TESOL International Journal

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

TESOL International Journal

Editorial Board

Contents

The Effectiveness of Self-Regulated Strategy Development on Improving Students' Narrative Text Writing Achievement

Lamhot Naibaho*

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

Abstract

This study is about the effectiveness of self-regulated (SRSD) strategy development on improving students' narrative text writing achievement. Narrative writing is a text that tells a story with a corresponding chronological sequence of events to entertain the reader. This study was done to find out whether SRSD is sufficient to improve the students' narrative text writing achievement. It was done at Teruna Muda School, and the method of the study was used as a classroom action research method. The subject of the study was 43 students who were learning narrative text have participated in this study. They were taught to write narrative text using SRSD. The result of this study was an improvement of students' scores in writing narrative text; it is about 62% of improvement. The conclusion is that the SRSD improved the students' essay writing achievement.

Keywords: improving, narrative text, SRSD, and classroom action research

Introduction

Some students will find it anxious when talking about writing since it is more complicated than other language skills. Therefore, the teacher should teach it well at the school or university level, especially to students majoring in language education or literature. "Since writing is one of the most challenging skills in language, of course, the teacher must be familiar with learning methods, strategies and techniques of writing in order to make the class as attractive as possible, to make the students more comfortable to understand writing, and to encourage the students to be creative students in mastering writing" (Harris & Graham, 2009). Therefore, an English teacher must apply a proper and appropriate technique because writing is an extraordinary complex that incorporates thought processes, feelings, and social interaction (Graham, Macarthur, Reid & Mason, 2011).

Writing is problematic because it is arranging the idea we have in our brain and the form of the word, sentence or paragraph, and grammatically putting the ideas. So, the message can be delivered to the reader. "To be able to produce good writing, students should be able to follow the proper language use, think as they write, and provoke the language development as they resolve problems when they put their ideas into the written form. Students fail to do the writing. Some weaknesses and failures factors are structure and limited vocabulary. The students are not able to compose their thoughts, ideas because they have a limited number of words, limited patterns of sentences, and lack of motivation" (Graham & Harris, 2003).

*lamhot.naibaho@uki.ac.id

The students' difficulties in writing are "(1) limited vocabulary, (2) difficulty in organising ideas, (3) no ideas to write about, (4) no motivation to write, (5) and lack of confidence in grammar" (Barras, 2005). "Writing is a highly complex process; the writer not only must negotiate the rules and mechanics of writing, but also maintain a focus on important aspects of writing such as organisation, form, and features, purposes and goals, audiences' need, perspectives, and evaluation of the communication between author and reader" (Graham, 2018; Harris & Graham, 2017). The writer has also experienced it when he finds it challenging to organise ideas into good writing. He did not know how to produce details to give relevant evidence to support selected topics and organise them into effective writing and, by an initial observation, he knew that most of the students at Senior High School 1 Sidikalang could not write well narrative writing. At the same time, the curriculum requires that that student should have mastered narrative writing. Besides, "it is expected that the students have to be able to write all kinds of writing such as "genre (e.g. Poetry, fiction, nonfiction), modes (e.g. narration, description, argument), the elements in the writing process (e.g. generating, revising, copy-editing), parts of rhetoric (e.g. invention, arrangement, style), purposes (e.g. persuading, informing, entertaining), or even by topics or themes (science writing, religious writing, technical writing)" (Elbow, 2000; Mourad, 2009).

"Writing is not only putting ideas on a paper, but it is the combination of the thinking process and the product of the process itself. On the other hand, writing is defined as an extraordinary complex that incorporates the thought process, feelings, and social interaction" (Graham & Santangelo, 2008; Naibaho, 2016; Tracy, Reid & Graham, 2009). In terms of skills, "To producing a coherent, fluent extended piece of writing is probably the most difficult things there is to do in language" (Mason, Harris & Graham, 2011; Graham, Harris & McKeown, 2012). Theoretically, "the text consists of some type, such as; narrative, recount, spoof, procedure, descriptive, report, explanation, exposition, discussion, news item and anecdote" (Harris, Graham, & Adkins, 2015; Baker et al., 2009). The only narrative text was discussed in this study.

