



language for at least 9 years in Thai schools as a compulsory subject. They followed the same study plan, and they had completed ten English courses by the end of their first year. In order to make sure that these two groups were at the same level of English proficiency at the outset of the study, their grade point average (GPA) of English courses they had taken in the previous two semesters were compared using t-test. Their pre-test scores were also compared. Table 1 shows that the GPA, the passage correction pretest scores and the writing pretest scores of both groups were not significantly different ($p. > .05$). These two groups of participants were randomly assigned to an

experimental group (N=30) where the students edited their errors in pair and a control group (N=27) where the students edited their errors individually. After that, the participants in the experimental group were purposively assigned into three sub-groups of high, mid, and low according to their English GPA. The students in these three groups, then, were further assigned into six different dyadic patterns where the members of each dyad had either the same or different levels of language proficiency namely, high-high, high-mid, high-low, mid-mid, mid-low, and low-low to do collaborative revision.

Table 1 Comparison of GPA, Passage Correction Pretest and Writing Pretest Scores between Experimental and Control Groups

| Measures | Scores | | t | p |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-----|
| | Control Group (N = 27) | Experimental Group (N = 30) | | |
| English GPA | 2.93 | 2.70 | 1.30 | .20 |
| Passage Correction Pretest | 5.85 | 6.75 | -1.37 | .18 |
| Writing Pretest | 56.49 | 55.38 | .38 | .70 |

Research Instruments and Materials

The writing genre used in this study was a narrative. The narrative was chosen because it had been one of the major themes in humanistic and social thought since the mid-twentieth century, and this type of paragraph was thought to be the most universal genre (Hatch, 1992). Not only that, because every culture has a storytelling tradition, it was the genre known in every culture, and the template of it is also universal (Schiffrin, Tannen, & Hamilton, 2006; Hatch, 1992). A narrative was assumed to be familiar to the participants, and it was, therefore, justifiably an important genre for students to learn and to practice to write. The target grammatical features were limited to those usually found in a narrative paragraph namely definite and indefinite articles, copula 'be', past tense form of the verbs excluding auxiliary verbs, temporal and locative prepositions, and cohesive ties which included pronoun references, conjunctions,

and conjunctive adverbs (Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009; Hatch, 1992; Holiday & Hansan, 1976 as cited in Johnstone, 2009). To assess the effects of indirect feedback and collaborative revision activity on grammatical accuracy two measurements, a passage correction test and a paragraph writing test, were used.

A passage correction test was used as a pretest and a posttest because it is considered an effective exercise to develop attention on error detection and correction in writing classes and can help students to learn to edit their own papers (Odlin, 1986). To develop a passage correction test, the narrative text was taken from Shiro (2002). To ensure that the vocabulary in the test would not hinder the participants from their real grammatical performance, that the level of difficulty of vocabulary of the text was suitable for the learners' language proficiency, that the content of the paragraph was familiar to the students and that the passage was comprehensible for the students, ten students who majored in Business



English and enrolled in a composition class at Loei Rajabhat University were asked to rate the difficulty level of vocabulary using the Likert scale (Vagias, 2006). In order to prevent students from getting confused on the scale items, the scale was converted (i.e., 5-extremely difficult....., 1- not difficult at all). Students were also asked to rate the level of familiarity to vocabulary and the level of overall comprehension of the text (i.e. 5-extremely familiar,...1- not familiar at all). The data from two pilot tests showed that the level of difficulty of vocabulary was 2.8 and 2.5 respectively. The levels of 3.3 and 3.6 were reported when they were asked if they were familiar with the content of the passage and their report on the level of comprehension of the tests were 3.1 and 3.9 respectively. The data obtained showed that the vocabulary used in the test was not too difficult for students to understand, and it was acceptable. The test was also considered familiar to students, and they could comprehend the test. After the test was drafted, three experienced English teachers were asked to rate the level of Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC). According to Brown (1996), the entire test items had the value of IOC higher than 0.5, so they were kept as such. After that, the test was piloted with 30 English major students who enrolled in a writing course and had similar characteristics to the target participants at Loei Rajabhat University. The quality of each particular item was analyzed in terms of item difficulty and item discrimination. Base on Brown (2005), the item that has an item facility that falls in the range between .30 and .70 are usually acceptable. Two items were deleted because they were out of the range. After that, 30 test items with an item of discrimination index between .30 and 1.00 were selected because they were considered to have reasonably good to very good items (Ebel, 1979 as cited in Brown, 2005). The test items were chosen with equal numbers of each target grammatical features limited for the study. The test's reliability was calculated with the real participants of the study. However, since it was impractical to have the participants take the test

twice in a normal classroom context, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Brown, 2004) was used to measure the internal consistency of the test. The coefficient obtained from the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .88, which showed that the scoring was highly consistent and trustworthy.

