The Effectiveness of Implementing Self-Monitoring and Peer Feedback Strategies with Mixed-Ability Students in an English Essay Writing Class

การใช้กลวิธีการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อนกับผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถแบบผสม ในรายวิชาการเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษ

Thanakorn Weerathai[1] and Tanyaporn Arya[2*]

[1]Department of English for International Communication, Faculty of Technical Education,

Rajamangala University of Technology Isan, Khon Kaen Campus

[2]Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

*Corresponding Author, E-mail: tjarya@gmail.com, Tel. 086-8543082

Submitted August 20, 2018; Last Edited October 7, 2018

Accepted in final form October 8, 2018; Available online January 2, 2020

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์ 1) เพื่อหาประสิทธิผลของกลวิธีการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อน ในรายวิชาการเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษกับผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถแบบผสม 2) เพื่อสำรวจทัศนคติของผู้เรียนที่มีต่อ กลวิธีการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อนในรายวิชาการเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษ กลุ่มเป้าหมายคือ นักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 3 สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารสากล จำนวน 30 คน จากมหาวิทยาลัยในเขตภาค ตะวันออกเฉียงเหนือ ผู้วิจัยสอนในภาคการศึกษาที่ 1 ปีการศึกษา 2559 ในการประเมินประสิทธิภาพกลวิธีการกำกับ ตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อนนั้น ได้ใช้ผลคะแนนการเขียนเรียงความแบบอธิบายก่อน-หลัง รวมถึงคะแนน จากการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อนมาเปรียบเทียบ ซึ่งพบว่าคะแนนที่ได้หลังจากเรียนจบรายวิชา เพิ่มขึ้นอย่างมีนัยทางสถิติ นอกจากนี้ ผู้วิจัยนำบันทึกผู้เรียนมาใช้เป็นเครื่องมือเพื่อหาทัศนคติของผู้เรียนต่อทั้งสองกลวิธี ซึ่งพบว่าผู้เรียนมีทัศนคติเชิงบวกต่อกลวิธีการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อน ทั้งสองกลวิธีช่วยพัฒนา ทักษะการอ่านอย่างมีวิจารณญาณและเพิ่มพูนความรู้ผ่านขบวนการเขียนแบบร่วมมือกัน จากผลการศึกษาดังกล่าวสรุป ได้ว่า แม้ทั้งสองกลวิธีจะส่งผลดีต่อผู้เรียนกลุ่มที่มีความสามารถในระดับสูง กลวิธีการกำกับตนเองและการให้ข้อมูล ย้อนกลับจากเพื่อนควรนำไปปรับใช้กับผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถทุกระดับ เพื่อเป็นจุดเริ่มต้นในการขัดเกลาทักษะการ กำกับตนเองและทักษะการวิเคราะห์วิจารณ์ในการเรียนการเขียน

คำสำคัญ: *การกำกับตนเอง การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับจากเพื่อน การเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษ*

Abstract

This study sought 1) to investigate the effectiveness of the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented with mixed-ability students in an English essay writing class and 2) to explore

students' attitudes toward using these strategies. Participants were 30 third-year undergraduate students majoring in English for International Communication (EIC) at a university in the northeastern region of Thailand. Results revealed that although the post-test writing performance as well as the quality of annotations and peer feedback significantly improved, students still found difficulties in making annotations and peer feedback specific. Findings from student logs; however, revealed that students viewed these two strategies positively. It helped students to develop critical reading skills and opened up their horizons to collaborative process writing. It can be concluded that although the strategies may have benefitted students of the higher proficiency level in particular, it is recommended to introduce the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies to learners of all levels as it serves as a springboard to honing self-monitoring skills as well as critiquing skills in writing classes.

