Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) for Grade 9 English

Alexandra L. Villasor

English Language Teacher, Abellana National School, Cebu City, Philippines
Email: alexandra.villasor25@gmail.com

Abstract— This study determined the effectiveness of using SRSD in enhancing the writing performance of Grade 9 students in Abellana National School, for the school year 2018-2019. It determined the significant relationship between the two groups of students' English 9 grades. The experimental group was taught writing using SRSD, while the control group was taught using the traditional method of teaching writing throughout the intervention which lasted for two weeks. Based on the findings, a proposed action plan which integrates SRSD was formulated. The study used the quasi-experimental design utilizing simple percentage rubric and narrative essay. A total of 44 students were rated. Statistical treatments utilized were weighted mean and simple percentage level of proficiency in writing essay. A writing prompt of Romeo and Juliet was used as the main instrument. The study findings showed significant differences between the mean scores attained by the experimental group and by the control group, and such difference was attributed to the SRSD writing strategy used. SRSD was able to aid the experimental group students to adapt the needed behavior of self-assessment wherein they became independent and active learners.

Keywords— Behavior, effective, narrative writing, self-regulated strategy development, quasi-experimental

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a productive skill, which needs competence in other macro skills, namely: listening, reading, and speaking (Almaden, 2006). As such, it is a highly complex process for both professional and non-professional writers since it involves a host of advanced skills that include critical thinking, logical development, and coherence of ideas. Additionally, this is often viewed by many as the most difficult task compared to the other macro skills because it relies on complex interrelated skills and (meta) cognitive abilities (Johnson, Mercado, and Acevedo, 2012).

It is a common observation that classrooms come alive once the teacher divides the class into groups (Foote, 2010). In fact, a trend of incorporating several group activities are happening in the elementary and secondary classrooms especially in the implementation of higher-grade percentage of performance tasks in the Enhanced K to 12 curricula in the Philippines.

But the goal of every teacher is not just to teach and motivate students so they can move up to the next level but to aspire them to be ready for senior high school and university. This is cognizant with Article IV Section 2 of 1987 Philippine Constitution which states that: (iii) Graduates will be prepared for higher education.

Moreover, senior high school and college education are heavy on essay exams, research reports, term papers, theses, and all other kinds of written output. Even top universities all over the world require incoming students to write an application essay and some also include an essay portion in their admission tests (Foote, 2010). This is why writing skill is considered imperative for success not just in education but also in employment (Yuan, 2010).

So, how can the teachers develop the writing performance of the students if there is more focus on group activities and less on writing tasks? Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) addresses students' cognitive, behavioral, and affective processes (Harris and Graham, 1999) and can be an effective intervention for students with or poor performance in writing. Students will be introduced to a writing strategy in tandem with the self-regulation strategy through SRSD and will monitor their performances, either individually or in a group, as the strategies are applied.

In theory, students do not instantly become effective independent learners by themselves, rather it is crucial that they learn how to learn. SRSD incorporates a writing strategy with self-regulation instruction. When students can monitor their own performances then there will be a shift of responsibility for the learning process from the teacher to the student. This shift involves students understanding their learning, being motivated to learn, and collaborating with their teachers and classmates to structure their learning goals which will result in becoming independent learners.

The researcher observed a grade 10 English class when students were asked to write a journal entry after a module was discussed. Students simply enumerated the lessons covered in the whole module. But when the teacher showed to the class a sample journal entry and gave comments and remarks of their previous entry, students learned to include insights and questions on their next entries. With this observation, two other English teachers were interviewed on their students' writing skills and received the same observation that students committed many mistakes not only in spelling and grammar but importantly they have poor essay development.

In the interview with the two English teachers, Grade 7 and 8 teachers at Abellana National School, they described the general classroom writing practices they implemented were a combination of traditional writing skills (e.g., grammar and punctuation) and teaching methods (e.g., Lecture and Didactic). Both teachers also shared the less frequent writing activities they implemented such as handwriting skills, using writing prompts, or dictation, in class the less interested their students were in writing activities.

