

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the summary of the previous four chapters and discusses the results of the testing of the four hypotheses formulated in order to compare the effects of the task-based instruction (TBI), form-and-task-based instruction (FTBI), and the conventional instruction (CI). Issues examined are related to: 1) English learning achievement, 2) grammatical accuracy of written production, 3) writing ability, 4) the relationship between accuracy in writing and writing ability, and 5) students' attitude on the TBI, FTBI and CI. Finally, after describing the implications of this present study, the dissertation concludes with a brief recommendation for further study.

5.1 Summary of the Study

Many studies (e.g. Angwatanakul, 1975; Prapphal, 2003; Sritamai, 1988) reported the inadequacy of English knowledge among Thai students, including high school students, university students, and graduate students. The investigation of the written production of the diploma technical students at the University of Technology Suvarnabhumi showed extensive errors in many language areas, especially the verb phrase. This has provoked the deepened awareness of how English could be effectively learned in this particular EFL formal classroom setting.

It is generally accepted that grammar is an essential and fundamental language component for effective communication (Batstones, 1994; Palmer, 1971; Purpura, 2004). In L2 learning, grammar is also a crucial and inescapable component of language learning and teaching (Rutherford, 1988). EFL students, in particular, need teacher's assistance with grammar learning. This is because opportunities for real use of language for communication are rare, so formal classroom may be only one place for many EFL students; only teachers can assist them with the complexities of language; and EFL students need high level of proficiency and accuracy, they may lack confidence if they are not provided with language knowledge (Celce-Murcia, 1985). Although the

importance of grammar is well-recognized, how to treat grammar effectively is a controversial issue.

Many studies reports the positive effect of focus-on-form on L2 learning (e.g. Carol and Swain, 1993; Doughty and Varela, 1998; Han, 2002; Long, Inagaki and Ortega, 1998; Mackey and Philp, 1998; Nobuyoshi and Ellis, 1993; Oliver, 2002; Spada, 1997; Swain and Lapkin, 1995; White, 1991). The focus-on-form is a cognitive, psycholinguistic and interactive- oriented approach to L2 learning. It is the incorporation of form-focused instruction into meaning-focused instruction. It has been conceptualized by Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis, emphasizing interaction where students negotiate for meaning, receive modified input and comprehensible output. The learning principle is that interaction facilitates L2 learning by providing learners with negative evidence, drawing their attention to the forms of the language while meaning is also focused, and pushing them to produce modified input which they can notice the target language, to compare it with their interlanguage, and thereby, produce grammatical accuracy (Swain, 1993, 1995).

Such a well-balanced treatment has raised a requirement to discover if it would enhance EFL technical students with a sound and accurate basis in the target language and derive benefit from collaborative and communicative tasks that help promote their communicative ability, *i.e.* writing ability, this study integrates focus-on-form into a communicative-oriented approach to task – Willis's task-based instruction. The term form-and-task-based instruction (FTBI) has been coined and used in this study. In order to see if the FTBI has better effect than the communicative dominant method as Willis's task-based instruction (TBI) and conventional instruction (CI) in which explicit and analytic grammar teaching is used with task-based learning, the three types of instruction are compared. Specifically, this study aims to:

- 1) to compare the effects of the TBI, the FTBI and the CI on the students' English learning achievement and their effect sizes
- 2) to compare the effects of the TBI, the FTBI and the CI on the students' grammatical accuracy of written production and their effect sizes

- 3) to compare the effects of the TBI, the FTBI and the CI on the students' writing ability and their effect sizes
- 4) to investigate the relationship between the students' grammatical accuracy and their writing ability and its effect size
- 5) to survey the learners' attitudes towards the TBI, the FTBI and the CI.

5.1.1 Method

5.1.1.1 Subjects

The subjects were technical students learning English as a compulsory course. Initially, a total of 96 subjects participated in this present study. Prior to the treatment, pretest score of 96 subjects were analyzed. ANOVA results did not show any significant difference among the three groups ($df = 2$, $F = 0.000$). Since four subjects left the university, the data of 92 subjects were analyzed to see the effects of the treatments on the English learning achievement and on the students' attitude towards the treatments. But for the analyses of the students' writing and the grammatical accuracy, only 30 subjects were used. The instructional treatments were provided in three actual English foundation classes which lasted 45 hours, including a three-hour pretest and a three-hour post test. Right after each teaching, the researcher who was assigned with full responsibilities for being the teacher for all three classes recorded the learning and teaching environment and other significant incidences. This type of information was used as the qualitative supplementary.

5.1.1.2 Instruments

The instruments consisted of an achievement test, three writing tests, and one questionnaire. The achievement test was used as pretest and posttest. It was validated and the reliability value of 0.812 was obtained for the objective part, and 0.972 for the subjective part. Three writing tests, as progressive tests, were given with the interval of five weeks between the pretest and posttest. The test was also validated and the reliability value of 0.892 was found. The data from the writings were used both qualitatively and quantitatively. Questionnaire with its reliability value of 0.977 was provided right after the post test to investigate the students' attitude towards each instructional treatment.

5.1.1.3 Instructional Treatments

This study utilizes Willis' task-based instruction (TBI) as a communicative dominant method, the form-and-task-based instruction (FTBI) as a balance of form and meaning method, and conventional instruction (CI) as a language dominant method and communicative task as a supportive.

