

Indonesian university students' self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies in writing expository essays

Atik Umamah^{1*} and Bambang Yudi Cahyono²

¹English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Malang, Jl. M. T. Haryono No. 193 Malang, East Java 65145, Indonesia

^{1, 2}Graduate Program in English Language Teaching, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No.5, Sumbersari, Kec. Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, East Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research is carried out to investigate Indonesian EFL students' use of self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies and to identify the SRW strategies applied, particularly by proficient students in writing. The research involved 45 students who have passed an essay writing course focusing on expository essays. Data on the students' use of SRW strategies came from a Self-Regulated Learning Strategy Questionnaire (SRLSQ) adopted from Abadikhah et al. (2018). The students' use of SRW strategies were categorized into six dimensions: *motive*, *method*, *time*, *performance*, *physical environment*, and *social environment*. Out of the total number of respondents, four proficient students were involved in a semi-structured interview. The interview was aimed at knowing the students' use of SRW strategies in the planning, execution, and evaluation (PLEE) cyclical model of process writing. The result of the questionnaire data analysis showed that the students use all of the six dimensions of SRW strategies, with the highest mean for the *social environment* dimension and the lowest mean for the *motive* dimension. The result of the interview data analysis revealed that the proficient students also use the six dimensions of SRW strategies. Still, they dominantly apply the *method*, *performance*, and *social environment* dimensions of SRW strategies.

Keywords: Essay writing; Indonesian EFL students; learning strategy; self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies; writing skill

First Received:

24 January 2020

Revised:

26 March 2020

Accepted:

30 April 2020

Final Proof Received:

26 May 2020

Published:

31 May 2020

How to cite (in APA style):

Umamah, A. & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Indonesian university students' self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies in writing expository essays. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 25-35. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.24958>

INTRODUCTION

In English as a foreign language (EFL) context, students commonly find difficulties in accomplishing writing tasks (Farooq et al., 2012; Karim et al., 2017). These difficulties are apparent in several research studies conducted in various EFL contexts. Javid et al. (2013) find a lexical, organization, and grammar as the critical problems encountered by Saudi Arabian learners. Omani students have issues with lexical and content aspects (Al Seyabi & Tuzlukova, 2014), while Bangladeshi students must deal with idiomatic expression and lexical problems (Karim, Maasum, & Latif, 2017). In Indonesia, Umamah et al. (2019) uncover that students have problems in

applying grammar items, mechanics, organization and content, and style. Flores and Lopez (2019) unveil that EFL students must tackle writing difficulties due to lack of English proficiency, poor reading comprehension skills, insufficient vocabulary, poor ability in documenting sources, and other non-academic challenges (e.g., time constraint). In essence, the EFL students' writing problems deal not only with micro-skills (e.g., grammar and vocabulary), but also macro skills (e.g., cohesive devices, rhetorical forms, and organization) (Brown, 2007) as well as non-academic problems.

To tackle the complexities in writing, EFL students need effective learning strategies (Cohen &

* Corresponding Author

Email: atikumamah@unisma.ac.id

atikumamah@unisma.ac.id

Macaro, 2007) and enormous self-regulation of recursive processes to improve their knowledge of writing and strategy (Harris & Graham, 2016). To be self-regulated, students need to initiate multidimensional aspects involving metacognitive, cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral processes to attain learning goals (Kizilcec et al., 2017). Therefore, self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies are appropriately used in process-oriented writing since students have an ample chance to develop their metacognitive knowledge about their own abilities, requirements of a task, and strategy use, and to encourage SRL for monitoring the entire writing process (Lam, 2015). In other words, the use of SRL strategies accommodates the three stages of writing: planning (PL), execution (E), and evaluation (E) (Rosário et al., 2019). Following previous research (Brunstein & Glaser, 2011; Reynolds & Perin, 2009), this research applies self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies to refer to self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies in writing.

Writing skills and learning strategies

In a process approach, writing is an arduous task since it proceeds in some stages (Karim et al., 2017). Commonly, the writing cycle includes planning (PL), execution (E), and evaluation (E) or PLEE cyclical model (Rosário et al., 2019). In this model, students start writing with planning to gain ideas. The execution involves organizing the ideas into an outline and developing the ideas. In the evaluation stage, the students monitor their learning by revising the content, editing the draft, and finalizing the writing. The process of writing is much more challenging for EFL students when they deal with essay writing since the essay is not easy to develop and usually written in poor quality (Ferretti & Graham, 2019). In writing an essay, students produce longer text consisting of introduction, body, and conclusion. They are required to compose different genres, such as argumentative and expository essays. In expository essays, for example, the students are trained to create different types of structures, including simple description, compare-contrast, sequence, cause-effect, and problem-solution (Roehling et al., 2017). Students often face problems in writing essays due to limited linguistic knowledge, anxiety, lack of ideas, L1 interference, and insufficient understanding of structure organization (Fareed et al., 2016). One of the factors causing the writing difficulties is an ineffective use of strategies (Graham et al., 2000). Thus, Cohen and Macaro (2007) suggest that students need strategy-based practices to enhance their writing performance. In other words, learning strategy use plays an essential role in maximizing the students' knowledge and skills in writing (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). Oxford (1990) proposes six strategy categories: cognitive (understanding and producing new language by recognizing patterns and practicing),

affective (the control of emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values), memory (dealing with the problems of remembering words), compensation (using the new language for comprehension and production), social (seeking for help to overcome learning problems), and metacognitive (controlling cognition, monitoring errors and evaluating progress).

