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ABSTRACT
Self-Regulated Strategy of Development (SRSD) is an intervention designed to improve students’ academic skills through a six-step process that teaches students specific academic strategies and self-regulation skills (mention them here). When it comes to writing, self-regulation allows students to manage tasks and monitor progress (also called self-monitoring), among other key skills. There are many ways to use strategy instruction to help students improve their writing skills in English.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PROBLEM

Now, most educational colleges need modern methods and strategies for teaching the English language subject that would help in overcoming the difficulties that students face in learning it, develop their abilities to be self-organized, and help in developing the various skills for learning that subject. Self-regulated learning strategies are considered a flexible teaching model that is compatible with modern global trends in teaching English language skills, and it helps learners learn appropriate planning, drafting, and review strategies that they use; replace with. Therefore, it is an effective strategy in developing writing skills and developing self-regulation among learners (Graham and Harris, 2005, 3).

Most of our students have no idea about how and when to use the self-regulation strategy when writing English essays. Therefore, using self-regulated learning in teaching the English language subject and learning its skills may change the course of the educational process. In this type of learning, the student is more active, because he analyzes the tasks and activities that the teacher presents to him, so he sets goals, plans, and controls his knowledge, motivation, and behaviors, using various methods of self- and social interaction to derive ideas and direct his efforts to acquire knowledge and skills more than relying with others, so the use of educational methods and methods that are appropriate for this type of learning should be reconsidered (Harris et al., 2008:8). Abdullah and Mousa (2023:1) mention that “Writing is the process of using symbols to communicate ideas. It is the mirror that shows one's knowledge about a language. It is considered as a cognitive process because its aim is to test memory, language, and thinking ability. Without learning writing, students will face a difficulty in achieving clarity which is the aim of any writing exercises. Consequently, many students have the ability to understand language, but...
most of them face the problem of communicating their ideas effectively. This problem is related to the lack of English vocabulary, and creativity in writing”.

1.2 THE AIMS
This research aims to achieve the following objectives:
- Knowing the effect of the self-regulated strategy on improving the writing skills of students in the college of Education at the University of Samara.
- Knowing the statistically significant differences between the average ranks of the experimental and control groups’ scores on the measurement in pre and post in the writing skills test.
- Knowing the statistically significant differences between the average ranks of the experimental group’s scores in pre and post in the writing skills test.

1.3 THE HYPOTHESES
The aims of this study are supposed to be achieved through verifying the following hypotheses:
1. There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group and the control group in the posttest for writing skills (content, organization, word choice, language, and writing mechanics).
2. There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) between the average scores of the pre- and posttest in the skills (goal and planning skills, organization and transformation, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, resource management and self-organization skills as a whole), among the students of the experimental group who studied according to the self-regulated learning strategy.

1.4 THE LIMITS
This research is limited to second stage students in English department / college of education / university of Samara who are studying writing composition.

2. INTRODUCTION
Self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) is a strategy instruction approach under development since 1982. Originally developed for struggling writers and students with learning disabilities, research has shown that SRSD is effective for average and above writers as well as aims (Harries and Graham, 2009).

Self-regulated strategies are those that students use to select, monitor, and use learning strategies. Successful students typically learn to self-regulate their learning early on; they understand how, when, and why to use a given strategy. On the other hand, many students with learning difficulties forget to use academic strategies or tend to use the same, often ineffective, strategy for all academic tasks. To be successful, these students must assume responsibility for their own learning. They can do so by learning how to self-regulate their behavior. (Graham and Perin, 2007).

