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Abstract

Peer assessment has been considered an important part of writing process that helps improving writing ability. Having a friend express opinions and provide certain guideline to improve the writing is analogous to a mirror reflecting the ability of the reviewer and the reviewed (Bostock, 2000).

The present study is aimed at investigating the effectiveness of peer assessment on writing and the subjects’ attitudes towards the technique and being assessed by peer. Participants consisted of 24 grade 11 students enrolled in The English Gifted Program of Triam Udom Suksa School of the South. The participants were taking the Creative Writing course offered in the 1st semester of 2010 academic year. Research instrument comprised 6 lesson plans, an English writing ability test, and a questionnaire asking learners’ attitudes on the writing process with peer review. The writing instruction was in the form of participants’ learning the process of peer assessment through the ‘Maze’ production for 30 hours in 15 weeks. A pre-test and post-test were administered prior and post the treatment, of which the scores were statistically computed to determine means, standard deviation, percentage and the difference between means of the two tests.

It was found that after experiencing the writing instruction with peer assessment and being assessed by peer the subjects’ writing ability improved significantly, at .01. Highly positive attitudes towards the teaching technique were also found, in particular on the following aspects: the writing ability development, self-directed learning, co-operative learning, and self-confidence.
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Background and related studies

Writing is a skill essential for a person’s intellectual and communicative development; it shows one’s thinking development. Vygotsky (1978) suggested that an appropriate instructional method can enhance complex thinking development. Similarly, Eggen & Kuachck (1999) maintained that language especially writing is a communicating tool used to express one’s thought and impart culture.

Although writing is a skill language learner need to acquire, teaching writing is normally provided after the learner have practiced listening, speaking and reading skills (Heaton, 1977). Possibility might be that writing is the most complicated skill. The learners have to be equipped with the other language skills prior to learning how to writing because the skills are reflected through the writing. Thus writing skill development deserves serious attention (Bowen et al., 1985).

Because of its importance, the writing instruction in Thailand has focused on developing the learners’ writing skill together with other skills (The Educational Academic and Standard, 2008). However, it was found that Thai learners at every education level still have problems with writing skill (Runghairan, 2007; Sriyong, 2009). It was found, for example, that Thai learners’ writing ability was at a low level. They were hardly communicate in the present society through writing because of various problems in writting including the vocabulary, expressions, grammatical constructions, writing mechanism, and idea organization (Suwansom, 2001). Therefore, developing writing skill has often been difficult and challenging to the learner. Learners are required to put all the time and effort in learning and practicing how to organize ideas as well as language elements (Kasper, 2000).

Besides the complexity of the teaching and learning writing skill, assessing writing is also a rather difficult process consisting of many steps and. Genera, this time consuming task has been responsible solely by the instructor. At present, however, with new teaching approaches, the learners started to take certain responsibility by learning how to and taking part in assessing their own and peer’s writing. Hyland (2000) and Xiang (2004), for example, maintained that in order for the learners to improve writing ability the learner should be able to assess and edit their own and peer’s work.

Peer assessment, therefore, is an alternative of assessment process that involves the learner’s participation. It can well reflect the effectiveness of the learners’ feedback and cooperation as well as enhance learners’ awareness of self-learning and self-esteem. Topping (2008) suggested that in peer assessment learners have to determine the standard or quality of the work written by learners of the same academic level, plan the learning process together, indicate peer’s strengths and weaknesses and outline the scope of editing the writing. The merits of peer assessing and editing have been rather well advocated. Conrad & Goldstein (1999), Min (2006), and Nakanoshi (2007) argued that if learners have learned and practiced assessing and editing skill, the skill will play an important role in developing their own’s writing skill. Unlike the feedback or assessment by the instructor, peer assessment provides the learners with opportunities to think and reason in negotiating with different ideas leading to the development of learners’ awareness of the audience (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994). Forman & Cazden (1986) added that in assessing peer’s work learners need to be always alert.
and attentive resulting in cognitive strengthening, and at the same time acknowledging the importance of and having positive attitude toward their work being assessed and edited by peer. In addition, assessing and editing peer’s writing helps learners gain more knowledge and ability in gathering, acquiring, analyzing and synthesizing formation, reading and writing skills. Through the assessing and editing process learners become more patient, responsible, and cautious and learn how to think systematically. They also enjoy reading and writing more which can lead to the increase in life skills because writing. In fact, it is essential that appropriate teaching and learning helps learners become autonomous in self development—knowing how to acquire knowledge and ready to encounter the complicated social problems (Jitpluem, 1996). Therefore, implementing peer assessment technique is truly influential to the learners’ language development.

