Developing Students' Writing Skill through Peer and Teacher Correction: An Action Research

Ashok Sapkota

Abstract

Writing is a form of an art and integral part of language learning. The present study concerns with development of writing skills through peer and teacher correction technique. As an action research in nature, the research aimed to test the progress of the students while writing an essay. After the analysis of data collected through test items, it was seen improvement in students writing in post test than in pre-test. The students (Ss1-Ss10) were found using the words in an increased order and grammatically correct sentences in their writing in each test made and committed less grammatical errors in post test than in pre and progress test. Regarding mechanics of writing, their writing was found systematic in case of punctuation, proper use of paragraphs, in coherence and cohesion in writing. The peer correction and teacher correction technique was found productive in teaching writing through action research as a whole.

Key words: Writing, Proficiency, Essay, Grammatical Units, Mechanics

Introduction

Writing is one of the most important skills in learning a new language. It is a productive skill. Writing is the act of putting down the graphic symbols that present a language in order to convey some meaning so that the reader can grasp the information which the writer has tried to impart. Turk and Kirkman (1989, p.1 as cited in Brown, 1994) write, "… we start from the assumption that thinking about writing can improve it, and that everyone can learn to write well. Most people, in reality can write successful letters to their friends and effective complaints about faulty goods".

For Nunan (1989, p.36), writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of variables simultaneously. At the sentence level, these include control of contents, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, spelling and letter formation. Beyond the sentence, the writer must be able to structure and integrate information into cohesive and coherent paragraph and text.

For Rivers (1968, p.243), writing refers to the expression of ideas in a systematic way to organize the graphic conventions of the language; the ultimate aim of a writer at this stage is to be able to express him in a polished literary form which requires the utilization of a special vocabulary and certain refinement structure.

Furthermore, Jordan (1999, p.41) takes writing as, "...the method of human inter-

communication by means of conventionally visible marks". Similarly, White and Arndt (1991, p. 3) take: "Writing is far from being a simple matter of transcribing language into written symbols: it is thinking process in its own right. It is a permanent record, as a form of expression and as a means of communication.

From the above citations, writing could be perceived as a complex process that requires many skills like mental, psychological, rhetorical and critical aspects. Writing is the system of written symbols which represents the sounds, syllables or words of language. Writing skill requires different mechanisms as capitalization, spelling and punctuation, word form and function. It helps to convey the meaning clearly. So, writing is an activity to improve our understanding of any subject. Writing is the ability not only to put ideas from mind to paper but also to generate more meaning and make ideas clear. Writing demands conscious intellectual effort, which usually has to be sustained over a considerable period of time.

There are various processes in writing skills. Process writing is one of the most important skills in writing.

Writing as a process

Writing is essentially a thinking process and those thoughts are finally imprinted in a written form as writing. Not only it can help to reconstruct thinking into the written form, it also supplies important clues for improving the coherence of the text. It can give us a fornicating insight into what goes on as we struggle to translate meaning into words. For White and Arndt (1991, pp.11-37), there are certain skills used in process writing as the following: *Generating ideas* is a crucial part of the writing process. Writing is primarily about organizing information and communicating meaning. Generating ideas is particularly as important as well as difficult to initiating process. For this reason, we follow the activities in the initial stages when we are attempting to discover a topic and identify the purpose. Even in later stages, however, idea generating continuously takes place. So that, the techniques used to stimulate ideas at an initial stage may prove useful.

Focusing includes discovering main ideas, considering purpose and so on. In this topic, the focus is given on main idea of the text; purpose of the text is described. *Structuring* information entails various organization processes of grouping ideas together and deciding upon how to sequence them. We rarely know exactly what we are going to write and how we are going to present it until we actually start writing. Although the writer starts with a general organizational scheme, new ideas are constantly generated by the actual process of writing. In order words, organizing oral scheme or new ideas are constantly generated by the actual process of writing. So, organization of the writing or ideas is a preliminary stage.

