Curriculum reform in China has aimed to teach students to self-regulate their learning (Ministry of Education, 2012). Teachers and researchers have acknowledged that being able to regulate one’s learning process is essential for achieving personal learning objectives (e.g., Ben-Eliyahu & Bernacki, 2015) and that self-regulated writing strategies are a reliable predictor of learners’ writing proficiency in English as a foreign language (EFL; L. S. Teng & Zhang, 2016). However, studies in exploring the predictive effects of self-regulated writing strategies on EFL writing proficiency are limited, particularly the extent to which self-regulated writing strategies contribute to secondary school students’ writing.

This study is based on self-regulated learning (SRL) theory, which delineates the ways in which learners can actively and efficiently manage the learning process by employing various strategies (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997). As recognized in previous studies (e.g., Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011), learners who are more self-regulated often exhibit a greater sense of self-efficacy, are more cognizant of their strengths and weaknesses, and are more likely to seek opportunities to acquire new knowledge and skills. Self-regulated learners can be characterized by their ability to initiate metacognitive, cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral processes to realize their learning goals (Kizilcec, Pérez-Sanagustin, & Maldonado, 2017). The self-regulated learning process has also been conceptualized as a constellation of actions (e.g., monitoring, directing, regulating) carried out in pursuit of learning goals (Ziegler, Stoeger, & Grassinger, 2011) or a sequenced set of specific processes by a learner who controls internal and external misdirection (Ben-Eliyahu & Bernacki, 2015).

In EFL teaching, SRL strategies and self-efficacy beliefs have been shown to predict EFL learners’ English proficiency (e.g., Wang & Bai, 2017). With the exception of a very limited number of studies
in recent years documenting self-regulated writing strategies by undergraduates in EFL settings (F. Teng, 2016; L. S. Teng & Zhang, 2016), most empirical research has assessed metacognitive strategies in L2 reading (Zhang, 2010; Zhang, Gu, & Hu, 2008). In addition, secondary school students tend to adopt fewer SRL strategies than university students, but there is a lack of studies examining the multiple dimensions of self-regulated writing strategies (e.g., cognition, metacognition, social behavior, motivational regulation) in secondary school EFL writing contexts where examination-oriented teaching and learning are common (Mok, Fan, & Pang, 2007). The lacunae at least point to two areas for exploration: (1) to identify whether self-regulated writing strategies are as influential to writing proficiency for secondary school EFL students as they are for university students and (2) to clarify whether the use of strategies may vary for secondary school EFL learners due to individual differences. To build on the findings of previous studies (e.g., L. S. Teng & Zhang, 2016), we examine how the reported use of self-regulated writing strategies may vary based on individual characteristics.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Models of Self-Regulated Learning

The extant literature proposes a considerable number of models to explain SRL. Two of the best known are those of Winne and Hadwin (1998) and Zimmerman (2000). Winne and Hadwin focused on multiple facets of SRL (e.g., conditions, operations, products, evaluation, standards), whereas Zimmerman described SRL as a three-phase process of forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Both models have been influential in SRL studies and share several characteristics. For example, each recommends using metacognitive strategies to acquire, store, and retrieve information. For pursuing predetermined learning goals, both models emphasize the importance of regulating learning behavior through planning, monitoring, and managing external distractors in the learning environment. However, the two models do not touch on the more nuanced dimensions of SRL (e.g., social behavior). To address the complexity of SRL more completely, a multi-dimensional model encompassing cognition, metacognition, social behavior, and motivational regulation is sorely needed (Zimmerman, 2011).
A Multidimensional Model of Self-Regulated Writing Strategies

