WOLKITE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

AN INVESTIGATION INTO STUDENTS' WRITING STRATEGIES USE AND PERFORMANCE: THE CASE OF GRADE ELEVEN STUDENTS AT YABERUS SECONDARY SCHOOL

YIDNEKACHEW FELEKE

WOLKITE

NOVEMBER 2023

AN INVESTIGATION INTO STUDENTS' WRITING STRATEGIES USE AND PERFORMANCE: THE CASE OF GRADE ELEVEN STUDENTS AT YABERUS SECONDARY SCHOOL

YIDNEKACHEW FELEKE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)

WOLKITE

NOVEMBER 2023

Declaration, confirmation, approval and evaluation

Research title: An investigation into students writing strategies use and performance: the case of grade eleven students at yaberus secondary school.

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of the materials employed for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Yidnekachew Feleke _____ _____

Name Signature Date

Confirmation and Approval

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a thesis advisor.

_____ _____ _____

Major Advisor Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

Co-advisor Signature Date

As members of the board of examiners of the master of social science Thesis open defense examination, we have read and evaluated this thesis prepared by Yidnekachew Feleke G/medihn and examined the candidate. We here by certify that, the thesis is accepted for fulfilling the requirements for the award of the degree of master of English (MA in TEFL)

_____ _____ _____

Internal Examiner Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

External Examiner Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

Chairperson Signature Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would most want to convey my sincere thanks goes to my principal advisor, Dr. Mitiku Tasisa for his valuable contribution throughout the process; his constructive feedback has helped me to understand the phenomena under the study from a global perspective. Also, I would like to thank my co-advisor, Dr. Teshale Ayalew for his advice, criticism, and support during the research process.

The completion of this study would not have been possible without their dedication and assistance I would like to thank the principal of Yaberus Secondary School, Mr. Gezahegn, and all those participants in this study who responded to my questionnaires and interviews. They played a huge role in the data collection process for the selected classes.

I am grateful to my friends Yitawesu Barega and Getahun Melaku for their ethical and typographical support. I would also like to thank Ato Kibatu, Mr. Debebe G., and Wondye T. for helping me with course planning during the data collection process.

Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family for their constant moral support, understanding, patience and love. My Father, Feleke G/medhn, my mother, Yimegnushal Deribe, my wife Bezawit Andarge, my brother Kumlachew , my sisters Samrawit Feleke, Genet Feleke, Mahlet Feleke, and my best friend Senbeta Tadesse have been my source of courage, vitality and delight during the long and challenging academic engagement I have gone through.

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate students' writing strategies use and their performance at Yaberus Ssecondary School. To achieve the purpose of this study, a descriptive-correlational design was employed. The design was also used to look at the relationship between writing strategy use and performance and then to determine writing strategies use between high and low achievers. A mixed method approach was used in this study. The data were collected from 80 respondents through questionnaires and interviews. Two sampling techniques (purposive sampling and simple random sampling) were used to select the school and respondents. The findings indicate that students' lack the awareness of using writing strategies, poor understanding about the compositional aspect of the English writing, did not view their English written text as a means of communication, and the teachers were not aware of writing strategies. However, descriptive data analysis revealed that students had lower writing strategies and poorest writing performance. The results of the study showed that there was a positive, but not significant correlation between the use of writing strategies and performance (r=0.63, p=.058, p>0.05). The findings indicated that high school students did not use effective writing strategies to overcome their writing problems. Therefore, it was suggested that the current materials should be designed considering the writing strategies. Students are also advised to practice writing in English both in and out of the classroom. This thesis would be used as springboard for future researchers to conduct studies related to investigating secondary school students' use in learning other language skills (i.e., speaking, reading and listening) and language proficiency.

thf

Table of contents

Contents **pages**

Acknowledgements..... i

Abstract.....ii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....**1**

1.1. Background of the Study.....1

1.2. Statement of the Problem.....4

1.3. Objectives of the Study.....7

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study.....7

1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the Study.....7

1.4. Research Questions.....7

1.5. Limitations of the Study.....8

1.6. Definitions of Key Terms.....9

1.7. Organization of the Paper.....9

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....**10**

2.1. Introduction.....10

2.2. The Nature of Writing.....10

2.2.1. The Purpose of Writing.....12

2.3. Second Language Writing.....13

2.4. Writing in English as a Foreign Language.....16

2.5. Writing Strategies and Classifications.....16

2.5.1. Writing Strategies.....16

2.5.2 Writing Strategies in Second Language.....18

2.5.3. Classification of Writing Strategies.....19

1. Memory Strategies.....20

2. Cognitive Strategies 20
3. Compensation Strategies 21
4. Metacognitive Strategies 22
5. Affective Strategies 22
6. Social Strategies 23
2.6. Writing Strategies and Writing Performance 23
2.7. Writing strategies used by Proficient Students 26
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY 28
3.1. Introduction 28
3.2. Research Design 28
3.3. Approach of the Study 28
3.4. Research Setting 29
3.5. Participants of the Study 29
3.6. Sampling Techniques and Sample Size 29
3.7. Instruments of Data collection 30
3.7.1. Questionnaire 30
3.7. 2. Writing performance Test 31
3.7. 3. Interview 32
3.8. Validity and Reliability of Instruments 33
3.9. Data Collection Procedures for the Main Study 34
3.10. Methods of Data Analysis 35
3.10.1. Quantitative Data Analysis 35
3.10.2. Qualitative Data Analysis 36
3.11. Ethical Considerations 36
3.12. Pilot study 36

3.12.1 Purposes of Conducting Pilot Study 36

CHAPTER FOUR: INTERPRETATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION 38

4.1. Introduction 38

4.2. Results of Students' Questionnaire 38

4.3. Results of Students' writing performance test 40

4.3.1. The Relationship between Writing Strategies Use and Writing Performance 42

4.3.2 Analysis of Data from the Interview 43

4.4. Discussion 44

4.4.1. The Students Writing Strategies use 45

4.4.2 The relationship between higher-level and lower-level students in using writing strategies. 46

4.4.3 The relationship between Students' writing strategies use and Writing Performance 48

CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusions and Recommendations 51

5.1. Conclusions 51

5.2. Pedagogical Implications 52

5.3. Recommendations 52

5.4. Future Research 54

REFERENCES 55

List of Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the frequency use of writing strategies…….39

Table 2: Variability in low achievers and high achievers in using writing strategies……41

Table 3: The Relationship between low-achieving group and high achieving group in using Writing Strategies…….42

Table 4: Results of Yaberus secondary school students' English writing proficiency test……43

Table 5: The Correlation between Students' Writing Strategies Use and Writing Performance…….44

thf

List of Abbreviations /Acronyms

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

L1: First language

L2: Second Language

LLSs: Language Learning Strategies

FL: Foreign Language

SILL: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The history of language teaching and learning has been a varied one. Carter and Nunan (2001) note that there has been a slow but important shift in the field of language education over the past few decades, resulting in less emphasis on teaching and more on learning. This widespread variation has opened the way and led many researchers and teachers to study various language learning strategies. What is more, O'Malley et al. (1990) pointed out that it is precisely because of this shift in focus that language learning strategies have become one of the most prominent issues in the teaching and learning of second and foreign languages. Research on language learning strategies began in the 1970s. In the field of second and foreign language learning, many researchers focus on how learners process new information and what strategies they use to understand, learn, or remember the information. For instance, learners are more successful than others in learning a second or foreign language despite being exposed to the same teaching methods and learning environment (Naiman et al., 1978; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). As Chamot and O'Malley (1987) noted, the use of language learning strategies by learners and the investigation revealed that these strategies help learners to plan their learning, think about the learning process, monitor their own comprehension or production, and evaluate the outcomes of their own learning.

Most researchers and language experts have explained language learning strategies (LLSs) from different points of view. For example, Wenden (1987) denotes that LLSs can be defined from the aspect of language learning behaviors such as learning and regulating the meaning of a second or foreign language, cognitive theory such as learners' awareness of language learning, and the affective views such as learners' motivation, belief, attitude, and autonomy. Similarly, Rubin (1987) pointed out that language learning strategies are behaviors, creativity, or techniques that learners use to facilitate language learning. This implies that LLS is a technique or means of action that students use to improve their language skills and progress in learning language content.

Moreover, as stated by Ehrman & Oxford (1990) LLSs contained cognitive, affective, and social aspects of language learning strategies that enhance learners' language learning proficiency. Researchers (Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; Dornyei, 2005; Byrne, 1988; Harmer, 2004) have suggested that students who use a variety of strategies and tactics in their learning may be able to

complete learning tasks more effectively in specific situations. Dornyei (2005) pointed out that learners who are good at language learning tend to have a wider range of strategies than less proficient learners, and they use these strategies more effectively. This clearly shows that students who use and apply a variety of language learning strategies in the process of their learning are more effective in language learning. Chamot & El-Dinary (1999) support this idea, pointing out that successful language learner's use various types of strategies to accomplish different language skill improvement tasks and use effective strategies according to task norms.

Writing is one of the most important language skills that academics need to develop. Byrne (1988) noted that writing provides learners with different learning styles, tangible evidence, creates diversity in the classroom, and creates autonomous learning. As Harmer (2004) points out, the ability to write is a very important skill for foreign language users, just as it is for every speaker of their native language. Weigle (2002) also pointed out that the ability to write effectively is becoming more and more important in the international society, so the role of writing instruction in second language/foreign language education is growing rapidly.

In Ethiopia, English is the language of instruction and an important subject in higher education. All students should learn English well. This may be because English is the global language connecting Ethiopia to the world (Habtamu, 2018). Writing is an important skill and most teachers view writing instruction as classroom preparation; however, most students face challenges in becoming effective writers (Goh e al., 2005; Wong & Hew, 2010). A poor writing skill among high school students is not only a problem for Ethiopian students, but also for English-writing students elsewhere. To make matters worse, there is very little literature on how EFL learners use writing strategies in the writing process (Bai et al., 2014). Another issue with the previous studies is that most studies were conducted with questionnaires, which failed to capture how writing strategies were used to solve students' writing problems.

To promote students' writing performance, efforts should be made to understand their writing difficulties by analyzing the characteristics of their use of the target language. In addition, English learners use writing strategies that enable them to overcome difficulties and write more effectively. Soltani and Kheirzadeh (2017) claim that writing strategies are the variables differentiates successful writers from unsuccessful writers. Using writing strategies contributes to solve students' writing problems and to boost their confidence to convey messages in a more advanced way.

Maarof and Murat (2013) found that most L2 students were users of moderate writing strategies. The study highlighted that secondary school students should be motivated to use effective strategies both inside and outside the classroom.

Writing strategies use has a great contribution on the quality of one's writing performance as using different writing strategies influences learners' writing performance (Ardila, 2020; Arifin, 2017; Umamah & Hidayanti, 2018).

Writing strategies use was one of the variables studied in this research to describe students' writing strategies use and its effect on their level of writing performance. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the writing strategies used by grade 11th students of Yaberus Secondary School. However, research conducted in Ethiopia shows that most learners are low users of writing strategies (Abebe, 2003). Among the reasons for this include learners' limited exposure to writing strategies instruction, English teachers who don't have an awareness of the wide range of writing strategies, and the nature of the education system relies heavily on exam results rather than on learners' development and creative thinking skills (Alamirew, 2005). The exam-oriented nature of Ethiopian education system renders most teachers of little strategies use other than helping students prepare for exams. For example, learners practice transcribing and memorizing a particular type of writing, that was common and simple task during instructional activities, rather than experiencing the actual writing process, which undoubtedly requires a lot of effort and time on both the learners and teacher side. Therefore, between the demands and dilemmas of doing well in exams, most teachers usually choose to employ the simplest strategies to teach writing.

Due to the time constraints of the school curriculum, the use of writing strategies, some of which are familiar to teachers, is ignored. However, studies on the use of EFL students writing strategies provide support for the use of different writing strategies to help learners to become autonomous writers who are in control of their own writing (Chen, 2011). Besides, writing strategies enable students to write good composition (Aripin & Rahmat, 2021). Given these findings, this study therefore examined secondary school students' writing strategies use. There is an urgent need for EFL learners to use a variety of writing strategies as this skill is critical in both academia and the professional world (Graham & Perin, 2007; Nur & Saadiyah, 2011). The need to teach writing strategies to learners is therefore important as recent studies show that the use of strategy-based instruction could help dwindle learners' anxiety level (Tsiriotakis et al., 2017) and reduce

dependence on teacher-centered method in teaching writing (Webb, 2015). The use of technology and ICT tools (Abdul et al., 2015; Cole and Feng, 2014) need also be incorporated into the teaching of writing strategies as they provide learners with a wider range of literacy practices and help promote independent learning beyond the classroom. Aripin and Rahmat (2021) showed that learners exposed to the use of writing strategies better in writing compared to learners who were not exposed to strategies. Practical implications of this research include the need to teach writing in a more process-based rather than just product-based approach. Furthermore, the use of writing strategies may help teachers to realize that introducing and training learners' specific writing strategies can result in positive outcomes for learners.

The use of writing strategies was also expected to persist over an extended period of time, with learners continuing to use these strategies to complete writing tasks both in and out of the classroom.

In Ethiopia, as students' progress from low to high levels, their writing performance remains poor. Geremew's (1999) finding, which is parallel with Italo's (1999), showed that students seem to have serious problems in writing in English. Some other studies also support that one of the main weaknesses of Ethiopian students at different levels is their ability to write in English, and this problem is more serious in high school (Tekle et al., 2012; Temesgen, 2008). Furthermore, various studies conducted in Ethiopia have shown that many Ethiopian students have difficulty acquiring writing skills (Alamirew, 2005: Abebe, 2003; Awol, 1999; Dejene, 1990; Gupta & Getachew. 2011; Habtamu, 2018; Yonas, 1996). As a result, the writing ability of students in different grades is lower than expected. If students have to be successful in their academic studies, their English language proficiency, in general, and writing performance, in particular, should be significantly improved. Writing plays in the academic, educational settings and its complex nature, it seemed essential to identify strategies that enhance the skill of students' writing. This was the main reason that motivates the researcher to conduct a study in this area.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Writing is an important skill in the process of language learning. Atkins, Hailom, and Nuru (1996) stated that writing is one of the most important skills that students learn for academic purposes. Many exams are written; therefore, students are evaluated based on their writing performance. The ability to write in a foreign language is also considered an essential skill for foreign language

speakers. Hu (2022) pointed out that writing is a way to express what is in your heart and cannot be expressed in words. This clearly shows that writing can help us express hidden issues that we cannot express through word of mouth.

