



การพัฒนาแบบการเรียนการสอนตามแนวคิดการเรียนรู้แบบสืบสอบร่วมกับแนวคิด
การให้ข้อมูลป้อนกลับแบบ 360 องศา เพื่อส่งเสริมความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษ
เชิงโต้แย้งของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาบัณฑิต

Development of an Instructional Model Based on Inquiry-Based Learning and
360 Degree Feedback Approaches to Enhance English Argumentative Writing Ability
of Undergraduate Students

วราพร ทองจีน¹ ฤดีรัตน์ ชูชนะโชติ² และ อัมพร : ³

Waraporn Tongjean, Ruedeerath Chusanachoti, and Aumporn Makanong

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อพัฒนาแบบการเรียนการสอนตามแนวคิดการเรียนรู้แบบสืบสอบร่วมกับแนวคิดการให้ข้อมูลป้อนกลับแบบ 360 องศา และศึกษาประสิทธิผลของรูปแบบการเรียนการสอนเพื่อส่งเสริมความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงโต้แย้งของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาบัณฑิต กลุ่มตัวอย่างคือ นักศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลพระนคร ชั้นปีที่ 2 วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ จำนวน 36 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการเก็บรวบรวมข้อมูล คือ แบบทดสอบวัดความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงโต้แย้ง สถิติที่ใช้ในงานวิจัยได้แก่ ค่าเฉลี่ย ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน และค่าที่ t-test

ผลการวิจัยพบว่า 1. รูปแบบการเรียนการสอนที่พัฒนาขึ้นประกอบด้วย 4 ขั้นตอน ได้แก่ ขั้นการกระตุ้นความสงสัย ขั้นการวางแผนการสร้างความรู้ใหม่ ขั้นการสร้างสรรคผลงาน และขั้นการสะท้อนคิดเพื่อการพัฒนา 2. การศึกษาประสิทธิผลของรูปแบบการเรียนการสอน พบว่า 2.1) ความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงโต้แย้งของนักศึกษากลุ่มทดลองหลังการทดลองสูงกว่าก่อนการทดลองอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .05 2.2) นักศึกษากลุ่มควบคุมและกลุ่มทดลองมีความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงโต้แย้งไม่แตกต่างกันอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .05

Article Info: Received 10 May, 2018; Received in revised form 1 August, 2018; Accepted 5 June, 2019

¹ Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University Email: joli_jour@hotmail.com

² Ph.D. Division of Foreign Language Teaching, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University Email: ruedeerath.c@chula.ac.th

³ Ph.D. Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University Email: aumporn.m@chula.ac.th

คำสำคัญ: การพัฒนารูปแบบการเรียนการสอน / แนวคิดการเรียนรู้แบบสืบสอบ / แนวคิดการให้ข้อมูล
ป้อนกลับแบบ 360 องศา / ความสามารถในการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงโต้แย้ง

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to develop and study the effectiveness of an instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches to enhance the English argumentative writing ability of undergraduate students. The sample was 36 sophomore English major students of Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon. The data collection instruments were the argumentative writing ability tests. Data were analyzed by the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and t-test.

The findings of this study revealed that 1) the instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches consisted of 4 steps: 1.1 stimulating curiosity, 1.2 making a plan to create new knowledge, 1.3 creating a new task, and 1.4 enhancing learning through reflection. 2) The results of the effectiveness of implementing the developed instructional model demonstrated that: 2.1) The experimental group's English argumentative writing ability was higher after studying with the developed instructional model at the .05 level of significance; and 2.2) the experimental group and control group had no significant difference in English argumentative writing ability at the level of .05.

KEYWORDS: INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT / INQUIRY BASED-LEARNING
APPROACH / 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK APPROACH / ENGLISH ARGUMENTATIVE
WRITING ABILITY

