The Katatau
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL

Self-Regulated Learning and Students' Written Communication Skills

[1]Allanie Bete*, [1]Dean Mark Ochoco, [1]Earl Dave Sabasaje, [1]Sandra Solon, [1]Kent Leo Estaura

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.bete.allanie@gmail.com

DOI: 10.63941/OCCkatatau.2026.1.1.03

Article Information

Received: *October 21, 2025*

Accepted: *November 23, 2025*

Published: *March 20, 2026*

Keywords

Self-Regulated Learning; Written Communication Skills; Teacher Education; Correlation; Instructional Method

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies and the written communication skills of second-year teacher education students in a local community college in Mindanao, Philippines. It examined how key SRL strategies—goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation—correlated with aspects of written communication such as content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. The research utilized a descriptive-correlational design with 84 students from the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) and Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) programs. Using a Likert-scale questionnaire to assess SRL behaviors and a rubric-based evaluation for written communication, the findings revealed weak, non-significant correlations between SRL strategies and writing skills. Despite high levels of SRL behaviors among students, the study suggested that other factors may have been more influential in improving writing performance, urging educators to consider alternative instructional methods or support systems to enhance written communication. The study encouraged educators to explore different teaching methods or support strategies to boost students' writing abilities and emphasized that improving writing skills might require a more holistic approach beyond just self-regulation.

INTRODUCTION

When you write, you must learn how to write. That doesn't necessarily mean a degree in writing, but it means reading and learning some of the rules that make writing readable. "It is none of their business that you have to learn how to write. Let them think you were born that way," said Ernest Hemingway (E. A. Carr, 2018). In this rapidly changing world, communication skills, especially through written language, are essential. The capability to communicate effectively and clearly with text is what written communication skills are all about. The proper language, tone, and style must be used in speaking to pass on the intended meaning of the message to the target people or receivers, while considering the intended purpose of the message (Graham, S., & Perin, D., 2007).

Nowadays, the majority of students are not capable of expressing themselves through writing. According to Urbano et al. (2021), the major challenges in writing are the absence of background knowledge relevant to a topic and a specific paper on texts, insufficient knowledge, and practice in writing properly using citations, wrong grammar, shallow vocabulary, and various development patterns when writing. In an academic setting, solid writing is particularly important since writing is widely used as a main evaluation tool and as an essential tool for enhancing understanding and clarifying ideas. Effective writing is one of the most crucial components for academic success and is considered an essential component of college and career readiness. As such, education professionals

and policymakers considered it a top priority to enhance the student's ability to write effectively. Despite these growing concerns, very few empirical studies investigated the relationship between self-regulated learning strategies and the development of students' writing skills in communicating messages across an educational preparation context. Although the bulk of the research was done based on general writing skill development, very few studies highlighted exactly how such factors are associated with the writing proficiency of future educators. It is important to understand how self-regulated learning strategies, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and time management, interact in shaping students' writing skills. This was a particularly salient gap to fill, as the educators of tomorrow will be expected to have highly developed writing skills not only for individual academic success but also in order to communicate well with their students and peers in professional settings. By gaining an understanding of how self-regulation influenced these capacities, involved educators would be better positioned to work in alignment with best practices to prepare better-positioned students to meet the demands placed on professional teachers in the classroom.

Another potential factor that contributes to the improvement of writing among students is self-regulated learning (SRL). In this regard, Zimmerman has defined SRL as following the strategies whereby the individual describes and executes what he wants to acquire through goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. Research has shown that students with active application of SRL strategies are more likely to enhance their writing as they can reflect on their development and change according to feedback (Philippakos et al., 2023). According to specific research, setting goals enhances the writing mechanics and grammar of students since they demonstrate transparent goals for each writing assignment (MacArthur et al., 2022). Despite this significance, only a few studies explored how SRL operated in teaching improvement of writing skills, more so in future educators. This study sought to explore the relationship between Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) and Students' Written Communication Skills. By examining how various elements of SRL, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation, correlated with students' abilities in key areas of written communication, including content, vocabulary, grammar, organization, and mechanics, we aimed to provide insights into how these cognitive processes influenced writing performance. This correlational research allows us to identify potential patterns or connections between students' self-regulation techniques and their proficiency in written communication, contributing valuable knowledge to educational strategies that enhance writing skills. Understanding these relationships would help in developing effective interventions for improving students' writing abilities through targeted SRL practices.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted at Opol Community College, Opol, Misamis Oriental, Philippines, during the first semester of the academic year 2024-2025. This study used a descriptive-correlational design to determine the relationship between students' self-regulated learning and their written communication skills. The respondents were 84 second-year BEED and BSED students. Additionally, the sample was determined using Cochran's Formula and selected through stratified sampling, ensuring representation from both programs.

Two main instruments were utilized in the study: A likert-scale questionnaire to assess students' self-regulated learning strategies (goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation), and a rubric-based assessment to evaluate their written communication skills in five key areas, which are: content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. Furthermore, the data were collected after securing necessary permission from the college administration. Students first completed the questionnaire about self-regulated learning, followed by a writing task, which was evaluated by three (3) inter-raters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the level of students' self-regulated learning in terms of:
1.1 Goal Setting;
1.2 Self-monitoring; and
1.3 Self-evaluation?