Nowadays, most EFL learners usually face writing difficulties because they find it intimidating to express themselves clearly, write according to ideas, and enjoy the writing process (Basturkmen & Lewis, 2002). Besides, different components of writing include writing strategies, organisation, vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and use of target audience (Raimes, 1984). The cognitive demand of writing further restricts EFL students' ability to think of suitable ideas to write, to maintain relevancy to the main idea of the topic, to discard irrelevant ideas, and to organize ideas coherently (Al-Sawalha and Chow, 2012). However, these problems are not unique to Ethiopian students, as EFL learners in other countries face the same challenges (Khuwaileh & Al-Shoumali, 2000; Rababah, 2002). The importance of writing skills increased as students' grade level increased from lower level to more advanced level. This is because good writing skills require higher level academic tasks. Working on high school students' writing skills could equip them so as to be competent and effective in their academic performance where high writing skill is required to work on academic tasks. Hyland (2004) stated that writing skills enable students to advance in their professional fields because they can build academic relationships within their disciplines through academic writing skills. She also added that mastery of writing skills is crucial for students at all levels to successfully complete writing tasks during their studies. Because of this, English is taught as a subject in the Ethiopian curriculum from the first grade through to higher education. Hence, it is supposed that students in high school should have to learn and practice more on the basic writing activities incorporated in the textbook to improve their writing skills.

Some studies indicated that the use of different writing strategies leads to improve students' writing performance (Abdollahzadeh, 2010; Arifin, 2017; Chen, 2011). These studies also support the idea of using appropriate writing strategies to help learners take responsibility and risk for their own learning (Oxford, 1990). Rubin (1987) revealed that students who use writing strategies to aid their learning appear to be more successful in language learning than students who do not use writing strategies. The use of a variety of English writing strategies supports learners to become autonomous writers who are able to control their own writing (Chen, 2011; Sasaki, 2002). Maarof and Murat (2013) findings also revealed that, secondary school EFL students were moderate users of writing strategies, and the study indicated that EFL learners need to be encouraged to use a

variety of strategies to improve their writing performance as stated above. The researcher hoped that the result of conducting an investigation of the writing strategies employed by secondary school students allowed a better understanding of the most frequently used writing strategies, and the extent to which they used these strategies while writing in and out the classes.

Some studies have also been done locally on the use of English writing strategies at the university level. For example, Habtamu's (2018) findings revealed that students have low writing strategies use and poor writing performance. The study also showed that there were non-significant relationship between students' writing strategies use and writing performance. Zeleke (2013) also examined the correlation between students' attitude toward learning to write lessons through receiving training on the strategies of writing and their writing performance to discuss relevant content, organize content appropriately, and use accurate grammar, appropriate vocabulary and correct mechanics in Hawassa University on first year students. The results of the study show that those students who receive training in writing strategies are the guarantee of their writing performance. Therefore, the researcher would be motivated to pursue this thesis due to the following motivating factors. The researcher's experience and classroom observation informed him that the students' writing performance was very poor. The informal reprimand after class was the main motivation that compels a researcher's to improve their writing performance. First, the researcher's practical observation on students' poor writing performance being English teacher and other teachers' blame after class or at the end of semester was the main motive that forced the researcher to conduct this research on writing strategies use and writing performance.

The second reason that initiated the researcher to conduct a study on the topic was students' poor writing performance at different grade level indicated in the literature (Solomon, 2001; Tekle et al., 2012; Temesgen, 2008). Third, the researcher has developed interest in the topic when he has read several works that are related to writing strategies, especially in high school settings where little research had been done.

However, the present study is different from the previous studies in some ways. It provides practical evidence on the level of the writing strategies used by learners and to identify the most common writing strategies employed by them to improve their writing performance. It also examined the correlation that exists between students' writing strategies use and their writing performance. Unlike previous local studies, the participants in this study will be Yaberus

Secondary school students; they are different from college students psychologically, socially, mentally, and physically, as well as in their general approach to language learning. Although the use of students' writing strategies in enhancing students' writing skills has been studied in the EFL context throughout the world, there seems to be insufficiency of local studies conducted on high school students' use of writing strategies. To the knowledge of the researcher, no studies have addressed high school students' use of writing strategies in the context of Ethiopia. Therefore, this paper attempts to fill the knowledge gap by providing important information to students, English teachers, and other relevant institutions.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective the Study

The main objective of this study was to investigate Yaberus secondary school students' writing strategies use and writing performance.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives the Study

The specific objectives of this study were to:

- Identify the writing strategies use most frequently by Yaberus secondary school students,
- Pinpoint the relationship between lower-level students and higher-level students in writing strategies use.
- Determine the relationship between secondary school students' writing strategies use and their writing performance.

1.4. Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following basic research questions:

- What are the writing strategies uses of students in Yaberus secondary school?
- Do high-level learners and low-level learners use similar writing strategies?
- What kind of a relationship is there between secondary school students' writing strategies use and their writing performance?

1.5. Significance of the Study

The findings of the present study would have the following benefits: First, it provides theoretical and practical contributions to the science of teaching and learning writing skills for all high school students by adding knowledge of the relationships among writing strategies use and writing performance. It hopes that this research could make a great contribution to familiarizing high school students with various writing strategies and using them effectively in writing classes to improve their writing skills. It also helps them develop awareness of how to use effective writing strategies in and out of the classroom. What is more, this study would help high school teachers develop their awareness of writing strategies to create different tasks other than the activities included in the textbook that guide learners to apply various writing strategies to improve their writing performance. The findings of this thesis might provide clues for English language specialists and curriculum designers to consider appropriate tasks for students to apply different writing strategies. It might also serve as a springboard for those interested in conducting research on writing strategies use and writing performance in terms of other variables in the future.

1.6. Scope of the Study

The study was delineate to the public secondary school in the town of Wolkite and focused on writing strategies used and performance particularly, grade 11th students at Yaberus Secondary School for the 2022/2023 academic year. The participants of this study were grade 11th students at Yaberus secondary school.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

A questionnaire was one of the tools used in the present study to measure students' writing strategies use. However, learners might not remember or be aware of the strategies use to determine the type of writing strategies they use. They might not provide enough information about the strategies use in and out of the classroom. Also, adapted self-report questionnaire might not cover all the writing strategies they use.

Participants in this study limited to only grade 11th students at Yaberus secondary school in Guraghe zone at Wolkite town. Therefore, the sample size might not be sufficient to generalize

the findings of this study to all secondary school students in the country. If students from all generations of public high schools participate, the results would be generalizable.

1.8. Definitions of Key Terms

Writing strategies: writing strategies are the sequence in which students engage in memory, cognition, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social writing strategies that means direct and indirect writing strategies.

Writing strategies use: Writing strategies use is the frequency with which students use six (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social) writing strategies to facilitate their writing.

Writing performance: Writing performance is the writing accomplishment score of students in the paragraph writing test prepared for the particular purpose.

1.9. Organization of the Paper

This thesis was organized into five chapters. The first chapter presented the introductory part of the study. It included the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, the significance of the study, scope, limitations of the study, definitions of the key terms, and conclusion. The second chapter presented the review of related literature in line with the writing strategies and writing performance with theoretical and conceptual framework of the thesis. The third chapter presented the methodology of the thesis. It described the research design, the research approaches, research site, the participants of the study and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, validity and reliability of the instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis, ethical consideration and conclusion. The fourth chapter presented interpretations, analysis and discussion of data; and the fifth chapter (last chapter) presented the findings of the study, its conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides a theoretical and conceptual review of the nature of writing, the purpose of writing, second language writing and writing in English as foreign language. This chapter also describes language learning strategies, writing strategies, and writing beliefs and the relationship between writing strategies and writing performance. Besides, it discusses the major factors affecting students' writing performance. Empirical evidence is also reviewed to strengthen the theoretical review of this study

2.2. The Nature of Writing

Unlike other language skills, writing has its own unique properties. As stated by Bader (2007), writing follows some principles that are unique of all which relate letters to words and words to sentences that must be well organized to have a coherent whole called 'text'. This communication skill or style is neither innate nor natural, it and its rules must be learned and utilized with a lot of practice; therefore, the writer is not writing for himself but he writes for his reader, for that the writer must clearly state his ideas to make himself understood (Bader, 2007).

With this, Hedge (1988) suggested that effective writing necessitates a number of things: a high degree of organization in the development of ideas and information, a high degree of accuracy so that there is no ambiguity of meaning, use complex grammatical devices for focus and emphasis, and carefully choose vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and sentence structures to create a style appropriate to the subject matter and the end reader. This implies that writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity for students to acquire and develop. Correspondingly, other researchers (Byrne, 1988; Hedge, 1988 & Heaton, 1988) pointed out that writing is a skill that must be practiced through experience, and they attribute the difficulty of writing to three factors: cognitive, linguistic and psychology.

With regard to the cognitive aspect, writers are expected to think and process what they want to put down on paper because writing requires much more care and thinking than speaking as the audience is not present at the time of writing. The linguistic factor is related to the need to consider the accuracy of the linguistic elements in the writing activity. Psychological factors are

associated with the production of writing alone, which can cause anxiety. Thus, compared to speaking, writing requires much more care, patience, skill and cooperation in its learning. As explained above, writing obviously requires a great deal of skill and technical knowledge in order for students to become proficient and effective writers.

In this context, Bell & Burnaby (1984) explained writing as an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control over content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation.

In addition to sentences, writers must be able to structure and integrate information into coherent paragraphs and texts. Therefore, it is a social act that fulfills a set of communicative needs, and accomplishes a particular purpose as Hyland (2003) puts it: every act of writing happens in a sense of both personal and individual, and it is also international and social, expressing a culturally recognized purpose, reflecting particular kind of relationship and acknowledging an engagement in a given community. Writing is a core element of language teaching, as students are required to take notes and take written tests.

For many years, writing seemed to be seen as a support system for learning grammar and vocabulary rather than a skill in itself. However, trainers and methodologists have looked again at writing in a foreign language classroom and acknowledged the importance of writing as a vital skill for speakers of a foreign language as much as for every one using their first language (Harmer, 2004).

Moreover, it is possible to say that writing is a difficult activity both in first and second language learning. Lack of interaction and feedback provision between the writer and the reader, lack of paralinguistic devices such as stress, intonation, gestures, and facial expressions are some of the writing difficulties that impose a great need for careful and precise completion, organization and connection of sentences (Byrne, 1988). Writing also requires formal and laborious instruction: we have to master the written form of language and to learn certain structures. Therefore, it can be said that writing skills are not only important for the academic performance of foreign language learners, but also a difficult and complex social activity.

In general, the findings strongly suggest that the nature of writing should be accepted and addressed by those who deal with L2 writers if these writers are to be treated fairly, taught effectively, and thus given chance to succeed in their writing related to academic endeavors.

2.2.1. The Purpose of writing

People have different ideas about the purpose of writing. Traditionally, the purpose of writing evolved just as one of the macro skills with a purpose of engaging students with grammar, vocabulary and comprehension exercises as a means of activating students' skills in these areas. More recently, the purpose of writing has shifted to the development of general writing skills (Ur, 1996). Various researchers (Ur, 1996; Hughey et. al., 1983; Byrne, 1988) have come up with several general and specific purposes for learning writing skills.

Writing has several general purposes for both second and foreign language learners. Hughey et al. (1983) developed a general purpose for teaching and learning writing skills. One of the main general purposes of writing is to serve as a medium of communication. Written communication is one of the most formal and common forms of communication in the world. The second purpose of writing is to use it to express what is hidden in our hearts but cannot be expressed in words. In this context, writing is seen as a tool that helps us express hidden knowledge and skills (Hughey et al., 1983).

Third, writing is useful to judge our thoughts since it helps us critically evaluate our thoughts and understanding. In line with the different stages of writing; as we write and rewrite, we will have the chance to think and rethink over our thoughts, which can finally result in judging and advancing out thought through writing (Hughey et al., 1983). In the end, writing is inevitably used as a means of self-reflection. This means that as we continue to write, it gives us the opportunity to learn about and evaluate ourselves, because the process of writing helps writers see how they are overall compared to the rest of the world. Therefore, the main purpose of teaching writing skills is to enable learners to be able to write high-quality written texts.

In addition to the general writing purposes described above, there are specific writing purposes that have various pedagogical benefits. Byrne (1988:6) identified four specific purposes of writing which have pedagogical implications. These are:

- *Writing enables us to provide different learning styles and needs.*

- *Written work serves to provide the learners with tangible evidences that they are making progress in the language.*
- *Writing provides variety in classroom activities, serving as a break from oral work at the same time; it increases the amount of language contact through work that can be set out of class.*
- *Writing is often needed for formal and informal testing.*

To sum up, it can be said that most professional communications such as proposals, memos, reports, applications, e-mails, and some of the daily activities of college students are done in writing. Even if students manage to learn the material in a college classroom but don't know how to write it well, they may not have the ability to communicate their knowledge to those who make big decisions. Likewise, writing skill has various purposes to Ethiopian students in general and university EFL students in particular since all of the general and specific purposes of writing we reviewed so far have a strong implication to students of EFL in Ethiopia.

2.3. Second Language Writing

Writing is a time when students produce their own texts which are based on their previously acquired skills and knowledge (Davidson, 2007). Hyland (2003) also proposed that the study of second language writing originated from the study of first language (L1) writing. However, the complexity of L2 writing extends well beyond the scope of L1. As further stated by Kroll (2003), second language writing is a distinct area of expertise that is related to, but does not entirely overlap with, the fields of teaching first language writing, second language acquisition, or second language pedagogy.

In order to understand the nature of L2 writing, it seems necessary to provide a brief account of the approaches that have dominated the teaching of L2 writing over the past few decades and are still applied in classroom methods today. Raimes (1991) provides a comprehensive account of the history of four major approaches to teaching L2 writing. These are in chronological order of how they develop: focus on form, focus on the writer, focus on content and focus on the reader. Focusing on form is a product approach that became the dominant approach to teaching writing in the 1960s, when the listening-language approach was the dominant mode of instruction in foreign language teaching. In this approach, writing is used as an auxiliary skill whose purpose is to reinforce the language structures needed to develop the learner's oral proficiency. Raimes claims

that writing took the form of sentence drills fillings, substitutions, transformations, and completions. The focus was on accuracy and the knowledge of grammatical rules. The product approach focuses on the final written product, which becomes the main object of study in second language writing. This approach also provided the basis for the development of contrastive rhetoric, which treats paragraph and text structures as culture-specific structures and will be examined in more detail in this study. In addition to the post-processing methods described above, contrastive rhetoric will be used in order to provide a comprehensive holistic account of second language writing strategies. The post-process approach will be applied to investigate the dynamics of L2 writing from the learner's perspective whereas the contrastive rhetoric will be used to establish whether students are equipped with the L2 writing strategies that are focused on producing texts that are sensitive to the target culture writing convention.