Reasons attributed to this, writing activities were only given as supplementary activities but not as a culminating output of the other macro skills. Students also showed a lack of proper usage of punctuation and capitalization. Though cohesion was evident the sentence structures were not established. There were also some spelling errors with same sounding words (e.g., "great" instead of "greet").

Despite the constant input and lecture of both teachers with basic writing skills, students still failed to produce quality written outputs.

Furthermore, according to Bloom's Hierarchy of Skills, writing comes last. Most of the time, a book report is asked after a reading assignment, a reflection paper for every film viewed, or a reaction paper after hearing a politician's speech, etc. Therefore, as mentioned, the researcher can say that writing is the achievement of the proficiency level of the other macro skills.

Educators, curriculum designers, and the government must examine current writing instructional practices to determine how to better support students who are struggling to acquire this necessary skill. Hence, these observations paved the way to study writing instruction in developing the writing performance of students through self-regulated goals and tasks.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This study is anchored on Barry Zimmerman's theory of Self-regulated Learning. The supporting theories are Donald Meichenbaum's Cognitive-Behavioral Modification (CBM) and Lev Vygotsky's Scaffolding theory.

Barry Zimmerman's theory of Self-regulated Learning discussed the four levels of development, namely: observation, emulation, self-control, and self-regulation. The main theory will be utilized to heighten the writing performance of the students and to regulate their output through goal setting, self-instruction, and self-assessment.

The first level, which is observation, is based on Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory which suggests that through observation, any individual can learn to do things by observing the behavior of others.

The second level, the emulative level, is when the learner begins to try the action or conduct the behavior on his or her own. The difference between the first two levels is that in the first level the student is merely observing, while the second level is using cognitive and motor skills to imitate the behavior that was observed (Schunk and Zimmerman, 1997).

The third level, which is self-control, allows the student to internalize what has been observed but will still be dependent on the teacher's modeling.

The final level is self-regulation, which occurs when the student can adapt the behavior as needed and is independent of the teacher's guidance (Zimmerman, 1998).

Zimmerman's level of self-regulation constitutes the framework for successful modeling for a writing task. Meichenbaum even added in his Cognitive-Behavioral Modification that modeling is used as a scaffold. Thus, for teachers to modify students' behavior and implement self-assessment for their performance, the sub-theories of Cognitive-Behavioral Modification and Scaffolding theory are utilized.

Meichenbaum developed Cognitive-Behavioral Modification that typically involves children learning to control their own behavior through goal setting, self-instruction, and self-assessment (Harris and Graham, 2009).

Students who had difficulty in writing may need more than a learning strategy, but also, they need to regulate their own behavior. The principle of setting a goal creates a positive linear relationship between a challenging specific goal and task (Locke and Latham, 1968). Thus, making goal setting as one of the most powerful and evidence-based interventions for enhancing performance (Locke and Latham, 2002).

No doubt that students' biggest critics are neither the teachers nor their parents, but themselves. And that is all right because when they are engaged in the process of thinking about (self-instruction), assessing their own work (self-assessment), then they take responsibility for their own learning. Thus, activating learners as owners of their learning leads to student performance improvement and positive behavior towards goal setting (Williams, 2008).

CBM also emphasizes the significance of the student playing an active and cooperative part in the design, implementation, and evaluation of learning (Meichenbaum, 1977). On the other hand, the teacher should gradually fade support and engage students in a hands-on task for the instruction to be highly responsive for each child.

Lev Vygotsky's Scaffolding theory is part of the education concept "Zone of Proximal Development" or ZPD. Vygotsky pointed out that students learn the most when they are in their ZPD with the help or guidance of someone else, may it be teachers or other students. In presenting a new instruction for writing through procedural facilitation and guided practice, students may acquire the final level of self-regulation.

This study is mainly focused on the effects of Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) instruction on the writing performance of students. Since SRSD is a form of self-instructional strategy that promotes writing quality in Grade two to twelve (Rogers and Graham, 2008) it allows students to do much of the work while achieving specific criteria.