Narrative text "is defined as literature written primarily to tell a story" (Herrera, 2013; Pao, 2016). Narrative "is not simply about entertaining the reader even though it generally does so, but also a powerful medium for changing social opinions attitudes and some soap operas and televisions drama as the narrative to raise the topic issue and present their complexities and different perspectives in ways that are not possible in news reports and current affair program. Formally, narrative sequences people/characters in time and place" (Cummins & Quiroa, 2012; Guerrero, Munoz & Nino, 2016).

The narrative text has a generic structure: orientation, evaluation, complication, resolution, and re-orientation. Besides the generic structures of narrative mentioned above, there are some typical linguistic realisations of narrative text, such as material process, the simple past, location relation, and circumstance of location. As it is quoted in Reid (1993), he said:

"…in evaluating the students' improvement in writing the narrative text, there are five components will be measured, such as content, organisation, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The score for content is 30 points, the organisation is 20 points, vocabulary is 20 points, language use is 25 points, and mechanics is 5 points. So for all components, students will get a score of 100 points. Writing is called good when the writing score is within 70-80, and 90-100 is called excellence…."

In solving this problem, one of the techniques that are suitable to apply is applying the SRSD technique. "SRSD technique is a structured process for helping a presenter thinks more expansively about a dilemma" (Zumbrunn & Bruning, 2013; Mason, 2013; Ennis et al., 2014;

Harris & Graham, 2016). The SRSD technique "involves self-directed prompts that require the students to consider their audience and reasons for writing, develop a plan for what they intend to say using frames to generate or organise writing notes, evaluate possible content by considering its impact on the reader, and continue the process of content generation and planning during the act of writing" (Reid, Hagaman & Graham, 2014; Lane et al., 2011; Lane et al., 2020; Berry and Mason, 2012; MacArthur, Philippakos, Lanetta, 2015).

SRSD "is built to make use of strategies to become more flexible and automatic, and besides, the SRSD strategy is very comprehensive" (Bakry & Alsamadani, 2015; Adkins & Gavins, 2012; Losinski et al., 2014). It ensures that crucial steps are not overlooked. a) assisting the students to develop the "knowledge about writing and essential skills and strategies involved in the writing process, including planning, writing, revising, and editing; b) supporting the students develop the abilities needed to monitor and manage their writing; and c) promoting students' development of positive attitudes about writing and themselves as writers" (Sreckovic et al., 2014; Bak & Asaro, 2013; MacArthur & Philipakos, 2013; Asaro, 2014). "How do students achieve such developments in their writing? Children like Vanessa, who enjoy writing and do not struggle with it, may merely need opportunities to share, discuss, and try out strategies for different genres or forms of writing. For other students, needed-more explicit instruction, more support, and more attention to their attitudes, beliefs, and feelings about writing" (Hacker et al., 2015; Palermo & Thomson, 2018).

The SRDS has "six instructional stages, and these stages represent a meta-script, providing a general guideline; they can be reordered, combined, revisited, modified or deleted to meet student and teacher needs" (Malpique, 2014). Furthermore, "the stages are designed to be recursive so that if a concept is not mastered at a particular stage, students and teachers can revisit or continue that stage as they move on to others" (Liberty & Conderman, 2018; Sanders et al., 2019). The "six stages in the SRSD model are: a) developing background knowledge; b) discussing; c) modelling; d) memorising; e) supporting, and f) independent performance" (Johnson et al., 2013; El-Sakka, 2016; Ennis & Jolivette, 2014).

That was why the researcher was very interested in proving it scientifically by doing a study on it. Then a study is designed entitled "The Effectiveness of SRSD on Improving Students' Narrative Text Writing Achievement", and the problem of the study is "Does SRSD effective on improving students' narrative text writing achievement?" and the purpose of this article is "finding out whether SRSD is useful to improve the students' narrative text writing achievement".

