Unveiling Learning Regulations Through Reflective Notes

JIULIANG LI

School of Science and Humanities, Beijing Institute of Fashion Technology
lijiu@hotmail.com

Abstract

While self-regulated learning (SRL) has been studied in various disciplines, insufficient attention has been paid to how formative assessment/assessment for learning (AfL) promotes students' SRL in learning English as foreign language (EFL) context. The present study attempted to address the gap. Forty four non-English majors in the second year of an undergraduate program at a Chinese university participated in the research. They completed 5 writing tasks, performed peer assessment, and wrote reflections to record their perceptions of the experience. Scoring rubrics was developed based on China's Standards of English Language Abilities (CSE) for the participants to use in peer assessment and complete a peer assessment report for essay revision. Analysis of the reflections suggests that CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment involved extensive SRL processes of planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting, and resource management, which were closely related to three contextual artifacts: rubric, peer assessment report, and essay script. These are important factors in support of the participants' SRL engagement from a social cognitive perspective. Implications are discussed with reference to language teaching and learning with a view to developing EFL learners' SRL capacity.

Keywords: SRL, EFL writing, CSE, peer assessment, formative assessment/AfL

Introduction

Self-regulated learning (SRL) refers to "the students' use of various cognitive and metacognitive strategies to control and regulate their learning" (Pintrich, 1999, p. 460). SRL constitutes a significant factor for enhancing L2 students' capacity to achieve learning goals (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Han & Hiver, 2018; Tseng et al., 2006) and plays an important role in lifelong development (Cauley & McMillan, 2010; Assessment Reform Group (ARG), 1999; Organization for Economic Cooperation

and Development (OECD), 2005). Researchers maintain that students may beneficially activate SRL behaviors through formative assessment in the classroom (e.g., Irving, 2007), because each aspect of formative assessment has influence on the development of the metacognitive functioning in the mastery of SRL strategies. Educators and researchers in language learning (e.g., Lee, 2016) believe that formative assessment aims to improve teaching and learning through its focus on the meta-cognitive skills essential for SRL: planning, monitoring and a critical reflection on learning, which both students and teachers employ proactively to direct further learning and enhance performance outcomes.

Assessment for learning (AfL), often used interchangeably with formative assessment (Lee, 2007; Wiliam, 2017), employs assessment to promote learning and improve teaching, and has the students' agency in the learning and assessment process as its central foci. AfL is deemed essential to teaching and learning as well as SRL development, because the role that students adopt in AfL is consistent with the SRL concept, where they act behaviorally, motivationally, and meta-cognitively in their own learning (Heritage, 2018). As an important AfL strategy, peer assessment maintains a pivotal role in the writing classroom to serve the purpose of improving students' learning and empowering them to become autonomous and self-regulated learners. It creates opportunities for learners to regulate their peers, reflect on their own writing process, imitate SRL strategies from each other, and develop their own strategies for future writing.

In view of the claims with respect to the influence on SRL development from formative assessment/AfL (cf. Clark, 2012), peer assessment in particular, it would be meaningful and fruitful to examine how this assessment form complements students' regulated learning in EFL context. However, endeavor of this kind is still a rarity in the body of research, EFL writing in particular. Such an effort holds potential significance for the design and delivery of educational activities that aim to enhance the learning process as well as the outcomes of English language learners. Being a part of a larger research project, this paper reports a study that investigates learners' use of SRL strategies and processes in peer assessment as a formative assessment/AfL activity in a Chinese college EFL writing classroom.

Literature Review

Self-Regulated Learning

Contemporary higher education demonstrates great interest in SRL (van den Boom et al., 2007), and much of recent development of classroom assessment is framed by the SRL theory (Clark, 2012). Although different SRL models exist, Pintrich constructs a consensual foundation for SRL that has been extensively utilized by researchers to conduct regulated learning studies in educational contexts (Clark, 2012). This model defines SRL as a process in which learners plan for their learning and then try to monitor, regulate, and reflect on their cognition (Pintrich, 1999, 2004; Pintrich & Zusho, 2002). Planning involves strategy selection, goal-setting, and the application of background knowledge. Monitoring requires students to use their work as a running record of their progress relative to established standards and criteria. Regulating implies modulation of thought, affect, behavior, or attention via deliberate use of specific mechanisms and supportive meta-skills. Reflecting involves evaluation on past work and the extent to which strategies facilitated or hampered the realization of learning goals. In addition, most SRL models include strategies to shape or control the learning environment as important resource management strategies (Pintrich, 2004; Zimmerman, 2002). This process helps to alleviate negative environmental impacts and to take advantage of positive influences in the service of a challenging goal (Tseng et al., 2006).

The field of applied linguistics embraces an increasing understanding that strategic, self-regulated learning plays an important part in second/foreign language (L2) teaching and learning for fostering

self-regulated learners who are independent, capable, and goal-oriented with lifelong learning strategies (Csizér & Tankó, 2017; Lau, 2013; Oxford, 2017; Zhang et al., 2019). A number of L2 researchers have proved that writing achievement is related to the employment of SRL strategies through which different dimensions of SRL processes effectively work in operating, directing, and sustaining learning efforts (Han & Hiver, 2018; Teng & Zhang, 2016, 2018; Xie & Lei, 2021).

Given the importance of self-regulation, L2 researchers have tried to foster its acquisition through interventions that focused on the sources of individual differences. In one study, Teng and Zhang (2020) found that self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction enabled students to become more active in using an array of SRL strategies (e.g., metacognitive strategies, social behavior strategies, and motivational regulation strategies). Similarly, Lee et al. (2023) found that strategy instruction within the framework of eight-phase self-regulated learning instruction resulted in increased use of self-regulated strategies among young learners. Other interventions include, for example, feedback that varies in terms of frequency, opportunity and content to guide the students' self-regulation processes; instructions that are designed to provoke perception and interest of SRL and to direct students' attention to various motivational goals, and finally, rubrics and assessment scripts that are employed to assist students in self-assessing their learning processes and performance (Alonso-Tapia & Panadero, 2010; Dignath & Büttner, 2008; Dignath et al., 2008; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011).

While many SRL studies focused on young learners and self-assessment practice (e.g., Andrade et al., 2009; Panadero, 2011; Panadero et al., 2012), less attention is given to tertiary level students in EFL context (Teng & Zhang, 2020) where standard and framework are used in rubric-referenced peer assessment of writing in classroom that practices formative assessment/AfL. This is an important void for self-regulated learning can occur not only during individual learning but also during cooperative and collaborative learning (e.g., Hadwin et al., 2011; Järvelä & Hadwin, 2013). Hadwin et al. (2011) even claim that regulated learning is the quintessential skill in collaborative learning. A theory of particular importance to social modes of SRL is Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory (Clark, 2012), which maintains that the role of the social in SRL is to influence individual regulation (Teng, 2022). The situation and context, including the social context, can support or hinder the acquisition of SRL (cf. Nolen & Ward, 2008). Examples of relevant factors for this support include modeling of self-regulation and feedback (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997) which again traces back to Bandura (e.g., 1986). This study aims to employ the social cognitive approach to address the above research gap to explore how the relevant factors support SRL.

Peer Assessment

Peer assessment is a collaborative activity involving students reading, critiquing and providing feedback on each other's writing, both to secure immediate textual improvement and to develop, over time, stronger writing competence via mutual scaffolding (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Zhu, 2001). An OECD (2005) report on formative assessment places self and peer assessment against well-defined goals and criteria as "skills that are invaluable for learning throughout their lives" (OECD, 2005, p. 24).

Peer assessment in L2 writing classroom is supported by a number of theoretical foundations, including collaborative learning theory and sociocultural theory which maintains that learning is socially constructed (Bruffee, 1984). Studies on collaborative writing have shown that scaffolding offered by peers in pairs or groups can aid students with their learning by pooling their respective resources together (Storch, 2011, 2013). Through peer collaboration and interaction, peer assessment builds "a facilitative socio-interactive environment in which L2 learners receive social support and scaffolding from peers" (Hu & Lam, 2010, p. 373).

Peer feedback has been practiced in EFL writing and was found to exert positive effects on students' cognitive, social, and linguistic development (e.g., Lee & Evans, 2019; Zhou et al., 2020). With the feedback provided by their peers, students reevaluate their essay drafts to make necessary changes so as to meet the established standard and criteria. Bruce (2001) maintains that students derive the most benefit when they are stimulated to check their work in individual activities before submission. Assessing work for mistakes and errors is the self-check of cognitive quality and progress and regarded in much SRL research as the fundamental construct for planning, monitoring, and reflecting upon cognition (e.g., Pintrich, 1999; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986).

