



Indonesian EFL secondary school students' self-regulated writing strategies

Shalfa Salsabila, Astri Hapsari*

Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia

Although EFL writing is considered a challenging skill for secondary school students to learn, there are still a few studies discussing how Indonesian EFL students use self-regulated writing strategies in their writing lessons. This survey study aims to discuss self-regulated writing strategies used by Indonesian secondary school students and identify whether gender differences exist in students' use of self-regulated writing strategies. Sixty-five grade 12 students from a high school in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, agreed to participate in the study. The findings reveal that the profile of the participants' writing self-regulated learning strategies, from the most frequently employed to the least frequently employed are: metacognitive judgment ($M = 5.59$, $SD = 1.26$), goal-oriented monitoring ($M=5.23$, $SD=1.27$), memorization ($M=5.14$, $SD=1.27$), emotional control ($M=5.13$, $SD=1.29$), writing planning ($M=5.11$, $SD=1.32$), and goal-oriented evaluation ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.22$). It also revealed that female students tended to employ more self-regulated writing strategies than their male counterparts. This study suggests that the teacher should optimize students' use of writing self-regulated learning strategies by raising students awareness of the strategies in the classroom instruction. For future study, a correlation study between writing self-regulated learning strategies and students' writing performance will enrich the discussion on how writing strategies may give benefits to students' writing performance.

Keywords: EFL Indonesian secondary school students, self-regulated writing strategies, survey study

INTRODUCTION

Writing plays a crucial role in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in secondary schools. Despite being one of the critical skills that secondary school students should have, writing in secondary education is considered a skill that is challenging and difficult for students to learn (Sogutlu & Ostrosi, 2022; Nurlatifah & Yusuf, 2022; Nguyen & Suwannabubpha, 2021; Alisha et al., 2019; Sinta & Astutik, 2019). The challenge arises because the students are English learners, where English is neither their first nor second language. One problem occurs due to inaccuracies in generating words, sentences, paragraphs, and ideas. Sinta & Astutik (2019) revealed that the participating students made errors in word use, syntax, and grammatical rules. Another study in the EFL context, conducted by Sogutlu & Ostrosi (2022), revealed that high school students in Albania find writing difficult due to their physiological condition (lack of interest and motivation), institutional factors (inadequate writing practice), and cognitive abilities (unfamiliarity with the writing process and a lack of language knowledge). As a result, students become burdened and find it difficult when they

OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 2503 3492 (online)

*Correspondence:

Astri Hapsari

astri.hapsari@uii.ac.id

Received: 15th September 2025

Accepted: 11th March 2026

Published: 30th April 2026

Citation:

Salsabila, S., Hapsari, A. (2026).

Indonesian EFL secondary school

students' self-regulated writing strategies.

JEES (Journal of English Educators

Society), 11(1).

<https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v11i1.1896>

learn to write. To overcome these challenges, students should be able to implement effective learning strategies that help them improve their English writing skills. Therefore, teachers should introduce EFL writing learners to various writing strategies (Teng et al., 2022).

Nowadays, self-regulation strategies are considered one of the key tools for achieving effective writing performance (Teng & Huang, 2019; Sun & Wang, 2020; Teng, 2020; Umamah & Cahyono, 2020; Redjeki & Hapsari et al., 2022; Teng et al., 2022; Sari et al., 2023). Some studies in China have found that self-regulated writing strategies primarily influence the writing performance of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) secondary school students. The results of these studies suggest that self-regulated strategies were significantly effective in increasing students' writing performance and proficiency (Teng & Huang, 2019; Teng, 2020; Sun & Wang, 2020). However, several studies have found that the effectiveness of self-regulated writing strategies can vary due to other influencing factors. A survey by Teng et al. (2022) explored university students' differences in the use of self-regulated writing strategies and found that the difference (grade and gender) significantly affects the use of self-regulated writing strategies on their writing performance. Another study by Teng and Huang (2019) also found that individual differences among students can affect their frequency of using self-regulated strategies.