Some writing strategy research was conducted in EFL context adopting Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) and reported that metacognitive is the most frequently used strategy by proficient students (Farahian & Avarzamani, 2018; Mistar et al., 2014; Zuhairi & Umamah, 2016). Other research concerns with the comparison of strategies by the L1 and L2 writers (Guo & Huang, 2018), the identification of writing strategy use in general, and the comparison of strategies by students with different proficiency levels (Bailey, 2019; Chien, 2012; Gibriel, 2019; Mistar et al., 2014; Zuhairi & Umamah, 2016). Other studies address the relationship between writing strategies and personality factors such as self-efficacy (Ahmadian & Ghasemi, 2017), anxiety (Bailey, 2019; Gibriel, 2019), and motivation (Nasihah & Cahyono, 2017). Some others focus on the use of specific strategies such as cognitive (Chien, 2007, 2012) and metacognitive (Xiao, 2007) strategies.

Self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies

Previously, learning strategies are linked to language learning strategies (LLS) by Oxford (1990). Still, criticisms concerning the elusive definition of LLS led Dörnyei (2005) to introduce and to suggest the use of self-regulation to replace LLS (as cited in Mizumoto, 2018). Self-regulation is the application of metacognitive strategies, the skills to manage, direct, regulate, and guide learners' learning through planning, monitoring, and evaluation (Wenden, 1998). The notion of self-regulated learning (SRL) emerged in the 1980s based on Bandura's social cognitive theory consisting of three aspects: personal (e.g., cognition and emotions), behavioral, and environmental aspects (as cited in Abadikhah et al., 2018). Furthermore, Kizilcec et al. (2017) posit that self-regulation covers multidimensional aspects involving metacognitive, cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral processes. In 1994, Zimmerman proposed self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies in the academic setting (Abadikhah et al., 2018) because learners' motivational, affective, and social aspects of their intellectual functioning and cognitive processing need to be regulated to obtain a maximum learning result (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). In writing context, SRL strategies refer to "self-initiated thoughts, feelings, and actions that writers use to attain various literary goals, including improving their writing skills as well as enhancing

the quality of the text they create” (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997, p.76).

Zimmerman (1994, 1998) classifies self-regulated learning in writing or self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies into six dimensions: motive (the way learners learn), method (strategies to accomplish a task), time (time management), physical environment (environmental structuring to support learning), social environment (seeking help), and performance (monitoring and self-evaluating learning and recognizing self-consequences) (as cited in Andrade & Bunker, 2009). Self-regulated learners have an awareness of their qualities of knowledge, beliefs, motivation, and cognitive processing (Butler & Winne, 1995) so that they have better academic performance than those with poor self-regulation (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994).

Current studies prove that SRW strategies provide a positive effect on students’ writing performance at different levels of education. In primary school, correlational research finds that proficient students are highly motivated and have a higher level of SRW strategies employment, and the SRW strategies correlate with motivation such as growth mindset, self-efficacy, and interest (Bai & Guo, 2019). Geres-Smith et al. (2019) conduct a self-regulated learning development (SRSD) intervention and report better improvement in students’ persuasive writing quality, composition duration, and self-efficacy after taught using SRSD with self-statements. Rosário et al. (2019), investigating the impact of three types of writing intervention: free-writing, self-regulated strategy development (SRSD), and SRSD plus story tool, reveal that SRSD and SRSD plus outperform the free-writing technique. In the EFL secondary education, Forbes (2019), conducting an intervention of strategy-based instruction, classifies writers into the strategic writer, the experimenter, the struggling writer, and the multilingual writer. The strategic writer applies a various range of writing strategies, including monitoring and evaluation strategies. In the EFL university level, graduate students use self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies to overcome rhetorical problems when accomplishing unfamiliar writing tasks (Roderick, 2019). Using a self-report measure of SRW, Abadikhah et al. (2018) uncover that EFL students employ SRW strategies at a moderate to a slightly high level, and more proficient students deploy SRW strategies more frequently than the less proficient students do.

Many studies provide evidence that self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies can improve students’ writing quality (Cer, 2019; Forbes, 2019; Geres-Smith et al., 2019; Roderick, 2019; Rosário et al., 2019; Teng & Huang, 2019; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994) and students’ motivation (Bai & Guo, 2019). However, the majority of the studies on self-

regulated strategies involved primary and secondary students, and very limited studies involved tertiary EFL students (e.g., Yot-Domínguez & Marcelo, 2017). Reflecting upon the literature review, research on SRW strategies involving Indonesian EFL students is a rare undertaking. Therefore, this research is conducted to reveal (1) the self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies used by Indonesian students in writing essays and (2) self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies used by proficient students in writing essays using PLEE cyclical model.