Table 1.1. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	75	89.29
2.00-2.99	Agree	9	10.71
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
T0TAL		**84**	**100.00**

The 1.1 highlights students' self-regulated learning in goal-setting. The mean score of 3.44 indicates that students generally excel in goal-setting. Notably, 75 students (89.29%) are classified as "Strongly Agree" (3.00–4.00), demonstrating a strong ability to set and achieve goals. Meanwhile, 9 students (10.71%) fall within the "Agree" category (2.00–2.99), reflecting moderate proficiency with room for improvement. Significantly, no students were categorized as "Disagree" (1.00–1.99) or "Strongly Disagree" (0.00–0.99), underscoring the absence of poor performers and confirming a baseline competency in goal-setting among all respondents. The standard deviation 0.47 shows minimal variation in responses, suggesting a high degree of consistency across the group. Overall, the results indicate a strong capacity for goal-setting, with targeted interventions recommended for the moderate-performing group to further enhance their skills.

This aligns with the findings of Osipova and Chernyakevich (2023), observing that most first-year students exhibit strong goal-setting abilities, with only a few categorized as moderate, indicating a small subset may benefit from further development in this area. Similarly, Blegur et al. (2021) found that while many students excelled in goal-setting, some fell into the moderate category, highlighting the need to refine their strategies for better academic performance. Kong (2021) underscores the positive impact of goal-setting on students' performance, noting that it enhances focus and motivation. Although many students demonstrate proficiency in setting goals, a minority require additional support to improve their outcomes.

Table 1.1.1. The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I set specific goals to improve the content of my writing.	3.46	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to expand my vocabulary for better writing clarity.	3.44	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to clearly outline ideas to strengthen content quality.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set vocabulary goals to enhance expression in my writing.	3.43	0.63	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to improve the organization of ideas within my writing.	3.44	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to enhance the mechanical accuracy (e.g., spelling) of my work.	3.51	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals for consistent improvement across all written tasks.	3.32	0.60	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set personal content-related goals to engage with meaningful topics.	3.39	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to connect my ideas with transition words like “however” or “for example”.	3.50	0.61	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to write about topics that enhance vocabulary relevance.	3.44	0.63	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.44	0.47	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Data show that Item 6 has the highest mean of 3.51, which states, *"I set goals to enhance the mechanical accuracy (e.g., spelling) of my work."* The low standard deviation of 0.55 reflects a strong consensus. This suggests that most participants understand the importance of technical accuracy in

writing, recognizing that spelling and other mechanical aspects are crucial for effective communication. Supporting this, Dubey (2017) found that students recognize technical writing as essential for clear communication, emphasizing that accuracy in spelling and grammar is critical for conveying information effectively. Similarly, Parker (2023) highlighted that students acknowledge the importance of technical writing skills for effective communication, particularly in professional settings, with an emphasis on the crucial role of technical accuracy, including proper spelling, in ensuring clear communication.

Item 9 has the second-highest mean of 3.50, which states that *"I set goals to connect my ideas with transition words like however or for example."* The slightly higher standard deviation of 0.61 suggests a bit more variability, but it still reflects strong agreement on the importance of coherence and flow in writing. This suggests that a significant majority of participants recognize the value of cohesion in writing. Consequently, this consensus highlights a shared understanding of how transitional devices contribute to logical flow and clarity, ensuring ideas are well-structured and easily comprehensible. In support of this, Pham (2022) found a significant improvement in students' writing competence, particularly in coherence and cohesion, which are essential for effective written communication. This finding indicates that the goal-based writing program positively impacted students' use of transitional devices in their writing. Moreover, Ksenia (2021) emphasizes that effective goal setting plays a crucial role in enhancing written communication skills, especially through the deliberate use of transitional devices. As a result, this approach helps learners organize their thoughts more clearly, ultimately improving both coherence and cohesion in their writing.

Similarly, Dobronyi et al. (2023) found that reflective goal-setting interventions improved academic performance among university students. By encouraging students to articulate personal goals and strategies for achieving them, the intervention led to enhanced writing quality, particularly in the clarity and coherence of ideas. This process also highlighted areas where students needed further focus, suggesting that while writing quality was improved overall, there was still room to place greater emphasis on goal setting to specifically enhance the content and depth of their writing. This reflects the understanding that content improvement through targeted goal setting remains an area with potential for further development.

Al-Bataineh et al. (2019) indicate that goal setting positively influences student growth, including aspects like self-efficacy and motivation. Variability in responses about content improvement may stem from differing definitions and individual writing development stages among students, affecting their goal-setting approaches.

Data show that item 7 has the lowest mean of 3.32, which states that *"I set goals for consistent improvement across all written tasks".* The moderate SD of 0.60 suggests that while most respondents agree on the importance of consistency, there is some divergence in how this goal is prioritized. This suggests that most participants do not consistently set goals for improvement across all written tasks. This indicates a lack of uniform goal-setting, which may hinder continuous progress in writing. It points to a need for strategies that encourage more consistent goal setting across all assignments.

