Strategies of Learning English Writing Skill by Indonesian Senior High School Students

Junaidi Mistar
English Education Department, Graduate Program
Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia

Alfan Zuhairi
English Education Department, Graduate Program
Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia

Firman Parlindungan
English Education Department, Undergraduate Program
Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia

Abstract
The research addresses three research objectives: (1) to identify learning strategies of writing skill used by senior high school students in Indonesia, (2) to measure the extent of use of the strategy categories, and (3) to study the differences in the use of the strategies by successful and less successful learners. The subjects of the study were 766 second year senior high school students in East Java, Indonesia. They were asked to complete a questionnaire of strategies of learning writing skill and a self-assessment. The results of the data analysis using Principal Component Analysis yielded twelve components with an initial eigenvalue greater than 1, explaining a cumulative variance of strategies 57.68%. The component matrix was rotated using Varimax with Keiser Normalisation Method and the resulting factors were then treated as posteriori strategy categories and named self-monitoring, language-focusing, planning, metacognitive affective, cognitive compensation, self-evaluating, social process-focusing, authentic practicing, meaning-focusing, vocabulary developing, metacognitive commencement, and mental processing strategies. All of these strategies were used at the moderate frequency level. Finally, successful learners reported using the strategies more frequently than less successful learners did.
*Keywords***:** language learning strategies, writing skill, writing strategies, strategies to learn writing skill

Introduction

Interest in studies directed at identifying and classifying learning strategies of second/foreign language learners did not emerge until the mid 1970s. At first the attempts came mainly from literature reviews or studies in the area of second language learning, rather than foreign language learning. Stern (1975) initiated them by drawing up a list of ten strategies that good language learners employ in their learning, including planning, active, emphatic, formal, experimental, semantic, practice, communication, monitoring, and internalization strategies. Then, using Stern's list as a framework, Rubin (1975) identified that good language learners are willing and accurate guessers, are not inhibited, have a strong drive to communicate, monitor their own speech and the speech of others, and focus on meaning as well on form. Similar studies are then carried out by other researchers (Chesterfield & Chesterfield, 1985; Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978). In the later development, the studies covered not only good but also less good language learners with cognitive psychology paradigm as their underlying theoretical basis (O'Malley, Chamot, Stenwe-Manzanares, Russo & Küpper, 1985) resulting in the classification of strategies into metacognitve, cognitive, and social. This area of research is even more popular when Oxford (1990) provided a detailed classification of language learning strategies, which she then converted into a readily-used questionnaire called Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL).

A great number of studies using Oxford's SILL are then carried out around the world and these studies can be classified into three categories. The first are studies attempting to reveal the use of strategies descriptively, such as Merrifiled (1996) in French, Oxford and Ehrman (1995) in the United States, Lunt (2000) in Australia, Wharton (2000) in Singapore, and Mistar (2001a) in Indonesia. Most of the studies reveal that the learners are moderate users of the strategies. The second are studies treating learning strategies as a predictor of learning success as measured either by language proficiency or achievement tests. Within this category are studies by Dreyer and Oxford (1996) in South Africa, Mistar (2006) and Setyadi (2004) in Indonesia, and Park (1997) in South Korea. These studies come up with a conclusion that learning strategies correlate significantly with learning success. The last category are studies attempting to find factors that may affect the use of learning strategies. Motivation, proficiency level, course status, gender, career choice, cognitive styles, personality, and length of study are found to affect the use of strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; El-dib, 2004; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Mistar, 2001b; Yang, 2007).

The current trend is studying the skill-based language learning strategies. In the case of strategies to learn writing, two studies carried in Europe are to mention. One is by Kieft, Rijlaarsdam, and van den Bergh (2006), who studied the effectiveness of adapting writing-to-learn task to different writing strategies (planning writing strategy and revising writing strategy) when teaching literature to 113 tenth-grade high school students in Netherlands. The result showed that a course adapted to the planning writing strategy is more effective for almost all students to improve literary interpretation skill. The other one is a study by Torrance, Thomas, and Robinson (1994), who investigated the writing strategies of graduate research students in the social sciences in UK. They divided the subjects into three categories; planners, revisers, and mixed strategy writers. The planners showed higher productivity than the two strategy writers. The conclusion of the study is that planning can be effective for some students, but planning alone will not guarantee for writing success. In Africa, moreover, Boudaoud (2013), investigating constructive planning strategy in writing used by English students at the University

of Constantine, Algeria, yielded that outlining strategy, particularly cognitive and metacognitive, affect not only a better logical organization of ideas in writing, but also a better overall writing quality.