The product approach became the target of criticism in the 1970s when researchers and educators embraced the cognitivist philosophy and shifted their attention from the product to the writer. This new approach, known as the process approach, stems from the development of native-language writing and seeks to interpret writing in terms of the mental processes the writer engages in in creating meaningful information. As Raimes (1991) argues, what replaces accuracy and pattern is process, meaning-making, invention, and multiple drafts. The content took priority over the form and the writer's cognitive activities were analysed: from generating ideas, through execution of writing to revising, receiving the feedback and acting on it. However, Raimes (1991) claims that this approach has revolutionary practices that include allowing students time to choose their own topics and explore ideas, providing constructive, meaning-oriented feedback, using communicative tasks and providing opportunities for peer collaboration, and it proved quite demanding to implement in instructional instruction, so some teachers reverted to the product approach. It was pointed out that another limitation of the process approach is the lack of a clear evaluation procedure. This can be attributed to the nature of the cognitive processes that are in the state of flux and they do not give themselves to direct examination easily. Thus, for evaluation purposes, the product approach with final ingredient labeling offers the most feasible solution.

Over the last four decades, it has been noticed that the development of students' writing skills has been by large neglected in educational curricula (Leki, 2001) and students do not seem to have a strong motivation to engage in writing tasks (Elliott, 1999). In Elliott's research, 60 students of English at Lisbon University were surveyed in order to establish the reasons behind their

reluctance towards L2 writing. They were asked to comment on how they feel when they are asked to write a composition, what their perception of written homework is, what they find difficult about writing, how this situation could be improved and what they consider to be the most effective form of feedback. They were also asked to rank the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) in order of importance. The researcher found Elliott's approach particularly relevant to the present study. It aimed to discover 'trends and not statistics', it took into account psychological aspects of writing and it set to examine whether students are aware of components which make up the writing process. The planning, execution and revision phases of writing are all given separate attention. The research found that students generally rated all language skills as equally important, while older students tended to see speaking as a higher priority skill. The researcher attributes this finding to the fact that students seem to find it relatively easy to control their reading and writing skills in terms of eliminating errors, but they still struggle to achieve error-free oral expression. Interestingly, it also found that overall; students tend to be passionate about writing. However, when this finding was probed further it was discovered that there is a significant difference between students' initial interest in beginning the writing task and its actual execution. The obstacles that learners found out in the process included the choice of topics, the time factor and the difficulty in planning the task and organizing ideas. As far as feedback was concerned, the students expressed their desire to have all errors corrected. They claimed that they analyzed their mistakes and they also learned from teachers' comments. They also felt that written assignments were an important aspect of learning a second language. These positive findings of the research were set against an alarming finding that only one student in the research sample was aware that writing is not an isolated activity but instead, it is interactive by nature, which means that every writing task should be conducted with the reader in mind. This correlates with another research finding that although students generally support peer collaboration, they mostly use this technique only to generate ideas, with the rest of the writing process carried out alone. Other findings of the research included the significance of the teacher's role in stimulating students' interest in writing and the fact that the teaching of writing in order to produce the best results should take a form of facilitation. The researchers concluded that writing, motivated by enjoyment of the process, is largely a personal issue that needs to be carefully addressed so that it is encouraged rather than hindered in the classroom. The researcher pinpoints this perspective worth further investigation on Ethiopian high school students’ writing strategies and writing performance.

2.4. Writing in English as a Foreign Language

Writing is generally considered by many researchers to be one of the most difficult language skills to perform at all levels (Kurt & Atay, 2007; Latif, 2007). Erkan and Sabon (2011) noted that learning to write in a foreign language (FL) faces multiple challenges because writing is an active and productive skill. Moreover, (Gere, 1987; Shapeless, 1993), in their studies explored the complexity of writing in FL as a task tends to heighten anxiety levels in students who are taking writing courses. This anxiety often leads to depression, which can lead to a negative attitude toward writing. Ethiopian students as foreign learners face these situations as they go through different level of education. Regarding this, in his PhD thesis, Lemma (1999) found that students in different facilities of Addis Ababa University (AAU) were faced with the problem of using discursive materials. Furthermore, Tola (2007) stated in his master's thesis that students find it difficult to write good essays that match their level of education.

Given the nature of writing as a skill, it is obvious that writing needs to go through an emotional development process. Sommers (2006) argued that writing needs a lot of practice to get better. Furthermore, Abdul Rahman (2013) explains that mastering the writing process requires painstaking skill development and years of practice. Writing is a challenge for many students, whether writing in their native language or in a foreign language (Maarol & Murat, 2013).

2.5. Writing Strategies and Classifications

2.5.1 Writing Strategies

Researchers' interest in learners' solutions to their writing problems, have long existed in pedagogy (McDonough, 1995). This interest was fueled by the behaviorist notion of the learner as the center of stimulus responses and by early discussions of strategies in classical writing categories such as grammar, phonology, and semantics. Researchers began focusing on micro structures of the learners' reaction to new languages and research extend to answer how learners find solutions to continuing problems, anticipate or actual communicative problems, the learner's need to fill the gaps in his/ her knowledge/ skills needed to perform tasks.

Researchers believe that an understanding of learning strategies is helpful in understanding language acquisition and individual differences in the pace and process of learning (McDonough, 1995).

Researchers use the term interchangeably with the term "strategy" to include writing techniques and procedures (Khaldieh, 2000). The act of writing (Manchon et al., 2007; Zamel, 1983) and the writing process strategies (Saasaki, 2004; Zamel, 1983). Saasaki (2004) defined writing strategies as a writer's mental behaviours use to achieve a goal in the ill structure problem solving … activity of writing.

Similarly, Wong (2005) made decisions to address the problems (language and rhetoric) posed by the writer's perceived writing task. However, the systematic categories established to analyze the participants' problem solving behavior distinguish between problem solving behavior and problem solving mechanism. Conjuan Mu (2007) also defined writing strategies as writers' methods of consciously generating ideas, planning, drafting, organizing, revising, and reducing anxiety during the writing process.

On the other hand, Manchon et al. (2007) distinguished between broad and narrow conceptualizations of writing strategies. The broad conceptualization has two definitions based on two perspectives: (a) intra-learner, and (b) social cognition. The learner-internal perspective defines writing strategies as actions used to create a text. The social cognitive perspective regards writing strategies as the actions taken by L2 writers in response to the writing situation and discourse group experience. In contrast, the narrow conceptualization is a purely cognitive perspective informed by cognitive theories of L1 writing and the problem-solving paradigm in cognitive psychology, which defines writing strategies as "control mechanisms use to regulate cognitive activity or heuristics use when L2 writer engages in problem-solving activity" (Manchon et al., 2007. P. 235). Thus, the socio-cognitive approach used in this active study combines a cognitive approach to internal control mechanisms with sociocultural factors imposing writing community and content.

The definition of writing strategies use in this study is agree with Cohen's (1998) definition: actions or behaviors consciously carry out the writers to make their writing more efficient in combination with the socio cognitive perspective stated by Manchon et al. (2007): strategies are tools available for the writer to use during the actual writing time. When writers have problems expressing their ideas, choose these tools consciously. These choices are made in response to contextual and social factors find the EFL writer in the individual's context.

In conclusion, the definitions say strategies are specific behaviors or techniques students' use, often consciously, to improve language skills. Investigating the writing strategies that L2 writers use can provide insight in to what writers think, thus increasing the researcher's understanding of the specifics of this process (Silva, 1993). Such investigations help to develop predictive models of writing structure that can be used in teaching, research, and educational practice, as well as in the evaluation of curriculum planning (Grabe, 2001).

A number of researchers have defined the concept strategy in various ways, such as Stern (1983) states that strategy is best reserved for general tendencies or overall characteristics of the approach employee the language learner, leaving learning techniques as the term to refer to particular forms of observable learning behavior, more or less consciously employee the learner (Stern, 1983). Cohen (1998) defines strategy as a process that consciously selects learners and which may result in actions take to enhance the learning or the use of the second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall and application of information about the language. Rubin (1981) again expressed strategies as the operations or steps that learners use to facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information.

More specifically, writing strategy is defined as the sequence in which a writer engages in planning, writing, revising, and other writing-related activities (Torrance et al., 2000).The study of strategies is part of a research movement known as process writing, which seeks to gain insight into the mental processes writers engage in when writing. In this process, traditional composition is viewed as a goal-oriented, cognitively demanding, problem-solving task (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Hayes, 1996). According to these researchers, writing strategies in their general view are seen as those procedures employed by the writer to (i) control the operational management of goals, (ii) compensate for the limited capacity of human cognitive resources and (iii) overcome the problems that writers pose to themselves.

2.5.2 Writing Strategies in Second Language

Research on the process of writing in a second language began in the early 1980s (Lay, 1982; Raimes, 1985; Zamel, 1983). L2 writing is a complex discovery process involving brainstorming, multiple draughts, practice with feedback, revisions, and final editing. It differs from L1 writing in that ESL writers (L2) have more than one language at their disposal (Wang & Wen, 2002). Research on the L2 writing process has also identified various specific writing

strategies used by L2 learners. Writers with different proficiency levels tend to use different strategies. Zamel (1983) found that the proficient L2 learners in the study revised more and spent more time on the paper than the less proficient L2 learners.

Proficient students are more concerned with ideas first, revising at the discursive level, showing stealth in the writing process and in the edits made at the end of the process. The less proficient students, however, revised less and spent less time writing compared to the skilled students. Raimes' (1985) protocol-based study of eight unskilled ESL students revealed that the L2 writers did not much planning before or during writing, paid less attention to revising and editing and kept rereading their work to develop ideas. Surveys of the writing process of learners, focusing primarily on revision and editing, have highlighted the importance of revision and editing in successful essay writing (Polio et al., 1998). Siti and Abdul's (2006) study on Malaysian Malay ESL students found that generating ideas using L1among students with low English proficiency helped them to produce a higher quantity of ideas and better quality essays in terms of overall score, content, language, organization, vocabulary and mechanics. Cumming (1989) had earlier reported that all six of his Francophone Canadian adult subjects tended to use the L1 for generating content for their writing tasks. Non-professional writers consistently use their L1 for idea generation, while expert writers use L1 for content generation and vocabulary search.

2.5.3. Classification of Writing Strategies

In order to classify writing strategies, it is useful to know the different schemes used in the L1 and L2 domains in previous studies. There are studies in the L1 field that classify writing strategies into a five-factor structure that considers the relationship between writers' beliefs on writing and the strategies that they employ: elaborative, low self-efficacy, no revision, scientist and task oriented (Lavelle & Bush row, 2007). Others use a two-dimensional structure to describe strategies: the first stage concerns the stage in the writing process at which writers decide content (Galbraith, 1992), while the second concerns the extent to which writers explore and reformulate their ideas and text (Hartley & Braithwaite, 1989). In the field of second language, some scholars (Hirose & Sasaki, 1994) have formed a three-factor structure of planning, expression or transcription and revision, and agree with these three macro-writing processes. Some others have created a four-factor structure: planning, monitoring, evaluation,

and resource allocation, which are metacognitive strategies themselves (Victori, 1997).

More recently, researchers used six-factors analytically-create composing strategy taxonomy, which included memory, cognitive, compensation, meta cognitive, social and affective strategies (Khaldieh, 2000) and it is based on Oxford's (1990) taxonomic approach. In this regard, the present study is conducted based on taxonomy of writing strategies created by a six-factor analysis, which the researchers in this study found to be inclusive and appropriate to the study context. It is conducted for secondary school students who wish to use various writing strategies to overcome writing problems. This classification was finding to be relevant to the subject as well as the context of this thesis since the study investigates students' writing strategies use in relation to their writing performance.

1. Memory Strategies

Memory learning strategies for writing include putting new words into context, using key words, and structured review. Placing new words into a context consist of applying words that read into a meaningful context as a way of remembering them. For example, learners may construct a sentence using the new words (Cabrejas, 2012). In a general language context, memory strategy helps students' link one L2 item or concept with another but not necessarily rely on profound understanding. Oxford (1990) lists various memory-related strategies that enable learners to learn and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the meaning of the word), both sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movements (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard). Memory strategies shows to relate to L2 proficiency in a course devote to memorizing large numbers of characters and in L2 courses designed for native-English speaking learners of foreign languages (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995).

2. Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are useful tools to help students solve learning problems. The mildest form of the term cognitive strategy is the use of the mind (cognition) to solve a problem or complete a task. Cognitive strategies can also be called procedural facilitators (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) or procedural cues (Rosen Shine, 1997). As described by Rosen Shine (1997), cognitive strategies

help support a learner in developing internal programs that enable him/her to perform complex activities. These strategies are viewed as individual strategies that enable students to process and transform information. They further infer an operation of the task through the effective use of the language to engage in the knowledge acquisition process (McCrindle & Christensen, 1995). According to Oxford (1990), cognitive strategies can be identified through the use of dictionaries (which can also manifest as social strategies), organising information, reading aloud, analyzing, summarizing, and reasoning. Weinstein & Mayer (1986) identify three types of cognitive strategies: organization strategies, which reorganize information to be learned to make it more meaningful; rehearsal strategies, which include the repetition of the information to be learned; and elaboration strategies, which link knowledge and previously acquired data (McCrindle & Christensen, 1995).