Introduction

/PXBE BZT ð &OHMJTI ð XSJUJOH ð TLJM
WBSJPVT ð HPBMT ð *O ð IJHIFS ð FEVD BUJ
JNQPSUBOU ð SFRVJSFE ð TLJMM ð GPS ð TU
PG ð XSJUJOH ð UIBU ð TUVEFOUT ð DPNN
BSHVNF OUBUJWF ð XSJUJOH ð XIJDI ð SFR
TUSPOH ð FWJEFODF ð BOE ð SFBTPOT ð UP
QJFDFT ð CFDPNF ð SFBTPOBCMF ð BOE ð DP
JNQPSUBOU ð QBSU ð PG ð DSJUJDBM ð UIJC
.FJMBOE ð ð TUBUFT ð UIBU ð UIF ð FTTF
UP ð UFBDI ð QSPCMFN TPMWJOH ð BOE ð DS
"SHVNF OUBUJWF ð XSJUJOH ð JT ð B ð EJGsD
&4- ð BOE ð &OHMJTI ð BT ð B ð 'PSFJHO ð -E
*U ð SFRVJSFT ð FGGPSU ð BOE ð QSDUJDF
EJGsDVMU ð CFDBVTF ð JU ð JOWPMWFT ð OI
UIF ð BCJMJUZ ð UP ð VTF ð UIF ð UBSHFU ð ME
#PPOQBUBOBQPSO ð ð ;IV ð ð "D
NPTU ð 5IBJ ð &' - ð TUVEFOUT ð IBWF ð GBDFE
XSJUJOH ð XSJUJOH ð UIF ð UIFTJT ð TUBUF
BSHVNFOUT ð QSFTFOUJOH ð BO ð PSHBO
TUSVDUVSF ð +BOUBTJO ð ð ,B LBO EI
ð *ORVJSZ CBTFE ð MFBSOJOH ð JT ð B
&EVD BUJPO ð %FWFMPQNFOU ð \$FOUFS ð
PS ð OPU ð UIFSF ð JT ð BO ð PCKFDUJWF ð SFB
UIFJS ð PXO ð SFBMJUZ ð JO ð BO ð FGGPSU ð U
JT ð sMUF SFE ð UISPVHI ð NFOUBM ð TUSVDU
QSJPS ð LOPXMF EHF ð CFMJFGT ð BOE ð QS

Many studies have supported the usefulness of inquiry-based learning in helping students develop their writing ability, especially in developing arguments, problem solving, giving reasons and connecting ideas. Neuby (2010) indicates that students are presented with a problem, some suggestions, and tools for finding the answer. They have constructed the knowledge by themselves with help from the instructor, through the problem, until they reach their answer. They learn by making connections from principle to practice and by collecting relevant facts in a logical order. Inquiry requires the identification of facts and assumptions, the use of critical thinking, consideration of a range of alternatives, and stimulates the mental processes towards a synthesis of information, application of principle, and evaluation of what has been done. Moreover, numerous studies found that inquiry-based learning could enhance reasoning ability (Chantraukrit, 2013; Dalai, 2008; Phiromrat, 2012; Ramkaew, 2009) as well as improve students' writing skills (Lestari, 2010; Sunarni, 2012). Therefore, it is assumed that students' argumentative writing ability could have continual improvement if teachers bring the principles of inquiry-based learning to practice or apply to teaching writing.

Another interesting approach to foster the argumentative writing ability of students is 360 degree feedback. 360 degree feedback can be particularly valuable feedback for the individual because it eliminates many problems of single-source feedback (London, 2003). Feedback is considered a critical teaching function that can be used to improve students' skills in analyzing their tasks critically (Keh, 1990). Mangelsdorf (1992) explains that students can learn how to use language and how to respond to peer feedback in order to improve their writing. The provision of well-designed feedback that is well structured takes learning forward. Feedback is defined as dialogue to support learning in both formal and informal situations, and it may enhance students'

S F t F D U J P O đ U I F J S đ B C J M J U Z đ U P đ N P O J
B O E đ U I F J S đ N F U B D P H O J U J W F đ B C J M J U Z đ
- F J C P X J U [đ đ 5 I F đ U F B D I F S T đ D B O đ
U I B U đ U I F đ T U V E F O U đ J T đ B C M F đ U P đ D P N đ
đ 5 I F đ W B M V F đ P G đ đ E F H S F F đ G F F E
G S P N đ U I F đ M F D U V S F S đ U I F đ Q F F S đ B O E đ
đ " T đ N F O U J P O F E đ B C P W F đ J G đ X F đ E
G F F E C B D L đ B O E đ đ E F H S F F đ G F F E C B D I
T U V E F O U T đ Q F S G P S N đ C F U U F S đ P O đ U I F J S
đ " M U I P V H I đ N V D I đ S F T F B S D I đ I B T đ C F F
B S H V N F O U B U J W F đ X S J U J O H đ B C J M J U Z đ U
X J U I đ P U I F S T đ 4 J N J M B S M Z đ B đ M P U đ P G đ
I B W F đ C F D P N F đ V T F G V M đ J O đ C V T J O F T T
X S J U J O H đ 8 J U I đ U I F đ C F O F s U T đ P G đ F B D I đ E
N P E F M đ D B O đ B N Q M J G Z đ U I F đ C F O F s U T đ U P
J T đ T I P X O đ J O đ s H V S F đ đ

' J H V S F đ đ \$ P O D F Q U V B M đ ' S B N F X P S

Objectives

1. To develop an instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches to enhance English argumentative writing ability of undergraduate students.

2. To study the effectiveness of an instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches by

2.1 comparing the English argumentative writing ability of undergraduate students in the experimental group and control group after studying with the developed instructional model.

2.2 comparing the English argumentative writing ability (both of overall score and scores in each component of English argumentative writing ability) of undergraduate students in the experimental group before and after studying with the developed instructional model.