Supporting this, Saks, K. (2024) emphasized the importance of specific and attainable goals for effective learning, yet many learners fail to establish such goals consistently, particularly in writing tasks. This inconsistency in goal setting directly affects their performance, as it leads to gaps in writing development and hinders progress. The study suggests that without clear, consistent goals, students may struggle to improve their writing skills over time. To address this issue, it highlights the need for targeted strategies that encourage learners to set and track specific goals for writing tasks, ensuring continuous growth and improvement. Such strategies could help foster a habit of goal setting, promoting consistent progress in writing and academic achievement overall.

Similarly, Barua, S. (2023) indicated that adult learners often lack structured goal-setting approaches, which affects their writing skill development and overall motivation. Furthermore, the study revealed that participants were inconsistent in setting goals across various writing tasks, often prioritizing certain assignments while neglecting others. This inconsistency hindered their ability to maintain continuous progress, as they failed to transfer the skills developed in one task to others. To address this, the study emphasized the need for strategies that encourage uniform goal-setting practices across all assignments, ensuring consistent improvement in writing competence.

Item 8 has the second lowest mean of 3.39, which states that *"I set personal content-related goals to engage with meaningful topics."* The lowest SD in the dataset, 0.54, indicates that respondents largely agree on this goal, even though it has a lower mean score. This means that most of the participants may not prioritize choosing or engaging with meaningful topics in their writing. This could indicate a lack of personal investment in the content or an underdeveloped practice of aligning writing tasks with topics that hold personal significance.

Pearson (2024) A systematic review of student engagement studies noted that students often choose topics that do not resonate with them personally, leading to lower cognitive and affective engagement in writing tasks. This lack of personal investment can hinder their ability to connect with the content meaningfully. Tadlock, (2016) shows that students who fail to choose or engage with meaningful topics in their writing often exhibit lower levels of personal investment, which impacts their overall writing quality. Studies indicate that when students lack a connection to the content, they are less motivated to explore ideas deeply, resulting in surface-level writing and reduced engagement with the writing process.

Table 1.2. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Monitoring.

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	78	92.86
2.00-2.99	Agree	6	7.14
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 1.2 presents the results of the level of students' self-regulated learning (SRL) in terms of self-monitoring. The findings reveal that the majority of students, 78 out of 84 (92.86%), strongly agree that they engage in self-monitoring, indicating a very high level of SRL in this domain. Additionally, 6 students (7.14%) agree, reflecting a moderate level of self-monitoring, while no students disagreed or strongly disagreed, suggesting there are no significant concerns about the lack of self-monitoring skills within the group. The mean score of 3.47 indicates that, on average, students strongly agree with their self-monitoring abilities, and the low standard deviation of 0.40 reflects minimal variability in responses, meaning most students share similar perceptions about their skills. This consistency implies that self-monitoring is a well-established and universally practiced skill among the students surveyed.

To support this, Guerrero and López (2022) highlight that self-regulated learning components, particularly self-monitoring, are effectively utilized by students. Their findings suggest that learners demonstrate strong self-monitoring skills, underscoring the critical role of self-regulation in achieving academic success within online learning environments. Similarly, Elesio (2023) reinforces this perspective, noting that students consistently employ self-regulated learning strategies, especially self-monitoring. These strategies often involve planning, monitoring, and evaluating their learning processes, all of which contribute significantly to enhancing academic performance.

These findings suggest that students are highly aware of their learning progress and capable of effectively tracking and regulating their behaviors, which is crucial for independent learning and academic success. The absence of negative responses further underscores the success of institutional

strategies in promoting SRL skills. However, for the small proportion of students in the "Agree" category, targeted interventions, such as workshops or mentoring programs, could help them achieve stronger self-monitoring practices.

Additionally, broader evaluations incorporating qualitative data, such as interviews or reflective journaling, could provide deeper insights into the specific strategies students use and their effectiveness in various academic contexts. Overall, the high level of self-monitoring among students highlights the success of educational efforts in fostering SRL skills, and continued reinforcement through reflective activities and progress assessments will help sustain these positive outcomes.

Nurjanah et al. (2022) highlight the significant influence of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies on the development of students' learning independence. Specifically, the study underscores how enhancing self-monitoring skills empowers students to become more autonomous learners, a hallmark of effective SRL. By actively monitoring their own learning processes, students demonstrated a positive level of self-regulation, which contributed not only to their academic success but also to their personal growth. These findings reinforce the importance of self-monitoring as an essential component of SRL and its pivotal role in fostering independence in learning.

Building on this perspective, Torre and Daley (2023) argue that SRL skills are not only innate but can also be explicitly taught and developed. The paper highlights that institutional strategies, such as targeted interventions, effectively enhance SRL practices, including self-monitoring. Notably, the authors emphasize that these interventions can be particularly beneficial for low-achieving students, helping them to cultivate self-monitoring skills that are critical for improving academic outcomes.