3. Compensation Strategies

Compensation learning strategies are direct strategies used by learners to 'overcome knowledge limitations in all four skills' in a new language learning process (Oxford, 1990). These strategies help learners maintain language learning without interruption due to gaps in their knowledge of the language elements they are learning (Oxford, 1990). Students vary in the way they fill in missing information during the writing process. Actually, good writers make wide rereading of their texts and repeat to keep their writing going or for revision purposes; however, less capable writers frequently do very little rereading or reread and repeat large chunks of text, but they do not have good overall results (Wolfersberger, 2003). These results indicate that L2 proficiency affects the use of L2 compensation strategies. A wealth of literature (Cumming, 1989; Cumming et al., 1989; Chamot, 1987; Pennington & So, 1993; Raimes, 1987; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996;) has concentrated on finding out the role of L2 proficiency and the writer's procedural knowledge in L2 writing expertise. For example, Jones and Tetroe (1987) compared the writing processes of a group of subjects writing in two languages and found that their students used the same planning strategies in both their L1 and L2. The results also indicated that the ESL writers' language proficiency affected the quantity, not the quality, of planning. Jones and Tetroe (1987) further concluded that if the planning model used in L2 writing was transferred from L1, then the lack of abstract planning cannot be attributed to the lack of expertise in L2. Conversely, lack of second language expertise affects the quality of the text but does not interfere with the planning process. Correspondingly, for Cumming et al., (1989) the use of problem-solving strategies in the L1 and

L2 was not related to second language proficiency, but to the learners' levels of writing expertise. It was, however, true that the higher the writing expertise and the writers' L2 proficiency level, the higher the grades in the compositions they obtained. These conclusions suggest that L2 proficiency has an important effect on explaining L2 writing ability, as writing strategies are crucial in the writing process.

4. Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive strategies are learning strategies that include activities such as planning, organizing, monitoring, and evaluating. In writing, it includes the process of planning and organizing ideas, as well as making more skilled choices about the use of strategies to facilitate writing (Ching, 2002). They also refer to students' global skills, reflecting their self-awareness of their level of understanding and degree of motivation. Schmitt (2002) considered them to be conscious processes that learners use to manage language learning.

According to Wiles (1997), Meta cognition is defined in terms of "self-management … the ability … to plan, monitor and revise, or … control … learning" (p. 17). These strategies are categorized by Ehrman & Oxford (2003, p. 317) and include planning writing, goal setting, preparing for action, focusing, using schemata, monitoring activities, evaluating their success, and identifying opportunities for practice.

5. Affective Strategies

Affective strategies are used to regulate mood, motivation, and attitudes (eg, strategies to reduce anxiety and self-encouragement) (Cohen & Dornyei, 2002). The use of negative affective strategies includes avoidance, passivity, difficulty concentrating, and lack of concern (Shapira & Lazarowitz, 2005, p. 75), and may ultimately lead students to abandon tasks. The aim of strategy-use training is, thus, to eliminate the use of negative strategies. Positive strategies, on the other hand, include "anxiety alleviation … calming or self-relation techniques such as deep breathing, meditation, listening to music, laughing … and self-rewarding" (p. 75). For example, if a student is writing an essay about a job interview, he/she must first focus on the information that should be included, not on possible grammatical errors.

It is worth mentioning that both affective strategies and social strategies are considered compensatory strategies, which are used to describe the actions learners take to overcome the difficulties they face, such as listening to music, eating or taking a break.

6. Social Strategies

Social strategies are strategies that are employed to develop consciousness of and emotion for others. These include activities chosen by the learner in order to interact with classmates or to help them cope with learning difficulties. Among these activities, Cohen and Dornyei (2002) mention: asking questions, cooperating with others to complete a task, and peer revision. Communication between readers and writers has the potential to stimulate thinking, assist the writing process, and improve overall writing (Shapira & Lazarowitz, 2005). In this regard, Nystrand (1986) studied the impact of peer responses on college students' writing. He found that students' performance developed significantly when they replied to comments from their peers. Some sharpen their thinking, while others only do editing activities.

2.6. Writing Strategies and Writing Performance

The role of writing strategies in the process of writing become increasingly important and differences between more and less proficient learners in number and range of strategies use, in how the strategies apply to the task, and in the appropriateness of the strategies for the tasks (Chien, 2010; Hu & Chen, 2007; Mu & Carrington, 2007; Ridhuan & Abdullah, 2009). This implied the interplay of a number of factors for a successful application of writing strategies.

Having a number and range of strategies for instance was useful, but students' understanding of the requirements of the writing tasks and the use of appropriate strategies to carry out the task often determine the effectiveness of the strategy use. Planning strategies are important for skilled students (Mu & Carrington, 2007; Ridhuan & Abdullah, 2009). The literature also shows that many underachievers rarely use these strategies (Chien, 2010). Lower-achieving students often do not plan their writing and often start writing right away (Ridhuan & Abdullah, 2009). On the other hand, proficient students differed in the amount of time they spent planning their writing tasks. They often use drating to develop a rough plan of how the paper will be presented, thus spending more time planning (Ridhuan & Abdullah, 2009). Hu and Chen (2007) observed that second language learners carefully weigh the decisions of what to write and how to proceed, suggesting that planning quality is more important than planning time. However, less proficient students usually take longer, although these efforts fail to generate ideas and the plans developed globally are mostly ineffective. In her observation of the writing behaviors of four writers from different

cultural backgrounds, Indra (2004) found that the good Chinese writer in her study planned his ideas using outlines whereas the good Indian writer planned by putting down visual representations. In contrast, the other two students with weaker writing skills took longer to mentally plan, and the effort proved somewhat ineffective in helping them develop ideas for the writing task. Ridhuan and Abdullah (2009) reported that in his study, high-achieving students and low-achieving students shared common writing strategies, mainly cognitive strategies, to generate ideas for their papers.

The strategies included transcribing, rehearsing ideas, rehearsing structure, rereading, translating and repeating. On the other hand, Chien (2010) claimed that in his study, high achievers focused more on generating text (writing out sentences), while low achievers focused only on generating ideas. Another important strategy for differentiating proficient students from less skilled students is revision strategies. According to Chien (2010), the high achievers in his study focused on revising and editing. Good writers make meaningful changes, a way of thinking and clarifying meaning for themselves rather than just focusing on mechanics.

Mu and Carrington (2007) reported that for the participants in their study, content modification was rated as the most important, followed by structure and vocabulary. In contrast, all writers including skilled writers in Hu and Chen's (2007) study revised mostly lexical and grammatical elements rather than the discourse structure which reflects a surface writing approach. A recent study by Chen (2011) that investigated the English writing strategies of 132 Chinese, non-English major college students found that although the students used some writing strategies in the pre-writing stage, while-writing stage and revising stage, they were still not frequent users of many of the strategies.

Data from the Writing Strategies Questionnaire indicated that students employed more writing strategies during the writing phase compared to the prewriting and revision phases. Baker and Boon Kit study (2004) showed that although there was no significant difference in the frequency of writing strategy used between high and low achievers, there were some differences in the types of strategies used. The low achievers seem to start writing without having any plans and frequently use the translation strategy throughout the writing process.

The perspective of social cognitive theorists is to study the relationship between the use of writing strategies and writing performance. Writing strategy is one of the factors that affect the writing performance of students (Mu, 2005). Scholars in the field (Beare, 2000; Mu 2005; Raimes, 1985, Zamel, 1982) have noted that writing strategy is the variable that distinguishes effective from ineffective writers. For example, Maarof and Murat (2013) show that middle school learners are common users of writing strategies. The study found that the writing-while-writing strategy was the most commonly used writing strategy, while the revising strategy was the least used strategy. Research also shows that low and intermediate learners use different types of strategies. This result implies that students should be motivated to use a variety of writing strategies to write better. Likewise, cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies were identified by Ridhuan and Abdullah (2009) as the most commonly used writing strategies. The study also found that high achievers use strategies differently than low achievers. Other similar studies revealed similar findings (Green & Oxford, 1995; Kaylani, 1996; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Philips, 1991; Sasaki, 2000) that indicated the propensity for capable learners to use more strategies efficiently than less proficient learners.

Similarly, other scholars (Lan & Oxford, 2003; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Wharton, 2000; Yang, 1999) found that social and affective strategies were among the most commonly used writing strategies. Wharton (2000) found that social strategies were the most frequently used strategies among the university students, followed by compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, memory strategies and affective strategies. In a study by Magogwe and Oliver (2007), students mentioned social and metacognitive writing strategies as their favourite strategies, respectively, followed by cognitive strategies, memory strategies, and compensation strategies. Affective strategies were not included in the framework of this study. However, Lan and Oxford (2003) ranked the most commonly used strategies in the following order: compensation strategies, affective strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, social strategies, and memory strategies.

Similarly, Yang (1999) lists the compensation strategy as the most commonly used strategy, while the other strategies are listed in descending order of strategy usage frequency as follows: social, cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and memory strategies.

Generally speaking, the above empirical data can help us infer that there is a certain consensus among researchers that there is a positive correlation between writing strategies and writing performance. The above data also show that despite the inconsistencies in the research in this area, most of the findings show that social strategies, compensatory strategies, and affective strategies are the authors' favorite strategies compared to other strategies.

2.7. Writing strategies used by Proficient Students

Writing is a productive skill. Brown (2001) states that writing includes thinking, drafting and revising, which requires an individual's specialized skills. Since writing is a language skill, a person must learn what to write and how to write it, and apply certain grammatical rules in writing. Xia (2011) points out that person's language ability is reinforced when thoughts or ideas are expressed through writing Carroll (1997) revealed that successful language learning depends on several factors. A human's intelligence is needed in learning. A person must have an understanding of grammatical rules and usage of language elements. It takes a lot of time, patience and effort for a person to learn a language. It is important that one has to know what to use and how to use certain appropriate strategies in language learning. Oxford (2003) defined language learning strategies as specific behaviours or thought processes that students use to enhance their second language learning. A strategy will be useful if it is practicable to language tasks and suits a learner's learning style preferences. At the same time, learners can use it effectively and relate it to other strategies. Outside the domain of language learning, studies comparing experts and novices have shown that experts use more systematic and useful problem-solving methods as well as a wider range of strategies. A similar finding occurs with more successful language learners as compared to less successful ones. Better language learners generally use strategies appropriate to their own stage of learning, personality, age, purpose for learning the language and type of language (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). Ellis (1994) indicates the results of various "good language learner studies" into five major aspects of successful language learning. The first aspect of successful language learning is attention to language form. The researcher has found that superior language learners view language as a system by making effective cross-language comparisons, analyzing the target language, and using reference books. Good language learners also pay attention to meaning, searching for it in the L2 data they are exposed to and trying to engage in real communication by seeking out opportunities for natural language use.

Third, successful learners show active involvement in language learning. Instead of relying on the teacher, they take charge of their own learning by identifying and pursuing goals and trying to introduce new topics into the conversation. A fourth characteristic involves their metacognitive awareness of the learning process. Proficient learners are thoughtful and aware of themselves, make conscious decisions and follow their own preferred learning style. These are the learners who have the ability to write effectively about their language learning because they have a well-developed meta-language with which to do it. Finally, Ellis explained that successful learners use learning strategies flexibly and appropriately, demonstrating the ability to select learning strategies that are appropriate for a particular task.

Chen (2011) conducted a study on the English writing strategies of 132 Chinese students. Although students used some writing strategies in the pre-writing stage, writing stage and review stage, many of them were still used infrequently. The findings showed that learners used more writing strategies during the writing phase compared to the prewriting and revising phases. Baker and Boonkit (2004) further pointed out that there was no significant difference in the frequency of writing strategies used by high and low achievers, but there were some differences in the types of strategies used. Less proficient writers seem to start writing without any plan and use translation strategies frequently throughout the writing process.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presented a detailed discussion of the methods that employed in this study. It describes the research design, the participants of the study, sampling techniques, data collection instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, procedures of data collection and methods of data analysis.

3.2. Research Design

A descriptive correlational design used in this study. In this regard, this study was employed to identify the writing strategies use by secondary school students. In addition, it was used to describe the relationship between high-level students and low-level students' use of writing strategies, and to identify the relationship between the students writing strategies use and writing performance.

3.3. Approach of the Study

A mixed-method approach (explanatory sequential Quan-Qual) was used in the present study because it was the collection of quantitative and qualitative data that neutralizes the weaknesses of each form of data. In most cases, there were two main reasons for applying this approach in this study. First, a mixed-method approach would be used in this study because it was difficult to address all research questions using only one method. A quantitative method approach used to numerically measure students' writing strategy use and level of writing performance. It will also be used to analyze the relationship between writing strategies use and writing performance.

Second, this approach was used to triangulate the quantitative data and the qualitative data obtained through the interview. Triangulation is used to coordinate information obtained on the same issue. Quantitative data (questionnaire and writing test) would be used to make out students' writing strategies use and to determine their writing performance. It used to describe the relationship between the independent variable and a dependent variable. On the other hand, qualitative data (students' interviews) was used to substantiate the information obtained through quantitative data. It was also obtained additional data to validate the quantitative data.

Therefore, this study used a mixed approach, as the collection of quantitative and qualitative data that neutralizes the weaknesses of each form of data collection.

3.4. Research Setting

The study was conducted at Yaberus Secondary School. The school is located in the town of Wolkite in the Gurage zone, south of Ethiopia. What is more, it was chosen for this study because the researcher was a staff member of the school's English department. Besides, the proximity of the school to the researcher's residence and workplace made it to be chosen, which makes easy to access and communicate with the studied students and to get relevant information.

3.5. Participants of the Study

The participants of the study were grade 11th students. According to data obtained by the school, the total numbers of students were 810 (385 men and 425 female). In total, 80 students were selected the participants those provided an equal opportunity for all students involved in the study, as it reduces bias in generalizing the findings of the study. The researcher was used writing performance test to determine the level of participants for the study. The data was collected in the time between September 2022 to June 2023.

3.6. Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

Two sampling techniques were used in this study to specify the school and respondents. These were purposive sampling and simple random sampling. More importantly, Yaberus secondary school was selected from the public Secondary schools that are found in Wolkite town using purposive sampling techniques to designate the study area and obtain accessible information. It has the resources available, including teachers, compared to others. They were expected to be able to develop a better understanding of learning strategies, approaches, methodologies and other aspects of writing skills.

A random sampling technique was used to select respondents from grade 11^{th} sections to obtain adequate and concrete information by giving a lottery system. This provided an equal opportunity for all students involved in the study, as it reduces bias in generalizing the findings of the study.

The researcher intentionally selected six students from the entire sample for interviews. Due to various reasons, it is difficult to interview all students, so 6 students were selected for interview. This sampling method was used in this study for some fundamental reasons. First, conducting detailed face-to-face interviews with many students would be impractical due to the participants' interests, finances, time and energy. Second, it helped the researcher to obtain in-depth information and communicate well with the interviewees.

3.7. Instruments of Data collection

The study used three data collection tools namely; questionnaire, writing performance test and interview.

3.7.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was the most widely used for collecting adequate information in this study. The main purpose of this questionnaire was to investigate the use of writing strategies among secondary school students. To ensure this, the researcher used standardized questionnaire to identify the writing strategies students used.