 Drafting is one of the important steps in writing process. Many of the activities described in earlier section are often classified as 'pre-writing'. The main concern of the writer in writing is that how best to organize an idea for their reader. The writer now has to think of how to attract their audience, how to continue appealing them, and how to lead them through the text to conclusion.

Evaluating is essential to ensure that the language is well comprehended and reasoning well maintained. It is the assessment of the draft. In general, length of the text, organization of the text, mechanics of writing are the basic features of evaluation.

One essential part of the process remains through, namely to '*review*' the text, with a new pair of eyes. Even at this stage, a new look at what is on the page is quite likely to give rise to get more ideas and thoughts which have to be worked into the original conception.

Process writing is way to structure our writing. When we structure it is beneficial to consider the type essay writing which is briefly discussed below:

Writing an essay and its types

One cannot write a complete essay in the first attempt. One starts with a simple sentence which is purposeful and moves to second one and third and fourth. These form a paragraph. Essays can be classified on the basis of different criteria. On the basis of writing and organizing the events, the essay can be of four common types: narrative, descriptive, argumentative, and persuasive essays. The present study is concerned with writing skills where the test items were concerned with narrative and descriptive essay writing. Adapting the ideas made by Awasthi, Bhattarai and Khaniya (2009, pp. 6-11), narrative and descriptive essay writing can be briefly discussed below:

Narrative vs. Descriptive Essays Narrative essays are those that consist of narration of some past event or from present world. The event can be historical or legendary occurrences, stories either true or imaginary, programs, accidents and biographies of the well-known personalities. Normally, the story of a narrative essay develops according to chronological order but it does not mean that chronological order is a must. On the other angle, descriptive essays are the accurate description of some places, objects and things such as countries, islands, mountains, seas, rivers, aspects and phenomena of nature, towns, buildings and so on. So, these types of essays can be said to be the accurate account of something which conveys the factual pieces of information to the readers. The information to be included in these kinds of essays is seen and what is heard by the writers. This is equally effective in works of fiction, nonfiction and poetry.

Statement of the problem in the context of Nepal

If the learners take the English language as an academic subject rather than a language, they will be concerned only with passing the exam for getting an academic degree. Among the different language skills, the students feel writing skill to be the most difficult in real practice and in the examination. It is mostly assigned as homework in teaching-learning activities and the answer made by the teacher is supposed to be final and correct. The students depend mostly on teacher's notes; guess papers, general books where very few consult the reference resources. In this context, the only solution lies in the continuous pursuit of knowledge and skills. If the learners have the skills and habit of learning independently, they will be able to face the challenges. Lack of the habit of

independent learning in students has been a major problem of total education system of Nepal. So, the English language teaching needs to rethought both from the eyes of teachers and students.

The study context

The study is related with measures of frequency and analysis of errors frequency at word and sentence level in relation to the mechanics of writing of FoE students studying in B.Ed first year of a college in Lalitpur as an action research. As a branch of applied linguistics, error analysis sets out to demonstrate that many learners' errors were not due to the learner's mother tongue but are reflected as universal learning strategies. However, error is something specific that results from incomplete knowledge and is distinguished from mistake, which is caused by the lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness or some other aspect of performance.

As action research in nature, the main task in this research was to look the progressive changes of on writing skills in English. In this regard it is worthy to talk about action research and its steps.

Action research was propounded by Lewin (1946 as cited in Cohen et al., 2010) for the first time assuming to bridge the gap between theoretical and applied research. Similarly, the essential impetus of carrying out an action research also is to bring change the system or assume to bring progress in the system. In Cohen and Manion's (1985, p. 87 as cited in Cohen et al. 2010) view, action research is conducted aiming at the improvement of the current affairs through the processes of identifying and solving problem in a specific context.