Keywords: Self-monitoring, Peer feedback, English essay writing

Introduction

Essay writing has long been known as a skill that needs training and practicing. Teaching and learning writing, especially in the context of English as a foreign language, has never been easy. Problems may stem from the complexity of the skill itself - instruction that does not emphasize the process of writing, or feedback that is not understood - all are prone to have a direct impact on students' writing progress as well as their confidence in writing (Chinnawongs, 2001; Honsa, 2013; Hyland, 1990; Truscott, 1999). In many cases where teachers have limited teaching time, the process of writing may be left out and learners' writing is responded to as if they were final drafts. Such instances lead to a lack of sufficient practice for students since the focus tends to be on product rather than process.

Types of feedback, i.e., direct or indirect teacher feedback also have an impact on the students' writing progress as well as their confidence. Teachers may, under circumstances, be pressed to provide feedback only on the final drafts, or may provide indirect feedback that is given in codes and symbols to students in order to reduce marking time. Doing so may not only be insufficient help for students, but it may also be difficult to revise drafts based on such feedback, since it is not always possible for students to identify errors accurately (Hyland, 1990; Sampson, 2012).

Conversely, teachers may provide plenty of direct feedback, explicitly pointing out both major and minor mistakes overtly. With this kind of feedback; however, students may fail to take note their mistakes perhaps not genuinely learning from their mistakes or understanding the feedback or the reasons behind the given feedback. Further, this type of feedback may even sway students away from their original intentions and focus their attention more on the teacher's ideas (Sommers, 1982).

This, in turn could lead them to lose their eagerness and interest in studying other corrections suggested by teachers (Honsa, 2013). More importantly, this type of direct feedback does not promote thinking or autonomous learning (Truscott, 1999); nor does it reinforce acquisition, or build up knowledge of students' productive skills (Cresswell, 2000), which are very important in writing.

In other instances, some students may not feel confident enough to write because they feel constrained by their weaknesses in English. Hence, these students tend to rely on teachers, prefer all errors pointed out by teachers, and view teacher feedback as the most useful in helping them improve writing (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009; Ferris, 2004; Lee, 2005; Riazantseva, 2012); so although teacher feedback has, to some extent, proven to be effective, it has not been shown to boost students' confidence in writing (Chinnawongs, 2001).

Self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies

Self-monitoring or annotating is a strategy that allows students to have control over the feedback they receive from reviewers. By writing comments or asking questions they may have about problems they anticipate during the process of writing, reviewers are able to respond directly to those concerns (Cresswell, 2000; Xiang, 2004). Also, it allows students more freedom, promotes critical thinking skills, and helps reviewers provide more specific feedback to writers to improve their writing (Charles, 1990). Thus, students may find this strategy better caters to their needs.

Previous research on self-monitoring has shown that students value self-monitoring as an effective strategy in helping them learn and improve their writing (Romano & Martinez, 2014; Toofan, 2014; Tsai & Lin 2012; Xiang, 2004; Yayli, 2012). Although, to some extent, students may want teachers to provide them feedback, especially on grammar, they still feel that self-monitoring would be beneficial to them in the long run (Charles, 1990; Cresswell, 2000; Romano & Martinez, 2014; Xiang, 2004). However, self-monitoring tends to be used more effectively by high-proficiency students, when compared with low-proficiency students, as they tend to have experience, awareness, and confidence in writing (Cresswell, 2000; Xiang, 2004). Moreover, studies have shown that students sometimes fail to self-monitor specifically on global aspects, i.e., content and organization, particularly if they have not been trained to self-monitor well and given insufficient practice (Cresswell, 2000; Sadeghi & Baneh, 2012).

Self-monitoring requires writers to annotate comments or questions as a reflective process of their own writing. When peer feedback is coupled with self-monitoring, a give and take process takes place, where students provide their own reflection on the writing and receive feedback. Whether or not feedback can be used to improve the writing, this process promotes critical thinking skills, collaboration, and autonomy (Rollinson, 2005; Yang, Banger, & Yu, 2006). It may also create mutual understanding among friends, leading to long-term improvement, and increased confidence and

motivation in writing (Chinnawongs, 2001; Hyland, 2000). Thus, it seems that self-monitoring and peer feedback would complement each other.