Table 1.2.1. The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I monitor my vocabulary when I write.	3.50	0.50	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my grammar when I write.	3.58	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my writing to ensure that my ideas are clear.	3.57	0.50	Highly Self-Regulatory
I ask others (ex. friends or teachers) for feedback on my writing while I'm still working on it.	3.39	0.64	Highly Self-Regulatory
I compare my writing to other people's works to improve my own writing.	3.33	0.59	Highly Self-Regulatory
I track improvement in my vocabulary while writing.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my content clarity by reading my work.	3.51	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I collaborate with my classmates to refine my ideas during my writing task.	3.43	0.52	Highly Self-Regulatory
I track how often I make spelling errors during the writing process.	3.48	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I pay attention to how clearly my ideas are being communicated as I write.	3.44	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.47	0.40	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Data show that item 2 has the highest mean of 3.58, which states that *"I monitor my grammar when I write".* This means that a high mean reflects that participants are particularly attentive to grammatical accuracy in their writing. The moderate SD 0.54 suggests there is some variation in responses, but overall, most participants agree with this statement. They likely make a conscious effort to avoid grammar mistakes and ensure correctness as they write. Focus is on avoiding errors and ensuring their ideas are communicated effectively.

Mahdiyah et al. (2023) emphasize that language error analysis aids in identifying and correcting grammatical errors, enhancing clarity, coherence, and cohesion in writing. Participants' attentiveness to grammar reflects a conscious effort to improve their writing skills through understanding and addressing mistakes. Similarly, Rofid Fikroni (2018) emphasizes that learners' grammatical competence is crucial in language production, supporting the idea that monitoring grammar, as indicated by a high mean score, reflects a conscious effort to ensure accuracy and effective

communication in writing. Furthermore, Diah (2018) indicates that students' awareness of grammar significantly improved through consciousness-raising activities, leading to a decrease in grammatical errors. This suggests that students actively monitored their grammar, enhancing their ability to communicate ideas effectively in writing.

Item number 3 serves as the second highest with a mean of 3.57, with a statement of ***"****I monitor my writing to ensure that my ideas are clear".* The lower SD of 0.50 suggests a high level of agreement among participants, this means that participants place importance on monitoring the clarity of their ideas in writing. This proactive approach reflects strong self-regulatory awareness, enabling writers to critically evaluate their work and make necessary adjustments for improved communication. By prioritizing clarity, participants are likely to enhance their overall writing effectiveness and develop stronger writing skills over time.

Research supports the claim that monitoring clarity in writing enhances self-regulated learning. A study found Tian et al. (2022) that self-regulated writing strategies, such as monitoring content clarity, significantly contribute to writing proficiency among learners, indicating that clarity-focused practices lead to better writing outcomes. Additionally, Susanti & Pratama (2020) self-regulated learners actively engage in evaluating their work, which fosters metacognitive skills necessary for effective communication and improves overall writing quality. Teng & Huang (2018) study found a significant correlation between these strategies and writing proficiency indicated that students who effectively monitor their writing processes, including clarity, tend to achieve higher levels of writing competence, reinforcing the idea that prioritizing clarity enhances overall writing effectiveness. These findings emphasize the importance of self-monitoring behaviors in achieving successful writing competencies.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 5 with a mean of 3.33 and a statement *"I compare my writing to other people's works to improve my own writing".* Which means participants acknowledge the value of comparing their writing to others' works. Lower mean scores suggest that this strategy is not as commonly or consistently employed as other self-monitoring techniques, such as tracking grammar or vocabulary. The standard deviation of 0.59 is slightly higher than the top mean's SD, reflecting greater variability in responses. Participants may find it difficult or intimidating to compare their writing with that of peers due to variations in skill level or writing styles. The successful application of this strategy may be hindered by the lack of organized opportunities such as peer review sessions.

Lu et al. (2021) conducted a study comparing self-feedback and peer feedback among undergraduate students, finding that both forms contributed to writing improvement. Notably, peer feedback had a greater effect, suggesting that comparing one's work with peers' contributions provides valuable insights for enhancing writing skills. However, despite its advantages, peer feedback has its challenges. According to Wei and Liu (2024), students' lack of feedback competency and domain-specific knowledge are among the barriers in peer feedback procedures that might lead to unproductive feedback exchanges. These challenges may cause students to feel uncomfortable or intimidated when comparing their work with others', particularly if they believe there are differences in writing styles or ability levels.

Item number 4, the second lowest, with a mean of 3.39 in the self-monitoring category, states *"I ask others (ex. friends or teachers) for feedback on my writing while I'm still working on it". A h*igher standard deviation of 0.64 indicates that students value feedback; they may not consistently seek it. This could be due to limited access to feedback sources or a preference for self-reliance.

Papi et al. (2024) emphasize that ESL learners benefit from written corrective feedback (WCF) only when they actively seek, process, and utilize it, suggesting that feedback-seeking behaviors are crucial for improvement. It also highlights that students who engage in feedback monitoring show significant improvements in their writing quality, reinforcing the need for proactive feedback-seeking strategies.

In contrast, Kim (2023) highlights the importance of strengthening self-feedback mechanisms important for developing writing skills. By focusing on self-assessment and reflection, students can improve their writing independently, which aligns with their preference for self-reliance. Similarly, Sadeghi & Baneh (2012) indicate that self-monitoring techniques can enhance writing performance. They found that students who engaged in self-monitoring showed significant improvements in their writing, suggesting that self-reliance can be beneficial.