Willis's three-phase TBL was applied in this present study. The pre-task phase was to prepare the students conceptually to the task before they worked together. Initially the teacher introduced and defined the topic, task and vocabulary related. Planning time was provided before students get together. The during task phase involved task performing, planning, and reporting. To perform the task, the students were provided with input text – a reading or listening text. In this study, the students were provided with unlimited time to complete the task. After completing the task, the students collaboratively prepared a report with the assistance of the more able peers, the teacher, dictionaries and grammar books. They rehearsed before presenting their outcome of the task in both spoken form and written form. Later, the teacher made comments on the content and organization of their writing. The post task phase was to provide an opportunity for explicit language instruction. The students were encouraged to reflect on how the task was performed. Then, they were provided with activities which were consciousness-raising activities that focused on the most problematic forms and use. With this activity, the students worked on their own time and pace. After this, the students did their re-writing before recording the language in their notebooks.

The TBI framework was exploited in the FTBI class. The main difference was how the teacher facilitated the learning of the target language. In the pre-task phase, the target language in reading text was enhanced. Grammar-consciousness raising activities could be provided if necessary. Oral interaction involved treatment of the forms using reactive focus-on-form such as recast, request for clarification, repetition. In the during-task phase, the teachers monitored the students' language performance as well as the content and organization. The reactive focus-on-form was also used at this stage. For the students' written production, the teacher indicated the language errors using code. The post-task phase was similar to the TBI class.

The CI was the PPP approach in which Skehan (1998) called a structure-oriented approach to task. This approach contained Presentation, Practice and Production. At the presentation stage, a single point of grammar was presented either explicitly or implicitly. At this stage the focus is on the declarative knowledge development. At the practice stage, the exercises that provided ready made meaning were practiced straightforwardly. At the production stage, learners did the task in which both oral and written production was expected as the TBI and the FTBI classes. The teacher corrected their errors and returned their work so that they would re-write and submit the correction version.

5.1.1.4 Data Analyses

To test the hypotheses in this study, both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed in this study. Quantitatively, the post test scores were tested to find if there is a significant difference among the three for the normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test before selecting the test. The non-normality and variance of the variables was obtained, so the posttest scores were calculated by the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The data from writing test were a ratio score, therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was also performed. Also, data from writing tests were analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. A significant difference in writing test 3 was obtained; therefore, a post hoc comparison – the rank sums test – was performed on every pair of conditions. The quantity of the writing accuracy and writing ability of each subject from each group was analyzed using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The data obtained from the measurement of attitude by using the semantic differential scale questionnaire were calculated on the spreadsheet program.

Qualitatively, the writing productions were analyzed to find the accuracy using T-unit analysis. The analysis followed Polio's (1997) guideline for T-units, clauses, and errors. The accuracy ratio was calculated by dividing error-free T-units by T-units.

5.1.2 Results

1) There was no significant difference in the English learning achievement among the three groups ($H = 0.708, p > 0.03$). This means that the treatments generally have more or less the same effect on the students' English learning achievement.

2) There were no significant differences in the grammatical accuracy of the writing test 1 ($H = 0.663, p > 0.03$), writing test 2 ($H = 0.663, p > 0.03$), writing test 3 (H

= 0.87, $p > 0.03$). The results can be interpreted that the grammatical accuracy in the written production of the students receiving different treatments is more or less the same.

3) There were no significant differences in writing ability of the three groups for the writing test 1 ($H = 0.61$, $p > 0.03$), and the writing test 2 ($H = 0.57$, $p > 0.03$); a significant difference among the three groups was obtained for writing 3 ($H = 0.03$, $p > 0.03$). Accordingly, the non parametric post-hoc multiple comparison – the rank sums test – calculation indicated that: 1) the FTBI group performed better than the CI group, but not significantly; 2) the FTBI group performed significantly better than the TBI group; and 3) the CI group performed significantly better than the TBI group. However, effect size was trivial (less than 0.2). This showed that at the practical level there is no significant difference among the three groups for writing 3. In light of the finding, the FTBI treatment has been more effective on the students' writing ability than the CI and TBI treatments, and that the CI treatment has been more effective on the students' writing ability than the TBI treatment does.

4) There was a significant relationship between the grammatical accuracy and writing ability of the three groups: TBI group, $r_{xy} = .583$, $p < 0.05$; FTBI group, $r_{xy} = .559$, $p < 0.05$; and CI group, $r_{xy} = .600$, $p < 0.05$. This means that as the students' grammatical accuracy increases, their writing ability increases, or vice versa. The results also signify that the grammatical of these students is developing towards the mastery of the target language. The effect size for TBI, FTBI, and CI was 1.43, 1.34 and 1.5 accordingly. The results provide evidence that the magnitude of the relationship between the grammatical accuracy and writing ability was large.

5) Generally, the students' attitude towards each treatment is quite positive. TBI and CI groups are quite positive: the score of the TBI group is the highest, $\bar{x} = 5.12$, $SD = 1.59$; score of the CI group, $\bar{x} = 5.1$, $SD = 1.7$; the FTBI students' attitude towards the treatment is slightly positive, $\bar{x} = 4.98$, $SD = 1.54$. The results provide evidence that students have quite similar positive attitude although they receive different methodological approaches.

