

EXPLORING ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES IN WRITING ENGLISH

Agus Sutrisno¹, Ani Fiani², Agus Triyogo³

Universitas PGRI Silampari^{1,2,3}

masaguz.216@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to describe the English education students' self-regulated learning strategies in writing English at PGRI Silampari University. A descriptive qualitative method was used for this study. The subject of this study was the second-semester English Education Study Program at PGRI Silampari University. The data were taken from the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners. The data were analyzed using Gay and Peter's qualitative data analysis. The results of this study showed that the second-semester students used metacognitive, cognitive, social, and motivational/affective strategies. However, there were differences in the intensity of writing English.

Keywords: Learning Strategies, Self-Regulated Learning, Students, Writing

INTRODUCTION

Writing skill is one of the four essential English skills for English learners including English Education students (Mildan, et al., 2021). Writing skill is a crucial skill for each English learner because it is useful for conveying their thoughts, emotions, messages, and experiences through written expression to other people (Wijayanti, Seli, & Triyogo, 2023; Alsariera & Yunus 2023; Tankovica, Kapes, & Benazic, 2023; Anh, 2019). At the university level, English Education students will meet academic writing, such as essays, research articles, theses, and so on. This is because they demand to be able to write in the academic realm by considering credible sources such as essays, theses, papers, journals, and paper conferences (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). In academic writing, they use a formal and systematic format because Altunkaya and Ayranci (2020) state that academic writing is a genre resorted to by individuals who can comment within the scope of a field and is based on various principles.

Furthermore, the writing skill is not easy to be mastered by English Education students. They have many challenges in writing such as lack of vocabulary, grammar problems, developing ideas, etc. This is supported by Muamaroh, et al. (2020) report that English learners still experience many difficulties in content, organization, comprehension, language use, and mechanical aspects. More specifically, students experience difficulties in assembling written content, organizing ideas, lack of mastered vocabulary, use of inappropriate words or phrases, and correct use of punctuation and spelling. The most significant factors hindering their English writing skills are a lack of understanding of grammar, lack of English vocabulary, lack of practice, and lack of self-confidence (Muamaroh, et al., 2020). In line with their study, the results of observation at the English Education Study Program of PGRI Silampari University on 8th of March 2024 via Google Form also show that most of the English Education Study Program students face several challenges in the writing process.

The writing challenges faced by English Education students include lack of vocabulary (26 students), using grammar (15 students), structure (3 students), developing ideas (3 students), hampered in building sentences (2 students), and writing text structure (2 students). Moreover, other writing challenges they experience are writing titles and style, self-confidence, making sentences that make sense, meaning, choosing ideas, incorrect word writing, bored easily, plagiarism, laziness, looking for ideas, and creating interesting text. To overcome these problems, according to Nadlifah (2020), the utilization of strategy in foreign language learning gives significant contributions to easing English learners' difficulties and assisting them to achieve better outcomes. They also need to regulate their learning because learning occurs not only in the classroom but everywhere (Tomak & Seferoğlu, 2021).

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is an activity where individuals who learn actively, compose, determine learning goals, plan and monitor, regulate and control cognition, behavioral motivation, and the environment to achieve predetermined goals (Pintrich, 2004). Self-regulated learning is essential for students especially English Education students because Pintrich and Zusho (2002) reveal that self-regulated learning is an important developmental task that must be mastered by individuals, as it is the key to adaptive growth and development (Laskey & Hetzel, 2010). Consequently, the development of self-regulated learning skills in each student is an urgent need and is a strategic step to facilitate the optimal development of learners as well as to prepare them to be a person capable of playing an active role in this century (Pintrich & Zusho, 2002).

