TEACHER MANAGEMENT OF SELF-REGULATED LEARNING THROUGH ePORTFOLIO

Meerita Kunna Segaran & *Zuwati Hasim

Faculty of Education, University Malaya,

50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
*Corresponding author: zuwati_hasim@um.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Background and Purpose: Students' ability to self-regulate their learning and to learn effectively are predictors of success. In developing and initiating Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), teachers play a significant role. Hence, this study aims at exploring teacher management of SRL in the ESL writing classroom using ePortfolio.

Methodology: This study adopts an interpretive paradigm with action research as its methodological approach. The data collection methods consisted of observation, documents, and interview. A total of one teacher and 16 of her students participated in this study. The data were analyzed thematically.

Findings: In using the ePortfolio, the teacher had managed to assist learners SRL development by employing several strategies. It was identified that the teacher used strategies such as setting the learning goals, sharing the criteria of success, questioning techniques, giving feedback, as well as allowing self-assessment activity to take place. These strategies were believed to promote the constructs of independent learning, autonomous learning, and assistance from a more capable peers particularly in learning ESL writing via ePortfolio. Also, a shift in a teacher's role from being authoritative in the classroom to a facilitative role is deemed necessary in developing SRL among ESL writing students.

Contributions: The results from this study offer new insights into pedagogical strategies that could be considered for promoting SRL in language teaching and learning. An outcome of this research could serve as a guide for teachers in planning their pedagogical approach and to decide on suitable strategies to be employed for different types of learners. Also, the sharing of the teacher practices in this study

would provide rooms for other researchers to further explore other possible strategies and ways for strengthening any weaknesses found in the practice.

Keywords: Self-regulated learning, ePortfolio, action research, autonomy, self-assessment.

Cite as: Segaran, M. K., & Hasim, Z. (2021). Teacher management of self-regulated learning through ePortfolio. *Journal of Nusantara Studies, 6*(1), 373-393. http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol6iss1pp373-393

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Self-regulated learning (SRL) strategy is consistently found to be effective in which it invariably generates a high learning outcome. Seker (2015) defined SRL as a process where an individual thinks, decides and implements strategies which are deemed essential for a better outcome in their learning process and by doing so they are able to regulate their own learning. Pintrich (2005) referred SRL to the process as a stage where learners set objectives, monitor their work, regulate and at the same time are positive and motivated driven by self-set goals. This view is supported by Barnard-Bark, Lan, and Paton (2010) who explained that SRL is closely related to 'self' in which these individuals will be able to make choices that will lead to positive outcomes. Zimmerman's (2000) definition highlights that self-regulation is a process consisting of thoughts, actions and feelings to achieve one`s personal goal in a cyclical process. Hence, it is noted that SRL requires students to participate in meaningful activities and learning strategically. Some researchers reveal that students who employ SRL strategies have higher learning outcomes, both with or without computer-based learning environment (e.g. Cheng & Chau, 2013; Greene & Azevedo, 2007; Nguyen & Ikeda, 2015). Studies conducted in the past by scholars like Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986, 1988, 1990) proved that correlation exists between students who successfully apply SRL strategies in their learning and academic achievements. In fact, in recent years, it has been justified that SRL is beneficial to students especially in the writing classroom (Aregu, 2011; Magno, 2009; Majid, 2007). It is also argued that students who possessed the SRL strategy are autonomous in their learning (Schuitema, Peetsma, & van der Veen, 2012). Although it is clearly reflected on individual self-learning, for the SRL culture to be regulated, there needs an initiation. In this case, particularly in developing learner autonomy and inculcating SRL among students, teachers play a significant role. Hence in this study, we looked at how a teacher utilized

ePortfolio in an ESL writing classroom to promote SRL among ESL students at the secondary school level.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Self-Regulated Learning

The concept of self-regulated learning is closely related to an individual where an individual learner makes informed decisions and execute the strategies that are deemed necessary throughout the learning process (Majid, 2007; Abdullah, 2016). Zimmerman (2000) considered self-regulation as a process that is done in a cyclical manner to achieve personal goals through well-planned thoughts, feelings and subsequent action. Zimmerman (2000) further elaborated the concept of self-regulation by stating that most learners have some knowledge on how to process information but what distinguishes the self-regulated learners from others are the ability to recognize their strengths and weaknesses and then act accordingly.

