



Universidad
Zaragoza

Trabajo Fin de Grado

An exploratory study of the self-perceived use of
writing strategies among EAP (English for
Academic Purposes) learners

Autora

Ana Iulia Romanescu

Directora

María Carmen Pérez-Llantada Auria

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Grado en Estudios Ingleses
2023

*Este TFG va dedicado a toda mi familia
y aquellos amigos que nunca me dejaron
rendirme en este camino recorrido,
y que me han hecho mejorar como persona.
Gracias por haber estado a mi lado.*

*“The future belongs to those who believe
in the beauty of their dreams”
Eleanor Roosevelt.*

ABSTRACT

Writing for academia implies a degree of mastery that is achieved using different strategies, being the metacognitive writing strategies among the most important ones, as reported in the scholarly literature. In this undergraduate dissertation, a qualitative study was set out for twenty-eight students from the third year of the English Studies undergraduate programme at the University of Zaragoza. The purpose was to understand what types of writing strategies are mainly used in the process of writing (i.e., pre-writing, while-writing and post- writing strategies). The results were codified through percentages of use and a posteriori analysed according to Lavelle and Zuercher's (2001), Inventory of Processes in College Composition (IPIC). The main findings show that metacognitive strategies such as the use of online resources and techniques such as making an outline and brainstorming mainly support the students' writing processes. The results also show that the students rarely rely on strategies such as writing in their own native language and thereafter translating it to English or creating new words in case of lack of knowledge when writing an academic text. The study findings further confirm the pedagogical value of engaging students in reflective questionnaires and tasks for critical self-assessment of learning, in this case learning to write academic texts.

Keywords:

Writing strategies – EFL – Metacognition – Formal Writing – Academic writing

RESUMEN

Escribir textos académicos implica un grado de maestría el cual es conseguido a través del uso de diferentes estrategias, siendo las técnicas metacognitivas unas de las más importantes, como es registrado en la literatura académica. En este trabajo de fin de grado, un estudio cualitativo fue expuesto a veintiocho estudiantes del tercer curso en el grado de Estudios Ingleses perteneciente a la Universidad de Zaragoza. El propósito es el de comprender qué tipos de estrategias para la escritura son las más usadas en el proceso de escritura (por ejemplo, estrategias para el antes, durante y después de escribir). Los resultados fueron codificados y tratados a través de porcentajes de uso y a posteriori analizados conforme al estudio de Lavelle and Zuercher's (2001), Inventory of Processes in College Composition (IPIC). Los principales resultados muestran que las estrategias metacognitivas como el uso de recursos online y técnicas como la realización de un guion y una lluvia de ideas son usadas por el grupo de estudiantes. Los resultados también muestran que los estudiantes raramente hacen uso de otros tipos de estrategias como escribir en su lengua materna y después traducirlo al español, o la creación de una nueva palabra en caso de desconocimiento, cuando escriben un texto académico. Los resultados del estudio confirman el valor pedagógico de incluir a los estudiantes en encuestas reflectivas y tareas para un análisis crítico de sí mismo en cuanto al aprendizaje, en este caso, el aprendizaje para escribir textos académicamente correctos.

Palabras clave:

Estrategias de escritura – EFL – Metacognición – Escritura formal – Inglés académico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	6
1.1. Writing in EFL	6
1.2. Spolsky's Model in SLA	7
1.3. Writing Strategies	8
1.4. Literature Review	9
1.5. Rationale and Aim of the Study	9
2. Methods	12
2.1. Participants	12
2.2. Survey Tool	13
2.3. Data collection Procedures	15
2.4. Data Analysis and Interpretation	16
3. Results	17
3.1. Main Findings from the Questionnaire	17
3.2. Results of Reflective Task	23
4. Discussion	25
5. Conclusion	28
APPENDIX I	34
APPENDIX II	46

1. Introduction

1.1. Writing in EFL

Writing is a social practice used by individuals for centuries. According to Warnock (1983), writing provides a conduct for keeping in contact with people, either from one's social or academic circle. Specifically, writing is useful for learning as its explicitness serves to create connections between old and new ideas. Writing is also considered to be a cognitive and metacognitive process (Flower & Hayes, 1984; Graham & Perin, 2007). As research in language and metacognition explains, writing has strategies to skills, which interact with each other. In order to develop metacognitive skills, first the student learns strategies such as summarizing, clarifying or predicting information. Metacognition helps the writer to understand the effects thinking has on the writing process (O'Brien & Soiferman, 2010, p. 5). This study focuses on writing and metacognition to explore pre-, while-, and post-writing strategies. These strategies deal with the processes each individual uses before writing an academic text, during the writing process and finally, after writing, processes of revision of content and form (Zimmerman, 1995; Schraw, 1998; Andrade, 1999; Todd, 2002).

In the present study writing strategies will be explored in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL hereafter). EFL concerns different aspects of learning, "teaching and learning of English to and by non-native speakers; [...] English that is taught to and/or learnt by non-native speakers" (Swan, 2012, p. 379). The focus is the concept of non-native speakers, that is, a learner whose mother tongue is other than English. The concept of EFL is framed within the broader concept of English as a Second Language (ESL) that relates to the processes of acquiring English by individuals whose mother tongue is not English. Ellis (2003, p. 2) defines SLA as "the systematic study of how people acquire a second language (often referred to as an L2)". This process involves

acquiring and learning the four language skills, speaking, reading, listening and writing (Petersen, 1984).

The CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) (Council of Europe, 2018) states that writing involves planning, compensating and monitoring and repairing strategies, that could be applied according to the level in which the language user writes. According to the CEFR descriptors for the C1 level of competence the writer “can, when preparing a more formal spoken or written text, consciously adopt the conventions linked to the particular type of text concerned (structure, level of formality and other conventions) (planning)” (2018, p. 78), “can exploit his/her range of vocabulary options creatively so as to readily and effectively use circumlocution in almost all situations (compensating)” (2018, p. 79), and “can backtrack when he/she encounters a difficulty and reformulate what he/she wants to say without fully interrupting the flow of speech. Can self-correct with a high degree of effectiveness (monitoring and repair)” (2018, p. 80).

1.2.Spolsky’s Model in SLA

In the context of Second Language Acquisition (SLA hereafter), B. Spolsky (1978) provides an insightful model to explain and understand the conditions that make second language learning more or less likely. This model establishes interactions across a range of factors (social context, attitudes, motivation, individual learner characteristics and opportunities for learning). Spolsky’s model is comprised by four tiers which are combined and can account for successful or unsuccessful language learning. The first tier represents the community before bilinguality; thus, a range of factors should be considered (e.g., age of the individuals or willingness to learn a new language, among others). The second tier holds the goals of the community. The third tier considers how it might affect the community the changes made for reaching bilingual education. Finally,

the fourth tier is about the effects of formal, informal and non-formal learning opportunities (Spolsky, 1978).

Depending on the type of writing the learner engages in, attention should be put on one or more of the following factors, “psychological, sociological, economical, political, religious, cultural, geographical, demographic, historical, linguistic and so on. When one is using the model to describe an individual case, not all the factors are likely to be equally relevant” (Spolsky, 1978, p. 347). Furthermore, Spolsky’s model also considers individual factors like motivation, attitude towards the writing, age, ethnicity, among others. By this means, it is relevant to mention Spolsky’s analysis in this present study as group and individual processes are going to be analysed to understand aspects of acquisition and learning to write in English as an academic language.

1.3. Writing Strategies

In order to understand what writing strategies are, firstly learning strategies should be defined. According to Noviyenty (2018, p. 36), learning strategies are “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques – such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task – used by students to enhance their own learning”. Perhaps the most robust study on writing strategies is that of Oxford (2003). Oxford (2003, p. 2) suggests six groups of strategies for further classification: “cognitive, metacognitive, memory-related, compensatory, affective, and social”. This study specifically aims to explore metacognitive writing strategies, which deal with

[...] identifying one’s own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy.

What makes relevant the study of these strategies is the capacity of the individual to self-

assess his or her own writing. According to Oxford's study, these strategies are developed and used by good learners of English, which makes language learning easier.

