WRITING EVALUATION: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF ANALYTIC, LEXICAL AND SYNTACTIC SCORES

A MASTER'S PROJECT

BY

ATCHARA MANOONYO

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master of Arts degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

May 2007

WRITING EVALUATION: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF ANALYTIC, LEXICAL AND SYNTACTIC SCORES

AN ABSTRACT

BY

ATCHARA MANOONYO

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master of Arts degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

May 2007

Atchara Manoonyo. (2007). *Writing Evaluation: A Correlational Study of Analytic, Lexical, and Syntactic Scores.* Master's project, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University. Advisory Committee: Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong, Assistant Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup, Mr. Peter Fayers.

The main purpose of the research was to study if there was any correlation between scores obtained from analytic scoring and the actual amount of academic words as well as the number of error-free t-units found in students' essays. Eighteen essays written by English majors at a state university were rated by two qualified raters. Then the analytic scores were correlated with the amount of academic words analyzed by the computer program VocabProfile. After that the analytic score was correlated to the number of error-free t-units in the students' essays. The results revealed that there were no significant correlations between the analytic score and the amount of academic words. Neither was there any correlation between the analytic score and the number of error-free t-units.

การประเมินการเขียน : การศึกษาเชิงสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผลคะแนนจากการประเมินแบบวิเคราะห์, คำศัพท์ และไวยากรณ์

บทคัดย่อ

ของ

อัจฉรา มนุญโย

เสนอต่อบัณฑิตวิทยาลัยมหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษา
ตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต สาขา วิชาภาษาอังกฤษ
พฤษภาคม 2550

อัจฉรา มนุญโย. (2550). *การประเมินการเขียน : การศึกษาเชิงสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผลคะแนนจากการประเมินแบบวิเคราะห์, คำศัพท์ และไวยากรณ์.* สารนิพนธ์ ศศ.ม. (ภาษาอังกฤษ). กรุงเทพฯ: บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ.

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาสารนิพนธ์ : ผศ. ดร. ทิพา เทพอัครพงศ์

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อหาความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคะแนนที่ได้รับการประเมิน โดยใช้การประเมินแบบวิเคราะห์กับจำนวนคำศัพท์วิชาการ และจำนวนของ error-free t-units ที่ปรากฏอยู่ในเรียงความของนิสิตมหาวิทยาลัย ขั้นตอนในการศึกษานี้อาศัยผู้ประเมินที่มีความเชี่ยวชาญ 2 คน ประเมินการเขียนเรียงความของนิสิต เอกภาษาอังกฤษ 18 คน จากนั้นนำคะแนนที่ประเมินได้มาหาความสัมพันธ์กับจำนวนคำศัพท์วิชาการที่ได้จากโปรแกรม VocabProfile และจำนวน error-free t-units ในเรียงความของนิสิต ผลของการศึกษาพบว่าไม่มีความสัมพันธ์สำคัญระหว่างคะแนนที่ได้รับการประเมินแบบวิเคราะห์กับจำนวนคำศัพท์วิชาการ และไม่มีความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคะแนนที่ได้รับการประเมินแบบวิเคราะห์กับจำนวนของ error-free t-units

WRITING EVALUATION: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF ANALYTIC, LEXICAL AND SYNTACTIC SCORES

A MASTER'S PROJECT

BY

ATCHARA MANOONYO

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master of Arts degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

May 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to all who sincerely motivated me while conducting this study.

First of all, I am really grateful to my beloved parents, Mr. Khoon and Mrs. Prapasri, and my brothers for their unfailing love and encouragement, which have contributed to the accomplishment of this master's project.

I wish to claim that this study has been possible through the enormous and constant assistance and inspiration given to me by my advisor, Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Akrapong. She has dedicated her valuable time, excellent suggestions, professional guidance and high patience to me. Her devotion is profoundly kept in my mind forever.

My sincere thanks are expressed to my readers, Assistant Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup and Mr. Peter Fayers for their advice and kindness. I would also like to express my gratitude to my composition raters, Ajarn Pranee Thanachanan and Ajarn Nantana Thong-Inkam, who gave me encouragement, useful suggestions, and kindness.

I also would like to thank Assistant Professor Dr. Nareerat Rakvijitkul, Mrs. Nipa Sripairot, and Mrs. Patcharee Prommak for their statistical suggestions.

My special thanks are dedicated to Dr. Paul Nation for providing me the software program, the VocabProfile and all researchers who studied and gave the idea of error-free t-units.

Finally, my special thanks should be expressed to the informants of this study, and especially Nattawadee Boonsiri and Nannapat Sriwalai, who encouraged me sincerely.

Atchara Manoonyo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

1 INTRODUCTION……..……..1

Introduction…….…….….1

Objectives of the study…….3

Significance of the study……..3

Scope of the study……3

Definition of terms……...4

2 REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE…….8

Writing Assessment…….8

Holistic and Analytic Scorings…….....9

Related Studies of Vocabulary and Grammar Evaluation……..14

3 METHODOLOGY……....17

Accumulation of Data…….17

Data Analysis……..17

4 FINDINGS…….……..20

5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION……..31

Summary of the Study…….....31

Results…….……...31

Discussion……..32

Application…….33

Suggestions for Further Studies…….……33

REFERENCES…….....35

APPENDICES…….……...…….39

VITAE…….52

LIST OF TABLES

Table **Page**

1 The coefficient inter raters' reliability of the total analytic score rated by two raters……..……..……...…21

2 The means of the raters' total scores…….……...22

3 The total of academic words in each informant's composition…….…..23

4 The correlation of the total score and academic vocabulary size …….....24

5 The coefficient inter raters' reliability of the analytic score in the vocabulary section……...……...24

6 The means of the score in the vocabulary section…….……..25

7 The correlation of the analytic score in the vocabulary section against the number of the academic vocabulary……...…….…….26

8 The amount of error-free t-units of each student……27

9 The correlation of the total analytic score against the amount of error-free t-units……..……28

10 The coefficient inter raters' reliability of the analytic score in the language use section……..……...28

11 The means of the analytic score in the language use section…..……..……29

12 The correlation of the analytic score in the language use section against the number of error-free t-units……...…….....30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In writing evaluation, two practices have been adopted by most teachers: holistic and analytic scoring because they are easy to use. In a holistic scale, the teacher rates the writing as a whole. In an analytic scale, the teacher has a kind of rubric which gives guidelines to rate each component of the writing. For example, in ESL Composition Profile, an analytic scale, (Jacobs et al., cited in Reid, 1993: 236), the content weighs 30 points; the organization, 20 points; vocabulary, 20 points; language use, 25 points; and mechanics, 5 points. However, these two kinds of writing evaluation are based on an individual teacher's experience and preferences. For example, in holistic scoring, a paper may be considered a good one if the teacher thinks it meets all his/her criteria. However, the very same paper may be failed if another teacher thinks that the student writer has misinterpreted the writing prompt. In analytic scoring, the range of scores in one component is wide. Potentially, the rater can give a particular section from zero to the highest point. In other words, in holistic and analytic scoring, there is still a lot of room for individual teachers' subjectivity.