Methodology

Research design

The study employed a quasi-experimental design. Pretest and post-test were used to determine the students' argumentative writing ability of the experimental group and control group. The scores from the two tests were compared by t-test in order to examine the effects of the traditional instruction and developed instructional model. The English argumentative writing ability tests were used to obtain the scoring data to determine students' argumentative writing ability.

Population and sample

The population of this study was undergraduate English major students

GSPN ð 3BKBNBOHBM ð 6OJWFSTJU ð Z ð PG ð
ð 5IF ð TBNQMF ð XBT ð ð &OHMJTI ð NBK
&OHMJTI ð 1BSBHSBQI ð 8SJUJOH ð DPVSTF
ZFBS ð BU ð 3BKBNBOHBM ð 6OJWFSTJU ð Z ð P
DPOEVDUFE ð GPS ð POF ð TFNFTUFS ð XIJD
ð 5IF ð TBNQMJOH ð UFDIOJRVF ð PG ð UIJ
QBSUJDJQBOUT ð XFSF ð EJWJEFE ð JOUP ð U
HSPVQ ð &BDI ð HSPVQ ð DPOTJTUFE ð PG ð
UIF ð UXP ð HSPVQT ð XFSF ð DPNQBSBCMF
U UFTU ð BOE ð UIF ð ' ð TUBUJTUJD ð 5IF ð SF
XSJUJOH ð BCJMJU ð Z ð PG ð UIF ð FYQFSJN
TJHOJ s DBOUMZ ð EJGGFSFOU ð CFGPSF ð U
GPS ð UIF ð FYQFSJNFOU

ð 3FTFBSDI ð JOTUSVNFOU

ð 5IF ð SFTFBSDI ð JOTUSVNFOUT ð DPOT
NPEFM ð ð BSHVNFOUBUJWF ð XSJUJOH
BCJMJU ð Z ð SVCSJD

ð ð *OTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð

ð 5IF ð JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð XBT ð E
BOE ð ð EFHSFF ð GFFECBDL ð BQQSPBD
JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð BSF ð SFMFW
JORVJSZ CBTFE ð MFBSOJOH ð BOE ð ð EF
QSPWJEFE ð UIF ð JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEF
JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð BOE ð IBE ð ð FY
UIF ð JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð CZ ð VTJC

(IOC), and all items rated higher than 0.5., so it was clear that the developed instructional model was efficient for the experiment. The instructional model and lesson plans were revised as experts suggested, and they were piloted with 30 English major students who were similar in all aspects to the participants at Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon. The researcher improved the instructional model and lesson plans after the pilot study session in order to increase the quality of teaching.

2. Argumentative writing ability test

Two parallel paragraph writing tests served as the pretest and post-test of the study, respectively. The purpose of these tests is to assess the students' argumentative writing ability before and after the instruction. The test was a subjective type designed by the researcher and validated by five experts by using the index of item-objective congruence (IOC). All items were rated higher than 0.5, which means the developed argumentative writing ability test was effective. The English writing prompts were developed by the researcher. The topics were chosen based on the result of informal needs analysis. For the writing test, there are three topics, which the participants are asked to select one topic and write an argumentative paragraph of approximately 250 words within 45 minutes. The researcher revised and edited the tests to make sure that each test was reliable by using the suggestions of experts before piloting them with 10 English major students who were similar to the participants at Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon.

3. Argumentative writing ability rubric

The analytical scoring rubric was used to assess the students' argumentative writing ability. The rubric was adapted from Krieger-James (2012),

0SFHPOđ%FQBSUNFOUđPGđ&EVDBUJPO
SVCSDđXBTđWBMJEBUFEđCZđsWFđFYQ
SFTFBSDIFSđSFWJTFEđBOEđFEJUFEđUIF
BTTFTTFTđUXPđNBJOđQBSUTđPGđUIFđ
BOEđDPVOUFSBSHVNFU SFCVUUBMđE
5IFđBTTFTTNFOUđPGđQBSUđ đDPOTJT
5IFđBTTFTTNFOUđPGđQBSUđ đBJNTđU
WPDBCVMBSZ đBOEđTFOUFODFđTUSVDU
PVUđPGđ đQPJOUTđBOEđQBSUđ 4TđTDP
TDP SJOHđUIFđBSHVNFUUBUJWFđXSJUJO
PGđFYQFSJFODFđJOđUFBDIJOHđXSJUJO

Data analysis

đ 'PSđUIFđRVBOUJUBUJWFđEBUBđBO
QSFUFTUđBOEđQPTU UFTUđUPđFWBMVB
TUVFOUTđJOđUIFđFYQFSJNFUUBMđHSP
SVCSDđXBTđVTFEđUPđFWBMVBUFFđUIFđ
HSBEFEđCZđUIFđSFTFBSDIFSđBOEđBOP
5IFđTDPSTFTđPCUBJOFEđGSPNđUIFđXSJU
U UFTUđUPđDPNQBSFđUIFđEJGGFSFODF
UIFđFYQFSJNFUUBMđHSPVQđBOEđDPOU
JOTUSVDUJPO đ%FQFOEFOUđU UFTUđXB
XSJUJOHđJOđUIFđFYQFSJNFUUBMđHSPVC
JOTUSVDUJPOBMđNPEFMđCBTFEđPOđJOF

Results

The results of this study were consistent with the objectives of this study. As a result, the results were divided into two parts: Part 1 the components and learning stages of the developed instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches, and Part 2 the effectiveness of the instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches.