In peer assessment, scoring rubrics are often used to provide descriptive and diagnostic information so as to help students better understand their strengths and weaknesses. As have been mentioned in the previous section attempts have been made to facilitate SRL development through application of rubrics in assessment. Panadero et al. (2012) pointed out, "The most important question is whether rubrics facilitate students' self-regulation and learning, and how their effectiveness can be enhanced" (p. 807). Studies have been conducted on the effects of rubrics on learning and performance, which yielded mixed results though (Andrade et al., 2009; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Schafer et al., 2001). However, its effects on self-regulation have not been paid enough attention. In addition, while research on peer assessment has grown rapidly over the past two decades, little is known about the strategies learners apply while they are involved in peer assessment activities in the L2 writing classroom (Yu & Lee, 2016).

Relation Between SRL and Formative Assessment/AfL and Peer Assessment

Formative assessment facilitates SRL strategy development among learners (Clark, 2012). A number of relatively recent studies have linked formative assessment to SRL directly (e.g., Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Bose & Rengel; 2009; Black & Wiliam, 2009). Relating formative assessment with the process of SRL further makes it stand out from other forms of classroom assessment. A significant body of qualitative meta-studies is available which support claims that formative assessment actualizes SRL (e.g., ARG, 1999; OECD/CERI, 2005, 2008; Ruthven, 1994; Mansell et al., 2009).

Self-regulatory processes align with the three questions asked during the AfL process: Where am I in my learning? Where do I need to go? How best to get there (Hattie & Timperley, 2007)? Students engage with similar AfL practices to help themselves and their peers develop into self-regulated, self-monitoring, and autonomous learners. Perrenoud (1998) even go so far as to characterizes AfL as the regulation of learning, which "entails the processes of goal setting, monitoring progress towards the goal, interpretation of feedback from monitoring, adjustment of goal-directed actions and/or of the definition of the goal" (Allal, 2010, p. 348). Moreover, SRL is considered a primary aspect of AfL, directly linked to AfL strategies (Wiliam, 2014). In the words of Clark (2012), AfL "reinforces and actualizes self-regulated strategies among students" (p. 205). In language learning research, self-regulation is found to aid language acquisition (Graham & Harris, 1994; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997), and it is particularly relevant to the development of writing competence (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1999, 2002). The major components of self-regulation, such as goal setting, self-evaluation, and self-reflection, are therefore valuable in the learning-to-write process, on which AfL is grounded.

Regarding the connection between peer assessment, SRL, and formative assessment/AfL, Hawe and Parr (2014) have pointed out that teachers should promote students' role in taking charge of their learning through self/peer feedback so as to realize the full potential of AfL. Similarly, Clark (2012) maintains that feedback is essential to formative assessment and therefore to the development of SRL strategies among students. Active participation in peer feedback stimulates various regulating

strategies, such as planning and coordinating feedback activities, discussing feedback to enhance its uptake, and utilizing it for performance improvement (Er et al., 2021). Mak and Wong (2018) adopted the SRL framework proposed by Pintrich (2004) in conducting their writing classroom portfolio assessment. The researchers found that in the various regulatory phases, the students frequently monitored and regulated their behaviors towards their goals through the feedback provided by their peers. Zhu and To (2021) found that the SRL interactions during peer discussion enabled the feedback receivers to resolve ambiguity and obtain important insights into peer feedback for revision of essay draft. The findings led the authors to an assumption that the more SRL behaviors feedback receivers displayed during peer discussion, the more likely they took ownership in the feedback processes and acted on the feedback for performance improvement.

Lee (2017) contends that AfL develops students' abilities to self-assess so that they can become reflective and independent in learning. It is therefore important to engage students in self- and peer evaluation, as well as self-reflection which, as van den Boom et al. (2007) observe, can also facilitate development of SRL capacity. Peer assessment provides an important means for student involvement in classroom assessment that is in line with the pedagogical principles of AfL for L2 writing (Lee, 2017). Other assessment theorists, including Black and Wiliam (1998), Shepard (2000), Brookhart (2003), and Wiggins (1998), put forward a similar conception of assessment as a moment of learning. The amount of research on the relations between formative assessment/AfL and SRL is growing. However, relevant research evidence in language learning remains scarce (Seker, 2015), and this is particularly true for EFL writing.

Review of related literature identifies some gaps: 1) While there is increasing consensus on the importance of learning regulation for the quality of collaborative learning or vice versa, empirical research is still limited (Panadero & Järvelä, 2014; Schoor et al., 2015; Ucan, 2017); 2) While the benefits of collaborative learning for SRL have been observed in various disciplines, insufficient attention has been paid to how collaborative learning, peer assessment in particular, is related to learners' SRL in L2 context.

To address the afore-mentioned research gaps, this study investigates EFL learners' self-reported SRL in peer assessment of EFL writing through the lens of social cognitive approach. The focus is not on examining the interaction between participants during peer assessment process as previous studies did (e.g., Zhu & To, 2021). Rather, it explores the SRL processes as a function of peer assessment. Since strategic learning is driven by mental processes that do not often lend themselves to direct observation and, therefore, for an accurate assessment of the extent of their functioning we need to draw on the learners' own accounts (Tseng et al., 2006). We chose to use reflection to elicit the participants' perception as reflection makes students aware of their experiences in learning processes (van den Boom et al., 2007). McTaggart and Kemmis (1995) define reflection as an active process that reviews, analyses and evaluates experience and draws on theoretical concepts or previous learning to provide an action plan for future experiences. The said tool has been used in L2 learning (e.g., Chang & Lin, 2014) and SRL research (e.g., Qiu &Lee, 2020). We believe that writing reflective notes could help the students make in-depth analysis and evaluation of their learning activity and thus help the researcher gain insight into their SRL process, which is often implicit and difficult to be observed (Vauras & Volet, 2013; Veenman et al., 2006). Specific to the context of the study, China's Standards of English Language Abilities (CSE) is adapted into scoring rubrics for use in peer assessment. Since its official release in 2018, CSE has received considerable attention within and beyond China. It is claimed applicable as a tool for assessment of English language and a yardstick for English language teaching and learning (Liu, 2017). Proposals have been made to incorporate CSE into classroom with a view to promoting formative assessment where learners take

the major responsibility for learning (Liu, 2017; Wang, 2018). This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How did the students employ SRL strategies to perform CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment in EFL context?
2. How did the relevant contextual factors, e.g. rubrics, feedback, etc., contribute to the deployment of the SRL strategies?

Methods

Participants

The participants were 44 Chinese students majoring in art and design in the second year of undergraduate study (2021/2022 academic year). Most of them had 6 or more years of experience of English learning starting from their secondary education or earlier. According to their performance in the English test of college entrance examination (mean = 118.28 with a full score of 150), or Gaokao, the participants' English language proficiency was between CSE level 4–5 (Wang, 2018), which was mostly aligned with CEFR B1 to lower B2 (Papageorgiou et al., 2019). The students reported little or no previous experience of peer assessment. In the semester when data was collected, they took a 10-week college English reading-and-writing course where they met the instructor twice a week with each time being allocated two 45-minute sessions with a 10-minute interval. According to the curriculum, the participants should finish five textbook units which were evenly distributed to the 10-week span. Each unit contained two English texts followed by an essay task aligned to the genre of the texts. Apart from the textbook, the instructor also used Langan (2014) as supplementary material for process-oriented writing instruction.

Writing Tasks

The students should complete five writing tasks (Table 1) as part of the requirement of the curriculum. For each task they were directed to write a five-paragraph essay: introduction (one paragraph), three main ideas (three paragraphs), and conclusion (one paragraph). For the purpose of the research, the students completed the first draft as homework, and then performed peer assessment either in the class or after as homework. Table 2 outlines the cycle of an essay task.

