

## **The Effect of Self and Peer Feedback: Learner Autonomy in High School Writing Classes**

**Chan-Suk Park\***

Dongtan Global High School

**Hyun-Ju Kim**

Dankook University

**Park, Chan-Suk & Kim, Hyun-Ju. (2016). The effect of self and peer feedback: Learner autonomy in high school writing classes. *Modern English Education*, 17(3), 53-77.**

The purpose of this study is to identify how self and peer-feedback affects learner autonomy in high school writing classes. This study examined perception fluctuations regarding three components which affect learner autonomy: responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use. This study was conducted at a public global high school in the Gyeonggi Province of Korea. The participants, all twenty-four of which are senior high school students, responded to pre and post surveys on learner autonomy and completed three writing tasks with two self or peer-feedback and revision sessions for each of the writing tasks. A paired *t*-test and the interviews were conducted to understand the perception changes and the effect of self and peer feedback on learner autonomy. The findings of this study showed that peer-feedback helped students feel more responsible for their own writing and increased their self-confidence about their English writing, while self-feedback helped them to use meta-cognitive strategies more effectively than before. These results suggest that self and peer-feedback can help Korean EFL learners improve learner autonomy and delve into the development of their own writing.

[learner autonomy/self-feedback/peer-feedback/writing/  
/ 가 / / ]

---

\* First author: Chan-Suk Park, Corresponding author: Hyun-Ju Kim

## I. INTRODUCTION

The 2015 national curriculum of Korea (Ministry of Education, 2015) states that the role of English Education is to nurture proficient communication with people around the world in English, to preserve the knowledge of other cultures, and to enlarge the influence of Korean culture. In order to help students to accomplish these goals, the newly developed national curriculum emphasizes helping students develop learner autonomy in class.

There are, however, a number of difficulties putting this into practice in the classroom. In an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) situation where English is not used in the students' daily lives, English classes should provide adequate opportunities for students to use English in class; however, there are too many students in one classroom, which results in a teacher-centric reading and grammar class. Therefore, students learn about English, not English itself, and they are not able to produce authentic conversations in English. Moreover, the university entrance exam, which is called the KSAT (Korea Scholastic Adaptive Test), has become the focal point of classes in that students are taught and trained how to solve various types of questions as opposed to communicative activities. In other words, students learn English at school to obtain high scores on the KSAT.

This learning context naturally causes some students to lose interest in English. According to Crookes and Schmidt (1991), if lessons consist of the same routines, patterns, and formats, students' attention and interests in class naturally decreased. Thus, classes only focusing on raising scores on the KSAT reduce students' motivation and interest in learning English. Losing interest hinders them from continuing their work while learning autonomously both inside and outside the classroom. Consequently, this can cause negative effects not only to their English learning in practice but also fostering learner autonomy in general. There are indications of limitations within the current education system which deter students from being responsible for their own learning and applying self-directed learning while setting up their own goals for studying. Without these limitations, students will be more likely to establish plans and their own goals, in addition to finding their own learning styles and strategies to achieve those learning goals. Within this current system, thus, more emphasis should be placed on helping students to feel more independent and responsible for their own learning.

Despite the importance of autonomy in an EFL situation, the research on autonomy has been mainly conducted with undergraduates abroad (Lee, 1998) and little has been done pertaining to Korean high school students. Still, some researchers have studied the relationship between the components affecting learner autonomy and English proficiency level (S. Y. Kim & W. K. Kim, 2005), and findings from this research have demonstrated what constructs of learner autonomy exist for university students (H. S. Chae & Y. S. Jung, 2013). H. J. Kim (2016) investigated the teachers' beliefs about learner autonomy in

university writing classes and suggested that more studies on learning activities to foster learner autonomy should be conducted; furthermore, the interrelationship between the effectiveness and the relevance of those activities to language achievement should be examined.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) stated that feedback has been a critical factor in encouraging and enhancing learning and furthermore, the importance of feedback has also been acknowledged in second language writing. Self and peer-feedback is considered by many to provide students with the opportunity to reflect and monitor their learning process by thinking about content and expressions while writing in English (D. H. Kang, 2008; Lalande, 1982). Writers also think about the criteria required for good writing by themselves through this monitoring of their own writings and peers' writings. In addition, through revisions they perceive how their drafts and peers' drafts have improved, thereby increasing their confidence in writing, and eventually contributing to the development of their own strategies to enhance their writing ability. It was suggested that learners should be naturally exposed to improving their autonomy through these learning experiences. Consequently, it is necessary to examine the role of self and peer-feedback in improving learning autonomy and provide some suggestions about useful practices to help learners improve autonomy.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Learner Autonomy

One of the earliest and most frequently cited definitions of learner autonomy is Holec's (1981) definition. He defined it as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (Holec, 1981, p. 3). Dickinson (1987) defined autonomy as a situation where learners have total responsibility for all the decisions related to their learning and application of those decisions. In Holec's (1981) and Dickinson's (1987) definitions, the learners' decision-making process concerning learning is mainly based on a cognitive aspect of learning. Little (1991) added "a vital psychological dimension" (p. 4) to this cognitive process-based definition. He defined autonomy as a capacity for "detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action" (p. 4). This notion entails that learners can improve specific psychological aspects of the process and content to advance their learning. He suggests that the capacity for autonomy is presented in a way that the learners learn and are able to transfer what they have learned to wider contexts (Little, 1991).