Nowadays, with extensive writing research, there are objective measurements for some linguistic aspects in writing. For example, the size of vocabulary used in a student composition can be measured by the computer program VocabProfile developed by Nation (1995). The program is usually served on the Internet. It is designed to count the frequency of general and academic vocabulary used in a text as users type any texts in the program. In terms of syntactic measurement, Gaies (1980)

offers the use of error free t-units, which refer to simple and complex sentences without grammatical errors. In fact the numbers of academic words and error-free t-units in a student paper should be strong indicators of writing quality. However, it is time-consuming for the teacher to count the words and error-free t-units used in a student paper in each writing evaluation.

In fact, teachers need some assurance that a simple scale such as analytic and holistic is objective and thus reliable. If we can prove that the score obtained from either scoring scale has a positive correlation with the numbers of academic words and error-free t-units in a student text, it will substantially help the writing teachers to be able to evaluate students' writings more objectively. If, however, the correlation is negative, we can pinpoint what problem should be addressed to improve the quality of the whole scoring process. In this current research, analytic scoring has been selected. It is divided into components such as content, organization, vocabulary and grammar. As such, the correlation of the score of the vocabulary in the analytic score can be correlated to the number of academic words found in the VocabProfile computer program. Likewise, the number of error-free t-units can be correlated to the sub-score of grammar in the analytic scoring tool.

Therefore, in the current research, the researcher took up to study if the score obtained from analytic scoring would correlate with the numbers of academic words and with the number of error-free t-units found in the student texts. The benefits of the research would be to improve the quality of writing assessments.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the research were as follows:

1. To see if there is a correlation of the analytic score obtained from the raters and the academic vocabulary size found in the students' texts. The correlation will be done at two levels: the total score against the number of the vocabulary size in the students' papers and the score in the vocabulary section in the analytic scale with the vocabulary size found.

2. To see if there is a correlation of the analytic score obtained from the raters and the number of error free t-units. Again, the correlation will be done at two levels: the total score obtained from the raters against the number of error-free t-units and the score in the language use section against the number of error-free t-units in the student text.

Significance of the Study

The research results will be beneficial as follows:

1. The study will be useful for researchers who would like to find or apply any instrument for assessing the students' writings effectively.

2. It can be used in the classroom to evaluate the students' writing more effectively.

3. It can be used to improve the quality of analytic scales.

Scope of the Study

Eighteen essays written by Srinakharinwirot University second-year English majors of the academic year 2005 were included. Errors and other mistakes done by the students were not corrected.

Definition of Terms

The following are some terms used in the study.

1. Word token

The first appearance of a word in each essay is counted as one word token. For instance, “Standard deviation is a statistic that summarizes the average amount of difference from the mean in any given data set” (Bailey, 1998: 99). There are 20 word tokens.

2. Word type

The appearance of a repeated word is counted as one word type. For example, *standard, deviation, is, a, statistic, that, summarizes, the, average, amount, of, difference, from, the, mean, in, any, given, data, set.* One word: *the* appears two times. Therefore, there are nineteen word types.

3. Word family

A word family can be defined as a headword. Although a derived form of a headword occurs, a word family can be counted as one. For instance, *ignore, ignores, ignored, ignorant, and ignorance* are counted as one word family with headword *ignore*.

4. Vocabulary size

The words found in the informants’ compositions are shown as vocabulary size. The vocabulary size in the computer program VocabProfile is divided into two categories. The first one includes word tokens, word types, and word families. The second one includes BaseList One, Two, Three, and Four. The amount of words is shown in the two categories.

5. VocabProfile program

A software program developed by Nation (1995) was employed in the study.

Words in separated types are included in the first, second, and third lists (henceforth BaseList One, Two, and Three, respectively). The program also performs words from the compositions and the amount of words on the four baselists explained as follows:

5.1 The first baselist is called BaseList One including the 1,000 most frequently used words of English such as *a, acceptability, addition, and, are,* and *around.*

5.2 The second baselist is called BaseList Two including the next 1,000 frequently used words such as *behave, parents, suitable,* and *suits.*

5.3 The third baselist is called BaseList Three including the academic word used in the upper secondary and university texts. Besides, these words are not in the first 2,000 words. For example, *adjust, conclude, consume, enables, environment, media,* and *trend* (see Appendix D).

5.4 The fourth baselist is called BaseList Four including the words which are not in the three aforementioned lists. Word tokens and word types except word families are included in this list.

6. T-unit

The t-unit is employed to measure syntactic developments of the written samples. A t-unit is defined as one independent clause and all its dependent clauses.

Example: She stays at home./

(1 t-unit)

She stays at home,/ but her husband goes outside./

(1 t-unit) (1 t-unit)

In defining error-free t-units, the following are some examples taken from the students' texts.

a. Spelling

Example: Sometime I asked teachers to cancle classes.

(1 error-free t-unit)

b. Nouns

Example: Changing of behavior may occur some part of time in our life.

(1 error-free t-unit)

c. Punctuation

Example: I loved to be alone in my own room with out my mother's noise.

(1 error-free t-unit)

d. Prepositions

Example: People need love, care, and communication with people.

(1 error-free t-unit)

e. Articles

Example: You still do it at first period.

