



SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES OF EFL STUDENTS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS

Prayogo Hadi Sulistio, Ifan Iskandar, Zainal Rafli

Universitas Negeri Jakarta

prayogo_9906922007@mhs.unj.ac.id, ifaniskandar@unj.ac.id,

zainal.rafli@unj.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Although self-regulated learning (SRL) has been widely recognized as a key contributor to academic success, limited empirical research has investigated how EFL students in Indonesian higher education settings apply SRL strategies specifically within academic writing classes. This study aimed to describe the self-regulated learning strategies employed by EFL learners during academic writing tasks. Using a descriptive qualitative approach with a survey method, data were collected from 40 sixth semester students in the English Education Department at Jenderal Soedirman University through the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS). Data analysis involved organizing responses, coding them based on SRL dimensions, categorizing them into relevant themes, and interpreting dominant patterns. The findings revealed that students employed all four SRL dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational or affective, and social strategies, with particularly high use of planning, emotional control, and peer collaboration. These results suggest that learners are not only aware of SRL strategies but also actively apply them to manage the demands of academic writing. The study contributes to SRL theory by providing context-specific insights into strategy use among Indonesian EFL learners and offers pedagogical implications for supporting SRL development in writing instruction.

Keywords: Self-Regulated Learning Strategies, Academic Writing, English for Foreign Language, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is a vital skill for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, not only for academic success but also for professional development in global contexts. It enables learners to participate in international academic discourse and equips them with standardized English expressions that enhance both writing fluency and confidence in publishing research (Wahyuningsih, 2021). Also, academic writing plays a critical role in shaping learners' academic identities by fostering engagement with disciplinary norms and encouraging the articulation of their scholarly voice (Juliaty, 2019). The ability to engage with academic writing also provides learners with tools to address global issues and participate meaningfully in international dialogues (Balle & Olsen, 2023). In conclusion, mastering academic writing not only contributes to EFL learners' academic achievement but also empowers them to navigate the complexities of global communication and professional growth.

Furthermore, academic writing is widely recognized as one of the most cognitively demanding skills for EFL learners in higher education, requiring the integration of multiple linguistic and mental processes. Unlike receptive skills, writing demands active

engagement in planning, organizing, drafting, and revising, all of which involve both cognitive and metacognitive functions (Chien, 2012; Han, 2024). It also requires learners to integrate grammar, vocabulary, semantics, and rhetorical conventions into cohesive and coherent texts (Al-Jarrah et al., 2018). These cognitive demands are heightened in integrated writing tasks, which have been shown to increase both lexical and syntactic complexity in student output (Zhao et al., 2024). Moreover, the act of writing itself activates higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, evaluation, and synthesis, thereby serving as a tool for cognitive development (Truong & Tran, 2022). Research further indicates that EFL learners perceive writing as a particularly taxing activity due to the interplay of these cognitive tasks with emotional stressors, often resulting in avoidance behaviors or reduced performance (Rozimela & Wahyuni, 2019). Therefore, understanding and addressing the cognitive load of academic writing is essential for designing effective pedagogical strategies that support EFL learners.

Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) plays a pivotal role in enhancing academic writing performance among EFL learners by fostering autonomy, motivation, and strategic engagement. Defined as a process where learners actively monitor and control their cognition, behavior, and motivation, SRL enables students to improve writing outcomes through planning, goal-setting, and self-evaluation (Pintrich, 2000; Zimmerman, 2002). Multiple studies confirm that SRL is positively correlated with academic achievement in EFL contexts; students who consistently apply SRL strategies such as cognitive and metacognitive regulation tend to outperform their peers (Amri, 2024). Learners with strong SRL are also more adept at solving problems in academic writing, as self-regulation boosts self-efficacy and promotes persistence through challenging tasks (Mujiono, 2024). Classroom research indicates that students utilize SRL strategies across cognitive, motivational, and social domains, applying them to manage their writing processes effectively (Andriyani et al., 2024). Furthermore, interventions such as SRL-based writing modules have led to measurable improvements in writing quality and significant reductions in learner anxiety (Sun et al., 2024). These findings underscore the necessity of incorporating explicit SRL training in academic writing instruction to better equip EFL learners for complex writing tasks in higher education.

Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) in academic writing for EFL learners encompasses four interrelated components. They are metacognitive, cognitive, social, and motivational or affective regulation strategies that together support writing development and learner autonomy (Andrade & Evans, 2012). Metacognitive strategies involve goal-setting, planning, monitoring, and self-evaluation, which help students structure their writing tasks and regulate their progress effectively (Andriyani et al., 2024). Cognitive strategies such as organizing, rehearsing, and elaborating content enable learners to connect existing knowledge with new ideas, facilitating deeper understanding and more coherent academic writing (Ariyanti et al., 2018). Social strategies involve series of strategies like seeking help, engaging in peer feedback, and collaborating. Social strategies enhance writing performance by encouraging interaction and reinforcing confidence (Sun et al., 2024). Lastly, Motivational or affective regulation strategies, including self-efficacy and task value, are crucial for sustaining effort and managing writing anxiety, allowing students to persist through complex writing tasks (Yang, 2024). Collectively, these components form a comprehensive framework for fostering effective academic writing practices in EFL contexts.