Part 1: The components and learning stages of the developed instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches consisted of three components: 1) objective, 2) principles, and 3) learning stages.

1) Objective of the instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches:

This instructional model aimed to enhance English argumentative writing ability of undergraduate students.

2) Principles of the instructional model based on inquiry-based learning and 360 degree feedback approaches

The developed instructional model consisted of 5 principles:

2.1) Learning occurs when students' curiosities are raised, or they have a controversial decision. Then students make attempts to find the answers and select information by using their critical thinking.

2.2) Using experiential learning in observing, analyzing, comparing, verifying and criticizing information or ideas promotes student understanding in learning, a wide range of creative viewpoints for task creativity and strategic learning, and as a result, they can bring these benefits to improve their learning.

ð ð ð 3 F t F D U J O H ð B O E ð D P O O F D U J O
T F W F S B M ð T P V S D F T ð I F M Q T ð T U V E F O U T ð

ð ð ð - F B S O J O H ð X J U I ð B ð Q S P D F T T ð F
B O E ð B T ð B ð S F T V M U ð T U V E F O U T ð I B W F ð U
P G ð U I F N T F M W F T ð B O E ð P U I F S T ð C F D P N F
B C P V U ð U B T L ð N B O B H F N F O U ð D B O ð T Z O U
W J F X ð G P S ð M F B S O J O H ð J N Q S P W F N F O U ð E

ð ð ð " Q Q M Z J O H ð Q S F W J P V T ð L O P X M
E F W F M P Q ð U B T L ð Q F S G P S N B O D F ð Q S P Q F
J N Q S P W F ð U I F J S ð T D I F N B U B ð B O E ð U I J O L

ð ð - F B S O J O H ð T U B H F T ð P G ð U I F ð J O T U S
M F B S O J O H ð B O E ð ð E F H S F F ð G F F E C B D L

ð 5 I J T ð E F W F M P Q F E ð J O T U S V D U J P O B M

Stage 1: Stimulating curiosity

ð 5 I F ð s S T U ð T U B H F ð B J N T ð U P ð S B J T F
D P O U S P W F S T J B M ð J E F B T ð F Y Q S F T T ð P Q J
B O E ð F Y D I B O H F ð F Y Q F S J F O D F T ð P S ð L O P X
ð T V C T U F Q T

ð ð ð \$ V M U J W B U J O H ð T U V E F O U ð J O U I
ð ð ð 5 F B D I F S T ð S B J T F ð B O ð J O U F S F T U
B O E ð Q S P W J E F ð E J G G F S F O U ð L J O E T ð P G
B O E ð F Y Q S F T T ð P Q J O J P O T ð C B T F E ð P O ð F I
D P O U S P W F S T J B M ð D V S S F O U ð B O E ð J O U F
T P N F ð B Q Q M J D B U J P O T ð P S ð D V S S F O U ð O

1.2 Exploring information and developing ideas

Based on the provided situations/questions of teachers, students search for more detailed information from websites or provided documents to discuss with other students in small groups or in pairs.

1.3 Making connections between prior learning and experience and exchanging information with others.

Students analyze information, situations or provided issues with the help of teachers as facilitators. Students are required to look for information, compare their knowledge with peers and share opinions with other students. Teachers provide various activities for students, such as a debate, exchanging ideas via Facebook or Blog and discussion. Students are required to verify their understanding of the context by exchanging their work with other students, and then trying to correct the mistakes of others' tasks.

Stage 2: Making a plan to create new knowledge

The important aim of the second stage is to let the students make their plans in order to construct new knowledge. This stage is divided into 4 sub-steps.

2.1 Planning using inquiry

Students check their prior knowledge, make plans to search for information and revise their plans based on the given questions, problems or situations. Teachers should provide some advice or useful learning sources for students, such as related websites and books.

2.2 Evaluating information sources

Students evaluate the sources used for their writing using a checklist.