(1 error-free t-unit)

To sum up, chapter one consists of research objectives, significance and scope of the study, and definition of terms. In the objectives, the study was analyzed if there was a correlation of the analytic score and the academic vocabulary size. Besides, another objective was to see whether there was a correlation of the analytic score and the number of error-free t-units. The study is significant for teachers and researchers in the sense of applying qualified writing evaluation instrument suitably. In the scope of the study, 18 essays of the students were studied. Then, word token, word type,

word family, vocabulary size, VocabProfile program, and t-unit were defined in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is involved with an overview of three topics: writing assessment, holistic and analytic scorings. Then related studies of vocabulary and grammar evaluation are presented.

Writing Assessment

In assessing writing, two major kinds of writing assessment are consistently developed. There are grammatical tests and essay tests.

Grammatical tests were employed in assessing writing approximately from 1950 to 1970. Writing had an obvious objective, as it was used to identify if the students were required to take a pre-college writing course. At that time it was designed to be a multiple choice test in grammar, usage, and punctuation. The test was very widely used because it was cheap and reliable for teachers and administrators (Clark, 2003: 200). Nevertheless, the test became problematic since it did not actually measure if students had abilities to write essays well.

Then, from about 1970 to 1986 the writing assessment was changed to an essay test. The test was more valid and reliable to use for writing evaluation as it was provided to measure the proficiency of writing more than to see if there were grammatical errors. However, this kind of assessment cannot evaluate the writing process efficiently; therefore, portfolio assessment has been used to evaluate students' writing process (Weigle, 2002: 230).

Later, writing assessment began to change into program assessment called programmatic assessment. The aim of this kind of assessment is to measure whether students have developed their writings from a particular program.

Recently, the writing assessment has been dependent on each institution. Some continue to use a grammar test as a part of an exit examination, and others employ the holistic score of the students' essays, writings done through portfolios in terms of portfolio assessment, and programmatic assessment (Clark, 2003: 201).

From students' grammar tests, teachers cannot know students writing abilities but only their amount of grammatical errors. In the students' portfolios, teachers can find the writing process of their students. In programmatic assessment, the objective is dependent on each institution. However, essay assessment is still significant because it has to be evaluated before portfolio and programmatic assessments. In the students' essay tests, in order to measure the proficiency of the student writers' writings, there are two main ways of scoring: holistic and analytic scorings.

Holistic and Analytic Scorings

Holistic and analytic scorings are useful in evaluating students' writings; nevertheless, both have different purposes (Reid, 1993: 235).

Holistic scoring can be used to assess the overall competence of writing. Teachers or evaluators who are trained to assess writings have to read and rate the writing based on the criteria of the scoring guide. In holistic scoring, each component has a judgment which has fewer details of criteria than in analytic scoring. In order to rate essays with a short time, a single scale is provided to consider the whole writing quality of writers.

An instance of holistic scoring is Test of Written English (TWE) scoring guide consisting of the rated score, 1-6; demonstrating incompetence in writing, 1 point; suggests incompetence in writing, 2 points; demonstrates some developing competence in writing, 3 points; demonstrates minimal competence in writing, 4 points; demonstrates competence in writing, 5 points; and demonstrates good competence in writing, 6 points.

Each scale has some broad explanations about scoring for raters. It is one of the most popular ESL holistic scoring methods (Reid, 1993: 239). This kind of scoring is useful for raters who require the least time in evaluating large numbers of papers as Clark (2003: 215) explained, "holistic scoring requires readers who read quickly, seeing the whole essay as greater than the sum of its parts."

Analytic scoring is obviously different from holistic scoring because it is designed to assess various components of students' essays separately. The separated factors include criteria based on different scales (Brookhart, cited in Moskal, 1999: 5). A numerical weight in each criterion is given with an appropriate range and informative details such as 30-27 referring to excellent to very good in content component. The detail of excellent to very good is explained in such a way that writings must be knowledgeable, substantive through the development of thesis and relevant to assigned topic. In another example, 16-22 refers to good to average in the content component. Any raters who evaluate within the range, have to consider if the writings consist of some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, and mostly relevant to the topic but lack details. An example of analytical scoring is ESL Composition Profile by Jacobs, Zingraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Hughey 1981 (Reid, 1993: 235). The profile has five independent sections including content, 30 points, organization, 20 points, vocabulary, 20 points, language use, 25

points, and mechanics, 5 points. In each component, there are four different scales with clear explanations provided from the highest to the lowest points. Moskal (2000: 5), points out the advantage of this scoring that the analytic scoring rubrics can make the writers have more proficiency and improve their compositions in the future.

According to the ESL Composition Profile by Jacob et al. (1981), the five separated components are obviously weighted. There are vocabulary and language use which are important in writing evaluation because the two main parts appear in other analytic scales. For example, Iowa Writing Assessment analytic scoring covers four trait scores: idea/ content, organization, voice, and conventions. The convention section is provided to assess vocabulary and grammar similarly to vocabulary and grammar sections in the ESL Composition Profile. The influence of vocabulary and grammar included in the two analytic scorings indicates that they are significant objective measurements used to assess students' writings.

In summary, holistic and analytic scorings are different in many ways such as the criteria, purposes, advantages, and time consuming for rating. Nevertheless, both of them are similar in one way; they are designed for raters. For this reason, they can be subjective instruments for writing assessment; therefore, there are two ways of measurements which can be used to evaluate students' writings without subjectivity, a vocabulary program and error-free t-units.

1. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is very important for students in writing because it comes from the students' thinking process. Regarding vocabulary assessment, Schmitt (2000: 163) showed that vocabulary is naturally assessed as it is an important component of language knowledge. In this section, three kinds of vocabulary tests and vocabulary size measurements are reviewed.

Vocabulary assessment must be done in a test with several specific purposes. First of all, three kinds of vocabulary tests and the most frequently used purpose are given. An achievement test is given to evaluate expected outcomes of students' vocabulary, whereas a placement test is provided for helping students to be in the proper level. Moreover, partly commercial proficiency tests such as TOEFL and TWL are provided to test students' vocabulary size (Schmitt, 2000: 164). In general, the most widely used purpose of testing is involved with students' vocabulary size which can be done by frequency count.