In Asian context, Abdullah et al. (2011) profiled writing strategies of four ESL Malay undergraduate engineering students of a local private university in writing English. It revealed that the skilled and unskilled students shared common writing strategies mainly cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies to generate ideas in essay writing. Chen (2011), moreover, correlated writing strategies and writing achievement among Chinese non-English majors. The results indicated that pre-writing strategies and revising strategies positively correlate with students' writing achievements. Finally, in Middle East, Alnufaie and Grenfell (2012) studied EFL students' writing strategies in Saudi Arabian ESP writing classes. The result indicated the use of two strategy categories, process-oriented writing strategies and product-oriented writing strategies. Moreover, it showed that 95.9 % of the participants mixed the two kinds of strategies.

Based on the studies reviewed above, it is clear that, while studies on general strategies of learning a second/foreign language have been carried out in a mountainous number around the world, studies that specifically focus on strategies of learning writing skill are still limited. Moreover, most studies are carried out among university students and none is done among senior high school students. It is in this context that the present study is carried out and it addresses three research problems: (1) what strategies do Indonesian senior high school students use in learning writing skill of English?, (2) how do they use the identified learning strategies?, and (3) is there any difference in the use of the identified strategies by successful and less successful learners?.

Research Method

Using descriptive and ex-post facto designs, the present study was participated by 766 second year students of science department of eleven senior high schools in East Java, Indonesia. They studied English for four hours a week as a compulsory subject in the context of English as a foreign language and had been learning it formally for five years, three years in junior high school and two years in senior high school. The ultimate goal of its teaching is to equip the students with the command of communicating oral and written English. Thus, the instructional process is carried out by focussing on the four language skills, including speaking, writing, listening, and reading. The teaching of grammar and vocabulary is carried out in the context of teaching the language skills.

The subjects were asked to complete two research instruments, a questionnaire of strategies of learning writing skill and a self-assessment. The questionnaire consisted of seventy items prepared in the Indonesian language. The reliability index of the data from the questionnaire as measured by using Cronbach's Alpha method (Pallant, 2011) was .935, indicating very high reliability. Moreover, the self-assessment contained 10 items asking the students to self-assess their writing performance. To each item, they had to respond by circling 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 indicating how well they were able to perform a writing act with 1 being 'not at all', 2 'with much difficulty', 3 'with some difficulty', 4 'with very little difficulty', and 5 'easily'. Self-assessment data have been found to be reliable as they correlate significantly with language proficiency (Bachman & Palmer, 1989). Goldburg's study (2013) on the relationship between the actual L2 writing ability and the self-assessed writing proficiency supports the reliability of self-assessment data.

The gathered data were analyzed statistically using SPSS 20. First, the data were factor analyzed using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to produce a posteriori taxonomy of strategies. Before having PCA, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was checked in terms of its Barlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Pallant, 2011). The analysis found that the KMO index was .967 and the Barlett's Test of Spherecity was significant the .000 level indicating that the data were factorable. The identified factors were then named based on the underlying strategy items that provided high loading. When an item provided high loadings to more than one factor, a decision was made regarding with which factor the item was best grouped.   Moreover, a descriptive analysis by computing mean scores was also employed to measure the intensity of use and it is considered low when the mean is between 1.00 and 2.44, moderate between 2.45 and 3.44, and high between 3.45 and 5.00 (Oxford, 1990). Finally, independent samples t-tests were performed to answer the question of the difference in the use of strategies between successful and less successful students. In this case, students scoring 36 or more in the self-assessment were grouped as successful learners, while those scoring 25 or less were considered less successful, leaving out those scoring between 26 and 35.