In 1985, Karen Harris and Steve Graham published their very first study on strategies instruction approach to writing called "Self-control Strategy Training". Further development was made of this approach as "Self-instructional Strategy Training" (Graham Harris, & Sawyer, 1987) and in 1989 as "Self-instructional Strategy Development" (Harris and Pressley, 1991). Since 1992, this approach has been referred to as "Self-regulated Strategy Development," or SRSD (Case, Harris, & Graham, 1992).

SRSD provides supported, definite instruction targeting: (1) writing strategies for specific writing genres (e.g., persuasive, descriptive); (2) general writing strategies (e.g., using powerful vocabulary, engaging opening and closing sections); (3) self-regulation strategies (e.g., goal setting, self-instruction, self-assessment, and self-efficacy); and (4) relevant declarative, conditional and procedural knowledge (knowing what to do; how to do it; and when, where, and why to do it) (Graham and Harris, 1992).

It is with this principle that the researcher will now proceed with the shift in strategy for English writing instruction using SRSD on narrative writing. The framework for the six stages of SRSD is explained below:

Stage I: Develop Background Knowledge (teacher to class). Teacher and students need to work together during stage one to develop the students' background knowledge. Students will recall any previous knowledge about narrative writing. Then, the teacher will discuss different examples of writing prompts.

Stage II: Discuss It (teacher to class). During this stage, the teacher will discuss steps in writing a narrative essay through two mnemonics: TOWER and TACO (Sandmel, 2010).

Stage III: Model It (teacher to class). Students will observe the teacher model the writing steps in answering an example writing prompt using the two mnemonics: TOWER and TACO.

Stage IV: Memorize It (student to student). Students will memorize the steps of the TOWER and TACO. With the use of flashcards and graphic organizers, the class will have an activity to reinforce memorization of steps.

Stage V: Support It (student). Students begin to write using the steps of the two mnemonics. If a student is struggling, the student and the teacher will collaboratively plan and write gradually shifting control to the student. The writing rubric will be explained to the students in this stage. Students are encouraged to assess their initial written output through the rubric.

Stage VI: Independent Performance (student). The teacher and students will review the rubric and the two mnemonics. In a timed practice test, students should now be able to plan and set a goal for their writing output and use the strategies effectively and independently.

These six stages of SRSD instruction are a flexible set of guidelines intended to be combined, modified, and redefined in response to the needs of the students and teachers. For example, stages I and II can be integrated together in the early part of the lesson rather than being taught as distinct individual stages.

III. RELATED STUDIES

This research used the SRSD approach in writing a narrative essay. To further support the present study, the following researches were conducted internationally and were found that the writing approach can be used across different writing genres:

Sandmel (2010) conducted a study using SRSD approach with new writing strategies (TOWER and TACO) for a writing genre (Story About Me) for a purpose (on-demand writing) within a comprehensive model of prevention for students with writing and behavior difficulties. The effect size (21) was small but positive. All students were given the WJ-III Test of Achievement Writing Sample Subtest prior to the beginning of the intervention and upon the completion of the study. However, the design of the study did not include a control group. This study makes an important contribution to the literature based on these findings. Fourth and fifth-grade students (N=12), with writing and behavior difficulties, were able to improve the total number of writing elements included in their writing. Five students scored SRSD instruction and the writing strategies higher at post-instruction than before the intervention, and two students scored the same. In regard to writing quality, five students discussed the quality scoring rubric with the teachers and developed individual goals for their writing.

Akincilar (2010) investigated the effects of a paragraph writing strategy PLEASE (Pick, List, Evaluate, Activate, Supply, End) instruction through the SRSD approach on descriptive writing of fifth grade English learners studying in a private elementary school in Istanbul. For the study, eight fifth grade students participated in a free writing workshop offered by the researcher at school. Strategies for planning and drafting descriptive paragraphs were taught to the students. They were also taught the procedures for regulating the use of these strategies and the writing process itself through the SRSD model. The findings of the study show improvement in terms of overall quality and length of the written paragraph by

students. Students became more aware of the planning of a descriptive paragraph. After the treatment, the students also gained self-confidence in writing.