The questionnaire adapted from Cabrejas (2012) thinking they were good enough to get students' self-reported data for the study. In adapting the questionnaire, the researcher would make a little modification at the level of phrases, clauses and structure of the sentences to make the language easy and understandable to the level of secondary school EFL students' standard. For example, items such as 'I seek assistance when I have a linguistic problem' would be replaced by 'I ask for help when I face language problems in my writing.'

The questionnaire contained 42 closed-ended items which consisted of six categories highlighted by Oxford (1990). These include metacognitive (items 1-10), Cognitive (11-21), memory (22-29), social (30-34), compensation (35-37) and affective (items 38-42). In this part, all students expressed the degree of their use of writing strategies on a 5 point Likert scale from 1-5 based on the frequency of strategy use (i.e., 1='never 'or 'almost never true of me' -5='always' or 'almost always true of me'). Mean score for the strategy group explained according to the adjusted reporting scale Cabrejas (2012). In addition, two open-ended questions are included that address writing strategies that may not have been covered in the closed-ended items. At the end, each participant was told to keep coding. The researcher informed students about the purpose of coding and what it was according to their seating arrangements.

3.7. 2. Writing performance Test

The second data collection instrument was writing performance test. The purpose of the writing test intended to answer the second research question which aimed at determining the level of Yaberus Secondary school students' writing performance. In the test, all students who filled out the questionnaire were asked to write a descriptive paragraph of about 120 words on the topic given by the researcher to examine their writing performance level. The descriptive topic ("Describe your best friend in your school") was given to students to write a well-organized paragraph. The researcher chose this topic because they thought learners would be familiar with it; they could pick up the words easily and write better descriptive paragraphs with ease. The researcher made all participants took writing performance test purposefully so as to check the effectiveness of the overall and individual writing strategy use on students' writing performance. The writing test was rated by two raters (an experienced volunteer teacher and the researcher himself) using analysis scoring guidelines adapted from Oshima and Hogue (2006) English paragraph, writing profile. This rubric tool contained a set of well-established guidelines that help the researcher get more or less the level of students' writing performance. During the rating process, the best performance is assigned the highest performance class and the worst performance is assigned the lowest performance class.

Scoring criteria provided descriptive criteria for the different levels of performance on the scale. These descriptors provided appropriate judgments to raters, allowing them to maintain the reliability of their ratings. Generally, these analytic rubrics provide systematic and inclusive feedback to raters and help them determine the level of students' writing performance objectively. The modified version of the analysis rubric contains 5 domains like the original version. This study determined the overall writing performance of students' rather than looking at their performance of the specific element in writing. Hence, 4 sub-domains would be given equal weight of 5 points. The final product has a four-point scale (from 1 indicating many errors in the work) to 5 (a complete understanding of the work), and features four sub-areas of paragraph writing performance - topic sentences, supporting details, mechanisms and concluding sentences .

Two raters marked the students writing performance test. The teacher (rater 2) selected using purposive sampling technique since the researcher thinks rating students' writing performance test requires teachers' interest and experience. Rater was given 30 minutes of presentation and discussion with the researcher to score students on a writing performance test according to

analytical scoring guidelines adapted from Oshima and Hogue (2006) English paragraph writing profile, which eventually aims at improving rating accuracy and rater agreement so as to control reliability. The orientation involved an explanation of the rating system and conversation on avoiding bias.

During rating, each rater worked independently and students were asked to write paragraph in two copies. This is purposefully done to keep the reliability of the test results. Then, the scores calculated out of 20 and the total score converted into 100 to level the students' writing performance achievement as high, medium and low. This made in line with the Ethiopian ministry of education that level students' general academic learning achievement below 50 as low, 50-74 medium and 75-100 as high achievers.

In the second term of rating, the raters exchanged the remaining copies of the paragraphs to be rated by the fellow rater. Finally, the average score had taken to determine students' writing performance.

3.7. 3. Interview

A semi-structured interview was used for students to get qualitative data on their use of writing strategies in English writing classes. It was used in order to supplement the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire and writing performance test. The researcher was used it to clearly obtain information from the participants on the types of writing strategies they used most often to improve their writing skills. An interview was better suited to gain full information, free discussion, responsiveness, and flexibility not available through other data collection tools (Best and Kahn, 2007). It also gave the researcher the opportunity to ask other relevant questions that can lead to more information. In addition, the test was also administered as a follow up (for triangulation) to the students' questionnaire. The interview questions were developed from the inventory questionnaire's result by the researcher. The interview consisted of eight questions used to elicit in-depth information about personal matters based on the subject areas covered in this study. The number was limited to eight for ease of management, and the researcher assessed the questions to be touched on the study. Interviews were conducted one-on-one orally to maximize data quality.

Of the 80 students, 6(six) students (i.e., 3 from high achievers and 3 from low achievers) were purposefully selected for the interview based on their writing performance test results. This

enabled the researcher to gather sufficient research data from both high and low achievers on the writing performance test. The interviews lasted 5 to 10 minutes for each interviewee. During the interview, the interviewees had the opportunity to speak in Amharic or English according to their preference. All respondents then coded and recorded their voices using a smartphone voice recorder, and the researcher took some additional notes during the interview.

3.8. Validity and Reliability of Instruments

The reliability and validity of the tools in this study were guaranteed by different means. The tools used in this study were prepared based on the existing literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Before the main study, the instruments were validated by the researcher's supervisors. Then, they commented on the content and face validities of the questionnaire items, the writing performance test and the interview.

Before conducting the main study, the instruments were also validated by two experts (MA in TEFL) working at Wolkite University. The experts have 6 and 8 years of working experience in English teaching in Ethiopian public universities. They then commented on the content and face validity of the questionnaire items, the IELTS writing performance test and the interview checklist. Not only that, but they commented on the statement of items, clarity, item's relevance, format, correctness, and how well the item actually measured what the researcher really wanted to measure. The researcher gained constructive insights on content and face validity, as well as the relevance of the items (including the wording, language usage, and format of the three tools).

The researcher conducted a pilot study to examine the reliability of data collection tools (i.e., questionnaire, interview and writing performance test) and administrative procedures. More specifically, the reliability of the questionnaire checked for its internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha coefficients. The Cronbach’s alpha for the questionnaire (42 items) was found to be 0.877, a high index of reliability. This means that the items were more reliable and acceptable in identifying the writing strategies used by students.

To ensure the reliability of writing performance test, the raters (the interested and staff English teacher) selected. Then, the rater oriented how to evaluate students' paragraph writing based on the sub-domains of writing performance scoring means that range from 1-5 taken from Oshima and Hogue (2006) scoring guidelines. The orientation also focused on highlighting on the objectives of the test and its role in their future careers. As noted in the rating process above,

students are asked to write their paragraph in duplicate. The raters then marked the two copies that were exchanged, and finally calculate and average the results to ensure reliability. Students were also provided with guidance regarding the objectives of the written performance test and its role. The students told them they had to get out of their anxiety and write a paragraph on a topic of “my best friend”.

To ensure the reliability of the writing performance test, inter-rater reliability was used to arrive at scores given by two raters. What is more, inter-rater reliability was used to realize the scores. The marks computed using Cohen's Kappa to verify the consistency of the marks given by raters.). In this study, there was a substantial agreement between the two raters. This value reflects the substantial strength of the test's consistency and reliability.

In order to maintain the credibility of the interview data, the researcher conducted face-to-face communication with each interviewee. The use of face-to-face interview would increase the credibility of the interview data. This was also supporting him to get adequate information about students' writing strategies use in relation to the variables such as writing performance, high achiever and low achiever.

3.9. Data Collection Procedures for the Main Study

First, a pilot study was conducted to test the reliability of the instruments. The researcher was briefed the teachers on the purpose of the study; with the help of the teachers, then arranged a data collection schedule: questionnaire, writing performance test and interview. After all arrangements were made, the researcher informed the respondents about the objective of the study before the main administration of the questionnaire. The necessary instructions were given to the respondents by reading the script; in addition, general instructions in Amharic would be provided for students. This process took 15-20 minutes. The researcher asked the students to fill out a questionnaire. What is more, participants were asked to ask questions to clarify anything they might not be able to fill out. Then, the questionnaire paper distributed to them to fill in though most of the respondents have difficulty in understanding the questionnaire's items. It took an average of 30-40 minutes to complete anonymously and confidentially.

As soon as the questionnaire completed, the researcher selected rater (experienced and volunteer English language teacher) who could help him to assess students' writing performance test. Then, the students received orientation on the purpose and function of the test. After the writing

performance test completed, 6(six) students selected for an interview. Then, the interview was used to corroborate the data obtained through the questionnaire and the writing performance test. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, the researcher coded the interviewees as in turn. To retain the interview data, the researcher recorded the interview using a smart phone and transcribed it line by line on the paper.

3.10. Methods of Data Analysis

The data was collected through the three tools, namely questionnaires, writing performance test and interviews. Then the collected data classified and analysed according to the types of research approaches (mixed-method approach).

3.10.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

In this study to describe students' writing strategies use and writing performance Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 used to quantitatively. However, the data obtained through the questionnaire computed as follows.

To address the first research question, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation used. More importantly, the mean score calculated to identify the most frequently used writing strategies by students. The frequency with which students use writing strategies determined according to the recommended benchmarks: 1.0-2.4 represents a low level and 3.5-5 represents a high level of strategy use (Oxford, 1990).

The Likert scale was transformed into continuous data. Then, the mean value used to identify the writing strategies used by students. In addition, Pearson momentum correlation (r) used to determine the relationship between students' writing strategies use and their writing performance. It was also be used to determine whether there was a correlation between higher-level and lower-level proficient students in using writing strategies. The p-value used to determine the significance level of $p<0.05$ or $p>0.05$ between high achievers and low achievers in secondary school students in using writing strategies. According to the statistical theory, if $p<0.05$, there was a significant difference. Conversely, there was no significant difference between the two groups if $p>0.05$.

3.10.2. Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data was collected through interviews. The data collected through the interview was analysed according to the following procedure. The audio-recorded interview was transcribed word for word and written in conversation form to identify the interviewee's response. The transcripts of students' interviews were coded and classified 6 interview records directly. Finally, the responses was analysed qualitatively.

3.11. Ethical Considerations

The researcher has a moral and professional obligation to meet ethical standards while collecting data for this study. Therefore, a consent letter was obtained from the head of the Department of English Language and Literature at Wolkite University. Then, the researcher submitted an official letter to the principal of Yaberus secondary school. Then, the researcher explained the objectives of data collection and identify whether the respondents were willing to take part in the study or not. For the confidentiality of the information, the respondents' names and addresses protected from any kind of identification while collecting data.

3.12. Pilot study

A pilot study is a preliminary or small-scale study that is used to evaluate the data collection tools, data analysis techniques and procedures that the researcher intends to use. In fact, this pilot study was used to confirm the reliability of the data collection instruments and the procedures used. It also helped the researcher to make some modifications to the data collection methods and approaches of the study. Thus, it was a small-scale study aimed at understanding the feasibility of the expected study design, methods and procedures for this main study.

In this part, the purpose of the pilot study, the setting of the study, the participants, and the sampling techniques of the study, data collection procedures, insights gained from the pilot study, and the measures taken were reported.

3.12.1 Purposes of Conducting Pilot Study

A pilot study is used to understand the reliability of the instruments of research (Saks & Leijen, 2014). This pilot study had two main objectives. The first objective was to try out the data collection tools (a questionnaire, writing performance test, and interview) and data analysis

methods, sampling techniques, and procedures that could be used in the main research. This supported the researcher to make sure that the procedures of data collection were revised as needed before the main data collection. Second, it was used to determine the level of difficulty and the degree of distinction between items. Third, it aimed to use the results of the study as a springboard for the main data. Therefore, this pilot study also enabled the researcher to predict the problems that might be encountered during the main study.

The researcher conducted a pilot study to check the reliability of the data collection instrument (questionnaire) and administrative procedures. More importantly, the reliability of the questionnaire was checked for its internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha coefficients. The Cronbach's alpha for the questionnaire (42 items) was found to be 0.877, showed a high index of reliability. This means that the items were more reliable and acceptable in identifying the writing strategies used by Yaberus secondary students.

CHAPTER FOUR: INTERPRETATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the results of data collected through tools such as a questionnaire, IELTS writing performance test and interview. It also presents the analyses and results of the data collected for this study. Moreover, this chapter interprets the findings of this study.

4.2. Results of Students' Questionnaire

LLSs are divided into two types according to their functions. These include indirect (i.e., metacognitive, affective, and social strategies, and direct (i.e., cognitive, memory, and compensation strategies (Oxford, 1990). Oxford underlined that the frequency of students' learning strategies is identified mainly through the mean (M) values: mean scores ranging from 3.5 to 5.0 indicate a higher strategy user who usually or almost always uses strategies, while mean scores in the range of 2.5 to 3.4 indicate a medium strategy user who sometimes uses strategies, and mean scores from 1.0 to 2.4 indicate a lower strategy user who does not usually use strategies (Oxford, 1990). Since writing strategies are a subset of LLSs, the following data were analysed by considering the mean (M) scores of students' writing strategies used. The students' responses to the questionnaire were categorized based on the above criteria.

Writing strategies students most frequently used.

Table : Descriptive statistics for the frequency use of writing strategies

Strategies	**Mean (M)**	**SD**	**Level of strategy use**	**Frequency of use**	**Rank**
Compensation	2.71	0.833	Medium	Usually used	1st
Memory	2.50	0.728	Medium	Usually used	2nd
Metacognitive	2.37	0.715	Low	Not usually used	3rd
Social	2.25	0.695	Low	Not usually used	4th
Affective	2.22	0.680	Low	Not usually used	5th
Cognitive	2.19	0.674	Low	Not usually used	6th
Grand total	2.37	0.720	Low	Not usually used	

Table 1 presents the mean scores of secondary school learners' strategies use that ranges from high 3.51 to low 2.21. Descriptive statistics (M=2.37) using the total score of the writing strategy showed that the respondents were low writing strategy users. Respondents' indicated that they used metacognitive (M=2.37), social (M=2.25), affective (M=2.22), and cognitive (M=2.19) writing strategy less frequently, but compensation (M=2.71) and memory (M=2.50) writing strategy were employed at moderate level. These results showed that compensation and memory writing strategies were the most frequently used by students.

Students' response to the second research question: whether high-level and low-level learners use similar writing strategies.