Research Design

A classroom action research was chosen to be the study's design, and the study was conducted at Teruna Muda School. The subject of this study was 43 students as the participants who were studying the narrative text. Those participants were taught narrative text and SRSD and finally taught how to implement SRSD on writing narrative text. The data (students' test score) were taken by conducting a narrative writing test that consisted of five tests; pre-test, progressing test 1, post-test in cyle one, progressing test 2, post-test in cycle two. Those tests were analysed calculated using the following formula to find the mean score:

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where: $\overline{X}$: Mean of Score

$\sum X$: Total of Students' score

N   : Number of students

After finding the mean score, those mean scores were compared and calculated again to see the improvement from the first test mean score to the next test mean score. Some steps were gone through in conducting such as; planning the action, observation and reflection, doing the action, doing the observation and doing the reflection (Naibaho, 2018).

Result and Discussion

The data were obtained from the test result, which had been conducted during the two cycles were analysed. Each cycle consists of six times meeting (The activities done in cycle two were giving treatment (Second, third and fifth) meetings, and besides, the researcher also conducted the test to the students (fourth and sixth) meetings. The quantitative and qualitative data were analysed, as is shown in the following explanation.

Table 1. Cycle One

No	Initial	Pre-Test	Second & Third Meeting	Fourth Meeting	Fifth Meeting	Sixth Meeting
1	Lin	56		62		73
2	Par	59		61		72
3	Res	65		60		71
4	Sar	66		67		78
5	San	67		67		78
6	Tim	54		69		72
7	Dy	55	**Giving**	60	**Giving**	69
8	Son	50	**Treatment**	60	**Treatment**	71
9	Ful	55		69		79
10	Rut	53		54		62
11	Ren	48		51		63
12	Rin	54		51		62
13	Ria	52		66		77
14	Nur	49		67		78
15	Nuv	49		59		64
16	Nic	49		54		65
17	Oca	47		61		72
18	Mar	49		60		71
19	Ari	47		61		72
20	Mei	48		63		74
21	Ani	48	**Giving**	63	**Giving**	74
22	Tha	45	**Treatment**	51	**Treatment**	62
23	Lut	51		56		67
24	Oli	51		67		67
25	Ad	51		60		71

26	And	47	58	69
27	Des	61	69	80
28	Dry	50	60	71
29	Sy	48	57	63
30	Na	48	63	74
31	Rik	50	66	77
32	El	48	56	65
33	Bi	48	67	78
34	Red	49	58	68
35	Hel	60	66	73
36	Ris	61	60	69
37	Her	53	63	74
38	Ati	51	63	75
39	Jh	50	61	72
40	If	55	64	75
41	Joe	64	68	79
42	Jun	46	62	73
43	Lam	51	60	68
	TOTAL	**2258**	**2580**	**3015**

The table shows that during cycle one, there was an improvement in the student's tests. It can be seen from the students' test results that they are improved from the first test until the third test. Although the score of the students improved from the first test to the next test, it was found still that some of the students have not achieved the passing minimum criteria score (70 – 80).

To know the improvement of the students' narrative writing achievement. The improvement was counted in the following part. The mean of the pre-test

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \overline{X} = \frac{2258}{43} \quad \overline{X} = 53$$

The mean of the progressing-test (4th)

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \overline{X} = \frac{2580}{43} \quad \overline{X} = 60$$

The mean of the post-test

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \overline{X} = \frac{3015}{43} \quad \overline{X} = 70$$

So the percentages of improvement from the pre-test into progressing test as follows:

Mean of Progressing-test (4th) - Mean of pre-test
= 60– 53
= 7
= 13%

The improvement from the progressing-test$_1$ into progressing test$_2$ as follows

Mean of Post-test - Mean of progressing-test
= 70 – 63
= 7
= 11%

Table 2 Frequency Distribution of Cycle One

Range	Frequency	Σ	Percentage
90-100	0	0	0%
80-89	1	80	1,86%
60-79	42	2987	69,46%
50-69	0	0	0%
40-59	0	0	0%

From the distribution of frequency table, it is known that from 43 students, only one of the students who passed achieved a good standard of narrative writing, and 15 students failed on achieving the minimum score criteria (<70). It happened because the students who failed to achieve the minimum score criteria paid less attention to the teaching-learning process. Therefore, it was decided to carry out cycle two, but before conducting cycle two, the researcher re-planned the teaching process by motivating the students about the purpose of the research and persuading them to be more enthusiastic during the teaching and learning process. The following table presents the data taken from the activities done in cycle two. The activities done in cycle two were giving treatment (seventh and ninth) meetings, and besides, the researcher also conducted the test to the students (8th and 10th) meeting. The score on the 6th meeting was taken from table 1. The result shows that all students significantly improved writing the narrative text by getting a score above 80.