In the Indonesian context, several studies have discussed self-regulated learning strategies. Umamah and Cahyono (2020) investigated the use of self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies. They identified the SRW strategies applied by learners, finding that students predominantly applied the method and performance dimensions of self-regulated writing. Another study by Redjeki and Hapsari (2022) in the context of online learning found that learners mostly employ self-regulated strategies in environmental structuring; however, students tend to have low scores in time management and task strategies. Meanwhile, Sari et al. (2023) found that self-regulated writing strategies help students overcome problems related to the complexity of writing assignments. This research emphasizes that differences in student achievement arise from how effectively students utilize these strategies. Therefore, knowing the application of self-regulation strategies in writing by students can also determine whether the writing strategy is effective or not. Although several researchers have researched self-regulated writing strategies in the Indonesian context (Redjeki & Hapsari, 2022; Sari et al., 2023; Umamah & Cahyono, 2020), research related to self-regulation in Indonesia does not explicitly address self-regulated strategies in the context of EFL writing and secondary education, therefore, to fill the gap in research on writing self-regulated writing strategies, especially at the secondary school level, it is necessary to conduct further research in this area.

Based on the research background and previous studies, the researcher formulated two research questions to guide the investigation.

1. What is the profile of secondary school students' self-regulated writing strategies?
2. Do gender differences exist in secondary school students' self-regulated writing strategies?

METHODS

This survey study aimed to identify students' self-regulated writing strategies. Survey designs aim to analyze a population's trends, attitudes, and opinions by studying a sample of that population (Creswell, 2014).

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of Grade 12 students at a private high school in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, comprising two science major classes and two social science major classes, totaling approximately 118 students. However, the authors acknowledge that the use of a limited and accessible sample may restrict the generalizability of the findings, as it may not fully represent the broader student population. Conroy (2018) states that survey research requires a sufficiently large and representative sample drawn from the population.

This study employed convenience sampling to determine the sample. According to Golzar and Tajik (2022), convenience sampling involves selecting participants based on their availability and accessibility. This approach was adopted due to limited access to participants during the data collection period. The researcher had access to two Grade 12 social science classes, which were therefore selected as the sample.

The participants were students who had submitted their writing assignments and were available at the time of data collection. The researcher obtained permission from the school prior to conducting the study. Ethical approval was granted on November 10, 2023, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Students were informed that their participation was voluntary and that their decision to participate or withdraw would not affect their academic standing. All data were treated confidentially.

A total of 65 out of 118 students agreed to participate in the study. The informed consent form was included at the beginning of the main instrument in the Google Form; only students who provided consent proceeded to complete the questionnaire.

Data Collection

Data were collected using the Self-Regulated Writing Strategies Questionnaire (SRWSQ), developed by Teng, Wang, and Zhang (2022), as the primary instrument for this study. The instrument is known as the Self-Regulated Writing Strategy Questionnaire (SRWSQ). The questionnaire then consists of six factors: writing planning (WP), goal-oriented monitoring (GOM), goal-oriented evaluation (GOE), emotional control (EC), memorization strategies (MS), and metacognitive judgment (MJ). The values of Cronbach's alpha for the instrument's reliability are WP (0.854), GOM (0.866), GOE (0.921), EC (0.915), MS (0.817), and MJ (0.863), respectively. Overall, these findings indicate the factorial structure of the SRWSQ and indicate good reliability and validity of the instrument. Each item was measured by a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Before being distributed to participants, the first author translated the questionnaire into Indonesian.

The translated version was further reviewed by two experts in ELT and piloted before the instruments were distributed to the participants. The data were collected online

via Google Forms from November 17, 2023, to November 25, 2023. The completion of the questionnaire was conducted collectively during class hours. Absent students were required to fill it out within the specified timeframe. Prior to completing the questionnaire, the students were provided with an explanation regarding the purpose and procedure for filling out the form. The data collection process proceeded smoothly and in a conducive environment; the students were able to understand the context and content of the distributed questionnaire

Data Analysis

The authors analyzed the data by using descriptive statistics to profile students' use of self-regulated writing strategies. Meanwhile, to answer the second question regarding gender differences, t-test analysis was used. Data were analyzed by using Microsoft Excell and SPSS 26 version. An independent samples t-test was conducted with a significance level of 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The primary objective of this study is to discuss the use of self-regulated learning strategies by Indonesian secondary students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. The profiles of the participants' self-regulated writing strategies, from highest to lowest, are presented in [Table 1](#).