Table 2: Variability in low level and high level in using writing strategies

Type of writing strategy	**Low achievers**			**High achievers**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Rank**
Metacognitive	2.34	0.805	3	2.41	0.444	4
Memory	2.32	0.690	4	2.61	0.431	**1**
Compensation	2.27	0.789	5	2.52	0.688	**2**
Social	2.48	0.691	**2**	2.40	0.772	5
affective	2.50	0.571	**1**	2.39	0.594	6
Cognitive	2.17	0.877	6	2.43	0.764	3
Total	2.34	0.737		2.46	0.612	

As can be seen from the Table 2 above, the high-achieving group and the low-achieving group did not use similar learning strategies to solve their writing problems. The high-achieving group (M = 2.46) used moderate-level writing strategies, whereas the low-achieving group (M=2.34) used lower-level writing strategies. More importantly, compensation and memory writing strategies were the most commonly used strategies by the high-achieving group, while social and affective writing strategies were the most commonly used strategies by the low-achieving group.

Table 3: The Relationship between low-achieving group and high achieving group in using Writing Strategies

Correlations		Low achievers	High achievers
Low achievers	Pearson Correlation	1	.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.058
	N	80	80
High achievers	Pearson Correlation	.063	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.058	
	N	80	80

Table 3 showed that there was not a significant relationship between high achievers and low achievers in the use of writing strategies (r=0.63, p=.058, p>0.05). These results showed that both low achievers did not use effective strategies to improve their writing skills.

4.3. Results of Students' writing performance test

Students' response to the third research question: What kind of a relationship was there between writing strategies and writing performance?

According to University of Cambridge (2019) the score of IELTS writing proficiency test scale includes 9 (expert user), 8 (very good user), 7 (good user), 6 (competent user), 5 (modest user), 4 (limited user), 3 (extremely limited user), 2 (intermittent user), 1 (no user) and 0 (did not attempt the test). What is more, students' writing performance is determined by considering the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR): learning, teaching, assessment. This means that proficient users (C2 or 9 score and C1 or 7-8 scores), independent users (B2 or 5.5-6.5 scores and B1 or 4-5 scores) and basic users (A2 or 2-3 scores and A1 or 0-1 scores) (Athiworakun et al., 2018; Little, 2007). Hence, the results of the students' IELTS writing performance test were defined using CEFR guidelines to determine their proficiency levels by using scales 0-9.

Table 4: Results of Yaberus secondary school students' English writing proficiency test

Students	IELTS Scores	Students	IELTS Scores	Students	IELTS Scores
S1	2.25	S36	3.13	S71	2.75
S2	2.00	S37	4.13	S72	3.50
S3	3.00	S38	4.00	S73	3.50
S4	3.00	S39	3.75	S74	3.00
S5	2.38	S40	2.50	S75	3.00
S6	3.00	S41	2.25	S76	3.00
S7	2.25	S42	2.00	S77	3.13
S8	3.00	S43	3.00	S78	3.25
S9	3.00	S44	3.00	S79	3.00
S10	3.00	S45	2.38	S80	3.25
S11	3.13	S46	3.00		
S12	3.25	S47	2.75		
S13	3.00	S48	2.50		
S14	3.25	S49	2.25		
S15	2.50	S50	2.00		
S16	3.50	S51	2.38		
S17	2.63	S52	2.88		
S18	3.00	S53	3.00		
S19	3.00	S54	2.25		
S20	3.00	S55	3.00		
S21	3.50	S56	2.00		
S22	2.50	S57	2.63		
S23	3.50	S58	3.25		
S24	2.63	S59	2.88		
S25	3.50	S60	2.38		
S26	2.50	S61	2.50		
S27	3.13	S62	2.63		
S28	3.38	S63	2.63		

S29	2.50	S64	3.00		
S30	2.63	S65	2.00		
S31	3.00	S66	2.38		
S32	3.00	S67	3.00		
S33	3.25	S68	2.25		
S34	4.00	S69	2.38		
S35	3.25	S70	3.13		

The results in Table 4 showed that students were limited users (4), extremely limited users (3), and intermittent users (2). The scores of students were from 2-4 the IELTS scores at levels A1 and A2 (Basic User) and B2 (Independent User). More specifically, most learners' IELTS scores were 2-3, which were equivalent to CEFR (Basic User) at A1 and A2 levels. A few students' IELTS score was 4, which was equivalent to B1 level (Independent User). Their writing performance level was found from band scales 2-4. Therefore, students of Yaberus test results are below the requirement of the IELTS writing performance test. This means that they are incompetent English users.

4.3.1. The Relationship between Writing Strategies Use and Writing Performance

Table 5: The Correlation between Students' Writing Strategies Use and Writing Performance

Correlations		Writing Strategy Use	Writing Performance
Writing Strategy Use	Pearson Correlation	1	.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	80	80
Writing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.046	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	80	80

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between students' use of writing strategies and their writing performance ($r=0.46$, $p=.000$, $p<0.05$).

These results showed that there was a weak correlation between the two variables though there was a linear relationship.

4.3.2 Analysis of Data from the Interview

In this section, the results of data collected from students through interviews were presented. For ease of analysis, interviewees were coded S1-S6 respectively. Thus, these codes had been used all the way.

The eight interview questions presented in this study were the same as the questions in the questionnaire as the target of this interview was to cross check the responses of the subjects during questionnaire. The response of each six interviewee was recorded separately on the question paper and using digital recorder.

Regarding the first question, the interviewees in this study were inquired to mention the types of learning strategies they regularly use to develop their English writing. Consequently, it was discovered that the high achievers partially identify the use of strategies they frequently deploy in learning the target language. They noted that they usually use strategies such as asking their partners for clarification, watching TV/films spoken in English, monitoring their progress, reading for pleasure, setting clear goals to boost their language ability, practicing the language, making summaries of information what they read and hear, saying or writing new English words several times, writing messages and letters in English etc. On the contrary, as the data obtained from the interview show that the Low achievers could not precisely list the use of techniques which are useful to enhance their English language. As can be possible to see from the respondents' response, the high achievers were able to refer to about six learning strategies. They reported that they usually utilize these strategies in their language learning. Whereas, the low achievers mentioned two or three learning strategies respectively which they were frequently use. Thus, this implied that unlike the low achievers, the high achievers more frequently apply a number of writing strategies to learn English language.

To put in a nutshell, responses of the subjects to the interview questions point out that the more successful learners in contrast with the low successful learners have high language learning strategies utilization in learning English language. Thus, Data gained from the interviews correspond with the data obtained through the questionnaire.

In their responses, 6 informants (S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, and S6) reported that sometimes they use strategies such as practicing with their friends, cooperating with one another, receiving and sending messages, and watching films and TV shows in English. Interviewees explained that they paid little attention to using these strategies inside and outside the classroom. These responses showed that they do not consciously use strategies to solve their writing problems. This means that although students have limited knowledge of using effective strategies, they use cognitive and social strategies in some way to practice writing. Similarly, the informants made it clear:

> We always need teacher's support and use gestures or facial expressions. Sometimes, we use different social media to chat with their friends and relatives to convey information although we have problems with grammar and word choices. (S1 and S6)

> We read different reference books and novels, play games on our smartphone, practise with our friends and ask questions for clarification, but we don't pay attention to how to speak English. As our hobby, we also like to watch films, YouTube relate to our familiar topics and music instead of focusing more on overcoming the problems of English writing. (S2, S3, S4 and S5)

It can be seen from the above responses that students most often use memory and compensation writing strategies, but they have limited language knowledge and do not know how to use the strategies in writing. This triangulation would have a great contribution to the reliability of the findings. Nonetheless, some data showed a disparity in the use of different writing strategies to exercise written texts. They also lack the motivation to practice writing in and out of the classroom. In other words, they have problems with the effective use of vocabulary, grammar and the knowledge of writing strategies. The sample interviewees ensured that students' linguistic knowledge and understanding of the writing strategies were very low. Please see the attachment for the original text of the interviewees' remarks (appendices).

4.4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to find out the writing strategies most frequently used by Yaberus secondary school students. The questionnaire and interview were used to pinpoint the writing strategies used by the students to achieve the objective of this study.

The results of this study showed that of all writing strategies under the categories, compensation (M=2.71) and memory (M=2.50) writing strategies were the most frequently used by secondary school students. Meanwhile, affective, metacognition, memory, and compensatory writing strategies were used the least.

Additionally, the data obtained through the tools which were used in this thesis for basic reasons. First, it requires bringing together the data gained through different tools of the same theme for the sake of triangulation. In relation to this, the data gained through the three tools (Questionnaire, interview and Writing Performance Test) were consolidated with the data onto the interview to draw meaning out of it. After triangulating and drawing meaning, an attempt was made to relate the major findings of the study with the literature. This helped to see the convergence or divergence of the findings in this study with the existing literature.

4.4.1. The Students Writing Strategies use

This part of the discussion mainly aimed at answering the second research question which deals with the level of students' writing strategies use. It also partially answers the last research question as it discusses the reasons for students' low writing strategy use. Students' knowledge about the writing strategies, which was described in the interview part, was found to be contradicting. Their understanding of the writing strategies was poor as they did not take the writing strategies clue.

One of the most important findings in this study was related to students' low writing strategies use which could be seen as one of the reasons for students' indistinct position on their knowledge of the writing strategies. The findings revealed that students' level of using the writing strategies was low. This means that students were not using the various writing strategies, which are believed to contribute to the fluency and accuracy of their writing performance, at a satisfactory level. They reported that they used the writing strategies quiet below average. This could mean that students were using the writing strategies occasionally than using them regularly to facilitate their writing. It could partly be because of students' low writing strategies use that their writing performance laid at an alarmingly low level.

In the interview session, students were asked to forward the likely reasons they have for their low writing strategy use, and they itemized factors such as their motivation, attitude and interest of using the writing strategies as the major ones. They also seriously indicated that the

marginalization of the writing strategies from the curriculum is a root cause for their poor writing strategy use. This might be further interpreted as students were not motivated to use the writing strategies. In conclusion, it can be said that students were not using the writing strategies because of their knowledge gap caused due to their psychological and educational backgrounds. Similarly, Park (2010) and Ellis (2008) stated that there are many variables besides using writing strategies. They also mentioned linguistic and background knowledge as factors that might affect students' writing strategy use. This makes it consistent with the finding of the current study.

The findings of the descriptive analyses on the Writing Strategies use Inventory Questionnaire revealed that the compensation and memory writing strategies were the two most frequently used writing strategies, though at an average level, compared to the remaining four writing strategies. Likewise, during the interview, students mentioned the compensation and memory writing strategies as their frequently used writing strategies. This convergence between the results gained through the tools could give a reliable picture of students' use of the writing strategies. In other words, it would be said that students' skills of connecting a given L2 item or concept with another and using supplementary techniques to complement their writing skill are better than their skills in the remaining strategies (Oxford, 1990). These findings partly agree with findings from previous studies (Cabrejas, 2012; Torrance et al., 2000) which identified cognitive and metacognitive strategies as the most frequently used writing strategies for successful writing. The studies did not overlook the compensation and affective writing strategies.

4.4.2 The relationship between higher-level and lower-level students in using writing strategies.

The main objective this section was to describe the relationship between higher-level and lower-level students in using writing strategies.

The results of this study showed that there was not a significant relationship between high achievers and low achievers in the use of writing strategies ($r=0.63$, $p=.058$, $p>0.05$). These results showed that both low achievers did not use effective strategies to improve their writing skills. These results showed that both low achievers did not use effective strategies to improve their writing skills. The interview also substantiated that there was a big gap between higher achievers and low achievers in using various writing strategies to solve their writing problems.

The writing performance of students' can be slightly changed as their writing strategy use gets

better. When we compared the results for the two predictor variables, it was found that writing strategy use was a better predictor of writing performance, although the difference was not significant. This finding is consistent with the findings of other researchers (Horwitz, 1987, 1988; Abraham & Vann, 1987; Wenden, 1986a, 1986ab) who suggested connections between learners' use of language learning strategies and their writing performance.

On the other hand, the effect of each of the six writing strategies use on writing performance was examined, and the students' writing strategies predicted writing performance though the prediction level was non-significant. This means that the more students use the affective writing strategies such as encouraging and rewarding themselves while writing to challenge their writing difficulties, the better their writing performance will be. Furthermore, the uses of writing strategies were the less predictor of secondary school students' writing performance. This means that the more students help each other, the better their writing scores will be. In other words, students' writing performance could be improved as they get the chance to work with their friends.

In general, it could be said that the aggregated effect of writing strategy and the individual influence of the six writing strategies use on writing performance were almost found to be consistent as there exists a positive, but insignificant level of influence in both cases. The few studies in this area (Lan & Oxford, 2003; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Wharton, 2000 & Yang, 1999) found that social and emotional strategies are among the most commonly used writing strategies. These findings are consistent with those of the current study.

As can be observed from the students' response in this study, it would seem reasonable to conclude that learners' use of language learning strategies in learning English is unsatisfactory. More specifically, the high achievers and the low achievers did not equally utilize language learning strategies to develop their English language performance. Low achievers used neither direct writing strategies nor higher levels of indirect writing strategies, indicating that they had little knowledge of strategy use. The high achievers utilize all six main language learning strategies found in both direct and indirect strategies at moderate level. This shows that high achievers outperform low achievers by applying a wide range of language learning strategies, which obviously means they have better experience in the use of English language learning strategies. In supporting this, researches in foreign language learning strategies' use also reflect similar results in favor of more successful learners' as higher and more often users (Altan, 2003;

Bruen, 2001; Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; Cohen, 1990; Green & Oxford, 1995; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1992; Wenden, 1987; Wharton, 2000).

At the same time, a few researches reveal that metacognitive strategies were found to be employed predominantly by high achievers (Chamot, 2005; Lai, 2005; Vandergrift, 2003; Wenden, 1998). Yet, this study disproves this fact for the reason that social strategies are applied more frequently by high achievers in the first place. This study also denies the fact that monitoring strategies under metacognitive strategies are used more frequently by more successful learners (Vandergrift, 2003) because they more frequently use opportunity-seeking strategies under this main category.

Therefore, it is expected that there was no significant relationship between high achievers and low achievers in using writing strategies. This might be due to the fact that low achievers did not value academic education. They did not know how to use writing strategies to develop their writing skills. Additionally, both groups of students were not given the golden opportunity to practice writing in class. Finally, the English did not motivate students' use different writing strategies.

4.4.3 The relationship between Students' writing strategies use and Writing Performance

The main objective of this section was to describe the relationship between secondary school students' writing strategies use and writing performance.