L2 teachers insisted that the grammar should not only be learned, but be applied to different linguistic or communicative purposes where they combine sentences, correct errors, write paragraphs, and so forth (e.g., Purpura, 2004; Richards, 2006). In order to assess the knowledge of grammar when students apply grammatical rules to real communication, a paragraph writing test was used as a pretest and a posttest. The picture composition task adopted from Fawbush (2010) entitled "Catching a Thief", was used as a writing prompt. To ensure that the participants understood the picture series and to determine the appropriate length of time for completing the test, the test was piloted with ten English major students who enrolled in a writing course and had similar characteristics to the target participants at Loei Rajabhat University. These students were asked to tell the story based on the picture series in Thai, and all of them could tell the story correctly. This ensured that the picture series was understandable for the participants of the study. The students spent 54 minutes to finish the test, so 60 minutes were given to the participants to finish the test. To ensure the consistency in making judgments of the researcher on the target grammatical features in writing tests, the intra-rater techniques were employed. The degree of agreement between the first rating and the second rating, which were two-weeks apart, was 96%, which is considered very high. This indicated that the researcher was adequately consistent in scoring the tests. In addition, the inter-rater technique was used. In order to do this, the tests were scored by another rater, an English native speaker with at least 5 years of L2 teaching experience, and his rating was compared with the researcher's rating. The agreement between the two raters on a writing pretest of the experimental group was 95.44 %, which



was considered very high, indicating that the rating was reliable. In order to avoid scoring bias, the participants' names and surnames were concealed in every piece of writing while scoring so that the raters could not see the writers' names and the students' ID numbers were used instead.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted in the first seven weeks of a normal classroom schedule. The students were scheduled to meet once a week in their regular learning schedule. During the first week, the participants were given a pretest. Over the course of the following four weeks, the participants received paragraph writing instruction, and three narrative writing prompts, developed by the researcher, were given as in-class assignments. Because the participants made errors on both the target and non-target grammatical features, and they had a tendency to ignore errors that were not underlined, direct corrections were made to errors related to non-

target forms. This was done in an effort to avoid any misunderstanding the students may have had between the use of the grammatical and target features. After the participants received their paragraph back, the students in the control group revised their work by themselves while those in the experimental group revised their writing piece collaboratively with a randomly-assigned partner with either similar or different levels of English proficiency. During the seventh week the participants were asked to do the post-test.

Findings

1. Grammatical Accuracy Improvement

In order to find out if both the control group and the experimental group improved their grammatical accuracy, their posttest scores from the passage correction test and from the paragraph writing test were compared with the pre-test scores.

Table 2 Comparison of Pretest and Posttest scores of Passage Correction Test and Paragraph Writing Test

| Group | Test | Scores | | | | t | f | p |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|----------|-------|-------|----|------|
| | | Pretest | | Posttest | | | | |
| | | M | SD | M | SD | | | |
| Control Group (N=27) | Passage Correction | 5.85 | 1.91 | 6.28 | 3.37 | -.75 | 26 | .46 |
| | Paragraph Writing | 63.57 | 11.55 | 66.92 | 14.36 | -1.13 | 26 | .27 |
| Experimental Group (N=30) | Passage Correction | 6.75 | 2.97 | 5.70 | 2.79 | 2.55 | 29 | .02* |
| | Paragraph Writing | 55.38 | 13.92 | 60.84 | 18.86 | -1.42 | 29 | .17 |

As seen in Table 2, the paired t-test shows that, for the control group, the scores of the paragraph correct posttest and the paragraph writing posttest were not significantly different from those of the pretests ($p > .05$). Unexpectedly, for the experimental group, the mean score of the passage correction posttest decreased significantly from the pretest ($p < .05$) while the mean score of the paragraph writing posttest was higher than that of the pretest, but no significant difference was found ($p > .05$).

