

Metacognitive Strategies for Developing Writing Skills

Ellen P. Yamson (MAED)¹, Norlyn L. Borong (EdD)²

¹Sogod National High School

²Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus

Abstract-

This study aims to determine the writing proficiency of 11th graders. The learning level and free writing were the main focuses of the research using Two-Level Factorial design. Three GAS sections totaled forty-five (45) student who were made respondents. Stratified sampling was used by the researchers to find individuals. The study instrument consisted of eight video clips. The researchers discussed environmental themes, drug abuse, teenage pregnancies, about OFWs, achievement, charity, religious belief, and poverty. To evaluate the writing skills of Grade 11 pupils, the following statistical methods were used: mean, standard deviation, t-test for dependent samples, one-way ANOVA, and two-way ANOVA. It was found that the students' writing skills in the pre-test, when the metacognitive technique was not yet applied, were typically very good in the organization and good ability was obtained in the element of mechanics in the three ways of correction. In the post-test (metacognitive strategy was used), all elements of writing increased the students' ability or had a significant increase. It was found that the intervention used had no effect on writing ability and the interaction had no significant and relevant effect on ability. The metacognitive technique employed in the study aids in the improvement of the students' proficiency with the five writing-related components. The researchers advised teachers to focus on improving their students' writing abilities.

Keywords: *components; elements; free writing; metacognitive; writing skills*

1.0 Introduction

Writing is the process of thinking up new ideas, considering how to put them into coherent writing, and logically organizing them into sentences and paragraphs. It has a significant impact on how one expresses ideas, thoughts, opinions, and attitudes. People can share their thoughts and feelings, as well as persuade and convince others, through writing. For many people, writing is difficult, yet it can be developed and sculpted. A teacher's biggest task is helping students write effectively. As a teacher, you'll never stop considering novel instructional techniques if you wish to develop productive students. One of a teacher's duties is to identify each student's areas of skill weakness. The teacher is a scholar who has knowledge of the subject, ability to generate knowledge and has a vision of their student's life.

Every teacher has a duty to identify interventions to address any flaws, deficits, and knowledge needs of their students. According to Novariana, Sumardi, & Tarjana (2018), writing tasks can be developed rapidly when students' concerns and interests are acknowledged, when they are given numerous opportunities to write and when they are encouraged to become participants. It means that learners will be encouraged to write if writing tasks motivate them and keep them interested.

One of the most crucial talents that any student should possess is writing, but most struggle to write well (Bruma and Marbella, 2019). This was confirmed in a survey conducted by The Chronicle of Higher Education, it was found that 61% of teachers claimed that their students couldn't write longer than five pages, which provided further evidence of this claim. The researchers are both Filipino subject teachers and both are concerned with the writing skills of their students.

This is considered a big problem by the researchers because it was noticed that many of the students did not take seriously the correct writing rules. As an example of this statement, "*Masaya, Kami dahil naligo kami kahapon sa Dagat*". (*We are happy because we went swimming in the sea yesterday*). This way of writing is often seen by the researchers as a problem with their students in grade 10. It can be seen that a comma (,)

should not be placed after the word *masaya* (happy); the words *Kami* (we) and *Dagat* (sea) should not start with a capital letter. Students should master this basic writing component in elementary school. Every time there is a class discussion the researcher faces a significant obstacle because they need to consider timely interventions and motivational strategies to engage their students.

Since we've been teaching for so long, the researchers noticed that students in grade 10 in particular, struggle with writing skills since so many of them ignore the proper use of grammar, punctuation, mechanics, and other writing activities. The researchers believes that this knowledge should be learned by students because it is key to having an artistic and unique fabrication.

The researcher is not the only one who is worried about the development of writing skills, according to an article of news and articles on various google sites. According to Añonuevo (2016), the Filipino Language Commission (KWF) has continued to suggest measures, plans, policies, and written work to improve pupils' vocabulary. This study aims to determine the writing proficiency of 11th graders.