Table 3. Cycle Two

No	Initial	Sixth Meeting	Seventh Meeting	Eighth Meeting	Ninth Meeting	Tenth Meeting
1	Lin	73		78		88
2	Par	72		77		88
3	Res	71		76		87
4	Sar	78	**Giving Treatment**	83	**Giving Treatment**	89
5	San	78		83		92
6	Tim	72		77		87
7	Dy	69		74		88
8	Son	71		76		83
9	Ful	79		84		90
10	Rut	62		67		85
11	Ren	63		69		71
12	Rin	62		67		85
13	Ria	77		82		90
14	Nur	78		81		86
15	Nuv	64		69		71
16	Nic	65		70		80
17	Oca	72		77		80
18	Mar	71		76		80
19	Ari	72		77		89
20	Mei	74		79		88
21	Ani	74		79		83
22	Tha	62		67		78
23	Lut	67		72		81

24	Oli	67		72		89
25	Ad	71	**Giving**	80	**Giving**	91
26	And	69	**Treatment**	74	**Treatment**	87
27	Des	80		85		90
28	Dry	71		76		83
29	Sy	63		68		88
30	Na	74		79		86
31	Rik	77		82		89
32	El	65		70		84
33	Bi	78		82		93
34	Red	68		82		87
35	Hel	73		78		85
36	Ris	69		74		85
37	Her	74		79		84
38	Ati	75		80		90
39	Jh	72		77		84
40	If	75		80		89
41	Joe	79		84		92
42	Jun	73		78		88
43	Lam	68		73		82
	TOTAL	**3067**		**3292**		**3685**

The percentage of improvement in each test as follows:
The mean of the progressing-test (8th)

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \overline{X} = \frac{3292}{43} \quad \overline{X} = 77$$

The mean of the post-test (cycle 2)

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \overline{X} = \frac{3685}{43} \quad \overline{X} = 86$$

Mean of Progressing-test (8th) - Mean of post-test (cyle one)
$$= 77 - 70$$
$$= 7$$
$$= 10\%$$

The improvement from the progressing test (8th) into post-test as follows;
Mean of Post-test - Mean of progressing-test
$$= 86 - 77$$
$$= 9$$
$$= 11\%$$

Based on the table above could be described the distribution of the students' scores was as described as follows.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Cycle Two

Range	Frequency	Σ	Percentage
90-100	8	728	16.93%
70-89	32	2737	63.65%
60-79	3	220	5.11%
50-69	0	0	0%
40-59	0	0	0%

From the distribution of frequency table, it is known that from 43 students, there were only three students who did not achieve the minimum score criteria (≥70), and there were 40 students who achieved the minimum score criteria, and 8 of them achieved the excellent achievement in writing narrative text. By then, because most of the students (93%) had passed the minimum score criteria, it was decided not to continue this research to the 3rd cycle.

From the two cycles of this study, the total improvement percentage from the pre-test into post-test was counted as follows:

Mean of post-test – pre-test,

$$= 86 - 53$$
$$= 33 = 62\%$$

The calculation above showed that the incremental improvement of the students' narrative text writing was 62%. So it could be said that students' narrative text writing increased as much as 62%. From the analysis, it is found that SRSD effectively improves the students' narrative text writing achievement. It was conducted using a classroom action research method. The problem of the study was answered.

Students who get the improvement score about 35-45 points - Their ability increased in every meeting. They were so active during the teaching process and paid excellent attention.

When they were taught, they listened carefully and thoughtfully, and also, in writing their narrative text, they felt so enthusiastic without asking their friends. If they did not understand the material, they kept asking questions, and they were responded excitedly. That was why their score improved in every test.