In order to know if there was any significant difference in the grammatical accuracy scores between the students who participated in collaborative revision and those who did self-revision after they received the teacher indirect feedback, the scores obtained from the passage correction posttest and from the paragraph writing posttest of the control and of the experimental groups were compared using an independent t-test.



Table 3 Comparison of the Passage Correction Posttest Scores and of the Paragraph Writing Posttest Scores between Groups

| Test | Group | | | | t | df | p |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-----|----|----|
| | Control Group (n=27) | | Experimental Group (n=30) | | | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | |
| Passage Correction Posttest | 6.28 | 3.37 | 5.70 | 2.79 | 71 | 55 | 48 |
| Paragraph Writing Posttest | 66.92 | 14.36 | 60.84 | 18.86 | .36 | 55 | 18 |

Table 3 shows that the mean scores of both the passage correction posttest and the paragraph writing posttest of the control group were higher than those of the experimental group. However, the difference was not significant ($p > .05$). It can be concluded that collaborative revision did not lead to higher accuracy of target grammatical features of the experimental group.

2. Grammatical Accuracy of the Students Working with a Partner with Different Levels of English Proficiency

To investigate if students who collaboratively edited their errors with their partner with similar or different levels of English proficiency performed differently in revising their grammatical mistakes, the paragraph writing scores of the students in different dyadic patterns in the experimental group were compared. However, because the passage correction posttest score of the students in the experimental group reduced significantly, the passage correction posttest scores of different dyadic patterns were not looked into.

The participants in the experimental group (N=30) were divided into six different dyadic patterns by their GPA in English. These dyadic patterns included 2 pairs of high-high (H-H), 3 pairs of high-mid (H-M), 3 pairs of high-low (H-L), 2 pairs of mid-mid (M-M), 3 pairs of mid-low (M-L), and 2 pairs of low-low (L-L) students. Table 4 shows the improvement of the paragraph writing test, obtained from a comparison between a pretest score and a posttest score as categorized by dyadic patterns. The data obtained show that the students in different dyadic patterns seemed to perform differently in improving grammatical mistakes in their writing after participating in the collaborative revision activity. The data also show that the mid-mid and the high-low dyads seemed to perform better in the paragraph writing posttest scores than the other dyadic patterns; three out of four members of the mid-mid dyadic pattern, and five out of six members of the high-low dyadic patterns higher posttest scores.

Table 4 Improvement of Paragraph Writing Tests of Experimental Group as Categorized by Dyadic Patterns

| Dyadic Pattern | Improvement | Dyadic Pattern | Improvement | Dyadic Pattern | Improvement | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------|-------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| H-H | Pair 1 | H | 3.38 | H-M | Pair 1 | H | 23.31 | H-L | Pair 1 | H | 16.16 |
| | | H | -1.18 | | | M | 27 | | | L | 2.04 |
| | Pair 2 | H | 12.21 | | Pair 2 | H | -9.83 | | Pair 2 | H | 19.83 |
| | | H | -3.22 | | | | M | | | -15.86 | |
| - | - | - | | H | 31.66 | Pair 3 | H | 4.04 | | | |
| - | - | - | | M | -4.55 | | | L | -10.43 | | |
| M-M | Pair1 | M | -0.14 | M-L | Pair1 | M | 4.17 | L-L | Pair1 | L | -22.39 |
| | | M | 58 | | | | L | | | -31.75 | |
| | Pair2 | M | 10.1 | | Pair2 | M | -7.28 | | Pair2 | L | 21.15 |
| | | M | 20.54 | | | | L | | | 37.5 | |
| - | - | - | | M | -45.91 | | - | - | | | |
| - | - | - | | L | -7.69 | | - | - | | | |

L = Low, M = Middle, H = High



The data also shows that the students with a high level of English proficiency seemed to improve better in their paragraph writing posttest when they worked with a partner with a low level of language proficiency than when they worked with a partner with either a high or middle level of language proficiency. The middle-level students who worked with a partner with the same language level seemed to score better in their paragraph writing posttest than when they worked with a partner with either a high or low level of English proficiency. For the students with a low level of language proficiency, they seemed to perform better in their paragraph writing posttest when they worked with the partner who had a higher level of language proficiency than theirs.