1.4. Literature Review

This type of strategies have been analysed in two main studies which will be further commented among the results of the study on the results section. The first one is Oxford's SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) which as mentioned before, is comprised by six groups of classification. These groups firstly are divided into direct strategies and indirect strategies. The former are comprised by the memory, cognitive strategies and compensation strategies of each individual. The later, include metacognition, social and affective strategies which are related to the emotions of the writer.

The second study is the one made by Božinović and Sindik (2007) which analyses how 201 students from the Rochester Institute of Technology from Croatia have learned diverse foreign languages, among them Spanish. The study was developed as a verification of Oxford's academic construct on how individual differences act across each individual student. These authors conclude that both cognitive and metacognitive strategies are combined when aiming at successful academic writing, and therefore, they cannot be separated into individual units but rather see them as complementing each other to achieve such aim.

The present study draws on both studies to enquire into the analysis on how everyone is influenced by one type of strategy or other, but also how this combination of strategies can support the writing process.

1.5. Rationale and Aim of the Study

According to Hyland (2014), English for Academic Purposes is a field of language education that infers the recognition of the specific features of language, discourse

practices, and communication between the interactants of a group. One of the challenges faced by students in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is to develop a balance between their own voice and the conventions of academic writing (Mallia, 2017), such as the organizational pattern, the argument or the purpose of the writing, among other important features. Moreover, one of the most remarkable difficulties faced by Spanish students when writing in English is writing in an impersonal way. In Spanish, academic texts are written in a personal way. However, there is a clear difference between the personality of an academic text with the one from a non-academic one. An academic text is characterized by an objective tone, such objectivity cannot be found in other registers of writing. Moreover, in formal academic writing in English impersonality is generally a core feature and therefore Spanish writers need to adapt to this convention when writing in academic English (Neff, 2006).

Qualitative research on writing strategies at the university level has also been conducted in Malaysian universities (Raofifi et al., 2014; Raofifi et al., 2017). The purpose has been to investigate writing strategies and what type, or types is/are the most commonly used, the results revealed that the majority of the students used metacognitive strategies leaving aside cognitive or social strategies. Research on writing strategies by Iranian students (Fahimi and Rahimi, 2014) investigates students' self-assessment writing skills with the teacher's supervision. These authors conclude that the students were able to think critically and correct their mistakes. Mallia's (2017) study on pre-writing strategies developed by non-native English speakers who are studying or about to study in British universities or Western universities in which the main language of instruction is English, focuses on pre-sessional courses to understand aspects from academic English that successful non-native speakers of English develop as they get familiarized with aspects such as academic language, plagiarism and autonomous learning. Similar research

has been done using ethnographic techniques involving the participation of students and teachers to achieve knowledge through writing, such as Prior's (1998) study of literate activity in academia. One of the main findings of Prior is the view of an academic writing as a shared task which shows different disciplines of the individual encompassing "personal, interpersonal, artifactual, institutional, and sociocultural as well as disciplinary histories" (Prior, 1998, p. xii). In the Spanish context Aula's (2016) study of metacognitive strategies, writing anxiety and writing self-efficacy in six participants from the second year of secondary education concludes that writing anxiety is a factor that should be addressed in order to improve the students' self-efficacy. Finally, Cer (2019, p. 13) investigates writing as a metacognitive process in a Turkish high school and concludes that metacognitive strategies should be used in the writing process as "the text should be restructured through planning and revision, monitoring, evaluating, and editing, instead of having students write compositions with only topics and simple instructions".

The present study aims to explore the pre-writing, while-writing and post-writing strategies used by a group of EFL students (n=28) at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. Following Dudley-Evans and St John (1998, p. 58), the study involved a situational analysis of the learners, that is, their language learning needs including, their expectations and needs, their core motivation and the "personal ability in which the participant's proficiency in those activities is evaluated". The motivation for carrying out this research was the need to identify which strategies prove to be helpful to the students when developing academic writing skills. The study also sought to contribute a better understanding of writing strategies and assess possible pedagogical implications that could inform pedagogical practice, above all strategy training. The two broad research questions this study sought to answer were the following:

RQ1: What writing strategies do the students use when they write academic texts?

RQ2: What are the similarities and differences among the students regarding strategy use?

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

The study involved 28 students (both female and male) from the third year of the English Studies undergraduate programme at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. On average, their L1 is Spanish (82.14%) and the remaining percentage, 17.85%, corresponds to students that have Romanian as their mother tongue. The majority of the students had studied English as a foreign language for at least ten years.

With respect to the decision about which set of individuals should be object of analysis, this specific group was conceived of as a convenience sample population to survey for several reasons. First, in year 3 the students have already developed skills in writing diverse academic texts in the different content courses of the study programme. These ranged from English language and academic English to English literature and culture. Secondly, the selected group of students was also considered a homogeneous group since in year 3, the students' expected target language level is a C1 level of competence in writing, as described in the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) (Council of Europe, 2018). Thirdly, the students have all completed several courses in general English in previous academic years, therefore ensuring that they have experience in writing in English. Moreover, they have attended two specialized English language courses (Inglés Académico I (27818) and Inglés Académico II (27828)). As stated in the course description, some of the learning outcomes involve the identification of characteristics and strategies for the organization of academic discourses whether written or orally, the elaboration of academic texts, and the expression of a critical stance at a C1 level of competence. Finally, in the specific content course this

study was conducted, Second Language Acquisition and Learning (Aprendizaje y Adquisición del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera (27829)), one of the learning goals was to instruct them in ways of applying relevant SLA theories for analytical and critical assessment and self-assessment of language learning processes.

According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 75), an individual who has achieved the level of C1 in writing shows competence in the following terms:

Can write clear, well-structured texts of complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues, expanding and supporting points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples, and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. Can employ the structure and conventions of a variety of written genres, varying the tone, style and register according to addressee, text type and theme.

2.2.Survey Tool

The study design involved two data gathering procedures for understanding the students' writing strategies. Firstly, a scale-based questionnaire was designed, which included 6 demographic questions, and 49 Likert scale (5-point) type questions (both in English and Spanish) (see Appendix). Providing the questionnaire in the two languages was deemed necessary to maximize the comprehension of the statements. In the present study ordinal variables were used as there is not an objective value within the numeric scale. The range was organized as follows: 1 (never or almost never done), 2 (usually not done), 3 (sometimes done), 4 (usually done), and 5 (always or almost always done). To facilitate the interpretation of the study findings, the questions were grouped based on three aspects of the writing process that the literature describes, pre-writing, while-writing and post-writing strategies, depending on when the strategy is used in the writing process. The

items of the questionnaire were adapted from Marquette's University (2008), ESLP82 Questionnaire: Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills and Use of Writing Strategies, Oxford's (1989) *Strategy inventory for Language Learning (SILL)*, and from Božinović and Sindik (2007) *Construction of the Questionnaire on Foreign Language Learning Strategies in the Croatian context*. The 49 questions from the survey were extracted from the studies mentioned previously although they were revised by the researcher in order to better contextualize the study. In the mentioned studies there were questions involving the correct use of MLA citation, cultural items involving the background of each student, or the academic writing instructors' guidelines to achieve academic accuracy. This type of questions were not included in the present study as its main aim was to analyse each individual independently and whether motivation had a role on how writing is developed and supported by strategy use.

Qualitative research, as defined by Creswell (2014), addresses a set of characteristics concerning the setting, the researcher and the sources of data. Firstly, to conduct research successfully, the setting for collecting data has to be where "the participants experience the issue or problem under study" (Creswell, 2014, p. 234), in this case, it was conducted during class time. Secondly, the researcher has to collect the data and create their own research instruments rather than rely on questionnaires produced by other researchers. Finally, there have to be diverse forms of collecting data, "such as interviews, observations, documents and audiovisual information" (Creswell, 2014, p. 234) in order to gather accurate information successfully.

To complement the students' responses to the questionnaire a qualitative data gathering tool was created using a Google Form. The Google Form writing task was based on four general questions (prompts) to elicit the students' critical reflection on strategy use. The prompts were the following:

- 1) From the pre-, while- and post writing strategies of the questionnaire, select the 3 strategies that you use the most. Explain the benefits of using them.
- 2) From the pre-, while- and post writing strategies of the questionnaire, select 3 that you have never used or that you have rarely used. Explain how your writing practice would benefit from using them.
- 3) Are there any strategies that you consider "useless"? Explain why.
- 4) Explain what you have learned in taking part in this small-scale SLA/SLL study that aims to help you become aware of your academic English writing skills.