Results and Discussion
Results
Question 1: What strategies do Indonesian senior high school students use in learning writing skill of English?
The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) discerned twelve factors with an initial eigenvalue 1 or greater explaining a cumulative variance of 57.68% (see Table 1). Factor 1 got high loadings (more than .3) from ten strategy items and it accounted for 33.44% of variance of learning strategies of writing. The items mainly dealt with correcting mistakes by reading, rewriting, and noticing mistakes. It also included strategies to be aware of and correct which words or grammar rules give the greatest trouble, strategies of reading text regularly when writing to check the satisfaction of the work, strategies to remember the meanings of words or the patterns by writing them, and strategies to make sure that each sentence was accurate and perfect before writing another sentence. Therefore, this factor was named self-monitoring strategies because there is tendency, from the underlying items, that students somehow use the monitor system to correct their work.

Factor 2, in addition, explained 4.41% of the variance. Six strategy items provided high loadings to this factor, including such strategies as thinking about rhetorical steps, the use of language features, and communicative function of the text types when writing, writing various kinds of texts, such as descriptive, narrative, news item, etc. Moreover, Factor 2 also consisted of strategies of having attention to feedback given by teacher or friends, and strategies of having attention to the use of transition signal within paragraph to show unity of idea. As such, this factor was described as language-focusing strategies.

Table 1. *The factors of strategies of learning writing skill and their variance*

Factor	Strategy Category	Variance (%)
1	Self-Monitoring Strategies	33.44
2	Language-Focusing Strategies	4.41
3	Planning Strategies	2.98
4	Metacognitve Affective Strategies	2.55
5	Cognitive Compensation Strategies	2.25

6	Self-Evaluating Strategies	2.02
7	Social Process-Focusing Strategies	1.88
8	Authentic Practicing Strategies	1.77
9	Meaning-Focusing Strategies	1.66
10	Vocabulary Developing Strategies	1.61
11	Metacognitive Commencement Strategies	1.58
12	Mental Processing Strategies	1.49
	Cumulative Variance	57.68

Factor 3 accounted for 2.98% of the variance of strategies to learn writing skill and obtained high loadings from seven items that chiefly dealt with pre-writing strategies, such as reading resources to collect information before writing, preparing for a writing plan, doing mind-mapping to generate and cluster ideas, and creating an outline for the whole content and organization. Moreover, such strategies as trying to have a clear argument before writing, writing right away when the argument and the structure of ideas is clear also contributed to this factor. Since these strategies involved activities prior to writing process, this factor was called planning strategies.

Factor 4 obtained high loadings from five strategy items and it explained 2.55% of the variance of learning writing skill. This factor involved strategies allowing students to control their personal feelings when writing, such as trying to relax whenever they feel afraid of using English in writing and giving themselves a reward or treat when they do well in writing. In addition, metacognitive awareness such as thinking about their progress in learning, having clear goals for improving their writing skill, and trying to find out how to be a better writer also provided high loadings to this factor. Thus, it was described as metacognitive affective strategies.

Factor 5, moreover, was called cognitive compensation strategies which explained 2.25% of the variance and consisted of five strategy items. Two of them were cognitive in nature, including strategies of analyzing English words by dividing them into parts and trying to find patterns in English. The other three strategies were compensatory, including making up new words when not knowing the correct ones in English, and using words or phrases with similar meanings in English or even in the first language.

Factor 6 also obtained high loadings from five strategy items and explained 2.02% of the variance. This factor was described as self-evaluating strategies because it dealt greatly with revising process of writing, such as strategies of having revision to improve the clarity, the style, and the content of the writing. Moreover, the layout of the content and the grammar were also the focus of revision.

The rest were factors that explained less than 2% of the variance each. Factor 7, for example, explained 1.88% of the variance with nine strategy items mainly concerned with social aspects of learning such as discussing the topic with others, asking friends or teacher to correct, and asking for examples of how to use a word or expression in English providing high loadings to this factor. Moreover, strategies of focusing on the writing process also contributed high loading to this factor. These strategies included using pictures or other visual aids in writing, thinking about differences between English and Indonesian, and keeping editing while writing. As such, this factor was defined as social process-focusing strategies.

Factor 8, moreover, accounted for 1.77% of the variance which covered four strategy items. This factor mainly dealt with the practice of writing, such as writing letters or messages to

friends, writing notes or reports in English, as well as writing articles for bulletin or school magazine. Therefore, factor 8 was described as authentic practicing strategies.