L. S. Teng and Zhang (2016) set out to develop and validate a multidimensional model of self-regulated writing strategies. The model was established based on a three-phase process of item generation, initial piloting, and psychometric evaluation. The model included four dimensions: cognition, metacognition, social behavior, and motivational regulation. Whereas the inclusion of cognitive strategies intended to ascertain students’ skills in processing information or knowledge while completing tasks (Oxford, 2013), the inclusion of metacognitive strategies aimed to determine learners’ skills in controlling and regulating cognition and cognitive resources to meet task demands (Winne, 2011). Social behavior strategies, focusing on feedback handling (FH) and peer learning (PL), were intended to measure students’ writing behavior under the influence of peers and teachers. The inclusion of motivational regulation strategies sought to measure learners’ motivational control in using specific techniques to enhance writing performance. Overall, L. S. Teng and Zhang’s multidimensional model offered a more refined perspective on self-regulated writing strategies.

As asserted by Tsuda and Nakata (2013), cognitive, metacognitive, social behavior, and affective components may all affect secondary school students’ EFL learning. In addition, previous studies revealed a decrease in students’ metacognitive competency in secondary school (Mok et al., 2007). Thus, a study with a sample of secondary school learners may be helpful in validating L. S. Teng and Zhang’s (2016) multidimensional model. The findings of the present study complement their original work by analyzing how individual differences may shape the use of self-regulated writing strategies.

THE STUDY

Despite emphasizing SRL and writing, respectively, scholarship on the predictive effects of self-regulated writing strategies on EFL secondary school students’ writing proficiency is relatively scant. As part of a larger project, this research was designed to (1) validate L. S. Teng and Zhang’s (2016) model using data from Chinese secondary school students, (2) examine the predictive effects of self-regulated writing strategies on students’ writing proficiency, and (3) identify personal characteristics that can predict different self-regulated writing strategies. This study addressed three research questions:
1. What structural model best represents self-regulated writing strategy dimensions in Chinese secondary school EFL students?

2. To what extent do self-regulated writing strategies predict writing proficiency for Chinese secondary school EFL students?

3. How does learners’ reported use of self-regulated writing strategies vary based on individual student characteristics?

METHODS

Participants

The sample consisted of 682 students: 342 girls (50.1%) and 340 boys (49.9%). Students were enrolled in Grades 1–6 at three secondary schools in southwest China. Participants ranged from 13 to 18 years old (M = 15.32, SD = 3.92). Among the 682 students, 442 had begun learning English in Grade 3 (64.8%), 200 in kindergarten (29.3%), and 40 in secondary school (5.9%). Students reported that writing instruction was incorporated as a component of their English lessons; however, they did not participate in separate writing lessons or receive explicit training on self-regulated writing strategies. The participants’ first language (L1) was Chinese. They each signed an informed consent form, and the study was approved by the Department of Teaching Affairs at each school.

Instruments

Measure of self-regulated writing strategies. Measuring self-regulated learning strategies can be challenging because SRL is not an explicit behavior (Zimmerman, 2011). Further, existing instruments that assess SRL strategies do not target writing. The present study adopted the Writing Strategies for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire (WSSRLQ) developed by L. S. Teng and Zhang (2016). The WSSRLQ, with 40 selective and synthetic writing strategy items, was designed to measure EFL students’ writing strategies. The WSSRLQ consists of writing strategies pertaining to cognitive, metacognitive, social-behavioral, and motivational regulation aspects. To align with the purpose of the present study, this questionnaire was initially piloted with a group of 30 secondary school students. Some students expressed concerns over item clarity and readability. The WSSRLQ was modified slightly based on their feedback. For example, the item “I write useful words and expressions taught in writing courses to help me remember them” was modified to “To help me remember useful
words and expressions taught in writing courses, I will write them down” in order to make it more accessible to the secondary school learners. Given the English language proficiency of the secondary school learners, we translated the questionnaire into Chinese.

In line with L. S. Teng and Zhang’s (2016) assertions, a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all true of me; 7 = very true of me) was used to explore the trait features of self-regulated writing strategies. Scale reliability tests showed that Cronbach’s alpha for each of the nine strategies ranged from .75 to .84, indicating robust internal reliability. Prior to questionnaire administration, demographic information (i.e., age, gender, English learning experience, time commitment to writing, familiarity with writing topics, examination experience, school prestige, and interest in learning English) was elicited through a separate survey.