With these prompts, the students were invited to reflect on their writing activity and comment on the use and perceived value of writing strategies.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Oficina de Proteccion de Datos at the University of Zaragoza to ensure that it fulfilled all the ethical requirements for conducting this type of research. The approval letter is included in Appendix II. Several documents had to be filled in in order to guarantee the permission and the validity of the study. The researcher also explained to the potential participants the study goals and the way the data were going to be collected, stored, analysed and finally deleted in six-months' time following the established requirements. The researcher also informed them that the data were going to be confidential and anonymous. The researcher also explained them the procedures for the data collection so that the students could make informed decisions as regards the participation in the study. Therefore, only those students that expressed their consent for participating in the study responded to the questionnaire.

2.3.Data collection Procedures

The study was carried out in the first half of the semester in the academic year 2021-2022. It involved the administration of the questionnaire (administered on paper in a face-to-face session) and the reflective writing task online, as previously mentioned. The

questionnaire was administered on paper and onsite with a view to compiling the highest number of responses and ensuring that the students did not have any queries when answering the questionnaire. The amount of time they were given was not strict, but they were encouraged to spend between twenty and thirty minutes completing the questionnaire and the online reflective writing task.

Once the students completed the questionnaire, the link to the online task was administered. Both data gathering procedures were conducted by the researcher under the supervision of one of the teachers of the Second language acquisition and learning course. The link was given to the students through the online educational platform of the University (Moodle). Access was given only to those students who were connected through their institutional e-mail (e.g, xxxxxx@unizar.es). As stated previously, conducting the questionnaire in a face-to face sessions was deemed apposite to ensure a high response rate.

2.4.Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected with the help of the questionnaire was analysed applying descriptive statistics. As explained by Kaur, Stoltzfus & Yellapu (2018, p. 60) a statistical approach can be “used to summarize data in an organized manner by describing the relationship between variables in a sample or population”. An Excel file was used to compile and analyse the data from the questionnaire in order to obtain both overall and comparative percentages of the different categories of writing strategies (pre-, while- and post-). The data were interpreted following Lavelle and Zuercher’s (2001) Inventory of Processes in College Composition (IPIC hereafter), who analyses the approaches for writing, either deep or surface, that simultaneously are divided into several categories. On the one hand, the deep approach category is divided into two subcategories, elaborative strategy and reflective-revision strategy. On the other hand, the surface approach is comprised by three

strategies, low self-efficacy, spontaneous-impulsive and procedural. Cer (2019) applied the same approach to his study of metacognitive strategies in writing, but with secondary education students, and analysed the data with the IPIC. The same procedures were then used in the present study.

3. Results

3.1. Main findings from the Questionnaire

Table 1 summarizes the main findings from the pre-writing section. It shows the students' rating of each item and the comparative percentages, that indicate the frequency of use of each strategy. As can be seen, their overall responses are rather homogeneous in most of the statements. Only statements 13, 14 and 17 show greater heterogeneity among the respondents.

Table 1. Use of pre-writing strategies

	1 (Never or almost never done)	2 (Usually not done)	3 (Sometimes done)	4 (Usually done)	5 (Always or almost always done)
11. I review my class notes, handouts, and assignment requirements before beginning to write.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (28.57%)	11 (39.29%)	9 (32.14%)
12. I consider the task or assignment and instruction carefully before writing.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	12 (42.86%)	14 (50%)
13. I brainstorm and write down ideas before I begin to write.	0 (0%)	7 (25%)	6 (21.43%)	11 (39.29%)	4 (14.29%)
14. I make an outline or plan in English before starting to write a text.	2 (7.14%)	4 (14.29%)	8 (28.57%)	8 (28.57%)	6 (21.43%)
15. I notice the academic vocabulary and phraseology of academic English and try to remember both.	0 (0%)	4 (14.29%)	12 (42.86%)	9 (32.14%)	3 (10.71%)

16. I read the feedback from my previous writing and use this feedback in my next writing.	0 (0%)	4 (14.29%)	3 (10.71%)	13 (46.43%)	8 (28.57%)
17. I think about my intended audience, that is to say, the readers that are going to read my work.	1 (3.57%)	2 (7.14%)	6 (21.43%)	12 (42.86%)	7 (25%)
18. I consider aspects of register and style in relation to the communicative purpose and audience of the academic text that I have to write.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (14.29%)	10 (35.71%)	14 (50%)

Considering the cumulative percentages (4 (usually done), and 5 (always or almost always done)), the most highly rated pre-writing strategies were: *'I consider aspects or register and style in relation to the communicative purpose and audience of the academic text that I have to write'* (cumulative percentage= 85.51 %), *'I think about my intended audience, that is to say, the readers that are going to read my work'* (cumulative percentage= 67.86%), and *'I make an outline or plan in English before I begin to write'* (cumulative percentage=50%). According to Lavelle (1993), item number fourteen, *'I make an outline or plan in English before starting to write a text'*, is considered to be an action not made by spontaneous-impulsive writers, which suggests that they see writing as impersonal and an action which should be done in one sitting. In the questionnaire, only 7.14% of the students were spontaneous-impulsive writers, while the majority are on a regular basis. This may be so because in this particular university context, the students have learned the importance of making an outline and how to structure the information in it in the academic English courses they attend in the second and third year of the study programme. Using Spolsky's model, the findings show that receiving formal instruction strongly relates to the frequent use of this strategy.

Table 2 summarises the students' responses to the statements related to while-writing strategies. As it can be seen in this table, there seems to be a disparity in the

responses except for two of them, where a high number of respondents rated similarly, namely 71.43% (item 20) and 78.57% (item 27). This indicates that the students agree as regards the strategy of writing directly in English, and not writing first in their native language and then translating it into English. This is possibly so because they have achieved the expected level of competence, but also on account of their previous experience concerning writings, more specifically academic writing which they have been practicing in the three academic years. The results also show that they use a wide use of online resources such as Linguee or WordReference while writing their academic essays.

Table 2. Use of while-writing strategies

	1 (Never or almost never done)	2 (Usually not done)	3 (Sometimes done)	4 (Usually done)	5 (Always or almost always done)
19. I use my background knowledge to help me develop my ideas.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	8 (28.57%)	18 (64.29%)
20. I like to write in my native language first and then translate it into English.	20 (71.43%)	4 (14.29%)	2 (7.14%)	2 (7.14%)	0 (0%)
21. I like to change or make my ideas clearer as I am writing.	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	5 (17.86%)	14 (50%)	7 (25%)
22. I use a dictionary to check things I am not sure about when I write.	0 (0%)	1 (3.57%)	4 (14.29%)	9 (32.14%)	14 (50%)
23. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	3 (10.71%)	9 (32.14%)	14 (50%)
24. I make up new word if I do not know the right ones in English when I am writing.	18 (64.29%)	8 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	0 (0%)

25. I think about how learning to write well in English will help me succeed in my other courses.	1 (3.57%)	0 (0%)	5 (17.86%)	13 (46.43%)	9 (32.14%)
26. I use previous knowledge when I organize the information (from generic to specific, from positive to negative, ...)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	8 (28.57%)	7 (25%)	11 (39.29%)
27. I use online resources (Linguee, WordReference, ...)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (21.43%)	22 (78.57%)
28. I can use different textual structures depending on the purpose of the text.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (17.86%)	12 (42.86%)	11 (39.29%)
29. I restate the topic sentence several times when writing the composition to make it more coherent.	1 (3.57%)	3 (10.71%)	9 (32.14%)	11 (39.29%)	4 (14.29%)
30. I use hedges to mitigate my claims and make the discourse tentative when necessary.	0 (0%)	1 (3.57%)	4 (14.29%)	12 (42.86%)	11 (39.29%)
31. I express my own voice or stance.	1 (3.57%)	4 (14.29%)	7 (25%)	12 (42.86%)	4 (14.29%)
32. I use evidence from other authors to support my point of view and make my arguments stronger.	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	2 (7.14%)	11 (39.29%)	13 (46.43%)
33. I include quotations, summaries, and paraphrases to integrate other authors' ideas in my own text.	0 (0%)	1 (3.57%)	3 (10.71%)	6 (21.43%)	18 (64.29%)
34. I use the language in particular ways to make my writing stand out from others.	1 (3.57%)	3 (10.71%)	14 (50%)	2 (7.14%)	8 (28.57%)
35. When writing I aim to make the reader follow my statements and arguments.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (28.57%)	11 (39.29%)	9 (32.14%)
36. I use support statements and counterarguments to prove my claims.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (25%)	9 (32.14%)	12 (42.86%)