Three cyclical phases make up the structure and function of self-regulatory processes: forethought, performance, and self-reflection (Zimmerman, 1994). During the forethought phase, students are asked to analyse the task given. This is when students have to set goals and determine the SRL strategies that they will be using. An important part of this stage includes students knowing the motive of completing the given exercise. In the performance phase, a salient feature of this stage is self-control and self-observation. Learners who are able to control themselves are able to select strategies needed in the forethought phase. On the other hand, self-observation is self-recording of events to find out the cause. The practices are fragmented into smaller sections which are the student's ability to imagine and observe the quality of their work by making necessary corrections based on the criteria stated. The self-reflection phase is divided into two major classes which are self-judgement and self-reflection. One of the components of self-judgement is self-evaluation, where Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986) described as "statements indicating student-initiated evaluations of the quality of progress of their work" (p. 618). The other component of self-judgement is causal attribution which is about beliefs of one's own error or success. The final one is self-reaction which means positive feelings that affect one's performance.

2.2 Zone of Proximal Development

The idea of SRL is in line with Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD). Vygotsky (1978) defined ZPD as:

> *.... the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers* (p. 86)

Vygotsky's emphasized that learning happens within a social context. There are four important terminologies in the construct of ZPD. First, the child's actual development where Vygotsky viewed that a child has already matured at the end of the development. When a child has reached the maturity level, he or she is able to complete the task independently. Secondly, the idea of independent problem-solving in ZPD can be seen when a child is able to conceptualize ideas without help from others. The level of potential development is another key feature in the concept of ZPD. In potential development concept, a child's function is still ongoing to obtain his or her maturity. Finally, the ZPD represents the gap of what a learner has mastered and what they can accomplish when given adequate educational support such as more experienced peers or teachers.

Vygotsky (1978) asserted that the learning process is a collaborative activity, and the process does not follow the specific direction of the teacher nor the student. Vygotsky believed that everything an individual learnt, is acquired at two levels which are interaction with others and integration of input into one's mental structure. As time progresses, the onus of learning shifts from the educator to the learner, but only when the learner reaches capability and independence. This creates a self-regulated learner (Vygotsky, 1978). As a psychologist, Vygotsky also affirmed the concept of ZPD exists with the idea of collaboration with a more capable partner (not necessarily a teacher, it might be a peer) to support students' understanding. Thus, knowledge construction occurs when the learners are able to take into account other people's perspective.

2.3 SRL and ePortfolio

One of the educational instruments that the new approaches bring to light is the electronic portfolio (ePortfolio). The ePortfolio is an instructional tool that can store students' work in a digital form that gives the reader an overview and captures students' development and achievements in multiple areas (Alexiou & Paraskeva, 2010). Greenberg (2004) added that ePortfolio is a platform for students' work, which is digitalised and available on the Internet. He further described that these materials can be seen on the web where a personal portfolio would have links to examples of work. He also stated that in contrast to an application programme, such as a word processor, an ePortfolio enables the owner of the page to manage

and organise files and to publish their achievements online. The ePortfolio also focuses on how well a learner achieves in a particular area and has elements of reflective practice (Slepcevic-Zach & Stock, 2018).

In fact, the studies on ePortfolios indicate the possibilities of learners constructing their knowledge, providing peer evaluation, and also developing their thinking ability (Chau & Cheng, 2010; Shepherd & Bolliger, 2011). Faravani and Attai (2015) posited that the potential of ePortfolios can also be seen in enhancing learner autonomy and facilitates the learning process, which is a method of self-regulation. Presently, students are often disengaged in the learning process, which fails to encourage SRL as students are not familiar with the self-assessment process since it is not incorporated in their curriculum (Abrami et al., 2009). Thus, there is a need for training the students on how to self-evaluate their work or their peers' (Brown & Harris, 2014). Nicolaidou (2012, 2013) claimed that SRL could be inculcated through the use of ePortfiolio. Similarly, other researchers also claimed that ePortfolio helps a learner to reflect their learning (e.g. Alexiou & Paraskeva, 2010; Cheng & Chau, 2013). Similarly, in earlier study, Barrett (2005) highlighted that reflection is one of the keys of SRL. This is because the idea of reflection enables a learner to evaluate their learning strategies in an online platform. Thus, in order to help students becoming active participants of learning, who are capable in dealing with complex phenomena and solve problems in the most imaginative and creative ways, student-centred learning is seen as a powerful medium. At the same time, technological tool such as ePortfolio also plays an important role in promoting this change. Several researchers indicated that the use of ePortfolios has enabled students to self-regulate their learning progress and enhanced their autonomy in learning and thus forming students who are active, reflective, independent and critical of their own work and learning as they are able to construct their own knowledge (Alexiou & Paraskeva, 2010; Cheng & Chau, 2013; Morales, Soler-Dominguez, & Tarkovska, 2015; Nguyen & Ikeda, 2015).

Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000) believed that ePortfolio offers a better platform to show what students are capable of and replaces time-based writing, which discriminates against second language learners. Students involved in ePortfolio are encouraged to assess their own learning and hence enhancing their success and valuing themselves as learners. When the current goals are met, consequently new goals are created. These achievements of meeting and creating new goals establish a successful SRL practice. Hence, in achieving their goals of becoming a good self-regulated writer, constructive feedback from peers and teachers through ePortfolio is essential. Engagement of students in SRL requires consideration of not only what students learn but also how they learn and if they have achieved their learning goals. In assisting

learners to achieve SRL, researchers have argued that teachers must act as agents to introduce and reinforce students' SRL experiences (Alvi & Gillies, 2020; Oates, 2019; Moos & Ringdal, 2012).

3.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

An action research following a model proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart (2000), consisting of stages of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting, was employed to explore the teacher's practice in managing writing tasks to promote SRL by using ePortfolio as the mediating tool. The planning stage involved designing ePortfolio writing tasks that incorporates self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment. The acting stage involved the execution of task following the process writing procedures and formative assessment practice. At this stage, self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment were exercised. At the observation stage, the observation was carried out at every process writing steps: pre-writing, drafting, evaluating, revising/editing, and producing final draft. At the reflecting stage, the reflection was made at the end of each writing process and each cycle of the action research. Altogether there were two cycles of action research.

3.1 Research Participants

The participants of this research were one ESL teacher and 16 of her Form 4 male students (aged 16 years old) in a secondary school in Malaysia. There were no female student participants as the school is a boy school. The selection of the participants was made on the voluntary and purposive sampling basis. The teacher has graduated from both the teacher training college and a university. She is a qualified teacher who has started her teaching career since 2009. As for the student participants, majority of the students were either speaking in Malay or English language. They were culturally diverse in their demographic background. The students were mostly from the Malay ethnic group, followed by the Chinese and the Indians. Students were of mixed-abilities of medium- and high-proficiency level of English. The selected school is a high-performing school that is located in the heart of Kuala Lumpur. The primary medium of instruction in this institution is Malay language with English as a second language.

3.2 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure was divided into four stages: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. There were several steps followed at the planning stage. First, permission was obtained to assess the schools from the Ministry of Education (MoE). Permission was also

sought from the Education District Office at the state level. Using the approval letters from both, several school principals were approached to seek permission for conducting the study in their schools. Once the permission was obtained from one of the principals, researchers were introduced to a few English teachers. One of the teachers volunteered to participate in the study. With all the consents given, a preliminary interview was conducted to know the background of the teacher. This was followed by a briefing session which was conducted to explain about the research and its procedures to the teacher participant. A step-by-step guide of opening an ePortfolio account was explained to the teacher participant. However, there was no restrictions set for the teacher in conducting the lesson. The teacher was given the autonomy to decide on the flow of her lessons. The nature of this study is an exploratory study; thus, the teacher was not guided on how she should plan and carry out her lessons.

At the acting stage, the teacher participant taught an expository essay, in two cycles. At this stage, self, peer and teacher assessment were exercised. During this stage, the teacher was observed. Apart from observation, a video recording of the lesson was also among the methods used in collecting the data. There were altogether two cameras located in the computer lab, where each lesson took place. One camera was positioned at the front of the computer lab and another camera was on the left corner of the lab. 45 minutes of each lesson was recorded. According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011), a video recording is an excellent medium to record the details that an observer might miss during the lesson. Finally, field notes were also part of the method employed in this study. The reflective field notes are personal records on the "insights, hunches, or broad ideas or themes that emerged during the observation" (Creswell, 2005, p. 214). The field notes were coded and categorized to complement other collected data. The final stage of reflecting involved teacher's reflective journal and an interview. This was essential to get an overview of the teacher's practice in managing writing tasks to promote SRL by using ePortfolio. Data for this research purpose were analyzed qualitatively using thematic analysis.

4.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings indicate several strategies adopted by the ESL teacher participant in managing her approach for developing SRL among her Form 4 students through the use of ePortfolio in the ESL writing classroom. The following sub-sections presents the data prescribing the different types of strategies employed and how they were perceived and practiced.