A growing body of research has emphasized the pivotal role of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) strategies in enhancing EFL learners' writing proficiency. Practical curriculum frameworks for integrating SRL components such as goal-setting and strategic monitoring into TESOL programs have also been proposed (Andrade & Evans, 2012). Motivational SRL strategies have been found to enhance writing performance indirectly, by activating cognitive and metacognitive processes that facilitate text production (Bing Shen & Bai, 2022). Similarly, learners' self-efficacy in writing is positively correlated with their use of SRL strategies, reinforcing the importance of confidence-building in writing instruction (Balaman, 2021). Additional research has shown that EFL learners in higher academic years tend to apply SRL strategies more frequently and effectively, suggesting that SRL development progresses with experience and exposure (Abadikhah et al., 2018). Finally, EFL students engage in a diverse set of SRL strategies, including metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and social approaches, which collectively support the growth of academic writing (Andriyani et al., 2024).

Although Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) has gained significant attention in global EFL research, there remains a notable gap in studies focusing on the specific SRL strategies employed by students within Indonesian academic writing classrooms. Much of the existing literature in the Indonesian context emphasizes general writing performance or SRL in online learning environments, rather than exploring how learners regulate their writing processes during in-class academic tasks (Mujiono, 2024). For example, findings often describe medium levels of SRL among EFL students without detailing how strategies are applied across the distinct stages of writing which involve planning, composing, and revising (Mahmud & German, 2021; Umamah & Cahyono, 2020). While self-assessment models for SRL have been suggested, there remains a lack of empirical research that captures the real-time, classroom-based application of SRL strategies during academic writing tasks (Taufiqulloh, 2015). Furthermore, the limited number of studies that do focus on Indonesian EFL writing classrooms tend to generalize SRL behaviors without distinguishing between types of strategies or instructional contexts (Ariyanti et al., 2018). These research gaps highlight the urgency and relevance of the present study, *Self-Regulated Learning Strategies of EFL Students in Academic Writing Class*, which seeks to explore the self-regulated learning strategies used by EFL students in academic writing classes. Specifically, this study aims to answer the research question: *What self-regulated learning strategies are used by EFL students in academic writing?*

METHOD

This study adopted a descriptive qualitative design utilizing a survey method to investigate the self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies employed by EFL students in academic writing. Qualitative description is well-suited for educational research where the goal is to understand participants' practices in naturalistic settings without experimental manipulation (Hall & Liebenberg, 2024). The use of a survey allowed for the efficient collection of detailed, self-reported data on learners' strategic behaviors. Focusing on SRL in the context of academic writing aligns with prior research emphasizing the need to examine learners' internal processes such as planning, monitoring, and self-reflection during writing tasks (Pintrich, 2000; Zimmerman, 2002). Participants in this study were 40 sixth-semester students from the English Education Department at Jenderal Soedirman University. This group was chosen purposively, as they had prior exposure to academic writing instruction and were thus considered capable

of reflecting on their writing strategies. Data were collected using the Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) developed by Shen & Wang (2024), which has been designed to assess SRL behaviors in EFL academic writing contexts. The instrument captures four key dimensions of SRL: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational (or affective), and social strategies components widely supported in SRL literature (Andrade & Evans, 2012; (Mark) Feng Teng & Huang, 2018). The questionnaire was administered in person after securing informed consent and ethical clearance, ensuring transparency and voluntary participation.

The analysis followed several qualitative steps to identify strategic patterns in students' responses. First, responses were organized and reviewed for completeness. Next, the data were coded deductively according to the SRL dimensions outlined in the QSRLWS (Shen & Wang, 2024). Then, responses were categorized into relevant themes. Finally, dominant trends were interpreted to determine which SRL strategies were most commonly applied. This analytical process enabled the study to provide nuanced insights into how EFL learners manage their academic writing through self-regulation, addressing a gap highlighted in Indonesian EFL contexts (Ariyanti et al., 2018; Mahmud & German, 2021)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets the findings related to the self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies employed by sixth-semester EFL students in an academic writing class. Drawing on data collected through the QSRLWS questionnaire, the analysis categorizes students' responses according to four key SRL dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, social and motivational or affective regulation strategies. The discussion highlights the dominant strategies used by learners and reflects on how these align with or diverge from prior literature. Emphasis is placed on how Indonesian EFL students independently apply these strategies to manage the challenges of academic writing. By linking the observed strategic behaviors to relevant theories and past studies, this section provides deeper insight into learners' self-regulation processes in academic contexts and addresses existing gaps in SRL research specific to Indonesian higher education settings. The results of the survey were organized and presented in the following tables to illustrate the distribution and frequency of SRL strategies employed by the students:

1. Metacognitive Strategies

a. Self Initiation

Table 1. Frequency Table for Self Initiation

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I make an effort to learn the techniques for writing effective English essays.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	16 (40%)	10 (25%)	Often
2.	I practice writing essays in English at home to enhance my writing skills.	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	12 (30%)	14 (35%)	6 (15%)	Sometimes
3.	I analyze well-written English essays to develop my own writing ability.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	18 (45%)	12 (30%)	Often



4.	I seek feedback from others to understand their opinions and the reasons behind them regarding my writing.	4 (10%)	5 (12.5%)	11 (27.5%)	12 (30%)	8 (20%)	Sometimes
----	--	------------	--------------	------------	-------------	---------	-----------

Based on the data presented in the Self Initiation frequency table, sixth-semester EFL students generally exhibit a proactive attitude toward developing their academic writing skills, though the degree of engagement varies across specific strategies. A majority of students reported that they “Often” (40%) or “Always” (25%) make an effort to learn techniques for effective writing, suggesting a strong awareness of the value of technical mastery in academic composition. Similarly, analyzing well-written English essays is a commonly practiced strategy, with 45% selecting “Often” and 30% “Always,” indicating that many learners use model texts to guide their own writing. However, writing practice at home appears to be less consistently applied; although 35% of students responded “Often,” 30% selected “Sometimes,” and only 15% chose “Always,” reflecting a more moderate engagement that may be influenced by factors such as time limitations or motivation. The least frequently used strategy in this subscale is seeking feedback from others, with only 20% reporting “Always” and 30% “Often,” while a combined 22.5% indicated “Never” or “Seldom.” This lower engagement in peer or instructor interaction may suggest hesitancy in seeking critique or limited access to constructive feedback opportunities. Overall, the findings indicate that while students actively apply individual self-initiated strategies which particularly those involving technique acquisition and text analysis socially oriented strategies like feedback-seeking remain underutilized, pointing to an area where targeted instructional support may be beneficial.

b. Planning

Table 2. Frequency Table for Planning

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	During the planning stage, I consider which ideas I want to include in my writing.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	18 (45%)	14 (35%)	Often
2.	While planning, I decide which words, phrases, and sentence structures will express my ideas clearly.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	16 (40%)	10 (25%)	Often
3.	I plan how to arrange my ideas in a logical and effective order.	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)	9 (22.5%)	17 (42.5%)	13 (32.5%)	Often

The analysis of the Planning frequency table indicates that the majority of sixth-semester EFL students consistently engage in pre-writing strategies that support idea development and text organization. For the first item, which asks whether students consider which ideas to include during the planning stage, 80% of respondents reported doing so “Often” (45%) or “Always” (35%), suggesting that idea generation is a commonly internalized aspect of their writing preparation. This pattern reflects an awareness of the importance of content relevance and coherence in academic writing. Similarly, 65% of students reported that they “Often” or “Always” think about appropriate vocabulary, phrases, and sentence structures to clearly express their ideas. Although a quarter of respondents indicated “Sometimes,” this still suggests a general

tendency toward linguistic planning prior to drafting. The third item, concerning the logical arrangement of ideas, was also widely practiced, with 75% selecting “Often” or “Always,” reinforcing the notion that learners recognize the role of organization in producing cohesive texts. The relatively low percentages in the “Never” and “Seldom” categories across all items further emphasize that most students engage regularly with planning strategies. Overall, the findings indicate that EFL learners in this study demonstrate a strong orientation toward thoughtful pre-writing practices, which likely supports the quality and clarity of their academic writing output.

c. Monitoring and Evaluation

Table 3. Frequency Table for Monitoring and Evaluation

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I read my writing out loud to help me find any errors.	3 (7.5%)	5 (12.5%)	11 (27.5%)	12 (30%)	9 (22.5%)	Often
2.	I focus on correct spelling and grammar as I write.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	15 (37.5%)	11 (27.5%)	Often
3.	Once I finish writing, I review my work to ensure it follows the teacher’s instructions.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	17 (42.5%)	13 (32.5%)	Often

The findings from the Monitoring and Evaluation frequency table reveal that most EFL students actively engage in strategies to assess and improve the quality of their writing during and after the writing process. A notable proportion of students reported reading their writing aloud to identify errors, with 30% selecting “Often” and 22.5% “Always,” indicating that this reflective practice is moderately common, though a combined 20% still reported “Never” or “Seldom” doing so, suggesting room for further development in this area. With regard to focusing on correct spelling and grammar during writing, the responses show stronger engagement: 65% of students indicated that they “Often” or “Always” apply this strategy, underscoring a general awareness of linguistic accuracy as a key component of academic writing. The most consistently applied monitoring strategy was reviewing the final text to ensure it aligns with the teacher’s instructions, with 75% of respondents selecting “Often” or “Always” and no students reporting “Never.” This reflects students’ understanding of task requirements and their ability to evaluate their output against academic expectations. Overall, the data suggest that while monitoring and evaluation behaviors are widely practiced, especially regarding alignment with instructional guidelines, there remains variability in the adoption of more reflective techniques such as reading aloud, pointing to potential areas for instructional reinforcement.