Next is factor 9 that explained 1.66% of the variance with five strategy items providing high loadings. The items were enormously concerned with meaning-based strategies, like trying to connect shorter sentences into longer sentence to clarify meaning, trying to use a lot of vocabularies, deleting or changing a word, a phrase, or a sentence when the meaning is not clear, trying to make use of complex grammatical structures, and memorizing proverbs or beautiful expressions to enhance and improve the writing. As a result, this factor was said to be meaning-focusing strategies.

Factor 10 was described as vocabulary developing strategies. This factor explained 1.61% of the variance which covered five strategy items about vocabulary exposure, such as remembering a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used, using new English words in sentences so that they can be remembered easily, using the English words in different ways, writing new English words several times, and trying to use correct punctuations when writing.

Factor 11 accounted for 1.58% of the variance which was loaded by five strategy items about metacognitive commencement strategies. Within this factor were strategies of planning writing schedule, finding ways to use English, noticing if nervous when to write, jotting down a few words and then working up notes into an essay, and thinking carefully what to achieve in writing.

The last one, factor 12, explained 1.49% of the variance. This factor was described as mental processing strategies with four strategy items providing high loadings to it, including writing the main ideas first as a guideline, writing ideas bearing in mind, writing sentences to apply certain rules, and writing new material over and over. The complete presentation of the strategies is enclosed in Appendix 1.

Question 2: To what extent do they use the identified strategies of learning writing skill?

The result of the descriptive analysis of the use of each strategy category as well as overall strategies is displayed in Table 2. The table shows that the intensity of use of overall strategies was at the moderate level (M = 3.03), suggesting that the Indonesian senior high school students sometimes used all of the reported strategies. Further inspection of the use of each strategy category revealed a similar finding, i.e the students used the strategies at the moderate level, with eight strategy categories being used with a mean score higher than 3.00 and the other four strategy categories being used with a mean score lower than 3.00. In this case, metacognitive-affective strategies (M = 3.34) and self-monitoring strategies (M = 3.31) were the top two strategy categories used the most frequently and metacognitive commencement strategies (M = 2.85) and authentic practicing strategies (M = 2.48) were the two strategy categories with the lowest freaquency of use. The mean score of use of authentic practicing strategies was even almost at the low range of use.

Table 2. *Intensity of use of strategies of learning writing skill*

Strategy Category	Mean	Intensity	Rank
Metacognitive Affective Strategies	3.34	Moderate	1
Self-Monitoring Strategies	3.31	Moderate	2
Social Process-Focusing Strategies	3.16	Moderate	3
Planning Strategies	3.12	Moderate	4
Self-Evaluating Strategies	3.11	Moderate	5

Vocabulary Developing Strategies	3.07	Moderate	6
Mental Processing Strategies	3.05	Moderate	7
Meaning-Focusing Strategies	3.05	Moderate	8
Language-Focusing Strategies	2.99	Moderate	9
Cognitive Compensation Strategies	2.92	Moderate	10
Metacognitive Commencement Strategies	2.85	Moderate	11
Authentic Practicing Strategies	2.48	Moderate	12
Overall Strategies	3.03	Moderate	

Question 3: Is there any difference in the use of strategies of learning writing skill by successful and less successful learners?

The result of the comparison to find the significance of the difference in the use of the twelve strategy categories is presented in Table 3. As the table shows, the differences in the use of strategies by the successful and less successful learners range from .42 (the lowest difference) for social process-foccusing strategies to .72 (the highest difference) for vocabulary developing strategies. The independent t-test analyses indicated that the successful learners used the twelve categories of the strategies significantly differently from the less successful learners. All of the differences were significant at the .000 level (two-tailed test) with higher mean scores being reported by the successful learners. It implied that the successful learners used the twelve groups of strategies more frequently than the less successful learners did.

Table 3. *The difference in the use of strategies of learning writing skill by successful (N=174) and less successful learners (N=214)*