As a classroom investigation based research, it carried out to find out and solve the specific problems here and now in local setting. It is a joint venture of language practitioner and researcher in a practical way. The main aim of the action research is to improve the current state of affairs within the educational context in which research is being carried out. Action research ultimately solves the practical problems of an academic context by bridging gap between theory and practice. It is a practical process of identifying, recognizing and solving the programs in the scientific way. It always orients towards the results change of certain phenomena, situation or issues. This research was based on the Nunan's (1992) steps of action research as.

a. *Initiation:* The researcher observed the problem by asking them write a simple essay.

b. *Preliminary Investigation*: An attempt was made to collect the concrete information about what the problem is.

c. *Hypothesis*: The researcher planned an activity to solve the problem of essay writing and postulates a hypothesis that the errors can be reduced.

d. *Intervention and Treatment:* The ongoing regular classroom activities were interrupted and a new treatment was introduced. The main purpose was to bring change in the organizing state of affairs.

e. *Evaluation:* The researcher evaluated the change brought by the new action introduced in preceding steps.

f. *Dissemination:* It is the post research activity of sharing the idea about the findings of the study.

g. *Follow up:* Here, the findings of the study are followed up by the practitioners. By this, the regular way of teaching and learning is changed and new one is adopted to introduce certain changes in the study. Addressing and solving the practical problems of an academic context by bridging the gap between the theory and practice is the ultimate purpose of an action research.

Research questions

Among different skills, writing covers the most of the weightage in the assessment of FoE students studying in B.Ed first year. They were found quite weak in the writing skills in preliminary investigation. In this situation, the researcher thought to be worthwhile to look over their writing abilities by providing progress tests through teaching focusing on the major problems of writing. The research was conducted to seek answer the following questions:

- Are they really weak in their writing ability?

- Are there any alternative ways of teaching to improve their writing skills?

- Will they really improve after using progressive tests?

- What could be their final result of writing in word, and sentence level and the errors found in their writing?

These are some of the questions raised beside my research. These questions are addressed in the analysis as well as in the finding section of this research.

Review of related literature

The researcher made an attempt to review research reports and journal articles came out in the field of literature and language teaching on writing skills. Such as: Karki's (1996) study on writing proficiency between the students of privates and public schools of grade ten in Lamjung district found out that the students of private schools were far better i.e., 65% than public school i.e., 45%. Likewise, Poudyal's (1999 as cited in Bhattarai 2005) study on writing proficiency in higher secondary school of Gulmi and Kathmandu district found that the students of Kathmandu district were better i.e, 68% than the students of Gulmi district i.e., 40% in writing proficiency. Bhattarai's (2002) study on writing proficiency of Bachelor's level students found that the students of institutes have greater proficiency in writing i.e., 60.23% then the students of faculties i.e., 57.37% and the boys are ahead of girls' i.e., 32.27%.

Sa-ngiamwibool (2007) wrote an article based on his research entitled enhancing structure and written expressions among EFL Thai students through consciousness-raising instructions and found that the skill was effective to improve the reaching of English to a higher level standard and learners to become more independent and improve their language skills. Basnet's (2008) study on proficiency of the students in guided writing found that the guided writing proficiency of the PCL first year students of faculties of humanities and social sciences i.e., 62.08% was found better than that of the students of faculties of education i.e., 60.87%. Hasan and Akhand (2010) wrote an article on approaches to writing in ESL/EFL context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level which aimed to examine the effects of product and process approach

Table No. 2. Analysis of the Students' Development on Writing Skills through Peer and Teacher Correction Strategies