Generally, the vocabulary section is based on the amount of effective or academic words scored by evaluators. In order to make the vocabulary measurement more reliable, the two objective ways of vocabulary size measurement are “sampling from a dictionary” and “a frequency list from a corpus” suggested by Nation (2001: 363). In the first method, a dictionary containing all the words is selected, and a representative sample of words from the dictionary is taken to test the students. Another method which is preferrable is a vocabulary test. It is arranged into groups based on frequency. West (cited in Coxhead, 1953: 213) employed this way and classified words into a group called *General Service List*. The word group was developed to provide words concerning their 2,000 highly frequent occurrences. In 1984, Xue and Nation studied and grouped words at the academic level called *The University Word List* (UWL). Later, in 1995 the computer program VocabProfile developed by Nation was employed to find levels of writers’ vocabulary. This program is very useful because it is designed to perform an analysis of words in any input text on the basis of frequency. It groups words into four baselists. Each baselist contains word families, word types, and word tokens.

According to Baselist One and Two, the words are from *A General Service List of English Words (GSL)* by West (cited in Coxhead, 1953: 213). In Baselist Three, the words are provided by *The University Word List* (Xue and Nation, 1984), which is significant to find the amount of academic vocabulary. Xue and Nation's *The University Word List* complies the academic word list on English written academic corpus including various subject areas. The word selection is based on range, frequency, and uniformity.

In conclusion, in students' writings, vocabulary is very important; therefore, there are several kinds of vocabulary assessment invented. However, the assessments are divided into two major types. They are vocabulary tests and vocabulary size measurements. All of them are objective and can be undertaken with a specific purpose. Read (2000: 75-76) also gave a brief idea of vocabulary assessment that the assessment is objective. The vocabulary test is scored without any scorers' consideration.

2. Grammar

The grammar or language use section can be rated on the amount of apparent errors found by the raters. Another way to make the assessment more objective is involved with the amount of error free t-units. It is conducted by counting error-free t-units in written texts. The high proficiency of grammar in writing is indicated by the high number of error-free t-units. There are studies of some researchers who employed t-units as a tool for counting errors in the students' texts.

In Polio (1997: 113-14), Ishikarwa, Casanave, Carlisle, and Robb, Ross and Shortreed have applied the t-unit as a tool for measuring the accuracy of their samples in teaching syntax. Then Polio (1997: 130) concluded in the study that "both error-free t-units and error counts were more reliable measures for the range of proficiency

examined here" in the purpose of offering measurements of linguistic accuracy. Similarly, Gaies (1980: 59) studied t-unit analysis in second language research and concluded, "It provides another lens, so to speak through which relevant empirical data can be usefully viewed, while it is a tool of which second language researchers should be aware."

Related Studies of Vocabulary and Grammar Evaluation

There are many researchers who have studied students' lexicon and syntax both in Thailand and in other countries.

Tharvarayus (2005) conducted research to analyze the amount of vocabulary employed and morphological errors found in 40 second-year and 40 third-year English major students' compositions. In the study, the software program VocabProfile was used to group words by frequency. The findings revealed that there were statistically significant discrepancies involving the vocabulary size and morphological errors calculated by *t*-test. The number of third-year students' vocabulary was higher than the second-year students' in BaseList 2 and 3. Both groups of the informants used 54.05% of the words in Base List One and had 39.31% of all classifications of errors in incorrect derivational suffixes. The third-year students' morphological errors were fewer than the second-year students'

Sujan (2000) conducted research to analyze vocabulary size and lexical errors in Rajabhat Institute Mahasarakham English majors' writings and to find the students' vocabulary development through the vocabulary size and lexical errors. One hundred and forty-six of first to fourth-year English major students' compositions were analyzed. Twenty representative samples of each level were analyzed by using the computer program VocabProfile. Then 40 essays from each level were randomly

chosen to study lexical errors based on the statistics ANOVA. The results revealed that the most used words of the students were in BaseList One while the words employed in BaseList Two, BaseList Three, and BaseList Four were much fewer than those in BaseList One. In lexical errors, errors in the use of the tense were the most highly found at 31.7 % followed by meaning errors 21.4 %, part of speech errors 17.7 %, errors of extra/ omitted words 5.9 %, and collocational errors 5.8 %. From the study, there was vocabulary development produced by the fourth-year students.

In 2000, Abdulsata conducted research to analyze errors at sentential and word levels in Srinakharinwirot University second-year English major students' writings focusing on the frequency of error types of two levels. The findings revealed that the most frequently made type of sentential errors was relative clause 19.68 % followed by the tense 15.74 %, singular and plural nouns 12.73 %, punctuation 8.04 %, subject-verb agreement 5.77 %, and fragments and run-ons 3.43 %. At the word level the most frequently made type was article 10.54 %, preposition 9.69 %, diction 8.66 %, and adjective 6.56 %. The author recommended that some typological differences between Thai and English were significant to explain the students' errors.

In other countries, three studies are reviewed.

Morris (2001) studied the use of vocabulary profiles in predicting the academic and pedagogic success of TESL trainees in a teacher training program. The vocabulary profile developed by Cobb (cited in Morris, 1999) was employed for 140 Canadian TESL trainees. The trainees had different ages and linguistic backgrounds but had a native spoken English background. They were asked to undertake a 500-word argumentative essay. For each text, the percentage of words was given for the first 1,000, the second 1,000, and the Academic Word List (AWL) was correlated with the off-list type. The findings revealed significant correlations. There was a

negative correlation of the first 1,000 category and academic performance in the training program. Besides, a positive correlation of Academic Word List (AWL) and the off-list category was shown.

Sotillo (2000) studied discourse functions and syntactic complexity in ESL learners through synchronous and asynchronous communication. She also employed error free t-units to investigate the students' syntactic complexity. The findings revealed that the syntactic complexity of students who were not in a synchronous discussion was more complicated than in synchronous discussion because the students had many more opportunities to produce more complex syntax.

Teemant (1988) conducted research to study lexical errors found in ESL compositions. The results revealed that errors in extra and omitted words, collocational, syntactic, or tense were found at 49.8 %. Orthographic errors were found at 25.6 % followed by errors in meaning 24.9 %.