This study determined the writing skills of Grade 11 students in relation to various writing-related components, including content, organization, vocabulary, usages, and mechanics. And this study also recognized the difference in the ability of students who were classified as Above average (AA), Average (A) and Below average (BA) based on free writing; symbol; and marker. The findings of this study, will help students in preparing themselves for college.

2.0 Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study is based on the assertions made by Flavell (1987), Hesse (2010), and Moore (2014). Flavell's statement (1987) every person has their own awareness of and regard for cognitive processes and tactics. According to Flavell (1987), the metacognitive method can help pupils acquire higher order thinking skills. The metacognitive technique gives students crucial direction on how to learn, rather than in assessments of recognition, isolation, recognition, and application, but in tests that call for creative and critical explanation. If a teacher uses an inappropriate method, he or she will not be successful. The authors of this study also cited Hesse (2010) and Moore (2014), who claimed that the aspects of content, organization, language, tools, and mechanics must all be present while writing fiction. This implies that if a piece of writing is missing, even good expression loses its significance.

Learning the many types of words, using them correctly, and connecting them correctly to construct clear grammatical thoughts are all important components of effective presentation. This statement is one of the bases for recognizing the writing ability of Grade 11 students. Using different topics the participants made from the video clips to be shown. Three strategies—the free-writing technique, symbols, and signs/markers—were employed to rectify the five elements of fiction writing.

After many years of teaching, the researcher is aware of the challenges that students face because of their weakness writing skills. The researchers were encouraged to conduct this study in order to address the common problems of students in writing. The researchers hope that the results of this research are significant, particularly in developing pupils' writing abilities.

3.0 Methods

Two-Level Factorial Design was used in the research, specifically the learning level and free writing for this study. This design is suitable for evaluating the ability of three groups or levels of participants. The participants of this study were classified from above average, average and below average where they both went through the process in this design.

Students in Grade 11-GAS made up the study's participants. From the three sections of the GAS strand, 45 students were selected as participants. The way the researchers recruited the participants was stratified sampling because the participants were chosen based on their ability. The researchers selected fifteen (15) people for each section. The GPA of the participants is based on their Grade 11 Filipino subject score. Five respondents were above average with GPAs of 90% and above, five students with 80-89% GPA, and five students below average with GPAs of 79% down.

Eight video clips were used by the researcher as a study instrument. Students create a reflection based on the displayed video segments. The researcher presented a variety of topics, including the environmental theme, drug addiction, teen-age pregnancy, about OFWs, success, generosity, religious belief, and poverty. The videos shown are related to the topics covered in the Grade 11 lessons specifically in GAS.

All of the students created reflections on the video clips they watched during the data collection procedure. The researcher emphasized that their presentation must be no less than 150 words. Its goal is to collect data on the five writing-related factors that were highlighted in this study: content, organization, vocabulary, use, and mechanics. Its purpose is to obtain the five aspects of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, use and mechanics) which were emphasized in this study. Three teachers with five years of classroom experience were chosen by the researchers to help them gauge the participants' writing skills. They will evaluate the respondents' output.

For each video clip shown by the researchers, the participants will go through four writing processes. It is as follows:

First, students were tasked with creating a reflection or essay from the video clip they had seen. This process is called *free-writing*.

Second, from their generated essay or reflection, the evaluators corrected it, then returned it to the respondents without adding any comments. Let the pupils learn from their error.

Third, the evaluators highlighted the words or sentences that they had found to be incorrect using symbols like circles, lines, boxes, etc. after the students had successfully completed their second essay. Circle, line, or box placement indicates that the pupils' fabrication has to be revised and fixed.

Fourth, when the third fabrication has occurred, evaluators note the student's mistakes.

Editing, often known as writing the final manuscript, is the last phase. In this section, the students edited the annotated research findings from their third essay.

