
	Development	2		Development	2	
	Coherence	1		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	2	
	Mechanics	4		Mechanics	3	
13	Organization	1	10	Organization	4	18
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	4	
	Organization	3		Organization	4	
14	Organization	3	13	Organization	4	17
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	3		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	2	
	Organization	2		Organization	5	
15	Development	1	10	Development	4	19
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	3	
	Organization	2		Organization	4	
	Development	2		Development	4	
16	Coherence	2	11	Coherence	3	18
	Structure	2		Structure	4	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	3	
	Organization	2		Organization	4	
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
17	Structure	1	9	Structure	3	18
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	4	
	Organization	2		Organization	4	
	Development	2		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
18	Organization	2	10	Organization	3	18
	Development	3		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	3	
	Structure	1		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	4	
	Organization	3		Organization	3	
19	Development	2	12	Development	4	18
	Coherence	3		Coherence	4	
	Structure	2		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	2		Mechanics	4	
	Organization	3		Organization	3	
	Development	3		Development	4	
20	Coherence	2	13	Coherence	4	19
	Structure	3		Structure	3	
	Mechanics	3		Mechanics	4	
	Organization	2		Organization	4	
	Development	3		Development	4	
	Coherence	2		Coherence	4	
Mean \bar{x}	11.20			17.05		