



The Journal of Asia TEFL

<http://journal.asiatefl.org/>

e-ISSN 2466-1511 © 2004 AsiaTEFL.org. All rights reserved.



The Effects of University English Writing Classes Focusing on Self and Peer Review on Learner Autonomy

Hyoshin Lee

Konkuk University Glocal Campus, Korea

The study aimed to investigate the effects of English writing classes focusing on self and peer review on learner autonomy at a Korean university, leading to finding ways to improve the quality of the English writing classes. An English writing class consisting of 29 students majoring in English language was organized and lessons were provided over a period of seven weeks. An online questionnaire was conducted to identify students' perceptions of the effects of the English writing class on motivation, responsibility, ability to make choices in learning activities, and engagement in learning activities. An open-ended questionnaire was also conducted with four students, the teacher who implemented the program, and one academic professional in L2 writing instruction. It was found that the English writing class focusing on self and peer review had positive effects on students' perception of students' and teachers' responsibilities and English learning activities outside classrooms while it had moderate effects on their motivation and English learning activities inside the classroom. Secondly, the results of the open-ended questionnaire to the students and the teachers implied that students' writing competences might improve. In addition, more systematic learner training needs to be provided to increase the effects of the class, particularly the effects of self and peer review. Finally, it was found that the clarity of the responsibility between teachers and students did not lead to the increase of the ability to choose the learning activities. Attention needs to be paid to how to increase the ability.

Keywords: English writing, self review, peer review, learner autonomy

Introduction

Since the importance of English speaking ability is high in Korean society, the psychological and economic burden of the people is also very high, and the English education gap is deepening (Kim, 2011). In particular, university students are required to have English proficiency, which is an important factor of preparing for employment. However, it is generally accepted that the university entrance examination in Korea has made English education at elementary and middle school focus on how to solve various types of questions rather than communicative activities. This has caused graduates from high schools to be equipped with insufficient English ability and have much anxiety about English. Hence it is a reality that anxiety is big while confidence is low. College English education is causing more problems. As the growing social demand for English has increased, the need to improve English competence at universities has also increased. The problem is that English education at universities is non-systematic and inefficient (Lee, 2014). Therefore, the issues of the increasing gap among regions and classes, and the cost of private education have been raised as a serious problem not only in primary and secondary schools but also in universities.

It is necessary to make efforts to improve English education in universities, but the simple extension of

the provision of individual programs is not sufficient. Rather it is necessary to change the method of English learning of adult learners, in a way that suits the lifelong learning society. In order to make this possible, the continuous learning system through the improvement in the learner autonomy attracts attention. Claims made in much of the research on the benefits of learner autonomy include the improvement of the quality of language learning, the promotion of democratic societies, and the preparation for individuals' lifelong learning, leading to allowing students to use learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom (Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012). Various studies and attempts have been made on the learner autonomy in foreign language learning both domestically and internationally (e.g., Benson, 2001; Littlewood, 1996). The issues addressed with regard to autonomy are concerned with the need to promote learner autonomy, the role of teachers in relation to learner autonomy, the institutional and personal dimensions of learner autonomy (Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012), and teaching and learning methods that can promote learner autonomy (Nguyen & Gu, 2013). In this context, attention has been paid to enhance learner autonomy in English writing. The traditional teacher review of writing is seen inefficient due to the lack of students' continuous follow-up and learner autonomy (Benson, 2001). Peer review and self-review have been regarded as ways of improving learner autonomy in English writing. The strengths of the peer review are the provision of multiple feedback from a variety of readers' perspectives (Ferris, 2014) and for the students to develop critical thinking towards their own writing, resulting in becoming more autonomous L2 English writers (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). On the other hand, self-review can develop awareness of what good writing is and helps them become self-critical learners. Hence peer and self-review is expected to enhance learner autonomy through enabling more deep learning rather than surface learning (Brown, Rust, & Gibbs, 1994). There is still little research on learner autonomy in foreign language learning. They include a study of the way of enhancing learner autonomy through participation in Korea (Yoo, 2010), a study on the relationship between learner autonomy and practical English ability (Kim & Kim, 2005), and the effect of self and peer feedback on learner autonomy (Park & Kim, 2016).

Under this circumstance, the study aimed to investigate the effects of English writing classes focusing on self and peer review at a Korean university on learner autonomy, leading to finding ways to improve the quality of the English writing classes. To this end, the following specific research problems were established:

1. To what extent did English writing classes using self and peer review influence learners' motivation?
2. To what extent did English writing classes using self and peer review influence the learners' perceptions of teachers' and students' responsibilities related to English learning?
3. To what extent did English writing classes using self and peer review influence learners' choices of the activities in the learning process?
4. To what extent did English writing classes using self and peer review influence the change of English learning activities inside and outside classrooms?

Theoretical Background

Learner Autonomy and English Education

English education innovations in the last four decades have changed the approaches from teacher-centered to student and task-centered, leading to the development of task-based and communicative approaches. As a result, students can have more opportunities to choose and create at the level of both learning process and product and are required to become active participants. The concept of learner autonomy has laid the foundation for this change (Sakai, Chu, Takagi, & Lee, 2008). Attention has been paid to learner autonomy in foreign language teaching and learning as well as general education. John Dewey contributed to the development of this idea. He emphasized the importance of a collaborative teaching environment for facilitating a child's continuous development beyond the pure acquisition of knowledge and subject matter

(Dewey, 1966). Holec (1981) applied this concept to foreign language education by defining an autonomous learner as someone who is capable of taking charge of his own learning. He stated that an autonomous learner held the responsibility for all decisions regarding all aspects of learning.