Syiem (2012) conducted a study on improving the English writing skills of higher secondary students (N=114) in Meghalaya, India, through a Three-Week Module grounded on the SRSD approach. A feasible and cost-time-effective training module for enhancing the writing skills (letter writing and composition) in English was developed, and its effectiveness was evaluated. Modules of varying duration and intensity were formulated with experienced teachers, some parents, and representative sample. A Pretest - posttest research design was followed for a period of three weeks. Statistical Analysis was done using paired t-test, Chi-square test, and ANOVA. The findings showed that the module was effective in teaching writing skills.

In these studies, the writing performance of students in the SRSD groups' post-instruction was significantly better than the writing of the control group in regard to sentence lengths, spelling, coherence, and quality of ideas.

Since, recent researches have demonstrated that the SRSD model of writing instruction has constantly been successful in improving student writing outputs across different writing genres at the elementary and secondary level (Graham, Harris, & Mason, 2005; Graham & Perin, 2007; Tracy et al., 2009). This study would like to culminate on narrative writing. The researcher believed it would be more effective if students are encouraged to write with the use of their imagination and personal experiences.

IV. RESEARCH PROBLEM

This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) in enhancing writing for Grade 9 English, Abellana National School, Cebu City, S.Y. 2018-2019. The findings were the base of a proposed action plan.

Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups?

2. What are the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups?

3. Is there a significant difference on the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups?

4. Is there a significant difference between the pretest and posttest performances of the control and experimental groups?

5. Is there a significant difference between the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups?

6. Grounded on the findings, what action plan could be proposed?

V.   METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quasi-experimental design to determine the effectiveness of SRSD to engage Grade 9 English students in improving their writing performance at Abellana National School, Cebu City, school year 2018 – 2019.

This study was conducted at Abellana National School, Osmeña Boulevard in Cebu City, Philippines. It is the biggest public high school in Cebu City Division with about 4,753 junior high school students. Also, there are 206 teachers and 17 of whom are English teachers. The other subjects include key areas like Science and Mathematics; major subjects under the Technical Vocational Livelihood (T.V.L) such as drafting, carpentry, garments, foods, and ICT; and Special Program for Sports (SPS) like swimming, basketball, etc. The school is the only school in the Cebu City Division that offers specialized subjects for T.V.L, SPS, and Special Program for Foreign Language – Japanese under T.L.E.

The sample population of this study utilized one class who are currently taking grade 9 English at Abellana National School. There were 44 students involved in this study who were streamed into two heterogeneous groups. There were 22 students for the control group and 22 students for the experimental group. Both groups were between 14 and 15 years old; clustered heterogeneously and had mixed gender. Their academic performances in English in the First quarter of the school year were used as the basis for their groups.

The main instrument used in this study was a researcher made writing prompt about Romeo and Juliet. This instrument served as a pretest and posttest assessment tool. Before the pretest was conducted, the writing prompt was given to three Grade 9 English teachers for review and validation purposes. The writing prompt was also pilot tested in another Grade 9 English class who took the same lesson and who were not part of the study.

Before the study was conducted, a letter requesting permission to conduct this study was also sent to the English Coordinator, Registrar, and the School Principal. The request to conduct the research enabled the researcher to secure access to students' records and other files helpful to the research process. The approved communication letter was provided to the Principal, English Coordinator, and the English teachers for their awareness of the ongoing

study and for any necessary support to the researcher. A letter request was also sent to the students and their parents explaining the background and purpose of the study and the utmost confidentiality of data were observed.

Prior to the administration of the pretest to the control and experimental groups, the writing prompt (Romeo and Juliet) was administered to students who were not included in the study. This was for the purpose of pretesting and piloting the research main tools before using it to collect data. Through this step, any errors and vagueness on the writing prompt (Romeo and Juliet) were modified and/ or changed by the researcher.

The pilot testing was administered to a class who were not included in the study but of the same grade level and the instrument was validated on 10 subjects. The result was interpreted through content reliability through the rubric. The content validity of the writing prompt was checked using the rubric and yielded the score of more than 75%. Thus, found out that subjects had a score of more than a passing score.