Students who got an improvement score of about 25-35 - Got improvement in every meeting. Some of them were not as serious as the students who got 35-45 points. Sometimes they did not pay attention to the teacher explaining in front of the class. However, some were active and enthusiastic as they got 35-45 during the narrative text writing and learning process.

They were active during the narrative text writing process. However, they showed improvement in every test.

The students who got an improvement score of about 15-25 - Got improvement in every meeting. During the learning process, some of the students paid excellent attention to the teacher. Then from the complete data analysis, it is concluded that all of the students had score improvement during teaching and learning.

In cycle one, twelve meetings were conducted with the students. The first meeting was conducted to formulate the problems that were found by the students in writing the narrative text and to find out the students' entry behaviour level. At the end of the teaching and learning process, the students wrote a narrative text. The narrative text writing of the students was checked. In the pre-test, it was found that the students were not right in their narrative text.

Nevertheless, after treating them with SRSD, the test was re-conducted, and the result was improved. Some of the students had good narrative text, including content, organisation, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Nevertheless, some were not, and then the tests were analysed to know what the problem was.

So after knowing the problem, the researcher decided to continue into cycle two and in cycle two. This cycle had six times meeting, and the expectation was that the result was getting better than cycle one. For that, the problem in cycle one really must be solved. The students were also motivated to show their best writing skills and use their creativity in using words. In this phase, the students were treated the SRSD back in the group, and they were given some narrative text writing and analysed in the group. They analysed the advantages and the disadvantages of the texts. After analysing the text's advantages and disadvantages, they were given some topics to be developed into narrative text writing. The students were divided into some groups and were given some texts of narrative text to be discussed, and they must be kept on controlling to lead them might avoid the wrong analysing. After they had finished analysing the texts, they were tested to know how far they got improvement. The test was done one a half hours. After checking the students' tests, the result showed that their scores improved. It is known from the calculation of the score in each test by comparing the mean score, which gets higher and higher every test was conducted. The mean of the pre-test was 53, the mean of the progressing-test was 60, the mean in the post-test in cycle one was 70, the mean in the progressing-test in cycle two was 77, and the mean in the post-test was 86. While the percentages of the students score improvement was that the pre-test to progressing-test was 13%, the progressing-test and post-test in cycle one was 11%, the post-test in cycle one to progressing-test in the cycle two was 10%, and the progressing-test to post-test in the cycle two was 11%. The total score improvement from pre-test to post-test cycle two was 62%. The same result also has shown that SRSD improved student writing ability (Harris et al., 2012; Andrzejewski et al., 2016; Sanders, 2020; Ennis et al., 2015). After analysing all the data, it was found that each student had improved from the pre-test until the post-test. It was described as follows.

Conclusion

From the complete data analysis, it is known that all of the students improved narrative text writing using SRSD Strategies. Thus the use of SRSD on students' narrative text writing achievement worked well. This study shows that the use of SRSD on writing ability improved the students' narrative text writing. It is proved by the result of the study that shows the total score improvement from pre-test to post-test cycle two. This study shows that English teachers should use the SRSD strategy when teaching narrative text to the students; students are also suggested to use the relevant topic to conduct further research by using SRSD, and may this research brings the reader to have a good insight on writing the narrative text.

References

Adkins, M. H., & Gavins, M. V. (2012). Self-regulated strategy development and generalisation instruction: Effects on story writing and personal narratives among students with severe emotional and behavioural disorders. *Exceptionality*, *20*(4), 235-249.

Andrzejewski, C. E., Davis, H. A., Bruening, P. S., & Poirier, R. R. (2016). Can a self-regulated strategy intervention close the achievement gap? Exploring a classroom-based intervention in 9th-grade earth science. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *49*, 85-99.

Asaro-Saddler, K. (2014). Self-regulated strategy development: Effects on writers with autism spectrum disorders. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 78-91.

Bak, N., & Asaro-Saddler, K. (2013). Self-regulated strategy development for students with emotional, behavioural disorders. *Beyond Behavior*, 22(3), 46-53.