Moreover, self-regulated learning is fundamental in the learning process of English writing. This is useful because Chansri, et al. (2024) report the relationship between the use of self-regulated learning strategies by undergraduate students in terms of their overall English language abilities and knowledge and the four main aspects of the abilities and knowledge. Two main aspects of them are grammatical knowledge and writing abilities. It indicates that self-regulated learning strategies are helpful so that students have good writing skills. They also argue that it shows the significant role of

self-regulated learning strategies in the success of students' English language learning. This is supported by Abdelhalim's (2022) study shows that there is a positive correlation between self-regulated learning strategy use and the student's writing proficiency level. Other researchers also report that students with high self-regulated learning have higher writing ability scores than students with low self-regulated learning (Khasanah, Kiswati, & Muslim, 2024). They also reveal that the high levels of self-regulated learning will help them to increase their writing skills.

However, in this century, Wang, et al. (2010) find that most studies focused on the SRL in primary, middle, and high school students, but little was known about the SRL in university students. Also, the annual research publication of self-regulated areas is still low in 2022 among three years ago as reported by Tao, Hanif, and Ebrahim (2023) there are 52 articles. It means that the other self-regulated area studies should be conducted by many researchers including English education researchers. They also report that countries actively participating in the self-regulated learning strategies study are the United States of America, China, Italy, Germany, Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, Spain, Netherlands, and Brazil. It indicates that other researchers in various countries must carry out self-regulated learning strategies research. Accordingly, the researcher will conduct a research entitled "Exploring English Education Students' Self-Regulated Learning Strategies in Writing English". The objective of the research is to describe the English education students' self-regulated learning strategies in writing English at PGRI Silampari University

RESEARCH METHOD

The procedure of this study has three steps.

- The research procedure starts with conducting research data collection systematically, and analyzing the research data (findings) systematically.
- Making discussions based on the research findings.
- Making a conclusion based on the findings and discussions in this research.

The researcher applied the qualitative descriptive research method to conduct this research. Hancock, et al. (2001) explain that the qualitative research method is concerned with describing participants' opinions, experiences, and feelings of individuals producing subjective data. Moreover, two experts, namely Schreiber and Asner-Self (2001:10) explain that descriptive studies describe some phenomena using numbers to create a picture of a group or individual. The study instrument used the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners made by Shen and Wang (2024). This questionnaire was valid and reliable.

The researcher used Riadil's data collection technique because Riadil (2020) said that the data could be collected by giving questionnaires to the participants in his qualitative research. In this study, there were several steps of data collection technique as follows:

- The data collection procedures of this study started by giving the questionnaire (Riadil, 2020). Moreover, the researcher can make an electronic questionnaire in

the form of a Google Form, and then distribute it to groups of WhatsApp research participants (Salsabila & Tirtanawati, 2021). Hence the researcher sent the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) in the form of a Google Form to the research participants' WhatsApp group.

- Asking the participants to fill in the questionnaire (Riadil, 2020). Accordingly, the researcher asked the research participants to answer the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS).
- The last step was the researcher compiled the questionnaire that had been answered by the research participants (Riadil, 2020).

This study used two types of data sources (Kothari, 2004). The primary data of this study were research participants' answers or responses in the questionnaire used. Then, the secondary data of this study were research articles, books, journals, e-books, proceedings, thesis publications, and other relevant sources.

FINDING

The number of English Education Study Program students at PGRI Silampari was 23 students. However, only 15 students answered the closed-ended questions in the questionnaire sent by the researcher through the WhatsApp research participants group. The results of the research were classified into four self-regulated learning strategies in writing according to Pintrich's (2004) theory, consisting of cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, social strategies, and motivational/affective strategies. The results of the research collected by the researcher were as follows:

1. Metacognitive Strategies

1. Self-initiation

Table 3.1. Self-Initiation Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I sometimes try to find out how to write good English essays.	0%	0%	33,3%	60%	6,7%
2.	I write English essays at home to improve writing.	0%	26,7%	66,7%	6,6%	0%
3.	I study good English essays in order to write well.	0%	20%	53,3%	20%	0%

4.	I ask others about how they think about my writing and why.	0%	6,65%	26,7%	60%	6,65%
Total		0%	53,35%	180%	146,6%	13,35%

Table 3.1. Self-Initiation Strategy showed that most of the students used the four strategies of self-initiation. It can be seen the sometimes do percentages were higher than other percentages of each scale. In addition, there was not a student of them never do all of the self-initiation strategies in writing. As a result, it can be concluded that the students used all of the self-initiation strategies in writing English.