Table 1.3. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Evaluation

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	76	90.48
2.00-2.99	Agree	8	9.52
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 1.3 clearly shows how participants perform on self-regulated learning, especially on self-evaluation, based on the responses of 84 participants. The majority, or 90.48% of the respondents, scored within the range of 3.00–4.00, which corresponds to "Strongly Agree." This indicates that most students possess strong self-regulation skills, particularly in self-evaluation, which includes setting goals, monitoring progress, and reflecting on their learning performance.

A smaller portion, 9.52%, scored within the range of 2.00–2.99 ("Agree"), suggesting these students exhibit moderate self-regulation abilities but may require additional development in areas such as motivation, focus, or time management. Notably, no participant scored in the ranges of 1.00–1.99 ("Disagree") or ≤0.99 ("Strongly Disagree"), indicating that all respondents demonstrated at least a baseline level of self-regulation in their learning.

The mean score of 3.43 falls within the "Strongly Agree" range, further emphasizing that, on average, participants exhibit a high level of self-regulation. The standard deviation of 0.41 reflects a relatively low variability in scores, suggesting that most students' self-evaluation abilities are closely clustered around the mean, indicating a consistent level of self-regulation across the group.

Suan (2023) found that students with higher self-regulation skills, particularly in reflection, demonstrated better academic performance. Reflection significantly influenced academic achievement, suggesting that strong self-regulation skills correlate with improved student performance in self-evaluation and overall academic success.

Nwikpo et al. (2024) established a medium relationship between self-regulation and academic performance. Although the students exhibit some degree of self-regulation, in their academic motivation, the connection is not strong and possibly needed to be enhanced by them for their academic success in general.

Andrade (2019), self-assessment evaluation relates to SRL with which the students have increased the ability of self-regulation when they take their time to self-assess themselves. This implies a positive correlation between self-evaluation confidence and the adoption of effective learning strategies, thereby reinforcing the importance of self-regulation in academic success.

Table 1.3.1 show that item 5 has the highest mean of 3.60, which states that "*I reward myself when I make significant improvements in mechanics.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.54. This means that students put a value on self-reward when they make a noticeable improvement in their mechanical skills in writing. It somehow indicates a positive impact where students are motivated by personal incentives and recognize their achievements.

Supporting this, Ramirez et al. (2020) discovered that reward positively influences students' academic performance, self-confidence, and class participation. In addition, Urhahne & Wijnia (2023) highlight the aspect of self-reward in promoting goal-oriented behavior and academic achievement. Furthermore, it underlines the importance of self-reward in motivating learners and improving their learning.

Table 1.3.1 The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Evaluation

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I reflect on feedback from my teacher to improve my future writing	3.57	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reflect on feedback from my friends to improve my future writing	3.37	0.58	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate reasons for any grammar errors in my work.	3.37	0.60	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reward myself when I meet my writing goals.	3.36	0.53	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reward myself when I make significant improvements in mechanics	3.60	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate teacher feedback to strengthen grammar	3.29	0.59	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate vocabulary choices to ensure precision expression.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
After writing, I evaluate whether my writing task meets the specific criteria or goal set for the task.	3.49	0.53	Highly Self-Regulatory
I read through my writings to check any mistakes or areas of improvement.	3.40	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I revise my content to enhance clarity of my ideas.	3.37	0.65	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.43	0.41	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Item number 1 serves as the second highest with a mean of 3.57, with a statement, **"***I reflect on feedback from my teacher to improve my future writing.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.54. This means that students seek and appreciate the feedback given to them by their teacher. This highlights the proactive learning attitude of students, who are also eager to strive for improvements. Selvaraj & Azman (2020) discuss the critical role of feedback in directing students to achieve their learning objectives. Similarly, Mamad (2022) highlights the significance of feedback literacy and how engaging with feedback can help in improving learning outcomes. In addition, Winstone et al. (2019) examine the growth of feedback literacy skills and their effects on students' proactive learning, indicating that the development of feedback literacy can greatly improve students' engagement with feedback and their motivation to learn.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item number 6 with a mean of 3.29, which states that "*I evaluate teacher feedback to strengthen grammar."* With a Standard deviation of 0.59, this means that students may not be able to engage effectively or understand the feedback provided by their teacher in terms of grammar. It can be that it is difficult for them to apply the feedback in their own work, unsure how to address it. Tay & Lam (2022) on students' engagement with teacher feedback reveal that students often struggle to act on feedback due to complexities in understanding it. Additionally, Amedu & Dwarika (2023) found that students' academic adjustment is closely linked to their ability to comprehend and utilize feedback. Gan et al. (2021) further highlight that a lack of motivation and understanding can impede students' ability to effectively use the feedback provided.

Item number 4, however, serves as the second lowest with a mean of 3.36, which states, *"I reward myself when I meet my writing goals.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.53**,** this implies that not many of the students reward themselves when they meet their writing goals. It might be that they somehow view it as not crucial to their productivity. According to Meryem yilmaz Soylu (2021) study on secondary students' writing achievement goals, students' self-efficacy and goal orientation significantly influence their writing achievements, implying that those who do not reward themselves might lack the motivation and self-efficacy to perform well. Additionally, Ling et al. (2021) study on writing motivation and performance suggests that students who do not engage in self-rewarding behaviors might lack the confidence and motivation necessary for academic success, further supporting

the notion that self-reward is an important aspect of maintaining productivity and achieving writing goals.