To sum up, the development of writing assessment indicates that there are methods of writing evaluation. All of them are significant; however, the most important way of writing assessment is rating essays. Nowadays, there are subjective and objective ways of scoring essays. The subjective way consists of holistic and analytic scorings. The objective way is employing tests and frequency for vocabulary and grammar assessments. Nevertheless, in order to improve the writing quality of students, many researchers studies several cases. In terms of errors, kinds of errors in syntax and lexicon were studied. In terms of size, vocabulary size and syntactic complexity were studied.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, there are two main parts including accumulation of data and data analysis. In the first part, the informants' information, and the process of collecting data are represented. Then the process to analyze the data and the study instrument, the VocabProfile program, are described in the second part.

1. Accumulation of data

The informants of this study were 18 second-year English majors at Srinakharinwirot University who took Composition I (EN 331) in the second semester of the academic year 2005. On February 23rd 2006, the students were assigned to write a 200-word essay on the topic "Changes of Behavior" for their final examination. The writing lasted three hours, and the students were allowed to use dictionaries.

2. Data Analysis

There were four main correlations related in this study.

a) The correlation of the total score in the analytic scale and the amount of academic vocabulary.

b) The correlation of the total score in vocabulary section in the analytic scale and the academic vocabulary size.

c) The correlation of the total analytic score and the number of error-free t-units.

d) The correlation of the score in analytic language use section and the number of error-free t-units.

All the four correlations have more informative processes as follows:

1. In terms of overall writing ability, all 18 students' compositions were assigned to two qualified Thai raters who were English teachers. The raters were asked to use analytic scoring ESL Composition Profile (see Appendix A). The raters' scores were calculated to find their coefficient inter raters' reliability using Product Moment Correlation. Then the score of each student rated by rater 1 and 2 were calculated for means using the formula:

$$\text{Means} = \frac{\text{The total score of rater 1} + \text{The total score of rater 2}}{2}$$

2. In order to investigate the overall academic vocabulary ability in the students' compositions, the computer program VocabProfile was used. The amount of word tokens shown in Base List Three would reveal the amount of academic vocabulary used by the students.

3. The means of the scores of each student rated by rater 1 and rater 2 were correlated with all students' academic vocabulary size.

4. To find the correlation of the score in the vocabulary section against the academic vocabulary size, the scores in the vocabulary section of each student rated by rater 1 and rater 2 were calculated to find their coefficient inter raters' reliability using Product Moment Correlation, and means. Then, the means of each student in the vocabulary section was correlated with the students' academic vocabulary size. The means is calculated by this formula.

$$\text{Means} = \frac{\text{The score in the vocabulary section of rater 1} + \text{rater 2}}{2}$$

5. In terms of syntax, the means of the total score of each student was correlated with the number of error-free t-units in the students' texts.

6. To find the correlation of the score in the analytic language use section against the amount of error-free t-units, the scores of the two raters were used to find the coefficient inter raters' reliability using Product Moment Correlation. Then the scores were calculated to find means. Then, the means of each student was correlated with the number of error-free t-units. The formula to find the means was provided as follows:

$$\text{Means} = \frac{\text{The score in the language use section of rater 1} + \text{rater 2}}{2}$$

Then the means was used to correlate with the number of error-free t-units.

In brief, in this chapter, the methodology has been presented. The data were taken from 18 English majors. Then four correlations of the total score in the analytic scale was correlated with the amount of academic words in the students' texts. After that the analytic score in the vocabulary section was correlated with the number of error-free t-units in the students' texts. Finally, the score in the analytic language use section was correlated with the number of error-free t-units in the students' writing.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the research findings are divided into four main parts as follows:

1. The correlation of the total analytic score against the amount of academic vocabulary size in the students' texts.

2. The correlation of the analytic score in the vocabulary section against the number of the academic vocabulary in the students' writing.

3. The correlation of the total analytic score against the amount of error-free t-units in the students' texts.

4. The correlation of the analytic score in the language use section against the number of error-free t-units in the students' texts.

Moreover, the findings are tabulated and some explanations of the above correlations are provided.

1. The Correlation of the Total Analytic Score against the Amount of Academic Vocabulary Size

The illustration of coefficient inter raters' reliability of the total score rated by two raters is shown in Table 1. The total score of the students' writing and academic vocabulary size are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Table 4 displays the correlation of the total analytic score against the amount of academic vocabulary in the students' texts.

Table 1 The Coefficient Inter Raters' Reliability of the Total Analytic Score Rated by the Two Raters

Coefficient inter raters' reliability	N	Rater 1	Rater 2	Sig.
Rater 1	18	1	0.87**	.01
Rater 2	18	0.87**	1	.01

** r < .01

The total score of the students rated by the two raters was used to find their coefficient inter raters' reliability. The result was 0.87. It was significant at .01 level indicating that the two raters' marking was good and reliable.

To examine the correlation of the total analytic score against the amount of academic vocabulary, the means of the raters' scores were calculated. The score is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 The Means of the Raters' Total Analytic Scores

Student	Rater 1 (100)	Rater 2 (100)	Means
1	87	87	87
2	84	84	84
3	76	73	74.5
4	86	83	84.5
5	78	72	75
6	74	75	74.5
7	72	74	73
8	85	85	85
9	89	81	85
10	82	80	81
11	72	74	73
12	77	74	75.5
13	69	69	69
14	81	78	79.5
15	78	76	77
16	80	76	78
17	80	78	79
18	77	72	74.5

It can be seen from Table 2 that the total analytic scores of the students ranged from 69 to 87. Most students' scores were between 70 and 79. Only six of them obtained 80 to 89 points, and the rest received 69 points.

The amount of word tokens shown in Base List Three reveals the amount of academic vocabulary of the students as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 The Total of Academic Words in Each Informant's Composition

Student	Number of academic words
1	10
2	11
3	4
4	14
5	6
6	2
7	10
8	4
9	5
10	2
11	4
12	3
13	9
14	3
15	16
16	10
17	7
18	1

According to Table 3, the amount of academic words ranged from 1 to 16. Most of the students had one to eight words. Seven students had nine to 16 words.

Table 4 The Correlation of the Total Score and the Academic Vocabulary Size

	N	The total score	Academic vocabulary size
The total score	18	1	0.20
Academic vocabulary size	18	0.20	1

r > .01

The correlation between the total analytic score and the amount of academic words was at 0.2 showing that the high writing proficiency of the students rated by the raters did not correlate with the high ability of using academic words.