Further dimensions have been added to the definition aiming to highlight a capacity allowing the learners to direct their own learning. Focusing on the social aspect of learning, Dam, Eriksson, Little, Miliander, and Trebbi (1990) defined an autonomous learner as a positive interpreter of new information as well as an active participant in the social process of classroom learning. Littlewood (1996) developed the concept of an autonomous learner “as one who has an independent capacity to make and carry out the choices which govern his or her actions” (p. 428) and presented ability and willingness as two main components of the capacity: communication, learning and (by processes of transfer) their personal life as three domains in which learners make and implement choices. Much effort was also made to understand the concept of learner autonomy. It was defined as a capacity for “detachment, critical reflection, decision-making” to transfer what they have learned to wider contexts (Little, 1991, p. 4) and “a capacity to take control of one’s learning as one that established a space in which differences of emphasis can co-exist” (Benson, 2001, p. 50). Sinclair (2000) suggested 13 aspects of learner autonomy. They include autonomy is a construct of capacity; autonomy involves a willingness on the part of learners to take responsibilities for their learning; developing autonomy requires conscious awareness of the learning process such as conscious reflection and decision-making; and autonomy can take place inside and outside the classroom. Recently in a study investigating the effects of strategy-based instruction in the development of learner autonomy, Nguyen and Gu (2013) defined learner autonomy as learners’ self-initiation and self-regulation ability. The former focuses on a learner’s willingness while the latter stresses the learner’s strategies and skills of self-management such as planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

In addition to the efforts to understand the concept of autonomy, there have been many studies on what constitutes such self-regulated learning. Littlewood (1996) emphasized that having learners’ autonomy consists of learning ability including knowledge and skills and willingness as well as motivation and confidence. Nunan (1996) emphasizes the autonomous choice of learners, their attitudes toward learning, and their sense of responsibility as factors that constitute learner autonomy. In other words, the learner must be deeply involved in the overall process of learning, accomplished when the learner makes choices and takes decision-making responsibility over their learning. This responsibility encourages the learner to perform a role as a more independent learner rather than relying on the person who guided him or her, and also to have the ownership of learning achievement in the learning process. In this context, Chae and Jung (2013) suggested learning responsibility, confidence, self esteem, learning strategy and support for teacher autonomy as factors influencing learner autonomy. It is emphasized that the learners have to take responsibility for their own learning process and keep it together with the recognition of their own learning method. Furthermore, in order for learners to have such ability, teachers need to have positive recognition and support for the learner autonomy.

Research on specific pedagogy for enhancing learner autonomy in ELT has also been conducted in Korea recently. However, there is insufficient research on the learner autonomy of college students. Kim and Kim (2005) examined the relationship between learner autonomy and practical English among university students. Kim (2013) demonstrated how to enhance learner autonomy of students using learning journals. Considering the fact that lifelong learning is being emphasized in a rapidly changing society, Kim (2013) suggested that there be a need for college students to concern themselves with how to learn to become lifelong learners, and how promoting self-confidence (e.g. positive self-talk) can help achieve life-long learning goals.

Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002) examined learners’ readiness for learner autonomy in language learning by investigating views of student responsibilities and those of their teachers in relation to confidence in capacity to operate autonomously, and how this relationship influenced student motivation levels to learn. The instruments they developed encompassed aspects of learner autonomy of interest in the current study, and therefore were adopted and modified for use in the present research.

Self and Peer Review in Writing

English writing is considered a difficult task for Korean college students who did not learn English writing properly in high school due to an imbalanced focus on the reading and listening-centered sections of university entrance examinations. Therefore, special efforts are needed to teach English writing at universities. In this context, the process-oriented writing approach which encourages the production of multiple drafts of writing with responses and revision is considered more effective than a result-oriented approach based on one-off writing and teacher review. Peregoy and Boyle (1993) suggested the following steps experienced by L2 writers in process-oriented writing:

1. pre-writing: generating ideas through brainstorming and oral discussion
2. drafting: letting ideas flow without too much concern for the forms of the language
3. revising: re-reading their papers, and, with feedback from the teacher or peers, making some possible changes so that the ideas are expressed effectively
4. editing: correcting punctuation, spelling, and grammar which should come at a late stage, and
5. publishing: putting out the writers' work in magazines, newspapers, etc.

As teachers' written feedback in the writing class is often not followed by students' continuous follow-up, the traditional teacher review in writing is thought to be inefficient. This may come from the lack of learner autonomy as stated by researchers such as Benson (2001) and others. Research has shown that peer review improves learner autonomy and improves writing ability in English writing. This starts with the idea that students can learn from their peers as much as they learn from teachers. Johnson and Roen (1989) defined peer review as the process of integrated activities in which learners are involved in responding to each other's writing. In the writing process, the students as reviewers review in various ways and return the output to their peers. In this process, students should use various communication skills such as reading, speaking, writing, listening, and thinking. Various strengths of peer review are recognized. Peer review can be useful for students who need to receive feedback on multiple drafts from a variety of readers' perspectives (Ferris, 2014). Another strength of using peer review is for the students to develop critical thinking towards their own writing, leading to becoming more autonomous L2 English writers (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Peer review encompasses negative aspects as well. It was found that students accepted far less peer feedback than teacher feedback (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Paulus, 1999). Yoshida (2008) also found that learners in an EFL context tended not to trust feedback received from their peers. Research indicated concerns about their ability to evaluate their peers' work (Cheng & Warren, 1997). It is suggested that training for learners is effective in mitigating these concerns (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997). Another suggestion is to provide feedback training programs to improve the accountability of peer reviewers (Ferris, 2014).