Table 1.4. The Summary for the Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Goal-Setting	3.44	0.47	Highly Self-Regulatory
Self-Monitoring	3.47	0.40	Highly Self-Regulatory
Self-Evaluation	3.43	0.41	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	**3.44**	**0.38**	**Highly Self-Regulatory**

Table 1.4 presents the summary of the level of students' self-regulated learning. The dimension of Goal Setting shows a mean score of 3.44, indicating that students consistently appreciate and engage in the process of establishing structured goals for their learning. Positioned within the "Strongly Agree" range, this suggests that goal setting is an essential practice for many students, aiding them in sustaining focus, motivation, and guidance in their educational endeavors. Verbally interpreted as highly self-regulatory.

The relatively low standard deviation of 0.47 points to low variability, but most students display a similar level of confidence and ability in forming and pursuing clear aims. This high level of consensus indicates that students acknowledge the importance of goal setting as a fundamental aspect of self-regulated learning and are likely to utilize effective strategies to navigate and assess their academic development. Supporting this, Sides & Cuevas (2020), highlights the practice of explicit goal setting significantly boosts academic success by enhancing students' motivation and self-efficacy. Their research supported the concept that dedicated goal setting contributes to improved performance outcomes, reinforcing the belief that clear objectives are vital for effective self-regulation in learning. Similarly, Dansu (2023) described various ways in which goal setting aids academic success, such as providing clarity and focus, enhancing motivation, enabling progress monitoring, aiding in planning, ensuring accountability, and fostering a long-term vision. The study emphasized that well-defined goals offer students a sense of direction and purpose, which is crucial for sustaining motivation and commitment to their academic goals.

The Self-Monitoring dimension, with an average mean score of 3.47, signifies that students have a strong belief in their capability to track and modify their learning progress. Positioned in the "Strongly Agree" category, this implies that self-monitoring is an established practice among students, allowing them to assess their performance and improve strategies for ongoing success. Verbally interpreted as highly self-regulatory. The low standard deviation of 0.40 indicates minimal variation in responses, implying that students consistently partake in self-monitoring and recognize their strengths as well as areas needing improvement. This consistency illustrates their active engagement in the learning process, highlighting the significance of self-regulatory skills in enhancing academic results.

Supporting this, Layden et al. (2022) conducted a comprehensive review analyzing various studies on self-monitoring as a technique for boosting student performance. The review determined that regular engagement in self-monitoring practices greatly contributes to enhanced academic performance and promotes greater self-regulatory skills among students, reinforcing the necessity for the continued use of these strategies. Similarly, Digital et al. (2018) investigated how permitting students to select their methods of self-monitoring influenced their on-task behavior and academic success. The results revealed that when students consistently utilized their chosen self-monitoring systems, there was a notable improvement in both on-task behaviors and academic performance. This indicates that maintaining consistency in employing personalized self-monitoring strategies can result in enduring academic advantages.

The Self-Evaluation dimension, with an average score of 3.43, indicates that students highly prioritize reflection and self-assessment in their educational journey. This score, falling within the "Strongly Agree" category, suggests that students are not only tracking their progress but also reflecting critically on their performance to pinpoint areas needing improvement. Verbally interpreted as highly self-regulatory. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.41 implies that most students adopt a similar perspective on self-evaluation, reinforcing the notion that they are actively involved in thoughtful reflection. This consistency illustrates a shared commitment to honing their learning strategies, ensuring they keep enhancing and adapting their methods for improved academic results. This aligns with the research by Al-Bashir et al. (2019), which explores how self-assessment helps students recognize the gaps between their objectives and actual results. It highlights that effective feedback, when paired with self-assessment, empowers students to discern areas for growth and refine their learning approaches. By participating in this reflective practice, students deepen their understanding of their performance and cultivate the skills necessary for self-regulation. Furthermore, Karaman (2021) indicates that structured self-assessment practices foster critical thinking and reflection among students. The study found that students who frequently engage in self-evaluation exhibit enhanced motivation and academic performance, indicating that thoughtful reflection significantly contributes to improving their learning strategies.

The overall mean for the level of students' self-regulated learning is 3.44, with a standard deviation of 0.38, which is interpreted as Highly Self-Regulatory. This indicates that, on average, students demonstrate a strong ability to regulate their learning through practices such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation, reflecting a high level of self-regulation across the group.

This aligns with the findings of Apridelia et al. (2024), which indicate that the level of self-regulated learning among high school students, revealing that 80.00% of the participants, or 44 students, demonstrated a high level of self-regulation. In contrast, 14.55% of students were categorized as quite high, and only 1.82% were rated as low. These findings highlight that, on average, students exhibit strong self-regulated learning abilities. Practices such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation were key indicators of this high level of self-regulation, showcasing their capacity to manage their learning effectively.