In light of the findings, the TBI, FTBI and CI treatments tend to have more or less the same effect on the students' English learning achievement and grammatical accuracy of the written production. The FTBI shows greater effect on students' writing

ability after the students receive the treatment for about 40 hours of instruction. Interestingly, there is strong possibility that grammar ability is an essential component in the quality of writing. With regard to the students' attitude towards each treatment, it is likely that a quite positive attitude was obtained. However, those judgments resulted from the main findings only. It is necessary that the generalization of the findings should be limited together with the views of the experts and the previous research is taken into consideration. The next section discusses the findings and presents the sub-analyses in order to defend any generalization made as a result of this study.

5.2 Discussions

This section discusses the results of statistical analyses:

5.2.1 Why did the three different methods of teaching, namely the FTBI, TBI and CI have more or less the same effects on students' English learning achievement?

This could be due to the following reasons:

- 1) The similarities between the three treatments may outweigh the differences.

The non significant difference in effects of the three different instructions on the students' English learning achievement is obtained. This may be due to the fact that each treatment contains similar aspects which may outweigh the different aspects. As mentioned in chapter 2, the three treatments are the combination of form-based and meaning-based teaching: the TBI class is communicatively dominant because of its emphasis on semantic aspects and communication and less emphasis on grammar teaching. The CI is linguistically dominant and the communication is supportive. The FTBI balances between language and communication. More importantly, the distinguishing features – how grammar is treated – may have little effect on the students' language learning.

The findings corroborate the finding of Pica (1985) who reports that the instruction with total, partial and no access to target language instruction show no statistical difference of language production. The finding also supports the results of Allen et al.'s (1990) study which points out that the students in the communicatively dominant classes where the treatment of language is supportive and in the linguistically

dominant classes where communication or meaning is supportive did not differ significantly in the English learning proficiency.

Based on the results of the study and previous research, grammar treatment and task may be complementary; they provide essential support for one another in the classroom, leading to the conclusion that the grammar treatment and task provide essential support for one another in the classroom, regardless of how grammar is treated.

2) The short period of time in the treatment to the three groups may be an important factor.

The previous discussion could indicate that the three treatments have more or less the same effect on the students' English learning achievement. However, this assumption is set up with the instruction which lasted 45 hours. Such length of time may be too soon to conclude the effects each treatment would distribute, especially, for the low proficient students participating in this study. Therefore, with such an amount of time, the participants in this study may be moving towards a mastery of certain language element, so no difference in effect among the treatment can be seen. In this regard, there is a good possibility that if the time of the experiment is lengthened, a difference between the groups might be noticeable.

3) Sample sizes may be too small for a significant result.

The non-significant result may be due to the sample size. Henkel (1976: 82) claims that *a major component of the power of a test is the size of the sample – power increasing as sample size increase*. It should be noted that this study utilized quite a small sample size. The samples in the TBI, FTBI and CI are 31, 30 and 30 accordingly. Such a number of samples were a minimal number for the statistical test would allow. The findings of this study are restricted to the sample size; therefore, they cannot be taken as evidence for the determination of the effect each treatment would distribute.

4) Student attitudes towards teaching and learning may be an intrinsic factor

With respect to the attested results, students' attitude may be a factor. The investigation of the students' attitude in this present study showed more or less the same level of attitude: the score of measurement by the semantic differential scale of the TBI is 5.12, the FTBI 4.98 and the CI 5.1. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), attitude

and achievements are positively correlated. Many studies could support this assumption. Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) reported a significant correlation of around 0.40. In Thai context, Toobanteng (1992) reported the relationship between the two variables with similar figure ($r = .40$) after conducting the investigation with high school students. Similarly, such significant correlation ($r = .37$) was found with university students (Pattarach, 1984). In this regard, it is not surprising to find that the achievement among the three groups did not differ significantly.

To conclude, although no differences were found between the TBI, FTBI and CI treatments, the ability to learn and achieve L2 may be due to opportunities to participate interactively in task performance with an access to grammar treatment appropriate to students, and positive attitude towards English instruction. A significant finding could be obtained if the length of the study is extended and the size of samples is larger.

5.2.2 Why did the three types of instruction, namely TBI, FTBI and CI have more or less the same effects on the students' grammatical accuracy in written production?

This might be due to the following reasons:

1) Explicit grammar instruction is similar in effects to implicit grammar instruction when integrated with task-based instruction

The findings in this study suggest that EFL language learners could develop their ability in using the target language when the instruction provides them with exposure to both meaningful content and sufficient language, regardless when and how language is explicitly or implicitly treated. This finding is consistent with Fotos's (1994) findings on the effect of grammar consciousness-raising task with the EFL learners in comparison to the teacher-fronted grammar class. Fotos, as reviewed in chapter 2, reported that the grammar knowledge of a group getting grammar consciousness-raising tasks was as good as that of a group with teacher-fronted grammar class. She concludes that opportunities to acquire implicit knowledge either through meaningful communication and negotiation or through explicit knowledge of L2 rules facilitate the acquisition of implicit knowledge, and that both teacher-fronted grammar lessons and grammar consciousness-raising tasks have equivalent effectiveness in promoting the acquisition of implicit knowledge. So, this study suggests that students may derive benefit from

explicit grammar instruction when it is integrated into task-based instruction though it is highly likely that it was not effective *per se* (Long and Robinson, 1996); it exerts its contributing with the task. The results of the present study provide support for Fotos's argument for positive role of explicit grammar instruction and for other scholars' claims that explicit language instruction is beneficial in L2 learning (Bialystok, 1979, 1982; Ellis, 1993; Green and Hecht, 1992; McLaughlin, 1978, 1987; Robinson, 1994, 1996; Smith, 1981; Sorace, 1985; Terrell, 1991).