Discussion

This study revealed that self-revision and the collaborative revision activity which were done after errors in the learners' pieces of writing were underlined by the teacher did not have any significant effect on promoting grammatical accuracy. The findings of this study were different from the results of other previous studies (e.g. Abadikhah & Ashoori, 2012; Kassim & Ng, 2014; Storch, 2007) which investigated the effects of collaborative work after the students received the teacher indirect feedback.

The first explanation was probably the low level of English proficiency of the participants in this study. The participants in the studies conducted by Abadikhah and Ashoori (2012) and Kassim and Ng (2014), Storch (2007) seemed to have higher levels of language proficiency than the participants of this study. The participants participating in the these studies were students at a high intermediate level, ESL students at the upper intermediate level in one college in Malaysia, ESL students in one Australian university, and junior or senior students from University of Pittsburgh respectively. In contrast, the participants of this study were Thai EFL

who were consider having rather low levels of English proficiency. They had never spent more than a month abroad in any country where English was used as a means of communication, nor had they attended a school where English was used as a medium of instruction. In addition, the English classes they had taken were usually conducted in Thai rather than in English. Scholars on L2 teaching state that some novice writers may not find feedback beneficial when they neither comprehend feedback nor have sufficient level of language proficiency to revise their works. The participants in this study, therefore, may find editing the errors difficult, and they may not be confident that what they had edited was correct when they neither understood the errors nor knew how to edit them.

This study also reveals one surprising result. It shows the scores of the experimental group in the passage correction posttest to be significantly lower than those of the passage correction pretest. An explanation could probably be the difference of the nature of the in-class writing tasks and that of the passage correction test. The passage correction test was used as a tool to measure the learners' ability to identify and correct the errors of the target grammatical features that were put into a paragraph. However, the in-class assignments required the students to write narrative paragraphs and receive feedback on their errors before they edited the errors in pairs. This task was different from what the passage correction test required them to do. The collaborative revision, therefore, may not be able to help students to detect and edit the errors in the passage correction test.

The study revealed that students with different levels of language proficiency benefited differently when they worked with their partners who have either the same or different levels of language proficiency. This finding was consistent with those found by the study of Kim and McDonough (2008), who found that the patterns of interaction were changed when the interlocutors collaborated with interlocutors from different proficiency



levels. The possible explanation could be the different learning techniques or learning styles that the students with different levels of language proficiency had. Scholars on L2 learning stated that with different levels of language proficiency, students may have different learning patterns (e.g., Kim & McDonough, 2008; Storch, 1998; Williams, 2001).

This study also found that the students in the high-low dyad benefited the most from the collaborative revision activity. The explanation was probably that while giving their partner suggestions on error correction, the high proficiency students recalled their grammatical knowledge and learnt from the errors that their partners produced. The more capable learners learnt from their less capable partners as they both gave and received corrective feedback to solve linguistic problems while working on a problem-solving task, and they also help a novice to learn by providing step by step scaffolding by calling their attention to the interlanguage they produce (Lee, 2008; Nassaji & Swain, 2000). The students who has limited level of language proficiency learnt better when they interacted with a high-level partner than when they interacted with their friends who had the same level of language proficiency (Kim & McDonough, 2008; Nassaji & Swain, 2000).