2. The Correlation of the Analytic Score in the Vocabulary Section against the Number of the Academic Vocabulary

In this section, the coefficient inter raters' reliability of the students' analytic score in the vocabulary section is shown in Table 5. Table 6 reveals the means of the rater's score. Table 7 shows the correlation of the score in the vocabulary section and the amount of academic vocabulary.

The score of the students in the vocabulary section rated by the two raters was used to find their coefficient inter raters' reliability.

Table 5 The Coefficient Inter raters' Reliability of the Analytic Score in the Vocabulary Section

Coefficient inter raters' reliability	N	Rater 1	Rater 2	Sig.
Rater 1	18	1	0.85**	.01
Rater 2	18	0.85**	1	.01

** r < .01

The result was 0.85. It was significant at .01 level showing that the two raters' marking was reliable; therefore, the scores of the two raters were calculated to find means. The result is presented in Table 6.

Table 6 The Means of the Score in the Vocabulary Section

Student	Rater 1 (20)	Rater 2 (20)	Means
1	16	17	16.5
2	14	16	15
3	14	14	14
4	15	15	15
5	14	14	14
6	14	14	14
7	14	13	13.5
8	17	17	17
9	16	17	16.5
10	14	14	14
11	14	14	14
12	14	13	13.5
13	15	14	14.5
14	17	16	16.5
15	13	13	13
16	13	13	13
17	14	14	14
18	13	13	13

From Table 6, the score ranged between 13 to 17 points. Among all 18 students, five of them obtained 13 to 13.5 points. Seven students received 14 to 14.5 points. There were six students who obtained 15 to 17 points.

Table 7 The Correlation of the Analytic Score in the Vocabulary Section against the Number of the Academic Vocabulary

	N	The total score	Academic vocabulary size
The total score	18	1	-.077
Academic vocabulary size	18	-.077	1

r > .01

The result of the correlation was -.077. The negative correlation shows that the number of academic vocabulary of the students was not correlated with the students' scores in the vocabulary section. It can be said that the total score in the vocabulary section of each student was rather high while the amount of academic words was rather low (see Tables 3 and 6).

3. The Correlation of the Analytic Total Score against the Amount of Error-Free T-Units

In this section, the amount of error-free t-units is shown in Table 8. The total analytic score and the amount of error-free t-units were calculated to find correlation presented in Table 9.

Table 8 The Amount of Error-Free T-Units of Each Student

Student	Number of error-free t-units
1	20
2	23
3	26
4	19
5	16
6	32
7	14
8	18
9	27
10	15
11	12
12	9
13	24
14	12
15	11
16	14
17	14
18	17

Table 9 The Correlation of the Total Analytic Score with the Amount of Error-Free T-Units

	N	The total score	The amount of error-free t-units
The total score	18	1	.098
The amount of error-free t-units	18	.098	1

r > .01

The result of the correlation was .098. It indicates that the amount of error-free t-units was not correlated with the total analytic score.

4. The Correlation of the Analytic Score in the Language Use Section with the Number of Error-Free T-Units

The score of the students in the language use section rated by the two raters was employed to investigate their coefficient inter raters' reliability.

Table 10 The Coefficient Inter raters' Reliability of the Analytic Score in the Language Use Section

Coefficient inter raters' reliability	N	Rater 1	Rater 2	Sig.
Rater 1	18	1	0.72**	.01
Rater 2	18	0.72**	1	.01

** r < .01

The result was 0.72 indicating that the two raters' marking was reliable. Then the scores of the two raters were calculated to find means. The result is presented in Table 11.

Table 11 The Means of the Analytic Score in the Language Use Section

Student	Rater 1 (25)	Rater 2 (25)	Means
1	19	20	19.5
2	21	18	19.5
3	20	19	19.5
4	20	19	19.5
5	17	16	16.5
6	17	17	17
7	17	15	16
8	21	19	20
9	21	20	20.5
10	18	19	18.5
11	19	19	19
12	18	19	18.5
13	17	16	16.5
14	21	20	20.5
15	17	16	16.5
16	17	16	16.5
17	17	17	17
18	17	17	17

From the above table, it can be seen that the score of the students ranged from 16 to 20.5 points. There are eight students who obtained 16 to 17 points. Ten of them had 18 to 20.5 points. It can be seen that most students' score was rather good in this section.

Table 12 The Correlation of the Analytic Score in the Language Use Section with the Number of Error-Free T-Units

	N	The score	The amount of error-free t-units
The score in language use section	18	1	.174
The amount of error-free t-units	18	.174	1

r > .01

From the above table, the result of the correlation was .174. It can be seen that the number of error-free t-units in the students' texts and the score in the language use section were not correlated.

In conclusion, in this chapter, the two results were shown. First, the coefficient inter raters' reliability was significant at the .01 level in the total score, vocabulary section, and language use section. It means that the raters' markings were reliable in every section. Second, the students' vocabulary size and the amount of error-free t-units were not correlated with all of the raters' markings.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the study and findings are summarized, followed by the application, and suggestions for further studies.

Summary of the Study

Eighteen SWU students' essays entitled "Changes of Behavior" composed in the final examination were analyzed in this study. Two qualified and experienced Thai raters scored the students' writing by employing ESL composition profile, an analytic scoring. Then, the data were statistically analyzed to find coefficient inter raters' reliability of the two raters which was significant at the level of .01.

Results

The purposes of the study were to see if the score obtained from analytic scoring would correlate with the number of academic words and with the number of error-free t-units found in the students' texts. The results revealed the following:

First, the total analytic score and the amount of academic words were not significantly correlated. Most students who received the high scores used a low number of academic words. On the other hand, some students who obtained low scores used a high number of academic words.

Second, the analytic score in the vocabulary section and the number of academic vocabulary were not correlated. Some students' scores in the vocabulary section were high, but the academic vocabulary size was small. Furthermore, some

students' scores in the vocabulary section were low, but the academic vocabulary size was big. Therefore, the score in the vocabulary section and the amount of academic words were not correlated.

Third, the total analytic score of the writing quality and the amount of error-free t-units of all students were not significantly correlated. It showed that almost all the students had no correlation between their scores and the amount of error-free t-units. Some obtained high total scores but a low number of error-free t-units. On the other hand, many of them obtained a low total score but used a high number of error-free t-units.