Table 1 *Essay plan*

Task No.	Time	Source	Essay topic	Pattern of development
1	Week 2	Book 3 Unit 5	Going to a movie or watching a movie at home	Comparison & contrast
2	Week 4	Book 3 Unit 6	My favorite restaurant/our college campus	Description
3	Week 6	Book 3 Unit 7	The effects of getting married in college/peer pressure/excessive packaging of products	Cause & effect
4	Week 8	Book 3 Unit 8	Which parenting method is more beneficial to children? Chinese or western?	Argumentation
5	Week 10	Book 4 Unit 1	A time I felt most proud of myself	Narration

Table 2 *Essay task cycle*

Week	Session	Activity
1	1st session	Introduction to the task type and assignment of an essay task (to be completed after class with no time limit)
	2nd session	Peer assessment (completed in class for task 1 and 2; then after class for task 3 onwards due to limited time availability) and revision followed by reflection
2	1st session	Submission of 1st and 2nd drafts together with peer assessment reports and reflective notes
	2st session	Return of teacher feedback and review of task

The Scoring Rubrics and the Peer Assessment Report

The analytic rating rubrics with four components were developed based on the CSE scales (hereinafter the CSE rubrics): Coherence & cohesion, Grammar, Lexical resources, and Task fulfillment that targeted at the three genres, that is, narration, exposition, and argumentation. The CSE has 9 levels that define learners' English proficiency from low to high. Research shows that CSE 8 is aligned with upper CEFR Level C1 and the lower C2; CSE 7 is aligned with upper CEFR Level B2 and lower C1; CSE 6 is aligned mainly with CEFR B2; CSE 5 is aligned with upper CEFR Level B1 and lower B2; and CSE 4 is mostly aligned with CEFR B1 (Papageorgiou et al., 2019). As most Chinese college English learners fall between CSE level 4–7 (cf. Wang, 2018), the scoring categories for the rubrics were designed to include six levels: 4–, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 7+. Prior to the first peer assessment session, a printed version of the rubrics was distributed to the participants followed by a training session, during which the instructor explained the rubric descriptors and its use in peer assessment. Taking into consideration the suggestions from related literature (Baker et al., 2020; Langan, 2014; Luo et al., 2015), a peer assessment report (Appendix 1) was developed for students to complete the peer review tasks. The participants were supposed to first give scores to the four rubric components and then provide qualitative judgment and comment.

Reflective Notes

We asked the participants to write reflections on their experiences of essay writing and peer assessment using their L1 (Chinese), including the feelings and opinions about the task process and their performance. As most students do not reflect spontaneously on their learning processes (Van Velzen, 2002), prompts were used to evoke these reflective activities (Appendix 2).

Data Collection

At the beginning of the course, the students were told to self-select their partners for peer assessment. It was assumed, and turned out to be the case for most of them, that they chose their friends to work with, which would be conducive to constructive peer feedback. Researchers proposed that working with a friend is very beneficial when students are engaged in challenging problem solving tasks (Miell & MacDonald, 2000). After each peer assessment session the participants handed in their reflective notes, which were summarized in Table 3. The instructor did not require the participants to perform reflection for Task 3 due to their heavy work load and tight schedule. The reduced number of submitted reflective notes was also likely to have resulted from the same causes, in addition to the fact that the instructor asked the students to hand in the Task 5 reflection

Table 3 *Number of reflective notes across tasks*

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 4	Task 5	ET	Total
Number of notes	37	37	32	17	12	135

N = 44. Task 5 and ET notes are collected together.

and end-of-term (ET) reflection together, which might lead to some participants putting the two reflections into one piece of paper.

Data Analysis

For the first research question which concerns the analysis of the use of regulating strategies and processes in learning, we developed a SRL model mainly based on Pintrich (1999, 2004), Tseng et al. (2006), and Ucan (2017). The model included five general processes: planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting, and resource management. All reflective notes of the participants were analyzed based on the above model using NVivo7 (N7), which was developed by Qualitative Research Systems and allowed data to be sorted and compared. Coding for the first research question underwent the following process. First, the cognitive-focused segments, that is, segment in which the focus was performing SRL activities in relation to the five processes in the reflection scripts of the first essay task, were identified and the type of regulated learning that was involved was coded. Open coding and axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) were first conducted for these segments. Then, after the reflection notes for the first task were coded, an initial coding scheme including the first level and the second level codes were developed. Segments related to SRL in the other essay tasks and the ET reflection were identified and categorized according to the scheme. During this process, new codes emerged for the second level codes and then saturation was achieved in each category. The coding was an iterative process in which changes were made to the coding results for certain segments to make sure that the coded segments meshed well with the scheme (Appendix 3). Finally, themes were summarized to explore further how the strategies corresponded to the processes in the SRL model.

Results of the above coding provided the basis for the exploration of the second research question. We carefully read all the coded segments, identified those involving certain types of contextual factors, such as textbook, peer assessment report, rubrics, etc., and categorized them accordingly. By analyzing the students' accounts and occurrence of the factors, we found out some important factors that were extensively involved in the participants' SRL.

To improve validity and avoid the possible pitfalls of high inconsistency between independent coders, as evidenced in Cohen's (1993, 1994) and Sawaki's (2003) studies, a linear coding process (Yu, 2008) rather than an independent one was adopted. When I finished coding, I invited an associate professor in applied linguistics to help check the coding validity. I explained the coding scheme and its categories to her and answered her questions regarding their purposes and processes. She then read all the entries from the 'codes', 'memos' of the 'codes' and 'coded segments' for 50% of the reflective notes in each essay tasks and the ET reflection, and pointed out any disagreement she had with my initial coding. The differences were then solved through discussions. For example, the excerpt "I try to maintain a clear thinking during the writing process" (ZDT task 1) was originally coded as "planning". The associate professor argued that the writer did not plan to do things in this excerpt, but rather, s/he was monitoring the writing process to keep his/her mind on the task. As a result, I recoded the expert as "monitoring". Based on our discussion, I revised the coding for all the remaining reflections.

Results and Discussion

RQ1: How did the students employ SRL strategies to perform CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment in EFL context?

Most of the segments from the reflective notes fell into the five major SRL categories, including planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting, and managing resource demonstrating how the participants utilized these regulatory processes to achieve the task goals. In composite these processes are akin to what researchers refer to as "self-inquiry" in AfL where students not only evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, but also set their own goals in writing and actively improve their writing (Lee, 2007, p. 204).

Planning

It was found that the participants made plans at both the beginning and end of the task. For the former, they mainly figured out viable ways to accomplish the task. For example:

> While reading, I used a color pen for making marks which would be convenient to locate the errors in the follow-up discussion. I read several times my partner's essay to find out the weakness and then composed the peer assessment report. (PXL task1)

The above excerpt revealed PXL's plan with respect to the strategies adopted for the peer assessment task. She used a color pen to highlight the errors identified to ease the coming discussion session, and read her partner's essay repeatedly for a good understanding about the strength and weakness to be written up in the assessment report.

Many participants briefly described in their reflections the procedures followed in the rubric-referenced peer assessment, which reflected their plans for completing the activity, for example:

> I exchanged essays with my partner and gave scores strictly against the CSE rubrics. I carefully read the essay, questioned and discussed with my partner when I had problems. When I received peer feedback I read it with care and discussed with my partner to clear any doubts I have, then I revised my first draft. (HZY Task1)

After students made assessment of their writing performance on the task and reflect on their pros and cons in learning writing they made various plans based on the rubrics for future learning. This corresponded to a significant part of what was conveyed in the message built in the question of "How do I get there?" in AfL. The coding results show that the participants made both general plans such as "Use more complex and diversified sentence structure", "Expand vocabulary" (GSY) and specific plans, such as those framed toward certain genres as illustrated below:

> In future learning I will pay more attention to narrative writing, read more excellent essays to learn useful expressions. In summary, narration is my weakness and I had bad performance in it. I will learn from this experience, make improvement, and put in persistent efforts. (GY Task 2)

In the task 2 reflection, ZJQ made the following plan about organization and outlining which was part of the coherence issue addressed in the CSE rubrics: "Before writing, I should make an outline and frame a clear thesis statement for my essay". According to the context of this piece of note, ZJQ arrived at this plan as a result of evaluating the peer essay which prompted ZJQ to realize the importance of

sequencing ideas in the delivery of message intended by a writer. This constitutes a piece of evidence of AfL. The results concerning the various plans and goals made in relation to the rubric components are in keeping with findings of previous research. For example, Panadero (2011) reported that students using the rubrics reported having more learning goals activated during the task.