In identifying the writing ability of students in Grade 11, the researchers based on the rubric from Tabek's rubric (2013). After identifying the students' ability through their score, the researchers conducted a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with the students. The purpose of the FGD was for the researchers to recognize and assess how they recognized their weakness in writing. The statistician used the mean, standard deviation, t-test for dependent samples, one-way ANOVA, and two-way ANOVA to determine the score or mark.

4.0 Results and Discussion

This part presents the results of Grade 11-GAS students' ability to write using metacognitive strategies.

Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students (Pre-test)

The writing ability of grade 11 students in the pre-test is presented in Table 1. The element *organization* has the highest level of competence among the five writing elements, scoring very well in all three types of correction in fact it obtained **very good** abilities. The *vocabulary* component followed, which gained **good** ability in the metacognitive and symbolic strategy, **excellent** the ability obtained in the sign/marker strategy. And both gained the ability to good in the element *content*, *usage*, and *mechanics* of the three strategies.

Table 1 : Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students (Pre-test)

Section	Learning Level	Content		Organizat ion		Vocabul ary		Usage		Mechanics	
		Me an	stdev	Mea n	stdev	Me an	std ev	Me an	stdev	Me an	stdev
Meta-Cognitive Group	Below Average	19.02	2.67	12.90	3.06	11.39	2.67	13.16	3.48	2.37	0.35
	Average	20.98	2.34	14.37	2.19	12.58	2.12	14.94	2.46	2.72	0.63
	Above Average	22.01	2.11	16.00	2.32	14.11	2.13	16.43	2.94	2.91	0.68
	AVERAGE SCORE	20.67	2.67	14.42	2.83	12.69	2.55	14.84	3.25	2.67	0.61
	Performance	Good		Very Good		Good		Good		Good	

Symbolic Group	Below Average	18.29	3.00	13.08	2.82	11.39	2.62	12.63	3.52	2.26	0.38
	Average	20.00	2.37	14.10	2.16	12.47	2.26	13.72	3.27	2.27	0.33
	Above Average	21.10	2.61	15.62	2.28	12.96	2.03	14.36	2.61	2.54	0.42
	AVERAGE SCORE	19.80	2.89	14.27	2.63	12.27	2.38	13.57	3.21	2.36	0.40
	Performance	Good		Very Good		Good		Good		Good	
Signs Group	Below Average	19.16	2.88	15.50	1.61	13.60	1.30	13.93	1.57	2.20	0.32
	Average	20.09	2.71	16.14	1.64	14.34	1.65	14.89	2.23	2.30	0.31
	Above Average	22.03	2.68	16.81	1.96	15.11	1.95	15.43	2.34	2.57	0.36
	AVERAGE SCORE	20.43	2.98	16.15	1.81	14.35	1.75	14.75	2.14	2.36	0.36
	Performance	Good		Very Good		Very Good		Good		Good	

This result showed that the students have the ability to create a piece of writing or to organize in fact it got the highest score when compared to other elements of writing. The results are concerning because, despite the students' great performance in organization, the fundamental writing components—which might be thought of as being quite important—got one of the lowest skills. The table shows that only **good** ability were obtained in the three strategies used. The findings of this study support Anyiendah's (2017) assertion that it is difficult to develop students' proficiency in writing-related skills, particularly in vocabulary and mechanics, because of their lack of motivation. Anyiendah (2017) emphasized, that in order to produce an effective essay, students must be familiar with proper punctuation or mechanics, usage, vocabulary, spelling, and sentence structure. This possibility helps them write in several languages. This shows that students need to be exposed to writing tasks in order to improve their skills, especially in the areas of content, usage, and mechanics. This result is in line with the findings of Fareed, Ashraf, and Bilal (2016), who discovered that the majority of errors are caused by grammatical and vocabulary problems.

This study demonstrates that even though some writing norms, such the use of appropriate punctuation and capital and small letters, should be taught to children when they are still in elementary school, they still need to remember them. The correct use of punctuation and upper- and lower-case letters, which are taught to students when they are still in primary school, will render the beauty of the text, organization, etc. worthless. This makes this aspect one of the most important.

Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students Using Metacognitive Strategies (Post-test)

Table 2 displays the results of the students' proficiency with the three correction techniques, particularly the technique utilizing *symbols* and *marks*. The aspects of *organization*, *vocabulary*, and *usage*, all of which achieved the best ability and the *highest performance* (*excellent*) in the standard, clearly demonstrated that the level of students ability had grown.

The three correctional tactics received high marks in the *vocabulary* and *organization* categories according to table. It is evident from two subsequent tables, table 1 (pre-test) and table 2 (post-test), that the participants only partially completed the tasks for which there were no corrections.

In fact, the table demonstrates that the students' abilities in the metacognition method deteriorated over the post-test.

Table 2 : Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students Using Metacognitive Strategies (Post-test)

Section	Learning Level	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Usage		Mechanics	
		Mean	stdev	Mean	stdev	Mean	stdev	Mean	stdev	Mean	stdev
Meta-Cognitive Group	Below Average	22.83	2.50	16.51	1.66	16.16	1.47	18.66	3.47	2.73	0.40
	Average	25.52	1.84	17.69	1.01	17.31	0.78	20.41	1.87	3.12	0.48
	Above Average	25.62	2.30	18.17	1.39	17.64	1.29	21.26	2.36	3.36	0.47
	AVERAGE SCORE	24.66	2.56	17.46	1.53	17.04	1.36	20.11	2.84	3.07	0.51
	Performance	Very Good		Very Good		Very Good		Very Good		Good	
Symbolic Group	Below Average	23.94	2.54	17.37	1.21	17.22	1.73	20.37	2.51	2.89	0.59
	Average	26.06	2.56	18.02	0.96	18.06	1.10	21.48	2.56	3.10	0.72
	Above Average	26.99	1.73	18.84	0.52	18.64	0.80	22.41	1.94	3.71	0.46
	AVERAGE SCORE	25.66	2.62	18.08	1.11	17.97	1.39	21.42	2.47	3.23	0.69
	Performance	Very Good		Excellent		Excellent		Very Good		Good	
Signs Group	Below Average	23.56	2.86	17.40	1.17	17.42	1.19	20.83	1.89	3.12	0.51
	Average	24.53	2.04	17.72	0.78	17.60	0.74	21.19	1.49	3.32	0.48
	Above Average	26.88	1.96	18.45	1.25	18.61	0.84	22.51	1.70	3.76	0.44
	AVERAGE SCORE	25.01	2.69	17.86	1.16	17.88	1.07	21.51	1.83	3.40	0.54
	Performance	Very Good		Excellent		Excellent		Excellent		Good	

This is similar to Conti's (2015), assertion that students are interested in the self-correcting method of language errors since they are unaware of their own errors. Furthermore, teachers should avoid employing such techniques whenever possible. According to Levinson, Cookson, and Sadovnik (2002), students may occasionally pause or even doubt their writing abilities, but it is inevitable that they will become comfortable since they believe teachers will edit their written work.

The researcher concurs with the assertion made by Conti (2015), Levinson, Cookson, and Sadovnik (2002) because it was noted that, when the researcher returned the papers for correction using the metacognitive method, it was noted that their effort to identify what needed to be changed in their composition was insufficient. This indicates that the teacher must provide accurate and pertinent correction because the students believe that the teacher did not read and correct their work.

On the other hand, the table shows that the participants are trying to improve their areas of weakness or error. It may be seen through symbols and indicators that both improved, honed, and expanded their writing abilities in the post-test. According to Young (2000), if the teacher can see the students' work and respond to it by correcting errors or making comments, the students are more likely to think about how to improve their writing.

According to this style of correction, the students require the teacher's direction. Most importantly, this outcome demonstrated that the teacher will continue to push pupils to develop their areas of weakness because doing so will help them succeed, particularly when they reach the tertiary level.