Baker, S. K., Chard, D. J., Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Apichatabutra, C., & Doabler, C. (2009). Teaching writing to at-risk students: The quality of evidence for self-regulated strategy development. *Exceptional Children*, 75(3), 303-318.

Bakry, M. S., & Alsamadani, H. A. (2015). Improving the persuasive essay writing of students of Arabic as a foreign language (AFL): Effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 182, 89-97.

Barrass, R. (2005). *Students must write a guide to better writing in coursework and examinations*—psychology Press.

Berry, A. B., & Mason, L. H. (2012). The effects of self-regulated strategy development on the writing of expository essays for adults with written expression difficulties: Preparing for the GED. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33(2), 124-136.

Cuenca-Carlino, Y., Freeman-Green, S., Stephenson, G. W., & Hauth, C. (2016). Self-regulated strategy development instruction for teaching multi-step equations to middle school students struggling in math. *The Journal of Special Education*, 50(2), 75-85.

Cummins, S., & Quiroa, R. E. (2012). Teaching for writing expository responses to narrative texts. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(6), 381-386.

Elbow, P. (2000). *Everyone can write Essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing*—Oxford University Press on Demand.

El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2016). Self-Regulated Strategy Instruction for Developing Speaking Proficiency and Reducing Speaking Anxiety of Egyptian University Students. *English Language Teaching*, 9(12), 22-33.

Ennis, R. P., & Jolivette, K. (2014). Existing research and future directions for self-regulated strategy development with students with and at risk for emotional and behavioural disorders. *The Journal of Special Education*, 48(1), 32-45.

Ennis, R. P., & Jolivette, K. (2014). Using self-regulated strategy development for persuasive writing to increase students' writing and self-efficacy skills with emotional and behavioural disorders in health class. *Behavioural Disorders*, 40(1), 26-36.

Ennis, R. P., Harris, K. R., Lane, K. L., & Mason, L. H. (2014). Lessons learned from implementing self-regulated strategy development with students with emotional and behavioural disorders in alternative educational settings. *Behavioural Disorders*, 40(1), 68-77.

Ennis, R. P., Jolivette, K., Terry, N. P., Fredrick, L. D., & Alberto, P. A. (2015). Classwide teacher implementation of self-regulated strategy development for writing with students with E/BD in a residential facility. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 24(1), 88-111.

Graham, S. (2018). A revised writer (s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258-279.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & McKeown, D. (2014). Redux, the writing of students with learning disabilities, a meta-analysis of self-regulated strategy development writing intervention studies, and future directions.

Guerrero Moya, M. E., Muñoz Ortiz, L., & Niño Díaz, A. M. (2016). Evidence of Intercultural Communication Competence in Tenth Grader's Narrative Texts. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, 13, 111-130.

Hacker, D. J., Dole, J. A., Ferguson, M., Adamson, S., Roundy, L., & Scarpulla, L. (2015). The short-term and maintenance effects of self-regulated strategy development in writing for middle school students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *31*(4), 351-372.

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2009). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Premises, evolution, and the future. *BJEP Monograph Series II, Number 6-Teaching and Learning Writing* (Vol. 113, No. 135, pp. 113-135). British Psychological Society.

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2016). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Policy implications of evidence-based practice. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*(1), 77-84.

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2017). Self-regulated strategy development: Theoretical bases, critical instructional elements, and future research. In *Design principles for teaching effective writing* (pp. 119-151). Brill.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Adkins, M. (2015). Practice-based professional development and self-regulated strategy development for Tier 2 at-risk writers in second grade. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *40*, 5-16.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., MacArthur, C., Reid, R., & Mason, L. H. (2011). Self-regulated learning processes and children's writing. *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*, 187-202.

Harris, K. R., Lane, K. L., Graham, S., Driscoll, S. A., Sandmel, K., Brindle, M., & Schatschneider, C. (2012). Practice-based professional development for self-regulated strategies development in writing: A randomised controlled study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(2), 103-119.

Harris, K. R., Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2008). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Going beyond NLEs to a more balanced approach. *Instructional Science*, *36*(5-6), 395.

Herrera Ramírez, Y. E. (2013). Writing skill enhancement when creating narrative texts through collaborative writing and the Storybird Web 2.0 tool. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *15*(2), 166-183.