Monitoring

It is borne out by the data from this research that "monitoring of one's thinking and academic behavior is an essential aspect of self-regulated learning" (Pintrich, 1999, p. 461). Based on our coding, the process of monitoring was a composite construct that consisted of three sub-processes where the largest number of excerpts occurred. This result might be supported by Weinstein and Mayer' (1986) early view that all metacognitive activities are varyingly related to monitoring behaviors. The three sub-processes included Monitoring use of CSE standard and criterion, Monitoring assessment of strength and weakness, and Evaluative monitoring of writing ability and assessment competence.

Monitoring use of CSE standard and criterion

This category was devoted to CSE rubrics related monitoring operation that illustrated how the students applied and benefited from the CSE rubrics while evaluating task performance. The category mainly focused on monitoring the performance against the analytical scales of the CSE rubrics as all the students mentioned using the CSE rubrics to help them assess their peer's as well as their own drafts. The rubrics provided them with the standard and criterion for writing performance against which comparisons were made in order to guide the students' monitoring process in assessing drafts and providing feedback based on the scale descriptors. For example:

> Then I restarted from the first paragraph to read the detail and make assessment according to the criteria in coherence and cohesion, grammar, and vocabulary. I translated the terms in the rubric descriptors into my own language to give sensible advice to my peer. (LXJ task2)

In this extract, LXJ translated the descriptors in the rubrics into her own language to help monitor the apprehension of the descriptors and verbalize the strength and weakness of the peer's writing so as to give pertinent suggestions for revision. This translation operation could help her develop better understanding of what aspects the rubric component intended to measure and how to use the descriptors to diagnose a piece of writing. These would help develop the necessary knowledge and skills to use the rubrics for assessment purpose, which would in turn help facilitate the writer's language learning.

Through the peer assessment practice the students reported developing fairly good command of the skills for using the rubrics, which helped monitor their planning and composing and other cognitive processes while trying to achieve the expected CSE level. For example:

> In this semester, my partner ZMY and I completed five peer assessment tasks with the CSE rubrics. We developed a sufficient mastery of the standard and criteria in it, and became clearer about how to write a good essay, how to achieve the corresponding level in terms of coherence and cohesion, grammar and vocabulary, and finally, task fulfillment. (CJX ET)

The above excerpt shows that CJX knew better what qualities a good essay entailed by frequently refereeing to the rubric descriptors which helped frame goals for learning writing. This finding is supported by what Shepard's (2000) observed previously that rubric makes learning objectives and the

features of excellent performance "transparent" (p. 11). Apart from the CSE rubrics, feedback from peers also contributed to monitoring the use of the rubric descriptors in making assessment. This point is illustrated in the following extract.

> As far as Coherence &cohesion is concerned, my essay suffers a lack of flow in idea development, variation in the use of phrases, and word power. From peer feedback, I think I should spend more efforts in transition in writing to enhance the flow and logic of my essay. (CMY task2)

In the above excerpt, CMY used peer feedback to help monitor performance in Coherence & cohesion against the rubric descriptors, which raised the awareness of the underdevelopment in writing in the aspects concerned and pointed out direction for future endeavors.

Monitoring assessment of strength and weakness

The participants reported monitoring assessment of their strength and weakness in writing, mainly in terms of the CSE rubric components which provided an important framework for their judgment. The most frequently mentioned form of monitoring was that the rubrics helped the participants identify weakness, be it their own or their peers', in the various aspects covered in the rubric. For example:

> Through the 5 essay tasks, peer assessment revealed the gap between me and the other students. In each peer assessment session, I always carefully read through my peer's essay. I found most sentences and words written by her were so sophisticated that I could only judge their accuracy by looking up the internet resources. (QJX ET)

In this excerpt, gaps between her peer's essay and QJX's were mirrored through deliberate comparison, which helped the reviewer QJX monitor the assessment of her underdeveloped lexical competence. The excerpt also indicated the writer's application of a SRL strategy of seeking information by using the Internet as a non-classroom resource as is presented in Clark (2012).

Many participants admitted that they gathered diagnostic information from their partner's feedback. For example, CBM wrote that her reviewer was careful and gave many pertinent advices in the feedback report, which made her aware of the bad habits in writing, such as the tendency to use very simple vocabulary and sentence structures. She thus planned to use more sophisticated sentence structures in her next assignment.

Apart from grammar and vocabulary, the participants also paid attention to the content and rhetoric aspects that specifically related to genre knowledge, which was an important element in the CSE rubrics and was mentioned frequently in this coding category, indicating the participants' awareness in the genre-specific features of writing.

Evaluative monitoring of writing ability and assessment competence

While the above category was mainly about how students benefited from peer assessment in terms of monitoring the identification of strength and weakness with respect to the rubric components, the current category described how the participants self-assessed their writing ability and assessment competence. Puustinen and Pulkkinen (2001) asserted that of all the processes implied in self-regulation, a crucial one is self-assessment. This self-assessment may be resulted from monitoring task fulfillment against the goals they set for themselves based on the understanding of the rubrics. Even though students did

not specifically mention the use of the CSE rubrics all the time in this category, their evaluation was related to it in one way or another. Take the following extract as an example of reference to monitoring of writing ability:

> In the past when I was writing, I put to paper whatever came to my mind and translated ideas from Chinese into English. I paid more attention to whether if I used advanced vocabulary or whether if my paper read well. I rarely considered the progression of topic development, or thesis statement, or logic in writing, or whether if I have accomplished the task goal. I realized the weakness through peer assessment, and will try to make improvement in the next tasks. (CYQ task 1)

This category also examined how the students kept themselves on track to approach writing objectives during the process of essay writing. For example, ZDT (task 1) wrote: "I try to maintain a clear thinking during the writing process". WYY wrote in her reflective note that she borne in mind along the composing process questions in relation to the rubric components to keep her on track:

> Does my essay have clear structure?
> Is my word choice accurate?
> Can I do it better? (Task4)

The various excerpts identified in this category show that processes and strategies encapsulated in this category reflected an important goal of formative assessment with respect to peer assessment activities: "Provide opportunities for students to become meta-cognitive and build knowledge of themselves as learners by encouraging students to evaluate and reflect on the quality or progress of their work" (Clark, 2012, p. 221). By actively involving students in the monitoring process through CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment, an important principle of AfL is realized, that is, "involving students in assessment" (Lee, 2007, p. 204). The monitoring process prepared for the follow-up activities that engaged the students in learning efforts for writing development.

Regulating

As students monitored their performance against the CSE rubrics and/or the goals they set for themselves, this monitoring process identified the need for regulating to bring behaviors back on track. In the regulating process, students were found to adapt and adjust their writing behaviors with regard to the various aspects described in the CSE rubrics. For example, ZXQ tried to use more collocations and transitions, which were closely related to the descriptors in the CSE rubrics in Lexical resources and Coherence & cohesion. Also, ZJQ wrote:

> I benefited a lot from evaluating my peer's essay. I began to realize that, compared to sophisticated vocabulary or sentence structures it was the vivid, concrete, and specific content and convincing language that mattered more in writing. (Task1)

The above excerpt suggests that ZJQ regulated her mindset about good writing by shifting her attention in composing from surface structure, such as grammar and vocabulary, to rhetorical aspects of text production. This change provides a contrast to the tendency early observed by researchers for L2 students to ignore macro textual concerns but focus on surface language problems in peer assessment (Leki, 1990; Nelson & Murphy, 1992, 1993). More recent studies, however, have also observed more positive effects of peer review on the global writing quality than on the local aspects. In particular, students in the role of feedback giver made greater progress in the global aspects than those in the role of feedback receiver (cf. Xu et al., 2022), similar to the present research.

There were instances where the participants did not refer specifically to the CSE rubrics for regulating their behavior or thinking, but the rubrics and regulating were related to one another to varying degree in different situations. For example, QMQ altered paragraphing of her first draft so that her essay became clearer and better organized; ZJJ developed several methods for improvement, such as reading exemplar essay and listening to classmates' advice. All these findings constitute evidence in support of the consensual view that peer feedback in L2 writing has its significance in providing opportunities for learners to grow in L2 language skills (Harris & Leeming, 2022; Zhang, 2016).

Reflecting

After students had finished a task, they may brood over the causes for the results—that is, made ascriptions for the results (Weiner, 1986). In this process the students made critical judgments on their performance in the writing task and assessment process. These judgments would inform their learning improvement in future learning. As the following excerpt shows, peer feedback directed ZXY to reflecting about ways to improve her argumentation.