Strategy Categories	Groups	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value
Self-Monitoring Strategies	Successful	3.68	.71	10.568***
	Less Successful	2.97		
Language-Focusing Strategies	Successful	3.34	.67	9.958***
	Less Successful	2.67		
Planning Strategies	Successful	3.44	.61	8.984***
	Less Successful	2.83		
Metacognitive Affective Strategies	Successful	3.68	.68	9.592***
	Less Successful	3.00		
Cognitive Compensation Strategies	Successful	3.27	.71	10.347***
	Less Successful	2.56		
Self-Evaluating Strategies	Successful	3.49	.69	9.160***
	Less Successful	2.80		
Social Process-Focusing Strategies	Successful	3.37	.42	6.542***
	Less Successful	2.95		
Authentic Practicing Strategies	Successful	2.86	.71	8.995***
	Less Successful	2.15		
Meaning-Focusing Strategies	Successful	3.41	.69	9.758***
	Less Successful	2.72		
Vocabulary Developing Strategies	Successful	3.42	.72	10.737***
	Less Successful	2.70		
Metacognitive Commencement Strat.	Successful	3.10	.50	6.679***
	Less Successful	2.60		

Mental Processing Strategies	Successful	3.40	.64	8.705***
	Less Successful	2.76		

*** The difference is significant at the .000 level (2-tailed)

Discussion

The present study reveals twelve posteriori taxonomies of strategies of learning English writing skill that altogether explained a cumulative variance of 57.68%. This indicates that the instrument used in the present study is able to reveal more than a half of the total variance of strategies of learning writing skill.

Out of the twelve strategies, the first one, self-monitoring strategies, could explain about one third (33.44%) of variance of strategies of learning writing skill. This implies that performance in writing to a large extent depends on how the learners employ self-monitoring mechanisms in their learning. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) describe that monitoring is an internal system of learners to process information consciously. The editing function of the monitor exists when students are trying to edit the writing and correct ungrammatical sentences.

The second category found in this research was described as language-focusing strategies which explained 4.41% of the variance. In his earlier research Mistar (2011) also found the instance of the use of form-focusing strategies, by which the learners pay a great deal of attention to linguistic aspects of English learning. This finding implies the necessity of having explicit or implicit form-focused instruction to improve students' writing skill. The form-focused instruction should also cover the teaching of text-structure which is found to significantly affect the writing performance of Arabian learners of English (Amer, 2013). Lighthbown and Spada (2001) argue that form-focused instruction can give advantages for students in terms of both speed and efficiency of learning, as well as in terms of proficiency.

Then, planning, metacognitive affective, cognitive compensation, and self-evaluating strategies may be clustered into a group of strategies that explain around 2.5% of variance each. All together, the four strategy categories explain 9.8% of the variance. As long as the planning strategies are concerned, the present study supports previous findings. Planning strategies have been found to be effective to improve literary interpretation skill (Kieft et al., 2006) and writing achievement (Chen, 2011). Similarly, Torrance et al. (1994) called learners who used a great deal of planning strategies as planners as opposed to revisers and found that planners showed higher productivity in writing than revisers and mix strategy users. Surprisingly, however, Johnson, Mercado, and Acevedo (2012) found pre-task planning did not have any significant effect on lexical and grammatical complexities and had only minor effect on writing fluency by Spanish-speaking learners of English.

Metacognition and affective strategies also play roles in learning to write. Nunan (1999) defines metacognitive strategies as "learning strategies that encourage learners to focus on the mental process underlying their learning" (p.310). In the present study, metacognitive strategies were found to cluster with affective strategies. Saville-Troike (2006) explains that affective factors in the forms of attitude, motivation, and anxiety level significantly influence second language learning and teaching. In the present study, the learners were found to relax when being afraid of using English in writing and to give self-reward when doing well in writing as affective strategies that lower their anxiety level.

Regarding with cognitive compensation strategies, Anitah et al. (2008) define that cognitive activities may consist of all activities that take place in the brain in order to acquire a foreign language. Relating this definition to the micro- and macro-skills of writing proposed by

Brown (2007), it can be said that cognitive strategies can promote micro-skills of writing which deal greatly with word, patterns, and meaning which work absolutely in the brain of the writer. The cognitive strategies, however, vary among learners as they may employ different language processing strategies (Cohen & Macaro, 2007). Thus, teachers should be aware of and understand differences in cognitive processes of the students so that they can provide teaching-learning activities that suit to the students' cognitive strategies. The compensatory elements, moreover, are in the form of looking for words in the first language and findings synonyms in the target language when being stuck in writing. That the learners use their first language in writing English has also been explicated in a study by van Weijen, van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam, and Sanders (2009).