2. Planning

Table 4.2. Planning Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	When planning, I think about what ideas to put down.	0%	6,7%	13,3%	40%	40%
2.	When planning, I think about what words, phrases, and sentences to use.	0%	0%	6,7%	60%	33,3%
3.	When planning, I think about how to organize ideas.	0%	0%	26,7%	53,3%	20%
Total		0%	6,7%	46,7%	153,3%	93,3%

Table 4.2. Planning Strategy showed that most of the students used the planning strategies. It was caused by each percentage of “often do” and “always do” was higher than others. Moreover, the most frequently used by the students were strategy number 3,

strategy number 2, and strategy number 1. It revealed that the students always make a plan before they write in English.

3. Monitoring and Evaluation

Table 4.3. Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I read their essay aloud to look for mistakes.	6,6%	0%	20%	46,7%	26,7%
2.	When writing, I pay attention to spelling and grammar.	0%	0%	26,7%	46,7%	26,7%
3.	After writing, I check whether their essay meets teacher's requirements	0%	6,7%	33,3%	20%	40%
Total		6,6%	6,7%	80%	113,4%	93,4%

Table 4.3. Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy showed that most of the students used monitoring and evaluation strategies. It was caused by the percentages of each “often do” and “always do” were high generally. These percentages indicated that they practice the revising strategies consistently. In addition, very few of them did not use the monitoring and evaluation strategies.

2. Cognitive Strategies

a. Revising

Table 4.4. Revising Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I change content when checking their essay.	0%	20%	60%	13,3%	6,7%
2.	I change spelling or	0%	6,7%	60%	13,3%	20%

	punctuation when checking my essay						
3.	I change words or phrases when checking my essay.	0%	0%	66,7%	13,3%	20%	
4.	I change grammar when checking their essay.	0%	6,7%	53,3%	33,3%	6,7%	
Total		0%	33,4%	240%	73,3%	53,4%	

Table 4.4. Revising Strategy showed that most of the students used the revising strategies. However, they have not consistently used revision strategies. This can be seen from the percentages of revision strategies on the sometimes scale was higher than the percentages on the often and always scale. Besides, there was not a student of them who did not use all of the revising strategies.

b. Text-generating

Table 4.5. Text-generating Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	During writing, I read other people's writings for language to use in my essay.	6,7%	6,7%	40%	33,3%	13,3%
2.	During writing, I read other people's writings for ideas to write down in my essay.	6,7%	6,7%	60%	13,3%	13,3%
3.	During writing, I	0%	6,7%	73,3%	20%	0%

	recall ideas read elsewhere for use in my essay.					
4.	I recall language from sources for use in their essay.	0%	13,3%	60%	26,7%	0%
	Total	13,4%	33,4%	233,3%	93,3%	26,6%

Table 4.5. Text-generating Strategy showed that most of the students sometimes used text-generating strategies. However, their consistency was low. This can be seen from the percentages on the scale which are sometimes higher than the percentages on the other scales.

Apart from that, it turns out that there were very few students who used text-generating strategies. This can be seen from the percentages on the always doing scale which were very lower than the percentages on the sometimes doing scale and the often doing scale. On the other hand, it was clear from the table above that there was a small number of students who have never carried out or used text-generating strategies at all.

c. Resourcing

Table 4.6. Resourcing Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I make use of dictionary to deal with lexical difficulties during writing.	0%	13,3%	40%	26,7%	20%
2.	I make use of grammar books, textbooks or writing guides when having difficulty in writing.	0%	13,3%	60%	13,3%	13,3%
3.	I make use of internet resources	0%	6,6%	26,7%	40%	26,7%

when having difficulty in generating ideas.					
Total	0%	33,2	126,7%	80%	60%

Table 4.6. Resourcing Strategy showed that overall students sometimes used resourcing strategies. This can be seen from the percentages of resourcing strategies on the scale, sometimes two of which were higher than the percentage of strategy number 3.