> I was wondering, why my partner had the impression that my essay emphasized too much the advantages of Chinese parents' educational methods. Maybe it was because the organization of information was not psychologically efficient. So I need to adjust paragraphing and give examples of the weakness of the parties to be compared. But the world is not governed by dualism and so things are not either right or wrong. Maybe I should mention the weakness of Chinese education at the concluding paragraph. In view of the requirements given in the task, maybe it does not deviate from the thesis statement to argue that Chinese education also has her merits. (ZXY task4)

The above extract demonstrates that peer feedback provided opportunities for ZXY to detect mismatches between intended and understood meaning, helping her foster a sense of audience (Jacobs et al., 1998; Liu & Sadler, 2003; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Paulus, 1999) and contributing to her move away from writer-based to reader-based writing (Stanley, 1992). It also illustrates the point raised by researchers that through peer feedback, learners develop reader awareness and build a stronger knowledge of audience expectations of good writing with respect to language, content, organization, and genre (Liu & Hansen, 2002). And by gaining an awareness and control of their thinking they become self-regulated learners (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997).

The following excerpt shows that ZMY tried to figure out the root of their lack of confidence in apprehending the knowledge of writing.

> During peer assessment, I had a lot discussion with my partner on text type. At the end I found that, in fact, we all unconsciously doubted in the first place that whether if we misunderstood. Was it because we didn't understand genre? I didn't realize it before, but today I found it seems to be a big problem. Even after reading many exemplar essays and learning much textual knowledge, we still couldn't maintain a sound control over our writing. (ZMY task4)

The extracts collected under this category show that through reflecting, students engaged in critical thinking about their progress towards their goals, and fostered a vision of where to proceed in the next stage of learning. This aided them to strategically adjust goals and plans for the follow-up writing activities, giving them encouragement in the development as writers. Pintrich (2004) emphasized that "... As students reflect on the reasons for their performance, both the quality of the attributions and… are important outcomes of the self-regulation process" (p. 396).

Resource management

The final part of the SRL model, resource management, concerned strategies that students used to manage and control their environment. As have been suggested by scholars, examples of these strategies include managing and controlling time, effort, study environment, and other people, including teachers and peers, through the use of help-seeking strategies (cf., Corno, 1986; Ryan & Pintrich, 1998; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986). Observation of the reflections shows that most of these strategies were found to be used by the participants.

The following excerpt illustrates how PXL and her peer managed their study environment to facilitate the task completion process. The pair chose to conduct peer assessment in their dorm as opposed to the other parts of the campus where there might be other students present. To them, the dorm provided a more familiar and comfortable setting where they felt free to express themselves in regard to the writing assignment. The pleasant environment was likely to produce positive emotions as well as desirable learning outcome in the participants.

> We completed the peer assessment and feedback session in our dormitory. The different environment made us more relaxed and happier. In such an environment, we discussed, argued, and communicated with each other freely. We made assessment with respect to the content, structure, logic, sentence, grammar and vocabulary in our writing. In this process we learned from each other's strengths and made up for our own shortcomings. The process brought about much benefit. (PXL task4).

The following excerpt illustrates how ZMY intended to manage and control her time to improve task completion.

> Because I usually set a time limit for myself, this was a lot like an essay that I didn't have time to think about in the exam room. In the process of peer-assessment, I thought I should first change such a way of writing practice. Next time I should stop timing, and will not do it until I become more proficient in writing. (ZMY task 2)

This extract attests to Lee's (2017) observation that many examination driven cultures put a premium on timed L2 impromptu writing, rendering it difficult for the students to practice process writing. Thus in the process-oriented writing classroom of the present research, ZMY seemed to adapt herself to the requirements of the process writing practice as explicitly intended in the classroom instruction. Based on a general adaptive approach to learning, the resource management strategies are helpful for students to adjust themselves to the environment as well as alter it to fit with their goals and needs (see Sternberg, 1985).

RQ2: How did the relevant contextual factors, e.g. rubric, feedback, etc., contribute to the deployment of the SRL strategies?

From the coding results for the second research question an important finding emerged that the participants' SRL activities were mostly initiated and performed through the use of the rubrics and the rubric-related artifacts/factors including essay script and peer assessment report, around which the participants' SRL processes were found to revolve, signifying a potentially significant role of these factors.

Influence from CSE rubrics

The CSE rubrics were reported in the reflections to have exerted influence throughout the peer assessment process, from assessing drafts and constructing peer assessment report to negotiating

with peers, all involving a range of SRL processes from goal setting to monitoring and regulating. Importantly, the influence of rubrics was observed in the various categories of the monitoring process, which is pivotal in the SRL process based on the consensus among researchers (e.g., Pintrich, 1999; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986). Most conspicuously, the rubrics were extensively employed in the category of Monitoring use of CSE standard and criterion and the category of Monitoring assessment of strength and weakness, signifying the participants' reliance on it in these respects. The students monitored their capacity in using the rubrics and the process of how they used it in making assessment with respect to the various aspects covered in the rubrics. The rubrics helped gather information about task performance based on their understanding of the rubric descriptors. These types of monitoring could be regarded as crucial evidence of AfL, the starting point of which focuses on the process of seeking and interpreting evidence to determine where learners are in their learning (ARG, 2002).

The reflection extracts presented in the previous section indicate that the students also used the rubrics for other learning purposes, including, but not limited to, guiding writing process (ZDT), providing criteria for good writing (CJX), and developing genre knowledge (LXJ) which was communicated mainly through the component of Task fulfillment in the rubric. These purposes were not strongly emphasized in the students' SRL process in the previous section, but they are important for L2 writing learning and teaching. As have already been pointed out by researchers (e.g., Andrade & Du, 2005), when used as part of a formative, student-centered approach to assessment, rubrics have the potential to help students "make dependable judgments about the quality of their own work" as well as develop a "vision of success" (Stiggins, 2001, p. 11). These findings reveal that the rubrics served as a substantial pool of resources for the students, which is in agreement with extant research (e.g., Hu & Gao, 2017).

The importance of the rubrics emphasized in the participants' reflective notes for assessment of writing to identify strength and weakness and share learning intentions consists, to a large extent, in its clear assessment standard and criteria, which are regarded as the sine qua non of formative assessment (Black et al., 2003; Mansell et al., 2009). The importance of transparent grading criteria and learning goals to assessment and learning has been recognized by scholars (e.g., Frederiksen & Collins, 1989; Shepard, 2000). In terms of its relation to SRL, Pintrich (1999) early stressed that "In order to be self-regulating, there must be some goal or standard or criterion against which comparisons are made in order to guide the monitoring process" (p. 461).

In spite of the small sample, the present research seems to corroborate previous observation with respect to rubric role in formative assessment/AfL that rubrics are valuable in supporting student learning, at least in combination with meta-cognitive activities such as peer assessment (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). This is significant for bringing the potential of rubrics into their full play and preventing the misconception that rubrics themselves are powerful without any treatments. A case in point is the research reported by Andrade (2001) who showed that simply providing students with a rubric was associated with higher scores on only one of three essays used in the study. Andrade hence concluded that simply handing out and explaining a rubric can increase students' knowledge of the criteria for writing, but translating that knowledge into actual writing is more demanding. Our results seem to show that the potential of rubrics could be better harnessed when they are used in collaborative learning such as peer assessment where SRL strategies are engaged to "mediate a three-way dynamic between personal and contextual characteristics and performance" (Pintich, 2000, p. 453).

Previous research suggests that rubric use can promote academic achievement, but there are few available studies that directly investigate the mechanism behind any rubric advantage. Many educators believe that student confidence is behind the effect (Andrade et al., 2009). Different from yet not unrelated to such belief, the present research unveils a potential and significant relationship between

rubrics and SRL in peer assessment, hence constitutes an important attempt to fill the above void as an essential part of its endeavor.

Influence from feedback report

In the present study the participants were required to write in Chinese the feedback report for each essay assignment and present to their partners to aid with revision. Both writing (e.g., LXJ task2; ZMY task1) and reading (e.g., CBM task2) the feedback report was found to facilitate and elicit SRL processes from the students. For example, reading the feedback report produced by the peer prompted CBM to have identified her weakness in terms of simple structure in her writing which she admitted resulting from the bad writing habits and CBM planned to improve it in the future. This is similar to Mak and Wong's (2018) findings that L2 students frequently monitored and regulated their actions towards their goals through the feedback provided by their peers. In another case, while composing the feedback report, LXJ monitored the understanding and application of the CSE rubrics. In doing so, LXJ converted the rubric descriptors to LXJ's own language so as to give constructive revision suggestions to the partner. These findings remind us of the important characteristics of valid feedback: challenging, requiring action, giving cues at appropriate self-regulatory levels on how to bridge the gap, and is achievable (Stobart, 2006). The observed influence of feedback on SRL in the present research and many other studies echoes with Butler and Winne's (1995) early caveat that "Research on feedback and research on self-regulated learning should be tightly coupled" so as to make fruitful findings (p. 245).