**Writing test.** The writing test was modeled after the writing portion of the National Matriculation English Test (NMET). This test was used to gauge learners’ composition of a 150-word argumentative essay debating the advantages and disadvantages of using an iPad in secondary school. The test focused on learners’ ability to provide and justify an opinion, discuss the topic, summarize details, outline problems, identify possible solutions, and support what they wrote with reasons, arguments, and relevant examples from their own knowledge or experience. Students were given 30 minutes for the test in accordance with NMET guidelines. The Cronbach’s alpha for the writing test was .76, indicating robust reliability.

Following NMET requirements, the marking scheme comprised five equally weighted components: content, organization, cohesion, word choice, and grammatical accuracy. The maximum possible score was 25 points. Two raters, who had not taught the participants, marked the tests independently. The raters were experienced EFL secondary school teachers and had experience marking written essays for NMET. They consulted each other to reach an agreement on a scoring system before marking the tests. The raters exhibited 170 discrepancies out of 3,410 markings (5 components × 682 students), reaching an interrater agreement of 95%. A third and equally experienced teacher was appointed to rate the tests independently to reconcile scoring differences between the raters. Scores for any controversial items were determined by majority opinion.

**Procedures**

Data were collected in the classroom. The questionnaire and writing test were completed in a paper-and-pencil format; they were
administered to the secondary school students in a single session spread over 2 consecutive days. The learners at each school completed the questionnaire on the first day and completed the writing test on the second day. One teacher acted as a proctor, ensuring that all sessions were completed in the same manner and that all participants in the three schools received identical instructions and explanations.

**Data Analysis**

To address the first research question, data were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using structural equation modeling through the SPSS AMOS program (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY). To address the second question, a multiple regression analysis was performed to investigate the predictive effects of self-regulated writing strategies on writing proficiency. To address the third question concerning how learners’ reported use of self-regulated writing strategies may vary due to individual differences, we used penalized regression to identify personal characteristics that may be predictive of each self-regulated writing strategy. In the context of this study, advantages of penalized regression included variable selection, simultaneous estimates of regression coefficients, and the ability to characterize the relationship between selected variables and each self-regulated writing strategy.

**RESULTS**

Three models were tested to validate the WSSRLQ for the selected student sample. Figure 1 presents results of the nine-factor correlated model. Standardized estimate loadings from the factors to the observed variables exceeded the benchmark value of .50, indicating an acceptable effect size. All parameter estimates were statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Figure 2 displays the results for the four-factor second-order model of self-regulated writing strategies. The nine self-regulated writing strategies can be conceptualized into four higher order correlated factors: cognition, metacognition, social behavior, and motivational regulation.

As displayed in the one-factor second-order model (Figure 3), all fitness indices reached the required level. Self-regulation loaded well on its nine subconstructs. In addition, the $R^2$ for each subconstruct was
high (.61–.83), reflecting a reliable contribution of self-regulation to its subcon structs. The model of self-regulation consisting of nine subcon structs therefore appeared to be supported.
Table 1 lists the results of the model comparisons. First, Models 2 and 3 had acceptable model fit indices. No significant improvement was noted between Models 1 and 2 ($\chi^2_{M1} - \chi^2_{M2} = 4.95$; $df_{M1} - df_{M2} =$

FIGURE 2. Four-factor second-order model of self-regulated writing strategies (Model 2).

Note. GME = goal-oriented monitoring and evaluating; IP = idea planning; PL = peer learning; FH = feedback handling; IE = interest enhancement; EC = emotional control; MST = motivational self-talk; TP = text processing; CM = course memory.
FIGURE 3. Factor loadings for the second-order and first-order constructs (Model 3).