TABLE 1 | The Participant's Self-Regulated Writing Strategies Profile

Domains of Self-Regulatory Writing Strategies	Mean	SD
Metacognitive Judgement (MJ)	5.59	1.26
Goal-oriented Monitoring (GOM)	5.23	1.27
Memorization Strategies (MS)	5.14	1.27
Emotional Control (EC)	5.13	1.29
Writing Planning (WP)	5.11	1.32

Metacognitive judgment has the highest mean score (M = 5.59, SD = 1.26) among the other domains. These results differ from those of [Teng et al. \(2022\)](#), which found that students' metacognitive judgments yielded the lowest scores. Despite being the domain with the lowest score in their research, [Teng et al. \(2022\)](#) confirmed that metacognitive judgment has a positive influence on students' self-confidence and cognitive performance.

Metacognitive judgment strategies relate to students' beliefs about their cognition, behavior, and goals ([Teng et al., 2022](#)). Metacognitive judgment strategies enable students to utilize their understanding to continue the task, adjust the strategies used as necessary ([Riwayatningsih et al., 2022](#)), reflect on their mistakes ([Zimmerman, 2002](#)), and systematically compare their performance with the set goals ([Zimmerman, 1989](#)). [Table 2](#) describes the participants' metacognitive judgement strategies profile.

In this research context, participants were selected who had high motivation while doing the writing task, had their learning goals, or at least be aware of them, whether they were set by the teacher or self-determined. Participants completed their writing assignments in groups or pairs. Therefore, as

described in the results, the aspects of metacognitive judgement strategies were the highest because the participants had a strong belief in learning. However, metacognitively, they still need to strengthen their belief in completing the writing exercise by themselves. They need to enhance their self-efficacy in writing individually, as peer learning does not predict students' writing proficiency ([Teng & Huang, 2019](#)).

TABLE 2 | Metacognitive Judgement Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
30. I believe that studying writing strategies will lead to better writing performance.	5.71	1.23
29. I believe that understanding the meaning of individual words in texts is important for writing.	5.60	1.36
28. I believe that understanding my strengths and weaknesses in English writing can lead to better writing performance.	5.55	1.26
27. I believe that it is important to complete the writing exercises by myself.	5.48	1.20

Students with high metacognitive judgement strategies tend to make judgments about the quality of their performance while writing in English. [Riwayatningsih et al. \(2022\)](#) found that metacognitive judgment strategies indicate students' efforts in the writing process, specifically in terms of vocabulary use, grammar, sentence structure, and organization.

The second domain with the highest mean score is goal-oriented monitoring strategies. In the Goal-oriented Monitoring (GOM) domain, there are six items. In writing activity, these strategies may include (1) setting clear objectives which is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound, (2) using data tracking and reference manager, such as Mendeley, and regularly analyzing progress and setting adjustment if necessary [Table 3](#) describes the goal-oriented monitoring strategies in order from highest to lowest.

TABLE 3 | Goal-oriented Monitoring Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
9. I monitor my learning process to find out solutions for my writing goals.	5.35	1.28
11. I check what I have learned from the English courses and what is helpful for writing.	5.34	1.29
10. I monitor my writing progress to achieve my writing goals.	5.25	1.12
7. I set up goals to check my writing activities or exercises	5.18	1.22
12. I find myself pausing regularly to think about the best expression for my writing.	5.12	1.40
8. I adjust the writing strategies if they are not effective for my writing goals.	5.12	1.32

As [Teng et al. \(2022\)](#) argue, goal-oriented monitoring strategies focus more on how students can monitor their writing progress after deciding on their writing goals and strategies. These strategies include: course learning monitoring strategies when students can recall material from English learning that can help them in writing, lexical level processing strategies when the students can think and choose the best expression for the writing product, monitoring learning progress, when students monitor and check their writing and learning progress so they can find a solution to achieve their writing goal, and adjusting strategies when students can set up their goals and adjust their writing strategies to achieve those goals.

[Zimmerman & Risemberg \(1997\)](#) argue that self-monitoring relates to how writers can track their performance and maintain their progress. Self-monitoring is one of the primary keys to effective self-regulation strategies in writing, enabling the creation of personal feedback. Students must monitor their writing process to improve their writing performance. Goal-oriented monitoring strategies align with students' habit of monitoring the changes they make in certain aspects of their writing, enabling them to analyze and react to writing results at a metacognitive level.