The students' responses to item 31 considering the cumulative percentages (4 (usually done), and 5 (always or almost always done)) also indicated that 56.97% of them usually express overtly their own voice or stance on their academic texts adjusting it depending on the type of writing they are developing. This question attached to Lavelle's (1993) Elaborative sphere from the Deep Approach category, which is based on viewing the task as an engagement in learning (1993). The Elaborative sphere corresponds with the correlation of meaning and the involvement of one's self in the writing. Thus, a combination of previously investigated data and personal voice are effective when writing. Another question that relates to the elaborative process is statement thirty-five (*'When writing I aim to make the reader follow my statement and arguments'*), which with the cumulative percentage (4 (usually done) and 5 (always or almost always done)) shows that almost three quarters (71.43%) of the students use it. This finding shows that more than half of the group does not have the sense of inclusion and belonging to an Academic sphere. For that reason, the respondents do not follow a logical path and line of argument in order to make the reader fully understand the statements and arguments made on the writing. Therefore, it could be hypothesized that in most cases the students make an academic writing because they have to do it but are not conscious enough about how to actively improve the writing by applying pre-, while- and post-writing strategies.

In Table 3 we can observe that the students' responses recall what Lavelle (1993) defines as a Reflective-Revisionist style from the Inventory of Processes in College Composition (IPIC). The Reflective-Revisionist style is composed by understanding the role and function of revising a text either from the Academia or for non-academic purposes. Writing is seen as a cognitive process and a problem-solving approach to a successful writing. The questionnaire's results strongly suggest that more than a half of the respondents (53.57%) always or almost always *'go back to their writing to revise the*

content and make their ideas clearer' (item thirty-seven), and *'go back to their writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation'* (item thirty-nine). Moreover, 57.14% of the students always *'correct, proofread and edit the text'* (item forty-seven). This shows a tendency towards correcting and demonstrating that writing is a cognitive process for them.

Table 3. Use of post-writing strategies

	1 (Never or almost never done)	2 (Usually not done)	3 (Sometimes done)	4 (Usually done)	5 (Always or almost always done)
37. I go back to my writing to revise the content and make my ideas clearer.	0 (0%)	3 (10.71%)	2 (7.14%)	8 (28.57%)	15 (53.57%)
38. I go back to my writing to revise and improve my organization.	0 (0%)	4 (14.29%)	2 (7.14%)	11 (39.29%)	11 (39.29%)
39. I go back to my writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation.	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	3 (10.71%)	8 (28.57%)	15 (53.57%)
40. I use a dictionary after I finish writing a draft.	7 (25%)	7 (25%)	5 (17.86%)	2 (7.14%)	7 (25%)
41. I make notes or try to remember feedback I get so I can use it the next time I write.	2 (7.14%)	7 (25%)	5 (17.86%)	9 (32.14%)	5 (17.86%)
42. I record the types of errors I have made so I do not keep making the same types of errors.	3 (10.71%)	8 (28.57%)	10 (35.71%)	4 (14.29%)	3 (10.71%)
43. I use the feedback to help with my other English skills (reading, speaking, and listening).	1 (3.57%)	4 (14.29%)	8 (28.57%)	11 (39.29%)	4 (14.29%)
44. I revise the style and make it adequate for my intended audience.	0 (0%)	1 (3.57%)	4 (14.29%)	12 (42.86%)	11 (39.29%)

45. I read aloud the writing once it is finished to check if the ideas make sense orally.	8 (28.57%)	4 (14.29%)	3 (10.71%)	4 (14.29%)	9 (32.14%)
46. I check for biased language and for gender-neutral language.	0 (0%)	4 (14.29%)	4 (14.29%)	11 (39.29%)	9 (32.14%)
47. I correct, proofread and edit the text.	1 (3.57%)	1 (3.57%)	3 (10.71%)	7 (25%)	16 (57.14%)
48. I ask another person to read my writing to check out if the topic is clearly developed and explained.	11 (39.29%)	4 (14.29%)	3 (10.71%)	4 (14.29%)	6 (21.43%)
49. I use resources to check that the text is original to avoid plagiarism.	3 (10.71%)	4 (14.29%)	5 (17.86%)	9 (32.14%)	7 (25%)

3.2.Results of Reflective Task

As stated in the Methodology section, the students were asked to do a post-questionnaire online writing task²⁸ to further reflect on the strategies they use the most and the least and make them self-assess critically their own writing habits.

The close reading of the data collected from these tasks showed that the most frequently used techniques by the students are the following. Regarding pre-writing strategies, item fourteen ‘*I make an outline or plan in English before starting to write a text*’ was mentioned by almost half of the students (42.85%), thus corroborating the results of the questionnaire, that indicated that 50% of the students considered that they usually use it. Continuing with pre-writing strategies, in the writing task six of the respondents (21.42%) stated that they mostly use the strategy of brainstorming (item thirteen), which partially supports the 14.29% of the students, indicating that they always or almost always use it.

In the while-writing strategies, the students’ responses to the prompts confirmed the use of two important strategies. Strategy twenty-seven (*‘I use online resources*

(*Linguee, Wordreference, ...*)' is considered by 32.14% of the students as a strategy they mostly use and perceived as beneficial for writing purposes. Some of the students affirmed so, as deduced from comments such as '*it helps me find synonyms to words that I want to use without sounding repetitive in my essay*' or '*to make sure that I have written everything correctly*'. Secondly, the strategy '*I express my own voice or stance*' (item thirty-one) in the online task was not mentioned explicitly as a strategy that they put into practice, although the questionnaire showed that 42.86% of the respondents usually does it.

The second writing prompt of the online writing task provided somewhat surprising results. In the forum, 71.43% of students stated that they have never relied on others to get feedback from the texts they write. However, responses from the post-writing section indicated that the participants did not consider answering someone to read their written production in order to check out if the topic is clearly developed and explained, is a useful strategy. Notwithstanding this, the students commented that after taking part in this small-scale questionnaire, they will consider doing it on a regular basis. The main reason given by the students was that a second opinion would help them better notice the possible weaknesses, therefore using the feedback for improving the text.

Regarding the third prompt, that invited the students to reflect on those strategies that they considered 'useless', the data showed a high level of consistency across the students' comments regarding the strategy '*I make a new word if I do not know the right ones in English when I am writing*' (item twenty-four). In the task, a very high number of students (82.14%) consider this strategy useless, which confirms why 64.29% of the students stated in the questionnaire that they had never used this strategy. The students perceived this strategy as useless and stated that it is time-consuming, and meaning could be lost in the process. Some of the affirmation made by the students answering why it is

useless for them are *'the grammar in both languages are mostly different, I think it would decrease the quality of my writing', 'there can be transfer errors', 'I feel like I lose a lot of time and in the translation I lose part of the meaning', 'it would slow down my ability of thinking in the second language'*.

Finally, the last prompt of the online writing task, that asked the students to reflect upon what they had learned by taking part in this small-scale SLA/SLL study revealed that in general the students had become more aware of strategy use. Specifically, they claimed that they would pay more attention to most of the strategies with a view to improving their writing skills and the quality of the academic texts they compose. On the other hand, from their responses it was also clear that they were not fully aware of the use of biased language or gender-neutral language, but it seems that by participating in this study they became aware of it. This was seen in students' comments such as the following ones: *'I learned how linguistic input, such as reading in English, can increase my level of writing in the language', 'that there are writing strategies I wasn't aware of and could be useful', and 'I revisited my habits of study and essay writing'*. In sum, a positive outcome of the task was the fact that the students perceived their participation in this small-scale SLA/SLL study as beneficial for improving their writing skills or, at least, for reflecting critically about them.