On the other hand, self-review raises awareness of what good writing is through the process of reviewing one's own writing (Johnson, 2012). This is because learner autonomy can be improved by enabling more deep learning rather than surface learning if they have an internalized ability to clearly recognize and apply the criteria for good writing (Brown, Rust, & Gibbs, 1994). Self-review is an effective way to replace teacher review in traditional classroom instruction, and is useful to review their performance and the ability to be self-critical learners. Self-review also has advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are to increase the responsibility of the students, to reflect on their roles, to participate in activities with colleagues, and to enhance students' ability for judgment. On the other hand, there is a problem of the burden of wrong feedback and the reliability of the result (Ashraf & Mahdinezhad, 2015).

Methods

Participants

The participants in this study are university students, freshmen to juniors, majoring in English language at a local university in South Korea. They met 3 hours per week and took part in the course during a period of 7 weeks. The focus of the course was on the development of writing skills, additionally improving learner autonomy. An English writing class consisting of 29 students focusing on self and peer review was organized. This paper reported the results of the comparison of the pre- and the post-questionnaire. The researcher designed the lessons for this study and analyzed the results after executing the lesson by the teacher, Jang.

An open-ended questionnaire was conducted to be used to interpret the results of the questionnaire and to find out ways to improve writing ability through peer and self-review and additionally learner autonomy. It was conducted with a teacher who implemented the class. Four students who participated in the English class were also selected for the open-ended questionnaire, based on their gender, age, and English proficiency levels. They are student A, 25 year old male student in the 3rd year with a 700 TOEIC score, student B, 20 year old female student in the 2nd year with a 650 TOEIC score, student C, 19 year old female student in the 1st year with a 750 score, and student D, 23 year old male student in the 2nd year with over a 900 TOEIC score.

Research Procedure

This course aimed to develop logical and effective communication skills by considering the relationship between sentences and paragraphs while writing. Students were expected to produce four to five paragraph-lengths essays over the course. They began with writing topical sentences and developed a paragraph-length essay. The writing class was a process-oriented one in that they were encouraged to produce multiple drafts of writing through self, peer, and lastly teacher reviews. The learners focused on developing the ability to become an active learning creator rather than a passive learner in the process of pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing. The teacher helped learners see themselves and colleagues as the main suppliers of knowledge and hold ownership over their learning.

Every lesson began with reviewing the previous lesson and introducing the new lesson. Topic setting by students was followed by discussion among students. Then it was followed by pre-writing. This stage aimed to generate ideas through topic selection, brainstorming, and planning. Students outlined the writing and presented their ideas by group and mutual feedback. Then they moved on to the next stage, drafting or putting ideas down into written form. Students structured the idea by taking it beyond notes, diagrams, and journal entry correction based on the prewriting (Brown & Hood, 1989). When the first writing began to take shape, they organized thoughts in a cohesive and coherent way to match their meanings. The next stage was revising, meaning rethinking, and rewriting. It included rewriting through self and peer review. Students reviewed their own drafts and rewrote them. They were shared by their peers for the review. After the peer review, they were shared and developed through mutual question and answer time. The final stage was editing and proofreading in which teacher feedback was given to students. As this study was designed to focus on the effects of self and peer review in a writing class, the teacher's role was minimized. Editing is defined as a further step in revision (Gardner, 2005). They focused on technical aspects of writing such as mechanics, sentence structure, and word choice. Attention needs to be paid to things like rhythm, pacing, word choice, accuracy, and sentence and paragraph structure (White & Arndt, 1991).

Questionnaire Survey

The questionnaire developed by Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002) was revised and utilized for the present study. The researcher developed a questionnaire to investigate students' readiness for learner

autonomy by identifying their views of responsibilities and those of their teachers', their confidence in their capability to operate autonomously, and their examination of their level of motivation to learn English. The questions are on the 5-point Likert scale in which "1" means not at all, very poor, and never while "5" means completely, very good, and very often. The questionnaire experienced some revisions considering the characteristics of students participating in the study. It consists of the following factors:

- Responsibility (the teacher's or the students') students believed various aspects of learning inside and outside class should be: 13 items
- Students' views of their abilities to manage these same aspects of learning inside and outside classrooms: 10 items
- Levels of student motivation: 1 item
- The actual activities students engaged in inside or outside the classroom which could be regarded as manifestation of autonomous language learning behavior: 20 items

Open-ended questionnaire

An open-ended questionnaire was conducted to understand the numeric figures obtained from the questionnaire. Four students who took the writing class, Jang, the teacher of the class, and Ryu, an ELT expert in teaching English writing at the university level, were selected and asked to respond to the following open-ended questions.

Questions for written interviews are as follows:

1. How do you think the quality of self and peer review can be improved?
2. How do you think students' perceptions of self and peer review effects teachers' and students' responsibilities related to English learning? What are the implications?
3. How do you think students' perceptions of self and peer review effect learners' choices in the learning process activities?
4. What do you think about students' perception of its effects on the change of English learning activities inside and outside the classroom?
5. What factors relating to English writing classes using self and peer review contributed to the learners' change in L2 English writing performance?

Data Analysis

The questionnaires collected online were analyzed using SPSS 24.0. Firstly, descriptive analysis was carried out on the pre- and post-questionnaires. An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to identify possible difference before and after self and peer review with respect to responsibility, motivation, ability, and learning activities. Finally, the qualitative data collected by an open-ended questionnaire were classified into topics and used to interpret the results of the questionnaire.