These strategies emphasize secondary students' self-evaluation and self-reflection during the writing process, which is crucial for their metacognitive awareness ([Teng et al., 2022](#)). Self-evaluation during writing activities involves language use and content, as well as language knowledge and skills, and previous learning, and whether they have achieved their previous goals. [Teng & Huang \(2019\)](#) emphasized that goal-oriented monitoring is essential for enhancing students' writing performance. These strategies help students improve almost all aspects of their writing, including writing ability, time management, motivation, and linguistic production. [Sari et al. \(2023\)](#) also found that using goal-setting monitoring strategies can help students improve their writing achievement.

The third-highest mean score is in the domain of memorization strategies. [Teng et al. \(2022\)](#) include these strategies to measure students' working memory capacity in retaining sentences, their ability to memorize the learning material, and their knowledge of vocabulary. These memorization strategies refer to how students can learn and organize ideas and information they have learned before. [Table 4](#) describes the participants' memorization strategies profile.

Memorization strategies refer to the methods students use to memorize and organize information. Participants in this study, at the stage of modelling sentences, were taught the text structure and language features of the assigned text type they were to write. In the classroom learning process, the first author also presented the new language features with visual text. This practice was found to align with the memorization strategies that students employ when completing their writing tasks.

The fourth domain with the highest mean score is emotional control strategies. Emotional control strategies involve students' strategies to manage their emotions and negative feelings while writing. Emotion control is important for learners while writing because it can help them avoid

distractions while they write. [Sun & Wang \(2020\)](#) added that learner writing success is also dependent on their psychological state, which includes emotions. [Table 5](#) describes the participants' profiles in terms of emotional control strategies.

TABLE 4 | Memorization Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
24. I read the course material over and over again to help me remember it.	5.49	1.25
23. I memorize key sentences for my writing.	5.15	1.18
26. I memorize words by combining them with pictures.	5.00	1.25
25. I read aloud words and expressions taught in English courses to help me remember them.	4.91	1.40

TABLE 5 | Emotional Control Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
21. I regulate my mood when I do not know how to write.	5.28	1.17
20. I tell myself not to worry when taking a writing test.	5.23	1.32
22. I continue doing my English writing when I encounter difficulties or challenges.	5.02	1.32
19. I calm down and finish the writing exercise, even though I do not want to.	5.00	1.35

The writer's ability to regulate emotions and the environment is essential and can be highly beneficial in maintaining effective writing performance. Therefore, the implementation of emotional control strategies by students will also help them achieve good writing performance.

Emotional Control, as indicated by previous research ([Teng et al., 2022](#)), yields similar results to the current study, suggesting that students can effectively manage their emotions and negative feelings during the writing process. The study's results found that, in terms of emotional control, students can regulate their mood and manage their feelings when encountering difficulties and anxiety while writing.

However, this finding is not the same as ([Sari et al., 2023](#)), which indicates that students are unable to regulate and control the anxiety they face when writing. Students' inability to control their emotions and anxiety affects their writing performance ([Sari et al., 2023](#)). Low-emotional-control strategies suggest that students need to be encouraged to manage their affective factors. Based on ([Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997](#)), emotional control is related to one of the concepts in triadic influences, namely environmental self-regulation, where it is explained that in environmental self-regulation writer can adaptively use strategies related to context, such as writers being able to avoid distractions and creating a comfortable environment when writing.

Writing planning strategies were indicated by the learners' awareness of their autonomy in organizing their thoughts and ideas before writing something ([Teng et al., 2022](#)).

The writing planning strategies consist of several subcategories, such as global discourse planning, where students can list main ideas or details before writing. Second, local lexical planning explained that students can search for an appropriate word and sentence before writing. Third, time management allows students to estimate the amount of time they will spend to complete an essay. Fourth, material preparation, from which learners can collect relevant information and conduct reading before writing. Other subcategories include planning based on feedback, where students can plan after receiving feedback from teachers or peers.

Thus, writing planning is essential for EFL writers to prepare for writing a piece of work. (Zhang, 2018) Well-prepared learners would generally be those who have a clear goal to complete their writing assessment. Table 6 describes the participants' profiles on writing planning strategies.