The present study, the investigation of the effectiveness of peer assessment on writing and the subjects’ attitudes towards the technique and being assessed by peer, was carried out in order to gain insight for improving the administration and teaching English writing skill. The instruction technique in the present was conducted using Creative Writing course provided for Grade 11 EFL learners Triam Udom Suksa School of the South. The participants, enrolled in the English Gifted Program, were considered having relatively high English ability. They were, thus, allowed to have their own choice of learning preference in order to reach the full potential in English writing ability. Peer assessment was the alternative they chose for such purpose.

Research questions

1. Can assessing peer’s writing and being assessed by peer enhance learners’ writing ability?
2. What are the subjects’ attitudes towards assessing peer’s writing and being assessed by peer?

Definition of terms

1. Writing ability means the learners’ ability in writing which is measured by a pre- and post- treatment tests. The writing elements subjected to the measurement include the completeness of content, idea organization, writing mechanism and grammar.

2. Peer writing assessment refers to the process of assessing, revising, editing and changing writing contents, organizing ideas in the writing Maze of peer in accordance with the writing objectives. It includes correcting writing mechanism and grammar features based on the assessment criteria for improving English writing. The process was carried out in groups of three learners based on Maze from the first draft to the final draft to be submitted to the class instructor.

3. Maze refers to the format of short story writing created by the learner. The model adopted the zigzag format for exit in creating story content in which readers have freedom of choosing the route of reading and analyzing the contexts with their own consideration until they manage to ‘get out’ of the story.
Research Methodology

1. Subjects

Specified sampling technique was adopted in recruiting research participants which consisted of 24 grade 11 students enrolled in The English Gifted Program of Triam Udom Suksa School of the South. They were divided into 8 groups of 3 learners based on the pre-test scores. Each group consisted of learners with different language proficiency but similar English writing ability.

2. Instrument

2.1 Lesson plan

Six lesson plans were used to induce the activities for developing learners’ knowledge and ability in assessing peer’s writing and writing development. The lesson plans consisted of: (1) Orientation about Maze map (2) What’s Maze? (3) Maze production (4) What is peer assessment? (5) Peer assessment (6) My Maze. Each lesson plan consisted of 3 main steps: presentation, practice, and production. Subjects learned how to do peer assessment through the 6 lesson plans following the following steps. In lesson plans 1-3, each subject learned about Maze in the form of short story and produced a Maze of his or her own. In lesson plan 4, they learned the peer assessment and editing principles and techniques based on assessment criteria. In lesson plan 5, each subject practiced assessing peer’s work and had peer assess his or her writing. In lesson plan 6, each subject revised his or her own writing according to the feedback from peer and produced the final version of Maze which was supposed to be perfect in terms of contents and language use. The IOC value from the three assigned experts’ quality assessment of the 6 lesson plans was 0.95.

2.2 English writing ability test

An English writing ability test was constructed to measure the subjects’ writing ability, and investigate the effectiveness of peer writing assessment and being assessed by peer in writing skill development. The test consisted of 3 parts. Part 1 tested subjects’ error recognition comprising 30 multiple-choice test items. Each test item had 4 choices required the subjects to identify and correct each error detected. Part 2 was a guided writing test. The subjects were provided with a group of words in jumble manner and required to use the words to write a short story. Part 3 was a free writing test on a topic given by the researcher. The reliability of the pre-and post-test, which was the same test, was 0.91.