2.1 WHAT IS SELF-REGULATED (STRATEGY) DEVELOPMENT IN WRITING?
SRSD, standing for self-regulated strategy development, was originally initiated by Harris and Graham in their research works since 1982 in order to address struggling writers and disabled learners (Harris & Graham, 2009) and has been empirically tested over decades. Harris et al (2008) suggest that this approach integrates both the strategy for writing and the self-regulation strategies simultaneously. They also consider that this approach as the strongest to have been proved effective in writing instruction at any level.
of education. Accordingly, SRSD hypothetically offers promising influence on students’ writing skill despite less research on it in the context of EFL. Roughly, SRSD can be split into two broad categories, **First**, strategy development, this aspect makes use of students’ pre-skills in writing which seem to be often neglected. **Second**, is self-regulated strategy or procedures which are presented to students as a form of training. In other words, self-regulated procedures train students to be autonomous by making use of such self-regulation procedures as goal setting, self-monitoring, self-assessment, and the likes. This approach has also evolved over years as a result of its application across educational institutions and levels. Some characteristics of this approach are as argued by Harris et al (2005) **First**, it helps anticipate glitches or area where problematic instructions exist. **Second**, in its realization, self-regulated instruction encourages and demands the collaboration between students and teachers in a flexible manner. Another prominent characteristic is the individualized instruction in which the strategy focuses on each student or is students-centred. The next characteristic is that it is criterion-based rather than time based in attaining the mastery of writing. Besides, it promotes both cognitive and metacognitive strategy to foster students’ writing performance and offers effective process during text composition.

There are many ways teacher can use strategy instruction to help students improve writing skills. Below are six strategies at the core of an evidence-based teaching approach called self-regulated strategy development (SRSD). These SRSD strategies can be challenging for students to learn. So, it’s best to have them try one strategy at a time.

**Strategy 1: Task analysis**

When students start a writing assignment, they often jump in without clearly understanding what they’re supposed to do. For example, students might write several pages of a book report before realizing they were supposed to write an opinion piece about the main character. This can lead to frustration and loss of class time.

How to teach this strategy: Ask students at the outset what the writing task is. Have them read or listen to the instructions aloud and then explain the assignment in their own words. During this process, you and your students may want to highlight or underline key parts of the writing task together.

**Strategy 2: Goal setting**

Even when students understand an assignment, they may start writing without an end goal in mind. They might be so focused on finishing the task that they don’t think about its purpose. This can lead to a lot of dead ends. Without clearly stated goals, it’s also difficult for kids to improve their skills over time.

How to teach this strategy: Explain to students that having clear goals can make the assignment easier and improve writing.

Try setting three goals together. One goal may be to write a certain number of words for the assignment. Another goal could be to improve the organization of their writing by using graphic organizers. If a student is writing a story, a challenging writing goal may be to show the emotions of characters through dialogue, rather than just through description (Cumming, 2001).

**Strategy 3: Task management**

It’s common for students to get sidetracked during a writing assignment. They may not have set aside enough time to tackle the assignment. Or they may have put off starting the assignment until 10 minutes before the period ends.
How to teach this strategy: Make a clear plan with students about how to get the actual writing done. A simple way to start is to ask students how long they think the assignment will take. Agree on a time and work in a plan of when to take a break. Talk about how to manage distractions, like how to address interruptions from other students.

**Strategy 4: Self-evaluation**

An important part of writing is looking over what you’ve written to decide if you need to make changes. Skilled writers do this continuously as they write. Struggling writers benefit from explicit instruction about how to self-evaluate their writing.

How to teach this strategy: Model when to stop and evaluate writing. For instance, skilled writers often re-read each paragraph as they finish it. Give students specific questions to ask themselves about each paragraph: Does it include all the ideas that were laid out in the graphic organizer? Does it address what the assignment calls for? If not, what changes are needed?

Over time, self-evaluation can become a habit with repeated opportunities for practice and feedback (Hyland, 2015).

**Strategy 5: Self-reinforcement**

Not surprisingly, students who struggle with writing often dislike the writing process. They may feel uncomfortable about their writing skills. If they make a spelling mistake, for example, they may obsess about it. These negative thoughts can overwhelm students and make the assignment painful to complete.

How to teach this strategy: Use effort-based and behavior-specific praise when students hit milestones during the writing process. For example, when students finish a paragraph, praise them for their hard work and focus. Or when a student is able to keep to the timing of the task, offer praise like, “Nice work keeping track of how much time you had left.”

**Strategy 6: Reflection**

Another key writing strategy happens after an assignment has been completed: pausing to reflect on how the assignment went. Did students achieve the goals you set together? Which strategies worked? Which ones didn’t, and why? Reflection is key to helping them improve writing skills.

How to teach this strategy: Set aside time after the writing assignment is done to talk with students about how it went. Ask if students hit any roadblocks, like distractions or negative thoughts. Brainstorm what you could change next time to make the process smoother.