TABLE 6 | Writing Planning Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
2. I search for some good words and sentences in my mind before writing	5.65	1.22
6. I plan for my writing based on teacher feedback.	5.18	1.21
4. I collect relevant materials and do some reading preparation for the writing topic.	5.08	1.34
3. I list the central ideas or details before writing.	4.98	1.39
1. I think about how much time I should spend on each part of	4.91	1.32
5. I plan for my writing based on peer feedback.	4.83	1.45

Kuyyogsuy (2019) explains that students tend to be afraid and unsure about giving or receiving feedback from peers, and as a result, they tend to avoid peers' feedback to prevent arguments and conflicts with them. In other research, it was explained that students consider feedback from teachers to be more important than feedback from peers, and they also believe that peer feedback tends to be ineffective and lacks responsibility (Putra et al., 2021). It means that students do not fully trust the feedback given by their peers because they assume that feedback from peers is not objective and does not provide enough input for developing students' writing results.

Recognizing this issue, it would be beneficial for the teacher to help students develop practical peer feedback activities by providing clear instructions and examples first (Putra et al., 2021). The teacher must provide a variety of feedback examples for students, considering three parts: positive feedback, constructive feedback, and concluding with positive feedback again. Teachers can also create anonymous peer feedback activities, allowing the feedback given to be more objective and unbiased. Peer feedback and other types of feedback are crucial for achieving good student writing outcomes through continuous improvement.

Finally, the lowest mean score is the domain of goal-oriented evaluation strategies. Table 8 describes the profile of the participants' goal-oriented evaluation strategies.

TABLE 7 | Goal-oriented Evaluation Strategies

Items and Statements	Mean	SD
17. I put all the words that I have written wrong together for further review	5.26	1.31
15. I evaluate my mastery of the knowledge and skills learned in the English course	5.22	1.15
16. I check and revise sentences to ensure content and grammar accuracy after writing	5.18	1.17
13. I evaluate what I have learned from the writing activities or exercises	5.18	1.22
14. I evaluate whether I have achieved my previously set goals for writing	4.98	1.08
18. After writing, I ask someone else to read it and give me feedback	4.78	1.35

This study found that Indonesian secondary students were still unable to evaluate their writing goals. The results in Table 2 confirm that the Goal-oriented Evaluation domain holds the position of the domain with the lowest value (M = 5.1, SD = 1.22), indicating that the majority of students gave low scores for items in this domain. However, as shown in Table 5, learners appear quite capable of self-evaluating their writing, including evaluating sentences, grammar, and the words used in written work. It was also demonstrated that students were capable of measuring and evaluating their writing abilities and knowledge independently.

Although the results indicate a relatively high ability for students to carry out self-evaluation, item 18 (M = 4.78, SD = 1.35) suggests that students are less likely to seek or receive feedback from friends and others on their written work. This shows that learners tend to evaluate their work independently rather than seek feedback from others regarding the content of their writing.

In contrast, goal-oriented evaluation has a high mean score on students' writing self-regulation strategies (Teng et al., 2022; Umamah & Cahyono, 2020; Teng & Huang, 2019). Teng & Huang (2019) report that goal-oriented evaluation strategies appear to be the most important strategies in writing learning. It is also stated that in dealing with writing difficulties, students mainly consider the social-environmental dimension through self-evaluation (Umamah & Cahyono, 2020).

Students with high regulatory skills, especially in monitoring and evaluation, better understand how effective these strategies are for the development of their writing skills and will continue to use these strategies to achieve writing goals (Teng & Huang, 2019). Moreover, a study conducted by Teng et al. (2022) highlighted the importance of self-evaluation for secondary school students to continue developing and progressing in their writing skills. Whenever students can evaluate their writing performance, it will also have a positive impact on their metacognitive abilities.

A study by Zimmerman (1989) identified that self-evaluation is a self-process involving self-efficacy, setting goals and standards, and the ability to observe. Where this refers to how students or writers can evaluate the results of

their writing at a predetermined quality (Zimmerman, 1989). The results show that students can carry out independent evaluations of their writing results even though they are still hesitant to receive feedback from friends or other people which would be very helpful for them. On the other hand, students still lack a sufficient understanding of implementing evaluation based on predetermined writing goals. Therefore, it will be necessary to increase students' awareness and ability to find the purpose or goal of their writing so that the evaluation carried out will be more effective.