Johnson, E. S., Hancock, C., Carter, D. R., & Pool, J. L. (2013). Self-regulated strategy development as a tier 2 writing intervention. *Intervention in school and clinic*, *48*(4), 218-222.

Lane, K. L., Graham, S., Harris, K. R., Little, M. A., Sandmel, K., & Brindle, M. (2010). Story writing: The effects of self-regulated strategy development for second-grade students with writing and behavioural difficulties. *The Journal of Special Education*, *44*(2), 107-128.

Lane, K. L., Harris, K., Graham, S., Driscoll, S., Sandmel, K., Morphy, P., ... & Schatschneider, C. (2011). Self-regulated strategy development at tier 2 for second-grade students with writing and behavioural difficulties: A randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *4*(4), 322-353.

Liberty, L. M., & Conderman, G. (2018). Using the self-regulated strategy development model to support middle-level writing. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *91*(3), 118-123.

Losinski, M., Cuenca-Carlino, Y., Zablocki, M., & Teagarden, J. (2014). Examining the efficacy of self-regulated strategy development for students with emotional or behavioural disorders: A meta-analysis. *Behavioural Disorders*, *40*(1), 52-67.

MacArthur, C. A., & Philippakos, Z. A. (2013). Self-regulated strategy instruction in developmental writing: A design research project. *Community College Review*, *41*(2), 176-195.

MacArthur, C. A., Philippakos, Z. A., & Lanetta, M. (2015). Self-regulated strategy instruction in college developmental writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *107*(3), 855.

Malpique, A. D. A. D. S. (2015). Implementing self-regulated strategy development for teaching argumentative writing: a multidimensional approach.

Mason, L. H. (2013). Teaching students who struggle with learning to think before, while, and after reading: Effects of self-regulated strategy development instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *29*(2), 124-144.

Mason, L. H., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2011). Self-regulated strategy development for students with writing difficulties. *Theory into Practice*, *50*(1), 20-27.

Mourad, A. E. (2009). The effectiveness of a program based on self-regulated strategy development on the writing skills of writing-disabled secondary school students.

Naibaho, L. (2016). Improving Students' Essay Writing Ability through Consultancy Prewriting Protocol at the Christian University of Indonesia. *The Asian EFL Journal*, *3*, 147-160.

Naibaho, L. (2018). Improving Students' Essay Writing Ability through Consultancy Prewriting Protocol at the Christian University of Indonesia. *Asian ESP Journal,* 14 (3), 67-80.

Palermo, C., & Thomson, M. M. (2018). Teacher implementation of self-regulated strategy development with an automated writing evaluation system: Effects on the argumentative writing performance of middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *54*, 255-270.

Pao, B. (2016). The Influence of Reading Habit and Grammar Knowledge on the Students' capability of Writing Narrative Texts. *LingTera*, *3*(2), 122-129.

Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Prentice-Hall.

Reid, R., Hagaman, J. L., & Graham, S. (2014). Using self-regulated strategy development for written expression with students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Learning Disabilities--A Contemporary Journal*, *12*(1).

Sanders, S. (2020). Using the Self-Regulated Strategy Development Framework to Teach Reading Comprehension Strategies to Elementary Students with Disabilities. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 1-14.

Sanders, S., Losinski, M., Parks Ennis, R., White, W., Teagarden, J., & Lane, J. (2019). A Meta-Analysis of Self-Regulated Strategy Development Reading Interventions to Improve the Reading Comprehension of Students With Disabilities. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *35*(4), 339-353.

Sreckovic, M. A., Common, E. A., Knowles, M. M., & Lane, K. L. (2014). A review of self-regulated strategy development for writing for students with EBD. *Behavioural Disorders*, *39*(2), 56-77.

Tracy, B., Reid, R., & Graham, S. (2009). Teaching young students strategies for planning and drafting stories: The impact of self-regulated strategy development. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *102*(5), 323-332.

Zumbrunn, S., & Bruning, R. (2013). Improving the writing and Knowledge of emergent writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Reading and Writing*, *26*(1), 91-110.