Benson (2011) emphasized the learner's capacity to take control of one's own learning in learner autonomy. He stated that there are three fundamental dimensions where learner

control is implemented: learning management, cognitive processes and learning content. These three dimensions are clearly interdependent. Managing learning effectively is measuring how well the learners control the cognitive process while learning, meanwhile, controlling cognitive processes inevitably has consequences for managing their own learning. Self-management and controlling cognitive processes, which involve decisions related to the learning content, are implied in autonomy.

Based on the definitions above, the concepts related to learner autonomy can be concluded as follows: first, autonomous learners are those who take responsibility for making all the decisions related to their learning; second, the decision-making process is mainly a cognitive process, but a psychological dimension also exists.

Then, what specific factors influence learner autonomy and in which situation and through which methodology, can it be fostered? Some researchers in Korea have identified the influential variables needed for learner autonomy. H. S. Chae and Y. S. Jung (2013) performed experiments to find the constructs of learner autonomy and suggested that responsibility, self-confidence, meta-cognitive strategy use ability, and student's perceptions of teachers' support are the key constructs which meaningfully affect learner autonomy.

On the other hand, S. Y. Kim and W. K. Kim (2005) summed up learner autonomy as comprising responsibility for one's learning, the ability to use learning strategies, a learning environment which enables the learner to choose their own learning contents and methods, and belief in success. Responsibility, self-confidence, and metacognitive strategy use were used as sub-constructs that may affect learner autonomy in their experiment.

In addition, as is suggested by Kohonen (2001), it is important to choose learning contents and processes, to reflect on the learner's own learning process, to be aware of achievements, and to discover new needs. H. J. Kim (2016) also stated that it is important for learners to have the chance to reflect on their own learning process and how they go about achieving their own learning goals. Thus, both Kohonen (2001) and H. J. Kim (2016) consider meta-cognitive strategy use as one of the essential factors of autonomy.

As shown in the research above, taking responsibility for one's own learning is a primary factor in learner autonomy. Confidence in one's own ability also affects learner autonomy since learners keep learning if they believe that they can improve their own language ability. Similarly, the meta-cognitive strategy use ability, which learners actually use in their learning, is also an important factor of autonomy because controlling one's own learning allows learners to better organize their learning. To sum up, responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use are essential factors which affect learner autonomy and which will be further examined in this study.

## 2. Self and Peer-Feedback

There seems to be a general consensus that involving students in their own correction is helpful (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Lalande, 1982) and that a combination of teacher-, peer-, and self-evaluation might yield the most successful results. D. H. Kang (2008) noted that generally many people agree that correction on their own is helpful and the final purpose of a writing class is to become independent writers; however, little research has been done on the issue of self-feedback (Lalande, 1982).

Lalande (1982) compared the influence of self-correction and teacher-correction on writing in college German classes. The findings showed that the self-corrected group had statistically fewer errors at the end of the experimental period than did the teacher-corrected group. He argued that the combination of being aware of one's own errors and revisions, which included problem solving techniques, were significantly beneficial for developing writing skills in German. On the other hand, D. H. Kang (2008) pointed out that there is no research directly examining the effect of self-review in Korean EFL contexts, except Y. I. Moon's (2000) study which indicates some possibility of self-correction. Y. I. Moon (2000) showed that high-quality peer-feedback was exchanged and then the students used that feedback in their self-review selectively. Additionally, D. H. Kang (2008) compared the effects of teacher-, peer-, and self-feedback, and concluded that peer-, and self-review influences students' revisions more positively than teacher feedback.

There is quite arsenal of research available pertaining to peer-feedback. According to M. H. Huh and J. H. Lee (2011), peer-review has repeatedly shown a positive influence on students' composition and thus has long been practiced in writing classes (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Paulus, 1999; Tsui & Maria, 2000; Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006). M. H. Huh and J. H. Lee (2011) noted that teacher feedback mainly focuses on grammatical errors, whereas peer-feedback usually deals with content, organization, and vocabulary. Hyland and Hyland (2006) pointed out that from a socio-cognitive perspective, peer-feedback can be viewed as a formative developmental process providing writers with the chance to deal with their texts and to discover others' understanding of them. Tusi and Maria (2000) argued that peer-feedback gives more information than teacher feedback because it is pitched more at the learner's level of development or interest. Moreover, it enhances audience awareness and enables the writer to see egocentrism in his or her own writing; thus, learners' attitudes towards writing can be enhanced with the help of more supportive peers and awareness of what makes writing successful and effective can be enhanced.

As shown in the studies above, many researchers have discovered the advantages of peer-feedback; however, several studies pointed out that L2 students' limitations in knowledge, experience and language ability have restricted the merits of peer-feedback

(Cornor & Asenavage, 1994; M. H. Huh & J. H. Lee, 2011; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Saito & Fujita, 2004). Similarly, students have shown some concern about their peers' proficiency to evaluate their work or their own ability to give meaningful feedback (Berger, 1990; Leki, 1990). Therefore, teacher feedback is more preferred than peer-feedback when they are able to choose between the two (Yang et al., 2006; Zhang, 1995).

Hyland and Hyland (2006) also stated that some researchers cannot confirm the positive effect of peer review in L2 writing. Chaudron (1984) concluded that teacher and peer-feedback both positively influenced a student's writing improvement at the same level, while Zhang (1985) argued that what is more helpful for improving grammatical errors is teacher feedback rather than peer or self-feedback. In conclusion, peer-feedback has been a popular topic in L2 writing but the central issue of whether peer response is an effective means of improving L2 writing or revision strategies has not been researched enough as of yet (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Previous studies strongly indicate that peer- and self-reviews are important and helpful sources of feedback in many writing courses, and therein suggest the clear need for further investigation.