Ss	No.QS	Mechanics of Writing							
		Total No. of Paragraphs		Use of Punctuation		Sentential Arrangements			
						Coherence in Writing		Cohesion in Writing	
		Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-Test	Pre-test	Post-Test
Ss1	1	2	4	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	unsystematic	Unsystematic
	2	2	1	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	unsystematic	Unsystematic
Ss2	1	2	3	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
	2	1	1	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
Ss3	1	6	2	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
	2	1	1	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
Ss4	1	3	3	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic
	2	2	1	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic
Ss5	1	1	2	Systematic	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
	2	1	1	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
Ss6	1	1	1	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
	2	1	1	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
Ss7	1	3	3	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
	2	1	1	Haphazard	Unsystematic	Haphazar d	Unsystematic	Haphazard	Unsystematic
Ss8	1	2	4	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic
	2	1	2	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic
Ss9	1	5	4	Systematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
	2	2	2	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Systematic	Unsystematic
Ss10	1	2	2	Systematic	Systematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Systematic	Systematic
	2	1	1	Systematic	unsystematic	Unsystematic	Unsystematic	Systematic	Unsystematic

to writing on learners' performance and found the advantages of using a product-process approach to gauging the effects of writing tasks were appraised. Similarly, Acharya's (2010) research on "Activities used in teaching essays concluded that the teachers did not motivate as it is required, large percentage of teacher (70%) translated difficult words into mother-tongue. In the same way, he found that the teachers were not comfortable in teaching essays because of poor linguistic background of the students in the English language.

This research was different from those reviewed researches in the sense that the researches above were conducted as survey and experimental rather than action research. They found that the students were weak in their writing skills in general illustrating their proficiency in percentage or found that the teacher did not motivate them. They were mostly statistical in nature. They were unable to identify the areas where students really need to improve. This study focused on the developing writing skills of FoE Students of B.Ed first year as action research with the frequency of different grammatical levels of writing essays descriptively and identify from where we need to begin teaching writing.

Objectives of the study

The main objectives of the study was to find out whether there will be improvement in students' writing skills through the strategies of peer correction followed by teacher correction and to forward some pedagogical suggestions based on the

findings of the research.

Data collection tools and procedures

The population for the study consists of ten students from a B. Ed College. The College was selected purposively and the students were selected by using simple random sampling procedure. Test items were the main tool used for data collection as primary sources. The tools was used to elicit the data involve pre-tests, progressive test and post-test. The test items consist of two different questions related to writing skill as for pre test and post test.

The study was limited to a bachelor level community college in Lalitpur district. The study was limited in the word level and sentence level at grammatical units, number of paragraphs, punctuation and cohesion and coherence as mechanics of writing of FoE students studying in B.Ed first year. There are only two techniques; peer and teacher correction techniques used in the study.

Analysis/results

This section deals with the data analysis which was collected from pre-test, progressive test and post-tests from the selected sample. In this section, data are analyzed using descriptive approach and statistical tool like measures of frequency count is used to show it more vividly. So, this section includes the analysis and interpretation of data to fulfill the objectives.

As illustrated in the table, No.1, there were ten students (Ss1-Ss10) involved in this action research. They were asked two free-writing questions in each test. The writing proficiency was tested on the basis of total

no. of words, total no. of ungrammatical words, total no. of sentences, as to test grammatical units in their writing skills and to test their mechanics of writing; total no. of paragraphs, use of punctuation, sentential arrangements (cohesion and coherence) was used. The table no.1 provides a holistic picture of frequency count of total no of words and ungrammatical words, total no of sentences and total no. of ungrammatical sentences total in writing skills made by the students in each test.

Table No. 1.

Analysis of the Students' Development on Writing Skills on Grammatical Units through Peer and Teacher Correction Strategies