Note. GME = goal-oriented monitoring and evaluating; IP = idea planning; PL = peer learning; FH = feedback handling; IE = interest enhancement; EC = emotional control; MST = motivational self-talk; TP = text processing; CM = course memory.
6, \( p = .11 \)); however, the indices of Model 3 improved significantly over those of Model 2 (\( \chi^2_{M1} - \chi^2_{M2} = 31.51; df_{M1} - df_{M2} = 21, p = .001 \)) and Model 1 (\( \chi^2_{M1} - \chi^2_{M2} = 36.47; df_{M1} - df_{M2} = 27, p = .001 \)). Model 3, with self-regulation as a hierarchical construct explaining the nine self-regulated writing strategies, fit well with the sample of secondary school learners in this study. Overall, the CFA results validated a hierarchical and multidimensional model of self-regulated writing strategies with satisfactory psychometric characteristics; that is, the higher order construct of self-regulation was correlated with nine lower order writing strategies involving cognitive, metacognitive, social-behavior, and motivational regulation. Model 3 was therefore determined to best fit Chinese secondary school EFL students, supporting L. S. Teng and Zhang’s (2016) hypothesis on the models.

Table 2 displays the results for the intercorrelation coefficients among the nine subconstructs. The intercorrelation coefficients ranged from .112 (PL and FH) to .535 (motivational self-talk [MST] and goal-oriented monitoring [GME]). All self-regulated writing strategies were significantly correlated at \( p < .01 \). The nine factors thus represented distinct but intercorrelated constructs.

Table 3 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis. The nine strategies were entered as a group in one step, accounting for 41% of the variance in students’ writing proficiency [\( F(9, 634) = 121.152, p < .01 \)]. A strong effect size of \( R^2 > .35 \) (Cohen, 1992) indicated that the nine strategies as a whole were a strong predictor of secondary school students’ writing proficiency. Among them, GME (\( \beta = .355 \)) was the most significant predictor of writing proficiency, followed by MST (\( \beta = .324 \)), text processing (TP; \( \beta = .316 \)), idea
TABLE 2
Intercorrelation Matrix of Writing Strategies for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>GME</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>FH</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>EC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GME</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

TABLE 3
Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis for Writing Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GME</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

planning ($\beta = .302$), interest enhancement ($IE; \beta = .301$), course memory ($CM; \beta = .192$), and emotional control ($EC; \beta = .178$). FH and PL were not identified as significant predictors of secondary school students’ writing performance.

Table 4 lists the results of nine penalized regressions, with one performed for each self-regulated writing strategy. The regression coefficient results show that older learners reported greater use of self-regulated writing strategies, except for PL. Female students reported more use of TP, CM, IP, GME, PL, FH, IE, and MST but less use of EC compared to male students. Whereas learners with more extensive English learning experience reported greater use of TP, CM, IP, and GME, they reported less use of PL, FH, IE, MST, and EC. Students who devoted more time to English writing reported greater use of various self-regulated writing strategies than those who devoted less time to English writing. Learners who were more familiar with writing topics reported greater use of TP, CM, IP, GME, FH, IE, and MST strategies but less use of PL and EC strategies. Learners with more examination
## Table 4

**Individual Differences in Self-Regulated Writing Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>GME</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>FH</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>EC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>≈0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender—female</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learning experience</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time commitment (hrs/week)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with writing topics</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>≈0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestigious school</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in learning English</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience did not report greater use of self-regulated writing strategies. Learners from more prestigious schools generally reported greater use of self-regulated writing strategies. Finally, learners with greater interest in learning English reported greater use of self-regulated writing strategies.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Our findings confirm that the nine self-regulated writing strategies significantly influenced EFL secondary school students’ writing outcomes. These results support the validity of a higher order model focusing on cognition, metacognition, social behavior, and motivational regulation (Zimmerman, 2011). Furthermore, self-regulation was found to function as an integrated construct that affects EFL students’ writing proficiency (L. S. Teng & Zhang, 2016). The nine self-regulated writing strategies were independent but closely and significantly correlated in many ways. Strong associations between the different strategies could be due to overlap among self-regulated writing strategies in general. For example, metacognitive regulation measured whether learners were able to adopt strategies to regulate their writing process, and metacognitive strategies measured whether learners had identified various strategies for managing the multiple aspects of composition. These elements may be inherently correlated. This likelihood corroborates earlier findings of self-regulated learning as a strong predictor of high-quality learning performance (e.g., F. Teng, 2017; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Hence, SRL enables learners to better manage their cognitive skills, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and discern appropriate writing strategies.