Difference in Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students in Pre-test and Post-test

The comparison of students' writing skills between the pre-test and post-test is shown in Table 3. The overall results of the pre- and post-test show that students who used the three strategies of correction, metacognition, symbols, and sign/markers improved in all writing-related skills.

Table 3 : Difference in Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students in Pre-test and Post-test

Aspect	Section	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		Mean Difference	df	t-value	p-value	Effect Size
		Mean	Stdev	Mean	Stdev					
Organization	Free-writing	20.67	2.67	24.66	2.56	-3.99	89	-13.31	0.000	0.67
	Symbol	19.8	2.89	25.66	2.62	-5.86	89	-18.73	0.000	0.80
	Sign/Marker	20.43	2.98	25.01	2.69	-4.58	89	-19.21	0.000	0.81
Organization	Free-writing	14.42	2.83	17.46	1.53	-3.04	89	-12.82	0.000	0.65
	Symbol	14.27	2.63	18.08	1.11	-3.81	89	-16.04	0.000	0.74
	Sign/Marker	16.15	1.81	17.86	1.16	-1.71	89	-9.76	0.000	0.52
Vocabulary	Free-writing	12.69	2.55	17.04	1.36	-4.35	89	-18.81	0.000	0.80
	Symbol	12.27	2.38	17.97	1.39	-5.70	89	-22.10	0.000	0.85
	Sign/Marker	14.35	1.75	17.88	1.07	-3.53	89	-21.34	0.000	0.84
Usage	Free-writing	14.84	3.25	20.11	2.84	-5.27	89	-16.20	0.000	0.75
	Symbol	13.57	3.21	21.42	2.47	-7.85	89	-19.66	0.000	0.81
	Sign/Marker	14.75	2.14	21.51	1.83	-6.76	89	-25.15	0.000	0.88
Mechanics	Free-writing	2.67	0.61	3.07	0.51	-0.40	89	-7.84	0.000	0.41
	Symbol	2.36	0.40	3.23	0.69	-0.87	89	-13.32	0.000	0.67
	Sign/Marker	2.36	0.36	3.40	0.54	-1.04	89	-16.83	0.000	0.76
OVERALL	Free-writing	65.28	9.87	82.33	7.11	-17.06	89	-18.91	0.000	0.80
	Symbol	62.29	9.33	86.33	6.95	-24.04	89	-23.42	0.000	0.86
	Sign/Marker	68.01	7.54	85.37	6.67	-17.36	89	-25.23	0.000	0.88

Note: if p-value < 5%, difference is significant.

The results only show that teachers' initiatives can aid in the ability development of their students. This can aid in enhancing their areas of weakness or deficiency, as evidenced by the outcome in Table 3. Here, it is amply demonstrated that teachers bear the primary responsibility for the growth of their pupils' weaknesses. Therefore, to produce successful students, teachers need have greater patience and commitment. Keep in mind that the written work should be corrected by the teachers in a way that is both clear and accurate, guiding the students to create an engaging product that will expand their knowledge and prepare them for higher-level thinking activities.

According to Echoga (2018) students who are sufficiently knowledgeable about writing mechanics will be more confident writers. The claim made by Echoga (2018) is concerning because it is clear from the findings shown in the three tables above that only the participants excelled in the element of mechanics. The level of pupils' proficiency in writing components other than mechanics has improved, as seen by the post-test results. Keep in mind that if students do not know when to employ the period, comma, and other punctuation marks, the composition's aesthetic quality will suffer.

Differences in Students' Ability in Pre-Writing, Symbols and Signs

Table 4 shows the contrast of students' ability in the three writing strategies.