Numerous studies suggest that peer feedback benefits students' writing process, allowing more control and autonomy to students, supporting the process of writing, encouraging high level of interaction and response between reader and writer, and also giving opportunities for students to learn from others' strong points to offset their own weaknesses (Hyland, 2000; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Rollinson, 2005; Yang, Banger, & Yu, 2006). With peer feedback, as studies showed, students' anxiety could be reduced while boosting confidence and motivation to learn writing, leading to improvement in writing (Chinnawongs, 2001; Min, 2005; Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014).

Although peer feedback provides several advantages, it does have one big challenge – the lack of trust in peers. Students may not easily accept the ideas that peers are qualified enough to act as substitutes for the teacher to critique their writing (Rollinson, 2005). They may feel uncomfortable being demanded by peers. Thus, at least, to minimize this problem, teachers may allow students to choose their own peers to work in pairs so they feel more comfortable to interact and exchange ideas (Yang, et al., 2006). It is also possible to allow them to communicate in their native language to establish trust, build relationships, and create rapport among. Lee (2008, p.146) mentions "when feedback is used to build relationships with students and targeted to their personality and needs, students are more likely to perceive it as effective". In this study, the researcher investigates whether or not these two strategies, when coupled, can enhance students' writing performance and create positive attitudes toward writing. The findings in this study may shed light on how these strategies may be used most effectively with mixed-ability students in an EFL writing context.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To investigate the effectiveness of the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented with mixed-ability students in the English essay writing class

2. To explore students' attitudes toward using the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in the English essay writing class

Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Can the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in the English essay writing class improve students' writing performance?

2. What are the students' attitudes toward the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in the English essay writing class?

Research Methodology

Research design and participants

This study adopted a pretest-posttest design with an intact group of 30 third-year undergraduate students, aged 20-23 majoring in English for International Communication (EIC) at a university in the northeastern region of Thailand. The students, both male and female, were taking a required English essay writing course in the first academic year of 2016, prior to which they had taken a paragraph writing course. The English writing proficiency of the majority was at the intermediate and low levels. This was observed from the grades obtained from the previous paragraph writing course.

Instruments and data collection

To assess the effectiveness and students' attitudes toward the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in the English essay writing class, a pre- and post-expository writing test and student logs were used to obtain the data.

The data collection period was 15 weeks. The participants met the teacher/researcher 3 hours every week. Participants selected their own counterparts who would provide them with peer feedback and whom they felt comfortable working with so that they could freely interact and exchange ideas (Yang, et al., 2006). For the first four weeks, they were trained to self-monitor and give peer feedback explicitly, after which, they were trained to write essays of different genres, i.e., narrative, descriptive, and expository. For every genre they learned, they also practiced making annotations and giving peer feedback throughout the course of study, having regular practice using the two strategies. Thus, participants had increasing confidence to write, make annotations, and provide peer feedback.

An English pre-test and post-test, designed based on the goal and objectives of the course, was used to examine the effectiveness of the strategies implemented in the course, indicating how much the students' writing skills had developed at the end of the course. Prior to the experiment, the topics of the two tests were validated by a panel of three experts using the content validity. The value of the content of the tests was 0.91. In order to minimize the practice effect, the topics of the two parallel tests were made different. Both tests were expository essays administered at the beginning and at the end of the course, which was 14 weeks apart. Each test, which lasted 1.40 hours, required participants to write a well-organized essay of 200 words (60 minutes), make annotations (20 minutes), and give peer feedback (20 minutes). Dependent *t-test* for paired samples was employed to calculate the data obtained from the two tests as well as the students' annotations and peer feedback to see the difference of the scores. The total score of the pre-test and post-test was 100 points each, while the total score of the students' annotations and peer feedback was 50 points each.