Apart from that, these students have not been seen consistently using resourcing strategies. This can be seen from the percentages on the scale which were always lower overall. However, there was not a single student who did not use resourcing strategies in writing English.

3. Social Strategies

a. Social Assistance or Collaboration

Table 4.7. Social Assistance or Collaboration Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I ask teacher for help when having difficulty in writing.	0%	6,7%	53,3%	26,7%	13,3%
2.	I ask classmates for help when having difficulty in writing	0%	0%	46,7%	33,3%	20%
3.	I go to writing tutors/writing centers/writing workshops for help when having difficulty in writing.	26,7%	20%	33,3%	20%	0%
4.	I brainstorm with my peers	0%	13,3%	46,7%	26,7%	13,3%

	to help me write.					
5.	I discuss with my peers to have more ideas to write with.	0%	6,7	53,3%	26,7%	13,3%
6.	I work with my peers to complete a writing task.	0%	26,7%	46,7%	46,7%	6,6%
Total		26,7%	73,4%	280%	180,1%	66,5%

Table 4.7. Social Assistance or Collaboration Strategy showed that overall, students have not consistently used social assistance or collaboration strategies. This can be seen from the percentage on the sometimes doing scale which is overall higher than the percentages on the often doing scale and the percentages on the always doing scale.

However, students seem to be trying to consistently use social assistance or collaboration strategies. This can be seen from the percentages on the often do and always do scales which overall showed that they have applied these strategies in writing English. This can also be seen from the percentages on the seldom do and never do scale which were overall lower than each percentage on the always do.

b. Acting on Feedback

Table 4.8. Acting on Feedback Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I try to improve my English writing based on teacher feedback.	0%	0%	40%	26,7%	33,3%
2.	I try to remember or write down other people's suggestions for future use.	0%	6,7%	33,3%	46,7%	13,3%
3.	I think carefully about	0%	0%	60%	26,7%	13,%

other people's suggestions for my compositions.						
Total	0%	6,7%	133,3%	100,1%	59,9%	

Table 4.8. Acting on Feedback Strategy showed that there was not a single student who did not respond to feedback from teachers and suggestions from other people. This can be seen from the value of 0% on the never doing scale.

Apart from that, most students do not seem to have used acting on feedback strategies with greater effort. It was caused by the two percentages on the sometimes scale still seeming quite high compared to the two percentages on the often do scale, the entire percentage on the always do, and the percentages on the never do.

4. Motivational/affective Strategies

a. Interest Enhancement

Table 4.9. Interest Enhancement Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I choose interesting topics to practice writing.	0%	0%	33,3%	40%	26,7%
2.	I connect the writing task with my real life to intrigue me.	0%	0%	66,7%	20%	13,3%
3.	I try to connect the writing task with my personal interest.	0%	13,3%	26,7%	33,3%	26,7%
Total	0%	13,3%	126,7%	93,3%	66,7%	

Table 4.9. Interest Enhancement Strategy showed that students continued to try to increase the use of interest enhancement strategies in writing English. It was shown by the percentages on the sometimes do scale, the often do scale, and the always do scale which varies in percentage. The data in the table also showed that the percentage of the scale rarely performs is lower than the percentages in all scales in the table above.

b. Emotional Control**Table 4.10. Emotional Control Strategy**

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I tell myself not to worry when taking a writing test or answering questions in writing courses.	0%	6,7%	60%	20%	13,3%
2.	I tell myself to keep on writing when I want to give up.	0%	0%	26,7%	40%	33,3%
3.	I find ways to regulate my mood when I meet difficulty in writing.	0%	6,6%	26,7%	46,7%	20%
Total		0%	13,3%	113,4%	106,7%	66,6%