2.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was constructed to investigate the learners’ attitudes. The questionnaire consisted of 25 items asking the subject about their attitudes towards assessing peer’s work and their writing being assessed by peer. Also included were open-ended test items allowing the questionnaire respondents to express their attitudes, both positive and negative, towards the assessment process. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.86.
3. Data collection

This quasi-experiment research followed the one group pretest- posttest design was carried out during the 1 semester of the 2010 academic year, as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Data collection procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Instrument / lesson plan</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1-2 (4 hours)</td>
<td>1. Orientation about Maze 2. What’s Maze?</td>
<td>The researcher introduced Maze, the lesson in the form of short story to the subjects. Subjects learned about the details and how to create Maze.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3-5 (4 hours)</td>
<td>3. Maze production</td>
<td>Each subject produced his or her first draft of Maze. The researcher checked the quality of each subject’s Maze considering the language use. The words, phrases, and grammatical errors selected from the subjects’ Mazes were used in writing the pre-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 (2 hours)</td>
<td>Pre-treatment test</td>
<td>The writing ability assessment test was administered as the pretreatment test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6-7 (4 hours)</td>
<td>4. What is peer assessment?</td>
<td>The researcher introduced the process and technique of peer’s writing assessment. The subjects did exercises and practiced peer assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8-14 (14 hours)</td>
<td>5. Peer assessment</td>
<td>Subjects in groups of 3 practiced assessing peer’s writing. The process of assessing, editing and revising was carried out from the first draft until the complete version was achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15 (2 hours)</td>
<td>6. My Maze.</td>
<td>Each participant revised his or her Maze for completeness in terms of both contents and language use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15 (2 hours)</td>
<td>Post-treatment test</td>
<td>The post-test was administered using the writing ability test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15 (1 hour)</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Subjects responded to the questionnaire asking their attitudes towards the implementation of peer assessment in developing learners’ writing ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Data analysis

The scores obtained from administering the pre- and post-tests, which were divided into 4 parts, were converted into 100 % for a more accurate result in the data analysis. The data was then analyzed by performing a set of dependent t-tests to identify the difference between means of the 2 tests. The information about the subjects’ attitudes towards the assessment techniques sought from the questionnaire was first counted from the number of subjects who
responded each test item. Then, it was categorized and analyzed to determine means and standard deviation. Results from the questionnaire were reported in percentages. Below is presented the summary of the results.

1. Implementing peer’s writing assessment and learner being assessed was found significantly increase the subjects’ writing ability, as the statistical analysis shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of the English writing ability test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Total scores</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>D value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 Error Recognition</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57.22</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Correction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Guided Writing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>18.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 Free Writing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scores</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>182.15</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>248.19</td>
<td>48.97</td>
<td>66.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Sig. level at .01

It is shown in Table 2 that the subjects’ mean scores from the post-test of writing ability was higher that of the pretest in all aspects. The t-test performed to identify the result of the subjects’ writing ability development shows that the mean scores of the post-test was statistically higher than that of the pre-test, at .01. When each aspect was considered, it is found that the subjects’ performance in the post-test was higher than that in the pre-test in all aspects. The score on error recognition (in part 1) was 72.22 in the post-test which was 15 higher than that of the pre-test, 57.22. Likewise, the mean score of the post-test on error correction was 48.33, 15.42 higher than that of the pre-test, 32.9. Similarly, a better achievement was found in the post-test on guided writing (in part 2); The post-test score was 62.64, 18.89 higher than that of the pre-test, 43.75. In the same manner, the post-test score on free writing (part 3) was higher than that of the pre-test, 64.99 and 48.26 respectively, 16.73 scores higher. It is notable that the subjects attained a rather good score in both part 2 and 3, which are subjective tests. Below are the data analysis results of part 2 and 3 which are involved with writing elements.

Figures 1-2: The pre-test and post-test scores on writing elements in Guided Writing and Free Writing
Figures 1 and 2 show that the subjects performed better in all writing aspects in the post-test, compared with that of the pre-test, namely the completeness of content, idea organization, writing mechanism, and grammatical structure. Thus, it can be concluded that implementing peer assessment technique in the writing class could satisfactorily improve the learners’ writing ability.

In addition to studying the subjects writing ability development using the writing ability test, the writing quality of the Maze story written before and after the implementation of peer assessment was assessed by the peer and teacher raters (the researcher and 2 native speaker teachers) using the same criteria. The IOC value of all the writing elements was 0.84. In other words, the peer assessment and teacher assessment was relatively similar. Thus, it can be concluded that after practicing peer assessment the learners’ ability in assessing peer’s writing was close to that of the instructor.