4. Discussion

According to ESL/EFL hereafter research there is systematicity in language learning, which means that all learners learn the second or foreign language very much in the same way. Overall, the study results showed similarities regarding strategy use within the group of students taking part in the study. Although the twenty-eight participants of the present study differed individually, which may obviously account for individual differences in SLA processes, the results of the present study have shown that they share the use of

certain strategies. According to their responses, the results of the study have shown that they were conscious of the importance of having background knowledge, using outlines and physical or online resources in order to write. As Mallia (2017, p. 5) points out, “critical and constructive thinking skills on the part of the writer are essential”. In the present study, half of the respondents made outlines before starting to write, which supports Mallia’s affirmation regarding the importance of pre-writing skills before producing a written piece of text. Thus, the present study provides further evidence that metacognitive strategies are enhanced and used more by proficient learners of the language (Raofi et al., 2014), being the case of the respondents which according to Zaragoza’s University, in the third year of the English Studies programme the level of competence is C1 according to the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). The study findings further supports Aula’s (2006) study findings in the same institutional context.

In their study of writing strategies, aimed to identify those types of strategies used the most among a varied level of proficiency (nine were low proficient learners and eleven had a medium to high ability) by students from a Malaysian University, Raofi et al. (2014) showed that the lack of use of metacognitive strategies involving revision of content and organization accounted for the students’ poorer writing ability than expected. In contrast, the present study has shown that the students had a higher degree of writing ability involving metacognitive strategies as more than a half of them reported that they ‘go back to their writing to revise the content and make their ideas clearer’ and ‘go back to their writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation’. These results show that the group of students selected for the study have achieved the expected level of proficiency by taking the compulsory courses on academic English, possibly, because their previous formal instructed learning opportunities provided in their study

programme.

This research has helped the students engage themselves to reflect critically on their own individual writing processes of writing strategies during their university years. Fahimi and Rahimi (2015, p. 735) highlight the knowledge achieved by learners on “how to plan and revise their essays”. Furthermore, they conclude by stating that maybe one day Iranian EFL learners will be able to self-assess effectively without the supervision of a teacher and show the expected level of competence. Comparatively, the present study has shown a greater level of involvement and capability on the part of the students surveyed. They were able to think critically about how they prepare for writing, how they write and how they revise the texts they have produced and what strategies they can put into practice in these three writing stages.

This study has also explored the use of the L1 in L2 text composing. The findings showed that the respondents never or almost never put into practice this strategy, which indicates that they are able write grammatically correct texts without the help of their mother tongue. Here it is worth recalling Kin and Yoon's (2014, p. 33) conclusion that “L1 use is not considered a debilitating factor, but rather as a kind of compensatory strategy for the difficulties that L2 writers face in L2 composition”. The study participants, however, did not consider necessary to write first in their L1 and then translate it into English, which suggests they are at an advanced stage of interlanguage development (i.e., proficient in the L2).

After analysing the results from the questionnaire and the forum, it can be stated that there is homogeneity among the group, but there are instances of mixed responses. Firstly, concerning pre-writing strategies, the students show a degree of agreement on the use of certain strategies such as considering the instructions, brainstorming before writing, thinking on the intended audience or adapting register and style to the type of

text they are writing. Talking about while-writing strategies the present study has shown that there is homogeneity concerning “bad” or “waste-timing” strategies like writing firstly in the native language and then translating it to English or making up a new word. It is also interesting to note that the survey results tentatively pointed to individual differences in SLA processes, which explains why there is diversity regarding the use of some strategies such as those of rephrasing for a clearer understanding, using previous knowledge, expressing their own voice or using statements and counterarguments to prove their claims. Overall, though, the students show a high level of proficiency and critical thinking regarding strategy use. Individual differences in SLA processes may also account for both similarities and differences in the use of post-writing strategies. While the strategy of revision of content, stylistic features and style was commonly use, the use of other post-writing strategies was not consistent in the group of studies surveyed.

5. Conclusion

This study has aimed to contribute to a better understanding of how university students learning English as a Foreign Language use a wide variety of writing strategies involving cognitive and, above all, metacognitive strategies such as planning, producing and revising the L2 writing effectively. This confirms the important role metacognition can play in writing processes Overall, the study provides further evidence that the strategies of outlining, the use of online resources or dictionaries, and the revision of content, grammar and vocabulary prove to be particularly helpful to the students, at least in this particular academic context.

Restating Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), the present study has identified possible language learning trends that could enlighten what strategies should be covered by teachers in formal language learning contexts. Moreover, this study contributes on the target situation analysis given to teachers and the need of performance and identification

of the language users' context and the recollection and analysis of target genres (Hyland, 2014, p. 3). From a methodological standpoint, the study has shown that combining quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures does not only make the results more consistent but also has beneficial effects for the students, insofar as they give them opportunities to reflect critically on their writing practices and become aware of the range of strategies, they can use to become effective writers of academic texts.

REFERENCES

- Andrade, H. G. (1999). Student Self-Assessment: At the Intersection of Metacognition and Authentic Assessment. *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada)*, 19-23.
- Ansarimoghaddam, S., & Tan, B. H. (2014). Undergraduates' experiences and attitudes of writing in L1 and English. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 14(1), 7-28.
- Božinović, N., & Sindik, J. (2017). Construction of the Questionnaire on Foreign Language Learning Strategies in Specific Croatian Context. *Collegium antropologicum*, 41(1), 1-11.
- Cer, E. (2019). The Instruction of Writing Strategies: The Effect of the Metacognitive Strategy on the Writing Skills of Pupils in Secondary Education. *SAGE Open*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681>
- Council of Europe (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989> [Last accessed on 11 November 2022]
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in ESP : a multi-disciplinary approach* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fahimi, Z., & Rahimi, A. (2015). On the Impact of Self-assessment Practice on Writing Skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 192, 730-736. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.082>.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1984). Images, plans, and prose: The representation of meaning in writing. *Written Communication*, 1, 120-160.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 445-476.
- Graham, S., Gillespie, A. & McKeown, D. (2012). Writing: importance, development, and instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 26(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9395-2>.

- Huang, R. (2020). Research on the Training Strategies of Adult Learners' English Self- Efficacy. *Open Journal of Social Sciences* 8(5), 25-34. <http://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.85003>.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*, (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Karabinar, S. (2014). Writing approaches of student teachers of English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(2), 1-16.
- Kaur, P., Stoltzfus, J., & Yellapu, V. (2018). Descriptive statistics. *International Journal of Academic Medicine*, 4(1), 60-63. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijam.ijam_7_18.
- Lavelle, E., & Zuercher, N. (2001). The Writing Approaches of University Students. *Higher Education*, 42(3), 373-391.
- Macpherson, K. (1999). The development of critical thinking skills in undergraduate supervisory management units: Efficacy of student peer assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24(3), 273-284. Retrieved from: <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/development-critical-thinking-skills/docview/203798395/se-2?accountid=14795>
[Last accessed on 30 November 2021]
- Marquette University. (2008). ESLP82 Questionnaire: Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills and Use of Writing Strategies. Retrieved from: <https://www.marquette.edu/oie/documents/ESLP82QuestionnaireFa08.pdf>. [Last accessed on 14 February 2022]
- Noviyenty, L. (2018). Strategies in Learning and Techniques in Teaching English Speaking. *ENGLISH FRANCA: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 2(1), 35-48. <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v2i1.454>.
- Nurharjanto, A. A., & Widyantoro, A. (2020). The Effect of Language Learning Strategy and Technology toward Students' Writing Skills. *Journal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 4(2), 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v4i2.34103>.
- Oxford, R. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: An overview*. Oxford: Gala. 1-25.
- Petersen, A., & Cepeda, R. (1984). *English as a Second Language: Its Scope, Role and Definition within California Community Colleges*. California: California Community Colleges.
- Piccardo, E. & Goodier, T. & North, B. (2018). Council of Europe (2018). *Common European*

- Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Prior, P.A. (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. (1st ed.). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203810651>.
- Raofi, S., Heng Chan, S., Mukundan, J., & Md Rashid, S. (2014). A Qualitative Study into L2 Writing Strategies of University Students. *English Language Teaching*, 7(11), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n11p39>.
- Raofi, S., Binandeh, M., & Rahmani, S. (2017). An Investigation into Writing Strategies and Writing Proficiency of University Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 191-198. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.24>.
- Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. *Instructional Science*, 26, 113-125.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca: A complete introduction to the theoretical nature and practical implications of English used as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, D., Campbell, J., & Brooker, R. (1999). The impact of students' approaches to essay writing on the quality of their essays. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24(3), 327-338. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/impact-students-approaches-essay-writing-on/docview/203771076/se-2?accountid=14795> [Last accessed on 10 December 2022]
- Spolsky, B. (1978). A Model for the Evaluation of Bilingual Education. *International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft / Revue Internationale de l'Education*, 24(3), 347-360.
- Spolsky, B. (1985). Formulating a Theory of Second Language Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(3), 269-288. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100005532>.
- Swan, M. (2012). ELF and EFL: are they really different? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*,

1(2), 379-389. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0025>.