Go over the strategies students used and talk about whether they worked. For example, if a student tried goal setting, ask about whether the goals were met. If the student used a planning strategy, talk through how the plan worked out.

Keep in mind that writing is one of the hardest skills for students to learn. Teaching self-regulation in writing can help students take a big step toward becoming better writers — but it may take some time to see improvement.

Read about how structured literacy supports reading and writing skills. Learn about written expression disorder. And find more evidence-based strategies for literacy instruction (Erlbaum et al., 2013).

The SRSD approach consists of explicit teaching of:

- general and specific writing strategies, such as:
  - using the right vocabulary,
  - being mindful of the intended reader,
Creating interesting introductions and conclusions
- the knowledge required to use these strategies;
- ways to manage these strategies;
- the writing process; and
- one’s behaviour as a writer
  - self-regulation
  - self-instruction

This approach offers a general framework for working with students that the teacher can then adapt to the writing strategies students are working on. It consists of six steps that can be re-arranged, re-combined, revisited, modified or even omitted, depending on student needs (Ferris, 2012).

2.2 GOALS OF SRSD
The major goals of SRSD are helping the students to (1) master cognitive and metacognitive strategies in writing academic essays and (2) develop autonomous, self-regulated use of the strategies. (Graham and Harris, 1996)

2.3 KEY STAGES IN SRSD
To achieve the goals, a 6-stage procedure for SRSD is adapted from the literature on SRSD. Information collected at the earlier stage will be analyzed and taken into account when the instruction is implemented. As detailed instruction plan is hardly possible before the information becomes available, the stages are briefly explained as follows:

a. Develop and Activate Background Knowledge:
At this point, the instructor will help the students recognize and create the basic components of a writing structure. By using this as a prompt, which will subsequently direct the students in the writing process, the goal is to develop the pre-skill required for writing. The nature, goals, and potential approaches to completing a writing task could be the first topics covered in the lesson. To reach this point, some researchers employed mnemonic devices. DARE, for instance, stands for develop topic sentence, add supporting detail, reject other people's arguments, and end with a conclusion. However, this is not the only thing the stage can do. In addition to the writing, Harris et al. (2008) emphasize that this stage's focus should also be on introducing and starting self-regulated tactics to the pupils. Stated differently, at this point, it is important to address the students' prior knowledge as well as their understanding of self-regulation techniques. The quantity of self-regulation techniques taught and practiced also varies according to the need and ability of the students. At this point, self-regulated techniques like goal-setting and self-monitoring techniques can be implemented.

b. Discuss It
At this point, teachers and students talk about the students' present writing skills and whether or not structured writing techniques can help them become better writers. It is important to talk about the students' perceptions of themselves and their writing abilities, as noted by Harris et al. (2013). It is the teacher's responsibility to guide the students in demonstrating the benefits of the two aspects they have discussed to their writing in order to determine whether their knowledge and perceptions will help or hinder their writing development. Demonstrating the benefits of the students' current knowledge and the self-regulation techniques they have previously discussed for both current and future...
opportunities is another aspect of this stage. Last but not least, at this point, the students' dedication to learning writing is also encouraged.

c. Model It

As the name implies, at this stage either teacher and student should interactively model writing and self-regulation strategies. Self-monitoring, self-evaluating, and other self-instructions procedure should be made clear to students through teacher modelling. Nonetheless, after modelling, teacher and students discuss the model and make changes when necessary.

d. Memorize It

Having the previous stages accomplished, the next stage will be memorizing both the writing and self-regulation strategies. Often, this is done by means of mnemonic, making acronyms of the compiled strategies. The suggested activities are also asking the students to make visual aids or graphs in the forms of mind mapping of the strategies the just learned and tell them to the teachers and other students.(Hyland,2015)

e. Support It

Students and teachers collaborate while writing. At this point, Harris et al. (2013) recommend that teachers provide guidance to each student utilizing tools like charts, graphic organizers, or self-instruction sheets in order to help them reach their ultimate objectives. Together, the teacher and students establish each student's unique writing performance standards and determine the level each student has attained. However, as the process progresses, the supervision, group work, and visual aids/sheets become less necessary, allowing students to write on their own and relying more on their mnemonics than those visual aids. Furthermore, Keh (2000) proposes the implementation of covert regulations and self-instructions during this phase.

f. Independent Performance

At this point, there is a complete transition from strategies and guided writing to independent writing. The teacher only observes and helps when needed; they are no longer in partnership with the students. Students' performance is almost at the target, and it is anticipated that their memory of the prior mnemonics will fade. Consequently, strategy generalization plans and maintenance are addressed and put into practice (Fathman et al., 1990).