METHOD

Research design

This research applied quantitative and qualitative approaches. It is quantitative in nature since it involves statistical analysis to describe the mean score of the self-regulated writing (SRW) strategy use based on the overall six dimensions and each item in each dimension. Meanwhile, a qualitative approach is used to describe how proficient students apply the SRW strategies in the processes of writing involving planning, execution, and evaluation.

Research site and participants

Forty-five Indonesian EFL students were involved as the respondents based on the convenience sampling technique. They are undergraduate students majoring in English at one of the private universities in Malang, Indonesia. They are in the third year and were selected because they have got an essay writing course, so they are supposed to have sufficient experience in writing and in using learning strategies. Before the questionnaire distribution, a letter of consent was sent to the head of the English department of the university to allow the students to participate in this research. Before responding to the questionnaire, the students were asked to read a purpose section put in the first page of the questionnaire asking their agreement in joining in this research. Out of 45 participants, four participants categorized as proficient students were selected to be the participants in the semi-structured interview session based on their writing score. This research involved proficient students because they are assumed to apply effective learning strategies.

Data collection

This research drew on data from a 60-item Self-Regulated Learning Strategy Questionnaire (SRLSQ) adopted from Abadikhah et al. (2018). The questionnaire was required to gather profound information and generate ideas related to the strategies used in six dimensions (motive, method, time, performance, physical environment, and social environment); detailed questionnaire distribution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Distribution of Self-Regulated Learning Strategy Questionnaire (SRLSQ)

Dimensions	Scales	Number of items
Motive	Goal-setting, self-efficacy	14
Method	Task strategies	10
Time	Time-management	8
Performance	Self-evaluation, self-consequence	17
Physical environment	Environmental structuring	5
Social environment	Help-seeking	6
Total		60

The questionnaire consisted of three parts: purpose section, demographic information, and the Self-Regulated Learning Strategy Questionnaire (SRLSQ). The first part is the purpose section informing the students with the title of the research, the purpose of the study, and a statement concerning the students' agreement or disagreement to join this research. The second is the participants' demographic information. The central part is the 60-item questionnaire with a 5-Likert scale (strongly disagree '1' to strongly agree '5'). The questionnaire is ready to use and has high reliability (0.95). To ensure that the respondents fully understand each item, the authors translated the questionnaire into the students' first language. A writing lecturer and two students were asked to read the items to make sure that each statement was clear and understandable, and according to them, the questionnaire was clear and unambiguous. The questionnaire was distributed via Google Form and was sent to the students using an instant messaging group.

Following the distribution of the questionnaire, the students were assigned to write an expository essay about 'A Great Teacher' with a length of approximately 500 words. The score was used to group the students into proficient and less proficient students. Four proficient students were then invited to join in a semi-structured interview to obtain in-depth data regarding the use of SRW strategies. The use of a semi-structured interview allows the interviewer to explore and clarify the students' answers and the reasons for the answers. Some interview questions were prepared by considering the three writing cycles in PLEE (planning, execution, and evaluation) and how the students use self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies to deal with problems in organization and content, grammar, mechanics, and writing style. The draft was checked by a colleague, a writing lecturer. Finally, three questions related to the PLEE cyclical model and five questions asking the strategies used to deal with the writing difficulties were used. The process of semi-structured interview lasted for about 45 minutes and was audio recorded to ensure no missing information. To triangulate the interview data, the students were contacted via instant messaging application.

Data analysis

The quantitative data from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The analysis of

the mean score was done to each dimension (a total of six dimensions) and each item in each dimension. The frequency of use of the SRW strategies is considered *high* if the mean score is between 3.45 and 5.00, *moderate* if it is between 2.45 and 3.44, and categorized *low* if it is between 1.00 and 2.44 (Oxford, 1990). Oxford's interpretation is adopted in a learning strategy questionnaire, especially with a 5 Likert-scale questionnaire. The data from the semi-structured interview were analyzed using content analysis. (coding data, locating categories and themes, organizing data and themes, and identifying and interpreting findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). At first, the audio recording of the interview session with the four proficient students was coded and categorized based on the PLEE (planning, execution, and evaluation) stages. The students' answers to each question for each stage were identified and organized in reference to the six dimensions of self-regulated writing strategies (motive, method, time, performance, physical environment, and social environment). Then the identified categories were interpreted. The final stage was to draw a conclusion based on both the quantitative and qualitative data analyses.

FINDINGS

SRW strategies used by Indonesian students in EFL writing

In answering the first research question, an analysis of descriptive statistics was performed to measure the mean score of each strategy dimension as well as the item in each dimension. As seen in Table 2, four SRW strategy dimensions (social environment, physical environment, performance, and method dimensions) obtain a high frequency of use (3.89-4.22) with the social environment in the highest rank (4.22). Meanwhile, the other two dimensions (time and motive) are at the moderate level, and motive dimension indicates the lowest frequency (3.08) (see Appendix for complete tabulation).