Table 4 : Comparative Analysis of the Effect of Intervention on the Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students according to Pre-Writing, Symbols and Signs

Aspect	Comparing Groups/ Interventions	Mean	df	F-value	p-value	Effect Size	Posthoc Analysis (Tukey HSD)	
							Compared Groups	p-value
Organization	Free-writing	24.66	2,226	3.403	.035	.03	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.029
	Symbol	25.66				(weak)		
	Sign/Marker	25.01						
Organization	Free-writing	17.46	2,226	41.713	.000	.32	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.000
	Symbol	18.08				(moderate)	Symbolic vs. Signs	0.000
	Sign/Marker	17.86						
Vocabulary	Free-writing	17.04	2,226	28.378	0.000	.24	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.000
	Symbol	17.97				(weak)	Meta vs. Signs	0.036

	Sign/Marker	17.88					Symbolic vs. Signs	0.008
Usage	Free-writing	20.11	2,226	15.03	0.000	.15	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.000
	Symbol	21.42				(weak)	Meta vs. Signs	0.000
	Sign/Marker	21.51						
Mechanics	Free-writing	3.07	2,226	26.412	0.000	.23	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.000
	Symbol	3.23				(weak)		
	Sign/Marker	3.40						
OVERALL	Free-writing	82.30	2,226	31.78	0.000	.26	Meta vs. Symbolic	0.000
	Symbol	87.38				(weak)	Symbolic vs. Signs	0.004
	Sign/Marker	84.35						

Note: if *p*-value < 5%, difference is significant.

It is clearly stated that of the five components of writing, *organization* scored highly, with a reasonable average of **.32 or moderate**. The ability to use *words, language, and mechanics* is lacking. All got weak, thus it demands our complete attention. Every teacher aspires to provide students with "Quality Education." Every educator and organization wants this to be met. The only way to ensure a high-quality education is to be aware of the variables that influence student achievement (Fabrigar, 2013). The teacher is in charge of this duty. He must be aware of it in order to build tactics that will improve pupils' performance in a more developed and effective way.

Many students, says Connor, Reyes, Yang, & GraceKim, (2021), believe that their writing is accurate and reliable, especially once it has passed the pre and post-test. Because the sentences have gotten longer and longer from the pre-test to the post-test. However, other students failed to realize that the addition of their ideas occasionally did not match the text read, preventing the development of the writing content element. The finding in Table 4 is consistent with Hameed (2021) study, which found that students' achievement in the subject element maintained at a satisfactory level. Both the pre-test and the post-test met expectations. It suggests that in order to improve pupils' proficiency in this area, care must be taken.

The table shows that students may organize concepts in the organizational component. In fact, it was the only one of the five criteria to receive a moderate score. This finding is connected to Pabuaya's (2016) study, which found that modern students are able to create a fiction from situations. According to Pabuaya (2016), the media can aid in the development of this skill. Among the participants' below average skills are vocabulary, use, and mechanics. *Vocabulary, usage and mechanics* are among the below average abilities of the participants. This outcome is consistent with the findings of the study by Guinoo (2015), where Emberda (2021) received the lowest rating. The findings of research like Huy (2015) and Gowon & Yashim, (2022) which have been read, are concerning because many of his college students have poor vocabulary and grammar skills.

Table 5 demonstrates that there is no discernible association between the strategy employed and the students' degree of knowledge, nor is there any difference in the participants' abilities across the three ways of free-writing, symbols, and signs. In this manner, the teacher provides the pupils with explicit guidance on how to fix their mistakes and become better learners.

Table 5 : Two-Way Analysis of Variance on the Effect of Intervention and Level of Writing Ability of Grade 11 Students

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	4496.600 ^a	8	562.075	16.220	.000	.332
Intercept	1935988.033	1	1935988.033	55868.243	.000	.995
Section	784.067	2	392.033	11.313	.000	.080
Learning Level	3537.156	2	1768.578	51.037	.000	.281
Section * Learning Level	175.378	4	43.844	1.265	.284	.019
Error	9044.367	261	34.653			
Total	1949529.000	270				
Corrected Total	13540.967	269				

Note: if *p*-value < 5%, effect is significant.