Ss.	No. QS	Use of Grammatical Units							
		Total no. of Words		Total No. of Ungrammatical Words		Total no of Sentences		Total No. Ungrammatical Sentences	
		PRT	POT	PRT	POT	PRT	POT	PRT	POT
Ss1	1	156	90	3	5	20	22	13	11
	2	225	105	8	2	15	9	15	6
Ss2	1	272	258	1	1	18	23	4	4
	2	232	297	0	2	32	31	15	3
Ss3	1	252	175	4	0	26	17	3	1
	2	297	203	4	1	26	22	8	4
Ss4	1	211	189	10	6	5	15	4	8
	2	175	170	4	3	4	12	4	10
Ss5	1	260	62	6	1	15	18	15	5
	2	120	36	5	0	9	2	9	10
Ss6	1	124	112	31	18	3	10	3	10
	2	26	79	3	13	18	9	18	9
Ss7	1	268	250	6	4	15	21	10	6
	2	176	207	6	0	3	16	3	5
Ss8	1	394	289	6	7	26	26	8	10
	2	284	69	3	9	14	9	4	5
Ss9	1	208	254	4	1	15	21	1	0
	2	108	244	0	0	14	18	5	6
Ss10	1	114	148	1	1	13	20	8	4
	2	80	83	0	2	8	9	5	9

(QS: questions, PRT: Pre-test, POT: Post test)

It has been found that half of the students

(Ss6, Ss7, Ss8, Ss9, and Ss10) increased in the use of number of words in their writing in post test than in pre-test as shown in table no.1. Similarly, in case of ungrammatical words, the students (Ss1, Ss3, Ss5, Ss6, Ss7, Ss8, Ss9, and Ss10) made less error in the post test than they had made in pre- test and progressive test. Likewise, in using total no. of sentences too, all the students (Ss1-Ss10) wrote more sentences in post test to explain the given question (*as in the appendix)* than in pre-test. Regarding the case of committing ungrammatical sentences, eight student's (Ss1, Ss2, Ss3, Ss5, Ss7, Ss8, Ss9, and Ss10) less erroneous were in each; pre and post test in lesser degree respectively. For example:

(The question asked for the qualities of good teacher as in appendix 1question no 1) Ss3 writing in the pre-test and post-test can compared as below:

Teacher plays the vital role in the school. There are different types of teacher in the school. Some teachers are good and some teachers are bad. Both of the teachers have so many qualities. Good teacher is that types of teacher who encourage the students in the class. who allows the discussion in the class. This type of teacher learn all the students name. They gives more importants for students views and openion…. (Ss-3, Pre test writing)

The following writing shows the development in writing of the same student (Ss3) on the post-test as following:

I teach in a lower secondary school. In this field, we can find different types of teacher. Among them, some of them have good qualities or bad qualities. Good teacher is that type of teacher who has positive thinking towards teaching. This types of teacher are mostly helpful, friendly with the students. Good teachers are those who always encourage students in the class, who allows discussion in the class. This type of teachers encourage students to ask or raise questions in the class….(Ss3: Post-test)

In the two examples if we compare the use of grammatical (word and sentence level) errors, we can find few words or sentences as erroneous words and sentences in the second example.

Regarding the mechanics of writing, in paragraphs, all of the students changed the paragraphs on the basis of the need of content in post- test than the need of length as in pre- and progressive test. Similarly, all the learners were found using the proper use of punctuation (mostly full stop and comma) in proper order in post- test in comparison to pre and progressive test. Similarly, the progress was also found in case of sentential arrangements as a whole. Hence, the table No.2 shows that overall writing mechanics of students was found better in post-test than in pre and post test respectively.

After the identification of problems, in the students' writing in the pre-test (*as specifically described in table 2)*, a real teaching was conducted for four weeks on the problematic areas.

Discussion of findings

After completion of the analysis and interpretation of the data, the following are the major findings of the study:

a) The overall performance of the students in acquiring or developing writing skill was found satisfactory

in almost all the test in an increasing order. All the students (Ss1-Ss10) increased their level on using the words in their writing in each test and made less grammatical errors in post test in comparison to pre test. Regarding the use of sentences, they were able to write correct sentences at post test stage than in pre-test. Regarding the mechanics of writing, they increased the level of progress on their writing in case of punctuation, coherence in writing and in cohesion in each test from haphazard to systematic and gradually to the stage of systematic.