Results and Discussion

Results of Questionnaire

Change in learners' motivation

Research question one investigated the extent that self and peer review influence learners' motivation to study English. The participants were asked to determine their level of motivation for English learning

before and after participating in an L2 writing class consisting of self and peer review. An independent *t*-test was conducted to compare possible changes in motivation. The results indicated that the average motivation level in the pre-test was 3.7 and was 3.8 in the post-test. It showed a somewhat higher level (mean difference=0.12), but there was no statistically significant difference at the level of $p=.05$. This level is generally high considering that the median value is 3 points in the 5 point scale questionnaire.

TABLE 1.
Students' Views of their Level of Motivation

Item	Test	N	Mean	Mean difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Motivation for English learning	post-	27	3.78	.12	.568	54	.57
	pre-	29	3.66				

Students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities

This section addresses changes in students' perceptions of responsibility before and after participating in self and peer review training. Answering research question two sought to determine whether teachers or students should be responsible for various aspects of learning inside and outside of class. In the pre-questionnaire, as presented in Table 2, the top five items that showed students were responsible for their own learning were "stimulate your interest in learning English," "make sure you make progress during lessons," "make your work harder," "evaluate your course," and "choose what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons." On the other hand, the top five items that showed teachers were responsible for students' learning were "stimulate your interest in learning English," "make sure you make progress during lessons," "choose what materials to use to learn English in your English lesson," and "decide what you should learn next in your English lessons."

In addition, it was found that students saw all the items regarding English education inside and outside classrooms other than "identify your weaknesses" as responsible for the teacher in the pre-test. Among the 12 items that teachers were responsible for learning English, the items showing statistically significant differences at the level of $p=.05$ were "choose what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons," and "choose what materials to use to learn English in your English lesson." This means that students clearly saw the two items as the teacher's responsibilities while they had no confidence in deciding who was responsible for the 10 items which did not show a statistically significant difference at the level of $p=.05$.

TABLE 2.
Students' Perceptions of their Teachers' and their Own Responsibilities in the Pre-questionnaire

		N	Mean	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	
Pair 1	make sure you make progress during lessons	student	24	4.21	-.08	-.36	23	.70
		teacher	24	4.29				
Pair 2	make sure you make progress outside class	student	24	3.58	-.13	-.44	23	.66
		teacher	24	3.71				
Pair 3	stimulate your interest in learning English	student	24	4.29	-.13	-.83	23	.42
		teacher	24	4.42				
Pair 4	identity your weaknesses in English	student	23	3.78	.30	1.37	22	.18
		teacher	23	3.48				
Pair 5	make your work harder	student	23	3.91	-.22	-.96	22	.35
		teacher	23	4.13				

Pair 6	decide the objectives of your English course	student	23	3.70	-.26	-1.14	22	.27
		teacher	23	3.96				
Pair 7	decide what you should learn next in your English lessons	student	23	3.74	-.30	-1.58	22	.13
		teacher	23	4.04				
Pair 8	choose what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons	student	22	3.73	-.45	-2.89	21	.01
		teacher	22	4.18				
Pair 9	decide how long to spend on each activity	student	22	3.73	-.22	-1.31	21	.20
		teacher	22	3.95				
Pair 10	choose what materials to use to learn English in your English lesson	student	22	3.36	-.73	-3.86	21	.00
		teacher	22	4.09				
Pair 11	evaluate your learning	student	23	3.83	-.17	-1.28	22	.21
		teacher	23	4.00				
Pair 12	evaluate your course	student	23	3.78	-.22	-1.42	22	.17
		teacher	23	4.00				
Pair 13	decide what you learn outside class	student	22	3.55	-.18	-.94	21	.36
		teacher	22	3.73				

In the post-questionnaire, the top five items that were answered by students in relation to various aspects of learning inside and outside class were “make your work harder,” “make sure you make progress in lessons,” “learn outside class,” “identify your weaknesses in English,” and “evaluate your course.” On the other hand, the top 5 items responding that teachers were responsible for were “evaluate your learning,” “choose what materials to use for English lesson,” “decide what you should learn next in your English lessons,” “decide the objectives of your English course,” and “make your work harder.”

In the post-questionnaire, the students answered that they were responsible for six items. They are “make sure you make progress during lessons,” “make sure you make progress outside class,” “identify your weaknesses in English,” “make your work harder,” “evaluate your course,” and “decide what you learn outside class.” All six items showed statistically significant differences at the level of $p=.05$, indicating that students changed their perceptions of the location of the responsibility. The seven items recognized as the responsibility of the teacher were “decide what you should learn next in your English lessons,” “decide how long to spend on each activity,” “choose what materials to use in English in your English lesson,” and “evaluate your learning” showed a statistically significant difference at the $p=.05$ level.

TABLE 3.

Students' Perceptions of their Teachers' and their Own Responsibilities in the Post-questionnaire

			N	Mean	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair 1	make sure you make progress during lessons	student	27	4.30	.74	3.63	26	.00
		teacher	27	3.56				
Pair 2	make sure you make progress outside class	student	27	4.19	1.93	6.20	26	.00
		teacher	27	2.26				
Pair 3	stimulate your interest in learning English	student	27	3.67	-.037	-.15	26	.89
		teacher	27	3.70				
Pair 4	identity your weaknesses in English	student	27	3.89	.82	2.99	26	.00
		teacher	27	3.07				
Pair 5	make your work harder	student	27	4.52	1.82	6.66	26	.00
		teacher	27	2.70				