### 3. Relationship Between Learner Autonomy and Feedback

There has been some research on learner autonomy and self and peer-feedback respectively, however, the studies addressing the relationship between autonomy and writing are few and far between. Vickers and Ene (2006) introduced some issues related to learner autonomy in advanced writing. They noted that encouraging learner autonomy is increasingly recognized as a beneficial practice to promote language learning, showing that explicit self-correction is effective in an advanced ESL composition classroom context and self-feedback helps students become more aware of their own error patterns and more cautious of language forms and functions. Another possibility of self-feedback nurturing autonomy can be found in the following document. CRAPEL (*the Centre de Recherches et d'Applications en Langues*)<sup>1</sup> states that in order to carry out effective self-directed learning, adult learners need to develop skills related to self-management, self-monitoring and self-assessment (Benson, 2011). Honsa (2005) examined how to boost students' autonomy through journal writing. The participants in his study were constantly encouraged to think about their writing by learning to fix their own errors. The results of her study suggested that learners show improvement in autonomy in writing in English with the help of new

---

<sup>1</sup> CRAPEL at the University of Nancy, France, was one of the outcomes of the project which is the Council of Europe's Modern Languages Project, established in 1971 and where the concept of autonomy first entered the field of language teaching. After then, CRAPEL rapidly became a focal point for research and practice in the field (Benson, 2011).

technology and a bit of support from teachers. She suggested that the students' experience would further encourage life-long learning and writing in English as well as establish a positive attitude towards studying English on their own in the future.

Yang et al. (2006) also indicated that developing learner autonomy is one of the advantages of peer-feedback, along with improving critical thinking and social interaction among students. Process-oriented writing, which involves peer-feedback, has benefits in developing a sense of audience and the autonomy to control the process of writing to achieve confidence as an L2 writer (H. Y. Kim, 2016). When considering the components of autonomy, Lee (1998) chose peer support as an important component in promoting learner autonomy. As discussed above, self and peer-feedback can have positive effects on fostering learner autonomy; in particular it can increase a student's sense of responsibility, enhance their self-confidence, and aid in the development of learning strategies.

### III. METHOD

This study attempts to probe into changes in learner autonomy through self and peer-feedback in Korean high school writing classes and to suggest how to implement useful learning activities in the classroom. The research questions were as follows:

- 1) To what extent does self or peer-feedback affect the learner's sense of responsibility in their writing?
- 2) To what extent does self or peer-feedback affect the learner's self-confidence in their writing?
- 3) To what extent does self or peer-feedback affect the learner's meta-cognitive strategy use ability?

#### 1. Participants

Twenty-four students participated in this study, of which there were 2 male and 22 female senior high school students. They all attend a special-purpose high school<sup>2</sup> and learn English through English; thus, they are quite proficient in writing in English. To identify the general background of their English writing experiences, a pre-research survey was conducted. The results of this survey showed that most participants have experienced

---

<sup>2</sup> In Korea, "special-purpose high school" means schools which have been established based upon a specialized curriculum, such as science, language, art, music, etc.. These schools use a customized curriculum to meet the needs of the students and school's educational goals.

self and teacher feedback but have not had many opportunities to participate in peer-feedback. Additionally, most of the participants thought that expanding their vocabulary and obtaining feedback was helpful to further develop their writing ability. In addition, in order to examine their English level in general, their scores from the latest mock KSAT in 2016 were used. Based upon their scores, 11 students were considered to be in the first level, 6 students in the second level, 3 students in the third level, 3 students in the fourth level, and 1 student was in the fifth level. The standard scores of the participants ranged from 100 to 134. In total, there were 17 students who were in the first two levels, which suggests that the English abilities of these participants is higher than the average Korean high school students. Based upon the scores above, they were separated into two groups: One a self-feedback group and the other a peer-feedback group.

## 2. Instruments

The participants were provided with three writing tasks. The topics of the writing tasks were chosen based on their previous knowledge and took into consideration familiarity issues. The topics of the writing tasks were as follows. Task 2 and Task 3 are from sample TOEFL essay questions.

**TABLE 1**  
Topics of the Writing Tasks

Task Topic	
Task 1	Sometimes the first impression of a person changes. Describe your own experience in detail when someone's first impression changed from good or bad.
Task 2	Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? High school students should be allowed to choose some of their classes. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.
Task 3	Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? People learn more from peers than those older than them. Use specific reasons and examples to explain your answer.

To examine each participant's level of responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use ability, a pre-survey was given. The survey items were based on Guglielmino's (1977) Self-Directed Learning Readiness (SDLRS) test and were modified to focus on writing for the purpose of this study, because normally SDLRS test items are related with one's general enthusiasm for furthering their own English ability. This survey consisted of 20 items which were divided into three parts; the items were narrowed down to concentration on writing ability in order to better examine the changes in three aspects of autonomy. The items were categorized under responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use to help students be more aware of how each factor. The response



options ranged from 1 to 5, which were based on a 5-level Likert scale (see Appendix).