4.1 Teacher Strategies for Promoting SRL

4.1.1 Setting the learning goals

Among the characteristics of a highly effective teacher in helping students' SRL through ePortfolio is prioritizing the need to set learning goals. One of the ways to increase learners' autonomous motivation and enjoyment of learning is through goal-setting. Based on the interview session, the teacher participant asserted:

> *Yes the learning objective, we will write on the board. By the end of the lesson, we will write the students should be able to do this and that*

> (IS3, Q5)

Although from the observations, the learning goals were not written on the board, the teacher did verbally express the learning goals to the students during the first lessons of opening an ePortfolio account. She believed that this practice was sufficient for her cohort of students.

> *Teacher   : So basically…you are going to write your essay online Ok.You are going to self-assess yourself and your friend going to assess your essay…understand.*
> *Student   : Yessss…*

> (Obs 1)

Several studies had shown significant improvement in learner autonomy when learners comprehend the learning goals (e.g. Bloom, 2013; Moeller, Theiler, & Wu, 2012). When verbally stating the learning goals, the teacher participant in this study explained to her students on what to expect in their writing. The teacher's choice of practice in this study complemented other similar studies in which it was indicated that when teachers start early effort in teaching goal-setting and make this goal setting personal, student engagement in the lesson consequently becomes visible (Nordengren, 2019; Stronge & Grant, 2014). The very act of discussing goals and monitoring progress towards reaching their goals may result in developing greater self-regulation that leads to greater academic achievement. A study conducted by Hyland (2000) mentioned that often learners misunderstood what the class teacher thinks of clear goals in a piece of students' work. Alternatively, these students face confusion as they have a different or no idea of the standards expected. Scholars like Nicol and Macfarlene-Dick (2006) stressed

that when the students do not internalize their teacher's idea of assessment goals (criteria/ standards), the feedback that they have obtained is unlikely to resonate with them.

4.1.2 Highlighting the areas of focus

In addition to emphasizing the learning goals for her students, the teacher often stressed on the importance of grammatical accuracy. In her daily instructional practice, she mentioned:

> *O.K First I will look at their grammar because I feel that they are already in Form 4 and simple grammatical errors should not be tolerated. And then I will look at their ideas. I will make sure they will have three main ideas in their introduction paragraph and also the criteria for expository writing. They should be able to write a proper essay*
>
> (IS3, Q1)

Also, from the observation, it was noted that emphasis was given by the teacher to her students on the importance of avoiding plagiarism. The following is an excerpt of her conversation from the classroom observation data.

> *Teacher : Guys the reason why I want you to do this is for you to improve your writing but if you have decided to copy and paste than there is no point, I don't think we need to continue cycle two also. Because this are all just writing by other people, not your own writing. Honestly, how many of you copy and paste, raise your hand, I can know ok, please I have marked your essays so many times…I know your standard…Students A… copy and paste right*
>
> *Students A : Huh…*
>
> *Teacher : Sure*
>
> *Student A : I just change the same meaning….ar…I Google …same meaning and translate*
>
> *Teacher : Ok I can actually check you know…I copy and then I put on plagiarism check …how many percent is from which page*
>
> (Obs6)

In the interview session, the teacher confirmed on the importance for the students to avoid plagiarism.

Definitely, because they can always look for the information online anywhere and anytime. OK. Everything has its pros and cons. They are able to find the information. But at the same time it is much easier for them to plagiarize because they just cut and paste. They type the topic, whatever information they find, they do not look at the information and pick the correct information. They just copy and paste, plagiarise the whole essay

(IS3, Q11)

The teacher constantly reminded her students to reflect on their writing and avoiding the same words found from the internet. In avoiding to use other people`s words as their own words and constantly monitoring their own work, implicating the kind of reflecting process inherent in SRL (Zimmerman, 1986). This is echoed by Chankova (2017) that teachers need to guide students on paraphrasing as most often learners are not aware that they do not give proper attribution to the original source.

4.1.3 Sharing criteria of success

Another strategy used to promote SRL was through sharing the criteria of success with the students. The teacher mentioned that she shared her success criteria with her ESL writing students at an overview level as well as at a specific task level.