2. What is the level of students' written communication skills in terms of:

2.1 Content;
2.2 Grammar;
2.3 Vocabulary;
2.4 Organization; and
2.5 Mechanics?

Table 2.1. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Content

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	26	30.95
2.00-2.99	Good	48	57.14
1.00-1.99	Fair	10	11.90
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.1 illustrates students' written communication skills in terms of content, evaluated on a scale from ≤0.99 to 4. With a mean score of 2.49, it shows that students typically perform at a "Good" level, though there is potential for further improvement. The majority of students, 48 (57.14%), are in the "Good" range (2.00–2.99), indicating they have a strong ability to convey content. Furthermore, 26 students (30.95%) scored in the "Excellent" range (3.00–4.00), reflecting a notable proportion with high-level skills in content presentation. On the other hand, 10 students (11.90%) are in the "Fair"

category (1.00–1.99), suggesting they might struggle with presenting content effectively. Importantly, no students fell into the "Poor" category (0.00–0.99), signifying that all students possess a foundational level of competence. The standard deviation (SD: 0.60) indicates a moderate spread in the scores. Although overall performance is favorable, students in the "Fair" category could benefit from targeted support to improve their skills, which would ultimately enhance the overall group performance.

The findings of this study align with existing literature. Nur Rahmiani (2020) reported that Islamic undergraduate students generally performed well in writing, achieving an average value of 24.3 for content. Similar to this study, Rahmiani observed that while most students demonstrated strong skills, only a few excelled, indicating the need to improve writing quality across all levels.

Ghosh (2023) also found that while the majority of students performed well in terms of content, only a small proportion achieved excellence. This trend is echoed in this study, where 30.95% of students scored in the “Excellent” range, reinforcing the importance of refining strategies to support higher levels of proficiency.

Similarly, Mariana (2019) noted that university students generally demonstrated “Good” performance in content but highlighted the need for enhanced writing strategies to address areas requiring improvement. In this study, the 11.90% of students in the “Fair” category underscores this need, suggesting that additional support in structuring and presenting ideas could bridge the gap between “Fair” and “Good” performance levels.

Table 2.2. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Grammar

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	20	23.81
2.00-2.99	Good	60	71.43
1.00-1.99	Fair	4	4.76
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.2 presents the level of students' written communication skills in terms of grammar. The majority of students (71.43%) fall under the "Good" category, indicating a solid grasp of grammar with occasional errors that do not significantly hinder communication. A smaller proportion of students (23.81%) achieved an "Excellent" rating, showcasing advanced proficiency in grammar with minimal or no errors. Only 4 students (4.76%) are rated as "Fair," reflecting significant difficulties in grammar that may affect communication clarity, while no students were categorized as "Poor," suggesting a baseline competency in grammar across the cohort. The mean score of 2.50, which falls within the "Good" range, confirms that the average grammatical skill level is competent but not exemplary. The standard deviation of 0.47 indicates moderate variability in grammar performance, suggesting that while most students’ scores cluster around the mean, a few outliers exist, primarily in the "Excellent" or "Fair" categories.

The study by Quiñones (2022) reinforces this notion by highlighting that, while students generally possess a functional understanding of grammar, they often struggle with maintaining consistency. Specifically, the study found that although many students demonstrated moderate proficiency in basic grammatical rules, persistent errors in areas such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, article usage, and prepositions continued to emerge. These findings align with the observation that the majority of students fall under the "Good" category, which reflects a solid grasp of grammar with occasional errors that do not significantly hinder communication.

Moreover, the study underscores the variability in students' performance, suggesting that proficiency levels are not uniform across the board. To address these inconsistencies, the research advocates for targeted interventions, such as grammar-focused modules and structured activities. These strategies

are particularly valuable for enhancing overall proficiency and ensuring that students can build on their foundational skills. Consequently, the findings emphasize the importance of providing additional support to help students move beyond baseline competency and achieve exemplary levels of grammatical precision.

In a similar vein, the study by Sparks et al. (2014) highlights the pivotal role grammar plays in academic success. While many students demonstrate baseline competency, persistent issues in grammar, syntax, and mechanics reveal noticeable variability in their levels of proficiency. This observation aligns with most students falling into the "Good" category, wherein occasional errors may occur but do not severely disrupt effective communication.

The findings suggest a generally positive trend in students' grammar skills, with opportunities for improvement to elevate more students into the "Excellent" category. To achieve this, targeted interventions such as remedial grammar workshops or personalized coaching can support students in the "Fair" category. Additionally, students in the "Good" category could benefit from advanced training opportunities like peer editing, writing competitions, or advanced grammar exercises to refine their skills. Recognizing and celebrating the achievements of students in the "Excellent" category could further motivate others and maintain high performance standards. The overall description of "Good" reflects satisfactory competence in grammar, but continued efforts to reduce variability and encourage excellence are essential for further enhancing students' written communication skills.

Table 2.3. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Vocabulary

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	28	33.33
2.00-2.99	Good	53	63.10
1.00-1.99	Fair	3	3.57
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

The data on written communication skills, specifically regarding vocabulary, provides a clear overview of participants' proficiency levels. The largest group, consisting of 53 individuals (63.10%), falls into the "good" category, with scores ranging from 2.00 to 2.99. This suggests that most participants have a solid understanding of vocabulary and can communicate effectively in writing. However, their vocabulary might not be as refined or sophisticated as that in the "excellent" category. supports this by emphasizing how important a broad vocabulary is for reading development and comprehension. A smaller but significant portion, 28 participants (33.33%), are classified in the "excellent" category with a score of 3. These individuals demonstrate a high level of vocabulary proficiency, able to express their ideas clearly and precisely, using a wide variety of words in the appropriate contexts. Meanwhile, a small group of 3 participants (3.57%) scored in the "fair" category (1.00 to 1.99), indicating that these individuals may have some difficulty selecting the most appropriate words, which could impact the effectiveness of their written communication. However, the absence of participants in the "poor" category (0.00 to 0.99) is reassuring, as it shows that no one is severely lacking in vocabulary skills.