Table 4.10. Emotional Control Strategy showed that they are significant emotional control strategies. This can be seen from the two percentages on the scale of often doing strategy number 2 and strategy number 3 being higher than the two percentages on the scale of sometimes doing the same two strategies. However, it was clear that there were still a small number of students who have not controlled their emotions. This can be seen from the percentage of strategy number 3 on the seldom do scale.

c. Motivational Self-talk**Table 4.11. Motivational Self-talk Strategy**

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I tell myself to practice writing to get good grades.	0%	0%	33,3%	20%	46,7%
2.	I tell myself	0%	0%	46,7%	26,7%	26,7%

	that I need to keep studying to improve my writing competence.					
3.	I persuade myself to work hard in writing courses to improve my writing skills and knowledge.	0%	6,7%	53,3%	20%	20%
4.	I persuade myself to keep on learning in writing courses to find out how much I can learn.	0%	0%	66,7%	13,3%	20%
	Total	0%	6,7%	200%	80%	113,4%

Table 4.11. Motivational Self-talk Strategy showed that overall students have not used all motivational self-talk strategies significantly. This can be seen from all percentages on the sometimes doing scale being higher than all percentages on the often do scale and the always do scale in the table above.

d. Self-consequence

Table 4.12. Self-consequence Strategy

No	Strategy	Never do	Seldom do	Sometimes do	Often do	Always do
1.	I reward myself when my writing performance is satisfactory.	0%	0%	33,3%	46,7%	20%
2.	I gain motivation to write when my writing performance is	0%	6,6%	26,7%	20%	46,7%

	praised.					
3.	I analyze the causes when I do not do well in a writing task.	0%	13,3%	33,3%	26,7%	26,7%
4.	I punish myself when my writing performance is not satisfactory.	20%	13,3%	33,3%	6,7%	26,7%
	Total	20%	33,2%	126,6%	100,1%	120,1%

Table 4.12. Self-consequence Strategy showed that overall students had not carried out or used all self-consequence strategies consistently. It was caused by the percentage of each strategy was still different, especially the percentage of all self-consequence strategies on the scale that were always carried out.

DISCUSSION

Discussions of each of the English education students' self-regulated learning strategies in writing English were as follows:

Based on the metacognitive strategies found, overall second-semester English language education students have several metacognitive strategies in writing. Their strategies are strategies for self-learning initiative which is shown by self-initiation. In self-initiation, the students studied good English essays to write well. They also asked others about how they think about their writing and why. In planning, the students plan or determine ideas, determine words, phrases or sentences before they write a type of writing. In monitoring and evaluation, the students read their writing and check the English grammar, and spelling errors so that their writing complies with the essay requirements of the teacher, in this case, the lecturer. This proves that the students already have metacognitive strategies that support learning to write English. Therefore, they can still be said to have learning strategies and a willingness to learn. The reason is that according to Pintrich (2004), there were two essential elements in the context of self-regulated learning, namely skills as students' learning strategies and the will to encourage students to use their learning strategies.

Based on the cognitive strategies found overall, second-semester English language education students used cognitive strategies in learning to write English. The students improved their writing ability and writing quality. It can be seen on the students' struggles so that they got relevant resources to revise the writing challenges such as grammar, punctuation, spelling, content, words, or phrases. These resources can help them in the text-generating because the students' text-generating strategies showed that

they remember ideas and language use after they read other people's writing. This showed that they actively seek out other people's ideas to add to their own writing.

Based on the explanation above, the description of their cognitive strategies is evidence that they have and use cognitive strategies to remember and understand, for example memorizing/remembering and evaluating their understanding of the writing they have written (Pintrich, 2000). These findings also indicated that cognition plays a key role in defining learner self-regulation (Pintrich, 2004). It refers to students' capacity to process information and enhance their understanding while working on various writing tasks.