Not, not to have any grammatical errors. They are allowed to have but maybe first draft slip and simple grammatical errors should not be allowed. Example subject verb agreement. They also should meet the minimum criteria of 350 words

(IS3, Q7)

In the first cycle of the ePortfolio study, the success criteria were phrased in simple sentences so that students could understand their main goal in the writing exercise. The teacher asked students to brainstorm ideas or obtain inspiration from the internet. Based on her topic given, "The importance of co-curricular activities in school", she shared the criteria of success by explaining to the students that in drafting their essay, they should not write their full essay in their ePortfolio but to list the points first. The following excerpt provides evidence to the teacher`s practice of sharing criteria of success.

> *Teacher   : Ok, please sign in to your sites.   Yes, you can invite your friends to*
> *visit your site also… Ok today you are going to do the first draft of*
> *an essay…ok meaning you don't have to write*
>
> *Students   : (students making noise)*
>
> *Teacher   :Shhhh…pay attention...ok…You   are going to do the first draft so I   will*
> *give you a topic…you brainstorm on the ideas first ok. The importance of*
> *cocurricular activities in school. This is your topic*
>
> *Student   : Can we Google, teacher.*
>
> *Teacher   :Yes… The importance of co-curricular activities in school. This is your*
> *first draft…you don't have to write your full essay yet.*
>
> (Obs 1)

Additionally, the teacher also ensured that her students understood the changes that they had made. It was evident in the teacher`s practice that students were alerted on the criteria of success throughout the ePortfolio lesson. The practice of sharing the criteria of success is in line with Sadler's (2009) idea that teachers ought to share the criteria implicitly at all stages of the writing lesson. Sadler (1989, 2009) stressed that in order for the students to be aware on the criteria of success needed and be able to make judgments on the quality of their drafts, students need to be trained and encouraged on various methods needed to achieve the criteria of success.

4.1.4 Reviewing students' work

In terms of monitoring the students' progress and SRL development, it was observed that the teacher systematically reviewed her students' work during the lesson. That gave her an insight into her students' progress. This is apparent in her journal reflection,

> *Some students were slow in making changes although advice has been given many times. More input should be given to students*
>
> (TRJ 6)

Occasionally, a few students were unclear about the tasks and the teacher had to repeat the instructions in the first few lessons. In the teacher's 5th journal entry, she stated that she was aware of how all the students were progressing. It was only when she marked the final draft that she realized the students' assessment of their own essay were not constructive enough.

Utilizing tasks and activities by providing students with the scaffolding intended to work consistently in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978). Instead of repetitive instructions, a clear guideline would give learners a clearer picture. Although sporadic foibles in giving instructions are acceptable, an essential hallmark of good classroom practice is mastering the technique of instruction-giving. A suggestion to improve the lesson, however, is by modelling the instruction. Sowell's (2017) notion that a good classroom practice includes modelling or demonstrating one or two examples as part of the instructional procedure. When demonstrating a task, it would help learners to progress through their ZPD.

4.1.5 Self-assessment

Another strategy used by the teacher was by introducing and practicing self-assessment, that could be used as learning evidence. The teacher helped to support self-assessment opportunities by providing templates or protocols as regular elements in the lesson. The protocols included questions such as what the students have learned, what was difficult in learning and what the students needed to spend more time learning. In addition, in order to identify the strength and weaknesses of each lesson, the teacher provided exit slips to her students to enable her to monitor students' progress in understanding the lesson.

The teacher in this study was also seen in supporting self-assessment, a feature of SRL. A number of research studies advocate a theoretical relationship between self-assessment and SRL (Lan, 1998; Panadero, Jonsson, & Strijbos, 2016; Paris & Paris, 2001). By facilitating learners' self-assessment, the teacher had successfully guide learners on how to define and use the criteria for assessing their work.

In terms of using journal reflections as part of self-assessment, the teachers found that the activity was rather time-consuming and that she would ask her students to complete their ePortfolio reflection at home. Among all the lessons conducted, journal reflection was only utilized once where students had to write their journal reflection in the classroom and later the teacher*"... assigned it as homework"* (TJR 4, Q5). When asked on the usefulness of journal reflection in her classroom, the teacher felt that it was a very long process.

> *I think the process might be too long for students because they keep on repeating. Maybe we can reduce the number of journals that they have to do because to them every journal seems to be a tedious job for them. So I think the process of writing journals can be cut down. It is good that they do self-assessment and then do peer assessment and teacher give them feedback. But the number of journals, may be at the end of writing they provide only one journal*

> (IS3, Q13)

However, in this study, the act of not using the journal to facilitate the instruction shows that the journal served no purpose but is just an additional task for the students. The teacher felt that journal reflection did not serve its purpose and regarded it as a tedious process. This scenario has highlighted an area which could be further researched on.