Another reason for peer feedback exerting influence on SRL activities might have to do with task authenticity. Students may perform authentic tasks with more motivation, which are closely related to SRL, because they know that they may have to do it in real life. That might be part of the reason why SRL is essential for lifelong learning and independent problem solving (Cauley & McMillan, 2010; ARG, 1999; OECD, 2005). Soliciting and utilizing peer response are authentic writing tasks (Berg, 1999), therefore it can help boost students' motivation for participation (Hu, 2005). This mentality urges students to concentrate, because their feedback would affect the way their peer proceed with the revision, and the result of which would affect the assessment results. For example, one student wrote:

> I think this kind of peer assessment activity is good. When I evaluate my own essay, I can't find the direction, and the process would be very perfunctory. However, I become serious when evaluating others' essay. (LXY task1)

This piece of reflection demonstrates that the level of care and responsibility required of the participants in assessment documentation, feedback in this case, motivated them by assigning the role of reviewer which offers opportunity for them to better understand themselves as learners.

The significance of feedback cannot be emphasized too much as pointed out by Bandura (1986, 1997), who concurs with Schunk (1998) and Butler and Winne (1995) who see feedback as pivotal to SRL, and Black and Wiliam's (1998, 2009) who deemed feedback as the material to be refined into the meta-cognitive processes required for self-regulation.

We are aware of the inexperience of the participants in giving quality feedback on the peers' writing given their limited proficiency and insufficient exposure to the said activity. These, however, give us the confidence that there is much more to be desired of the effects of their feedback to be more trans-parent, which is inherent in and an important predictor of processes that make up SRL (Bandura, 1986; Butler & Winne, 1995; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986).

Influence from essay script

The results show that reading and criticizing the peers' essay scripts elicit SRL behaviors from the participants, regardless of their language proficiency. In the case where the reviewer is less successful than the reviewed, careful reading and criticizing the essay of a more abled learner provide a precious opportunity for making improvement by, among other things, identifying the gap between the current level and the target level and learning from the peer the more advanced composing skills (e.g., QJX ET).

For the pair that the two students are parallel in terms of language ability, the peer essay script could provide a means for the participants to complement each other in various aspects of essay writing. For example, ZJQ (task2) wrote that she obtained new knowledge from criticizing her partner's script that the order of presentation of ideas could have impact on essay quality, which prompted her to set plans in this respect in future writing.

For the pair that the reviewer is more successful than the reviewed, the former could also benefits from evaluating the essays produced by the latter. For example, ZCT (task1) wrote, while picking out the errors in the partner's essay, ZCT became more aware of the weakness in her own essay, which helped ZCT avoid those errors and monitor the assessment of the advantages and disadvantages in writing.

These findings corroborate Lee's (2017) views that students "learn from their peers' writing – both the strong areas that they can incorporate into their writing and their peers' weaknesses that they should avoid" (p. 97), and Clark's (2012) suggestion that essay script provides opportunities for indirect interaction through observation that are conductive to successful learning and development. The type of external input provided by essay script may constitute an important source of knowledge, though it has not received enough research attention so far.

Together, the influence from the contextual factors including rubrics, peer feedback, and essay script could be viewed from the social cognitive perspective, which emphasizes that the situation and context can influence self-regulation of learning (cf. Nolen & Ward, 2008). Our study suggests that these artifacts constitute an essential part of the social context of peer assessment and provide a multiplicity of external supports to the students' SRL, building important connections between CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment, SRL, and formative assessment/AfL. These findings are in keeping with previous researchers' contention that the social context provides support for the development of self-regulation (e.g., Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). It also offers important insight into the mechanisms through which social factors support SRL, and how one of the key objectives of classroom assessment can be served, that is, to "develop learners who are capable of self-regulated learning" (Lee, 2017, p. 84).

Conclusion

The present research explored how CSE rubrics referenced peer assessment promoted SRL in a Chinese EFL class that practiced formative assessment/AfL with a view to improving students' writing development. Analysis of the participants' reflective notes reveals that peer assessment enhanced regulated learning which involved various strategies and processes including planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting, and resource management. The operation of these SRL strategies and processes were found to be facilitated by three closely related contextual factors: the CSE rubrics, peer assessment report, and essay script. These were important tools for the students to gather and capitalize on assessment information and to receive social support while they argued and

negotiated with their peers. The study attests to the generally accepted yet not sufficiently validated view that peer assessment contributes to the development of self-regulation, demonstrating a close relation between SRL, peer assessment, and formative assessment/AfL. The results reflect an important objective of formative assessment to "actualize SRL strategies among students by sharing verbal feedback and written assessment documentation (e.g., rubrics, briefing papers)" (Clark, 2012, p. 240).

The study has implications for fostering SRL in EFL teaching and learning. As classroom-centered language teaching might not be able to provide sufficient input for students, self-regulation constitutes an essential variable in language learning. This is particularly the case for the Chinese non-English majors, for whom the English course competes against their major courses as well as other course types for the limited space in the curriculum. In class, teachers should emphasize the important academic implication attributable to SRL that "the learner actually has control over his own learning, steering and directing cognitive and motivation processes to achieve the learning goal" (Boekaerts & Cascallar, 2006), and that taking responsibility and self-regulating the learning processes and positive motivational beliefs are required for academic achievement. As is demonstrated in the present research as well as previous studies, peer assessment facilitates SRL development. Teachers are therefore suggested to employ this assessment form as an important strategy to encourage student involvement in classroom activities, which is in line with the pedagogical principle of formative assessment/AfL (Lee, 2017). The CSE, as a national standard of English learning, provides an important tool for conducting peer assessment in the present study. It is recommended that the tool be adapted and used by college English teachers, who may also develop their own rubrics based on CSE to cater to the specific context of the classroom and the special need of their students as well as themselves.

Despite the significance of this research, we acknowledge that the strength of our findings may be restricted as we solely used reflective notes to collect data. Future research is suggested to obtain data from various sources to generate more information for tackling the issue, such as classroom observation, interview, and essay drafts. Data from a variety of sources and instruments would allow the researchers to investigate not only the process but also the outcomes of students SRL activities and therefore further our understanding of learners' SRL development. Research efforts may also be directed to issues focusing on different agent of peer feedback, that is, feedback provider and receiver, and different forms of feedback, that is, teacher feedback and self-feedback under the L2 context where formative assessment/AfL is practiced.

We are aware that there are factors refraining L2 students in collectivist cultures (e.g., Chinese students) from efficient peer assessment process, such as giving constructively yet critical comments for fear of, for example, conflict and disagreement and to keep interpersonal harmony (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Connor & Asenavage, 1994). However, that should not pose a hurdle hindering them from capitalizing on formative assessment/AfL for developing SRL capacity, especially in view of the research insight that self-regulation is not a "fixed personality trait" (McCombs, 1989, as cited in Clark, 2012). Students can be taught, directed, and encouraged to consciously manage their learning by integrating their personal strategies with social strategies, such as peer assessment and its related artifacts, so as to enhance academic performance and achieve learning goals.

Acknowledgements

References

Allal, L. (2010). Assessment and the regulation of learning. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 348–352). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00362-6

Alonso-Tapia, J., & Panadero, E. (2010). Effect of self-assessment scripts on self-regulation and learning. *Infanciay Aprendizaje, 33*(3), 385–397.

Andrade, H. G. (2001, April 18). The effects of instructional rubrics on learning to write. *Current Issues in Education [On-line], 4*(4). Retrieved from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume4/number4

Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*(3), 1–11. Retrieved from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=3

Andrade, H. L., Wang, X., Du, Y., & Akawi, R. L. (2009). Rubric-referenced Self-assessment and Self-efficacy for Writing. *The Journal of Educational Research, 102*(4), 287–302. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.102.4.287-302

Assessment Reform Group. (1999). *Assessment for learning: Beyond the black box*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, School of Education.