ø ø ø \$POEVDUJOHøJOWFTUJHBUJPOTø
ø ø ø 4UVEFOUTøDPMMFDUøJOGPSNBUJF
XFCTJUFT øCPPLTøBOEøJOUFSWJFX øBOEø
JOGPSNBUJPOøJTøSFMFWBOUøFOPVHIøUPøL
ø ø ø 0SHBOJ[JOHøJEFBTøBOEøFYBNJOJ
ø ø ø 4UVEFOUTøSFFYBNJOFøJGøUIFøJOC
5IFøUFBDIFSTøDBOøBMTPøBTLøUIFøTUVEFO
PSEFSøUPøEPøTP øTUVEFOUTøIBWFøUPøEPø
GFFECBDLøUPøUIFJSøQFFST

Stage 3: Creating a new task

ø 5IFøQVSQPTFøPGøUIJTøTUBHFøJTøUPø
JOGPSNBUJPOøUPøXSJUJOHøUBTLøCBTFEøPC
JOUNøøTVC TUFQT
ø ø ø 4FBSDIJOHøJOGPSNBUJPOøGPSøPV
ø ø ø 4UVEFOUTøCSBJOTUPSNøJEFBTøGPS
UIFøHJWFOøUPQJD ø5FBDIFSTøQSPWJEFøTP
TUVEFOUTøXSJUJFøUIFJSøPVUMJOFTøDMFBSI
ø ø ø &EJUJOHøBOEøSFWJTJOHøZPVSøPV
ø ø ø 4FMG BTTFTTNFOUøBOEøQFFSøGFF
XJUIøUIFøHPBMøPGøJNQSPWJOHøUIFøPVUMJ
PVUMJOFTøBOEøIBWFøPUIFSøTUVEFOUTøIFM
ø ø ø 8SJUJOHøZPVSøSSTUøESBGU
ø ø ø "GUFSSøSFDFJWJOHøBMMøGFFECBD
UFBDIFSTøPSøPUIFSøFYQFSUT øTUVEFOUTøB

Stage 4: Enhancing learning through reflection

The last stage's aim is to have the students reflect on their learning, problems and problem solving during the learning process. As a result, the students understand their strengths and weaknesses while learning and have guidelines for writing improvement. This stage is divided into 4 sub-steps.

4.1 Individual reflection on writing task

Students use a reverse outlining to check their writing before improving the writing. The checklist can also be used in this stage for checking the correctness of their first drafts and outlines.

4.2 Conducting the full-circle feedback

Students evaluate their own writing, and then teachers, peers or others will give some feedback to each student's paper by using several kinds and forms of feedback, such as direct feedback, indirect feedback (comments, symbols or questions), verbal feedback and written feedback. The checklist and grading can also be used in this stage. The teachers should prepare the criteria for giving feedback for the students and others.

4.3 Editing and revising the final draft

Students check all feedback obtained from several people and sources, and find solutions to revise their writing. The students can do the inquiry again to get more useful information to complete their writing.

4.4 Reflecting on the learning process

Students reflect on their writing, outlining, inquiry, and feedback in order to apply what they have learned to their future writing. In this sub-stage, teachers need to provide a questionnaire, reflective journal or open-ended questions to get more ideas from students about their learning.

Part 2: 5IF ð FGGFDUJWFOFTT ð PG ð UIF ð EFWF
PO ð JORVJSZ CBTFE ð MFBSOJOH ð BOE ð ð EFH
CZ ð QSFUFTU ð BOE ð QPTU UFTU ð UIF ð TUV EFC
UIJT ð TUV EZ ð BSF ð TIPXO ð JO ð UBCMFT ð ð BOE ð
5BCMF ð ð \$PNQBSJTPO ð PG ð UIF ð QSFUFTU ð BOE ð QPT
ð 5PUBM ð TDPSF ð ð ð O ð

"SHVNFOUBUJWF ð XSJUJOH ð BOE ð JPUW ð EZ
M SD M SD

ð \$MBJN ð SFBTPOJOH ð BOE ð ð
ð ð ð ð DPVOUFSB SHVNFOU SFCVUUBM
ð -BOHVBHF ð VTF ð JEFBT ð BOE ð DPOUFOU

Total

/PUF ð Q ð ð

ð *O ð UBCMF ð ð UIF ð UPUBM ð NFBO ð TDPSF ð
FYQFSJNFOUBM ð HSPVQ ð JT ð ð 4% ð ð
QPTU UFTU ð PG ð TUV EFOUT ð JO ð UIF ð FYQFS
5IF ð NFBO ð TDPSF ð PG ð UIF ð QSFUFTU ð PG ð UIF
SFBTPOJOH ð BOE ð DPVOUFSB SHVNFOU SFCV
-BOHVBHF ð VTF ð JEFBT ð BOE ð DPOUFOU ð JT
TDPSF ð PG ð UIF ð QPTU UFTU ð PG ð UIF ð FYQFSJ
BOE ð JO ð QBSU ð ð JT ð ð 4% ð ð ð 5IF ð sC
HSPVQ4T ð &OHMJTI ð BSHVNFOUBUJWF ð XSJUJ
UIF ð EFWFMPQFE ð JOTUSVDUJPOBM ð NPEFM ð E