2. The subjects had positive attitudes towards the process of assessing peer’s writing and their writing being assessed by peer, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: The learners’ attitudes towards the process of assessing peer’s writing and their writing being assessed by peer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects assessed</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Attitude level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think writing skill is an important skill in learning English.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer assessment helps improve learners’ writing ability as a whole.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My Maze story was better after I have experienced peer assessment process practice.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer assessment helps increase my enthusiasm in writing.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peer assessment makes me more cautious and pay more attention on the details in my own writing.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Peer assessment helps me learn about errors and remember them better.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt relax and not tense when doing peer assessment in group activities with friends.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Learning writing through peer assessment provided me with the new knowledge and points of view of English writing.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would be glad if peer assessment technique is implemented in other courses.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peer assessment helps improve my knowledge about English grammar in writing.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Peer assessment helps improve my ability in organizing ideas and contents in my writing.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I have learned to improve and edit my writing after practicing peer assessment.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Peer assessment helps learners know each other better and become closer friends.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I get me benefits for peer assessment than from the teacher.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am confident that my friends have enough ability to assess my writing.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aspects assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects assessed</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Attitude level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I am confident that I have enough ability to assess my friends’ writing.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I want the friends who have higher ability than me to assess my writing.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I want the friends who have lower ability than me to assess my writing.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. After my writing was assessed by peer, I want my teacher reassess it.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I feel embarrassed when my writing was assessed by peer.</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I felt that the peer kept finding faults in my writing when he or she assessed my writing.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I felt uncomfortable when I had to assess peer’s writing.</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Peer assessment is a boring learning method and wastes of time.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If I can choose, I would choose to have peer assess my writing.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If I can choose, I would choose to have a teacher assess my writing.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

| Average                          | 4.63      | .20  | highest |

*The subjects were required to give reason for the level of each attitude.  
** The statistical value of the negative attitude questions have been adjusted.

It can be concluded from the questionnaire analysis that subjects highly agreed with the implementation of peer assessment in teaching writing ($X = 4.63$). Subjects showed highest agreement with most of the questionnaire items because they have witness the improvement in their writing ability. However, they wanted to have teacher assessment after the peer assessment to enhance their confidence. This attitude reflects the Thai learners’ familiarity with having teachers and their confidence in the teacher.

3. Other findings from the open-ended questions are summarized as follow. All participants unanimously agreed that learning writing made them recognize the errors and learn how to use grammar rules in writing. Learners get closer to their classmates. They learned how to work in groups. They were proud to have produced the Maze story which contained good contents, idea organization, and grammar. They also learned about their own writing ability through their work being assessed by peer. The writing learning process, peer assessment, helped them remember the errors and language rules. It was an interesting learning technique in which better learners had an opportunity to help poorer learners. However, some participants suggested that the technique may cause certain errors in the assessment because the learners have different levels of language ability.

**Discussion**

1. **Language ability**

   Through cooperative working in groups of 3 students, the subjects’ writing ability significantly improved. The improvement included the more accuracy in using grammatical...
elements, completeness of contents, and better idea organization. This can be attributed to the fact that in the process of peer assessment, learners could learn from the peer’s error and make use of them in composing their own work. They also better earned and remember grammatical rules leading to their writing ability improvement writing better with fewer errors. Eventually the number of error decreased to the minimal or none existence. Beaven (1977) argued that learners had ample opportunities to see the errors made in the writing they assessed and made use of such errors in improving their own writing ability. Similarly, Freeman (1987) suggested that learners would try to make use of the errors they encountered while performing peer assessment task to improve their own writing.

2. Attitudes towards the peer assessment practice

Subjects had highly positive attitudes towards the implementation of peer assessment and their writing being assessed by peer for writing ability development. In particular, they stated that the assessing peer benefited the in several aspects. In they could improve their general writing ability. They could also learn to write their own Maze. In addition the assessment technique helped increase their enthusiasm in writing. Ellis (1994) maintained that learners’ attitudes have direct effect on learners’ L2 learning process and achievement. Learners’ positive attitudes were an important learning catalyst because they helped open learners different perspectives towards writing. The learners, thus, feel relax with the learning task they are encountering.