Todd, R. (2002). Using self-assessment for evaluation. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), 16-19.

Yoon, H. (2014). The Use of L1 as a Writing Strategy in L2 Writing Tasks. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 14(03), 33-50. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2014-1403-03>.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Dimensions of academic self-regulation: A conceptual framework for education. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 3-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX I

ASSIGNED CODE:

Questionnaire title: The Use of Pre-, While-, and Post- Writing Strategies in Academic English

Título del cuestionario: El Uso de Estrategias de Pre-, Durante y Post-Escritura en Inglés Académico

Background Information

What is the language you mainly speak at home? <i>Cual es el idioma que más se habla en su casa?</i>	
How long have you been learning English? <i>Durante cuanto tiempo ha estado estudiando inglés?</i>	
Which is your level of proficiency? (CEFR) <i>Cual es su nivel de idioma? (CEFR)</i>	
How important is for you to become proficient in English? <i>Que importancia tiene para usted convertirse en un usuario competente en inglés?</i>	
Why do you want to learn English? <i>Por qué quiere aprender inglés?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="radio"/> Interest in the language<input type="radio"/> Interest in the language learning<input type="radio"/> For passing the exams and getting a certificate<input type="radio"/> For your future professional career<input type="radio"/> Others:
Have you studied or do you study at present other languages? Which ones? Why? <i>Ha estudiado o estudias actualmente otros idiomas? Cuáles son? Por qué?</i>	

(Adapted from: Oxford, Rebecca L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Boston, Mass: Heinle)

Questionnaire title: The Use of Pre-, While-, and Post- Writing Strategies in Academic English

Título del cuestionario: El Uso de Estrategias de Pre-, Durante y Post-Escritura en Inglés Académico

(Adapted from: Marquette University. (2008). *ESLP82 Questionnaire: Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills and Use of Writing Strategies*. Retrieved from: <https://www.marquette.edu/oie/documents/ESLP82QuestionnaireFa08.pdf>)

Use a scale from 1 (never or almost never) to 5 (always or most always) to rate the following statements.

- 1: never or almost never done
- 2: usually not done
- 3: sometimes done
- 4: usually done
- 5: always or almost always done

Self-Assessment of Academic English Writing Skills

1. I can write a clear topic sentence that identifies the topic and controlling idea of a paragraph. <i>Puedo escribir una oración con el tema en la que se identifica el tema y la idea dominante de un párrafo.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
2. I can use appropriate vocabulary and word forms to effectively communicate with the reader. <i>Puedo usar vocabulario apropiado y formas de palabras adecuadas para comunicarme eficazmente con el lector.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
3. I can write an accurate summary of information that I have read in English. <i>Puedo escribir un resumen preciso de la información que he leído en inglés.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
4. I can write using different patterns of organization (e.g., process, comparison, cause, effect) <i>Puedo escribir utilizando diferentes patrones de organización (por ejemplo: proceso, comparación, causa, efecto).</i>	1	2	3	4	5
5. I can edit my writing to improve the wording, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. <i>Puedo editar mi escritura para mejorar la redacción, la gramática, la puntuación y la ortografía.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
6. I can use my own independent thinking in my writing.	1	2	3	4	5

<i>Puedo usar mi propio pensamiento en la redacción.</i>					
7. I notice my mistakes and use that information to help me do better. <i>Me doy cuenta de mis errores y uso dicha información para ayudarme a mejorar.</i>	1	2	3	4	5

General Academic Writing Strategies

8. I often use English to write academic texts. <i>A menudo uso el inglés para escribir textos académicos.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
9. I write compositions, short essays and long essays using English for academic purposes. <i>Escribo redacciones y ensayos breves y largos usando el inglés para fines académicos.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
10. I use a monolingual or bilingual dictionary. <i>Uso un diccionario monolingüe o bilingüe.</i>	1	2	3	4	5



Pre-Writing Strategies

<p>11. I review my class notes, handouts, and assignment requirements before beginning to write. <i>Reviso los apuntes de clase, guiones y los requisitos de la tarea antes de empezar a escribir.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>12. I consider the task or assignment and instruction carefully before writing. <i>Leo cuidadosamente las instrucciones de la tarea o trabajo antes de escribir.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>13. I brainstorm and write down ideas before I begin to write. <i>Hago una lluvia de ideas y escribo las ideas antes de empezar a escribir.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>14. I make an outline or plan in English before starting to write a text. <i>Hago un esquema o guía en inglés antes de empezar a escribir un texto.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>15. I notice the academic vocabulary and phraseology of academic English and try to remember both. <i>Reviso el vocabulario y la fraseología del inglés académico e intento recordarlos.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>16. I read the feedback from my previous writing and use this feedback in my next writing. <i>Leo las correcciones de mi anterior redacción y uso dichas correcciones en la nueva redacción.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>17. I think about my intended audience, that is to say, the readers that are going to read my work. <i>Pienso en mi audiencia meta, es decir, los lectores que va a leer mi trabajo.</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>18. I consider aspects of register and style in relation to the communicative purpose and audience of the academic text that I have to write. <i>Tengo en cuenta aspectos de registro y estilo en relación con el propósito comunicativo y la audiencia del texto académico que tengo que escribir</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5

While-Writing Strategies

19. I use my background knowledge to help me develop my ideas. <i>Uso mi conocimiento previo para ayudarme a desarrollar las ideas.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
20. I like to write in my native language first and then translate it into English. <i>Me gusta escribir primero en mi lengua materna y luego traducirlo al inglés.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
21. I like to change or make my ideas clearer as I am writing. <i>Me gusta cambiar o dejar claras mis ideas conforme voy escribiendo.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
22. I use a dictionary to check things I am not sure about when I write. <i>Uso un diccionario para revisar cosas de las que no estoy seguro mientras escribo.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
23. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing. <i>Si no me sale una palabra concreta en inglés, utilizo una palabra o frase que signifique lo mismo.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
24. I make up new word if I do not know the right ones in English when I am writing. <i>Creo una nueva palabra si no conozco las adecuadas en inglés mientras escribo.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
25. I think about how learning to write well in English will help me succeed in my other courses. <i>Pienso en cómo me beneficiará en otras clases el aprender a escribir correctamente en inglés.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
26. I use previous knowledge when I organize the information (from generic to specific, from positive to negative, ...) <i>Utilizo mi conocimiento previo cuando organizo la información (de lo general a lo específico, de lo positivo a lo negativo, ...)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
27. I use online resources (Linguee, WordReference, ...) <i>Utilizo recursos online (Linguee, WordReference, ...)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
28. I can use different textual structures depending on the purpose of the text. <i>Puedo usar distintas estructuras textuales dependiendo del propósito del texto.</i>	1	2	3	4	5