Then, concering about self-evaluating strategies, the present study is consistent with that of Mistar (2011) that the learners employ self-evaluation strategies to learn a new language as a separate category of learning strategies. This taxonomy is quite different from Oxford (1990), who illustrate that self-monitoring and self-evaluating strategies are under metacognitive strategies. In addition, Kieft et al. (2006) and Chen (2011) refer these strategies as revising writing strategies. That some students prefer the use of revising strategies is also admitted in Torrance et al.'s study (1994), in which they group the subjects into those who prefer planning, those who prefer revising, and those who like to do both planning and revising.

The last group of strategy categories found in the present study consists of strategy taxonomies that each explains less than 2% of variance of strategies of learning writing skill. Within this group are social process-focusing, authentic practicing, meaning-focusing, vocabulary developing, metacognitive commencement, and mental processing strategies. As far as authentic practicing strategies are concerned, Brown (2007) recommends that teachers provide as much authentic writing tasks as possible and this stands as one of the nine main principles of teaching writing skills he proposes. Moreover, the emergence of meaning-focusing strategies in the present study is consistent with that of Mistar (2011). The use of vocabulary developing strategies, furthermore, will develop the learners' competence in micro-skills of writing in which they focus on graphemes and orthography patterns of English as well as macro skills of writing in which they focus on contextual use of vocabulary items. Thus, explanation and exploration of meanings (Harmer, 2007) may be pursued to support learners' use of vocabulary developing strategies. Then, the metacognitive aspects of writing are also found in the pre-writing stage. Finally is mental processing strategies such as writing what is thought. Oxford (1990) subsumes mental processing activities as part of memory strategies.

In terms of the frequency of use of strategies, the present study found that metacognitive affective strategies obtained the greatest mean score indicating that the students used metacognitive affective strategies in learning writing skill the most frequently. This is interesting because these strategies are part of indirect strategies (Oxford, 1990) and they are supportive in nature, i.e. they "provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation and empathy and other means" (Oxford, 1990:151). The fact that the students use indirect strategies more highly than the direct strategies such as mental processing startegies, meaning processing strategies and language processing strategies that Alnufaie and Grenfell (2012) call process strategies may stand an explanation for the relatively poor result of teaching writing skill in Indonesia. The data of students' self assessment revealed that those who thought themselves less successful in learning writing outnumbered those who thought successful.

The low use of authentic practicing strategies seems also to be related with the context of English teaching, in which English is a foreign language. As a result, the availability of authentic media for writing like letters, bulletins, magazines, and notes were limited. Brown (2007) pointed out that authenticity in teaching writing is about emerging classroom writing as a real writing act. If writing in classroom is taught to enable students to interact through written forms, they will be able to communicate through writing in educational, business, or personal setting (Weigle, 2002). As such, providing authentic writing practice in classroom is obligatory.

The last point to comment is the finding that successful learners tend to use the strategies more frequently than the less successful learners. This finding is consistent with the findings of several other studies, though they deal with learning English in general. Mistar (2006), for example, found that the use of learning strategies was the best predictor of English proficiency among Indonesian university students. Park (1997) also came up with a conclusion that learning strategies affected learning proficiency significantly among students of English in a Korean university. In Palestine Khalil (2005) found that the overall learning strategy use was affected by the learners' proficiency level. Similarly, Wu (2008) found that high proficiency and low proficiency learners in Taiwan used different strategies. In the context of learning writing skill, Chen (2011) found that pre-writing strategies and revising strategies positively correlate with students' writing achievements. Thus, the present finding implies that trainings of the use of writing strategies should be designed for less successful learners so that they will be able to use the strategies as much as the successful learners do. Expectedly, they will then be able to perform as well as their counterparts, the successful learners. To this point, practices to write authentic pieces of writing such as notes, messages, and articles should be prioritized as the use of authentic practicing strategies was found to be the the least.

Conclusion

This study investigated the categories of strategies of learning English writing skill by Indonesian students of English and it yielded twelve strategy categories that accounted for 57.68% of strategy variance with self-monitoring strategies being the most explaining factor (33.44%) and mental processing strategies the least explaining factor (1.49%). All of the strategy categories were reported to be used at the moderate level (M=3.03) with metacognitive affective strategies being the most frequently used strategies (M=3.34) and authentic practicing strategies being the least frequently used strategies (M=2.48). Finally, successful learners were found to use all of the twelve strategies more frequently than less successful learners did. These findings call for classroom strategies-based instructions to be specifically designed for developing the writing skill of the less successful students.