One unexpected result merits further discussion. The sub-group analysis yields valuable result concerning language learner variables. As shown in the table 5.1 below, among the high proficient students, the TBI students can produce the greatest number of grammar accuracy; among the average proficient students, the CI students can produce the highest number of accuracy and can gradually and steadily improve their accuracy in their writings 1, 2 and 3. The findings show that each instruction has different effects on different students. This finding tends to support the claim that learners do not learn the same way (Ehrman, Leaver and Oxford, 2003). This would be significant to L2 teachers in considering which instructional treatment is appropriate for which group of students in order to develop the grammar accuracy in the written production.

Table 5.1: Percent of Grammatical Accuracy of Writing

Source	Treatments	Grammatical Accuracy of Writing (%)		
		high	average	low
Writing 1	FTBI	14.00	11.00	3.00
	TBI	37.00	8.50	3.33
	CI	12.00	10.50	6.67
Writing 2	FTBI	43.33	50.00	26.67
	TBI	51.33	21.75	38.67
	CI	44.33	33.25	13.33
Writing 3	FTBI	21.33	15.25	22.33
	TBI	33.33	20.00	5.67
	CI	9.00	33.50	16.67

2) Students are responsive to similar elements of language.

The non-significant findings may be because the students are responsive to similar elements of language. Confirmation comes from the in-depth investigation of the students' language in their writing tests 1, 2 and 3 which suggests that the students are responsive to similar elements of language.

Table 5.2: Percentage Errors Produced by Students Receiving Different Treatment

<i>writing 1</i>	VP	NP	PP	Others	Total
TBI	36.8% (43)	41.9% (49)	14.5% (17)	6.8% (8)	100% (117)
FTBI	28.8% (47)	44.8% (73)	19% (31)	7.4% (12)	100% (163)
CI	38.9% (63)	51.9% (84)	3.7% (6)	5.6% (9)	100% (162)
<i>writing 2</i>	VP	NP	PP	Others	Total
TBI	36.5% (19)	32.7% (17)	3.8% (2)	26.9% (14)	100% (52)
FTBI	63% (34)	20.4% (11)	3.7% (2)	13% (7)	100% (54)
CI	53.7% (22)	24.4% (10)	4.9% (2)	17.1% (7)	100% (41)
<i>writing 3</i>	VP	NP	PP	Others	Total
TBI	61.3% (57)	20.4% (19)	9.7% (9)	8.6% (8)	100% (93)
FTBI	59.5% (103)	28.9% (50)	3.5% (6)	8.1% (14)	100% (173)
CI	59.5% (69)	23.3% (27)	9.5% (11)	7.8% (9)	100% (116)

As shown in Table 5.2, the percentage of the NP errors of the three groups dramatically decreased: in writing 1, the percentage error of the noun phrase in the TBI, FTBI and CI classes were 41.88 %, 44.79%, and 51.85% respectively; in writing 3 the percentage error of the noun phrase in the TBI, FTBI and CI classes remarkably decreased 20.43%, 28.90%, and 23.28% respectively. It can be seen that the CI students can reduce the highest number of the NP errors, followed by the TBI and the FTBI students (28.6%, 21.5% and 15.9% respectively); however, table 5.2 shows that the number of VP errors in writing 3 in all three groups is extensive, especially in writing 3; the percentage of error is higher than writing 1 and 2 in all three groups.

The results suggest that all of the three groups acquired the NP before the VP, thus for these students the VP is more difficult than the NP. This signifies that moving students towards a mastery of certain language form takes time since students are able to respond to a certain form that is easy for them before the more difficult ones, not various forms at a particular point in time as Pienemann (1985, 1989) regards this as the

readiness of learner to acquire the form which is learnable, not the ones which are too advanced for them. The results illustrate a comment made by Nassaji and Fotos (2004) that why acquisition of grammar cannot be *instantaneous but it will naturally require time as learners move toward mastery* (p. 137).

This result concurs with Leeman et al.'s (1995) finding that compared to meaning-oriented treatment; students with focus-on-form treatment did not make significant gain in accuracy in the essay writing. Leeman concluded that for these students, the acquisition of verb tense might have been too difficult for them. Therefore, it can be concluded that formal instructions could not influence the students' order of language acquisition and formal instructions that take account on the students' order of language acquisition will be effective.

5.2.3 Why did the FTBI treatment have better effects on the students' writing ability in writing test 3 than the CI treatment and the CI treatment have better effects on the students' writing ability in writing test 3 than the TBI treatment?

This may be due to the following reasons:

- 1) Ability to write may gradually and steadily increase.

Although the findings of students' accuracy of writing indicates that students' linguistic knowledge is more or less the same among the three groups, the students may be making ongoing-development from their whole learning experience at the same time their confidence to test their current language may be raised. Sasaki and Hirose (1996) claim that confidence is one factor interrelated to L2 writing ability. The confidence is a result of the students' perception of their ability in their control of language in the target situation. As the students become more confident, they could produce higher amount of writing. Although long compositions are not always better than short ones, length is one of the effective indicators of L2 learners' level of writing ability (Crowhurst, 1991). Length alone could account for 60% of the variance of the quality rating of the L2 English writing (Ma, 1998) and *students with good writing ability tend to write longer composition* (Larsen-Freeman, 1978:440).