To get a clearer picture of the SRW strategy use, the mean score of each item of each strategy dimension was also analyzed. An exciting finding is uncovered in the social environment dimension. The students highly apply all items in this dimension. The highest mean (4.58) belongs to item number 50 (calling/texting a classmate about the writing homework that I missed), while the lowest mean

score is related to item number 55 (enjoying group writing works to help one another. The physical environment dimension places the second rank with all items in a high frequency of use. The most frequently employed strategy in this dimension with a value of 4.42 is item number 57 (not being able to write in a dark place), and the least used (3.58) is item number 60 indicating that the students avoid watching TV or using the Internet when having pending writing task. The performance dimension is

in the third rank. The students mostly ask feedback and listen attentively when commented on their writing. It indicates that they recognize the great benefit of feedback. It can be seen from the highest mean score (4.44) of the two strategies. As noted in the mean score (3.11 or moderate level), the students sometimes write their improvements in writing. In the method dimension, the fourth place, students mainly proofread their essay as it is indicated by the high mean score with a value of 4.31.

Table 2
Ranking of the Six SRW Strategy Dimensions

Self-Regulated Writing Strategy Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Social Environment Dimension	45	4.22	.53	1 (high)
Physical Environment Dimension	45	3.92	.87	2 (high)
Performance Dimension	45	3.89	.63	3 (high)
Method Dimension	45	3.89	.60	4 (high)
Time Dimension	45	3.32	.55	5 (moderate)
Motive Dimension	45	3.08	.64	6 (moderate)
Overall		3.72		High

In contrast, they rarely use graphic organizers to organize their ideas, as shown by the moderate frequency of use of this strategy (2.93). It might be best explained by the insufficient exposure to the use of a graphic organizer when students organize their ideas. The next one is the time dimension, which is related to the use of time management when accomplishing the writing task. Attending a writing class regularly is the most often used strategy with a mean score of 4.44. Meanwhile, it is found that the students do not often set goals for their writing. It can be seen from the moderate level of the mean score (2.49). The least used dimension is motive. The highest mean score (3.60) for this dimension belongs to item number 13, stating that the students can write a proper introduction to an essay. Meanwhile, setting a detailed schedule for writing task obtains the lowest mean score (2.58).

SRW strategies used by proficient students in writing essays

After administering several steps in content analysis: coding data, locating categories and themes, organizing data and themes, and identifying the data from the interview, the interpretation is presented in the following section. The students' SRW strategies were revealed in reference to the stages in the PLEE (planning, executing, and evaluating) cyclical model and their writing difficulties in terms of organization and content, grammar, mechanics, and style.

In terms of planning, it was found that proficient students planned their writing tasks well. They find references such as articles to gain ideas. They also prefer to get ideas together through discussion, list the ideas, and then create a physical and/or mental outline. One of the students stated, "... *finding ideas together is really helpful.*" (Student 2)

In the execution stage, they write the main idea at first and then support it with the details by reading

some references. Then they mostly share with peers (asking for proofreading) regarding the content and grammar. The use of online and offline dictionaries also helps them in drafting the essay. Using grammar knowledge mentally (not opening grammar book) benefits them in dealing with grammar items because they can use their grammar knowledge to check their sentences without wasting time to search the grammar rules in the book. This is evident from the response of Student 4, who stated, "*I also share... the content and what is it... grammar...whether it is correct or not.*" When asked further whether she opened her grammar book, she answered, "*No, Ma'am. I only remembered the grammar patterns. Using grammar books takes longer time.*"

In the stage of evaluation, there are two categories: self-evaluation and expert-evaluation. Self-evaluation involves rereading the essay and reviewing the content, organization and content, grammar, and mechanics in order. Self-evaluation, according to the students, is not enough; thus, they need expert-evaluation by asking more knowledgeable and helpful peers and teachers to proofread their essay draft to get useful feedback. They primarily reflect the feedback whether it is appropriate before applying the feedback into their revision. They also make use of grammar and spelling check in word processing software. Interestingly, two of them also use online grammar checker.

"Reading repeatedly...the main idea is appropriate or not with the supporting sentences and the details...the content and the structure" (Student 1)

"I check the mechanics but the last...I also use ehmm grammar checker... (mention one application of grammar checker)...I reflect...the feedback...if I use this in my context, is it appropriate?" (Student 3)

To deal with difficulties in organization and content, the proficient students tend to use self-evaluation and expert-evaluation. The self-evaluation was performed by rereading the essay to find the problems with the essay structure and the content. They also require an evaluation from peers, more knowledgeable persons, and teachers to evaluate their draft. The example of the interview response is in the following.

“For me...writing ...must be read, so after writing the draft, I reread ... sometimes I consulted to my mom [her mom is a teacher].. (Student 4)

Regarding with grammatical problems, they prefer to ask peers to check their grammar. Something interesting is that they make use of online resources such as Google and grammar checker application to help them detect and correct their grammar problems.