2. Cognitive Strategies

d. Revising

Table 4. Frequency Table for Revising

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I change content when checking my essay.	2 (5%)	5 (12.5%)	14 (35%)	13 (32.5%)	6 (15%)	Sometimes



2.	I change spelling or punctuation when checking my essay.	0 (0%)	3 (7.5%)	9 (22.5%)	15 (37.5%)	13 (32.5%)	Often
3.	I change words or phrases when checking my essay.	1 (2.5%)	4 (10%)	10 (25%)	16 (40%)	9 (22.5%)	Often
4.	I change grammar when checking my essay.	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	11 (27.5%)	15 (37.5%)	11 (27.5%)	Often

The data from the Revising frequency table indicate that EFL students are actively engaged in various revision strategies, particularly in the areas of language accuracy and expression. For the first item which indicates changing content when reviewing an essay, student responses were more evenly distributed, with the majority selecting “Sometimes” (35%) and “Often” (32.5%). This suggests that while many students are willing to reconsider their ideas during revision, content-level changes may be more cognitively demanding or less emphasized in instruction compared to surface-level edits. In contrast, revisions related to spelling and punctuation were more consistently applied, with 70% of students reporting “Often” or “Always” making such changes, and no one selecting “Never.” This trend highlights a strong awareness of mechanical accuracy during the revision process. Similarly, word and phrase revisions were frequently practiced, with 62.5% indicating they revised these elements “Often” or “Always,” demonstrating students’ attention to improving clarity and precision in language use. Grammar corrections also showed a high level of engagement, as 65% of students reported revising grammatical errors regularly. Overall, the data suggest that EFL learners in this study are more confident and consistent in revising language-related issues than in reworking content. This pattern points to the need for pedagogical support that encourages deeper revisions focused on idea development and content organization in addition to surface-level corrections.

e. Text Generating

Table 5. Frequency Table for Text Generating

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I revise the content of my essay when I review it.	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	13 (32.5%)	14 (35%)	5 (12.5%)	Often
2.	I correct spelling and punctuation errors during the revision process.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	10 (25%)	16 (40%)	12 (30%)	Often
3.	I replace or improve words and phrases while reviewing my essay.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	11 (27.5%)	15 (37.5%)	10 (25%)	Often
4.	I fix grammar mistakes when editing my writing.	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	17 (42.5%)	9 (22.5%)	11 (27.5%)	Sometimes

The results of the table of frequency of Text Generating reveal that EFL students engage actively in revising and editing strategies during the writing process, particularly in areas related to language form and expression. A large portion of students reported revising the content of their essays, with 35% selecting “Often” and 32.5% “Sometimes,”

indicating a moderate level of engagement with meaning-level revisions. However, the relatively lower percentage of students selecting “Always” (12.5%) suggests that while many consider content during revision, they may prioritize surface-level corrections over deeper structural changes. This pattern is further reflected in responses to spelling and punctuation corrections, where the strategy was among the most frequently applied, as 70% of students reported doing this “Often” or “Always,” with no respondents selecting “Never”. Similarly, replacing or refining words and phrases appears to be a common practice, with 62.5% reporting frequent use (“Often” or “Always”), highlighting students’ attention to lexical precision and stylistic clarity. Grammar correction was also a regular part of students’ editing behavior, though with slightly more variation: while 50% indicated “Often” or “Always,” a notable 42.5% reported only “Sometimes,” suggesting that grammatical revision may still pose a challenge for some learners. Overall, the data suggest that students are generally attentive to surface-level language aspects when generating and refining text, yet there remains room for greater emphasis on deeper content revision and consistent grammatical accuracy. This implies that instruction should continue to reinforce both linguistic and organizational aspects of revision to enhance the overall quality of students’ academic writing.

f. Resourcing

Table 6. Frequency Table for Resourcing

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I use a dictionary to help me understand or choose the right words when I have trouble with vocabulary.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	9 (22.5%)	17 (42.5%)	12 (30%)	Often
2.	I refer to grammar books, textbooks, or writing guides when I face challenges in writing.	1 (2.5%)	4 (10%)	12 (30%)	15 (37.5%)	8 (20%)	Often
3.	I search online for ideas when I struggle to come up with content for my writing.	0 (0%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	13 (32.5%)	14 (35%)	Always