Table (1) Mnemonic devices for use with the self-regulated strategy development
(Graham and Perin 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mnemonic</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>All genres</td>
<td>Pick my idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organize my notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write and say more</td>
<td>WWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is the main character?</td>
<td>Story writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does the story take place?</td>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>story take place?:</td>
<td>How=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where does the story take place?:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What does the main character do or want to do;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. THE METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the experimental method (quasi-experimental design) based on two control and experimental groups. The quasi-experimental method is defined as studying the relationship between two variables as they exist in reality, without the researcher controlling them (Berry and Mason (2010)).

3.1 THE POPULATION

The population of the study consisted of all female students in second stage in College of Education in University of Sammra their number is (61) students, according to statistics from the English Department.

3.1.1 THE SAMPLE

The research sample is limited to (61) students in second stage in English Department in College of Education / University of Samara. They are selected randomly and divided into two groups: an experimental group (30) students, the control group is (31) students.

3.2 INSTRUMENTAL DESYGN

It is to determine the writing skills necessary for students with writing difficulties in the second stage College of Education in University of Samara

In order to benefit from them when constructing the achievement test according to the self-control strategy, as it includes:

List of writing skills. The researcher relies on several sources in constructing the tool, including reviewing: results of some studies and literature that dealt with writing skills, analysis of students’ papers in Composition material in English language.

The following aspects are included in the treatment: (a) discussion of each genre and the reasons for its organizational elements using models of weak and strong papers; (b) explanation and modeling of self-regulation strategies named earlier (“to make the cognitive processes visible,” (MacArthur et al., 2015, p. 857); (c) scaffolding students’ use of the strategies through collaborative and guided practice, with control being released as students’ independence grew; and (d) emphasis on self-evaluation, with students being given evaluation criteria based on genre elements and with ample opportunity to practice evaluating and revising unknown peers’ writing before they engage in actual peer review and self-evaluation.

Writing Skills Test The test aims to measure the writing skills of the sample members, which are the skills of content, organization, word choice, language, and punctuation. It
was formulated in the form of two essay questions, where four topics were developed and the student must choose two basic topics, so that each student writes a specific essay that includes the basic parts that make up the essay (Descriptive and Narrative Essay). This list has been converted into rubrics as in Table (1) for the Marks of the writing skills’ test.

Table (1) The Marks of the Writing Skills’ Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good proficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate mastery proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 VALIDITY OF THE ACHIEVEMENT TEST

The validity of the tool means “verifying that the form includes all the elements that must be included in it”.

Analysis on the one hand, and the clarity of its paragraphs and vocabulary on the other hand, so that it is understandable to everyone it is used” (Khan, 2012, p. 179). This step also aimed to ensure the validity of the tool (Testing) of the application, and achieving its goals in collecting the required data, which is called the validity of the form validity, i.e. the validity of the tool in achieving the goal for which it was designed (measuring what is required) its measurement) (Hattie J, Biggs J and Purdie N (1996) To verify the validity of the study tool, the researcher did the following:

A- The apparent validity of the study tool (the veracity of the arbitrators):

After completing the construction of the study tool; It was presented to a number of (15) experts specialized in methodology. The jurors are graciously asked to express their opinion on the clarity and extent of the expressions. Its suitability to what it was developed for, along with modifications and suggestions through which a tool can be developed the study.

B- Internal consistency validity of the study tool:

After ensuring the apparent validity of the study tool, the researcher applied it in the field and on data. The researcher calculated the Pearson correlation coefficient to determine the internal validity of the study tool, where the correlation coefficient was calculated between the score of each statement of the study tool and the total score of the tool.

3.4 Reliability of the test

Reliability according to Fraenkel et al. (2009:154) refers to the consistency of the scores obtained—how accurate they are for each person from one instrument to another and from one collection of items to another.