“I usually ask my senior... for example, I make this kind of sentence...this tense... [then asking the senior] is it right or wrong?” (Student 3)

“I don’t open a grammar book, but search on Google... how to use it [the tense]...I used (mentioning one application of grammar checker). That time I thought that...I mean, I often do not realize my grammar mistakes. (Student 4)

In dealing with problems in mechanics, they self-evaluate by learning how to use correct mechanics, rereading the essay, and making use of word processing software.

“Rereading..we learned the previous materials in Writing 2 (previous writing course)..opening the writing book about mechanics...I also used (mentioning a word processing software) check..it’s like disturbing to see blue [and red] on the screen [indicating wrong in spelling, capitalization, or punctuation].” (S1)

In terms of style, they state that they use a dictionary to choose various words (especially synonym) and theory of writing in their book to have multiple sentences and cohesive devices. One student also learns writing style from the text she read, but the text is in the first language (Indonesian). Interestingly, there is also a kind of avoidance strategy (style is not a priority; for the most important is the sentence is correct) used by one of the subjects.

“For the style in vocabulary, I search for example..what is it...there are two words with the same meaning. For example, instead of using *because* I used *since* so the word like different...high level..*pivotal* instead of *important*..so it’s like readers read wow it’s something new... (Student 1)

“I prefer to be safe..using the common style...the main point is my sentences are correct, so I do not consider the style that much.” (Student 2)

DISCUSSION

The findings of the statistical analysis show that the overall use of SRW strategies is at a high level, except for the two dimensions: time and motive, which are used at a moderate level. The most frequently employed strategy dimension is the social environment. This result implies that the students mostly seek help from peers, teachers, seniors, or resources like a book, computer, or Internet to accomplish their writing tasks. The lowest mean score belongs to the motive dimension. It indicates that the students find it challenging to set goals, and they perceive moderate self-efficacy in writing.

Furthermore, the semi-structured interview reveals that in the PLEE cyclical model, proficient students thoroughly go through the three stages of writing processes (planning, execution, and evaluation). Besides, to deal with the four writing aspects, they apply similar SRW strategies. They mostly use method, performance, and social environment dimensions through self-evaluation, expert-evaluation, and the use of offline and online resources.

The high frequency of use of the social environment dimension explains that EFL students tend to find assistance when performing writing tasks. They ask peers, seniors, and teachers about content and grammar. They also make use of offline resources (book, dictionary, word processing software) and online resources (Google, online grammar checker, online dictionary). It is in agreement with the finding of Yot-Domínguez and Marcelo (2017) reporting that university students generally prefer to use social support. However, this finding is different from a previous research finding stating that help-seeking is the least common SRW strategy use (Kizilcec et al., 2017) and writing strategy in general (Gibriel, 2019). Different courses (non-English course) and subjects (mixed of students, bachelors, masters, and Ph.D. students) might be the valid reasons for this different result. The students in this research mostly seek help since they were still in the early stage of essay writing, so they were not autonomous yet.

The finding that the lowest mean scores belong to time and motive dimensions is similar to the previous research result (Abadikhah et al., 2018). These prove that EFL students deal with a challenge in time management, goal setting, and self-efficacy. In terms of time, the students in this research use their time very well to attend writing class and work on the given assignment regularly. However, they do not set a specific schedule when performing writing assignments. In fact, time management is a pivotal factor in writing (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997) and has a positive correlation with writing achievement (Farahian & Avarzamani, 2018). Further, poor time management could result in the failure in the use of other SRW strategies and the writing process accomplishment (Abadikhah et al.,

2018). Also, goal setting seems to be another problem for EFL students, and it is regarded to contribute to their poor time management (Abadikhah et al., 2018). Accordingly, the students need to set their goals in writing a specific task and make an efficient timetable to achieve each goal. Self-efficacy is another issue in the motive dimension. Though the mean score is higher than of the goal setting, it is still at a moderate level. It shows that the students do not have high confidence in writing an essay, whereas self-efficacy affects writing performance significantly (Cer, 2019; Rosário et al., 2019), and proficient students were reported to have a higher level of motivation involving growth mindset, self-efficacy, and interest (Bai & Guo, 2019).

Regarding the PLEE cyclical model, some interesting findings are worth to be discussed further. Supporting the previous study conducted by Farahian and Avarzamani (2018), proficient students consider planning as a crucial stage since it does significantly affect the students' quantity and quality of writing (Rostamian et al., 2018). They plan their writing task through drafting, outlining, and proofreading (Munoz-Luna, 2015). In this research, the proficient students mainly use resources, i.e., articles and discuss with peers to gain ideas, make a list of the ideas, and then create a physical and mental outline. In the execution and evaluation stages, they apply the combination of method, performance, and social environment dimensions through self-evaluation, expert-evaluation, and the use of offline and online resources. Self-evaluation is predictive of completing assessments and lectures.