The results of the Resourcing frequency table indicate that students make regular and strategic use of external resources to support their academic writing. Most notably, the use of dictionaries to resolve vocabulary challenges is a widely adopted strategy, with 42.5% of students reporting "Often" and 30% "Always," suggesting a strong reliance on this tool for lexical precision and word choice. This pattern reflects a common self-regulatory behavior among EFL learners who often consult dictionaries to bridge vocabulary gaps and refine expression. Similarly, consulting grammar books, textbooks, or writing guides is also a frequently used strategy, with nearly 58% of respondents selecting "Often" or "Always." Although this item has a slightly more distributed response pattern, with 30% selecting "Sometimes," it still demonstrates students’ active efforts to seek structured support when dealing with language or content difficulties. The most frequently and consistently practiced resourcing strategy is searching online for ideas when content generation becomes challenging. With 67.5% of students indicating "Often" or "Always," and none selecting "Never," it is clear that digital tools play a vital role in students’ writing preparation. These findings collectively highlight that EFL



students are resourceful and intentional in their use of reference materials and digital platforms, integrating these aids as part of their self-regulated learning strategies to overcome linguistic and ideational difficulties in academic writing.

3. Social Strategies

g. Social Assistance or Collaboration

Table 7. Frequency Table for Social Assistance or Collaboration

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I seek help from my teacher when I encounter problems in writing.	1 (2.5%)	4 (10%)	11 (27.5%)	16 (40%)	8 (20%)	Often
2.	I ask my classmates for support when I face difficulties in writing.	0 (0%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	15 (37.5%)	12 (30%)	Often
3.	I visit writing tutors, centers, or workshops when I need assistance with my writing.	5 (12.5%)	10 (25%)	14 (35%)	8 (20%)	3 (7.5%)	Sometimes
4.	I share and exchange ideas with peers to support my writing process.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	14 (35%)	12 (30%)	Often
5.	I talk with my peers to gather more ideas for my writing.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	12 (30%)	14 (35%)	12 (30%)	Often
6.	I collaborate with peers to finish a writing assignment.	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	13 (32.5%)	12 (30%)	7 (17.5%)	Sometimes

The data from the Social Assistance or Collaboration frequency table suggest that EFL students frequently engage in peer- and teacher-supported strategies to enhance their academic writing, though engagement with formal writing support services remains relatively limited. A strong majority reported seeking help from teachers when facing writing difficulties, with 60% indicating “Often” or “Always,” reflecting a tendency to rely on instructor guidance as a primary form of support. Peer assistance is also commonly utilized; 67.5% of students reported “Often” or “Always” asking classmates for help, and similar trends were seen in sharing and exchanging ideas (65%) and talking with peers to generate content (65%). These findings highlight the importance of informal, collaborative environments in facilitating writing development among EFL learners. However, institutional support options such as writing centers or workshops appear to be underutilized, with 72.5% of students indicating “Sometimes” or less, suggesting possible issues related to access, awareness, or preference for peer-based interaction. Lastly, collaboration on writing assignments was moderately practiced, with 32.5% selecting “Sometimes” and 47.5% choosing “Often” or “Always.” Overall, these results point to a strong reliance on social learning through peer and teacher interaction, while also indicating a potential need to encourage greater use of formal academic writing resources.

h. Acting on Feedback

Table 8. Frequency Table for Acting on Feedback

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I use my teacher's feedback to make my writing better.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	17 (42.5%)	13 (32.5%)	Often
2.	I note or remember suggestions from others so I can use them later in my writing.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	11 (27.5%)	15 (37.5%)	10 (25%)	Often
3.	I reflect on the feedback I receive to improve my compositions	1 (2.5%)	4 (10%)	12 (30%)	14 (35%)	9 (22.5%)	Often

The findings from the frequency table of Acting on Feedback demonstrate that EFL students consistently engage with feedback as part of their writing improvement process, particularly through teacher input and peer suggestions. The majority of students reported that they “Often” (42.5%) or “Always” (32.5%) use teacher feedback to enhance their writing, indicating a high level of responsiveness to instructional guidance and a recognition of its value in academic development. Similarly, a combined 62.5% of students noted that they “Often” or “Always” remember or take note of suggestions from others for future use, reflecting a strategic approach to feedback that extends beyond immediate revisions. Although slightly more varied, the practice of reflecting on received feedback also showed strong engagement, with 57.5% of students selecting “Often” or “Always,” suggesting that many learners engage in metacognitive thinking about their performance. The relatively low responses in the “Never” and “Seldom” categories across all items highlight that most students view feedback not as a one-time correction but as an integral part of their writing development. Overall, these results point to a well-established feedback culture among the learners, where feedback is actively processed and utilized as a meaningful tool for academic writing improvement.