Two raters rated the writing tests using Jacob's analytical scoring guide (Jacobs, et al., 1981). The quality of annotations and peer feedback were also rated by these two raters using the self-developed annotation and peer feedback scoring guides. The Pearson correlation coefficient was employed to determine the inter-rater reliability between the two raters. The inter-rater reliability values of the pre- and post-tests were .96 and .95 respectively.

Students were asked to keep a learner log to reflect their thoughts toward the strategies practiced throughout the course, as well as problems when using the two strategies and how they solved the problems. Data obtained from the student logs were analyzed using content analysis.

Research Findings

The effectiveness of implementing self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies as determined by students' writing performance

To determine the students' writing performance, the data from the expository English essay writing pre-test and post-test revealed that there was a significant difference of the mean scores (t = 8.68; p = .000) as seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison between the English pre-test and post-test expository essay writing scores using t-test

Test	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. (1-tailed)
Pre-test	30	43.31	9.63	8.68	.000
Post-test	30	53.35	10.62		

The effect size of the mean scores was 0.99. Hence, the means were likely very different or large when d = 0.8 (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that the students' writing performance significantly improved after attending the course.

To further confirm the effectiveness of the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies, the quality of students' annotations and peer feedback from the pre-test and post-test were also calculated. The inter-rater reliability values of the annotations and peer feedback from the pre-test were .90 and .91, while the values in the post-test were .94 and .96.

The results of the quality of annotations and peer feedback also revealed significant differences in the mean scores (t = 7.53; p = .000) and (t = 3.10; p = .002) as shown in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Table 2: Comparison between the annotation scores from the English pre-test and post-test expository essay writing using t-test

Test	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. (1-tailed)
Pre-test	30	18.70	2.18	7.53	.000
Post-test	30	24.16	4.86		

Table 3: Comparison between the peer feedback scores from the English pre-test and post-test expository essay writing using t-test

Test	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. (1-tailed)
Pre-test	30	20.33	3.79	3.10	.002
Post-test	30	23.03	5.10		

Values of the effect size of the annotations and peer feedback were 1.55 and 0.61 respectively. Although the means of self-monitoring and peer feedback were not very high at all, it is still evident that there was a slight improvement in students' self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies after being trained.

When studying the mean scores of each proficiency level, it was found that the students' annotations and peer feedback scores did not change significantly from the pre-test to post-test. For the annotation average scores, the high-proficiency students were found to annotate better on content, vocabulary, and language use with the scores of 9.54, 5.90, and 5.63 respectively. The intermediate students slightly improved in three aspects, i.e., content, organization, and vocabulary with 7.00, 5.20, and 4.30 respectively, while the language use and mechanics scores remained the same in the post-test. The scores of the low-proficiency students were also slightly improved in three aspects, i.e., content, organization, and mechanics with 7.22, 5.66, and 1.20 respectively, but the scores of the vocabulary and language use remained unchanged in the post-test. Tables 4 shows the annotation scores according to proficiency levels.

Table 4: Pre-test and post-test annotation scores according to proficiency level

Students		Content (15 points)		Organization (10 points)		Vocabulary (10 points)		Language Use (10 points)		Mechanics (5 points)	
Level	Number of students	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
High	11	6.36	9.54	4.54	5.09	4.00	5.90	4.00	5.63	1.00	1.90
Intermediate	10	5.00	7.00	4.00	5.20	4.00	4.30	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00
Low	9	5.00	7.22	4.00	5.66	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.20

In addition, the peer feedback average scores were found to be slightly improved in the post-test. The high-proficiency students' scores were increased in all aspects, especially for the content with 7.27. The intermediate students also gained more average scores in all aspects. On the other hand, the average scores of the low-proficiency students on the vocabulary and language use were not improved in the post-test, with 4.33 and 4.00 respectively. Table 5 shows the peer feedback scores according proficiency levels.