Subsequently, the researcher used the improved writing prompt (Romeo and Juliet) and the rubric as the main tools to measure the writing performance of students. The writing prompt was administered to the control and experimental groups in a unified session. Then, the two-week SRSD approach was taught to the experimental group from November 26, 2018, to December 7, 2018, which was guided with a 6 researcher-made Lesson Plans. The experimental group had their sessions during their original English class schedule at 11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. while the control group had their classes at 3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. The research was done in the Third quarter since Romeo and Juliet was one of the main selections.

Both the control and experimental groups were taught with Lesson 1 of the researcher-made Lesson Plans in developing the students' background knowledge. After which, the control group was taught how to write a narrative essay (without SRSD) using the Writeshop Guide found on pages 128-129 of Grade 9 English Learner's Manual: A Journey through Anglo-American Literature. Paper and pencil were utilized. During the two-week of intervention, the control group answered the intervention writing prompts using the Writeshop Guide, while the experimental group was taught with Lessons 2 - 6 SRSD based Lesson Plans.

The pretest writing prompt was also found in the researcher-made lesson plan. However, the presented situation was used in a different context. A posttest using the same assessment tool in the pretest was administered after two weeks of experimental study. The data gathered

was treated for tabulation, statistical analyses, and interpretation.

The SRSD stages of instruction were used as a guide to construct the six researcher-made lesson plans. Lesson 1 was administered to both control and experimental groups since it was the development of background knowledge. Narrative writing and a sample writing prompt are explained in this lesson.

However, Lessons 2 - 6 were introduced to the experimental group, while the control group used the Writing Guide found on their Learner's Manual.

In Lesson 2, students discussed what they learned with one another and with their teacher. Then, the teacher introduced 2 writing steps through the mnemonic TOWER and TACO.

In Lesson 3, students observed how the teacher models the writing steps.

In Lesson 4, students memorized the steps of TOWER and TACO. With the use of flashcards and graphic organizers, the class had an activity to reinforce memorization of steps.

In Lesson 5, students began writing using the mnemonics and the sample writing prompt. The writing rubric was also explained to the students in this lesson. Then, students were encouraged to monitor their progress through the given rubric.

In Lesson 6, the teacher and students reviewed their writing outputs using the rubric. Afterward, a timed practice test using the same writing prompt was conducted as an independent writing performance.

After giving the SRSD based Lesson Plans, a posttest using the same assessment tool in the pretest was given to both control and experimental groups. The result served as the basis for the proposed action plan.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Pretest Scores of Control and Experimental Groups

The performances of students in the control and experimental groups were examined through writing prompt and were evaluated by two English teachers using the researcher-made rubric. Table 1 presents the results of the pretest performances of the two groups.

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents in both control and experimental groups belong to poor and good category. The data revealed that most of the students in control and experimental groups showed low performances in the pretest. Furthermore, it gives an implication that writing is a skill that needs to improve, and students need to master their written communication especially sentence structure and grammar. One probable reason for this is the failure of exposure to writing activities during lower years which have not been drilled through narrative writing.

Table 1 Pretest Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups

Pretest Result		Control Group		Experimental Group	
Score	Level of Performance	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
13-16	Very Good	0	0.00	0	0.00
9-12	Good	7	31.82	12	54.55
5-8	Poor	12	54.55	8	36.36
1-4	Needs Improvement	3	13.64	2	9.09
Total:		22	100.00	22	100.00
Mean:		7.09	*Poor*	8.63	*Good*

The Cognitive-Behavioral Modification of Meichenbaum supports the result of the students' scores; students who had difficulty in writing may need more than a learning strategy; they may need to regulate their own behavior. CBM is a form of self-instructional learning, meaning students can do much of the work and learn best when guided with a challenging specific goal and task.

Thus, making goal setting as one of the most powerful and evidence-based interventions in enhancing writing performance (Locke and Latham, 2002).

6.2 Posttest Scores of Control and Experimental Groups

Table 2 shows the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

As shown in table 2, the experimental group shows a remarkable increase in performance from Good to Very Good. While the control group shows an increase from Poor to Good apart from 7 students (31.82%) who belong to the Very Good Category.