The findings of this study showed that there was a significant relationship between writing strategies and writing performance, but it was weak. In this part, an attempt was made to give meaning to the findings related to students' writing performance level and the major reasons for their poor writing performance. All respondents scored below and far below average in the writing performance test. This could mean that most of the students were not able to produce fluent and accurate writing. This can be further explained by the fact that students are unable to produce sentences without grammatical and mechanical errors. These students were also unable to write meaningful compositions/ or letters that convey the intended content. Furthermore, the above result can also be a good indicator that students' capacity of organizing the ideas and using appropriate words in their writing was below the expectation. This implied that when the

students' writing strategies maximized, the students' writing performance becomes improved and vice versa. Therefore, students' compositions were not found qualified when they were evaluated against the five criteria (mechanics, content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar) which were used to evaluate their writing performance level. The above discussion might help to conclude that students' level of writing performance was at the elementary level while they were expected to be at the high school level. This is one of the basic findings in this thesis.
After identifying that students' writing performance was at a shocking level, students were asked reasons for their poor writing performance.

Here, students raised the major reason for their poor writing performance. They mentioned that lack of motivation, interest, and positive attitude in writing were some of the major factors responsible for their poor writing performance. They also cited poor quality of writing instruction, marginalization of writing strategies in the curriculum, inappropriate use of writing methods, and lack of regular practice as the main reasons for their poor writing performance. These factors can be categorized under the pedagogical factors that could affect students' writing performance. They also cited a poor background in writing skills as one of the reasons for their poor writing performance.

Therefore, it could be said that there were many factors that cause students' poor writing performance, which can be summarized into two categories: educational background and psychological background. In the literature, there are several studies (Hampton & Mason, 2003; Hinkel, 2004; 2002; Millis et al., 2007; Pajares, 2003) that support the results of the current study. Some researchers disagree with this view. Correspondingly, Reddy and Talcott (2006) argue that students' educational background has little to do with their future academic performance.

The results had found a positive relationship between writing strategy use and writing performance, although this relationship was weak. This might be further explained as the use of writing strategies has its own impact on the quality of students' writing. That is, as the frequency of students' writing strategy use increases, the quality of their writing will also be built up. However, the use of writing strategies contributed little to writing performance as the relationship between the two variables was found to be weak. This might be alternatively discussed as writing strategy use is one of perhaps the least determinant factor among other factors that contributes to students' writing performance though it better determines writing performance. This finding is consistent with various hypotheses arguing for a relationship between writing strategy use and

writing performance (Chien, 2012; Harris et al., 2008; Hu & Chen, 2007; Victori, 1999).

The study also found that the relationship between these two variables was the weakest compared to the relationship between writing strategy use and writing performance. In other words, it could be said that the change in one's writing has an impact, but insignificant, on the use of writing strategies. Therefore, it can be concluded that beliefs about writing and the use of writing strategies can influence each other, although the extent to which they contribute is irrelevant. Sundry studies support this finding as they found positive relationships between beliefs about writing and writing performance in an academic setting (Garcia & de Caso, 2006; Pajares, 2003; Bruning & Horn, 2000; Pajares & Johnson, 1996; Pajares & Valiente, 1999). The findings of the studies reveal that those students who are proficient in writing are more frequent users of effective writing strategies.

It was expected that there was a positive relationship between the two variables. That is, if the learners employ writing strategies frequently, their writing performance will increase. However, the results of this study indicate a weak correlation between the two variables. As mentioned earlier, one of the possible reasons for the weaker correlation between the two variables may be that learners are not aware of using effective writing strategies based on their interests. What is more, they use writing strategies that have very limited use of the target language. It can be considered that the learners' writing performance was influenced by other factors, such as writing strategies used by students in and out of the classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study:

Secondary school students' use of the overall writing strategy was reported to be a low level of frequency. Learners did not use effective writing strategies to because they had limited knowledge about using writing strategies and had less exposure to language learning environments. This means that Ethiopian secondary school students do not use writing strategies effectively, even though they consider these strategies to be very important.

The findings showed that memory and compensation writing strategies were used most frequently by students, while social, cognitive, metacognitive, and affective writing strategies were used the least.

Students' writing strategies use level was found to be even far average; this means that students were less frequently using the writing strategies than using them regularly to ease their writing. This could have its own impact on students' low writing performance, poor understanding about the compositional aspect of the English writing, the teachers did not understand about writing strategies and the marginalization of the writing strategies from the text as the reason for their less frequent use of writing strategies. It was also confirmed that the writing strategies are not included in the current secondary school English material. This can have a huge impact on overall writing pedagogy and students' writing performance, because it's difficult to talk about effective writing without writing strategies that are considered a road map to effective writing. The learners' self-awareness of their learning is essential elements in the development of the English writing proficiency and therefore, the teaching materials and classroom instruction should include these as their objectives.

The data in the student's response confirm that the high achievers and the low achievers employ the six major language learning strategies at different frequency level. This could be ranked into the following order of their strategy use:

High-achieving learners used memory and compensation writing strategies most frequently, whereas they used cognitive, metacognitive, social, and affective writing strategies least frequently.

Though it can certainly be argued that the strategies used at a higher frequency were more interesting, looking into the strategies that see the least use is also importance, as the different factors that affect strategies use and choice might mean that strategies are used at a low frequency by one group, and may be used at a higher frequency by other groups.

Lower-achieving learners used affective and social writing strategies most frequently, whereas they used metacognitive, memory, compensation, and cognitive writing strategies least frequently.

At the same time, the researcher found statistically significant mean differences between high and low achievers in the use of all strategies. Therefore, it can be concluded that high-achieving learners had high strategy use, while low-achieving learners had low strategy use. This actually shows that in terms of the use of writing strategies, more effective students had better experiences in using strategies than lower-achieving students.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications

This study has some pedagogical implications for students, English teachers, and curriculum and material designers that it is hoped that be helpful. First, students need to develop an awareness of language learning strategies in general and writing strategies in particular to improve their proficiency level in the target language. Second, English teachers should enrich learners' knowledge and experiences around the world through writing English courses in a more advanced way. Third, English teachers should review their teaching methods, classroom styles and personal preferences. They also need to provide students with more opportunities to use the most frequently used writing strategies and recognize the importance of strategies for all students.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the conclusions and pedagogical implications above, the following recommendations were made.

- Students should constantly use different writing strategies in and out of the classroom to solve their writing problems. They should also be aware of the different writing strategies. With respect to English language teachers, they should explicitly and implicitly introduce, train and encourage students on how to use different writing strategies based on their interests and preferences.

- Students' should develop their awareness of using varies writing strategies to solve their writing problems.

- To improve the achievement diverse and the inadequate proficiency level of English language learning with respect to the two groups (high and low achievers), it is suggested that awareness raising should be made to boost students' use of writing strategies at higher frequency. Moreover, it must be specified that learners need to be trained on the use of strategies to develop a sense of responsibility in learning the target language. This is for the reason that learning strategies serve as a way to develop one's own language competence in general and writing competency particularly, and learners can really seize due responsibility for their competence if they recognize these techniques. Therefore, learners should receive training in a wide range of language learning strategies, helping them to identify the strategies that work for them and helping them discover how and when to use these strategies.

- Likewise, it is suggested that language teachers should create teaching conditions where learners can help each other. English language teachers on their part are also responsible to distinguish the most and the least used sub-categories of strategies by the high and the low achievers and provide them with the necessary support to help the students use all the sub-categories in order to enhance their language performance. Most importantly, they should encourage students, especially lower-achieving students, to use effective writing strategies to overcome their writing problems.

- Lower achieving students should be encouraged to use different strategies to overcome their writing problems. It is also suggested that secondary school teachers should pay more attention on training students to develop their writing skills.
- It is necessary to arrange short-term and long-term training for English teachers to improve their overall understanding of language learning strategies in general and writing strategies in particular.
- Being majority of secondary school students' learning strategies use towards the target language is daunting; they need to be instructed writing strategies as a single subject to remedy the problem.

- They should have more opportunities to take more writing courses. On the other hand, the

new curriculum should consider more new writing English courses with more opportunities to improve students' writing performance.

- Finally, the researcher strongly recommends that the Curriculum developers should understand the value of teaching writing strategies. Therefore it is important to develop a separate section for teaching strategies as is given to the teaching of English language in general and writing strategies in particular.

5.4. Future Research

The current study was conducted only at Yaberus secondary School and included only grade eleventh students. This research needs to be extended in terms of large-scale investigation using large samples in different contexts, to obtain more detailed information across all regions to understand the generalizability of the findings.

The present study was only conducted at the secondary school level. This calls for more research investigating students' writing strategies use in terms of educational background and motivation level at primary school and higher education throughout the country. Future researchers should conduct different studies in this area to confirm the generalizability of the results.

This study suggests that apart from writing performance and low and high achievers, more extensive studies on the variables such as secondary school students' academic achievement, attitude, background knowledge and motivation should be taken into account in the identification of writing strategies.

Last but not least, this study suggests for future researchers to conduct studies related to investigating secondary school students' use in learning other language skills (i.e., speaking, reading and listening) and language proficiency.

REFERENCES

Abas, I. H., & Abd Aziz, N. H. (2016). Classification of L2 writing process and writing strategies. *Proceedings of the ICECRS*, *1*(1), v1i1-505

Abdollahzadeh, E. (2010). Undergraduate Iranian EFL learners' use of writing strategies. *Writing & Pedagogy*, *2*(1), 65-90.

Abraham, R.G., & Vann, R.J. (1987).Strategies of two language learners: case study. In A. L. Wen den & J. Rubin (Eds.),*Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.85-102). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alamirew G/Mariam,(2005).*A Study on the Perception of Writing, Writing Instruction, and Students' Writing, Performance*. (PhD Dissertation). Addis Ababa: AAU. Unpublished.

Anderson, G.(1983).*Fundamentals of Educational Research (1st Ed.)*.London: the Falmer Press.

Angel ova, M. (1999). *An exploratory study of factors affecting the process and product of writing in English as a foreign language.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo

Ardila, I. (2020). Writing strategies used by Indonesian EFL undergraduate students across their proficiency and gender. *Journal of Language Intelligence and Culture*, *2*(1), 16-27.

Arifin, S. (2017).L2 Writing strategies used by EFL graduate students. *Journal of ELT Research, 2(2),* 115-129.

Aripin, N., & Rahmat, N. H. (2021). Metacognitive writing strategies model used by ESL writers in the writing process: A study across gender. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *11*(1), 1-9.

Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal, 41*, 257-267

Athiworakun, C., Vathanalaoha, K., Thongprayoon, T., Rajprasit, K., & Yaemtui, W. (2018). SWU-SET as a CEFR standardized English test. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 9(2),* 261-267.

Baker, W., & Boonkit, A. (2004). Learning strategies in reading and writing: EAP contexts. *Regional Language Centre Journal, 35(3),* 299-328.

Bialystok, E. (1979) A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning* 28(1),69-83.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd edition).* Addison Wesley Longman.

Canale, Michael & Merrill Swain (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47

Carroll, L. A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers. Carbondale and*

Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Chamot, A.U., & El-Dinary, P.B.(1999).Children's learning strategies in language immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(3), 319-338.

Chamot, A.U., & Küpper, L.(1987)*'Learning strategies in foreign language instruction'* Foreign Language Annals,22, 13-24.

Cohen, A. D., (1998) *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Cohen, A.D., Oxford, R.L., and Chi, J. (2003) *Language Strategy Use Inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, *39*(1), 81–141.

Davidson, C. (2007). Independent Writing in Current Approaches to Writing Instruction: What Have We Overlooked?. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *6*(1), 11-24.

Dörnyei, Z., (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ehrman, M. and R. Oxford.(1990).*Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive raining setting*. Modern Language Journal, 74, pp. 311–326.

Elliot, J. (1999). Motivating students to write. *4o encontro sobre o ensino das linguas vivas no ensino superior em Portugal*, 51-64.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis.(2003) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Geremew Lemu.(1999*).A Study of the Requirements in Writing for Academic Purposes at Addis Ababa University*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, AAU).

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996).*Theory and practice of writing*. London and New York: Longman.

Griffiths, C. (2004). *Patterns of language learning strategy use*.

Griffiths, C. (2008) Strategies and good language learners. In Griffiths, C. (ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners*, pp. 83-98.Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Griffiths, C. (2013) *the Strategy Factor in Successful Language Learning.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters

Gupta, D., & Getachew S. (2011). The influence of motivation and attitude on writing strategy use of undergraduate EFL students: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives. *Asian EFL Journal*, *13*(2), 34-89.

Hsiao, T.-Y. And R. Oxford.(2002).*Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis*. Modern Language Journal, 86,pp. 368–383.

Hyland, K. (2003). Writing and teaching writing. *Second language writing*, 1-30.

Hu, N. (2022). Investigating Chinese EFL Learners' Writing Strategies and Emotional Aspects. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 15*(1), 440-468.

In J. Martin & J. Morill as (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international conference of applied linguistics* (pp.604–617).Granada: University Press.

In M.C. Witt rock(Ed.), *Hand book of research on teaching* (3rd ed.pp.315-27).NY: Macmillan.

Khaldieh, S. A. (2000). Learning Strategies and Writing Processes of Proficient vs Less-Proficient Learners of Arabic. *Foreign language annals, 33*(5), 522-533.

Kroll, B. (2003). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Little, D. (2007). The Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. *The Modern Language Journal, 91(4),* 645-655.

Manchon, R., Roca, R., & Murphy,L.(2007). A review of writing strategies: Focus on conceptualizations and impact of first language. In A.D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* Oxford, England: University Press.

McDonough, S. (1995).*Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London, England: Edward Arnold.

Mu, Congjun and Carrington Suzanne. (2007). An Investigation of Three Chinese Students' English Writing Strategies. *TESL-EJ, 11(1),* 1-23.

Naiman, N., Froehlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Tedesco, A.(1978).*The good language Learner* (Research in Education Series No.7). Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewne Manzanares, G., Russo, R.P.,& Kupper, L.(1985).Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *LanguageLearning*,35, 21-46.

O'Malley,J.M.,&Chamot, A.U.(1990).*Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

O' shima, A. & Hague, A (2006).*Introduction to Academic writing(3rd ed.).* White plains,

NY: Pearson Education.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989).Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal,* 73,291-300.

Oxford, R. L., Ehrman, M.E., & Lavine, R. Z. (2003*). Style wars: Teacher-student style conflicts in the language classroom*. In S. S. Magnan (ed.), Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs.

Perl, S.(1979).The composing processes of less killed college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *13*(4), 317–336.