Table 5: Pre-test and post-test peer feedback scores according to proficiency level

Students		Content (15 points)		Organization (10 points)		Vocabulary (10 points)		Language Use (10 points)		Mechanics (5 points)	
Level	Number of students	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
High	11	6.81	7.27	5.09	5.63	4.54	5.90	4.00	5.09	1.54	1.90
Intermediate	10	5.50	6.00	4.00	4.60	4.00	4.60	4.00	4.90	1.40	1.80
Low	9	5.55	6.11	4.66	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.44

These findings indicate that although students, especially the low-proficiency students, were trained to self-monitor and provide peer feedback explicitly, they continued to have difficulties in making annotations and peer feedback specific, especially on the vocabulary and language use. Hence, their ability to annotate and provide peer feedback on these two aspects did not change significantly.

Students' views from student logs

The student logs served as reflective journals where they answered the following two questions:

1. What did you think about these two strategies?

For the self-monitoring strategy, students as a whole reported that it was a beneficial strategy. High-proficiency students reported that although self-monitoring encouraged them to be more critical and aware of their writing, some of them still found it difficult to self-monitor their own grammar. Some stated that they were unsure about tenses and sentence structure, indicating that even students of a higher proficiency level may not always be able to self-monitor on the aspect of syntax.

Intermediate and low-proficiency students reported that the strategy was useful and that they felt they could annotate better on content and organization. The strategy helped them be more aware of their work. However, it was quite difficult for them to self-monitor their vocabulary, language

use, and mechanics. Based on the analysis of students' answers, the following are examples of their views that represent the majority of each proficiency level.

I feel that self-monitor was useful, but rather a difficult strategy. So I did not know how to question specifically on grammar and vocabulary. (Student #1 – Low)

I think that self-monitoring was useful, but quite difficult. Sometimes, I did not know what problems to ask my friend clearly. (Student #24 – Intermediate)

I think self-monitoring was a beneficial strategy because it helped me be more critical about my work, but it was too difficult for me to annotate on grammar such as tense and sentence structure. (Student #16 – High)

For the peer feedback strategy, the high-proficiency students did not find the strategy very helpful because, sometimes, feedback offered to them was not clear, particularly that on vocabulary and language use. They were not able to benefit from given feedback on these aspects to revise their work. However, although in general high-proficiency students did not benefit much from given peer feedback, in some cases, they received useful feedback on content and organization. In rare cases, they received useful feedback on language use (e.g., verb agreement) and mechanics, as their partners were able to detect the errors that have been overlooked.

Intermediate and low-proficiency students reported that the strategy was quite useful. It encouraged them to learn writing collaboratively. In general, they received comments and feedback that were instrumental in improving their content and organization. They could sometimes get additional feedback that they did not request for, e.g., verb tense and punctuation marks, helping them improve their writing in a collaborative social process.

The downside of peer review was that in some cases, feedback was not constructive and straightforward, especially feedback on vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, making it too difficult for students to revise their work on these aspects. The following are examples of their views on peer feedback that represent the majority of each proficiency level.

I think the strategy was good. It helped me see problems that I did not think about and I could use the feedback to revise my work. However, the problem was my partner sometimes did not know the answers and I was not sure to use the feedback. (Students #5 – Low)

I think peer feedback was a very useful strategy. It allowed us to discuss and share ideas. We were closer to each other as well. However, at the beginning, my friend was not very straightforward. She said nothing was wrong, or everything was correct. I think she did not want me to lose face or was afraid of offending me. (Student #9 – Intermediate)

I did not like peer feedback because the feedback that I received was not constructive. So, it was hard for me to revise my drafts because I did not know for sure if the feedback was correct. (Student #21 – High)

2. How did you solve those problems?

In terms of self-monitoring, most of the high-proficiency students solved the problems by using the handouts that the teacher provided. By observing the annotation examples, they were able to think of ideas and ask better questions. The high-proficiency students were found to be more independent when self-monitoring. Low-proficiency students also used the provided handouts and consulted their partners or the teacher. Interestingly, many of the intermediate students preferred to ask the teacher to clarify the problems and explain directly to them. They felt that by consulting the teacher, they could relate to the ideas better than following only the examples. Thus, the intermediate and low-proficiency students were more dependent on their partners or teacher when self-monitoring. The following examples are what were reported in the student logs.