Assessment Reform Group. (2002). *Assessment for learning: 10 principles*. Cambridge University Press.

Baker, B., Homayounzadeh, M., & Arias. A. (2020). Development of a test taker-oriented rubric: Exploring its usefulness for test preparation and writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 50*, 100771.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.

Berg, E.C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 215–241.

Black, P., &Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(2), 139–148.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*(1), 5–31.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Open University Press.

Boekaerts, M., & Cascallar, E. (2006). How far have we moved toward the integration of theory and practice in self-regulation? *Educational Psychology Review, 18*, 199–210. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9013-4

Bose, J., & Rengel, Z. (2009). A model formative assessment strategy to promote student-centered self-regulated learning in higher education. *US-China Education Review, 6*(12), 29–35.

Bruce, L. B. (2001). Student self-assessment: Making standards come alive. *Classroom Leadership, 5*(1), 1–6.

Brookhart, S. (2003). Developing measurement theory for classroom assessment purposes and uses. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 22*(4), 5–12.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind". *College English, 46*(7), 635–652.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245–281.

Carson, J., & Nelson, G. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*, 1–19.

Cauley, M. C., & McMillan, J. H. (2010). FA techniques to support student motivation and achievement. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 83*(1), 1–6.

Chang, M.M., & Lin, M. C. (2014). The effect of reflective learning e-journals on reading comprehension and communication in language learning. *Computers & Education, 71*, 124–132.

Clark, I. (2012). Formative Assessment: Assessment Is for Self-regulated Learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*, 205–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6

Cohen, A.D. (1993). The role of instructions in testing summarizing ability. In D. Douglas & C. Chapelle (Eds.), *A new decade of language testing research* (pp. 132–59). TESOL.

Cohen, A.D. (1994). English for academic purposes in Brazil: The use of summary tasks. In C. Hill & K. Parry (Eds.), *From testing to assessment: English as an international language* (pp. 174–204). Longman.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: how much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 257–276.

Corno, L. (1986). The metacognitive control components of self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 11*, 333–346.

Csizér, K., & Tankó, G. (2017). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. Applied Linguistics, *38*(3), 386–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv033

Dignath, C., & Büttner, G. (2008). Components of fostering self-regulated learning among students. A meta-analysis on intervention studies at primary and secondary school level. *Metacognition and Learning, 3*, 231–264. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11409-008-9029-x

Dignath, C., Büttner, G., & Langfeldt, H. (2008). How can primary school students learn self-regulated learning strategies most effectively? A meta-analysis on self-regulation training programs. *Educational Research Review, 3*(2), 101–129. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2008.02.003

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner*. Routledge.

Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). A Collaborative Learning Approach to Dialogic Peer Feedback: A Theoretical Framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(4), 586–600. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1786497

Frederiksen, J., & Collins, A. (1989). A systems approach to educational testing. *Educational Researcher, 18* (9), 27–32.

Graham, S., & Harris, K.R. (1994). The role and development of self-regulation in the writing process. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (pp. 203–228). Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Hadwin, A. F., Järvelä, S., & Miller, M. (2011). Self-regulated, co-regulated, and socially shared regulation of learning. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 65–84). Routledge.

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 44–59.

Harris, J., & Leeming, P. (2022). The impact of teaching approach on growth in L2 proficiency and self-efficacy: A longitudinal classroom-based study of TBLT and PPP. *Journal of Second Language Studies, 5*(1), 114–143.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112.

Hawe, E., & Parr, J. (2014). Assessment for learning in the writing classroom: An incomplete realisation. *The Curriculum Journal, 25*(2), 210–237.

Heritage, M. (2018). Assessment for learning as support for student self-regulation. *Aust. Educ. Res. 45*, 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0261-3

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 321–342.

Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science, 38*, 371–394.

Hu, J., & Gao, X. (2017). Self-regulated strategic writing for academic studies in an English-medium-instruction context. *Language and Education, 32*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1373804

Irving, K. (2007). *Teaching science in the 21st century: Formative assessment improves student learning*. National Science Teachers Association (NSTA). Retrieved from http://www.nsta.org/publications/news/story.aspx?id053559

Jacobs, G.M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S.Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 307–317.

Järvelä, S., & Hadwin, A. F. (2013). New frontiers: Regulating learning in CSCL. *Educational Psychologist, 48*(1), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.748006

Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review, 2*, 130–144.

Langan, J. (2014). *College writing skills with readings* (9th ed.). Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Lau, K.L. (2013). Chinese language teachers' perception and implementation of self-regulated learning-based instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 31*, 56–66. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.12.001

Lee, I. (2007). Assessment for Learning: Integrating Assessment, Teaching, and Learning in the ESL/EFL Writing Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 64*(1), 199–214.

Lee, I. (2016). Putting Students at the Centre of Classroom L2 Writing Assessment. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*(2), 258–280. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2802

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.

Lee, M., & Evans, M. (2019). Investigating the operating mechanisms of the sources of L2 writing self-efficacy at the stages of giving and receiving peer feedback. *Modern Language Journal. 103*, 831–847. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.1259

Lee, M., Lee, S.Y., Kim, J.E., & Lee, H.J. (2023). Domain-specific self-regulated learning interventions for elementary school students. *Learning and Instruction, 88*, 101810.

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 University Press.

Liu, J. (2017). China's Standards of English and Its Applications in English Learning. *Foreign Languages in China, 4*, 4–11. (In Chinese)

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.

Liu, J., & Sadler, R.W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*, 193–227.

Luo, S., Huang, J., & Ma, X. (2015). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment in L2 classroom*. FLTRP Basic Education Publishing. (In Chinese)

Mak, P. & Wong, K. M. (2018). Self-regulation through portfolio assessment in writing classrooms. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 49–61. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx012

Mansell, W., James, M. & the Assessment Reform Group. (2009). Assessment in schools. Fit for purpose? A commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme

McCombs, B. L. (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 51–82). Springer-Verlag.

McTaggart, R., & Kemmis, S. (Eds.). (1995). *The action research planner*. Deakin University Press.

Miell, D. & MacDonald, R. (2000). Children's creative collaborations: The importance of friendship when working together on a musical composition. *Social Development, 9*(3), 348–369.

Nelson, G.L., & Murphy, J.M. (1992). An L2 writing group: task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 171–193.

Nelson, G.L., & Murphy, J.M. (1993). Peer response groups: do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 135–142.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218.

Nolen, S. B., & Ward, C. J. (2008). Sociocultural and situative approaches to studying motivation. In M. L. Maehr, S. A. Karabenick, & T. C. Urdan (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives. Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 15, pp. 425–460). Emerald Group.

OECD/CERI. (2005). *Formative assessment: Improving learning in secondary classrooms*. CERI/OECD.

OECD/CERI. (2008). Assessment for learning: Formative assessment. International Conference, Learning in the 21st Century: Research, innovation and policy. CERI/OECD. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/19/31/40600533.pdf

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Panadero, E. (2011). *Instructional help for self-assessment and self-regulation: Evaluation of the efficacy of self-assessment scripts vs. rubrics*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

Panadero, E., & Järvelä, S. (2014). Reviewing findings on socially shared regulation of learning. *European Psychologist, 20*, 190–203.

Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review, 9*, 129–144.

Panadero, E., Tapia, J.A., & Huertas, J.A. (2012) Rubrics and self-assessment scripts effects on self-regulation, learning and self-efficacy in secondary education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*, 806–813.

Papageorgiou, S., Wu, S., Hsieh, C-H., & Cheng, M. (2019). Mapping the TOEFL iBT®Test Scores to China's Standards of English Language Ability: Implications for score interpretation and use. TOEFL® Research Report TOEFL–RR–89 ETS Research Report No. RR–19-44.

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 265–289.

Perrenoud, P. (1998). From formative evaluation to a controlled regulation of learning processes: Towards a wider conceptual field. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice, 5*(1), 85–102.

Pintrich, P. R. (1999). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research, 31*(6), 459–470.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press.

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(4), 385–407.

Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). The development of academic self-regulation: The role of cognitive and motivational factors. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 250–284). Academic Press.

Puustinen, M., & Pulkkinen, L. (2001). Models of self-regulated learning: A review. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 45*(3), 269–286. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313830120074206

Qiu, X., & Lee, M.K. (2020). Regulated learning and self-efficacy beliefs in peer collaborative writing: An exploratory study of L2 learners' written products, task discussions, and self-reports. *System, 93*, 102312.