4.1.6 Questioning technique

Another strategy to promote SRL was through the use of questioning strategies. The teacher's questioning technique varies. From the observation, she developed questioning strategies that allowed students to think analytically. During the first cycle of this research, when students asked the difference between 'tournament' and 'competition', instead of giving the answers immediately she guided the students by creating a situation for the students to understand the difference and posting guiding questions to the whole class. Based on the students' responses, the teacher then summarized the meaning.

> *Teacher responded to the student's question of tournament and competition by making it into a classroom discussion. At the end of the discussion, all the students gave explanation by stating that tournament involves a large number of competitors with multiple matches while competition only involves one match*

> (Obs 5)

In this study, it was observed that the teacher tried supporting the SRL process through effective pedagogy where questioning was widely used as a strategy for engaging students to think deeply. Vogler (2005) alleged that most of the teachers are aware that questions can stimulate students to think about the content being studied, connect it to prior knowledge, consider its meaning and implications, and explore its application. In this study, students were asked questions most of the time to elicit brief factual replies.

When one of the students asked the teacher to seek clarification whether to use "think out of the box" or "thinking outside of the box", the teacher used probing questioning technique and coached the students to reflect on the word "out" and "outside". Students were told to differentiate these two words by giving examples. One of the students replied think out of the box. The student explained that outside is used for location

(Obs 4)

4.1.7 Selective feedback

ePortfolio is an important catalyst to enable the feedback process. From the study, the teacher's understanding of feedback involved providing guidance to students towards their next learning steps. Her decision was influenced by her conception of students' linguistic proficiency and their capability to complete the task where she did not go into details with her higher proficiency learners because she believed that they would be able to give her the output required. Therefore, she did not engage in a lengthy discussion with her high proficiency students.

During the observations, the teacher's feedback practice was evident in individualized written corrective feedback only at the end of the final drafts in both cycles of the research. The participating teacher's feedback practice centred mostly after the students completed all their drafts. During the first cycle of the study, she mainly used teacher feedback worksheet in her instruction. In her feedback worksheet, she used cues to suggest that there were grammatical errors and provided a few hints to help the learners. She expected the students to read the feedback and she only explained (via oral feedback) to students who came forward to seek clarification.

Another feature of promoting SRL in the feedback practice through the ePortfolio is the ability for the teacher to ensure that students were able to give comments and suggestions to improve their peer's essay. This is seen as an approach of allowing peer-support and autonomy in learning.

Teacher expected learners to be able to complete peer assessment without explaining on the details of the task. Students were able to complete the task but have difficulty in giving comments as they were not sure of how to give feedback. Comments given to their peers only consist of a single line

(Obs 5)

Additionally, it was observed that when she gave her feedback to the high proficiency learners, she gave her full trust that the students would make changes to their ePortfolio based on her feedback given. Based on the students' drafts, it could be identified that some students did the changes while some did not. It was also observed that:

> *Students copied and pasted the same essay into their ePortfolio and naming them as final draft*
>
> (Obs 7)

In order to have a quality feedback practice, Bailey and Heritage (2018) mentioned that the feedback given by teachers should help learners to troubleshoot their own performance and to self-correct. Ideally, a process for writing through ePortfolio platform, which is driven by the learner through expert coaching, the teacher should promote self-regulated learning. Similarly, in this study, the teacher was not troubleshooting all their errors. Instead, she provided them with hints. Panadero et al. (2016) believed that when students are allowed to correct their errors, they would be able to regulate their own learning. The teacher in this study was seen giving opportunity to her learners to identify their own mistakes in which complemented her use of self-assessment as a strategy to promote SRL among ESL writing learners.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In summary, SRL could be promoted through several strategies. In the case of this study, the teacher participant had managed to use several strategies for promoting SRL among her learners, the strategies used are: setting learning goals, sharing criteria of success, reviewing process, self-assessment, questioning technique, and selective feedback. These strategies were employed to allow learner autonomy to take place by getting them to take responsibility of their own learning and think critically of the work assigned to them. Based on the findings of the study, collective evidence, and the literature, several recommendations for successfully implementing ePortfolio to promote SRL are outlined.

First, since the process of drafting essays in ePortfolio and giving feedback to peers is a time-consuming process, it is essential for teachers to establish time management strategy for students to encourage them to work independently. Students need to learn how to manage large blocks of time.