To help students give accurate and helpful feedback, a feedback worksheet was constructed. The feedback worksheet needed to emphasize both content and form, therefore, the worksheet used in Yang et al. (2006) was revised for this study. Yang et al. (2006) used a structured peer-feedback sheet covering organization, the development of ideas, grammar, and vocabulary and mechanics to provide comments on a student's draft. These guidelines helped students to see what they should comment on when analyzing a draft. For the purpose of this study and the comfort level of the students involved, the worksheet was translated into Korean and some criteria were omitted.

In addition to the pre and post survey, a reflective interview was also conducted to identify the reasons and process of their perception changes. Two students from each group were interviewed and the interview data was transcribed and summarized inductively based on a list of probable codes and themes.

### 3. Procedures

Due to the lack of experience of giving feedback to themselves and peers, a feedback workshop was held to help students perform feedback on their own or a peer's draft. During this workshop, the students were provided with guidelines on how to give feedback using a feedback worksheet. The workshop was a very beneficial experience for the students since it helped clarify some aspects about what they should do when giving feedback and also suggested some tips to help them produce good outlines and rough drafts.

This study was conducted during a period of nine weeks during the English classes held by one of the current researchers. The researcher encouraged students to write their own ideas in English while reading English passages of diverse topics. Moreover, the researcher provided opportunities for the students to proofread their own writing or a peer's writing and to give feedback on both content and form. The purpose of the writing tasks within these classes was to help students to write a structured English essay. The class met three times a week and each class was 50 minutes long. Each writing task took about a week and a half to complete and consisted of one topic and two feedback sessions. Once the revisions were completed after each feedback session, a new topic was given.

The first draft was usually written during the class and the students were asked to do self or peer-feedback using the feedback worksheet. Then they were asked to write the second draft before the next class. After completing their second draft, they had a second feedback session during the class, which, once they completed their third and final draft, was turned into to the teacher. After students finished the writing sessions, the post survey was conducted. The results of the pre and post surveys were analyzed by a paired *t*-test in SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) Statistics version 24.0.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Effect of Self and Peer-Feedback: Responsibility, Self-Confidence, and Meta-Cognitive Strategy Use Ability

The following tables show the self-feedback group's responses to the pre and post surveys on responsibility. A mean comparison was performed using an SPSS paired *t*-test to compare the mean difference and to illustrate more concretely the significance of this experiment.

**TABLE 2**  
Changes in Responsibility of the Self-Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
1	pre	0 (0%)	5 (20.8%)	8 (33.3%)	8 (33.3%)	3 (12.5%)	.16	7.49	-2.18	.03
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	9 (75%)	1 (8.3%)				
2	pre	0 (0%)	4 (16.6%)	6 (25%)	8 (33.3%)	6 (25%)				
	post	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	2 (16.7%)				
3	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	3 (12.5%)	11 (45.8%)	9 (37.5%)				
	post	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (50%)	5 (41.7%)				
4	pre	1 (4.2%)	4 (16.6%)	2 (8.3%)	10 (41.7%)	7 (29.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)				
5	pre	0 (0%)	3 (12.5%)	10 (41.7%)	8 (33.3%)	3 (12.5%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)				
6	pre	0 (0%)	7 (29.2%)	5 (20.8%)	6 (25%)	6 (25%)				
	post	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

It was revealed that the peer group's level of responsibility increased more than the self-feedback group in general. The peer-feedback group students felt more responsibility for their own writing and in trying to find ways to write a better draft than before. The participants of the self-feedback group showed a slight increase in the level of responsibility. It can be assumed that the reason these differences appeared is that the peer-

feedback group students were more aware due to the opportunities provided to share their drafts with their readers. This suggestion is supported by the reflective interview which was analyzed later.

**TABLE 3**  
Changes in Responsibility of the Peer-Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
1	pre	0 (0%)	5 (20.8%)	8 (33.3%)	8 (33.3%)	3 (12.5%)	-.83	6.19	-2.52	.01
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	11 (91.7%)	0 (0%)				
2	pre	0 (0%)	4 (16.6%)	6 (25%)	8 (33.3%)	6 (25%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	7 (58.3%)	2 (16.7%)				
3	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	3 (12.5%)	11 (45.8%)	9 (37.5%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	7 (58.3%)	2 (16.7%)				
4	pre	1 (4.2%)	4 (16.6%)	2 (8.3%)	10 (41.7%)	7 (29.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.7%)				
5	pre	0 (0%)	3 (12.5%)	10 (41.7%)	8 (33.3%)	3 (12.5%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	9 (75%)	1 (8.3%)				
6	pre	0 (0%)	7 (29.2%)	5 (20.8%)	6 (25%)	6 (25%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

According to the paired *t*-test result, it was revealed that there was a significant change in responsibility both in the self and the peer-feedback groups. The *p*-value of the self-feedback group was .03 and the *p*-value of the peer-feedback group was .01. Although the changes of the self-feedback group are less significant than those of the peer-feedback group, the self-feedback group students also showed a high level of responsibility; thus, they seemed to be attentive and more aware of their errors and how they could go about improving their writing.

The following tables show the students' responses to the pre and post surveys on self-confidence. Generally, the participants from both groups agreed with the statement that they can improve their writing skills if they put in the effort. In the *t*-test results, which compared the pre and post survey results, however, the changes in self-confidence in the

self-feedback group were not shown. The mean scores of the self-feedback group increased but the  $p$ -value indicated no significant change of self-confidence through self-feedback. The participants of the peer-feedback group seemed to become more confident in writing. The  $p$ -value was .01, indicating significant improvement in self-confidence. The results pertaining to self-confidence showed that the peer-feedback group's self-confidence gradually increased to higher levels while the self-feedback group's did not significantly change. This indicates that peer-feedback affected the participants' self-confidence.