Fourth, the analytic score in the language use section and the number of error-free t-units of all students were not significantly correlated. The result showed that almost all the students had no correlation between the language use section scores and the amount of error-free t-units. Some received high scores but used a low number of error-free t-units. Many of them received low scores but used a high number of error-free t-units.

In brief, the scores of the writing quality, syntactic and lexical abilities rated by the two raters were not significantly correlated with the amount of academic vocabulary and error-free t-units used.

Discussion

According to the results, there were not positive correlation shown between the raters' scores and the academic vocabulary size and error-free t-units number. This indicated that there were no correlation between analytic scoring and academic words and error-free t-units assessed by frequency. It is plausible to explain that the

raters were subjective. Their evaluation was not reliable enough. Therefore, the raters should practice evaluating writing extensively.

In short, every rater and writing teacher should take courses in scoring training. Experiences and skills from the training may support and help them to be skilled raters so that their scoring will be acceptable.

Application

1. The results of this study can be used as a guideline for writing teachers who would like to apply them for assessing writing effectively.

2. The results can be used to improve and design quality and suitable courses for raters.

3. Other objective assessments done by frequency such as the amount of cohesion, content, and organization can be applied to evaluate students' writings.

Suggestions for Further Studies

1. The correlation of the analytical scoring, academic words, and error-free t-units should be studied with other groups of English majors in order to assess their writing ability before graduation.

2. According to the study, the number of informants should be raised.

3. Raters of different ages can be studied with the same objectives of this study.

4. The students' compositions in academic area and non-academic area should be studied.

In brief, this chapter provided a summary of the objectives, processes, and results. According to the results, the raters should be trained more in writing

evaluation. The results can be applied to improve and develop courses or guidelines for assessing students' writings.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Abdulsata, P. (2000). *An error analysis of Srinakharinwirot university second-year english major students' compositions.* Unpublished master's thesis, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakharinwirot University. Thailand. Photocopied.

Bailey, K.M. (1998*). Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decisions, and directions.* Pacific Grove [Calif.]: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Clark, I.L. (2003). *Concepts in composition: Theory and practice in teaching of writing*. Mahwah, N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*. *34*(2): 213-238.

Gaies, S.J. (1980). T-unit analysis in second language research: application, problems and limitations. *TESOL Quarterly*. *14*(2): 53-60

Jacob, L., Sephen A. Zingraf, Deanna R. Wormuth, V. Faye Hartfiel, and Jane B. Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach.* Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Morris, L. (2001) *The use of vocabulary profiles in predicting the academic and pedagogic performance of TESL trainees.* Retrieved October 20, 2006, from http://www.lextutor.ca/vp/research.htm

Moskal, B.M. (2000). *Scoring rubrics part I: what and when*. Retrieved August 20, 2005, from http://www.eric.ed.gov

Nation. I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polio, C.G. (1997). Measure of linguistics accuracy in second language writing research. *Language learning*. *47*(1): 101-43

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reid, J.M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. N. J. : Regents Prentice Hall.

Schmitt, N. (2000) *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sotillo, S.M. (2000). *Discourse functions and syntactic complexity in synchronous and asynchronous communication*. 4(1): 82-119 Retrieved March 18, 2006, from. Language Learning TechnologyARTICLES database.

Sujan, P. (2000). *An analysis of vocabulary used in Rajabhat Institute Mahasarakham English majors' writing*. Unpublished master's thesis, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakharinwirot University. Thailand. Photocopied.

Teemant, A. (1988). *Lexical errors in ESL compositions.* M.A. Thesis. Brigham Young University.

Tharvarayus, N. (2005). *An analysis of vocabulary and morphological errors in compositions written by second and third year English majors at Srinakharinwirot university*. Unpublished master's thesis, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakhanrinwirot University. Thailand. Photocopied.

Weigle, S.C. (2002) *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words*. London: Longman.

Witt, E.A. (1995*). Issues in constructing an analytic scoring scale for a writing assessment.* Paper presented at Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association on Writing Test Prompts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 387500).

Xue, G.;& Nation, I.S.P. (1984). A university word list. *Language Learning and Communication*. 3(2): 215-22

Electronic Reference Formats Recommended by Paul Miller http:www.swan.ac.uk/cals/calsres/encyclopedia/vp.htm

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ESL Composition Profile

APPENDIX

ESL COMPOSITON PROFILE

Student:	Date:	Topic

SCORE	RANGE	*CONTENT* CRITERIA	COMMENTS
	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • through development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic	
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail	
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic	
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate	

SCORE	RANGE	*ORGANIZATION* CRITERIA	COMMENTS
	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported •succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive	
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing	
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development	
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate	

SCORE	RANGE	*VOCABULARY* CRITERIA	COMMENTS
	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/ idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register	
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured	
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage • meaning confused or obscured	
	9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate	

SCORE	RANGE	*LANGUAGE USE* CRITERIA	COMMENTS
	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order / function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured	
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/ complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/ or fragments, run-ons, deletions • meaning confused or obscured	
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate	

SCORE	RANGE	*MECHANICS* CRITERIA	COMMENTS
	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing	
	4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured	
	3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • meaning confused or obscured	
	2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate	

TOTAL SCORE	READER	COMMENTS

Source: Reid, J.M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. New Jersey: Regents Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX B

Sample Data of the Second-Year Students' Writings

The second-year students' compositions

1. There are two main causes which can change our behavior. The first cause is environment which has so much influence that enables us to change our behavior; for example, people who are around us and media. Friend is very important person for everyone because we spend time in one day with our friends more than with our parents. If our friends do or have something, sometimes we have to follow no matter we like it or not for being common with them. In addition, nowadays we consume a lot of media which is everywhere. It brainwashes us by giving us new values to change our behavior of consumption which pushes us to be in trend and buys unnecessary products. The second cause is our own mind to consider which is good or bad things for us to behave. If we think our old behaviors are good and suitable, we just keep behaving that way. On the other hand, if we think what we're behaving should adjust or change, find some which suits for us because we can choose which is the best for us. In conclusion, environment and our own mind are two main causes which can change our behavior in both good and bad ways depending on each person's acceptability.