This study further found that the middle-level students seemed to perform better when they worked with a partner with the same language level. The reason was probably the equal participation of the pairs in achieving the task goal. Since both of the pair members had somewhat similar levels of language proficiency, they did not feel reluctant or embarrassed to share what they knew about the errors and might feel comfortable to learn from each other. This finding was supported by Storch (1998) and Williams (2001), who found that, in groups where the students were approximately of the same level of proficiency, all members of the group participated in the task.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Based on the findings reported earlier, it can be concluded that self-revision and collaborative revision done after the errors of the target grammatical features on the pieces of writing were underlined did not have any effects on grammatical accuracy of the students in this study. The findings of this study may suggest to EFL teachers that not every group of students benefits from the integration of the teacher indirect feedback with collaborative revision activity in promoting grammatical accuracy. The learners' learning backgrounds and levels of English proficiency should be brought into consideration when the teacher plans to implement the teacher indirect feedback and collaborative revision activity in a writing classroom. The teachers should provide different types of feedback in class and find out the feedback that is the most suitable for a particular group of students. For the students who may not be familiar with a collaborative revision activity, the teachers may have to negotiate with the students by talking about advantages of this activity and by explaining why the students can benefit from the activity. However, due to the short period of time that the students participated in the study, the students might not become familiar with the teacher indirect feedback and the collaborative revision activity. These limitations may prevent the students from making use of a collaborative revision activity in improving their grammatical accuracy. Therefore, in order to be able to make a more reasonable conclusion about the effects of teacher indirect feedback together with a collaborative revision activity, a study of this similar nature should be replicated using a longer period of time. In addition, the participants of this study were considered to have low levels of English language proficiency, and this was probably the reason why this study resulted in the findings that were different from those of the previous studies. A study of this nature that includes a group of participants with a high level of English language proficiency may result in different findings.



References

- Abadikhah, S., & Ashoori, A. (2012). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' performance after collaborative output. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 118-125.
- Bennui, P. (2008). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 4, 72-102.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431.
- Brooks, F., Donato, R., & McGlonem, J. V. (1997). When are they going to say "It" right?: Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 524-541.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in Language Programs*. NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, J. D. (2005). *Testing in language programs: A comprehensive guide to English language assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill College.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Donato, R. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 453-464.
- Englert, C., Mariage, T. V., & Dunsmore, K. (2006). Tenets of sociocultural theory in writing instruction research. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 208-221). New York: Guilford.
- Erel, S., & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, Erciyes University*, 23(1), 397-415.
- Fawbush, B. (2010). *Implicit and explicit corrective feedback for middle school ESL learners*. (Master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and writing corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201.
- Hatch, E. M. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Intratrat, C. (2004). *Evaluation of CALL materials for EFL students at KMUTT, Thailand*. Retrieved from <http://digital.lib.kmutt.ac.th>
- Johnstone, R. (2009). Review of research on language teaching, learning and policy. *Language Teaching*, 42(3), 287-315.
- Kassim, A., & Ng, L. L. (2014). The roles of collaborative dialogue in enhancing written corrective feedback efficacy. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 10(1), 16-30.



- Khaourai, P. (2002). A Study of mistakes in English essay writing: A case study of students majoring English at Ratchapat Nakhonprathom. *Journal of Passa Paritasna*, 20, 137–156.
- Kim, Y. J., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 211–234.
- Lee, L. (2008). Focus-on-form through collaborative scaffolding in expert-to-novice online interaction. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(3), 53–72.
- Lush, B. (2002). Writing errors: A study of Thai students' writing errors. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin*, 15(1), 75–82.
- Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 1(1), 34–52.
- Odlin, T. (1986). Another look at passage correction tests. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 123–130.
- Purpura, J. E. (2004). *Assessing grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sattayatham, A., & Honsa, S. J. (2008). Medical students most frequent errors at Mahidol University, Thailand. *Quarterly Journal*, 9(1), 17–38.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2006). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. MA: Blackwell.
- Sersen, W. J. (2011). Improving writing skills of Thai EFL students by recognition of and compensation for factors of L1 to L2 negative transfer. *US-China Education Review*, A(3), 339–345.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556–569.
- Shiro, M. (2002). Genre and evaluation in narrative development. *Journal of Child Language*, 30, 165–195.
- Storch, N. (1998). A classroom-based study: insights from a collaborative text reconstruction task. *ELT Journal*, 52, 291–300.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 143–159.
- Storch, N. (2008). Metatalk in pair work activity: Level of engagement and implications for language development. *Language Awareness*, 17, 95–114.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320–337.
- Vagias, W. M. (2006). *Likert-type scale response anchors*. Retrieved from <http://www.clemson.edu/centers-institutes/tourism/documents/sample-scales.pdf>
- Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 67–78.
- Williams, J. A. (2001). Classroom conversations: Opportunities to learn for ESL students in mainstream classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(8), 750–757.