**TABLE 4**  
Changes in Self-confidence of the Self-Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
7	pre	6 (25%)	8 (33.3%)	8 (33.3%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	-91	7.56	-42	.683
	post	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	8 (66.7%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)				
8	pre	2 (8.3%)	4 (16.6%)	11 (45.8%)	6 (25%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)	1 (8.3%)				
9	pre	0 (0%)	11 (45.8%)	7 (29.2%)	5 (20.8%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)				
10	pre	0 (0%)	4 (16.6%)	9 (37.5%)	9 (37.5%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)				
11	pre	5 (20.8%)	6 (25%)	9 (37.5%)	2 (8.3%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25%)	1 (8.3%)				
12	pre	1 (4.2%)	1 (4.2%)	4 (16.6%)	14 (58.3%)	4 (16.6%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (75%)	3 (25%)				
13	pre	1 (4.2%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	3 (12.5%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	1 (8.3%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

**TABLE 5**  
Changes in Self-confidence of the Peer-Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
7	pre	6 (25%)	8 (33.3%)	8 (33.3%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	-.91	7.29	-2.66	.01
	post	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	8 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)				
8	pre	2 (8.3%)	4 (16.6%)	11 (45.8%)	6 (25%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (83.3%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0%)				
9	pre	0 (0%)	11 (45.8%)	7 (29.2%)	5 (20.8%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)				
10	pre	0 (0%)	4 (16.6%)	9 (37.5%)	9 (37.5%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)				
11	pre	5 (20.8%)	6 (25%)	9 (37.5%)	2 (8.3%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0%)				
12	pre	1 (4.2%)	1 (4.2%)	4 (16.6%)	14 (58.3%)	4 (16.6%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (66.7%)	4 (33.3%)				
13	pre	1 (4.2%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	3 (12.5%)	1 (4.2%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (41.7%)	7 (58.3%)	0 (0%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

The following Tables 6 and 7 show the students' responses to the pre and post surveys on meta-cognitive strategy use. Generally, meta-cognitive strategy use increased. The self-feedback group students showed a significant increase, indicating that the self-feedback experience helped them to realize what they should do to improve their writing. The results of the meta-cognitive strategy use imply that self-feedback activities give the students planning time and make them evaluate their own work. This indicates that self-feedback affected the participants' meta-cognitive strategy ability positively.

**TABLE 6**  
Changes in Meta-Cognitive Strategy Use Ability of the Self- Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
14	pre	0 (0%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (50%)	4 (16.6%)	1 (4.2%)	-1.25	5.15	-2.21	.03
	post	0 (0)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	9 (75%)	0 (0%)				
15	pre	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	14 (58.3%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0%)				
	post	0 (0%)	4 (33.3%)	6 (50%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)				
16	pre	0 (0%)	2 (8.3%)	8 (33.3%)	11 (45.8%)	3 (12.5%)				
	post	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	8 (66.7%)	2 (16.7%)				
17	pre	1 (4.2%)	6 (25%)	11 (45.8%)	4 (16.6%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	6 (50%)	1 (8.3%)				
18	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	5 (20.8%)	10 (41.7%)	8 (33.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)				
19	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (50%)	4 (16.6%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)				
20	pre	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	10 (41.7%)	1 (4.2%)	5 (20.8%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	8 (66.7%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

An interesting change emerged when comparing the results of the self-feedback group and the peer-feedback group in relation to strengths and weaknesses: the peer-feedback group students noticed their strong points more than the self-feedback group students. In contrast, the self-feedback group students did not have the same opportunities available to them, which is probably why they were not able to discover their own strengths in writing. However, the self-feedback group students did show a bigger change in regards to pursuing their own goals related to improving their writing. It seems that the self-feedback group students did not recognize their strengths well, and therefore they might have tried to compensate for it in other ways once the need to improve became evident.

**TABLE 7**  
Changes in Meta-Cognitive Strategy Use Ability of the Peer-Feedback Group

Item	Pre /Post	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
14	pre	0 (0%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (50%)	4 (16.6%)	1 (4.2%)	-.41	6.24	-.23	.821
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	6 (50%)	0 (0%)				
15	pre	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	14 (58.3%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0%)				
	post	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0%)				
16	pre	0 (0%)	2 (8.3%)	8 (33.3%)	11 (45.8%)	3 (12.5%)				
	post	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)	8 (66.7%)	2 (16.7%)				
17	pre	1 (4.2%)	6 (25%)	11 (45.8%)	4 (16.6%)	2 (8.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	5 (41.6%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)				
18	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	5 (20.8%)	10 (41.7%)	8 (33.3%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	8 (66.6%)	2 (16.7%)				
19	pre	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (50%)	4 (16.6%)				
	post	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	4 (33.3%)				
20	pre	1 (4.2%)	7 (29.2%)	10 (41.7%)	1 (4.2%)	5 (20.8%)				
	post	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)				

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

## 2. Reflections on Responsibility, Self-Confidence and Meta-Cognitive Strategy Use

Reflective interviews were conducted to understand the process of and reasons for perception changes in the learner's responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use. The interviews are summarized as follows:

### *Why do you think your responsibility for your writing increased through self/peer feedback?*

I felt responsibility for my writing during the writing session. I thought my writing should be better than before because I did feedback twice. And, also I thought I should write more delicate and appropriate expressions. So I felt

responsibility doing self-feedback and revising my writing task.