3. Self-directed learning

Subjects were found to have autonomously learned grammatical features after the implementation of peer assessment. Knowles (1980) suggested that autonomous learning is the learning that actually occurs in the situation in which the learners designate his or her own need, objective, learning plan and assessment. This learning mode is truly essential in the present socioeconomic and educational situations. Thus teacher, thus, should encourage the learner to become self-taught learner in order that they can pursue the lifelong learning. In other words, the subjects should be able to recall what they have done in the course of their language learning and realize what they should do to pursue the task in order that they can develop themselves to become autonomous learners.

4. Co-operative learning

I was found that through the peer assessment process the subjects closely cooperated in every step in carrying out the task given. Those considered more proficient were helpful to those poorer classmates. Thus, peer assessment activities in the present study can be assumed to develop the learner’s social and cognitive ability. Vygotsky (1978) argued that in the regular learning situation, learning would occur in the situation where learners have good relationship and each participant helps each other and language input only takes the role of cognitive medium or tool. In addition, Rimes (1983) and Nunan (1999) suggested that cooperative learning motivates learners to write more. It also helps the good and poor learners to learn and develop themselves together in additional to learning how to be co-responsible for and co-operate to achieve the assigned task.
5. Self-confidence

It was found in the present study that, through the process of giving feedback to peer, the subjects became consistently more confident in their language ability. Therefore, they became active learners. The finding supported the finding in Gooden & Jones’ (1996) study. They found that through sharing ideas in carrying out learning activities, the learners could generate more ideas, learn new words, understand the language they were learning, and gain the writing structure. It was also found in the present study that the learners who had asked their teacher almost all the time became increasingly self-reliant. They were observed to make their own decision more often.

6. Other findings

Besides the findings described earlier, it was found that the subjects had different opinions on the language ability of the peer feedback providers who assessed their writing. Ninety percent of the subjects, generally considered as poor learners, wished their writing had been assessed by more proficient learners. They thought that the proficient peer had more integrity and would provide them with correct and more appropriate language input than their own.

On the other hand, 10% of the participants, who were considered having higher language proficiency, wanted their work to be assessed by the learners with lower language proficiency. These proficient learners gave certain interesting and productive perspectives. They believed that those poorer learners would learn more about writing from assessing the work written by better learners. At the same time the poor learners would have chances to read better written work through the peer assessment task.

However, while showing their satisfaction for the assessment process, the subjects showed certain values. They stated they would prefer their work being assessed by the instructor. The response reflected the fact that Thai learners respected and had confidence in their teacher and that were familiar with the assessment practice which were carried out almost totally by the class instructor. They thought that the teacher the teacher were the person who had the knowledge and could give them the right direction for their self improvement. They also believed that the teachers’ judgment correction would help produce better writing.

Suggestions for application

1. Pedagogy application

1.1 In classroom management teachers are advised to provide ample opportunities for students to participate in the learning activities. The learners should be encouraged to learn autonomously. One way to do so is to have learner-centered classroom which is believed to increase learners’ motivation. Learner-centered classroom environment also provides the learners opportunities to discover and strengthen their strong points leading.
They can gradually become autonomous learners and less dependent on the instructor. The learners eventually can achieve a lifelong learning process.

1.2 Peer assessment is beneficial to the classroom instructor. Teachers have to change their role from being a instructor who spends the whole time teaching and grading students’ work to manager and facilitator. Through this instructional model part of the process of evaluation is assigned to the learners. The instructor, thus, will spend less time teaching and giving feedback. As a facilitator, instead they will promote the learning by giving the learners guidelines, instructions and all-kind assistance during the class time.

1.3 Implementing peer assessment technique in the writing classroom can make large class management easier. Generally it is a tedious and burdensome and almost impossible for a teacher to manage a class consisting of 30-50 students efficiently, especially grading writing assignments. With this technique the teachers simply train the learners how to carry out the peer assessment and help them when they need help. The learner will learn how to become autonomous through the practice of peer assessment.