In facing difficulties in the four aspects of writing, proficient students mostly consider method, performance, and social environment dimensions through self-evaluation, expert-evaluation, and resources as effective strategies. This finding is in agreement with Abadikhah et al. (2018); however, in their research context, it is not specifically addressed to proficient students. In conjunction with Forbes (2019), proficient students self-evaluate their essay draft, particularly in content and grammatical issues. In the same vein, Lam (2015) reports that low-intermediate students he/she investigated seemed to focus more on revising discourse-related aspects of texts than on the linguistic aspects. Not only that, but expert-evaluation is also regarded as essential to gain feedback for what might miss or inappropriate from the students' draft. Furthermore, they consider feedback as a beneficial aspect to improve their writing, as reported by Kusumaningrum, Cahyono, and Prayogo (2019). Moreover, feedback from different sources might lead to enhancement in students' variables such as motivation and self-concept, so they will be more risk-taking and independent of incorporating the feedback into their revisions (Lam, 2015).

Interestingly, proficient students also make use of digital resources such as word processing

software, Google, online dictionary, and online grammar checker to tackle problems in the linguistic level such as grammar and mechanics. It is significant proof that the integration of technology in writing classroom offers students with promising benefits (Hughes, Regan, & Evmenova, 2019; Imelda, Cahyono, & Astuti, 2019). In terms of style, three out of four proficient students mention that they take high consideration of the stylistic expression by using synonyms, various types of sentences, and cohesive devices. Meanwhile, one student prefers to be in the safe zone though still making an effort not to be monotonous. It is in line with the finding that there is a significant effect between writing achievement and stylistic expression (Cer, 2019). In other words, proficient students tend to use a better stylistic expression to avoid monotonous writing.

CONCLUSIONS

This research reveals that EFL students use self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies frequently in their writing processes by seeking help from others and making use of resources to accomplish their writing tasks. However, they still find it challenging to set goals to achieve certain writing tasks consistently and they are not confident with their ability in writing. Proficient students, in particular, go through the writing processes effectively in the planning, execution, and evaluation processes. They also engage themselves in method, performance, and social environment dimensions to cope with challenges in the four aspects of writing (content and organization, grammar, mechanics, and style). These findings provide writing teachers with insight into the proficient students' use of self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies so that it can be used as a reference to integrate SRW strategy intervention to help less proficient students improve their writing skills. Besides, it is suggested that future researchers examine the effect of self-regulated writing (SRW) strategy intervention (adopted from proficient students' strategies) on the less proficient students. Further investigation on the use of self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies across proficiency levels is also demanded.

REFERENCES

- Abadikhah, S., Aliyan, Z., & Talebi, S. H. (2018). EFL students' attitudes towards self-regulated learning strategies in academic writing. *Issues in Educational Research, 28*(1), 1–17. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier28/abadikhah.pdf>
- Ahmadian, M., & Ghasemi, A. A. (2017). Language learning strategies, multiple intelligences and self-efficacy: Exploring the links. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 14*(4), 18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.4.11.755>
- Al Seyabi, F., & Tuzlukova, V. (2014). Writing problems and strategies: An investigative study in

- the Omani school and university context. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 3(4), 37–48. [http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.3\(4\)/AJSSH2014\(3.4-05\).pdf](http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.3(4)/AJSSH2014(3.4-05).pdf)
- Andrade, M. S., & Bunker, E. L. (2009). A model for self-regulated distance language learning. *Distance Education*, 30(1), 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910902845956>
- Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2019). Motivation and self-regulated strategy use: Relationships to primary school students' English writing in Hong Kong. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216881985992. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819859921>
- Bailey, D. R. (2019). Conceptualization of second language writing strategies and their relation to student characteristics. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(1), 14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.1.9.135>
- Brown, D. H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Brunstein, J. C., & Glaser, C. (2011). Testing a path-analytic mediation model of how self-regulated writing strategies improve fourth graders' composition skills: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(4), 922–938. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024622>
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543065003245>
- Cer, E. (2019). The instruction of writing strategies: The effect of the metacognitive strategy on the writing skills of pupils in secondary education. *SAGE Open*, 9(2), 215824401984268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681>
- Chien, S.-C. (2007). *The role of writing strategy use in relation to Chinese EFL students' achievement in English writing: A cognitive approach*. CamLing. http://www.ling.cam.ac.uk/camling/Manuscripts/CamLing2007_Chien.pdf
- Chien, S.-C. (2012). Students' use of writing strategies and their English writing achievements in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 32(1), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2012.655240>
- Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learner strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Farahian, M., & Avarzamani, F. (2018). Metacognitive awareness of skilled and less-skilled EFL writers. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0052-4>
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Farooq, M. S., Uzair-Ul-Hassan, M., & Wahid, S. (2012). Opinion of second language learners about writing difficulties in English language. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, 27(1), 183–194. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/951b/3442733b7e154daf2ac374e61338297f7dee.pdf>
- Ferretti, R. P., & Graham, S. (2019). Argumentative writing: Theory, assessment, and instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 32(6), 1345–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09950-x>
- Flores, E. R., & Lopez, M. (2019). Self-reported summarizing and paraphrasing difficulties in L2 writing contexts: Some pedagogical interventions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20219>
- Forbes, K. (2019). The role of individual differences in the development and transfer of writing strategies between foreign and first language classrooms. *Research Papers in Education*, 34(4), 445–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1452963>
- Geres-Smith, R., Mercer, S. H., Archambault, C., & Bartfai, J. M. (2019). A preliminary component analysis of self-regulated strategy development for persuasive writing in grades 5 to 7 in British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 34(1), 38–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573517739085>
- Gibriel, M. (2019). Investigating writing strategies, writing anxiety and their effects on writing achievement: A mixed method design. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 16(1), 429–436. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.1.33.429>
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Troia, G. A. (2000). Self-regulated strategy development revisited: Teaching writing strategies to struggling writers. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 20(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00011363-200020040-00003>
- Guo, X., & Huang, L.-S. (2018). Are L1 and L2 strategies transferable? An exploration of the L1 and L2 writing strategies of Chinese graduate students. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1435710>
- Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2016). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Policy implications of an evidence-based practice. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(1), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215624216>
- Hughes, M. D., Regan, K. S., & Evmenova, A. (2019). A computer-based graphic organizer with embedded self-regulated learning strategies to support student writing. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 55(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451219833026>
- Imelda, Cahyono, B. Y., & Astuti, U. P. (2019). Effect of process writing approach combined with video-based mobile learning on Indonesian EFL learners' writing skill across creativity levels.