I used the handouts that the teacher had provided to follow. I also asked my partner whether or not she understood my annotations. (Student #1 – Low)

I sometimes asked my friends about my annotations if they were clear or good. However, most of the time, I liked to ask the teacher. The teacher always suggested ideas, gave hints, and explained closely to the students. This helped me see how to question more specifically. (Student #24 – Intermediate)

I tried to solve the problems by practicing more on making annotations on the aspects that I was weak. I also used examples in the handouts as a guideline to help me annotate. (Student #16 – High)

With peer feedback, irrespective of proficiency level, students reported that they normally solved the problems by asking their partners to elaborate or explain more about the feedback. When they did not receive any clear feedback that they asked for, they would verbally probe, such as, *"What do you mean exactly"*, *"Can you circle or underline the problems for me"*, and *"Where are the mistakes?"*. If their partners knew the answers, they would elaborate more on the feedback. This helped provide a clearer picture of how and where to revise their work. If their partners, on the other hand, were uncertain about the answers, they would ask the teacher whether or not the given feedback was correct. By doing this, they felt more confident with the feedback. Some students reported the following:

When I did not understand the feedback, I had to tell her to explain the feedback again and be direct with her feedback. (Student #5 – Low)

When I did not get clear and specific feedback from my partner, I would tell her to explain the feedback again or ask the teacher. (Student #9 – Intermediate)

When I was not sure about the feedback, for example, about spelling and vocabulary, I checked with other sources such as dictionaries and the Internet. I also asked the teacher if the feedback was correct or not. (Student #21 – High)

Overall, most students valued the benefits of the two strategies as they facilitated students to be more critical and careful during the process. Naturally, it would be quite difficult for students with limited English language abilities to see their own errors and make annotations and provide peer feedback clearly and specifically on particular aspects such as vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. They had to slowly develop these skills by using the provided handouts, asking the teacher, and checking for accuracy from other sources such as dictionaries and the Internet. However, they were able to slightly improve their ability to annotate and provide peer feedback on content and organization, as these aspects did not require language skills.

Discussion

This study examines the effectiveness of the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in the essay writing class as well as the students' attitudes toward using the strategies. Results from the pre- and post-test essay writing and students' annotations and peer feedback indicate a slight improvement of their writing performance as well as annotations and peer feedback. This makes a case for the need of the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies in any writing class.

Early exposure to self-monitoring and peer feedback training

Evidence that students' writing scores as well as annotation and peer feedback scores were slightly improved suggests that students who are in the low or even intermediate proficiency level are not quite ready for the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies despite being trained. Previous studies (Chen, 2009; Cresswell, 2000; Xiang, 2004) showed that self-monitoring was most beneficial to high-proficiency students. The current study reflected similar performances of high-proficiency students being able to question their own work and improve writing better than low-proficiency students.

Moreover, studies on peer feedback (Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Onghena & Struyven, 2010; Yu & Hu, 2016) showed that peer feedback worked well with students of the same proficiency level or higher proficiency level as they tended to feel more confident with the feedback, rather than feedback given by lower proficiency levels. Since students' proficiency levels in this study were mixed and the majority of their proficiency levels were intermediate and low, this perhaps explained the slight improvement of their scores.

This does not, however, mean that they did not gain from the strategies. The strategies, in fact, served as an initial exposure to skills that they could find useful in their future writing. However, ideally, students should be trained at an earlier stage, or even age, to be acquainted with these two strategies. Many studies on self-monitoring (Sadeghi & Baneh, 2012; Toofan, 2014) and peer feedback (Gielen et al., 2010; Min, 2005, 2016) maintain the importance of training students to use these two

strategies, revealing that the quality of their writing derived from how explicit training to self-monitor and give feedback is. Although they did not state exactly how long training in self-monitoring and peer feedback should be to see effective results, it may be suggested that training should be explicit, continuous, and early enough to instill students to self-monitor and give peer feedback more honestly and effectively.