b) Most of the students (Ss2, Ss3, Ss4, Ss7, Ss8 and Ss9) were found using grammatically appropriate vocabulary in their writing in the final post test analysis than they used in pre-test. The sentences were found meaningful. The significant finding was seen in the use of vocabulary (word level) which was ranged from 172 words in pre test in an increasing to 424 in the post test while writing an essay and the error that they had made in using the words only ranged from 1-6 as erroneous words.

c) Regarding the use of paragraphs, half of the students (Ss1, Ss2, Ss4, Ss8, and Ss9) were able to make proper sentential organization in their essay writing. In case of using punctuation marks, all the students improved the use of punctuation marks (mostly full stop, comma, semi-colon, and question) in their writing in post test as compared to pre test.

d) The students (Ss4, Ss5 and Ss6) who used the punctuation marks haphazardly improved their level to unsystematic and the students (Ss8, Ss9, and Ss10) who used punctuation marks unsystematically improved a level to systematic stage using punctuation marks.

e) Similarly, in case of using sentential arrangements, most of the students (Ss1, Ss3, Ss8, Ss9, and Ss10) improved their level of arranging their answers more cohesively and coherently in post test as compared to pre test.

f) As a whole , it was found that the students were able to increase their level of proficiency in the use of grammatical units and in using mechanics of writing in post-test from their level in pre-test and post-test. The use pair- correction followed by teacher-correction was found effective while dealing with the problematic areas identified. It was found an effective tool to improve the writing proficiency of the students.

Conclusions and pedagogical implications

a. It is essential for the teachers to know the basic ground or level of the students' in their levels of writing and then move into the course teaching. It is very essential to know the current level of learners before we go for the real teaching. It is essential to provide instructions as well as technique on essay writing according to the interest, level and capacity of students.

b. The research report strongly recommends that the teaching of writing could be successful when we teach using peer correction followed by teacher correction. Teacher correction could be just used as a facilitation or

monitoring practices.

c. The different events like: essay competition, spelling contest, puzzle practice could be used as the activities in teaching that facilitates the organization of students writing.

d. The access to reading and writing materials on essay in computer labs and in the library, project work, self-study practice, etc. are other helpful tools to improve students' writing.

e. The teacher needs to focus students' on the organizing the word to sentence; sentence to paragraph' and paragraph to essay before teaching essay writing as a whole.

Conclusion

Many students feel weak in speaking in English but in the real sense they are weaker in writing than they think. Teachers assign writing as homework giving it less preference and mostly focus on transformations practices in the class but the examination is highly based testing writing proficiency. In additional to washback effect, they perform weak in the examination and they could not achieve handsome marks. As a common problem, it is necessary focus on writing in the class along with other skills as a form of action research.

About the author

Ashok Sapkota is a Teaching Assistant at Central Department of English Educaton, Tribhuvan University. He has published articles and presented papers on English language teaching, applied linguistics and research methodology in international conferences. He has co-authored a book on applied linguistics (2011) and authored a book on Research Methodology in Language Education and Thesis Writing (2012). He is a teacher trainer at British Council, ETTE project and NELTA, an executive member of NELTA, a member of IATEFL, South Asia Teachers Association, ELTECs/U.K. He has also received Hornby Regional Schools Training (2012) in Sri Lanka.

References

Acharya, H. (2011). *Activities used in teaching essays*. An unpublished Thesis of M.Ed, TU.

Awasthi, J. R., Bhattarai, G.R. and Khaniya, T.R .(2009) (eds). *New generation English*. Vidyarthi Prakashan Pvt. Ltd: Kathmandu

Bhattarai, P.D. (2002). *A comparative study of the writing proficiency of bachelor's Level students*. An unpublished Thesis of M.Ed,TU., Kathmandu.

Basnet, B. (2008). *The proficiency of the students in guided writing*. An unpublished Thesis of M.Ed, TU., Kathmandu.

Bhattarai G.R. (2005*). A thematic analysis of research reports*, Kathmandu Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. London: Prentice Hall Regents.