In light of the metacognitive and cognitive strategies discussed above, the researcher found that second-semester English Education students involved were self-regulated writers. They tend to use multiple SRL writing strategies (Glaser & Brunstein, 2007; Bai, et al., 2021). Before writing, they used planning strategies to analyze task requirements, set goals, plan, and generate ideas. While writing, they retrieve relevant information from long-term memory and translate ideas into textual output (i.e. text-generating strategies). At this stage, they also constantly monitor what has been planned or written for refinement (i.e. self-monitoring). After writing, revising strategies are used to detect and correct writing problems (Bai, et al., 2021).

Based on the motivational/affective strategies found, second-semester students of the English Education study program have several motivational/affective strategies. In interest enhancement, they always choose interesting topics for writing practice and connect their personal interests with their writing assignments.

In addition, the findings of this research prove that English students have emotional control strategies in writing English. Some of them include telling himself not to worry when completing a written exam in a writing course. In addition, researchers found that these students encouraged themselves when they wanted to give up on writing and had ways to regulate their mood when there were difficulties or obstacles in writing. Therefore, they also have motivational self-talk strategies to support their writing process.

In motivating themselves, researchers found that students always told themselves to continue practicing writing so that they could get good grades. Therefore, they always give themselves prizes when their writing performance is satisfactory. This can be seen from the findings of this research which show that they are motivated to write after being praised.

Furthermore, students also motivate themselves to continue learning to write to improve their writing competence/skills. If their writing performance is satisfactory, they will give themselves a prize. On the other hand, when students are unable to show satisfactory performance, they punish themselves. This punishment makes it clear that they have self-consequences in writing English. Consequently, these findings showed that each second-semester English Education students managed their self with self-regulation, gave self-reward for themselves, and gave self-punishment in a self-regulated learning context (Pintrich, 2004).

In light of the discussions about social strategies and motivational/affective strategies above, the self-regulated learning strategies in writing English of second-semester English Education students showed that they were self-regulated writers because they ask other people, such as lecturers, classmates, teachers, etc. Besides, the students got feedback from other people. This was consistent with Zimmerman and Risemberg's (1997) claim that self-regulated writers make good use of social resources for assistance (Bai et al., 2021). Second-semester English Education students were also self-regulated writers because they received feedback from teachers or lecturers. Self-regulated writers are open to criticism of the effectiveness of their writing abilities and the quality of the content they produce as explained by Han and Hyland (2015).

CONCLUSION

The researcher concluded that the second-semester English Education students used all of these strategies in writing English although the percentages of the specific strategies were still low. Moreover, students' self-regulated learning strategies in writing English consist of the metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, social strategies, and motivational/affective strategies. The metacognitive strategies included self-initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluation. The cognitive strategies included revising, text-generating, and resourcing. The social strategies included social assistance or collaboration and acting on feedback. The motivational/affective strategies included interest enhancement, emotional control, motivational self-talk, and self-consequence.

REFERENCES

- Abdelhalim, S. M. (2022). An Investigation into English Majors' Self-Regulated Writing Strategies In an Online Learning Context. *Language Teaching Research*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221100296>
- Altunkaya, H. & Ayranci, B. (2020). The Use Edmodo in Academic Writing Education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 89-103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712659>
- Anh, N. D. T. (2019). EFL Students' Writing Skills: Challenges and Remedies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 9(6), 74–84.
- Bai, B., Wang, J. & Nie, Y. (2021). Self-Efficacy, Task Values, and Growth Mindset: What Has the Most Predictive Power for Primary School Students' Self-Regulated Learning in English Writing and Writing Competence in an Asian Confucian Cultural Context?. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 51(1), 65-84, DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2020.1778639
- Chansri, C., Kedcham, A., & Polrak, M. (2024). The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and English Language Abilities and Knowledge of Undergraduate Students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 17(1), 286-307.