Table 2 Posttest Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups

Posttest		Control Group		Experimental Group	
Score	Level of Performance	Frequency	Per Cent (%)	Frequency	Per Cent (%)
13-16	Very Good	7	31.82	14	63.64
9-12	Good	14	63.64	6	27.27
5-8	Poor	1	4.55	2	9.09
1-4	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total:		22	100.00	22	100.00
Mean:		10.95	*Good*	12.52	*Very Good*

The experimental group which used SRSD in writing a narrative essay showed a high increase in performance which could be described that the use of self-regulation is effective. The experimental group proves that students are motivated by visuals and writing strategies (TOWER and TACO) which were actively used during the writing drills.

As pointed out in Lev Vygotsky's Scaffolding theory, if a concept or skill is something that a student could do with the help of a "more knowledgeable other," then that skill is something they could perform on their own after learning it with less support (Farr, 2014).

6.3 Significance of the Difference Between the Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 3 shows the significant difference between the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 3 Test of the Significance between the Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Variables	Computed t-value	Critical Value	ρ-value	Decision on H_0
Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Group	2.15817352640354	2.01808167886218	0.0366785504116581	Reject H_0

Table 3 shows the computed ρ-Value is 0.036 which is lesser than the level of significance alpha (α) which is 0.05; (ρ-Value = 0.036 < α=0.05); therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference in the pretest scores of the control and experimental groups. It showed that the teaching strategy used in the writing activities has a correlation with both groups' performances.

6.4 Significance of the Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 4 presents the significant difference between the pretest and posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 4 Test of the Significance between the Pretest Performances and Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Variables		Mean	Computed t-value	Critical Value	Decision on H_0
Control Group	Pretest	7.09	16.7467269955862	2.07961383708272	Reject H_0
	Posttest	10.95			
Experimental Group	Pretest	8.64	16.5834850392764	2.07961383708272	Reject H_0
	Posttest	12.52			

Table 4 presents the mean of the posttest of the control group is 10.95 which is higher than the mean of the pretest of 7.09. There is also a significant increase on the mean of the experimental groups' performance from 8.64 on the pretest to 12.52 on the posttest.

The table further implies that after the discussion of what is narrative essay and application of the steps using the Writeshop Guide found on pages 128-129 of Grade 9 English Learner's Manual: A Journey through Anglo-American Literature in writing a narrative essay through traditional teaching improved the performance of the students in the control group. Furthermore, the significant increase of the experimental group's performance can be attributed to the SRSD writing intervention. Though traditional teaching methods are still effective given that they are closely monitored, the significant increase of the performance of the experimental group implies that SRSD is more effective than the traditional teaching method.

6.5 Significance of the Difference Between the Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 5 shows the significant difference between the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 5 Test of the Significance between the Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Variables	Computed t-value	Critical Value	ρ-value	Decision on H_0
Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Group	2.15070933898399	2.01808167886218	0.0373002322120877	Reject H_0

Table 5 shows the computed ρ-Value is 0.037 which is lesser than the level of significance alpha (α) which is 0.05; (ρ-Value = 0.037 < α=0.05); therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference in the posttest scores of the control and experimental groups. It strongly supports that the teaching strategy used in teaching the two groups has a correlation on their performance.

The main theory of this study firmly supports the result of the posttest performances. Self-regulation which is the final level of Barry Zimmerman's Self-regulated Learning, highlighted that students who were able to adapt the needed behavior of self-assessment becomes independent and active learners (Zimmerman, 1998). Hence, SRSD provided additional support to students to target writing strategies and self-regulation strategies.

VII.   CONCLUSION

This study shows that the intervention that uses self-regulation such as SRSD proved to be effective in aiding students during writing tasks thus enhancing their writing performance. Therefore, self-regulated strategies are important for executing higher-level skills involved in the writing process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION

The researcher proposed the following as a result of this research:

1. Topics for future researches

1.1. SRSD Application to General Education Classroom

1.2. SRSD Intervention to Students with Writing Disabilities

1.3. Impact of Writing Fatigue on Students Written Output

2. Adopt the proposed action plan.

REFERENCES

[1] Calkins, S., & Perin, D. (2007). The Art of Teaching Writing. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.
[2] Devine, J. (1993). The role of metacognition in second language reading and writing. In J.G. Lasson and I. Leki

(Eds), Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second language perspectives. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

[3] Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (1990). A theory of goal setting & task performance. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[4] McCutchen, D. (2006). Cognitive Factors in the development of children's writing. In C.A. MacArthur, S. Graham and J. Fitzgerald, Handbook of writing. New York, New York: The Guilford Press.