Pair 6	decide the objectives of your English course	student	27	3.41	-.41	-1.32	26	.20
		teacher	27	3.82				
Pair 7	decide what you should learn next in your English lessons	student	27	2.96	-.89	-3.31	26	.00
		teacher	27	3.85				
Pair 8	choose what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons	student	27	3.22	-.48	-1.91	26	.07
		teacher	27	3.70				
Pair 9	decide how long to spend on each activity	student	27	3.22	-.56	-2.43	26	.02
		teacher	27	3.78				
Pair 10	choose what materials to use to learn English in your English lesson	student	27	3.00	-1.04	-4.01	26	.00
		teacher	27	4.04				
Pair 11	evaluate your learning	student	27	3.19	-.89	-2.76	26	.01
		teacher	27	4.07				
Pair 12	evaluate your course	student	27	3.89	.74	2.39	26	.02
		teacher	27	3.15				
Pair 13	decide what you learn outside class	student	27	3.93	1.26	4.34	26	.00
		teacher	27	2.67				

In the pre- and post-questionnaire, there was a change in perceptions of students' responsibility for various aspects of English learning. First, in the pre-questionnaire, the teachers were seen responsible for 12 items, which reflected the tendency of students' perceptions that teachers were responsible for English learning as a whole. However, the post-questionnaire had a significant change in the perceptions. It was recognized so that seven items were the responsibility of the teacher while six items were the responsibility of students. The number of items recognized as the responsibility of the students increased by five with a statistically significant difference.

It was found that students had clear perceptions of four out of seven items seeing them as a teachers' responsibility by showing statistically significant differences. It showed that teachers' responsibility for English learning became more clearly recognized after students conducted self and peer reviewed English writing lessons. This implies that students' dependence on the teacher was reduced, meaning the increase of learner autonomy.

TABLE 4.

Summary of the Change of Students' Perceptions on the Responsibilities

			Clarity of perception*				Change	
			Pre	Clarity	Post	Clarity	Yes/No	Direction
Pair 1	make sure you make progress during lessons	Student	T	×	S	○	○	T→S
		Teacher						
Pair 2	make sure you make progress outside class	Student	T	×	S	○	○	T→S
		Teacher						
Pair 3	stimulate your interest in learning English	Student	T	×	T	×	×	T
		Teacher						
Pair 4	identity your weaknesses in English	Student	S	×	S	○	×	S
		Teacher						
Pair 5	make your work harder	Student	T	×	S	○	○	T→S
		Teacher						
Pair 6	decide the objectives of your English course	student	T	×	T	×	×	T
		teacher						

Pair 7	decide what you should learn next in your English lessons	student teacher	T	×	T	○	×	T
Pair 8	choose what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons	student teacher	T	○	T	×	×	T
Pair 9	decide how long to spend on each activity	student teacher	T	×	T	○	×	T
Pair 10	choose what materials to use to learn English in your English lesson	student teacher	T	○	T	○	×	T
Pair 11	evaluate your learning	student teacher	T	×	T	○	×	T
Pair 12	evaluate your course	student teacher	T	×	S	○	○	T→S
Pair 13	decide what you learn outside class	student teacher	T	×	S	○	○	T→S

* Clarity of perception means that there is a statistically significant difference between students and teachers.

Perceived abilities in choosing learning activities

This research examined how students perceived the learners' abilities to choose and evaluate English learning activities before and after English writing classes. The questionnaire consisted of 10 items. The results showed that the level of abilities increased in five items. They are "choose learning activities outside class," "choose learning materials outside class," "choose learning materials outside class," "evaluate your course," and "decide how long to spend on each activity." However, there were no statistically significant differences at the $p=.05$ level.

On the other hand, the level of abilities decreased in five items. They are "choosing learning activities in class," "choosing learning objectives in class," "choosing learning materials in class," "evaluate your learning," and "decide what you should learn next in your English lessons." However, there was no statistically significant difference at the $p=.05$ level in the four items except for "choose learning objectives in class."

To sum up, the results presented in Table 5 suggest that the English writing lesson did not influence their abilities to manage the various aspects of learning inside and outside the classroom. One exception is that "choose learning objectives in class" decreased, which means that they thought it is the teachers' responsibility.

TABLE 5.
Students' Perceptions of Abilities in Choosing Learning Activities

	Questionnaire	N	Mean	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
choose learning activities in class	Pre	27	3.52	-.34	-1.85	54	.07
	Post	29	3.86				
choose learning activities outside class	Pre	27	3.70	.19	.86	43.213	.39
	Post	29	3.52				
choose learning objectives in class	Pre	27	3.22	-.50	-2.59	54	.01
	Post	29	3.72				
choose learning objectives outside class	Pre	27	3.48	.21	.83	54	.41
	Post	29	3.28				

choose learning materials in class	Pre	27	3.22	-.30	-1.44	54	.16
	Post	29	3.52				
choose learning materials outside class	Pre	27	3.26	.052	.25	54	.81
	Post	29	3.21				
evaluate your learning	Pre	27	3.44	-.21	-.90	54	.37
	Post	29	3.66				
evaluate your course	Pre	27	3.81	.16	.79	54	.43
	Post	29	3.66				
decide what you should learn next in your English lessons	Pre	27	3.37	-.18	-.83	47.99	.41
	Post	29	3.55				
decide how long to spend on each activity	Pre	27	3.44	.07	.29	54	.78
	Post	29	3.38				

Students' engagement in outside and inside class learning activities

Students were asked to answer the 25 items regarding students' engagement in outside and inside class learning activities. Fourteen learning activities outside class showed an increase after the English writing classes as shown in Table 6. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p=.05$ level in 10 out of 14 learning activities. This means that students were actively engaged in English learning activities outside regular classes after English writing classes.