29. I restate the topic sentence several times when writing the composition to make it more coherent. <i>Repito la oración temática varias veces al escribir la redacción para hacerla más coherente.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
30. I use hedges to mitigate my claims and make the discourse tentative when necessary. <i>Utilizo lenguaje atenuativo para mitigar las afirmaciones y hacer que el discurso sea tentativo cuando es necesario.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
31. I express my own voice or stance. <i>Expreso mi propia voz o postura.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
32. I use evidence from other authors to support my point of view and make my arguments stronger. <i>Utilizo evidencia de otros autores para apoyar mi punto de vista y fortalecer mis argumentos.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
33. I include quotations, summaries, and paraphrases to integrate other authors' ideas in my own text. <i>Utilizo citas, resúmenes y paráfrasis para integrar las ideas de otros autores en mi texto.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
34. I use the language in particular ways to make my writing stand out from others. <i>Utilizo el lenguaje de formas distintivas para hacer que mi escritura destaque de los demás.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
35. When writing I aim to make the reader follow my statements and arguments. <i>Al escribir, intento que el lector siga mis afirmaciones y declaraciones.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
36. I use support statements and counterarguments to prove my claims. <i>Utilizo argumentos de apoyo y contraargumentos para probar mis afirmaciones.</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Post-Writing Strategies

37. I go back to my writing to revise the content and make my ideas clearer. <i>Vuelvo a la redacción a revisar el contenido y aclarar mis ideas.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
38. I go back to my writing to revise and improve my organization. <i>Vuelvo a la redacción a revisar y mejorar mi organización.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
39. I go back to my writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation. <i>Vuelvo a la redacción para modificar la gramática, vocabulario, ortografía y pronunciación.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
40. I use a dictionary after I finish writing a draft. <i>Uso un diccionario al acabar de escribir un borrador.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
41. I make notes or try to remember feedback I get so I can use it the next time I write. <i>Anoto o intento recordar las correcciones para así poderlas tener en cuenta la próxima vez que escriba.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
42. I record the types of errors I have made so I do not keep making the same types of errors. <i>Registro los tipos de errores cometidos para así no volver a cometerlos.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
43. I use the feedback to help with my other English skills (reading, speaking, and listening). <i>Utilizo las correcciones para ayudarme con las otras destrezas del inglés (lectura, expresión oral y comprensión auditiva)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
44. I revise the style and make it adequate for my intended audience. <i>Reviso el estilo y lo modifico para que sea adecuado para mi audiencia.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
45. I read aloud the writing once it is finished to check if the ideas make sense orally. <i>Leo en voz alta la redacción una vez está acabada para revisar si las ideas tienen sentido al ser expresadas oralmente.</i>	1	2	3	4	5

46. I check for biased language and for gender-neutral language. <i>Verifico el lenguaje sesgado y lenguaje no sexista.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
47. I correct, proofread and edit the text. <i>Corrijo, reviso y edito el texto.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
48. I ask another person to read my writing to check out if the topic is clearly developed and explained. <i>Le pido a otra persona que lea mi redacción para comprobar si el tema está claramente desarrollado y explicado.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
49. I use resources to check that the text is original to avoid plagiarism. <i>Utilizo recursos para comprobar que el texto es original para evitar el plagio.</i>	1	2	3	4	5



An exploratory study of the self- perceived use of writing strategies by English for Academic Purposes learners

*Required

Ley Orgánica de Protección de Datos

Si Ud. es estudiante de 3º curso de la asignatura de Adquisición y Aprendizaje del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera del Grado en Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad de Zaragoza le invitamos a participar.

Contestar a esta encuesta no le llevará más de 10 minutos. Pero es totalmente libre de completarla o salir sin completarla, en cuyo caso sus contestaciones no se tendrán en cuenta. Redactar la reflexión post-encuesta mediante un formulario online no le llevará más de 15 minutos.

Su participación es totalmente voluntaria y gratuita, no le ocasionará perjuicios ni más molestias que el tiempo que emplee en completar la encuesta y redactar la reflexión que deberá realizar a través de un formulario Google Forms, pero contribuirá a obtener el conocimiento que necesitamos. Sólo le pedimos que sus respuestas se ajusten lo más posible a la realidad.

La encuesta y la reflexión son totalmente anónimas, no incluye datos que permitan identificarle y todas las respuestas serán confidenciales. No obstante, al igual que ocurre cuando realiza una búsqueda en Google o utiliza sus servicios, esta empresa sí podría identificarle y recopilar sus datos al enviar su reflexión a través del formulario Google. Por ello le informamos que puede acceder a la Política de privacidad de Google y revisar sus ajustes de privacidad en el siguiente enlace: <https://policies.google.com/privacy>.

En relación con esta encuesta, Ud. puede ejercer sus derechos en materia de privacidad directamente ante Google (puede acceder al centro de Ayuda de privacidad pulsando

AQUÍ) y, caso de no verlos satisfechos, podrá, si lo desea, dirigirse al Delegado/a de Protección de Datos de la Universidad de Zaragoza (dpd@unizar.es) o, en reclamación, a la Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (www.aepd.es).

La Universidad de Zaragoza cuenta con una página donde ofrece amplia información respecto de este tratamiento y de su política de protección de datos, así como formularios para el ejercicio de sus derechos: <http://protecciondatos.unizar.es/>

Muchas gracias de antemano por colaborar con esta investigación rellenando la encuesta. Su consentimiento en participar supone su aceptación de las políticas de privacidad de la Universidad de Zaragoza y de Google por lo que le pedimos que antes lea detenidamente esta información.

*Obligatorio. Si se marca NO, no podrá acceder a la encuesta.

1. ¿Ha leído y acepta la Política de Privacidad de la Universidad de Zaragoza: documento de información extensa y de Google: <https://policies.google.com/privacy?> *

Mark only one oval.

- SI acepto.
- NO acepto.

2. ¿Acepta participar en este estudio respondiendo a las siguientes preguntas? *

Mark only one oval.

- SI acepto.
- NO acepto.

CÓDIGO ANÓNIMO DE IDENTIFICACIÓN _____

Reflective essay

Write a short reflection on writing using the following questions as prompts

1. From the pre-, while- and post writing strategies of the questionnaire, select the 3 strategies that you use most. Explain the benefits of using them. *

2. From the pre-, while- and post writing strategies of the questionnaire, select 3 that you have never used or that you have rarely used. Explain how your writing practice would benefit from using them. *

3. Are there any strategies that you consider “useless”? Explain why. *

4. Explain what have you learned in taking part in this small-scale SLA/SLL study that can help you improve your academic English writing skills. *

Google Forms

APPENDIX II



Nª refª.: RAT 73/2021

Expte.: TFG “An exploratory study of the self-perceived use of writing strategies among EAP (English for Academic Purposes) learners”

Trámite: ACUERDO de 22 de diciembre de 2021, del Gerente de la Universidad de Zaragoza, por la que se aprueba el Tratamiento de datos personales relativo a dicho TFG.

Examinada la solicitud formulada por Dña. Carmen Pérez-Llantada Auría, en calidad de Directora/Tutora del Trabajo Fin de Grado arriba enunciado y la documentación que la acompaña,

De conformidad con lo establecido en el Reglamento (UE) 2016/679, General de Protección de Datos (RGPD) y en la Ley Orgánica 3/2018, de Protección de Datos de Carácter Personal y Garantía de Derechos Digitales (LOPDyGDD), **DISPONGO:**

1. **Autorizar el tratamiento de datos personales en el TFG “An exploratory study of the self-perceived use of writing strategies among EAP (English for Academic Purposes) learners”.** En todo caso, esta autorización comprende el cumplimiento de las condiciones que se establecen por parte del Responsable de Seguridad recogidas como anexo de este Acuerdo.
2. **Designar a la Profesora Dña. Carmen Pérez-Llantada Auría, en su calidad de Directora/Tutora del TFG, como responsable interna de este tratamiento y a la alumna, Ana Iulia Romanescu, autora del TFG, como encargada interna de dicho tratamiento.**
3. **El tratamiento seguirá las determinaciones establecidas en este Acuerdo** y, en lo que no se oponga a él, en el formulario propuesto por el solicitante.
4. Además, el tratamiento se llevará a cabo con respeto a los siguientes principios:
 - a) **Los datos personales serán tratados de manera lícita, leal y transparente en relación con los interesados** a quienes se les informará ampliamente de la finalidad de tratamiento («licitud, lealtad y transparencia»).

Se acompaña documento conteniendo la información a proporcionar a los interesados y para obtención de su consentimiento que se estima suficiente.