About the authors:

Dr. Junaidi Mistar is a senior lecturer at English Education Department, Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia. His research articles mainly concerned with strategies in learning English and classroom assessment have been published in Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, AJELT Hong Kong, Korea TESOL, and TEFLIN Journal, Indonesia.

Dr. Alfan Zuhairi is a lecturer at the English Education Department, Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia. He earned his doctorate degree from State University of Malang, Indonesia. His research interest concerns with language learning strategies and language attrition.

Mr. Firman Parlindungan is a non-permanent lecturer at the English Education Department, Undergraduate Program, Islamic University of Malang. He has completed his masters degree from the Graduate Program of English Education Department, Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia.

References

Abdullah, M. R. T. L., Bakar, Z. A., Ali, R. M., Yaacob, R. A. I. R., Rahman, A., Embong, A. M. et al. (2011). Writing strategies of Malaysian ESL undergraduate engineering learners. *IJET-IJENS Journal, 11*(2), 1-9.

Alnufaie, M. & Grenfell, M. (2012). EFL Students' writing strategies in Saudi Arabian ESP writing classes: Perspectives on learning strategies in self-access language learning. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 3*(4), 407-422.

Amer, M. (2013). The effect of explicit instruction in expository text structure on the writing performance of Arab EFL university students. *Arab World English Journal, 4*(1), 224-238.

Anitah, W. S., Setyadi, Ag. B., & Mistar, J. (2008). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa Inggris (Strategies of English teaching)*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1989). The construct validation of self-ratings of communicative language ability. *Language Testing, 6*(1), 14-29.

Boudaoud, R. (2013). Investigating the impact of constructive planning as both a cognitive and metacognitive strategy: A case study of third-year LMD students of English at the University of Constantine Algeria. *Arab World English Journal, 4*(2), 160-172.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Chen, Y. (2011). Study of the writing strategies used by Chinese non-English majors. *Theory and practice in language studies, 1*(3), 245-251.

Chesterfield, R., & Chesterfield, K. B. (1985). Natural order in children's use of second language learning strategies. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 49-59.

Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Language learning strategies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikans Speakers in South Africa. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross cultural-perspectives* (pp. 61-74). Honolulu: University of Hawa'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 1-13.

El-dib, M. A. B. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: Links to gender, language level, and culture in a hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals*, *37*(1), 85-92.

Goldburg, M. E. (2013). English writing proficiency among three types of students in an ESL composition course. *Arab World English Journal, 4*(4), 45-59.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.) Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Johnson, M. D., 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, 21*(3), 264-282.

Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(1), 108-119.

Kieft, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (2006). Writing as a learning tool: testing the role of students' writing strategies. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(1), 17-34.

Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and awareness. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*(1), 7-32.

Lighthbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). *How languages are learned.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lunt, E. H. (2000). *The learning strategies of adult immigrant learners of English: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Merrifield, J. (1996). *Examining the language learning strategies used by French adult learners.* Unpublished masters thesis, Aston University.

Mistar, J. (2001a). The profile of English learning strategies by Indonesian university students. *Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 21-36.

Mistar, J. (2001b). English learning strategies of Indonesian university students across individual difference. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 11,* 19-44.

Mistar, J. (2006). The effect of learning strategies on perceived English proficiency. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 4*(1), 25-36.

Mistar, J. (2011). Learning strategies by Indonesian senior high school EFL learners. *Korea TESOL Journal, 10,* 52-74.

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G, Russo, R. P., & Küpper, L. (1985). Learning strategy application with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quaterly, 19*(3), 557-584.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System, 23*(3), 359-386.

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.). Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Park, G. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(2), 211-221.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Setyadi, Ag. B. (2004). Redesigning language learning strategy classifications [Electronic version]. *TEFLIN Journal, 15*(2), 1-13.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*(3), 304-318.

Torrance, M., Thomas, G. V., & Robinson, E. J. (1994). The writing strategies of graduate research students in the social sciences. *Higher Education, 27*(3), 379-392.

van Wijen, D., van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: an empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 235-250.

Weigle, S. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 203-243.

Wu, Y. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*(4), 75-91. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/December_08_ylw.php.