- International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12320a>
- Javid, C. Z., Farooq, M. U., & Umer, M. (2013). An investigation of Saudi EFL learners' writing problems: A case study along gender-lines. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 16(1), 179–203. <http://kjlr.pk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/10.-An-Investigation-of-Saudi-EFL-learners-Writing-Problems.pdf>
- Karim, S. M. S., Maasum, T. N. R. T. M., & Latif, H. (2017). Writing challenges of Bangladeshi tertiary level EFL learners. *E-Bangi: Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 14(2), 296–306. <http://ejournal.ukm.my/ebangi/article/view/20435/>
- Kizilcec, R. F., Pérez-Sanagustín, M., & Maldonado, J. J. (2017). Self-regulated learning strategies predict learner behavior and goal attainment in Massive Open Online Courses. *Computers & Education*, 104, 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.10.001>
- Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1). http://www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2019_1_14.pdf
- Lam, R. (2015). Understanding EFL students' development of self-regulated learning in a process-oriented writing course. *TESOL Journal*, 6(3), 527–553. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.179>
- Mistar, J., Zuhairi, A., & Parlindungan, F. (2014). Strategies of learning English writing skill by Indonesian senior high school students. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(1), 290–303. <https://awej.org/images/AllIssues/Volume5/Volume5Number1March2014/22.pdf>
- Mizumoto, A. (2018). On questionnaire use in language learning strategies research. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 15(1), 184–192. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.1.12.184>
- Munoz-Luna, R. (2015). Main ingredients for success in L2 academic writing: Outlining, drafting and proofreading. *Plos One*, 10(6), e0128309. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0128309>
- Nasihah, M., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2017). Language learning strategies, motivation, and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(1), 250–263. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no1.18>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Reynolds, G. A., & Perin, D. (2009). A comparison of text structure and self-regulated writing strategies for composing from sources by middle school students. *Reading Psychology*, 30(3), 265–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710802411547>
- Roderick, R. (2019). Self-regulation and rhetorical problem solving: How graduate students adapt to an unfamiliar writing project. *Written Communication*, 36(3), 410–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319843511>
- Roehling, J. V., Hebert, M., Nelson, J. R., & Bohaty, J. J. (2017). Text structure strategies for improving expository reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(1), 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1590>
- Rosário, P., Högemann, J., Núñez, J. C., Vallejo, G., Cunha, J., Rodríguez, C., & Fuentes, S. (2019). The impact of three types of writing intervention on students' writing quality. *Plos One*, 14(7), e0218099. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0218099>
- Rostamian, M., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Jabbari, A. A. (2018). The effect of planning time on cognitive processes, monitoring behavior, and quality of L2 writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(4), 418–438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817699239>
- Teng, F., & Huang, J. (2019). Predictive effects of writing strategies for self-regulated learning on secondary school learners' EFL writing proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.462>
- Umamah, A., Hidayanti, I., & Kurniasih, K. (2019). Kesulitan mahasiswa dalam menulis teks eksposisi: Analisis berbasis gender. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 4(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v4i1.1004>
- Wenden, A., L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.515>
- Xiao, Y. (2007). Applying metacognition in EFL writing instruction in China. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 19–33. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253991425_Applying_metacognition_in_EFL_writing_instruction_in_China
- Yot-Domínguez, C., & Marcelo, C. (2017). University students' self-regulated learning using digital technologies. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0076-8>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(4), 845–862. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031004845>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(1), 73–101. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>
- Zuhairi, A., & Umamah, A. (2016). The Indonesian junior high school students' strategies in learning writing skill. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3), 385–393. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no3.27>