4. Motivational or Affective Regulation Strategies

i. Interest Enhancement (IE)

Table 9. Frequency Table for Interest Enhancement (IE)

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I select topics that interest me to make writing practice more enjoyable.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	15 (37.5%)	11 (27.5%)	Often
2.	I relate the writing task to my personal experiences to keep myself engaged.	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	9 (22.5%)	16 (40%)	11 (27.5%)	Often
3.	I link the writing task to my own interests to stay motivated.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	11 (27.5%)	14 (35%)	11 (27.5%)	Often

The results from the Interest Enhancement (IE) frequency table above indicate that EFL students frequently employ motivation-driven strategies to sustain engagement during academic writing tasks. A strong majority of students reported that they "Often" (37.5%)



or "Always" (27.5%) select topics that interest them, suggesting that personal relevance plays a key role in maintaining their enthusiasm for writing. Similarly, relating writing tasks to personal experiences was also a widely used approach, with 67.5% indicating they "Often" or "Always" do so, highlighting a strategic effort to connect academic work with lived realities to make it more meaningful. The third item, linking the task to personal interests, yielded comparable results, with 62.5% of students frequently applying this strategy. These findings collectively suggest that interest enhancement is a common and effective motivational strategy among EFL learners. By aligning writing tasks with personal interests and experiences, students are likely fostering deeper engagement, which in turn may support sustained effort and improved writing outcomes. The consistently low percentage of "Never" and "Seldom" responses further underscores the general importance of interest-based motivation in students' self-regulated writing practices.

j. Emotional Control (EC)

Table 10. Frequency Table for Emotional Control (EC)

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I remind myself to stay calm during writing tests or when answering writing-related questions.	1 (2.5%)	3 (7.5%)	11 (27.5%)	15 (37.5%)	10 (25%)	Often
2.	I encourage myself to continue writing even when I feel like stopping.	2 (5%)	4 (10%)	10 (25%)	14 (35%)	10 (25%)	Often
3.	I manage my emotions when I face challenges in writing.	1 (2.5%)	5 (12.5%)	12 (30%)	13 (32.5%)	9 (22.5%)	Often

The results from the Emotional Control (EC) frequency table above indicate that EFL students regularly utilize strategies to manage their emotional responses during academic writing tasks. A strong majority of students reported that they "Often" (37.5%) or "Always" (25%) remind themselves to stay calm during writing tests or writing-related activities, suggesting a conscious effort to maintain composure in potentially stressful situations. Similarly, 60% of the students stated that they "Often" or "Always" encourage themselves to continue writing even when they feel like stopping, which reflects a high level of perseverance and internal motivation. Managing emotions when facing challenges in writing was also commonly reported, with 55% selecting "Often" or "Always," although a noticeable portion (30%) reported doing so only "Sometimes." These findings indicate that while emotional control is generally well-practiced, there remains variability in how consistently students apply these strategies. Overall, emotional control appears to be an integral part of EFL learners' self-regulated learning behaviors, helping them to persist through difficulties and sustain their writing performance under pressure.

k. Motivational Self-Talk (MST)

Table 11. Frequency Table for Motivational Self-Talk (MST)

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
-----	-----------	----------	-----------	--------------	----------	-----------	------------------------

1.	I motivate myself to practice writing so I can achieve better grades.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	10 (25%)	17 (42.5%)	11 (27.5%)	Often
2.	I remind myself that continuous study is necessary to develop my writing skills.	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	16 (40%)	13 (32.5%)	Often
3.	I encourage myself to put in effort in writing classes to enhance both my skills and understanding.	0 (0%)	3 (7.5%)	10 (25%)	14 (35%)	13 (32.5%)	Often
4.	I motivate myself to stay engaged in writing classes to discover how much I can improve.	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	9 (22.5%)	15 (37.5%)	13 (32.5%)	Often

The results from the Motivational Self-Talk (MST) frequency table indicate that EFL students consistently apply internal motivational strategies to sustain effort and engagement in academic writing tasks. A significant number of students reported that they "Often" (42.5%) or "Always" (27.5%) motivate themselves to practice writing to achieve better grades, suggesting a clear goal-oriented mindset that supports their writing development. Similarly, 72.5% of students indicated that they "Often" or "Always" remind themselves of the importance of continuous study to improve writing skills, reflecting strong awareness of the long-term nature of writing proficiency. Encouraging oneself to exert effort in writing classes was also a commonly practiced strategy, with 67.5% responding "Often" or "Always," highlighting learners' commitment to both skill and understanding. Lastly, staying engaged in class to monitor personal improvement was frequently endorsed, with 70% of students selecting the top two frequency options. These findings suggest that motivational self-talk is a prevalent and effective self-regulation tool among EFL learners. It helps reinforce persistence, focus, and confidence, factors that are essential for navigating the challenges of academic writing in a foreign language.