Confirmation comes from the analysis of the length or the number of words produced (See Table 5.3) in writing 1, 2 and 3. The finding convincingly demonstrated

that although the three groups of students were obviously different in writing 1 which occurred on week five of their learning, the FTBI students could produce the highest number of words when they produced writing 2 and writing 3. This suggests that the FTBI students could write much longer than the TBI and CI groups when they have more experienced in language learning by the FTBI treatment.

Table 5.3: Length of Writings Produced by Students Receiving Different Treatment

Groups	N	Writing 1	Writing 2	Writing 3
TBI	10	818	491	440
FTBI	10	818	641	650
CI	10	881	477	468

Therefore, it might not be wrong to say that the writing ability of the FTBI students is affected by their confidence to write productively; their understanding of connection between form and meaning may be enhanced. It is likely to be that FTBI treatment could make grammar connect more efficiently and fruitfully to content, that is, the FTBI treatment provides extensive occasions encouraging students to focus their attention closely on the relevant meaning and form connection, for example, textual enhancement, proactive focus-on-form, writing feedback dealing with both language and content. This leads to an understanding of how language is used for communication, strengthening confidence to try out their current language, and thus producing a greater quantity of their writing.

2) Explicit knowledge may be an essential factor.

An important finding is that the CI students outperformed the TBI students in writing 3. This should be taken into careful consideration as the results suggest that the CI method which treats language analytically and explicitly enhances students' writing ability. It may be assumed that explicit knowledge is another factor influencing an increase of writing ability.

The finding substantiates Sasaki and Hirose's (1996) finding that L2 explicit knowledge is one significant factor influencing writing ability. This also concurs with Little's (1994) observation of native speaker's writing that native speakers often use explicit knowledge when they plan, monitor and edit their writings in order to produce

effective communication. Additionally, the CI treats language explicitly and systematically, this may help students write because overt and systematic grammar instruction could help students access the grammar rules that they know and use them judiciously (Fathman and Whalley, 1990; Kroll, 2001; Robb, Rose and Shortreed, 1986; Terrell, 1991)

5.2.4 Why was the relationship between grammatical accuracy and writing ability of the students in the three groups positive and moderate?

This may be due to the following reasons:

1) Students' writing ability may be determined by their grammatical accuracy.

Analysis reveals that the grammatical accuracy of the three groups is positively correlated to the writing ability and a statistically significant correlation is obtained. This suggests that grammatical accuracy in writing determines the writing ability.

The positive relationship between grammatical accuracy echoes the claim made by Kelsch and Kelsch (1981), Raimes (1983), and Reid (1994) that effective writing for communication certainly contains accuracy of language and good quality writing involves accurate and appropriate grammar and syntax. The result supports the previous research' finding that the grammatical accuracy and writing ability is positively correlated (e.g. Leelayong, 1975; Karnjanapan, 1978; Kroll, 1990; Prasertsang, 1983; Wongtip, 1998).

2) Outcome measures may be a factor.

Analysis reveals that the grammatical accuracy of the three groups is moderately correlated to the writing ability. Accordingly, the results reveal that the magnitude of the correlation between grammatical ability and writing ability is low. This may be due to the outcome measures, that is, how the accuracy of language is evaluated and measured. The present study evaluated the students' language accuracy by using free writing composition and measured it using T-unit analysis. This measurement can elicit implicit knowledge rather than the explicit knowledge because the students produced the writing under pressure (test condition). It is possible that they focus on the meaning that they want to express through writing without conscious awareness of the rules or structures which are considered the explicit knowledge.

According to Polio (1997), test condition influences learners' accuracy of language. Wongtip (1998), for example, measured grammatical accuracy at the surface sentential and semantic level using objective-based test, and evaluated writing ability using controlled composition writing. With this type of test, the students were in a controlled and specific context; explicit knowledge – the knowledge of rules and structures – rather than implicit knowledge – the ability to apply the knowledge into use – was mainly measured. He found that correlation between accuracy and writing ability was found high ($r = .71$). In contrast, Kroll (1990) evaluated his EFL students' free writing production independently under test condition and measured their language accuracy using T-unit analysis. With this measure, implicit rather than explicit knowledge was measured because when the students write a composition, they focus on how they could communicate the message rather than the forms of the language. She found no statistical correlation between the accuracy and writing ability. Ellis (2006:434) states that when students have to perform under pressure conditions, students can call only on their implicit knowledge. The language production is less accurate. The results of the present study derived from the analysis of the accuracy using T-unit analysis on the written work produced in the form of essay writing under the time constraints, so the implicit knowledge rather than explicit knowledge was measured. This leads to the conclusion that test conditions and type measurement varies the accuracy of language.

5.2.5 Generally speaking, why did the students in the three groups have similar attitude (at the level of moderately positive) towards each teaching method?

This may be due to the following reasons:

- 1) Students attitude may be affected by their learning achievement

It is likely that student attitude is affected by the learning achievement. The attested results concerning student English learning achievement show no significant difference among the three groups. That the students' English learning achievement is affected mainly by the similarities among the three instructional methods may be essentially influential on their attitude towards the instructional treatment. As shown in Table 5.4 below:

Table 5.4: Components with Similar Teaching Strategies and Student Attitude

	TBI		FTBI		CI	
	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
Task preparation	5.33	1.35	5.31	1.66	5.38	1.47
Group work	5.45	1.39	5.33	1.61	5.59	1.44
Talking with peers	4.93	1.3	5.18	1.39	5.09	1.41
Listening	4.64	1.28	4.81	1.72	4.66	1.58
Writing exhibition	5.23	1.25	5.22	1.5	5.35	1.2

Each instructional method basically contains different teaching strategies, for example, ways to learn grammar and vocabulary, task preparation, oral preparation, talking with teacher, writing, reading, teacher's feedback on writing, re-writing. However, as shown in table 5.5, the students' attitude towards those components is not remarkably different.