Yang, M. (2007). Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: Investigating ethnicity and proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(2), 35-57. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_07_mny.php.

Appendix A Posteriori Taxonomy of Strategies of Learning English Writing Skill

Factor 1: Self-Monitoring Strategies
1. I read my writing and correct mistakes.
2. I rewrite my composition by correcting the mistakes that I notice.
3. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
4. Before I consider my text as finished, I read it again to be certain it is worth reading for someone else.
5. I try to be aware of and correct the words or grammar rules that give the greatest trouble.
6. I read my text regularly when writing to check whether I am satisfied with it.
7. I try to remember the meaning of words or the patterns by writing them.
8. I check if each sentence I write is accurate and perfect before I write another sentence.
9. I constantly check the grammar in my writing.
10. I write more than one draft before handing in the final product of the essay.

Factor 2: Language-Focusing Strategies
1. I think of rhetorical steps of the text when writing in English.
2. I think of the use of language features of the text when writing in English.
3. I think of communicative purposes of the text when writing in English.
4. I write various kinds of texts in English (descriptive, narrative, news item, etc.).
5. I pay attention to the use of transition signals within paragraph to show unity of ideas.
6. I pay attention to feedback given by my teacher or friends about my writing.

Factor 3: Planning Strategies
1. Before writing, I do mind-mapping to generate and cluster my ideas.
2. Before writing, I create an outline for the whole content and organization.
3. I always make a writing plan before I start to write.
4. Before I start writing, I read about the topic and collect information from different sources.
5. I try to have my argument clear before starting writing.
6. I start writing right away after I have a clear argument.
7. I like to start writing when both ideas and structures are clear in my mind.

Factor 4: Metacognitive Affective Strategies
1. I think of my progress in learning English writing.
2. I have clear goals for improving my English writing skill.
3. I try to find out how to be a better writer of English.
4. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English in writing.
5. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in writing.

Factor 5: Cognitive Compensation Strategies
1. I analyze English words by dividing them into parts that I understand.
2. I try to find patterns in English.
3. I make up new words if I do not know the right one in English.

4. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
5. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Factor 6: Self-Evaluating Strategies
1. I do revising to improve the clarity of my writing.
2. I do revising to improve the style of my writing.
3. I do revising to develop the content of my writing.
4. When revising, I focus on the layout of the content.
5. When revising, I focus on grammar as well as ideas.

Factor 7: Social Process-Focusing Strategies
1. I discuss the topic of writing with others (my teachers, my classmates, etc.).
2. I ask my friends or my teacher to correct my writing.
3. I ask for examples of how to use a word or expression in English.
4. I use pictures or other visual aids to get ideas in English writing.
5. I think about the differences between English and Indonesian to avoid making mistakes.
6. I interrupt myself when I notice that I have made a mistake in writing.
7. I stop after each sentence or paragraph to relate ideas together and get more new ideas.
8. When I revise, I rearrange sentences and paragraphs to make ideas clear.
9. I keep editing until I finish writing the whole passage.

Factor 8: Authentic Practicing Strategies
1. I write letters to my friends in English.
2. I write messages to my friends in English.
3. I write notes, letters, or reports in English.
4. I write for wall magazines, bulletins, and school magazines in English.

Factor 9: Meaning-Focusing Strategies
1. I delete or change a word, a phrase, or a sentence when the meaning is not clear.
2. I try to connect shorter sentences into longer sentences to have the meaning clear.
3. I try to use a lot of vocabularies.
4. I try to make use of complex grammatical structures.
5. I memorize proverb or beautiful expression to enhance and improve my writing.

Factor 10: Vocabulary Developing Strategies
1. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
2. I use new English words in sentences so that I can remember them.
3. I use the English words I know in different ways.
4. I write new English words several times.
5. I try to use the correct punctuations when writing.

Factor 11: Metacognitive Commencement Strategies
1. I plan my schedule so that I have enough time to write in English.
2. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
3. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am writing.
4. When I am going to write a text, I jot down a few words and then I work up my notes into an essay.
5. Before I start writing, I think carefully of what I want to achieve and how I am going to approach it.

Factor 12: Mental Processing Strategies
1. I write the main ideas first as a guideline.
2. I write what I am thinking about.
3. I write sentences to apply certain rules.
4. I write new materials over and over.