TABLE 6
Students' Engagement in Outside Class Learning Activities

	Questionnaire	N	Mean	Mean difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
read grammar books on your own	Pre	27	2.74	.22	1.24	54	.22
	Post	29	2.52				
done assignments which are not compulsory	Pre	27	2.70	-.26	-1.36	53	.18
	Post	28	2.96				
noted down new words and their meanings	Pre	27	3.48	.31	1.64	54	.11
	Post	29	3.17				
written English letters to pen pals	Pre	27	2.33	.74	3.47	54	.00
	Post	29	1.59				
read English notices around you	Pre	27	3.04	.52	2.54	51.60	.01
	Post	29	2.52				
read newspapers in English	Pre	27	2.04	.45	2.07	54	.04
	Post	29	1.59				
sent emails in English	Pre	27	2.74	.64	2.59	54	.01
	Post	29	2.10				
read books or magazines in English	Pre	27	2.81	.67	2.89	54	.01
	Post	29	2.14				
watched English TV programs	Pre	27	2.78	.50	2.07	54	.04
	Post	29	2.28				
listened to English radio	Pre	27	1.96	.58	2.68	54	.01
	Post	29	1.38				
listened to English songs	Pre	27	3.70	.22	1.48	54	.15
	Post	29	3.48				

talked to foreigners in English	Pre	27	3.22	.63	2.85	54	.00
	Post	29	2.59				
done English self-study in a group	Pre	27	2.63	.53	1.99	54	.05
	Post	29	2.10				
done grammar exercises	Pre	27	3.04	.55	3.02	47.40	.00
	Post	29	2.48				
watched English movies without subtitles	Pre	27	2.44	-1.04	-4.34	44.35	.00
	Post	29	3.48				
used the Internet in English	Pre	27	2.37	-.01	-.034	54	.97
	Post	29	2.38				
done revision not required by the teacher	Pre	27	2.44	.08	.41	45.04	.69
	Post	28	2.36				
attended a self-study center or group	Pre	27	1.78	-.39	-1.90	54	.06
	Post	29	2.17				
collected texts in English (e.g. articles, leaflets etc.)	Pre	27	1.56	-.10	-.45	54	.66
	Post	29	1.66				
gone to see your teacher about your work	Pre	27	1.85	-.67	-3.11	54	.00
	Post	29	2.52				

Changes were made after the English writing classes in the items of English learning activities during the regular class time as shown in Table 7. There was a decrease in “asked the teacher questions when you don’t understand” and “made suggestions to the teacher” while there was an increase in “noted down new information,” “taken opportunities to speak in English,” and “discussed learning problems with classmates.”

Among them, there was a statistically significant increase in “discussed learning problems with classmates” while there was a statistically significant decrease in made suggestions to the teacher at the $p=.05$ level. This means a decrease in the dependence on the teacher as the students became more aware of their responsibility. Further observations are needed as to whether these short-term outcomes are desirable or will continue in the long term.

TABLE 7.
Students’ Engagement in Inside Class Learning Activities

	Questionnaire	N	Mean	Mean difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
asked the teacher questions when you don’t understand	Pre	27	2.89	-.14	-.761	54	.45
	Post	29	3.03				
noted down new information	Pre	27	3.56	.25	1.35	54	.18
	Post	29	3.31				
made suggestions to the teacher	Pre	27	1.93	-.47	-2.54	53	.01
	Post	28	2.40				
taken opportunities to speak in English	Pre	27	3.26	.40	1.90	53	.06
	Post	28	2.86				
discussed learning problems with classmates	Pre	27	3.15	.51	2.16	53	.04
	Post	28	2.64				

Results of Open-ended Questionnaire

Improvement of learners' motivation

The response to the questions of the effects of the English writing on the motivation for English learning (pre: 3.66 → post: 3.78 with no significant difference) slightly increased although there was no statistically significant difference. The increase in motivation can be attributed to the fact that “they had become more motivated in the process of trying to understand and apply what they needed to know through writing” (Ryu, an expert in ELT writing at a university level). However, the effects are limited in that there was no statistically significant difference. Jang, the teacher of the writing class, stated that the limited effects might come from the fact that “Korean students were not familiar with self and peer review,” and the lack of confidence in overall English knowledge made it difficult to have confidence in the review processes. This is understandable in the same context as a student's response that he had difficulty in peer review due to the lack of confidence in giving feedback and self-review. It was suggested that “we have to pay more attention to teaching not only grammatical accuracy but also encouraging them to read more books and debate about related issues” (Ryu). Another suggestion is to apply the English writing approach differently according to the students' competence levels (Ryu).

Students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities

The questionnaire regarding students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities showed that the English writing class made students more aware of the distinction between teachers' and learners' responsibilities. Jang emphasized that “students write their thoughts constantly in their own words as I think students' role is more important than teachers in an English writing class.” Ryu also noted that students who had experienced self and peer review would have naturally recognized the responsibility of the teachers and the students in English learning. Both Jang and Ryu agreed with the students' perceptions of the responsibilities of the teachers and students in the questionnaire results.

On the other hand, Jang and Ryu both perceived the negative effects of asking students to make decisions about those that they perceive as teachers' responsibilities. Ryu demonstrated students' resistance to the increase of their responsibilities while Jang pointed out the negative aspects in terms of the teachers' role in classes. Jang stressed that:

Stimulate your interest in learning English' is directly related to the teaching method and preparation of the materials. Therefore, if the responsibilities of this task are passed on to the students, this will lower the quality of the class. (...) Students will be confused if the teacher leaves everything to the student without providing a guideline. I think that the teacher should make some kind of hedge and let the students freely open their minds in the fence. (Jang)

According to a study by Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002), Hong Kong students thought it was 'lazy' or even 'crazy' transferring responsibility from the faculty to the students. This suggests that it is necessary to share the roles of the students and teachers properly and make efforts to keep the distinction even teachers intend to plan a lesson aiming at enhancing learner autonomy.