Table 5.5: Components with Different Teaching Strategies and Student Attitude

	FTBI		CI		TBI	
	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
Learning grammar and vocabulary	4.69	1.36	4.85	1.65	4.91	1.42
Oral preparation	4.59	1.56	4.98	1.58	4.98	1.51
Talking with teacher	4.63	1.37	4.53	1.91	4.77	1.58
Writing	4.96	1.46	5.13	1.58	4.97	1.48
Reading	5.02	1.33	5.18	1.65	5.09	1.36
Teacher's feedback on writing	5.48	1.23	5.36	1.72	5.73	1.3
Language activity	5.37	1.14	5.25	1.5	5.47	1.12
Re-writing	5.2	1.38	5.22	1.6	5.26	1.43

The results lead to the conclusion that English learning achievement affects students' attitude. This claim can be supported that learning achievement is the factor (Bachman, 1977; Burstall, 1975; Savignon, 1972) and by many research findings that students attitude is significantly and positively correlated with English learning achievement of Thai students (e.g. Hotrakul, 1981; Wongsotorn, 1975; Toobuntern, 1982).

2) Students' motivation may intrinsically be affected by their attitude towards the instructional treatments.

It might be more trustworthy to view the students' attitude towards the instructional treatments as a factor that affects their motivation to learn English.

These students, in fact, carry quite similar characteristics: motivation, opportunities to be involved in real English use outside classroom, sex, age, and etc. Kirisri (2004) investigated the factors affected the students taking the English I course at Rajamangala University of Technology (RMUT) Srivichai, Songkhla, Thailand. It was initially discovered that few students spend their time on English homework (2.01%), on entertainment via English media (2.65%), on the self-access English Learning Center (1.46%) and on reading English supplementary texts or articles (1.31%). It was also found that the majority of students neither attended the tutoring class (88.1%) nor watched English movie with a soundtrack (77.8%). Regarding English learning, 63.1% of students realized that those who have English proficiency find jobs more easily than the ones without English proficiency and 61.9 % of students acknowledge that English is an important subject.

It might not be wrong to say that students at RMUT Suvarnabhumi carry more or less the same characteristics of English learners as the ones found at RMUT Srivichai: motivation is not strong. Moreover, these students are imposed by their technical study. They spend most of their time on their subject matters aiming to develop their technological knowledge rather than English knowledge. These students study English for 3 hours and other subjects, mostly, their subject matters, 32 hours a week. Therefore, students' motivation to learn is more instrumental than integrative because the needs to learn are less important than the needs to complete their course of study.

It was found that the students' attitudes towards the instructional treatments were quite positive and that different students receiving different treatments had quite similar level of attitude and no difference in the English learning achievement. This may be because the three instructional treatments could motivate the students to participate in learning and the experience in learning affected their attitude in learning English (Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1995).

Since motivation is determined by the attitude towards the language learning environment (Baker, 1992; Gardner, 1985; Kruidenier, 1985; Spolsky, 1989; Wlodkowski, 1985) and thus influences L2 learning (Clement et al. 1994), it can be concluded that the positive attitude towards the English language learning will reinforce the student motivation to learn English more favorably, thus their language proficiency will be developed.

5.3 Response to the Instructional Treatments

Interesting findings result from the sub-analysis of the questionnaire in order to see which components the students evaluate as very positive, which components help them feel positive towards their English ability, and which ones are enjoyable for them. As shown in table 5.6, the FTBI students feel that task preparation, teacher's feedback on writing, group work, language activity, writing exhibition, oral preparation, re-writing and pair work are very good components in English learning and they feel somewhat positive towards reading, learning grammar and vocabulary, talking with peers in English, talking with teachers in English, and listening. This suggests that for the FTBI class, the while-task activities – task preparation with teacher intervention on both forms and content, performing task in groups, oral preparation, language activity, pair work, feedback on writing by comment on content and indicating error using language code are very good activities. However, there are only five components about which the students feel very positive: language activity, group work, re-writing, and teacher feedback on writing. The teaching components they found really enjoyable are group work, pair work, talking with peer in English, teacher feedback on writing, writing exhibition, task preparation, reading and re-writing.



Table 5.6: Attitude relating to Evaluative, Potency and Activity Dimension on FTBI Components

	FTBI components	FTBI Components				
		Evaluation	Potency		Activity	
1	Task preparation (TP)	6.08	PW	5.83	TFW	5.38
2	Teacher feedback on writing (TFW)	5.75	TFW	5.4	LA	5.37
3	Group work (GW)	5.63	LGV	5.27	RDG	5.3
4	Language activity (LA)	5.63	TTE	5.12	TP	5.23
5	Writing exhibition (WE)	5.5	GW	5.03	GW	5.23
6	Oral presentation (OP)	5.48	TP	4.97	WE	5.17
7	Re-writing (RW)	5.24	TPE	4.97	TPE	5.15
8	Writing (WTG)	5.02	OP	4.82	LGV	5.03
9	Pair work (PW)	5	RDG	4.8	TTE	4.8
10	Reading (RDG)	4.99	WE	4.8	PW	4.75
11	Learning grammar and vocab. (LGV)	4.98	RW	4.47	WTG	4.75
12	Talking with peer in English (TPE)	4.84	LA	4.32	RW	4.71
13	Talking with teacher in English (TTE)	4.83	WTG	4.2	LTG	4.46
14	Listening (LTG)	4.62	LTG	4.12	OP	4.38