- Glaser, C., & Brunstein, J. C. (2007). Improving Fourth-Grade Students' Composition Skills: Effects of Strategy Instruction and Self-Regulation Procedures. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 297–310. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.297>
- Han, Y. & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring Learner Engagement with Written corrective Feedback in a Chinese Tertiary EFL Classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 31–44. DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002
- Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., & Windridge, K. (2001). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Trent Focus Group: London.
- Khasanah, S., Kiswati., & Muslim, A. H. (2024). The Effect of Self-regulated Learning Toward Student's Writing Ability. *Eductechmium Journal of Educational Technology*, 2(2), 1-9.
- Kothari, C, R. (2004). *Study Methodology, Methods and Techniques*(2nd revised ed),. New Age International (P), Ltd, Publishers: New Delhi. Retrieved from: <https://libgen.is/book/index.php?md5=BE41EA57BA374FE4B3E09FAEEDD929F3>
- Laskey, M. & Hetzel, C. (2010). Self-regulated Learning, Metacognition, and Soft Skills: The 21st Century Learner. Online Submission: 1-17. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED511589.pdf>
- Mildan, A.F., Nurhayati. & Istikomah. (2021). Vocabulary and Grammar Mastery on Students' Reading Skill. *SCOPE: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 30-35. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/scopev6i1.10237>
- Muamaroh, M., Mukti, V. C. & Haryanti, D. (2020). The Process and Problems of EFL Learners in English Writing. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 7(2), 405-418. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.215>
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing Academic English* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman: New York.
- Pintrich, P. & Zusho, A. (2002). *The Development of Academic Self-Regulation: The Role of Cognitive and Motivational Factors*. Erlbaum: Hilldale, NJ.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The Role of Goal Orientation in Self-Regulated Learning. In *Handbook of Self-regulation* (pp. 451–502): Elsevier.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning in College Students. *Educational Psychology Review*. 16, 385–407. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>
- Riadil, I. G. (2020). Efl Students in Speaking Skill: Identifying English Education Students' Perceptions of Psychological Problems in Speaking. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 8-20.
- Salsabila, D. S. & Tirtanawati, M. R. (2021). English Students' Perception on the Use of WhatsApp Group in Speaking Class. *JELTIS: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 1(1), 1-19. Available at: <http://journal.iain-manado.ac.id/index.php/jeltis/index>

- Schreiber, J. & Asner-Self, K. (2001). *Educational Research*. John Willey & Sons, Inc: New York.
- Shen, B. & Wang, L. (2024). Development and validation of Questionnaire for Self-regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners. *IRAL* 2024; aop, 1-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0192>
- Tankovica, A.C., Kapes, J., & Benazic, D. (2023). *Measuring the Importance of Communication Skills in Tourism. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 36(1), 460–479. DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2022.2077790
- Tao, X., Hanif, H., & Ebrahim, N. A. (2023). Emerging Trends of Self-regulated Learning: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Analysis. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 252-269. DOI: 10.5430/wjel.v13n6p252
- Tomak, B. & Gölge Seferoğlu, G. (2021). Self-regulated Learning Strategies of Learners of English in a Turkish State University to Improve their Language Proficiency. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 12(3), 22-27. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.12n.3.p.22>
- Wang, J. Q., Zhu, Z., D., Zhen, S. J. M. L., & Zhang, W. A. (2010). A Modulating Model for the Impacting Factors in Self-regulated Learning of College Students. *Acta Psychological Sinica*, 42(2), 262-270.
- Wijayanti, E., Seli, S., & Triyogo, A. (2023). The Effectiveness of Using the Think-Talk-Write (Ttw) Strategy to Teach Writing Skills to the Tenth-Grade Students of SMAN Raksa Budi. *LIED (Linguistics, Literature, and English Education)*, 3(1), 1-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55526/lie.v3i1.485>
- Zimmerman, B. J. & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a Self-Regulated Writer: A Social Cognitive Perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22, 73–101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>