Table 2 Comparison of the post-test mean scores between the experimental group and control group (Total score = 21)

Argumentative writing ability	Control group (n = 29)		Experimental group (n = 36)		t	df	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
1) Claim, reasoning and counterargument/rebuttal	4.45	2.237	5.04	1.436	1.238	45.65	0.222
2) Language use, ideas, and content	4.50	3.882	5.68	2.630	1.399	47.35	0.168
Total	8.95	5.941	10.72	3.883	1.387	46.21	0.172

Note. * $p < .05$

In table 2, the post-test mean score of the experimental group is 10.72 ($SD = 3.883$). The mean score of the posttest of the experimental group in part 1 is 5.04 ($SD = 1.436$) and in part 2 is 5.68 ($SD = 2.630$). Furthermore, the total mean score of the post-test of 29 students in the control group is 8.95 ($SD = 5.941$). The mean score of the post-test of the control group in part 1 is 4.45 ($SD = 2.237$) and in part 2 is 4.50 ($SD = 3.882$). The findings indicate that the experimental group and control group had no different significance in English argumentative writing ability at the level of .05.

Discussion

The results in table 1 revealed that the experimental group's English argumentative writing ability was higher after studying through the developed instructional model at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, it was obvious that the developed instructional model could enhance English argumentative writing ability of the students. This instructional model could help the students in the experimental group improve their argumentative writing ability.

"DDPSEJOHðUPðUIFðHVJEFMJOFTðPGðUIJTð
QSFQBSFðWBSJPTðBDUJWJUJFTðUPðSBJTF
UIFðBOTXFSTðCZðUIFNTFMWFT ð4FWFSBMðM
QSPWJEFEðGPSðTUVEFOUT ðBOEðUIFZðIBEð
5IFZðMFBSOFEðUPðNBLFðDPOOFDUJPOTðCF
JOðBðMPHJDBMMZ PSEFSFEðXBZ ð5IFðTUVEF
FYDIBOHJOHðJEFBTðBOEðTIBSJOHðUIFJSð
TUJNVMBUFEðUPðSBJTFðJOUFSFTUJOHðJTT
PQJOJPOTðPOðFBDIðJTTVF ð"EEJUJPOBMMZ
VTFGVMðJOGPSNBUJPOðGSPNðEJGGFSFOUð
TUVEFOUT4ðMFBSOJOH ð ðEFHSFFðGFFECE
5FBDIFSTðBQQMJFEðDPSSFUDUJWFðGFFECBD
QFFSðGFFECBDL ðUFBDIFSðGFFECBDLðBOE
TUVEFOUðMFBSOJOH ð"TðBðSFTVMU ðUIFðT
BOE ðUIFSFGPSFðQFSGPSNFEðCFUUFSSðPOð
MFBSOJOHðTUFQTðPGðUIFðEFWFMPQFEðJO
DMBJNðBOEðQSFTFOUðSFMFWBOUðFWJEFODI
JTTVFTðMPHJDBMMZ ð"TðTUBUFE ðUIFðMFBS
SFMFWBOUðUPðDPOTUSVDUJWJTNðUIFPSZð
QSPDFTTðJOðXIJDIðTUVEFOUTðDPOTUSVDU
DVSSFOUðPSðQBTUðLOPXMEHFð #SVOFS ð
BCPWFðDBOðCFðTVQQPSUFEðCZðNBOZð
FGGFDUJWFOFTTðPGð ðEFHSFFðGFFECBD
UIFðFYQFSJNFOUBMðHSPVQðIBEðIJHIFSðT
BCJMJUZðBGUFSðSFDFJWJOHðUIFðUSFBUNF
ð *OðDPOUSBTU ðBTðTFFOðJOðUBCMFð
HSPVQðIBEðOPðEJGGFSFOUðTJHOJsDBODF

at the level of .05. The control group received the traditional instruction while practicing writing the English argumentative writing. The control group's learning activities consisted of 3 stages: pre-writing, writing, and post-writing. This finding could occur after the treatment since the students in the experimental group might not be familiar with the learning stages of the developed instructional model that required students to be more self-directed students. They had to learn to construct their own knowledge by using critical thinking and experiential learning. The learning of students arose out of an investigation and a variety of feedback types from several sources. Besides, another reason that had a vital influence on the writing ability of the experimental group was the efficiency of feedback. Participation and accurate, appropriate and meaningful feedback in Asian cultures is constrained by fear of mistakes, politeness norms, and the belief that peer feedback lacks credibility (Roskams, 1999). However, if students have more chance to practice giving feedback, it will be more useful to their learning in the long run. Once the students master the task with the benefits of feedback or scaffolding, the scaffolding can then be removed, and the student will be able to complete the task again on his own (Vygotsky, 1978). Although several researchers have claimed that peer feedback in writing classes is useful because of the cognitive, and social benefits of peer feedback, a number of studies challenged the strong positive comments about peer review and cautioned that some peers are likely to comment on surface errors and give advice that does not help revision (Bijami, Kashaf, & Nejad, 2013). However, nowadays, peer feedback has been known as a critical technique for improving students' writing all around the world (Bijami et al., 2013). Hyland (2003) mentions that peer feedback encouraged students to participate in the classroom activity and made them less passively teacher dependent. So, teachers need to be more concerned