Perceived abilities in choosing learning activities

In the case of English learning activities before and after English writing classes, the change of learners' decision making ability showed about half of an increase and decrease, but there was no statistically significant difference. This is different from the expectation that the ability to make decisions about English learning will increase in proportion to the increased responsibility of the student. Ryu proposed that “what part of the English writing process should be accountable for the learners should be clearly defined and

concrete and clear training courses be provided so that they can play an effective role.” On the other hand, Jang pointed out that the results were originated from the situation in which they were “unfamiliar with evaluating themselves and their peers as they are accustomed to being evaluated.” She proposed that students be encouraged to practice reading critically and evaluating others’ writings in order to develop the change in the perception of responsibility into that in the ability to make decisions.

The perception of ability in learning requires higher level of awareness than that of responsibility as the former is concerned with specific actions. As Jang and Ryu pointed out, it is necessary to actively change the attitudes of learners to self-review and peer review and increase their competency. An effective approach for this is learners’ training. Reviewing literature, Johnson (2012) presented four aspects of learner training. Cognitive need for students’ training is concerned with writing features and genre features before review for their own and others’ writing. Affective factors such as anxiety and self-efficacy are related to willingness to trust advice from a peer. Sociocultural factors including cultural and communication issues are challenges to ESL students. Finally, linguistic factors can become barriers.

Students’ engagement in outside and inside class learning activities

The responses to the English learning activities showed that those who completed the course had made changes outside the classroom while there were small changes inside the classroom. The possible reasons for the small change could be “as learners have to do not only writing activities but also learning concerned with writing in the classroom, it is difficult to have time to spend on other things” (Ryu). In contrast, the positive change in outside the classroom might be caused by the fact that “the lesson caused curiosity about English and they became more involved in activities other than regular classes” (Jang). Ryu mentioned that there was no need to concentrate on learning activities outside the classroom, since students were more interested in English. The suggested ways to make it more active were to use real life materials such as news articles and video clips in English writing classes (Jang) and an extension of general English writing activities to writing in students’ major fields (Ryu).

Students’ perceptions on learner autonomy

Students agreed that they became more autonomous learners through these lessons. Student C (19 years old, female student, 1st grade) recognized the use of the method learned in English writing classes for other major lessons as an improvement of learner autonomy.

I have used the writing method in other major courses as well as for my personal learning in studying English. For example, I use the writing style on the subject when I study for my own exam, and I use the paragraph structure that I learned in writing class in the discussion activity in English. (Student C)

Student D (23 years old, male student, 2nd grade) pointed out that the recognition of the distinction between students’ and teachers’ roles were clear evidence of learner autonomy. Classes that use self and peer review are lessons that are not unilateral relations between teachers and students, but complementary ones. Students said that their motivation and learner autonomy were enhanced through various intellectual and emotional experiences. Student A (25 years old, male student, 3rd grade) reported that he changed a sense of shame to motivation. He said that when he was doing self and peer review, he felt the painful feeling of ‘why can’t I write this expression naturally?’ However, he became motivated to learn while overcoming his sense of shame. Recently he tried to find natural expressions by watching dramas without subtitles. Particularly, student A reported that motivation of peer review was greater than that of self-review. Student B (20 years old, female student, 2nd grade) also stated that “peers with similar abilities encouraged him to feel less pressure to use English,” leading to increasing confidence and seeing movies and dramas without subtitles.

Effects of English writing classes on students' English writing ability improvement

The efficacy of English writing classes through self-review was to improve the writing ability through the correction of grammatical mistakes such as the habit of writing, except articles and repetitive errors. While peer review held the advantage of correcting errors that the learner could not recognize such as grammatical mistakes or pointing out the organization of the sentences, there was a big difference in the effect according to the competence of the peer. It was also pointed out that the problem of inhibiting the writing by only imitating peers' writing styles. Nevertheless, there was a positive evaluation that a combination of self and peer review had the effect of improving English writing ability and confidence.

I was able to see and use expressions used by other people and to incorporate them into my writing. As an example, I saw that another friend used the not only but also phrase in the paragraph, and I used it in my paragraphs as well. (Student C)

Common difficulties in self and peer review were the lack of confidence in the review output, and there was a common suggestion that the writing should be corrected through the teacher review. It was recognized that good learning habits had been formed such as the habit of reviewing written essays many times and thinking before performing tasks.

Conclusion

The starting point of the present study was to find ways to improve university students' English writing competencies under the circumstances where students had not been given proper education for English writing before entering university mainly due to the reading-centered university entrance examination. The problem has been based on the teacher-led approach which focuses on teacher feedback. The negative effects of a teacher correcting everything for the students have long been pointed out. Examples are as follows: it has a limitation on the improvement of their linguistic competence (Allwright, 1975), and it does not help students become responsible for their own learning (Chatranonth, 2008). Peer review has been seen as a complementary approach to teacher feedback by encouraging learners to become involved in their learning. It is related to the components of learner autonomy such as responsibility, ability, and motivation. In this context, a lesson plan for an English writing class was designed by the researcher and was implemented by a teacher at a local Korean university. The English writing class employed a process-oriented approach in which students were encouraged to produce multiple drafts through self and peer-review. The study raised issues relating to the English writing approach and learner autonomy.