The second aim of the research is to identify the emergence of gender differences in students' self-regulated writing strategies. As a next step, after a descriptive statistical

analysis was conducted, a t-test was used to compare the male and female students self-regulatory writing strategies based on the six dimensions of self-regulated writing which are Writing Planning (WP), Goal-oriented Monitoring (GOM), Goal-oriented Evaluation (GOE), Emotional Control (EC), Memorization Strategies (MS), and Metacognitive Judgement (MJ).

After conducting a descriptive statistical analysis to gather detailed information about the self-regulation writing strategies used by participants, a t-test analysis was performed to compare the self-regulation writing strategies employed by female and male students. Table 8 below presents the results of the t-test, which indicate that the values of female and male students did not differ significantly across all domains.

TABLE 8 | Descriptive Statistics and T-test Results

Domains Strategies	Group Statistics			t-test	
	Gender	N	Mean	t	p
Writing Planning (WP)	Male	35	29.34	-1.856	0.068
	Female	30	32.13		
Goal-oriented Monitoring (GOM)	Male	35	30.51	-1.224	-0.226
	Female	30	32.37		
Goal-oriented Evaluation (GOE)	Male	35	28.8	-2.935	0.005
	Female	30	32.73		
Emotional Control (EC)	Male	35	19.8	-1.619	0.110
	Female	30	21.37		
Memorization (M)	Male	35	19.77	-1.705	0.093
	Female	30	21.47		
Metacognitive Judgement (MJ)	Male	35	21.66	-1.293	0.201
	Female	30	23.13		

There are no significant differences found between female and male students in the five domains of SRWSQ (WP $p=0.068 > 0.05$; GOM $p=0.226 > 0.05$; EC $p=0.110 > 0.05$; MS $p=0.093 > 0.05$; MJ $p=0.201 > 0.05$). However, statistically significant differences were found between females and males in one of the domains of SRWSQ, specifically the Goal-oriented Evaluation domain ($p=0.005 < 0.05$). Moreover, the results indicate that female students scored higher than male students in the goal-oriented evaluation.

The result in Table 8 indicates that the mean scores for male students tend to be lower than those for female students. Although male students tend to have lower scores when compared to female students, the results of the analysis prove that there are no significant differences between male and female students in five self-regulated writing domains (WP $p=0.068 > 0.05$; GOM $p=0.226 > 0.05$; EC $p=0.110 > 0.05$; MS $p=0.093 > 0.05$; MJ $p=0.201 > 0.05$).

This means that although there are differences in the self-regulation used by male and female students, the differences in the five domains of self-regulation writing strategies are considered not to be significant. However, a significant difference was found in one of the domains of self-regulatory writing, specifically the Goal-oriented Evaluation domain ($p=0.005 < 0.05$). This means that this difference can be interpreted as significant.

The findings of this research reveal differences while also sharing some similarities with previous research on gender differences. Previous research conducted by Teng et al. (2022) found significant differences between male and

female students in all aspects of self-regulated writing strategies, with female students reporting the use of more self-regulated writing strategies compared to male students.

However, in the current research, significant differences were found only in one domain, namely the Goal-Oriented Evaluation domain, between male and female students. These results align with research by Teng & Huang (2019), which found significant differences in the goal-oriented monitoring evaluation domain.

The results were attributed to the condition of the participants, where female students indeed have higher motivation and awareness of their learning goals compared to male students. Female participants tend to have the habit of asking for advice and seeking feedback, which they then use to evaluate and improve their writing results. In contrast, male students tend to show an indifferent attitude towards their writing results. Therefore, it is essential to consider individual differences as a component to enhance the effectiveness and development of students' self-regulated writing strategies. Hence, it is proven that in the other five domains of self-regulated writing strategies, female students employ more writing self-regulation strategies than male students. However, the difference shown is not significant.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to describe the self-regulated writing strategies of Indonesian secondary school students. A total of 65 students in grade 12 from a secondary school in

Yogyakarta, Indonesia, have completed and filled out the questionnaire. The findings reveal that the profile of the participants' writing self-regulated learning strategies, from the most frequently employed to the least frequently employed are: metacognitive judgment ($M = 5.59$, $SD = 1.26$), goal-oriented monitoring ($M=5.23$, $SD=1.27$), memorization ($M=5.14$, $SD=1.27$), emotional control ($M=5.13$, $SD=1.29$), writing planning ($M=5.11$, $SD=1.32$), and goal-oriented evaluation ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.22$). It also revealed that female students tended to employ more self-regulated writing strategies than their male counterparts. However, a significant difference between male and female students was found only in the domain of goal-oriented evaluation strategies.