APPENDIX

Descriptive Statistics for the Social Environment Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
50	I call/text a classmate about the writing homework that I missed.	45	4.58	.69
52	I use library sources and the Internet to find the information I want.	45	4.29	.82
52	I look for a friend whom I can have an exchange of writing questions.	45	4.27	.78
54	I take my own notes in writing class.	45	4.20	.76
51	I use a variety of sources in making my writing paper.	45	4.09	.90
55	I enjoy group writing works because we help one another.	45	3.89	1.15

Descriptive Statistics for the Physical Environment Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
57	I can't study nor do my writing homework if the room is dark.	45	4.42	1.10
56	I isolate myself from unnecessary noisy places.	45	4.09	1.06
58	I don't want to hear a single sound when I am writing.	45	3.93	1.30
59	I switch off my TV or mobile phone for me to concentrate on my writing.	45	3.58	1.41
60	I avoid watching TV or using Internet if I have a pending writing homework.	45	3.58	1.32

Descriptive Statistics for the Performance Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
35	I listen attentively to people who comment on my writing.	45	4.44	.72
36	I ask feedback of my writing performance from someone who is more capable.	45	4.44	.87
34	I am open to feedbacks to improve my writing.	45	4.33	.85
37	I ask others what changes should be done with my writing.	45	4.33	.83
33	I am open to changes based on the feedbacks I received.	45	4.24	.86
44	I make a deal with myself that I get a certain amount of the writing done I can do something fun afterwards.	45	4.22	.95
46	If I am having a difficulty in writing, I inquire assistance from an expert.	45	4.18	.98
39	I ask others how my writing is before passing to my professors (lecturer).	45	4.16	.98
38	I welcome peer evaluations for every writing output.	45	4.13	.94
45	I tell myself I can do something I like later if I right now I do the writing I have do get done.	45	4.07	1.10
47	I promise myself I can do something I want later if I finish the assigned writing now.	45	4.00	1.00
43	I browse through my past writing outputs to see my progress.	45	3.40	1.05
48	I set a goal for how much I need to write and promise myself a reward if I reach that goal.	45	3.36	1.19
41	I monitor my improvement in doing writing task.	45	3.29	1.08
42	I evaluate my accomplishments at the end of each writing session.	45	3.27	1.14
49	I promise myself some kind of a reward if I get my writing done.	45	3.18	1.28
40	I take note of the improvements on what I write.	45	3.11	1.07

Descriptive Statistics for the Methods Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
24	I proofread my work.	45	4.31	.79
23	I revise my paper if I am not content with it.	45	4.04	.95
29	I ask tutors to evaluate my writing and give suggested revision.	45	4.29	.97
27	I create a draft before writing the final paper.	45	4.22	.90
26	I create outline (physically or mentally) before I write.	45	4.16	.90
25	I reread my work several times to find errors in my writing.	45	4.09	.87
30	I brainstorm (i.e. listing thoughts as they come to you) for ideas before I write.	45	3.87	1.01
31	I free-write (i.e. writing about the subjects without worrying about sentence structure) to get out my thoughts.	45	3.62	1.17
28	I ask my peers to edit my writing.	45	3.36	1.37
32	I use graphic organizers (e.g. tree diagrams) to organize my ideas.	45	2.93	1.01

Descriptive Statistics for the Time Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I attend my writing class regularly.	45	4.44	.66
2	I make sure I keep up with the weekly writing assignments for the writing course.	45	4.33	.83
3	I find it hard to stick to a writing schedule.	45	3.24	1.09
4	I make good use of my study time (e.g. 5:00-7:00 p.m.) for writing assignments.	45	3.24	.98
5	I make a schedule of the writing activities I have to do on workdays.	45	3.13	.94
6	I make a list of the things I have to write each day.	45	2.93	1.03
7	I spend time each day planning for writing.	45	2.73	.89
8	I write a set of goals (including writing one or two paragraphs) for myself (not for assignment) each day.	45	2.49	1.20

Descriptive Statistics for the Motive Dimension

No.	Questionnaire items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
13	I can write a proper introduction to an essay.	45	3.60	.94
12	I can complete a writing task without difficulty by the due date.	45	3.47	.92
20	I make a timetable of all the writing activities I have to complete.	45	3.31	1.18
11	I can write paragraphs with details that support the ideas in the topic sentences or main ideas.	45	3.22	.88
10	I can write a proper conclusion of an essay.	45	3.18	.89
21	I keep track of everything I have to write in a notebook or on a calendar.	45	3.16	1.15
16	I can get ideas across in a clear manner by staying focused without getting off the topic.	45	3.07	.89
15	I can edit essays throughout the writing process.	45	3.04	1.02
17	I can easily generate ideas to write about.	45	3.04	.80
22	I use a planner to keep track of what I am supposed to accomplish.	45	3.04	1.28
14	I can write on an assigned topic without difficulty.	45	3.00	.90
9	I can write a well-organized and sequenced paper with good introduction, body, and conclusion.	45	2.69	.97
19	I plan the things I have to write in a week.	45	2.76	1.11
18	I make a detailed schedule of my writing activities.	45	2.58	.94

Note: Data in the tables are ranked from the highest to the lowest score.