Secondly, both pre-service teachers and existing teachers need to be given professional development course on scaffolding. Teachers especially need to move from their comfort zone of only focusing on correcting students' surface-level errors. To help teachers in the scaffolding

process, Benko (2013) suggested the scaffolding process to involve several stages. First, teachers have to select a task which is challenging enough for the students, and that should be followed by the teacher's instructional method. The type of support given at this stage includes providing direction and demonstrating possible ways of completing a task and the final stage is teachers' attitude. Teachers must maintain a collaborative practice by facilitating students learning needs rather than holding an authoritative role in giving comments to the students' learning outcomes.

Next, teachers have to be more specific in giving feedback especially in highlighting students' strength and weaknesses. For advanced learners, the teacher should avoid giving general comments. This is to help students to critically analyse their own learning process and output, to allow them to be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses. Nevertheless, studies have shown that students are not the best judges of their own performance (Bjork, 1999; Kaufman, Evans, & Baer, 2010). Kicken, Brand-Gruwel, Van Merrienboer, and Slot (2009) emphasized that inaccurate judgment of one's own performance may be due to ignorance of desired performances and its expected standards. Hence, students do not know what they do not know and are oblivious of what differentiates unacceptable from an acceptable performance.

Finally, teachers need to redefine their role as "grammarian(s)" (Uysal & Bardakci, 2014). Although grammar is essential, teacher favouring traditional practices of explicit grammar teaching will not help students in expanding ideas in their drafts. Teachers need to shift their roles towards experts, advocates and consultants.

Although ePortfolio for teaching writing demonstrates great potential in the educational process, it is apparent that the development of self-regulated learning in the teaching of writing using ePortfolio cannot be enacted into classroom practice without supports from the teachers. It is also important to be able to change teachers` belief and pedagogical practices. Minimal development will take place if the teacher still holds on to their traditional beliefs and authoritative role. Teachers need to play more of a facilitative role instead.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. N. L. Y. (2016). Interaction effects of gender and motivational beliefs on self-regulated learning: A study at ICT-integrated schools. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 13*(1), 25–41.

Abrami, P. C., Wade, A., Pillay, V., Aslan, O., Bures, E. M., & Bentley, C. (2009). Encouraging self-regulated learning through electronic portfolios. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 34*(3), 1-12.

Alexiou, A., & Paraskeva, F. (2010). Enhancing self-regulated learning skills through the implementation of an e-portfolio tool. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 3048–3054.

Aregu, B. B. (2011). P*romoting self–regulated learning in writing classes: Effects on self-beliefs and performances.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Addis Ababa University.

Alvi, E., & Gillies, R. (2020). Teachers and the teaching of self-regulated learning (SRL): The emergence of an integrative, ecological model of SRL-in-context. *Education Sciences, 10*(98), 1-19.

Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2018). *Self-regulation in learning the role of language and formative assessment.* Harvard Education Press.

Barnard-Brak, L., Lan, W. Y., & Paton, V. O. (2010). Profiles in self-regulated learning in the online learning environment. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 11*(1), 61–80.

Barrett, H. (2005). Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement: The REFLECT initiative. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(6), 436-449.

Benko, S. L. (2013). Scaffolding: An ongoing process to support adolescent writing development. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 56*(1), 291–300.

Bjork, R. A. (1999). Assessing our own competence: Heuristics and illusions. In D. Gopher & A. Koriat (Eds.), *Attention and performance XVII: Cognitive regulation of performance: Interaction of theory and application* (pp. 435–459). MIT Press.

Bloom, M. (2013). Self-regulated learning: Goal setting and self-monitoring. *The Language Teacher – Readers' Forum, 37*(4), 46- 51.

Brown, G., & Harris, L. (2014). The future of self-assessment in classroom practice: Reframing self-assessment as a core competency. *Frontline Learning Research, 3*(1), 22-30.

Chankova, M. (2017). Dealing with students' plagiarism pre-emptively through teaching proper information exploitation. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 11*(2), 1-10.

Chau, J., & Cheng, G. (2010). Towards understanding the potential of e-Portfolios for independent learning: A qualitative study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26*(7), 932–950.

Cheng, G., & Chau, J. (2013). Exploring the relationship between students' self-regulated learning ability and their ePortfolio achievement. *Internet and Higher Education, 17*(1), 9–15.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson.