2. Nowadays, there are many changes of our behavior, for Thai people receive foreign cultures from other countries such as America, England, Japan and South Korea, which is now the most popular for Thai teenagers. The first change of behavior is eating. In the past, Thailand was the agricultural land, so the people always ate the product of planting; this is vegetable. It is noticed that the ancient people are not fat. Nevertheless, because of rush hour, the people now have meals from the junk-food restaurant. For example, they eat fried chicken from KFC, hamburgers from Burgerking, or some ice-cream from Mc Donald's. Secondly, our fashion is being changed. On the side of street, we can see many teenagers wearing clothes, having hair styles, and making up from the Japanese magazines. For instance, they darken eyebrows and eye-liner, or make up their face thickly. Moreover, the girls likely wear the mini-skirt that is too short as female foreigners do in order to want other people to see their self-confidence. On the other hand, the adults think these girl are bad and not womanlike because Thai women need to take care of themselves well. The last change of behavior is that people have more confidence; they dare to speak, listen, and think by themselves in order to protect their rights. For example, in the public place, the musicians can show their abilities to others. If it was in the past, a person showing would be embarrassed, for other people think this job was low; he can show even though he had no education. However, the present people are able to understand that playing the musical instrument, people need to have musical knowledge. In conclusion, since the past, our eating, fashion, and confidence has been changed by the worldwide; however, we still need to keep our Thai culture, which is individual culture of Thailand, to inherit for the next generations.

3. When you are growing up, you will see the development of your body, mind, and also your behavior. You have two ears to hear, two eyes to see, and two legs to walk. They don't change, you still have it but your behavior will be changing. It can change in many factors; the surrounding at your home or school and the civilization of the society.

At the age of 13, when I looked back, I could feel about changing of my behavior. That because around that age, friends had many influences on me. I

wanted to be accepted among friends and never realised which way I should turn, bad or good, right or wrong. So I began taking time with my friends and telephone, spended a lot of money on clothes, and loved to be alone in my own room with out my mother's noise. Although the situation was getting bad, I did not accept that I changed. The relationship between my parents and I became worse; fighting and talking back were more often. At the school, I only cared about fitting in with my friends and ignored my lesson. My study was bad although I used to be an outstanding student of the school before. I was very regretful what I did.

So I decided to change my behavior; I spended more time on my lesson and favourite sport in my leisure time. With my family, we had more chance to talk and do many activities together. The home situation became good again.

Changing of behavior may occur some part of time in our life. In each character is from many factors. Maybe it has been with you since you was born or it was changed by the surrounding. It depends on you to put yourself in a good or bad side at last.

4. Behavior is the way that somebody behaves, especially toward other people. All people who live in the world need love, care, and communication with people, so they have to change their behavior in order to deal more successfully with a new situation and people. There are many causes that affect your changes of behavior. We can divide them into three points. First of all, requirements can affect your behavior. For example, you are a freshman in the university and you want to make new friends, so you change your behavior to adapt to other people. Moreover, if you want to be a rich person, you must work hard and have more responsibility in spending your money. It can make your behavior changes. Second, emotions can affect your behavior. For example, if you feel relax, you behavior will be kind. On the other hand, if you feel depress and angry, they can make you behave more aggressive. Third, the environment around you can make you change your behavior. For example, if you come from a good environment, social, and family, your behavior will be kind and generous. If the environment around you are bad such as unhappy family, it can make your behavior are selfish because you always see the bad things and bad behavior. In conclusion, requirements of life, emotions, and the environment around you can make your behavior changes.

5. When I live in the society, I must meet many people, so I should change my behavior in order to adapting myself to people in the society. For example, I must adapt to living in the dormitory. I never lived in the dormitory, so I must change my behavior in many ways. First of all, when I live in my house, my mother always prepare food and wash-cloth for me, but when I live in the dormitory, I must buy food and do everything by myself. Second, I always watch TV when I live in my house. It makes me does not do anything. There is not TV in the dormitory that makes me can find other activities to do such as reading and riding a bicycle. Third, I have three roommates in the dormitory, so I must adapt to living with them. For example, I do not annoy them while they read a book. Finally, I always get up late when I live in my house because I watch TV untill mid-night. Since I lived in the dormitory, I always get up early because there is not TV. It makes me has time to do many things when I get up early. I always say, "I don't have enough time to do my homework." If I change my behavior to get up early, I will have enough time to do my homework. In conclusion, I think changes of behavior is good for me such as living in the dormitory.

It is good experience. It makes me know to adapting myself to people in the society and I can do something that I never done.

APPENDIX C

Sample Data of the Second-Year Students' Error-Free T-Units

The second-year students' error-free t-units

Example: * I spend my money too much.

(1 error-free t-unit)

Example: * I start to work.

(1 error-free t-unit)

Example: * I was very regretful what I did.

(1 error-free t-unit)

Example: * I don't know anything about my work.

(1 error-free t-unit)

Example: * Also, you have to help other people who are in trouble.

(1 error-free t-unit)

Example: * If you follow these steps, you will be successful in changing your behavior.

(2 error-free t-unit)

Example: * Everyone has a different living background, so it is difficult to change everyone's behavior.

(2 error-free t-unit)

Example: * In conclusion, televisions make our behavior change in many ways so we have to be careful with them.

(2 error-free t-unit)

APPENDIX D

The VocabProfile Academic Word List

Academic Word List

adjust
adapt
adult
Affect
Analyze
Area
Aspect
Attitude

Benefit
Communicate
Compute
Concentrate
Conclude
Conduct
Consequent
Consume
culture
Depress
Enable
Environment

Factor
Fee
Final
generation
Grade
Ignorant
individual
instance
Instruct
Job

Legal
Major
Media
Medical
Motive
Nevertheless
Norm
Occur
Participate
Period

Perspective
Philosophy
Policy
Relax
Rely
Require
Research
Role
Specific
Style

Summarize
Technology
Tradition
Trend
Utilise

VITAE

VITAE

Name : Atchara Manoonyo

Date of Birth : 4 August 1977

Place of Birth : Mueng District, Petchburi

Address : 65 Taksin 8, Bukkalo, Thonburi, Bangkok 10600

Mobile phone: 081 5533375

Educational Background

May 2007 Master of Arts (English)

Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok

March 1998 Bachelor of Arts (English)

(Minor: Linguistics)

Mahasarakham University, Thailand