I felt I needed to study writing more. I think the next draft should be better after the feedback, so to write better, I need to make an effort to improve my writing skills.

I felt responsibility in that I would like to give help through peer feedback. And also I felt more responsibility for my writing because my friend will read my essay.

After receiving the first peer feedback, I felt more responsibility for my writing. I thought next time I would like to show her a better essay.

Based on the interview data, the revising experience itself made participants feel more responsibility toward their writing. Self-feedback participants seemed to feel more pressure to write a better draft after revisions while peer-feedback participants felt more responsibility since they wanted to improve their writings to help their readers understand their essays better. The interview data on responsibility implies that the students feel more responsibility while reading their peer's drafts and the awareness of audience caused an increase in responsibility.

***How do you think your confidence in writing improved through self/peer feedback?***

I felt more confident in writing because I saw my writing becoming better without someone's help. So I knew that I have the ability to improve my own writing.

I didn't have confidence in writing at first, but I had a meaningful experience in the writing class. When my friend asked me to show my first draft of the first writing task, I refused, but, later, I showed my third draft to her. I thought my first draft was poorly written, but through the revisions, my writing became better so I could show my last version to my friend. From this experience, even though my first draft was not good, I realized that my writing can be improved through self-feedback and revision. So, I gained confidence in learning writing.

When my peer gave positive feedback on my writing, I felt confident because my English expression can be understood by others. And I realized that



someone can understand my essay while receiving peer's feedback.

When I wrote the first draft, I was not confident and I thought my writing was poor. But when I compare my first draft and the third draft, I could see the improvement of my writing so I gained confidence that I can develop my writing like this.

In the survey analysis, it was revealed that the peer-feedback affected students more positively than the self-feedback. However, one interviewee said that the self-feedback helped improve their self-confidence. The first participant of the self-feedback group said that she was able to see significant improvement in her writing and that she realized that she had control over if she improved or not. As a result, she became more confident when writing in English. The second participant of the self-feedback group also demonstrated a marked increase in confidence in writing, like the first participant. The realization that she could improve her writing by herself influenced her self-confidence in writing. This change also elicited a positive effect in regards to responsibility in that her raised confidence made her study writing because she was sure that her writing ability would be improved if she kept on studying.

In addition, the peer-feedback participants' answers revealed the reason they gained more confidence through this feedback experience. The first peer-feedback participant became more confident in her writing because her peer-feedback partner gave positive feedback on her writing. Moreover, the second interviewee said she noticed how much she had progressed and her confidence in writing was heightened. Thanks to the detailed feedback worksheet, her feedback partner was able to pinpoint and show her exactly what her good points were. Furthermore, the peer-feedback participants felt more confident with their own writing because their writing was understood by other people. Consequently, it seems that detailed positive feedback from peers leads to an increase in self-confidence.

***What kind of strong or weak points did you learn while doing self/peer feedback? Did you discover any goals for improving your writing?***

I found that my strong point is that I can express my idea enough in a simple sentence. And I found that my weak point is my writing is not logical.

I am not sure about my strong point in writing, but I think my weak point is that my English is not natural, which means that it sounds like Korean English. So I want to make my English natural. And I learned that each word has its own usage in the various contexts so I will try to use words considering the

context in which the word is used.

I think my strong point is that I can write proper words to express my idea, on the other hand, I learned that I need to make my main idea clear with supporting details and detailed explanation.

I learned that some of my expressions are not clear so I need to develop my idea more logically. And I learned that too long sentences can distract from the main idea so I realized that writing in simple sentences but in a clear way is effective. Also, I think my strong point is that my opinion is appropriate for the topic. The other thing I learned is how to use thesaurus dictionary and how to choose the best word for the topic. And I set my learning goal, which is to writing grammatically correct expressions to make the audience understand better.

To sum up the answers, the participants from both feedback groups generally learned more about themselves. The first self-feedback group participant discovered her weak points in writing and how to write words properly. The second self-feedback participant also realized what her weak points were and learned how to solve this problem through the feedback experience. She added that the feedback worksheet was quite helpful for reviewing a draft because of the detailed criteria provided on the worksheet. This suggests that giving detailed feedback was effective in helping students become more aware of their strong and weak points

Additionally, the first peer-feedback participant found her strong points and weak points through the writing experience as well, which contributed to the goals that she had set for writing. The second peer-feedback participant also said that she was able to identify her strong and weak points and had her own goal in mind when writing through the feedback experience. She added that the feedback sheet played a significant role in improving her writing because the detailed criteria suggested on the feedback worksheet provided helpful information. At the same time, she emphasized that the feedback worksheet was helpful in giving feedback to her peers. According to the reflective interview, it can be concluded that because the peer-feedback group participants received positive feedback from their peers based on the specified criteria on the feedback worksheet, they could learn which aspects they were strong at.