In the present study, seven types of writing strategies (GME, MST, TP, IP, IE, CM, and EC) produced significant predictive effects on writing proficiency. GME appeared to be the most important learning strategy in writing. Learners with high regulatory skills, including monitoring and evaluating, were more likely to ascertain whether the strategies were effective. They continued using those approaches when the strategies worked well and could adaptively align the techniques with their goals. As such, these learners might be better prepared to monitor, evaluate, and improve the final product of their writing (e.g., F. Teng, 2016; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997). On the other hand, learners who reported lower SRL skills might achieve lower writing outcomes.

However, FH and PL were not significant predictors of writing proficiency for secondary school EFL students. In L. S. Teng and Zhang’s (2016) study, IE, CM, and PL did not predict Chinese university EFL
students’ writing proficiency. Secondary school students reported better CM and IE strategies in the present study; they tended to memorize words and expressions taught in class or to adopt IE strategies to facilitate their writing. One unexpected finding was that the secondary school students in the Chinese context of a test-oriented environment might lack feedback from peers and have little experience in dealing with constructive criticism. Although FH does more than simply correct or enrich learners’ knowledge and can also enhance students’ effective engagement in writing (L. S. Teng & Zhang, 2016; Zimmer- man & Schunk, 2011), writing instruction in the Chinese secondary EFL context tends to be test-driven and product-oriented. These circumstances might have contributed to learners’ reporting less use of monitoring and self-evaluation strategies, which could potentially lead to negative writing outcomes.

Our findings also reveal that students’ individual differences affected their reported use of SRL strategies (Kizilcec et al., 2017). Individual differences, including common learner characteristics (e.g., age, gender, English learning experience, time commitment to writing, familiarity with writing topics, examination experience, school prestige, interest in learning English), could be leveraged in measuring self-regulated writing strategies. The scale and level of heterogeneity advance understanding of the factors influencing learners’ reported use of self-regulated writing strategies. These findings may partially explain the differences in the use of self-regulated writing strategies reported by university students and secondary school students.

This study is not without limitations. First, the lack of options for some factors (e.g., PL) might not fully elucidate self-regulated writing strategies. Another limitation is related to the methodological difficulties inherent in assessing self-regulated writing strategies. Some learners might not be able to explain their use of strategies in a questionnaire based on a quick recall of their academic routine. Future studies should tap into additional aspects of SRL (e.g., self-efficacy). Finally, various types of writing tests should be administered to measure learners’ writing proficiency.

Despite its limitations, the current study provides several noteworthy pedagogical implications. First, the significant predictive results of some self-regulated writing strategies suggest a need to teach such strategies to secondary school EFL students. For instance, to improve EFL secondary school students’ writing performance, GME—involving the adaptation of skills to monitor and evaluate writing—should be explicitly taught. Second, feedback from external sources (e.g., unplanned interactions with the learning setting, peers, or teachers) warrants consideration in secondary school EFL education. Third, the
higher order model of self-regulated writing strategies may be a useful tool for secondary school EFL students to appraise their awareness of self-regulated writing strategies. Finally, teachers could use the higher order model of self-regulated writing strategies as a pedagogical tool when examining students’ preferences for self-regulated writing strategies.
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