To achieve the aim, Thus, the same achievement test has been administered to the pilot sample of (50) students and (10) teachers. Chronbach’s Alpha, which statistically measures the internal consistency, has been used to find the reliability of the diagnostics test. Chronbach’s coefficient is 0.84 for achievement test is 0.82 which indicates that the test is very highly reliable.

4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The first hypothesis:

The first hypothesis states: “There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group and
the control group in the posttest for writing skills (content, organization, word choice, language, and writing mechanics) and for the skills as a whole. To verify this, the researcher used a t-test for two independent samples to determine the significance of the differences, and the results were as in Table 2.

**Table (2) Means scores and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups’ scores in the posttest for writing skills (content, organization, word and language choice, and writing mechanics) and for the skill as a whole.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>standard deviations</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>2.253</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word and language choice</strong></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing mechanics</strong></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The skill as a whole</strong></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>6.211</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>4.923</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table (2) that the mean scores in the post-test of the skills (content, organization, word and language choice, and writing techniques) for the experimental group are: (22.07), (12.13), (21.97) and (16.17), respectively, which is higher than the mean scores of the control group, which reached (14.26), (7.29), (10.58), respectively. It is also clear that the effect size reached (0.67), which is large and means (0.67) of the variance obtained in the scores of the experimental group students in content skills.

This is due to the use of a self-regulated learning strategy that contributed to facilitating the experimental group’s students’ understanding of the main idea and related sub-ideas through a model followed during the initial draft writing stage (PLAN AND WRITE). This strategy contributed to increasing self-motivation, which helped motivate the students of the experimental group to begin writing processes, using brainstorming, individual discussion, and the use of shapes and illustrations.

As for the skill of organization, this strategy helped in self-organization of learning and self-regulation of writing processes through the steps in organizing the essay in terms of the introduction, which includes the main idea, including a number of related sub-ideas, and a number of paragraphs, each of which includes a main, connected idea. With a number of sentences that link to it, along with the use of transition words between sentences and paragraphs, and then the article was concluded appropriately, such as: organization, transformation, self-monitoring, and also self-evaluation, which helped the students of the experimental groups to rely on themselves. This was reflected positively on the organization of the article.

With regard to the skill of choosing words and language, this strategy contributed to helping the sample members while writing the initial draft through the sub-step (WRITE), which helped in choosing appropriate vocabulary and sentences related to the topic of writing. The step (POST WRITING) also helped in the students reviewing what
they wrote in addition to consulting their colleagues. To self-evaluate and self-monitor what they are doing using relevant sources, which has led to improve their skills in using appropriate relevant vocabulary and grammar.

Table (2) illustrates the effect of using the self-regulated learning strategy in improving and developing partially or completely the skills of (content, organization, word and language choice, and writing mechanisms) for the experimental group. In general, table (1) shows that the mean scores of the post-test writing skill as a whole for the experimental group was (72.33), which is higher than the mean scores mean of the control group, which was (42.65), and the effect size was (0.88), which is large and means that (0.88) of the variance occurring in the experimental group’s students’ grades in skills in the Writing test as a whole. This difference is due to the use of the self-regulated learning strategy, which has proven effective in the sub-writing skills discussed previously, as this strategy provided procedural steps to use these skills during writing and help students plan, generate ideas, and organize content, in addition to seeking help from external sources to enrich and refine their writing through steps. Procedural based self-regulated learning.

The second hypothesis

The second hypothesis states: **There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) between the average scores of the pre- and posttest in the skills (goal and planning skills, organization and transformation, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, resource management and self-organization skills as a whole), among the students of the experimental group who studied according to the self-regulated learning strategy**, the T-test was used to know the significance of the differences, and the results were as in Table (3).

Table (3)

Mean scores, standard deviations, degree of freedom and t-value of pre- and posttest for experimental group in (setting goals and planning, organization and transferring, self-monitoring, self-evaluation and resource management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>standard deviations</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals and planning</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.130</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and transferring</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.340</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-monitoring</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.997</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluation</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.672</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>6.685</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.845</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>7.823</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The test as a whole</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>7.533</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.960</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>147.43</td>
<td>16.498</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from Table (3) that the mean scores mean of the post-measurement scores for the skills (setting goals, planning, organizing, transferring, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, resource management) for the experimental group reached to (22.40) (27.03) (28.03) (20.90), (46.97), respectively. It is higher than the mean scores mean of the pre-test scores, which amounted to (9.47) (15.23), (13.90), (9.67), and (15.57), respectively, which indicates that there is a difference at the significance level (0.05) between the pre and posttest that is statistically significant in favor of the posttest, as is evident.