1. Self-consequence (SC)

Table 12. Frequency Table for Self-Consequence (SC)

No.	Statement	Never Do	Seldom Do	Sometimes Do	Often Do	Always Do	Most Frequent Response
1.	I give myself a reward when I am satisfied with how I performed in writing.	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	11 (27.5%)	13 (32.5%)	8 (20%)	Often
2.	I feel more motivated to write when others recognize or praise my writing.	1 (2.5%)	5 (12.5%)	10 (25%)	12 (30%)	12 (30%)	Often
3.	I reflect on the reasons behind poor writing performance to understand what went wrong.	0 (0%)	3 (7.5%)	9 (22.5%)	16 (40%)	12 (30%)	Often



4.	I discipline myself when I'm unhappy with my writing performance.	3 (7.5%)	5 (12.5%)	13 (32.5%)	12 (30%)	7 (17.5%)	Sometimes
----	---	----------	-----------	------------	----------	-----------	-----------

The results from the Self-Consequence (SC) frequency table indicate that EFL students regularly engage in self-regulatory behaviors that involve both positive reinforcement and critical reflection on their writing performance. A substantial portion of students reported that they "Often" (32.5%) or "Always" (20%) give themselves a reward when satisfied with their writing, suggesting that self-reward is a commonly used strategy to sustain motivation. In addition, 60% of students indicated that they "Often" or "Always" feel more motivated to write when others recognize or praise their work, emphasizing the role of external validation in maintaining writing effort. Reflective behavior was especially strong, with 70% of students stating that they "Often" or "Always" think about the reasons behind poor writing performance to identify what went wrong, reflecting a thoughtful and metacognitive approach to learning. In contrast, disciplinary actions such as self-imposed consequences were less prevalent, with only 47.5% reporting they "Often" or "Always" do so, while 32.5% responded "Sometimes." These findings suggest that while self-consequence strategies are present among EFL learners, they are more likely to engage in motivational and reflective responses than punitive ones. This highlights the importance of fostering balanced self-regulation habits that not only celebrate progress but also encourage constructive responses to setbacks in academic writing.

The findings from this study underscore the central role of self-regulated learning (SRL) in shaping EFL students' writing behaviors, validating the theoretical constructs proposed by SRL theorists (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Students demonstrated varied yet consistently active engagement with multiple SRL strategies throughout the writing process, ranging from planning and resourcing to emotional control and motivational regulation. The high frequency of use reported for strategies like goal setting, interest enhancement, and motivational self-talk reveals that students are not passive recipients of instruction, but rather active agents capable of directing their own learning through reflective and goal-oriented behavior.

Metacognitive strategies were prominently used in planning, monitoring, and evaluating writing tasks. Students reported behaviors such as thinking ahead about their essay structure, organizing ideas, and reviewing drafts for alignment with the assignment goals. This strategic behavior supports effective task management and fosters autonomy in learning (Andriyani et al., 2024). Cognitive strategies also emerged as critical components in students' SRL toolkit. Learners actively used dictionaries, revised sentence structures, and generated ideas to enhance their drafts. These findings are in line with research showing that cognitive and metacognitive strategies mediate the relationship between motivation and writing proficiency (Teng & Huang, 2018). Social strategies were commonly reported. Students sought assistance from teachers and peers, exchanged feedback, and collaborated on writing tasks, reinforcing the social dimension of learning and its role in academic success (Yang, 2024). Motivational or affective regulation strategies were consistently applied, particularly in the form of motivational self-talk and emotional regulation. Students encouraged themselves to persevere through writing difficulties and used interest enhancement to stay engaged. These strategies are essential for managing stress and maintaining consistent effort, especially in cognitively demanding tasks like academic writing (Teng, 2021).

While earlier studies indicated moderate use of SRL strategies among EFL learners (Abadikhah et al., 2018), the current findings suggest a more extensive and integrated application of SRL behaviors, particularly in Indonesian university contexts. This may reflect evolving pedagogical approaches that more explicitly promote learner autonomy and reflective practice. These findings carry important implications for teaching. Writing instructors should model and scaffold metacognitive routines such as planning and evaluation, encourage the use of cognitive tools like outlining and paraphrasing, support motivational strategies through goal setting and interest-based tasks, and provide opportunities for peer collaboration. Structured implementation of these components has been shown to improve writing outcomes and learner confidence (Shen & Wang, 2024). In sum, this study affirms the relevance of SRL theory in EFL writing instruction and highlights the importance of integrating metacognitive, cognitive, social and motivational or affective regulation dimensions into classroom practices to support student growth and academic success.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that EFL students in an academic writing class actively engage in a diverse range of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies encompassing metacognitive, cognitive, motivational or affective, and social dimensions. The frequent application of metacognitive strategies such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating reflects learners' growing autonomy in managing their writing processes. Cognitive strategies like revising content, consulting reference materials, and generating ideas were also commonly employed, suggesting that students approach writing tasks with deliberate effort and strategic thinking. The consistent use of social strategies such as seeking feedback and collaborating with peers highlights the value of interaction in refining ideas and developing writing competence. Furthermore, motivational or affective regulation strategies including motivational self-talk, emotional control, and interest enhancement played a significant role in helping students sustain effort and manage the emotional challenges associated with academic writing. Collectively, these findings affirm the relevance of SRL theory in EFL contexts and underscore the need for writing instruction that explicitly incorporates SRL components. By fostering environments where learners are supported in setting goals, monitoring progress, regulating emotions, and engaging with others, educators can enhance students' writing performance and promote greater learner independence.