As shown in table 5.7, almost all components relating to the evaluative dimension are perceived as very useful for the TBI students, except learning grammar and vocabulary which is regarded only slightly positive. Regarding the potency dimension, the TBI students feel very positive about their language ability when they are involved in language activity, group work, re-writing, teacher feedback on writing, writing, writing exhibition, reading, listening, task preparation, learning English, talking with peer in English. They feel slightly positive about their English ability when they are involved in pair work, grammar and vocabulary learning, oral preparation and talking with teacher in English. They also feel that they enjoy pair work, teacher feedback on writing, group work, writing exhibition, task preparation, talking with peer in English, learning grammar and vocabulary, reading and listening. They feel happy with re-writing, oral preparation, talking with teacher in English, language activity, and writing.

Table 5.7: Attitude relating to Evaluative, Potency and Activity Dimension on
TBI Components

TBI components		Evaluation	Potency		Activity	
1	Teacher feedback on writing (TFW)	6.01	LA	5.87	PW	5.51
2	Task preparation (TP)	5.98	GW	5.74	TFW	5.48
3	Group work (GW)	5.87	RW	5.45	GW	5.4
4	Oral presentation (OP)	5.84	TFW	5.31	WE	5.27
5	Language activity (LA)	5.81	WTG	5.19	TP	5.23
6	Writing exhibition (WE)	5.67	WE	5.14	TPE	5.15
7	Re-writing (RW)	5.35	RDG	5.13	LGV	5.04
8	Talking with a peer in English (TPE)	5.18	LTG	5.13	RDG	5
9	Reading (RDG)	5.12	TP	5.06	LTG	5
10	Listening (LTG)	5.12	TPE	5	RW	4.87
11	Pair work (PW)	5.09	PW	4.85	OP	4.84
12	Writing (WTG)	5.06	LGV	4.71	TTE	4.81
13	Talking with the teacher in English (TTE)	5.04	OP	4.56	LA	4.77
14	Learning grammar and vocab. (LGV)	4.89	TTE	4.32	WTG	4.72

Table 5.8 show that the CI students feel that all components except listening are very good and useful. Regarding the potency dimension, the CI students feel very positive about their language ability when they are involved in language activity, group work, talking with the teacher in English, pair work, writing, re-writing, reading, talking with a peer in English, teacher's feedback on writing, writing exhibition, and task preparation. The rest found positive affects language learning but they perceived them slightly positive. They found the teaching components really enjoyable are pair work, group work, talking with the teacher in English, talking with a peer in English, task preparation, reading, writing exhibition, teacher feedback on writing and re-writing.

Table 5.8: Attitude relating to Evaluative, Potency and Activity Dimension on
CI Components

	CI Group	Evaluation	Potency		Activity	
1	Task preparation (TP)	5.68	LA	5.58	PW	5.77
2	Oral presentation (OP)	5.63	GW	5.45	GW	5.43
3	Writing exhibition (WE)	5.61	TTE	5.45	TTE	5.43
4	Group work (GW)	5.55	PW	5.29	TPE	5.31
5	Talking with teacher in English (TTE)	5.55	WTG	5.27	TP	5.23
6	Pair work (PW)	5.53	RW	5.27	RDG	5.21
7	Teacher feedback on writing (TFW)	5.53	RDG	5.24	WE	5.21
8	Language activity (LA)	5.48	TPE	5.22	TFW	5.13
9	Re-writing (RW)	5.3	TFW	5.18	RW	5
10	Writing (WTG)	5.17	WE	5.05	WTG	4.98
11	Reading (RDG)	5.1	TP	5.03	LTG	4.9
12	Talking with peer in English (TPE)	5.03	LGV	4.98	OP	4.85
13	Learning grammar and vocab. (LGV)	5.01	LTG	4.84	LGV	4.83
14	Listening (LTG)	4.73	OP	4.68	LA	4.74

Interestingly, the students did not share mutual feeling regarding positive effects on their perception on evaluation, activity and potency dimension. The three groups of students have positive attitude on group work activity in all dimensions. They perceive group work as good, necessary, and an enjoyable activity. Group work provides good opportunity for them to learn English co-operatively. It is one useful component in the instructional treatment they enjoy.

Another finding which is significant is the teacher feedback on writing. The FTBI and the TBI students feel very positive in all dimensions towards the teacher feedback on writing. However, the CI students do not see teacher feedback on writing as very important as the FTBI and the CI do, although the CI students felt somewhat positive on the teacher feedback on writing.

Summary of the response to the questionnaire

Six conclusions can be drawn from the investigation of students' responses to the questionnaire:

1. The students in the FTBI, TBI, and CI groups had positive attitudes towards every component of the treatment.
2. The students in the FTBI, TBI and CI groups shared a positive attitude on the group work in which they collaboratively participated in order to produce the outcome of the task. All of them agreed that it was a good activity with very positive outcomes for their language ability. Also, they think that this activity is very enjoyable.
3. The students in the FTBI and TBI groups had highly positive attitudes towards teacher feedback on writing, but not the CI students.
4. The students in the FTBI, TBI and CI groups agreed that learning grammar and vocabulary was not very good for them, at the same time lacking confidence with their language ability. However, the TBI students felt that the activity relating to the grammar and vocabulary was very enjoyable while the FTBI and CI students discovered that the grammar and vocabulary activities were not enjoyable.
5. The students in the FTBI and TBI groups had less positive attitudes towards their use of English to communicate with the teacher than the CI group has.
6. The FTBI, TBI and CI were very positive that language activity, group work, writing, re-writing, and the teacher's feedback on writing were effective in developing their English learning.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion, this study has a number of recommendations for both researchers and research consumers.