Regardless of the feedback type, participants thought feedback had a positive effect on improving their writing skills. In short, first, they felt more responsibility for their writing because they had to revise their writing or they had to show their writing to others. Due to those reasons, both the self-feedback and peer-feedback participants concentrated

improving their essays and spent more time on writing autonomously. Second, they gained more confidence in their writings through working on feedback and revision because they were able to monitor their own writing progress and notice their improvement on their own. Raised confidence played a significant role in making learners continue their learning because with the expectation of improvement, they spent more time and effort in learning by themselves. Lastly, they learned more about their own strengths and weaknesses, and they were able to set up their own goals for writing, learn more about themselves, and learn how to use meta-cognitive strategies for future learning experiences. Learners need to continually find ways to continue learning and to enhance their strengths and improve their weaknesses, therefore, meta-cognitive strategies are necessary to carry on their learning effectively by solving the difficulties and obstacles that they will face while learning.

## V. CONCLUSION

Among the many variables which affect learner autonomy, the levels of learner's responsibility, self-confidence, and meta-cognitive strategy use were examined during the course of this study through pre and post surveys. Based upon the survey analysis and the reflective interview, the major findings of this research can be summarized as follows.

First, peer-feedback helped students have relatively more responsibility in writing than self-feedback. Although the self-feedback group showed some increase in the level of responsibility, the peer-feedback group participants felt more responsibility in writing because they had to show their draft to their peers. The peer-feedback group participants noted that they tried to write better in the subsequent drafts because they wanted to show their improvement to their peers. The awareness of the audience made the participants feel more responsibility than the self-feedback group participants. Specifically, one interviewee said that she felt more responsibility since she wanted to express things so that her peers could understand.

Second, peer-feedback in writing helped the participant's self-confidence increase. The participants from the peer-feedback group said that their peer's positive feedback on their drafts led them to have more confidence in their writing. At the same time, they were excited that their opinions were successfully conveyed in English and understood by others through the peer-feedback experience. Through this experience, they became more confident in their writing because they were able to communicate in English and be understood by others. In the reflective interview, a participant from the self-feedback group said that she gained more confidence while revising own draft because she was able to improve her own essay without someone else's help.

As for meta-cognitive strategy use, it was found that when participants did not receive

positive feedback from others, they were less confident in their writing, which led them to think about their weak points more. They tried to find other ways to solve their problems, and thus their meta-cognitive strategy use ability was activated. Both self and peer-feedback participants learned more about themselves. They realized what their strong points and weak points were and eventually they formulated their own goals for writing. This realization will most likely positively affect their plans for the future in learning since they are now more prepared to use meta-cognitive strategies effectively. The participants said that by reading their own draft or the feedback from their peers, they were able to not only find their strong points and weak points, but they were able to think of ways to overcome the weak points since they were now aware of them.

All the interviewees said that they want to use self and peer-feedback in the future. This is mainly because they experienced an overall improvement in their drafts, and thus this feedback experience will be one of the strategies that they will use in the future. They were able to think about the appropriate usage of words and finally learned that reading example sentences where the word was used and using a thesaurus was helpful to improve their expressions and make them sound more natural. This process of exploring and finding things out by themselves can help students become more autonomous while learning English. Therefore, feedback experience provides many positive effects on students' meta-cognitive strategy uses. Based on the results of this study, it is suggested that EFL teachers within Korean contexts incorporate self and peer-feedback activities in their English writing classes.

Throughout the whole process of this research, several pedagogical implications can be made based upon the findings of this research. First, when giving feedback, whether it is self or peer, it is very beneficial to use detailed and specified criteria for improving a student's draft itself and student confidence. Second, in a writing class, it is necessary for students to compare their first draft with the final version to monitor their progress in writing. The third suggestion is that when students do self-feedback, it is essential to emphasize that they need to take into consideration their audience.

This study has some limitations which should be taken into consideration. First, the participants are special-purpose high school students and their average level of English proficiency is relatively higher than other Korean high school students. Second, the three components which were used to define learner autonomy cannot represent learner autonomy as a whole. Therefore, further research dealing with other factors of autonomy should be conducted to give more meaningful suggestions for EFL learners' autonomy. Third, the participants of this study consisted of 22 female students and 2 male students, and thus there can be a possibility that gender distribution might have affected the result of the study. These limitations suggest that future research should attempt to validate current results in several contexts in Korea in order to confirm the viability of the autonomy

constructs in writing classes and expand the applicability of the constructs to other English classes.

## REFERENCES

- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy*. New York: Routledge.
- Berger, V. (1990). The effects of peer and self-feedback. *CATESOL Journal*, 3(1), 21-35.
- Chae, Hee Sook, & Jung, Yang Soo. (2013). Demonstrating constructs of learner autonomy in English language learning. *Modern Studies in English Language & Literature*, 57(4), 239-263.
- Chaudron, C. (1984) The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, 15(2), 1-15.
- Cornor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257-276.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt. R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guglielmino, L. M. (1977). *Development of the self-directed learning readiness scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 255-276.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Honsa, S. (2005). Boosting students' autonomy as well as writing accuracy and fluency through journal writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 2(2), 151-178.
- Huh, Myung-Hye, & Lee, Jang Ho. (2011). Feedback on peer feedback in EFL composing: Four stories. *English Language and Literature*, 57(6), 977-998.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, Dong Ho. (2008). Feedback on EFL writing: Teacher, peer, and self-review. *Foreign Languages Education*, 15(1), 1-22.
- Kim, Hye Yeong. (2016). Changes in EFL students' perceptions and approaches to writing in a process-oriented writing class. *Modern English Education*, 17(1), 49-67.
- Kim, Hyun-Ju. (2016). Teachers' belief about learner autonomy in EFL classrooms in Korea. *Studies in Linguistics*, 38(1), 143-166.
- Kim, Sung Yeon, & Kim, Won Ki. (2005). An investigation into learner autonomy in relation to practical English skills. *English Language Teaching*, 17(3), 107-129.