This study suggests that teachers should optimize students' use of self-regulated learning strategies by raising students' awareness of these strategies during classroom instruction. Students can be more independent by managing their learning patterns and developing effective learning strategies to achieve their planned learning objectives, thereby supporting their learning success.

For pedagogical implications, improving task strategies, especially in writing planning and goal-based strategies, can help students develop their English writing skills. For future study, a correlation study between writing self-regulated learning strategies and students' writing performance will enrich the discussion on how writing strategies may give benefits to students' writing performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the participants, proofreaders, and reviewers of the article who have contributed to the publication process of this research manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Alisha, F., Safitri, N., Santoso, I., & Siliwangi, I. (2019). Students' Difficulties in Writing EFL. *PROJECT*, 2(1), 20-25.
- Conroy, R. M. (2018). *The RCSI Sample Size Handbook*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30497.51043>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Golzar, J., & Tajik, O. (2022). Convenience Sampling. *In International Journal of Education and Language Studies*, 1(2), 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijels.2022.162981>
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting Peer Feedback in Developing Students' English Writing Ability in L2 Writing Class. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 76. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76>
- Nguyen, T. T. L., & Suwannabubpha, S. (2021). EFL Writing in Thai Secondary Schools: Teachers' and Students' Views, Difficulties, and Expectations. *Language Related Research*, 12(3), 187–214. <https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.3.7>
- Nurlatifah, L., & Yusuf, F. N. (2022). Students' Problems in Writing Analytical Exposition Text in EFL Classroom Context. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(3), 801-810. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i3.6633>
- Putra, I. G. K. M., Santosa, M. H., & Pratiwi, N. P. A. (2021). Students' Perceptions on Online Peer Feedback Practice in EFL Writing. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 8(2), 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i2.21488>
- Riwayatningsih, R., Rukmini, D., Yuliasri, I., & Pratama, H. (2022). Unpacking Students' Metacognitive Experiences in Writing Course: The Effects of Strategy Instruction. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/iset>
- Redjeki, G.P.D., & Hapsari, A. (2022). EFL Undergraduate Students' Online Self-Regulated Learning Strategies during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature, and Linguistics*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v9i1>
- Sari, R. N., Umamah, A., Anggraini, M. P., Arianto, M. A., Kurniasih, & Mukminatien, N. (2023). Exploring Self-Regulated Writing Strategies: A Comparison between Paragraphs and Essays. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(2), 805–821. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.26146>
- Sinta, N. A., & Astutik, Y. (2019). Difficulties in Writing Recount Text Faced by Senior High School Students in Indonesia. *Proceedings of The ICECRS*, 2(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.21070/picecrs.v2i1.2404>
- Sogutlu, E., & Veliaj-Ostrosi, M. (n.d.). EFL Learners' Challenges in Essay Writing: The Case of a Non-Public High School in Albania. *In Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2022(4). <http://journalppw.com>
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221>
- Teng, M. F., Wang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Assessing self-regulatory writing strategies and their predictive effects on young EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, 51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100573>
- Teng, (Mark) Feng. (2020). Young learners' reading and writing performance: Exploring collaborative modeling of text structure as an additional component of self-regulated strategy development. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100870>
- Teng, (Mark) Feng, & Huang, J. (2019). Predictive Effects of Writing Strategies for Self-Regulated Learning on Secondary School Learners' EFL Writing Proficiency. *In TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 232–247. Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.462>
- 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>

- Winne, P. H. (2019). Paradigmatic Dimensions of Instrumentation and Analytic Methods in Research on Self-Regulated Learning. *In Computers in Human Behavior*, 96. 285–289. Elsevier Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.03.026>
- Zhang, L. J., Q. T. L. (2018). Validating a questionnaire on EFL writers' metacognitive awareness of writing strategies in multimedia environments. *In Metacognition in Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 157–178). Taylor and Francis.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351049146-9>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A Social Cognitive View of Self-Regulated Academic Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 329–339.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.3.329>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(2), 64-70.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Research for the Future: Becoming a Self-Regulated Writer: A Social Cognitive Perspective. *In Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22. 73-101.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright ©2026 Shalfa Salsabila, Astri Hapsari. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.