Providing sufficient input or reading passages

Evidence from post-test annotations suggested, as expected, that the high-proficiency students were able to make good annotations. However, contrary to expectations, the intermediate students, were able to make average quality annotations on all aspects of writing except for, not surprisingly, language use. Some of the low-proficiency students were also able to give average annotations on content and organization, although very few, it is considered a promising start.

This suggests that sufficient input or reading is needed for intermediate and low proficiency students. Renandya (2007) studied the power of extensive reading and found that reading input was important for students' learning progress, as students who read a lot and extensively, and to a longer period of time gained more vocabulary and performed better in writing, and even on grammar. Thus, sufficient reading input to expose students with more vocabulary and world knowledge and a broader outlook may in turn enable students to annotate better, and should not be overlooked.

A combination of writing and reading instruction

Evidence from student logs where students reported to have increasing awareness of critical reading skills and supported learning to write collaboratively suggests a need for writing courses to be taught separately from the four skills, or even taught in conjunction with reading. Research on the reading-writing relationship (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991) found that a combined instruction between reading and writing led to students' improvement in both reading and writing skills. Thus, educational institutions may want to consider this aspect when developing or revising their curriculum if they aim for effective results in the teaching and learning of writing, reading or even critical reading.

A need to understand a clear concept of giving straightforward peer feedback

Evidence from student logs where students reported that their partners, even though working with the partners they themselves chose, did not give constructive and straightforward peer feedback to them. It is possible that students might still have the "kreng jai" outlook, or being afraid of offending others, and did not want to question their friend's essay where they might upset their feelings and make them lose face. This is a problem found in many Asian countries, including Thailand. Studies on peer feedback (Chen, 2009; Chinnawongs, 2001; Yu & Hu, 2016) found that students, especially in Asian cultures, avoided criticizing peers' work. Instead of giving useful and straightforward feedback to their peers, students tended to provide positive feedback to save face

and create harmony. This suggests that students need to understand a clear concept as well as hold beliefs of giving constructive and straightforward peer feedback.

Perspectives on implementing the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies in a writing class

From the researcher's view, implementing the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies was as an experiment to observe how they may be used to minimize problems of teaching and learning writing in the EFL context where the process of writing instruction has not been emphasized due to limited teaching time and where teacher feedback, either direct or indirect, was not understood. Although evidence suggested a slight improvement of the students' writing performance and there was still no clear-cut conclusion to the effectiveness of the two strategies due to their challenges when implementing with students of different levels, it could be observed that it might be possible to implement these two strategies with mixed-ability students because of the following.

In terms of the writing process, the two strategies complemented the process of writing allowing students to have continuous and sufficient practice. Not only did this helped reduce the teacher's burden providing students with written feedback but it allowed the teacher to focus more on teaching and consulting with students about their drafts via the process of writing, encouraging them to learn to write independently and collaboratively, which would benefit them in the long-run and also boost their confidence in writing.

These two strategies also allowed students and teacher to interact with each other more actively and openly. Although none of any form of written teacher feedback was given to students to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation of feedback, it was evident that verbal teacher feedback (i.e., mini-conferencing) was essential for students of all proficiency levels. As students, irrespective of proficiency levels, sometimes coped with their problems when self-monitoring and providing peer feedback by consulting and interacting actively with the teacher, which rarely occurred when they were given written feedback. Thus, it is suggested that teachers, as facilitators, should always be in the process of training and providing practicing for students to annotate and give peer feedback since to self-monitor their own work was difficult and feedback from peers was not always sufficiently and explicitly given. Teachers may assist students by providing them with either written feedback on the aspect that they are not good at (i.e., syntax), verbal feedback, or even both in order to guide and sharpen their self-monitoring and peer feedback skills.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies implemented in a writing course were somewhat effective in enhancing students' writing performance and helping them learn to write via social process, where they learned to be more independent and

collaborative. Despite their shortcomings, the students were able to appreciate the benefits of the two strategies in learning writing. Although the implementation of these two strategies came with challenges, where it may have benefitted higher proficiency students in particular, and where it could have been strengthened in terms of providing long-term training, sufficient reading input, and a combination of writing and reading instruction: it is recommended to introduce these two strategies to learners of all proficiency levels because it serves as a springboard to honing self-annotating skills as well as critiquing skills in writing classes.