- Kohonen, V. (2001). Towards experiential foreign language education. In V. Kohonen, R. Jaatinen, P. Kaikkonen, & J. Lehtovaara (Eds.), *Experiential learning in foreign language education* (pp. 8-60). London: Longman.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140-149.
- Lee, I. (1998). Supporting greater autonomy in language learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(4), 282-290.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy I: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journals*, 46(3), 274-84.
- Ministry of Education. (2015). *English Curriculum*. Ministry of Education Official Announcement 2015-74 [Supplement 14].
- Moon, Young In. (2000). The nature of peer revisions in an EFL writing class of a Korean university. *English Teaching*, 58(4), 99-126.
- Nelson, G., & Carson, J. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113-131.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 31-54.
- Tusi, A., & Maria, N. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Vickers, C., & Ene, E. (2006). Grammatical accuracy and learner autonomy in advanced writing. *ELT Journal*, 60(2), 109-116.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Zhang, S. (1985). The differential effects of sources of corrective feedback on ESL writing proficiency. *Occasional paper series no 9*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

## APPENDIX

## 1. Survey Items on Learner Autonomy

- 
1. I feel responsibility for my writing.

---

  2. I think about how I can improve my writing skills.

---

  3. I try to find words and grammatical expressions by myself.

---

  4. I like to decide the content and ways to express my ideas by myself.

---

  5. I am trying to find a way to write a better draft.

---

  6. I would like to improve my writing ability.

---

  7. I have confidence in my writing.

---

  8. I am good at constructing content in writing.

---

  9. I am confident in my grammatical and word expressions.

---

  10. I am well aware of my writing process.

---

  11. I like writing in English.

---

  12. I can improve my writing skills if I put in the effort.

---

  13. I have high expectations for learning writing.

---

  14. I know what I need to study to improve my writing skill.

---

  15. I know my strong points in writing.

---

  16. I know my weak points in writing.

---

  17. I have my own goals related to improving my writing skills.

---

  18. I know how to find the words or content necessary to write.

---

  19. I would like to know more about my writing ability.

---

  20. I know how to write well in English.

---

## 2. Peer Feedback Worksheet

Draft Written by \_\_\_\_\_ Feedback Provided by \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Composition: \_\_\_\_\_

*Your purpose in answering these questions is to provide an honest & helpful response to your partner's or group member's draft. You should also suggest ways to make his/her writing better. Before beginning your review, be sure to read the composition carefully. After that, respond to the following questions. BE SPECIFIC. BE CONSTRUCTIVE.*

**Content**

1. What do you like the **best** or the **worst** about the ideas in this essay? Be specific. You can choose a tick for the best one and a cross for the worst or give your own comments (vocabulary, cohesive/linked ideas, clear/easy to follow, convincing, effective reasoning, well-developed ideas, attention-grabbing introduction, strong conclusion, intriguing style, well-supported topic sentences, understandable transitions, etc.)
2. Of the proofs, reasons or arguments given to support the writer's opinion, which one/ones is/are irrelevant or illogical to the topic? Point it/them out and explain your reasons and, if you can, suggest improvements.

3. What part(s) should be developed more? Mark these with a letter **D**. Explain why you think this should be developed more and make some suggestions.
4. What part(s) are confusing? Mark these with a letter **C** in the draft. Explain why you think they are confusing and make some suggestions for improvement.

**Organization**

5. Does the first paragraph include an introduction expressing the writer's position statement of opinion? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
If yes, underline the sentence(s). If no, should the writer explicitly express his/her topic in the revision? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
6. Does each paragraph have a topic sentence? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
Point out the paragraphs without topic sentences. Paragraph \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_,  
Should topic sentences be added to these paragraphs? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
7. Is there a conclusion in the final conclusion? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
Is it effective? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

**Grammar, Vocabulary & Mechanics**

8. Use the following correction codes to point out the errors. Mark the codes in the draft.

**V** Error in verb tens/verb form (active/passive voice, present/past participle)

**S** Spelling error

**Art** Article/other determiner, missing or unnecessary or incorrectly used

**Prep** Preposition incorrectly used

**Pron** Pronoun

**Conj** Conjunction incorrectly used

**NE** Noun ending (plural or possessive) missing or unnecessary

**WW** Wrong word/ wrong word form

**WO** Wrong word order

**SV** Subject and verb do not agree

**^** Missing word

**♂** Unnecessary word

**SS** Sentence structure: incorrect structures, sentence fragments

**P** Punctuation wrong

**CL** Capital letter

**□□** Paragraph indentation

**//** run-on



**Examples in: English**

**Applicable Languages: English**

**Applicable Levels: Secondary**

Chan-Suk Park  
Dongtan Global High School  
27 Dongtannaru-ro, Hwaseong-si,  
Gyeonggi-do, 18441, Korea  
82-31-8015-9000  
wishlove@korea.kr

Hyun-Ju Kim  
Dept. of English  
Dankook University  
119 Dandae-ro, Dongnam-gu, Chonan-si  
Chungnam, 31116, Korea  
Tel: 82-31-8005-3069  
E-mail: hyunjukim@dankook.ac.kr

Received 25 June 2016

Revised 30 July 2016

Accepted 19 August 2016