XJUIđIBWJOHđBđGFFECBDLđTFTTJPOđBOE
QBSUJDJQBUFđJOđBMMđMFBSOJOHđBDUJWJ
GFFECBDLđUSBJOJOHđGPSđTUVEFOUTđ
JOTUSVDUJPOBMđNPEFM đ0OđUIFđPUIFSđIB
UFBDIJOHđNFUIPEđDPVMEđCFOFsUđUIFđTU
)PXFWS đXFđDPVMEđTFFđPCWJPVTMZđUIBU
TUVEFOUTđJOđUIFđFYQFSJNFOUBMđHSPVQđ
DPOTJEFSBCMFđQSPHSFTTđCPUİđJOđPWFSB
BSHVNFOUBUJWFđXSJUJOHđBCJMJUZđDSJU
UIFZđIBWFđNPSFđUJNFđBOEđFGGPSUđUPđ
JOTUSVDUJPOBMđNPEFM đ

Conclusion

đ *OđUIJTđTUVEZ đUIFđSFTFBSDIFSđDPOT
POđJORVJSZ CBTFEđMFBSOJOHđBOEđ đE
BSHVNFOUBUJWFđXSJUJOHđBCJMJUZđPGđVO
UIBUđUIJTđEFWFMPQFEđJOTUSVDUJPOBMđN
XSJUJOHđBCJMJUZđPGđVOEFSSHSBEVBUFđTU
NPEFMđDPVMEđBMTPđIFMQđTUVEFOUTđJNQ
BCJMJUZ đUIFđNFBOđTDPSFTđJOđBMMđDPN
BCJMJUZđPGđTUVEFOUTđJOđUIFđFYQFSJNFO
TUVEFOUT4 đ5IBUđNFBOTđUIJTđJOTUSVDUJ
JNQSPWFđUIFJSđMFBSOJOH đ4UVEFOUTđJO
TDPSFTđBGUFSđUSFBUNFOU đCVUđ&OHMJI
FYQFSJNFOUBMđHSPVQđBOEđDPOUSPMđHS
UIFđMFWFMđPGđ đ.PTUđPGđUIFđTUVEFO
NPEFSBUFMZđDPNQFUFOUđJOđVTJOHđ&OHM

no experience giving feedback, and they were not acquainted with learning by themselves. They were required to learn actively through each learning activity of this developed instructional model. Therefore, we could assume that these factors might be strong reasons to support why there was no difference between the effectiveness of the developed instructional model and the traditional instructional model.

Recommendations

1. To implement this developed instructional model, teachers should be provided with students in the experimental group that comprise three English ability level groups (good-moderate-poor). In case most students' English ability level in class is moderate or poor, it tends to be difficult to achieve the learning outcomes since the overall learning activity of this instructional model aims to have the students construct their own knowledge through investigation, discussion, exchanging ideas, giving feedback and reflection. Thus, if the class does not consist of students who have several English ability levels, the students are less likely to get a lot of learning perspectives and useful information from sharing knowledge with other peers while learning.

2. The teachers should provide training for students about giving feedback before conducting the developed instructional model.

3. The teachers should study the instructional model carefully so that they can follow the teaching procedures correctly. However, the teachers can use other techniques to get the students' interest in learning by considering the appropriateness in accordance with the purposes of learning stages, learning outcomes, teaching procedures and content.

4. The teachers should prepare a one-week training course on basic grammar usage about paragraph writing for students to help them learn better during the experiment.