Firstly, the study revealed that the process-oriented English writing class focusing on self and peer review had positive effects on students' perception of students' and teachers' responsibilities related to English learning and English learning activities outside classrooms, while it gave moderate effects on their motivation and English learning activities inside classrooms. Further research is needed to identify the relationship between the factors such as motivation, responsibility, ability to make choice in learning, and engagement in the activities inside and outside the classroom. For example, Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002) insisted that motivation be a key factor that affects the extent to which students are ready to learn autonomously, stressing the importance of teachers' efforts to facilitate motivation before they train students to become autonomous. Their findings were different from the previous literature and need examination. The weakness that it examined learners' perceptions without treatment can be complemented by quasi-experimental research like the present study.

Secondly, although the present study did not directly intend to investigate students' writing competences to what extent students improved, the responses of the students and the teachers to the open-ended questionnaire implied that students' writing competences might improve. They suggested that self and peer

review held different advantages respectively. Ashraf and Mahdinezhad (2015) reported the positive effects of peer and self-review on speaking competences as well as learner autonomy. Further intensive research is needed to examine the effects on the writing competences in a variety of aspects such as the extent and the areas of the improvement.

Finally, the importance of learner training was found to help students to conduct their roles, leading to more improvement in both the increase of learner autonomy and writing competences. Johnson (2012) argued that the inhibiting factors for the effects of peer review such as the quality of feedback, type of feedback, and the students' perceptions of the quality of peers' feedback can be overcome by sufficient learner training. Johnson (2012) demonstrated four areas needed for peer review: cognitive, effective, sociocultural, and linguistic. Careful design and implementation of learner training for peer and self-review will contribute to better English writing lessons. Checklists are also recommended to help with the implementation of peer feedback (Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2015S1A5A8018140).

The Author

Hyoshin Lee is an assistant professor in the Dept. of English Language, Konkuk University Glocal Campus, Chungju, Korea. Before moving to the university, she taught English at state secondary schools for about 20 years. She has worked on teacher/trainer training since she received her doctorate degree in teacher development in 2003 from The University of Manchester, UK. She has been involved in a wide range of English education programs. Her major interests include continuous professional development, curriculum alignment, ESP and learner autonomy.

Department of English Language
Konkuk University Glocal Campus
Email: hslee2012@kku.ac.kr

References

- Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. K. Burt & H. C. Dulay (Eds.), *New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education* (pp. 96-109). Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- Ashraf, H., & Mahdinezhad, M. (2015). The Role of peer-assessment versus self-assessment in promoting autonomy in language use: A case of EFL Learners. *Iranian Journal of Language Testing*, 5(2). 110-120.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*. London, UK: Longman.
- Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). *Learner autonomy: English language teachers' beliefs and practices*. ELT Research Paper 12-07. Leeds, UK: University of Leeds.
- Brown, K., & Hood, S. (1989). *Writing matters: Writing skills and strategies for students of English*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, S., Rust, C., & Gibbs, G. (1994). *Strategies for diversifying assessment in higher education*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Staff Development.
- Chae, H. S., & Jung, S. J. (2013). Demonstrating constructs of learner autonomy in English language

- learning. *Modern Studies of in English Language & Literature*, 57(4), 239-263.
- Chatranonth, P. (2008). *The impact of teacher feedback on students' grammatical writing accuracy: A case study in Thailand* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Manchester, Manchester.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (1997). Having second thoughts: Student perceptions before and after peer assessment exercise. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 233-239.
- Dam, L., Eriksson, R., Little, D., Miliander, J., & Trebbi, T. (1990). Towards a definition of autonomy. In T. Trebbi (Ed.), *Third Nordic workshop on developing autonomous learning in the FL classroom* (pp. 102-103). Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6-23.
- Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31-38.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp.1-19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, D. M., & Roen, D. H. (Eds.). (1989). *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students*. Oxford, UK: Longman.
- Johnson, K. G. (2012). *Peer and self review: A holistic examination of EFL learners' writing and review process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/228470/1/azu_etd_12223_sip1_m.pdf
- Kim, H. (2011). *A study on equity and efficiency of investment in learning English*. KDI Research Monograph 2011-04, 1-213. Retrieved March 31 from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2787547>
- Kim, K. (2013). A study on the self-directed classroom learning in the university setting. *Modern English Education*, 14(2), 189-212.
- Kim, S.-Y., & Kim, W.-K. (2005). An investigation into learner autonomy in relation to practical English skills. *English Language Teaching*, 17(3), 107-129.
- Lee, H. (2014). Study of improving the current English education system in a Korean local university. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 13(3), 151-174.
- Little, D. (1991) *Learner autonomy I: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": An anatomy and a framework. *System*, 24(4), 427-435.
- McGroarty, M. E., & Zhu, W. (1997). Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 1-43.
- Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perception of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113-131.
- Nguyen, L. T. C., & Gu, Y. (2013). Strategy-based instruction: A learner-focused approach to developing learner autonomy. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 9-30.
- Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: Some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. In R. Pemberton et al. (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 13-26). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Park, C., & Kim, H. (2016). The effect of self and peer feedback: Learner autonomy in high school writing classes. *Modern English Education*, 17(3), 53-77.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.
- Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (1993). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Sakai, S., Chu, M., Takagi, A., & Lee, S. (2008). Teacher roles in developing learner autonomy in the East Asian region. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 5(1), 97-121.

- Sinclair, B. (2000). Learner autonomy: The next phase? In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 4-14). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, H. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 245-266.
- Yoo, Hyun-Jung. (2010). Enhancing learner autonomy through participation' using authentic materials. *Foreign Languages Education*, 17(3), 197-225.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Learners' perception of corrective feedback in pair work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 525-541.