The size of the effect was (2.94), which is a high effect, and means that (294), (3.43), (3.57), (1.94), (4.43), respectively, of the variance occurring in the scores of (goal-setting skills. Planning, organization and transformation, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, resource management). The reason may be due to the use of a self-regulated learning strategy, which included a number of activities that helped the students of the experimental group to practice these skills using writing processes, taking into account the use of checklists before starting the writing process in order to self-regulate learning.

This may be due to the fact that this strategy focused on a number of sub-skills, such as classifying and writing down ideas, developing preliminary diagrams, using concept maps, and taking notes. Perhaps the reason for showing these differences is that the self-regulated learning strategy has enabled students to be trained to self-monitor by reviewing writing processes and developing a number of possible options for any difficulties that students may face, knowing the extent of the improvement they have gained through this strategy, in addition to summarizing what they have done.

It sought to benefit from it in possible written assignments, and it sought to change the students’ beliefs in terms of self-evaluation, that it is not only the task of the faculty member, but that they can self-evaluate themselves through the self-evaluation models that this strategy provided for them, and it provided a number of courses with its sub-skills that benefited.

It is also clear from Table (2) that the value of the mean scores of the scores for the posttest of writing skills for the tool as a whole for the experimental group amounted to (145.33), which is higher than the mean scores average of the scores for the pre-test, which amounted to (63.90), which indicates that there is a difference between the average scores of the pre- and post-tests, which means that there is a statistically significant difference at the significance level (.000) and the effect size was (5.57), which is a high effect size and means that (5.57) of the variance occurred in scores on self-regulation skills as a whole.

This may be due to the use of the self-regulated learning strategy, which helped improve self-regulation skills as a whole by training students to use the self-regulated learning strategy in their writing tasks, as it helped them plan, rephrase, arrange, and organize ideas, in addition to the learner knowing the extent of his progress in his learning through a number of the criteria that were developed for this purpose contributed to identifying their strengths and weaknesses, in addition to adapting to the environment and how to deal with their colleagues, in addition to managing and controlling time.

5. CONCLUSION

The research results reached to a number of conclusions, the most important of which are: The self-regulated learning strategy activated the students’ previous knowledge background related to writing skills, and helped them determine the goals to be achieved in writing in order to know the students’ potential and metacognitive potential in terms of
good planning of the time and effort required for the process. Learning. - Taking into account the self-learning strategy of methods of immediate monitoring and evaluation by the course professor to enhance the strengths and address the weaknesses directly. This strategy also enhances self-evaluation through students following the self-evaluation standards. The self-regulated learning strategy helped in self-monitoring by identifying possible options when there was any problem while writing, reviewing the writing processes, determining the extent of their improvement, and summarizing what they had done. The self-regulated learning strategy helped students support their learning steps, control their awareness, thinking, and conclusions, and know the extent of the development of their self-abilities. It also contributed to improving self-organization skills by training students to use self-regulated learning strategies in performing written tasks, and in managing, controlling, and monitoring time. Their surrounding environment. Monitoring students’ thinking and academic behavior by setting standards or benchmarks to compare them with their performance in order to necessitate the monitoring process. The learner’s monitoring of his academic performance also provides valuable information about his learning.

“The curriculum includes an overall self-regulation strategy that includes goal setting task management, progress monitoring, and reflection. Students use their journals to reflect on their learning and set new goals, and instructors guide discussions of goals, strategies, and progress”. The self-regulation strategies helped students to become more effective in writing and to experience more control over their learning. Results for writing showed positive effects for overall quality on a persuasive essay and for length but not for grammar. Other positive results emerged for learner motivation in terms of mastery goals and self-efficacy, but not in terms of beliefs or affect.

The researcher finds that the strategies provided a systematic way for students to approach writing assignments and feels that their think-aloud modeling is critical to the success of the approach. Although the researcher had taught writing strategies in the past, she had not used self-regulated strategy instruction before applying this strategy.
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