[5] Meichenbaum, D. (1977). Cognitive behavior modification: An integrative approach. New York: Plenum.

[6] Almaden, D. (2006). An analysis of topical structure of paragraphs written by Filipino students. The Asia-Pacific Education Research, 15(1),127-153.

[7] Case, L.P., Harris, K.R., & Graham, S. (1992). Improving problem solving skills of students with learning disabilities: Self-regulated strategy development. Journal of Special Education, 26, 1-19.

[8] Ennis, R.P., Jolivette, K., & Boden, L.J. (2013). STOP and DARE: Self-regulated strategy development for persuasive writing with elementary students with EBD in residential facility. Educational and Treatment of Children, 36(3), 81-99.

[9] Foote, R. (2010). Age of acquisition and proficiency as factors in language production: Agreement in bilinguals. Bilingualism, 13(2), 99-118.

[10] Graham, S., & Harris, K.R. (1999). Assessment and intervention in overcoming writing difficulties: An illustration from the self-regulated strategy development model. Language Speech and Hearing Services in School, 30, 225-364.

[11] Graham, S., Harris, K.R., & Mason, L. (2005). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, self-efficacy of struggling young writers: The effect of Self-regulated Strategy development. Contemporary Education Psychology, 32(2), 207-241.

[12] Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99, 445-476.

[13] Graham, S., Harris, K.R., & Sawyer, R. (1987). Composition instruction with learning disabled students: Self-instructional strategy training. Focus on Exceptional Children, 20(4), 1-11.

[14] Gustilo, L. (2010). What you think, feel and experience shape your writing: Cognitive, affective, and contextual processes in ESL writing. The Asia-Pacific Education Research, 19(2), 271 – 285.

[15] Harris, K.R., &Latham, G.P. (2002). Self-regulated strategy development in writing. Premises, evolution, and the future. British Journal of Education Psychology (monograph services), 6, 113-135.

[16] Harris, K.R., &Pressley, M. (1991). The nature of cognitive strategy instruction: Interactive Strategy Construction. Exceptional Children, 57, 392-405.

[17] Johnson, M., Mercado, L., & Acevedo, A. (2012). The effect of planning sub-processes on L2 writing fluency, grammatical complexity, and lexical complexity. Journal of Second Language Writing. http://dx.dol.org/101016/

[18] Locke, E.A., &Latham G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705-717.

[19] Rogers, L.A., &Graham, S. (2008). A meta-analysis of single subject design writing intervention research. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100, 879-906.

[20] Sandmel, K. (2010). Story Writing: The Effects of Self-Regulated Strategy Development with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties. The Journal of Special Education, 44(2), 107-109.

[21] Schunk, D.H., & Zimmerman, B.J. (1997). Social origins of self-regulatory competence. In B. Zimmerman, Development of Self-regulated Learning Social Learning. Educational Psychologist, 32(4), 195-208.

[22] Tracy, B., Graham, S., & Reidgraham, R. (2009). Teaching young students strategies for planning and drafting stories: the impact of Self-regulated Strategy development. The Journal of Education Research, 2(5), 323-332.

[23] William, K.A. (2008). Foreign Language Learning Anxiety in EFL university classes. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5(2), 181-191.

[24] Yuan, L.T. (2010). Enhancing EFL learners writing skill via journal writing. English Writing Teaching, 3(3), 82-88.

[25] Zhai, L. (2008). Research methods in study of influencing factors on L2 writing performance. Canadian Social Science, 4(6), 66-74.

[26] Zimmerman, B.J. (1998). Academic Studying and the development of personal skill: A self-regulatory Perspective. Educational Psychologist, 33,73-86.

[27] British Columbia Ministry of Education (2009). BC performance standards: Writing. Retrieved September 22, 2018, from http://www.bced.gov.b.ca/perf-stands/writing.intro