Cohen, L. Manion, L. and Morrison, K.(2010). *Research methods in education (6th edition)*. London: Routledge.

Jordan, R. R. (1999). *Academic writing course*. London: Pearson education Limited Longman.

Karki, H. B. (1996). *A comparative study of English language writing proficiency in H.S.S of Gulmi and Kathmandu district*. An unpublished Thesis of M.Ed. Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.

Hasan, K.M. and Akhand, M.M. (2010) Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level: *Journal of NELTA*. Vol-15, Kathmandu, NELTA

Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classroom*. U.K: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: CUP

Rivers, W. (1968). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: Chicago University.

Sa-ngiamwibool, A. (2007) Enhancing structure and writing expression amon EFL thai students through consciousness-raising instructions: *Journal of NELTA*. Vol-15, Kathmandu, NELTA

Wallace, M. J. (2000). *Action research for language teacher*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

White, R. and Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. London.: Longman.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX- I

Test-items

This test- item has been prepared to have the authentic data to achieve the objectives of the study entitled" Developing Students' Writing Skill Through Peer and Teacher Correction: An Action Research". I hope that your invaluable co-operation will be a great contribution in the accomplishment of my research work.

<div align="center">Researcher</div>

Personal Information

Name:…………………………………………………………………………………

 Gender: Male: ( )   Female: ( )

1. Imagine that you are a teacher teaching in a lower secondary school. What could be the qualities of a good or bad teacher in your view point? Explain it in about 200 words.

....
....
....

2. Write a ghost story that you have read or heard when you were a small child in about 120 words.

....
....
....
....

Appendix-II

Sample Lesson Plan

College: Adarsha Saula College   Date: 2069-10-17

Level: FoE Graduates (B.Ed. First Year)   Time: 45 minutes

Teaching Items: Introduction of Essay.   Subject: English

Specific Objectives

On the completion of this topic, students will be able to:

- define an essay and characteristics of an essay

- use of punctuation while writing essay

Instructional Materials

- Usual materials

- Sentence cards including the definition of essay.

Teaching Learning Strategies

Lead in

Here the teacher simply reviews the topic that was discussed in the earlier class.

Activities

-    As the teacher enter into the class, He will write a paragraph and ask the students to read silently and guess what can be the topic of the paragraph and observe the use of punctuation marks used.

-    Then, He will give the idea that it is an essay and introduce the present topic i.e., introduction of an essay.

-    He will show the definition of an essay in a sentence cards and writes in the board. He will take the idea from the students and with the help of students, He will discuss about the essay.

-    Then, He will ask students about the characteristics of an essay to write in their copy and exchange with each other so that they can more ideas. Furthermore, he use other examples and instruct them to use the punctuation marks (full stop, colon, question mark, comma) providing some of the examples on the board. After that with the help of students, He will describe the characteristics of an essay.

Evaluation

T will ask to write a paragraph in about 80 words describing their village.

Appendix-III
Marking Scheme for Mechanics of Writing

- *Systematic (3 or 75-100%) Good User*: The students can produce clear, well structured detailed text showing control of organization of paragraphs and cohesive devices. They produce variety of sentence structures. Their writing is meaningful and contains appropriate transitions. They use precise, varied and descriptive vocabulary and their writing contains virtually no grammatical and punctuation error. They have their own voice (i.e. what they want to say).

- *Unsystematic (2 or 30- 60%) Modest User:* Their writing does not contain variety of sentence structures. Range of vocabulary is rather low. Their writing is somehow meaningful though it contains a few errors in the use of transitional words. It contains considerable degree of redundancy. The number of sentences containing grammatical errors overweighs the correct ones and there are many errors in the use of spelling and punctuation as well.

- *Haphazard (2 or below 30%) Beginner User*: Students may write single word or word combinations. The level of language is too low and it is very difficult to understand the intended meaning. They can communicate minimally. Students may leave the page blank or the answer may be totally irrelevant.