THANK-YOU NOTE

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided by the Beasiswa Pendidikan Indonesia (BPI) program, which enabled the completion of this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abadikhah, S., Aliyan, Z., & Talebi, S. H. (2018). EFL Students' Attitudes towards Self-Regulated Learning Strategies in Academic Writing. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(1), 1–17. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55540884>
- Al-Jarrah, T. M., Mansor, N., & Rashid, R. A. (2018). The Impact of Metacognitive Strategies on Jordanian EFL Learners' Writing Performance. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(6), 328–339. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:53958777>



- Amri, Z. (2024). Self-regulated Learning and Academic Achievement in the EFL Classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2024.6.1.11>
- Andrade, M. S., & Evans, N. W. (2012). *Principles and Practices for Response in Second Language Writing: Developing Self-Regulated Learners*. Routledge.
- Andriyani, S., Anam, S., & Nugroho, H. A. (2024). Can Self-Regulation make a difference? Exploring Students' Voices in Academic Writing Course. *XLinguae*, 17(4), 300–316. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:274013926>
- Ariyanti, A., Fitriana, R., & Pane, W. S. (2018). Self-Regulated Learning in Writing of EFL Learners. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 155–166. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:150446814>
- Balaman, S. (2021). Investigating the relationship between the perception of self-efficacy and the use of self-regulated learning strategies in the English writing skill. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 23, 768–796. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:236257041>
- Balle, S. H., & Olsen, M. (2023). From words to text – academic writing in EFL classrooms. *Nordic Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 11(3), 16–27. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267324886>
- Chien, S.-C. (2012). Students' use of writing strategies and their English writing achievements in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 32, 112–193. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143529425>
- Hall, S., & Liebenberg, L. (2024). Qualitative Description as an Introductory Method to Qualitative Research for Master's-Level Students and Research Trainees. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 23, 16094069241242264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241242264>
- Han, L. (2024). Metacognitive Writing Strategy Instruction in the EFL Context: Focus on Writing Performance and Motivation. *SAGE Open*, 14(2), 21582440241257080. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241257081>
- Juliaty, H. (2019). Exploring academic identities of EFL novice writers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 324–334. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:208071262>
- Mahmud, Y. S., & German, E. (2021). ONLINE SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES AMID A GLOBAL PANDEMIC: INSIGHTS FROM INDONESIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 18(2), 45–68. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2021.18.2.2>
- Mujiono, M. (2024). Self-Efficacy and Self-Regulated Learning's Role in Self-Directed Learning's Impact on Academic Writing Problem-Solving for EFL Undergraduates. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 9(1), 19–32. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:275192543>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press.
- Rozimela, Y., & Wahyuni, D. (2019). The Relationship between Students' Perceived Needs, Their Learning Preferences, and Their Ability of Writing an Academic Text. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 7(2), 1–9. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:151136964>

- Shen, B., & Wang, L. (2024). Development and validation of Questionnaire for Self-regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 1–31. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/iral-2023-0192>
- Shen, Bing, & Bai, B. (2022). Chinese university students' self-regulated writing strategy use and EFL writing performance: influences of self-efficacy, gender, and major. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15, 161–188. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248325281>
- Sun, J., Motevalli, S., Chan, N. N., & Khodi, A. (2024). Implementation of Self-regulated Learning Writing Module: Amplifying Motivation and Mitigating Anxiety among EFL Learners. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 89–109. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:271023995>
- Taufiqulloh, T. (2015). A SELF-ASSESSMENT MODEL IN TEACHING ACADEMIC WRITING FOR INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 50–58. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54737311>
- Teng, (Mark) Feng, & Huang, J. (2018). Predictive Effects of Writing Strategies for Self-Regulated Learning on Secondary School Learners' EFL Writing Proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 232–247. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:149770373>
- Teng, L. S. (2021). Individual differences in self-regulated learning: Exploring the nexus of motivational beliefs, self-efficacy, and SRL strategies in EFL writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(2), 366–388. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:234833489>
- Truong, K. D., & Tran, B. C. N. (2022). Higher Order Thinking Skills in Teaching Academic Writing: Suggestions for Application. *The New English Teacher*, 16(1), 101–124.
- 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://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:225870526>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2021). Engaging EFL Students in English Phrases of Academic Writing: How and Why? *Prominent*, 4(2), 116–126. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:251454850>
- Yang, M. (2024). Fostering EFL university students' motivation and self-regulated learning in writing: A socio-constructivist approach. *System*, 124(12). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103386>
- Zhao, Z., Nimehchisalem, V., & Chan, M. Y. (2024). Independent Writing Tasks vs. Integrated Writing Tasks: The Cognitive Demands and Their Impacts on Linguistic Complexity in EFL Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(8), 2606–2617. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:271832368>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). Self-Regulated Learning and Performance. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance* (pp. 1–12). Routledge.