Recommendations for Future Studies

This study was conducted over a period of one semester, and therefore, might not be enough to see big improvement on students' writing performance as well as their annotations and peer feedback. For future research, it can be interesting to conduct long-term training to train students on self-monitoring and giving peer feedback whether or not it can yield better results and boost students' confidence in writing after an exposure to long-term training, especially on content and organization.

Furthermore, research could be conducted to find out whether or not peer feedback would work ideally in a situation where the number of high-proficiency students are equal to the number of intermediate or low-proficiency students, so that the ratio will be balanced and the number of students would be enough to be paired up equally to help each other out.

Finally, it may be interesting for researchers to conduct a longitudinal study investigating whether or not students will continue using the self-monitoring and peer feedback strategies in the future.

Bibliography

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(3), 409-431.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 193-214.

Charles, M. (1990). Responding to problems in written English using a student self-monitoring technique. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 286-293.

Chen, X. (2009). "Self-monitoring" feedback in English writing teaching. *Research in Theoretical Linguistics, 3*(12), 109-117.

Chinnawongs, S. (2001). In search of an optimal writing feedback strategy. *PASAA, 31*, 27-43.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: developing learner responsibility. *ELT Journal, 54*(3), 235-244.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 49-62.

Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 304-315.

Honsa, S. (2013). Self- EFL assessment in EFL writing: A study of intermediate students at a Thai university. *Voices in Asia Journal, 1*(1), 34-57.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 33-54.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 279-285.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 2*, 83-101.

Jacobs, H. L., et al. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach.* MS: Newbury House.

Lee, I. (2005). Error corrections in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think?. *TESL Canada Journal, 22*(2), 1-16.

Lee, I. (2008) Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 144-164.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System, 33*, 293-308.

Min, H.T. (2016). Effect of teacher modeling and feedback on EFL students' peer review skills in peer review training. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(1), 43-57.

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(1), 102-122.

Renandya, W.A. (2007). The power of extensive reading. *RELC Journal, 38(2),* 133-149.

Riazantseva, A. (2012). Outcome measure of L2 writing as a mediator of the effects of corrective feedback on students' ability to write accurately. *System, 40*, 421-430.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-31.

Romano, M. E., & Martinez, J. I. (2014). Implementing self-monitoring in the EFL writing classroom. *SLW News: The Newsletter of the Second Language Writing Interest Section.* Retrieved September 25, 2014, from http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/tesolslwis/issues/2014-03-05/3.html

Sadeghi, K., & Baneh, M. D. (2012). Relationship between student self-monitoring, type of peer feedback and EFL writing performance. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(5), 909-915.

Sampson, A. (2012). Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Columbian EFL learners' writing. *System, 40*, 494-504.

Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 148-156.

Tierney, R.J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research Vol.2* (p.246- 280). New York: Longman.

Toofan, Z. Z. (2014). Individual self-monitoring & peer-monitoring in one classroom in writing activities: Who is at disadvantage? *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 5*(1), 99-111.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 111-122.

Tsai, Y. R., & Lin, C. F. (2012). Investigating the effects of applying monitoring strategy in EFL writing instruction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(13), 205-216.

Xiang, W. (2004). Encouraging self-monitoring in writing by Chinese students. *ELT Journal, 58*(3), 238-246.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 179-200.

Yayli, D. (2012). Tracing the benefits of self-annotation in genre-based writing. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2*(1), 45-58.

Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2016). Can higher-proficiency L2 learners benefit from working with lower-proficiency partners in peer feedback? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *22*(2), 178-192, doi:10.1080/13562517.2016.1221806