5.4.1 For research consumers

5.4.1.1 Although no significant difference was found among the three groups of students, the three teaching methods had positive effects on the English learning achievement because the scores gained by the three groups of students significantly increased. So, this study has confirmed L2 teachers that the teaching method that integrates the treatment of the language forms and an interactive and meaningful task in which the students have great opportunities to use English purposefully is effective, regardless of how the language is treated. Therefore, the teacher could exploit any

methods: the conventional instruction, the task-based instruction or the form-and-task-based instruction depending on the need, and constraints of the target teaching situation such as student learning style, age, student motivation, the proficiency level.

5.4.1.2 Although the three instructional methods differ mainly in how grammar is treated, the results of statistical analysis show that students' grammatical accuracy of their written production is not significantly different. Such findings have informed L2 teachers that they can choose any of the three teaching methods when the focus of teaching is the accuracy of the target language. Moreover, among high ability students, the TBI group has been proven to obtain the highest percentage of grammatical accuracy, and that among the low ability students, the CI group has achieved the highest percentage of grammatical accuracy. Therefore, it may be more advantageous if teachers choose TBI for a class of high ability students and CI for a class of low-ability students. For a mixed-ability group, teachers should use a variety of instructional methods in order to take care of all different ability groups.

5.4.1.3 Another important finding is that there is a significant difference among the three groups in their writing ability when the students perform their writing in week 15; the writing ability of the FTBI group is significantly better than TBI's, the writing ability of the CI is significantly better than TBI's, and the writing ability of the FTBI is better than CI's but not significantly. Based on such findings, this study suggests that if the teaching objective is to improve the students' writing ability, FTBI treatment in which the language is emphasized simultaneously with meaning-focused activities may be worthwhile.

5.4.1.4 The findings show that the grammatical accuracy in the writing production as measured by T-unit analysis is correlated positively and moderately with the writing ability and a significant relationship is obtained. This implies that as grammatical accuracy increases, writing ability increases, or vice versa. So, this study recommends that teachers should facilitate students by giving a grammar treatment since grammar is an essential component in the production of a qualified piece of writing. In non-composition class, writing should be a skill that students use since writing will assist development of grammatical accuracy, and that in composition courses, grammar and writing should be inseparable; exclusive treatment on one than another could damage both writing ability and grammatical ability.

5.4.1.5 The study generates important findings which are essential components for both reinforcement of students' positive attitude and effective L2 learning. In this regard, recommendations are as follows:

1) Teacher feedback on writing were highly positive, L2 teachers should utilize written feedback which includes either form-focused feedback or feedback on content. This will strengthen the students' positive attitudes and will be beneficial to FL writing.

2) Since the students in the three groups felt very positive towards re-writing activity, L2 teacher should encourage students to rewrite with teacher's contingent help. This will reinforce positive attitudes in L2 learning.

3) L2 teachers should provide task-based instruction where opportunities for interaction and communication for meaning is focused, form-focused instruction, opportunities for task preparation, process writing and feedback from the teacher. This is because the students in different classes shared the same positive attitudes towards the same components of teaching though some were treated differently. These essential components will promote positive attitudes in L2 learning, and thus, effective L2 learning:

5.4.2 For Further Research Studies

Based on the limitations of the present study, recommendations for further research are as follows:

1) The sample size in the present study was very small; any generalization based on this study is limited and must be done with caution. Therefore, it would be better if a greater number of the sample size is selected.

2) The sampling method in this study was not a simple random selection; the sample distribution could have an effect on the statistical generalization to be made. Based on this limitation, a suggestion for the same line of study is that researchers utilize random sampling method.

3) Motivation is a vital factor in language learning; however, this study did not take this variable into consideration and a conclusion can be made on only statistical analysis. This study, therefore, recommends that the researcher should measure the participants' motivation prior to the study.

Based on certain perspectives underpinning the results of the study, recommendations are:

4) A wide range of samples highly distinguishable in subjects' abilities: high, average, and low is suggested since this study is constrained with the range of the samples which was very restricted in this study, affecting the test of significance.

5) In fact, L2 acquisition is really a complex phenomenon. A significant difference among the three groups for the writing ability was found after week 15 of the study. This shows that it takes time for any treatment to be effective. So, more than 45 hours would be a suggestion.

6) This study discovered that the errors of certain features of language such as verb phrase was still extensive, though all the three treatments affecting their learning positively. Therefore, it would be a fruitful distribution to L2 pedagogy if the effects of instructions on a particular problematic form are examined. This is because each element of language functions differently in different system of language processing.

7) This study could draw on students' implicit knowledge via free written production in which accuracy of production was measured by a single method, T-unit analysis. It would be of greater interest if explicit and implicit knowledge were both measured and compared in order to see which type of instruction has positive effects on which type of knowledge and to test the linguistic accuracy by taking both explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge into consideration.