Faravani, A., & Attai, M. R. (2015). Portfolio assessment and the enhancement of higher order thinking through multiple intelligence and dialogic feedback. *Issues in Language Teaching, 4*(1), 1-25.

Greene, J. A., & Azevedo, R. (2007). A theoretical review of Winne and Hadwin's model of self-regulated learning: New perspectives and directions. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 334-372.

Greenberg, G. (2004). The digital convergence: Extending the portfolio model. *Educause Review, 39*(4), 28-37.

Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (1999). *Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research.* Hampton Press.

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

Kaufman, J. C., Evans, M. L., & Baer, J. (2010). The American idol effect: Are students good judges of their creativity across domains? *Empirical Studies of the Arts, 28*(1), 3-17.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). *The action research planner.* Deakin University Press.

Kicken, W., Brand-Gruwel, S., Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Slot, W. (2009). The effects of portfolio-based advice on the development of self-directed learning skills in secondary vocational education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 57*(4), 439-460.

Lan, W. Y. (1998). Teaching self-monitoring skills in statistics. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice* (pp. 86–105). Guilford Press.

Magno, C. (2009). Developing and assessing self-regulated learning. *The Assessment Handbook: Continuing Education Program, 1*(1), 26–41.

Majid, F. (2007). Self-regulated learning: Effective practices in ESL writing classes. *Journal of Language Studies, 3*(1), 115–128.

Moeller, A. K., Theiler, J., & Wu, C. (2012). Goal setting and student achievement: A longitudinal study. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*(1), 153-169.

Moos, D. C., & Ringdal, A. (2012). Self-regulated learning in the classroom: A literature review on the teacher's role. *Education Research International, 1*(1), 1-15.

Morales, L., Soler-Dominguez, A., & Tarkovska, V. (2015). Self-regulated learning and the role of ePortfolios in business studies. *Educational Information Technology, 21*(1), 1733–1751.

Nicolaidou, I. (2012). Can process portfolios affect students' writing self-efficacy? *International Journal of Educational Research, 56*(1), 10–22.

Nicolaidou, I. (2013). E-portfolios supporting primary students' writing performance and peer feedback. *Computers & Education, 68*(1), 404-415.

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.

Nguyen, L. T., & Ikeda, M. (2015). The effects of ePortfolio-based learning model on student self-regulated learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 16*(3), 197–209.

Nordengren, C. (2019). Goal-setting practices that support a learning culture. *Phi Delta Kappan, 101*(1), 18–23.

Oates, S. (2019). The importance of autonomous, self-regulated learning in primary initial teacher training. *Frontiers in Education, 4*(102), 1-8.

Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Strijbos, J. W. (2016). Scaffolding self-regulated learning through self-assessment and peer assessment: Guidelines for classroom implementation. In D. Laveault & L. Allal (Eds.), *Assessment for learning: Meeting the challenge of implementation* (pp. 311-326). Springer.

Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2001). Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(2), 89–101.

Pintrich, P. R. (2005). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In R. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation, 2nd ed.* (pp. 452-494). Elsevier Academic Press.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science, 18*(2), 119-144.

Sadler, D. R. (2009). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*(2), 159-179.

Schuitema, J., Peetsma, T., & van der Veen, I. (2012). Self-regulated learning and students' perceptions of innovative and traditional learning environments: A longitudinal study in secondary education. *Educational Studies, 38*(4), 397–413.

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.

Shepherd, C. E., & Bolliger, D. U. (2011). The effects of electronic portfolio tools on online students' perceived support and cognitive load. *Internet and Higher Education, 14*(1), 142-149.

Slepcevic-Zach, P., & Stock, M. (2018). EPortfolio as a tool for reflection and self-reflection. *Reflective Practice, 19*(3), 291-307.

Sowell, J. (2017). Good instruction-giving in the second language classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 55*(3), 10-19.

Stronge, J. H., & Grant, L. W. (2014). *Student achievement goal setting*. Taylor & Francis.

Uysal, H. H., & Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching: Focusing on meaning, form, or forms? *South African Journal of Education, 34*(1), 1-16.

Vogler, K. E. (2005). Improve your verbal questioning. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 79*(2), 98-103.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental process.* Harvard University Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Development of self-regulated learning: Which are the key subprocesses. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 16*(1), 307-313.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). Dimensions of academic self-regulation: A conceptual framework for education. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (pp. 3-21). Erlbaum.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13–39). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(1), 614-628.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1988). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 284–290.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 51–59.