Todo ello se presentará a informe del Comité Ético de la Investigación de la Comunidad de Aragón (CEICA).

 - b) Los datos personales serán recogidos con fines determinados, explícitos y legítimos como es identificar a través de un cuestionario las estrategias de escritura (pre-, while- and post-

Copia auténtica de documento firmado digitalmente. Puede verificar su autenticidad en <http://valide.unizar.es/csv/24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be>

CSV: 24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be	Organismo: Universidad de Zaragoza	Página: 1 / 3	
Firmado electrónicamente por	Cargo o Rol	Fecha	
ALBERTO GIL COSTA	Gerente	22/12/2021 12:05:00	

Copia auténtica de documento firmado digitalmente. Puede verificar su autenticidad en <http://valide.unizar.es/csv/24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be>
 24c0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be



writing) utilizadas por los estudiantes de inglés para fines académicos (**«limitación de la finalidad»**).

El tratamiento está dividido en dos partes. En primer lugar, se administrará en papel un cuestionario sobre técnicas de escritura académica. A cada estudiante se le asignará un código (consistente en un número y una letra).

Posteriormente se les solicitará la redacción de una breve reflexión (de 200 a 250 palabras) para conocer su percepción sobre el uso de las estrategias de escritura recogidas en el cuestionario. Se les solicitará enviarla online mediante un enlace (vinculado a un Formulario de Google) disponible en el Moodle de la asignatura. Al acceder al formulario solamente se les pedirá que incluyan el mismo código identificativo que han introducido en el cuestionario en papel.

- c) Los datos personales serán adecuados, pertinentes y limitados a lo necesario en relación con los fines para los que son tratados (**«minimización de datos»**).
- d) Los datos personales serán exactos y actualizados (**«exactitud»**).

Los datos serán proporcionados por los propios participantes.

- e) Los datos personales no se mantendrán por más tiempo del que sea estrictamente necesario conforme a lo explicitado en el Protocolo del Trabajo Fin de Grado (**«limitación del plazo de conservación»**).

Los datos recogidos se conservarán durante el tiempo legalmente establecido y necesario para cumplir con la finalidad para la que se recabaron y para determinar las posibles responsabilidades que se pudieran derivar de dicha finalidad y del tratamiento de los datos.

Se estima que el marco temporal de conservación de los datos personales será de 12 meses. Una vez transcurrido este plazo, será preciso destruir los datos personales por medios seguros, sin perjuicio de que puedan conservarse los resultados anónimos de la investigación.

- f) Los datos personales serán tratados de tal manera que se garantice una seguridad adecuada de los mismos, incluida la protección contra el tratamiento no autorizado o ilícito y contra su pérdida, destrucción o daño accidental, mediante la aplicación de medidas técnicas u organizativas apropiadas que serán establecidas por el Responsable de Seguridad (**«integridad y confidencialidad»**).

CSV: 24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be	Organismo: Universidad de Zaragoza	Página: 2 / 3	
Firmado electrónicamente por	Cargo o Rol	Fecha	
ALBERTO GIL COSTA	Gerente	22/12/2021 12:05:00	



Los cuestionarios en papel serán guardados y custodiados por la tutora del TFG en su despacho, cerrado bajo llave.

En todo lo demás, deberá seguirse lo indicado en su informe por el Responsable de Seguridad (Anexo).

5. **Estos principios serán de obligado cumplimiento para todo el personal implicado en el tratamiento de datos**, correspondiendo al responsable y a el encargado interno cumplirlos y hacerlos cumplir.
6. **El tratamiento se inscribirá en el Inventario de Actividades de Tratamiento** y se publicará en la web de la Universidad.

Cualquier adición, modificación o exclusión posterior en el tratamiento de los datos deberá ser autorizada por el Gerente, previo informe del responsable de Seguridad y de la Delegada de Protección de Datos e incorporada al Registro de Actividades de Tratamiento (RAT).

7. **La responsable interna y la encargada interna del tratamiento** deberán documentar cuantas actuaciones tengan relación con la recogida, operaciones de acceso y tratamiento de los datos y medidas de seguridad.
8. **Cualquier vulneración de las medidas de seguridad aplicadas al tratamiento de los datos personales se notificará al Gerente**, al Responsable de Seguridad y a la Delegada de Protección de Datos con carácter inmediato y siempre dentro de las 24 horas siguientes, describiendo la naturaleza y alcance de la misma y las medidas de seguridad adoptadas o las que proponga adoptar. Deberá documentarse todo el procedimiento.
9. **La responsable interna del tratamiento** se obliga a comunicar en su día al Gerente la finalización de las actividades de tratamiento interesando de éste las instrucciones oportunas en orden a la supresión/destrucción de los datos.
10. **La responsable interna y la encargada interna del tratamiento** tendrán las funciones y responsabilidades establecidas con carácter particular en este Acuerdo y, con carácter general, en las Instrucciones de Servicio sobre tratamiento de datos de carácter personal aprobadas por Resolución de Gerencia de 30 de mayo de 2003.

El Rector. Por delegación (Resol. 15/01/2019. B.O.A. nº 31, de 14 de febrero), firmado electrónicamente y con autenticidad contrastable según el artículo 27.3.c) de la Ley 9/2015, por Alberto Gil Costa, Gerente de la Universidad de Zaragoza.

Copia auténtica de documento firmado digitalmente. Puede verificar su autenticidad en <http://valida.unizar.es/csv/24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be>
 24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be

CSV: 24d0b6045aae77dbec553b95354e30be	Organismo: Universidad de Zaragoza	Página: 3 / 3	
Firmado electrónicamente por	Cargo o Rol	Fecha	
ALBERTO GIL COSTA	Gerente	22/12/2021 12:05:00	



e8a434ab0336128ed4023461f1494657

Copia auténtica de documento firmado digitalmente. Puede verificar su autenticidad en <http://valide.unizar.es/csv/e8a434ab0336128ed4023461f1494657>

INFORME TRATAMIENTO - RESPONSABLE DE SEGURIDAD



Servicio de Informática y Comunicaciones Universidad Zaragoza

Destinatario: Sr. Gerente de la Universidad de Zaragoza

INFORME: SOBRE EL TRATAMIENTO DE DATOS “An exploratory study of the self-perceived use of writing strategies among EAP (English for Academic Purposes) learners”

Dando cumplimiento al punto 3 del Protocolo para la creación de nuevos tratamientos se procede a la emisión del informe por parte del Responsable de Seguridad

De acuerdo con el artículo 28 de la LO 3/2018, de 5 de diciembre, de Protección de Datos Personales y garantía de los derechos digitales, junto con las directrices del Esquema Nacional de Seguridad (Real Decreto 3/2010, de 8 de enero, por el que se regula el Esquema Nacional de Seguridad, en adelante ENS, en el ámbito de la Administración Electrónica) en su artículo 1 de protección adecuada de la información exige unos requisitos mínimos que se deben cumplir con el objetivo de asegurar el acceso, integridad, disponibilidad, autenticidad, confidencialidad, trazabilidad y conservación de los datos, informaciones y servicios utilizados en medios electrónicos que gestionen en el ejercicio de sus competencias.

Como Responsable de Seguridad emito Informe positivo por:

- GoogleDrive¹ y Formularios están certificados en el cumplimiento del ENS a nivel alto.
- Se recomienda la activación de la verificación en dos pasos - o doble factor de autenticación - para proteger el acceso a la cuenta o cuentas de Google utilizadas.
- Se recuerda que debe cumplir las políticas y normativas de seguridad vigente en la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Información disponible en:
 - <https://ens.unizar.es>

Se informa de que las medidas de seguridad serán comprobadas a través de auditorías periódicas

Zaragoza, 21 de Diciembre de 2021

Fdo.: Pascual Pérez Sánchez

¹ <https://cloud.google.com/security/compliance/ens/?hl=es-419>



CSV: e8a434ab0336128ed4023461f1494657	Organismo: Universidad de Zaragoza	Página: 1 / 1	
Firmado electrónicamente por	Cargo o Rol	Fecha	
PASCUAL MARCELINO PEREZ SANCHEZ	Vicegerente de Tecnologías de la Información y Comunicación	21/12/2021 14:55:00	