References

#JKBNJ ð. ð, BTIFG ð4 ð) ð ð /FKBE ð. ð4
ð &OHMJTIðXSJUJOH ðPZSVOBMBPIGð ðBOEð
ð &EVDBUJPO ð ð ð
#PPOQBUUBOðBQPSQOBSBðJWFð ðUVEZðPGð &
ð TUSBUFHJFTðBOEðEJGsDVMUJFTðBTðQFS
ð TUVEZðPGðTDIPPMðPGðIVNBOJUJFTð 3F
ð UIFð5IBJð\$IBNCFSðPGð\$PNNFSDF ð
#SVOFS5ðP+XBðSðBðUIðP SZðPGðJOTUSVDUJPO
ð 1SFTT
\$IBOUSBV%ð\$WUFðM PðNF O UðPGðBOðJOTUSVDU
ð UIFðB SHVNFOU ESJWFOð JORVJSZðNP
ð BQQSPBDIðUPðQSPNPUFðTDJFOUJsDðMJ
ð PGðMPXFSðTF D6FOQVECSMZðTIDFIPðMFDU ðR ðE ðM
ð \$IVMBMPOHLPSOð6OJWFSTJUZ ð#BOHLPL
%BMBJ ððGðGðFDUTððPGðEFWFMPQJOHðDPODFC
ð NBUIFNBUJDTðPOðMFBSOJOHðBDIJFWFN
ð HSB E FððQVEFMQUT ðE ð. BTUFS4Tð5IFTJT ð
ð #BOHLPL
&EVDBUJPOð %FW*FOVRP/Q ðS ðZ ðCUBðT\$FEOðUMFFSB ðS OJOH
ð UPðFEVDBUJPOðHTðBPOEðð&ðVQBðSJJðPðð%ðJEW ðFð
)JMMPDLT ð+ ð ð5FBDIJOHðB SHVNFO
ð "OðJOUSPEVDUJPO ð&OHMJTIð+PVS OBM
)ZMBOE4ðBðBðOEðMðBOHVBFðXSJUJOH ð/FXð:P
+BOUBTJðGðGðFDUðPGðXSJUJOHðJOTUSVDUJPO
ð tJQQFEðMFBSOJOHðFOWJSPONFOUðPO
ð VOEFSSH SB E V Q V E M T U V F S T O N B M P S 4 H L P S E B .

University, Bangkok.

Ka-kan-dee, M., & Kaur, S. (2015). Teaching strategies used by Thai EFL lecturers to teach argumentative writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 143-156. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815055317?via%3Dihub>

Keh, C. L. (1990). *Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Krieger-James, T. (2012). *Argumentative writing rubric based on Toulmin model*. Retrieved from <https://www.uen.org/lessonplan/view/31420>

Leibowitz, B. (2016). Postgraduate students' perceptions of the 360-degree approach to feedback. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(1), 81-92.

Lestari, M. P. (2010). *Improving students' writing ability by using inquiry based learning* (Unpublished Undergraduate's Thesis). Sebelas Maret University, Central Java.

London, M. (2003). *Job feedback: Giving, seeking, and using feedback for performance improvement*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think?. *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 274-284.

Meiland, J. W. (1981). *College thinking: How to get the best out of college*. New York: A Mentor Book.

Neuby, B. (2010). Inquiry teaching in the college classroom. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 10(1), 4-21.

Oregon Department of Education. (2016). *Revised writing scoring guide informative / explanatory and argumentative writing and research projects*. Oregon Department of Education.

1 I J S P N S B U G G F D U T ð P G ð V T J O H ð U I J O L U B M L X
ð N B U I F N B U J D T ð M F B S O J O H ð B D U J W J U J F T ð C
ð S F B T P O J O H ð B O E ð D Q W C M O T I F E U J B O ð B S 4 T
ð \$ I V M B M P O H L P S O ð 6 O J W F S T J U Z ð # B O H L P
1 S J O D F ð . ð + ð ð ' F M E F S ð 3 ð . ð ð * O E V
ð % F s O J U J P O T ð D P N Q B V S S O B M ð R B O & O S J O
ð & E V D B U J P O ð ð ð
3 B N L B F X & G G F D U T ð B G ð P S H B O J [J O H ð N B U I F N E
ð H V J E F E ð J O R V J S Z ð P O ð N B U I F N B U J D B M ð D
ð F J H I U I ð H S B E F A C T M J T E I F O ð U T B T U F S 4 T ð 5 I F T J
ð 6 O J W F S T J U Z ð # B O H L P L ð
3 P T L B N T ð 5 ð ð \$ I J O F T F ð & ' - ð T U V E F O U T 4
ð B T T F T T N F O U ð J O ð B O - S F Y U F S O B M ð Q B J S X P
4 V O B S O 5 I F ð B Q Q M J D B U J P O ð P G ð J O R V J S Z ð N F
ð X S J U J O H ð T L J M M T ð P G ð T F D P O E ð H S B E F ð P
ð B D B E F N J D ð Z F B S ð ð 3 F T F B S D I ð 3 F Q P S U
ð * T M B N J D ð 4 U V E J F T
5 F F ð % ð % ð ð " I N F E ð 1 ð , ð ð ð E F H S F F
ð G P S ð M F B S O 5 B B D I B O E H ð B T D F J # N F S O U & B V D
ð ð
7 Z H P U T L Z J O - E ð 4 O ð T P D J F U Z ð \$ B N C S J E H F ð . "
; ð I V ð 8 ð ð 1 F S G P S N J O H ð B S H V N F O U B U J W
ð B O E ð T U S B U F H J F T ð 5 & 4 - ð \$ B O B E B ð + P V S O