1.4 Attitude is an important factor that can impose effect on the learning achievement. The present study found that the subjects had highly positive attitudes towards peer assessment and being assessed by peer. Thus, it is suggested that classroom teachers incorporate peer assessment in their class, especially in EFL Thai classroom. It has been known that Thai learners have limited writing ability. Generating positive towards learning activities by implementing peer assessment will increase learners’ motivation in learning, and ready to learn more of the language leading to a faster and more effective learning achievement.

2. Suggestions for further study

2.1 Results from the present study show that the subjects had positive attitudes towards the assessment process. The subjects participating in the present study were English-gifted students. Therefore, results from this study should not be generalized. Thus, it is suggested that this assessment technique be implemented to learners of different levels, especially non-gifted learners to determine their attitude towards the technique. It is specially suggested the technique be introduced to elementary classroom. The earlier the learners experience the learning process they have positive attitude towards, the better chance we have to enhance language learning development.

2.2 As stated earlier, Thai EFL learners are known to have limited writing ability. The results on effectiveness of the peer assessment found in the present study were deduced from a group of gifted-learners. Thus, future research should be conducted with regular students in order to find out the effectiveness of this assessment technique.

2.3 The writing model employed in the present study was Maze story. Therefore, it is suggested that peer assessment be implement in writing class using other genres, including narrative and exposition, based on the learner’s level.

2.4 Peer assessment in the present study was implemented in the writing class. It is, thus, suggested that the technique be incorporated into the teaching of other language skills, such as reading and speaking.
2.5 Another research aspect worth investigating can be a qualitative study on the accuracy of the correction the learners gave to their peer. The study may cover both the aspects the learners are able to correct and those they fail to do themselves.
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What is a maze?

It is a problem situation you try to work your way out of. Each maze starts by posing a problem and offers several choices of action, each of which is numbered. You must select one of these choices and turn to the numbered section, where you learn the consequences of your choice. Once again you are faced with further choices, all of which lead you on to other sections of the maze. The order in which you go through the maze depends on the choices you make at each stage. You may go through all the sections or only some of them. The object is to try and get out of the maze if you can.

อ้างอิงจาก "Maze : A Problem-Solving Reader by Berrer, M and Rinvolucri, M"
What is a maze?

You can start developing your own maze by writing a very clear opening section, demonstrating a clear situation seen from the specific point of view of one of the main character. It is not clear in the opening, it is difficult to go further. From this opening section you should think up of at least three choices, for action to start off. Then write the section that go with these choices, showing the consequences of that choice and the next set of choices following.

Tree diagram for Hitchhiking Maze in "Maze : A Problem-Solving Reader by Berrer, M and Rinvolumcri, M"
You are the prime minister of a small country that only became independent a few years ago. You are economically dependent on Imperia, super power, which provides you with much of the aid you need.

One of your main political problems is that a large number of people in your country feel that you have taken their land and made them feel slaves. These people have their own culture and religion and feel separate from you and the rest of the people in the country.

Suddenly one morning you are informed that a group of armed hijackers have taken over a plane flying from your capital to the capital of Smogland, a powerful, industrial nation. The hijackers say they represent the struggle of your internal enemies, the people in your country who are fighting for independence. The hijacked plane there are one hundred of your nationals, fifty people from Smogland and a further fifty people from various other countries.

■ Go to 2.
You wait anxiously all day for more news of the hijacked plane. At six in the evening you are told the plane. At six the evening you are told the pane landed in Lombia, 2000 kilometres from your country. Several years ago your army trained the Lombia army. You suspect the government of Lombia now supports your internal enemies. At nine p.m. a message comes through from the hijackers demanding that you negotiate with them. What are you going to do?

- **Refuse to negotiate under duress.** Go to 18.
- **Tell Smogland that, since the plane is theirs, they should take responsibility for negotiating with the hijackers.** Go to 7.
- **Ask a friendly country’s ambassador in Lombia to negotiate with the hijackers on your behalf.** Go to 4.
- **Ask your cabinet if you can send a former minister to Lombia for secret minister to Lombia for secret talks with the Lombian President. This ex-minister used to be a friend of the President.** Go to 11.