The outcome shown in the table shows that the teacher provides straightforward correction or advice to help the pupils when they make mistakes. The participant asked, "What do the circles, question marks, and underlined words mean, ma'am?" when the researcher returned the output that was utilized for correction symbols. It simply means that teachers should make clear recommendations for what the pupils should alter as a teacher and shaper. The students will be inspired to work hard because they will believe that their efforts have been valued and given attention in this way. Giving students feedback on their errors encourages them to improve their speaking, writing, reading, and other skills, claims Yoshihara (2012). The results presented indicate that the strategy is helpful in developing students' abilities.

5.0 Conclusion

Teachers that apply effective teaching methods can assist pupils improve their areas of weakness. It aids in the growth of students' proficiency in the five components of writing—content, organization, vocabulary, use, and mechanics—as a metacognitive method.

About the Authors

Ellen P. Yamson is an high school school teacher. She currently holds a position as Teacher III.

Norlyn L. Borong is a Filipino college teacher who is teaching both language and literature.

6.0 References

1. Añonuevo, R. (2016). *Paglingon sa ugat ng komisyong sa wikang Filipino*. <https://kwf.gov.ph/tungkol-sa-kwf/>
2. Anyindah, M. S. (2017). Challenges faced by teachers when teaching english in public primary schools in Kenya. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00013>
3. Connor, C., Reyes, M., Yang, D. & GraceKim, Y. (2021). Writing instruction improves students' writing skills differentially depending on focal instruction and children: A meta-analysis for primary grade students. *Educational Research Review*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100408>Get rights and content
4. Conti, G. (2015). *Why asking our students to self-correct the errors in their essay is a waste of time*. The language gym. Retrieved from <http://www.gianfrancoconti.wordpress.com/2015/05/20why-asking-our-asking-our-students-to-self-correct-the-errors-in-their-essay-is-a-waste-of-time>.
5. Echoga, B. O. (2018). *Effect of conference method on the performance of senior secondary schools' student written composition in Jos North Local Government Area of Plateau State, Nigeria*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. Jos: University of Jos.
6. Emberda, S. (2021). *Pagdisenyo at pagpapaunlad sa gabay ng pagtuturo sa paglinang ng makrong kasanayan ng pagsulat gamit ang addie model*. Di-nailathalang tesis. Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus Campus. Tomas Oppus Southern Leyte.
7. Guino, J. (2015). *Reproduktibong imahinasyon sa pagsulat ng katha mula sa mga piling kwento sa modyul ng grade 9*. Di-nailathalang Tesis. Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus.
8. Gowon, R. & Yashim, H. (2022). Effects of concept mapping strategy on sentence construction, paragraphing and editing in junior secondary schools students' composition writing achievements. *Front. Educ.*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.973844>
9. Hameed, P. F. M. (2021). Enhancing students writing skills using novels: The Saudi EFL learners' perspective. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1469-1483. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.106
10. Huy, N. T. (2015). Problems Affecting Learning Writing Skill of Grade 11 at Thong Linh High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3, 53-69.
11. Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4, pp. 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>

12. Flavell, J. H. (1987). *Speculation about the nature and development of metacognition*. In F. Weinert & R. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding* (pp. 21-29). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
13. Hess, A. (2016). Designing for engagement: Using the ADDIE model to integrate high-impact practices into an online information literacy course. *COMMUNICATIONS IN INFORMATION LITERACY*, 10 (2).
14. Novariana1, H., Sumardi, S. & Tarjana, S. (2018). Senior high school students' problems in writing: A preliminary study of implementing writing e-journal as self assessment to promote students' writing skill. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, 2
15. Pabuaya, A. (2016). *Pagsusuri sa pagkamalikhain at pagkakritikal sa kakayahang pasalita ng mga mag-aaral*. Di-nailathalang Tesis. Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus
16. Tabec, S. (2013). *Kasanayan sa pagsulat ng sanaysay ng mga mag-aaral na kumukuha ng kursong edukasyon*. Di-nailathalang Tesis: Saint Louis University
17. Yoshihara, R. (2012). ESL teachers' teaching beliefs and practices: A case study of three teachers in an ESL program. *The Journal of Humanities and Sciences*, 18, pp. 41-61.