Ruthven, K. (1994). Better judgment: Rethinking assessment in mathematics education. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 27*(4), 433–450.

Ryan, A., & Pintrich, P. R. (1998). Achievement and social motivational influences on help-seeking in the classroom. In S. Karabenick (Ed.), *Strategic help seeking: Implications for learning and teaching* (pp. 117–139). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sawaki, Y. (2003). *A comparison of summarization and free recall as reading comprehension tasks in web-based assessment of Japanese as a foreign language* [Unpublished PhD thesis]. University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Los Angeles.

Schafer, W. D., Swanson, G., Bené, N., & Newberry, G. (2001). Effects of teacher knowledge of rubrics on student achievement in four content areas. *Applied Measurement in Education, 14*(2), 151–170.

Schoor, C., Narciss, S., & Körndle, H. (2015). Regulation during cooperative and collaborative learning: A theory-based review of terms and concepts. *Educational Psychologist, 50*(2), 97–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2015.1038540

Schunk, D. H. (1998). Teaching elementary students to self-regulate practice of mathematical skill with modeling. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice* (pp. 137–159). Guildford Press.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Social origins of self-regulatory competence. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(4), 195–208.

Seker, M. (2015). The use of self-regulation strategies by foreign language learners and its role in language achievement. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(5), 600–618. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815578550

Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29*(7), 4–14.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 217–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(92)90004-9

Sternberg, R. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.

Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

Stobart, G. (2006). The validity of formative assessment. In J. Gardner (Ed.), *Assessment and learning* (pp. 133–146). Sage.

Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 275–288.

Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Teng, L. S. (2022). *Self-regulated learning and second language writing: Fostering strategic language learners*. Springer, Singapore.

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). A questionnaire-based validation of multidimensional models of self-regulated learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal, 100*(3), 674–701.

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2018). Effects of motivational regulation strategies on writing performance: A mediation model of self-regulated learning of writing in English as a second/foreign language. *Metacognition and Learning, 13*(2), 213–240.

Teng, L.S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 48*, 100701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701

Tseng, W. T., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 78–102.

Tsui, A., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147–170.

Ucan, S. (2017). Changes in primary school students' use of self and social forms of regulation of learning across collaborative inquiry activities. *International Journal of Educational Research, 85*, 51–67.

Vauras, M., & Volet, S. (2013). The study of interpersonal regulation in learning and its challenge to the research methodology. In S. Volet, & M. Vauras (Eds.), *Interpersonal regulation of learning and motivation: Methodological advances* (pp. 1–13). Routledge.

van den Boom, G., Paas, F., & van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2007). Effects of elicited reflections combined with tutor or peer feedback on self-regulated learning and learning outcomes. *Learning and Instruction, 17*, 532–548.

Van Velzen, J. H. (2002) *Instruction and self-regulated learning: Promoting students' self-reflective thinking* [Unpublished dissertation]. Leiden University, The Netherlands.

Vauras, M., & Volet, S. (2013). The study of interpersonal regulation in learning and its challenge to the research methodology. In S. Volet & M. Vauras (Eds.), *Interpersonal regulation of learning and motivation: Methodological advances* (pp. 1–13). Routledge.

Veenman, M. V., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning, 1*(1), 3–14.

Wang, S. (2018). The application of China's Standards of English language Ability to college English teaching. *Foreign Language Education, 39*(4), 1–4. (In Chinese)

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. Springer-Verlag.

Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R. E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 315–327). Macmillan.

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wiliam, D. (2017). Assessment for learning: meeting the challenge of implementation. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25*(6), 683–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2017.1401526

Wiliam, D. (2014, April). *Formative assessment and contingency in the regulation of learning processes* [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia.

Xie, Q., & Lei, Y. (2021). Diagnostic assessment of L2 academic writing product, process and self-regulatory strategy use with a comparative dimension, *Language Assessment Quarterly, 19*(3), 231–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2021.1903470

Xu, Z., Zhang, L.J., & Parr, J.M. (2022). Incorporating peer feedback in writing instruction: examining its effects on Chinese English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners' writing performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 61*(4), 1337–1364. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021-0078

Yu, G. (2008). Reading to summarize in English and Chinese: A tale of two languages? *Language Testing, 25*(4), 521–551. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208094275

Yu, S. & Lee, I. (2016). Exploring Chinese students' strategy use in a cooperative peer feedback writing group. *System, 58*, 1–11.

Zhang, L. J. (2016). Reflections on the pedagogical imports of western practices for professionalizing ESL/EFL writing and writing-teacher education. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 39*(3), 203–232.

Zhang, L. J., Thomas, N., & Qin, T. L. (2019). Language learning strategy research in System: Looking back and looking forward. *System, 84*, 87–92.

Zhou, J., Zheng, Y., & Tai, J. H. (2020). Grudges and gratitude: the social affective impacts of peer assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. 45*, 345–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1643449

Zhu, Q., & To, J. (2021). Proactive receiver roles in peer feedback dialogue: Facilitating receivers' self-regulation and co-regulating providers' learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 47*(8), 1200–1212. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2017403

Zhu, W. (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 251–276.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

Zimmerman, B., & Kitsantas, A. (1999). Acquiring writing revision skill: Shifting from process to outcome self-regulatory goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 241–250. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.2.241

Zimmerman, B., & Kitsantas, A. (2002). Acquiring writing revision and self regulatory skill through observation and emulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(4), 660–668. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.660

Zimmerman, B., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*, 614–628.

Zimmerman, B.J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22*(1), 73–101. https://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*. Routledge.

Appendix 1 Peer assessment report

Writer: **Reviewer:**

	Coherence & cohesion	Grammar	Lexical resource	Task fulfillment		
				Narration	Exposition	Argumentation
Score						

Score Justification

Essay Strength

Essay Weakness

Revision Suggestions

Appendix 2 Prompts/Guiding questions for reflective notes

Round of reflective notes	Guiding questions
	Please write a reflection on your peer assessment experience, writing process and performance. Below are some questions you might consider when drafting your reflection.
	(1) How did you collaborate with your peer in the peer assessment session?
	(2) What are your feelings toward the peer assessment task? Do you like it? Why or why not?
	(3) What did you learn from peer assessment?
	(4) How would you reflect on your performance in the writing task?

Note: adapted from Qiu & Lee, 2020.

Appendix 3 Coding scheme

Level 1	Level 2	Example (Translated from Chinese)
Planning and goal setting	Goal setting	I will be more careful in reading task instructions, work out the thesis of my essay, pay attention to the topic sentence and narrative description, the mind map and structure. My writing needs to be up to the standard and demonstrate strict logic. (ZXY task2)
	Planning	While reading, I used a color pen for making marks which would be convenient to locate the errors in the follow-up discussion. I read several times my partner's essay to find out the weakness and composed the peer assessment report. (PXL task1)
Monitoring	Monitoring use of CSE standard and criterion	Peer assessment reveals many issues in my writing. Much information needs to be provided to enrich the content and strict logic needs to be demonstrated in essay structure. There are less grammatical errors, but still many remains. The essay sees much progress compared to the previous one, but many issues persist; a wider range of vocabulary and structure need to be used. (MCJ task2)
	Monitoring assessment of strength and weakness	I become aware of some bad habits in writing. For example, I find that the vocabulary and structure are rather simple. (CBM task2)
	Evaluative monitoring of writing ability and assessment competence	In this essay task, I used many sentence structures to improve the syntactic variety of my essay. However, I should pay careful attention to vocabulary and grammar to avoid fundamental errors. My essay had clear logic in that it expounds the features of and differences between Chinese and western education, and compared their advantages and disadvantages; it advanced a clear thesis statement. However, I didn't use sophisticated or advanced vocabulary due to my limited lexical resource. Many frequently used words could be replaced with more advanced vocabulary. (YXY task4)
Regulating		So in my second draft, I based my revision on my first draft to refine the argument and the major supporting ideas and presented them in different paragraphs. I thought that overall the organization of my revised essay was much better than the first draft. It became clearer and more straightforward. (QMQ task4)
Reflecting		When I got the essay task, I first thought about how to develop the outline, since I am not good at connecting paragraphs. However, I forgot to attend to the genre of the essay task. (LXY task1)
Resource management		After class we found a quiet place to discuss our essays. (GSY task4).