Politzer, R. L., & McGroarty, M. (1985).An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quartely,* 19,103-123.

Purpura, J.(1999) *Learner Strategy Use and Performance on Language Tests: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Raimes , A. (1985)."What Unskilled Writers do as they write: A Classroom Study of Composing. *TESOL Quarterly*,19,229-258.

Raimes, A. (1991). "Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in the Teaching of Writing" TESOL Quarterly, 25/3, 407-30.

Rigney, J.W.(1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In H.F.O' Neil, Jr. (Ed.), *Learning Strategies* (pp.165-205).NY: Academic.

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

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K.(1996). Explanatory variable for EFL students, exposition writing. *Language Learning, 46*, 137–174.

Sasaki, M.(2004).A multiple-data analysis of the3.5-yeardevelopmentof EFL student writers. *Language Learning Journal*,*54*(3), 82–525.

Schmidt, R., and Watanabe, Y., (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dornyei, and R. Schmidt (Eds.) Motivation and second language acquisition, [online] Available at:<http://nflrc. hawaii.edu/>

____(1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research, history, and Typology. In A. L. Wen den & J. Rubin (Eds), *Learner strategies in language learning*,15-30,Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Seliger, H (1984*). Processing universals in second language acquisition*. In F. Eckman, L Bell & D Nelson(eds) 36-47sey.Stern,H. H.(1975).What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern LanguageReview*,31,304-18.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct natureofL2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*.

Solomon, A. (2001). *The Realization of Process Approach to Writing at the Level of Grade 10* (Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).

Soltani, A., & Kheirzadeh, S. (2017). Exploring EFL students' use of writing strategies and their attitudes towards reading-to-write and writing-only tasks. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 535-560.

Tekele. F., Melese, E., & Tefera, E. (2012). A descriptive Survey on Teachers' Perception of EFL Writing and Their Practice of Teaching Writing: Preparatory Schools in Jimma Zone in Focus. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences, 8*(1), 29-52.

Temesgen Chibsa. (2008). *The Effects of Peer Feedback on the EFL Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety at Adama University* (Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University,).

Umamah, A. & Hidayanti, I. (2018).Writing strategies and factors contributing to EFL university students' preference. *ELT-Echo, 3(1),* 70-76.

University of Cambridge ESOL Examination, (2019).*IELTS Official Website.* https://ielts material. com/IELT.

Wang, W., &Wen, Q. (2002). L1 useinL2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3)

Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R. E. (1983). The teaching of learning strategies. In *Innovation abstracts*, 5(32), 1-4.

Wenden, A L (1985). Learner strategies, *TESOL Newsletter,* 19(5), 1-7Wesche, M(1977). Learning Behaviors.

Whalen, K. (1993). A strategic approach to the development of second language written production processes.

Wong, A. (2005).Writers,, mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they

composed. *System*, *33*.

Xia, C. (2011). Learners' Strategies in English Writing. Sino-US English Teaching, 8(4), 221-226.

Yang, N.D (1999). *The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use*. System, 27(4), 515-535.

Yonas Adaye. (1996). *Teaching writing as a Process at the First year level at AAU with special reference to College English*. Master Thesis: Unpublished.

Zamel,V.(1982). Writing: The process of Discovering Meaning'. *TESOL Quarterly, 17,165-187.*

____(1983).The Composing Process of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies'. *TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187*

Zeleke A. (2013). *Training in the Learning Strategies of Writing: Its Effects on Students' Writing Skills* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation Addis Ababa University).

APPENDIX - A

Wolkite University

College Of Social Science and Humanities

Department Of English Language and Literature

Dear students,

Firstly, I would like to thank you for spending your precious time to fill this questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information for MA on '**an investigation into students' writing strategies use and writing performance: the case of grade eleven at Yaberus secondary school'** This questionnaire is used to collect adequate information about the writing strategies you use improve to your writing performance. Your response to the questions would help me to identify the problems and to suggest the possible solutions. Therefore, you are kindly requested to be honest to give genuine responses to all items in the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance!

Part I: General information

1. Name of the school----------

2. Sex: Female ☐ Male ☐

3. Grade level: 9th ☐ 10th ☐ 11th ☐ 12th ☐

Part II: Rating items

Direction: **Read the following items carefully and then put a tick (✓) against your choice.**

(Use: Never or almost never true of me=**1**,Generally not true of me=**2**, Somewhat true of me=**3**,Generally true of me=**4**, and Always or almost always true of me=**5**) of each statement describing the extent to which you agree or disagree with.

No	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
I.	***Metacognitive strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2.	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3.	I pay attention when someone is speaking English	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
4.	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5.	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
6.	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7.	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8.	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9.	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
10.	I think about my progress in learning English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
II.	***Cognitive strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11.	I read for pleasure in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12.	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly then go back and read carefully.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13.	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14.	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15	I try to talk like native English speakers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
16	I practice the sounds of English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
17	I try to find patterns in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
18	I say or write new English words several times.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
20	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
21	I start conversations in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
III.	***Memory strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
22	I review English lessons often.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
23	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24.	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
25	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
26	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
27	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
28	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
29	I use rhymes to remember new English words.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

IV	***Social strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
30	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
31	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
32	I ask questions in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
33	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
34	I practice English with other students.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
V	***Compensation strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
35	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
36	I read English without looking up every new word.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
37	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
VI	***Affective strategies***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
38	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
39	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
40	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
41	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
42	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

43. List any other writing strategies you use that are not specified in the above list.

_____

_____

_____

43. Which writing strategies are the most important to develop your writing performance?

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!!!

APPENDIX - B

Wolkite University

College Of Social Science and Humanities

Department Of English Language and Literature

Interview questions for students

This interview aims to investigate your English language writing strategies use. Your reflections will provide an insight into the nature of the foreign language writing. The interview should take approximately half an hour and your participation and cooperation throughout the process is highly appreciated. All the information collected in this interview will remain confidential and it will be used only for academic purposes at Wolkite University. All the data will be destroyed within six months from the submission date of the final project. There will be no personal information required of you and findings in the final report will be presented anonymously. You also have the right to drop out at any time in the course of the research.

1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

   _____

2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

   _____

3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

   _____

4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

   _____

   _____

5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

_____

_____

6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

_____

_____

7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

_____

_____

8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!!!

APPENDIX - C

Wolkite University

College Of Social Science and Humanities

Department Of English Language and Literature

Writing performance test

This Writing performance test aims to investigate your English language writing strategies use. Your writing will provide an insight into the nature of the foreign language writing.

Write a short paragraph for each of the following writing tasks.

1. Describe your best friend.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Write a letter from holidays to your relatives/parents.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Decide whether you are for or against wearing school uniforms.

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Find a solution to how you can help the school.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX - D

Wolkite University

College Of Social Science and Humanities

Department Of English Language and Literature

The Students' Interview Responses Transcriptions

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 1. Vocabulary; because it is essential to express the meanings.

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 1. I think about what I should write, I read some samples of similar compositions.

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 1. I start writing because once I planned my work I don't think there is anything else remaining to be done.

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 1. Yes, I do. I read a fable, news, extracts…etc. which is written in English. I think it helps to improve vocabulary and to get more familiar with grammatical constructions.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 1: I search for a synonym; either I use a dictionary or I try to remind it myself in order to be confident that what I write is correct.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 1. While writing, I think a lot about my composition and all doubts regarding the vocabulary and grammar I try to check as it goes.

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his or her comment? Why?

S 1. No, I don't; but sometimes I ask my friend for clarification.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 1. I read samples of similar works which helps me to find some ideas for writing because it helps as a guide for my writing.

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 2. I write a letter to my friends and a diary to improve my writing.

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 2. I plan out and what I want to write; I write down the messages which I want to convey. In this way it is easier to produce a coherent text.

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 2. Then I write the whole text and once I finish, I correct the mistakes because it is quick that way.

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 2. Yes, I do. I think that reading in English is helpful because you can expand your vocabulary, which is useful for writing.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 2. I try to guess and I write down what I think might be right because there is a high probability that I chose the right option.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 2. I read it again and correct if necessary. It takes me a few minutes.

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

S 2. Rarely, my works are usually ones of the best.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 2. I don't have this problem. I always have some ideas.

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 3. I sometimes write English short notes using my own words.

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 3. I think about the general concept and how to structure and organize the text.

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 3. Then I write the whole text and once I finish, I correct the mistakes because it is quick that way.

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 3. Yes, I do; especially books which I have already read in English. In this way I learn more vocabulary.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 3. I replace it with another which I am sure about. I don't want to waste time on searching in the dictionary.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 3. I read it again and correct if necessary

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

S 3. Rarely, my works are usually ones of the best.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 3. I don't have this problem. I always have some ideas.

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 4. I ask my classmates anything for clarification related with my writing.

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 4. I check some vocabulary which I will need. I think that using unusual vocabulary makes my writing more interesting.

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 4. Then I check some grammar and I'm reading around the subject. It's easier to write then

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 4. Yes, it is helpful because I can find there interesting vocabulary.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 4. I'm checking it on internet. I don't know why I do that, it just makes me sure.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 4. No. I don't have a lot of time.

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

S 4. Sometimes, I sometimes don't see my mistakes.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 4. I'm searching some clues on internet because there is everything and I can find something what will help me.

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 5. I watch English films in order to improve my writing skill

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 5. The first thing is to prepare the general layout of my text which I follow when writing. This helps me to complete the task in an effective and confident manner.

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 5. Then I write the first draft in order to be able to evaluate the produced text for its quality and length. This allows me to check the mistakes related to the grammar and the coherence of the text.

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 5. Personally, I don't read articles or books in English because my level of English does not allow me to that. However, I am sure it is helpful in learning the language; helps to expand the vocabulary, improve the grammar including the idioms.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 5. I focus on how the missing word is usually used in a sentence. If neither approach works, I leave that word out and continue writing.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 5. I check if the text is relevant to the topic and if it follows the task instructions. I check if I stayed within the word limit. Then I proofread the text.

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

S 5. Yes, I also try to ask them what else i could include in my compositions.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 5. In such case, I try to imagine myself in the context of what I am writing. Such approach

allows me to better understand the topic.

Q 1. Which writing strategies do you use to improve your writing skills?

S 6. I use vocabulary

Q 2. What is the first thing that you do when you are given your English writing task in EFL class? Why?

S 6. Plan out the answers in my head

Q 3. What are your next steps in writing in English? Why?

S 6. I write.

Q 4. Do you like reading books, compositions or paragraphs written in English? Do you think reading can help you in writing? Why?

S 6. Yes, I like to read this. I do think that is helpful because I learn spelling and grammar.

Q 5. What do you do when you are not able to remember the right word to use in your writing? Why?

S 6. Find on translate google.com.

Q 6. Do like revising your paragraph written? If so, what are the priorities you give in your revision?

S 6. I always check my grammatical errors and I talk about my essay with my friends.

Q 7. Do you give your English written work to another student to read and ask for his/her comment? Why?

S 6. Yes, because opinion about my work of English is important to me, when it is reasonable.

Q 8. What do you do when you don't know what to write in your writing class? Why?

S 6. I ask the teacher or fellow students for their opinion.

APPENDIX - E

Wolkite University

College Of Social Science and Humanities

Department Of English Language and Literature

Summary statistics for individual items

strategies	*Items*	*Opinion*	*Frequency*	*Percent*
Metacognitive	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	Never True of Me	12	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	22	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	35	43.3
		Usually True of Me	8	10.0
		Always True of Me	3	3.3
	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	4	13.3
	I pay attention when someone is speaking English	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	5	16.7
		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	8	26.7
	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	Never True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3

		Always True of Me	10	33.3
	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	4	13.3
		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	9	30.0
		Always True of Me	4	13.3
	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	Never True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	6	20.0
	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	1	3.3
		Always True of Me	7	23.3

	I think about my progress in learning English.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	5	16.7
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	8	26.7
		Always True of Me	6	20.0
Cognitive	I read for pleasure in English.	Never True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly then go back and read carefully.	Never True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually not True of Me	5	16.7
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	10	33.3
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	3	10.0
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	6	20.0
	I try to talk like native English	Never True of Me	7	23.3

	speakers.	Usually not True of Me	2	6.7
		Somewhat True of Me	12	40.0
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I practice the sounds of English.	Never True of Me	1	3.3
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	8	26.7
		Always True of Me	6	20.0
	I try to find patterns in English.	Never True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	9	30.0
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I say or write new English words several times.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually True of Me	10	33.3
		Always True of Me	6	20.0
	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7

		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I start conversations in English.	Never True of Me	0	0.0
		Usually not True of Me	16	53.3
		Somewhat True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	7	23.3
Memory	I review English lessons often.	Never True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually not True of Me	10	33.3
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	2	6.7
	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	Never True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually not True of Me	7	23.3
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	9	30.0
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	11	36.7
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	0	0.0
	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	12	40.0

	board, or on a street sign.	Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	2	6.7
	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	Never True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually not True of Me	10	33.3
		Somewhat True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually True of Me	10	33.3
		Always True of Me	0	0.0
	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually True of Me	3	10.0
		Always True of Me	8	26.7
	I use rhymes to remember new English words.	Never True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	4	13.3
Social	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	Never True of Me	9	30.0
		Usually not True of Me	5	16.7
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	4	13.3

		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	Never True of Me	2	6.7
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	10	33.3
		Usually True of Me	1	3.3
		Always True of Me	9	30.0
	I ask questions in English.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	7	23.3
		Usually True of Me	3	10.0
		Always True of Me	10	33.3
	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	6	20.0
		Somewhat True of Me	10	33.3
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I practice English with other students.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	11	36.7
		Somewhat True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
Compensation	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	10	33.3
		Somewhat True of Me	11	36.7
		Usually True of Me	4	13.3
		Always True of Me	2	6.7

	I read English without looking up every new word.	Never True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually True of Me	6	20.0
		Always True of Me	5	16.7
	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	Never True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
Affective	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	Never True of Me	8	26.7
		Usually not True of Me	8	26.7
		Somewhat True of Me	6	20.0
		Usually True of Me	5	16.7
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	Never True of Me	3	10.0
		Usually not True of Me	7	23.3
		Somewhat True of Me	10	33.3
		Usually True of Me	7	23.3
		Always True of Me	3	10.0
	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	Never True of Me	4	13.3
		Usually not True of Me	9	30.0
		Somewhat True of Me	5	16.7
		Usually True of Me	10	33.3
		Always True of Me	2	6.7

=== THE END ===