The mean score of 2.63, which falls between the "good" category, suggests that, on average, participants have a strong vocabulary. Most individuals are competent in using a range of words, though there is some variation in the sophistication and depth of their vocabulary. The standard deviation of 0.51, while moderate, indicates that while most participants are concentrated in the "good" category, there are still some differences in proficiency levels. This variability shows that, while the group as a whole is proficient in vocabulary, a few individuals might need additional support to further develop their vocabulary skills.

Santillan, J. P. (2020) highlights that while students possess a presumed understanding of vocabulary knowledge, their actual knowledge often falls short. This observation suggests that although many students understand the importance of vocabulary, only a few excel in recognizing its critical role in comprehension and learning strategies. Similarly, Yuhariah (2023) underscores that while students generally demonstrate good vocabulary proficiency, only a minority acknowledge its essential contribution to enhancing their writing skills. This finding points to the need for greater awareness and practice in vocabulary usage to support effective writing.

Building on these insights, Quines (2023) further emphasizes the significant impact of vocabulary levels on both reading and writing performance. Although many students achieve good proficiency in vocabulary, only a select few excel in appreciating its indispensable role, revealing a persistent gap between vocabulary awareness and actual performance in writing.

Table 2.4. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Organization

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	24	28.57
2.00-2.99	Good	49	58.33
1.00-1.99	Fair	11	13.10
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

The Table shows the data on students' written communication skills in terms of organization, and reveals that the majority performed well, with 58.33% achieving a "Good" level and 28.57% reaching the "Excellent" level. This indicates a strong ability among most students to structure their written work effectively. A smaller group, 13.10%, performed at the "Fair" level, highlighting the need for targeted interventions to improve their organizational skills, while no students fell into the "Poor" category, demonstrating that all participants possess at least basic competence in this area. The mean score of 2.46, falling within the "Good" range, and a standard deviation of 0.57 reflect a moderate variability in performance, with most students clustering around the average level.

These results suggest that instructional methods have been effective for a majority of students but also indicate opportunities for improvement. To support those in the "Fair" category and encourage more students to excel, educators can implement targeted strategies, such as additional practice in outlining and structuring arguments, as well as peer mentoring programs where high-performing students assist their peers. Overall, the data demonstrates a positive trend, with most students performing at a satisfactory or exemplary level, but there is room to refine teaching strategies to elevate more students to excellence.

The findings align with those of Wulandari et al. (2023), who observed that 75% of fifth-semester students at Muhammadiyah Malang University demonstrated effective organization of ideas in essay writing. Similar to the 58.33% "Good" level in this study, Wulandari et al. identified organizational strengths among most students. However, they also noted that 25% of students faced challenges in organizing their thoughts, a figure comparable to the 13.10% "Fair" level in this research. This similarity underscores a consistent pattern across contexts, highlighting the need for interventions targeting those who struggle.

Additionally, Nardone (2017) further supports this observation, emphasizing that while many students exhibit adequate organizational skills, a significant portion still requires improvement. This parallels the 13.10% identified in this study as needing support and reinforces the importance of tailored instructional strategies to enhance these students' skills.

Also, Farida (2024) found that even students with strong organizational abilities often struggled with achieving coherence and logical flow. This observation complements the current study, suggesting that while students perform well overall, targeted strategies such as structured outlining exercises and focused feedback on logical progression can help bridge the gap for those at the "Fair" level.

Table 2.5. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Mechanics

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	12	14.29
2.00-2.99	Good	49	58.33
1.00-1.99	Fair	23	27.38
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.5 presents the level of students' written communication skills in terms of mechanics, focusing on punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The majority of students (58.33%) demonstrated a Good level of proficiency, indicating an adequate command of basic writing rules, though there remains room for improvement. A significant portion (27.38%) fell into the Fair category, suggesting struggles with certain aspects of mechanics that require targeted support or remediation. Meanwhile, 14.29% of the students achieved an Excellent level, showcasing high proficiency in applying mechanical rules to their writing. Notably, no students were categorized as Poor, suggesting that all participants demonstrated at least a foundational understanding of written mechanics.

The mean score of 2.24 reflects an overall performance at the Good level, indicating that students, on average, possess a satisfactory level of skill in mechanics. However, the standard deviation of 0.55 shows moderate variability, with some students performing significantly above or below the average. While the overall performance suggests competency, the relatively large proportion of students in the Fair category highlights the need for targeted interventions to address common errors in punctuation, grammar, and spelling. Providing additional practice opportunities, workshops, or peer feedback sessions could help students in the Fair category improve their skills, ultimately increasing the number of students achieving Excellent results and setting a higher benchmark for overall performance.

Yuliawati (2021) further corroborates the notion of foundational competence but provides a quantitative lens on specific aspects of mechanics. Her study reveals that students excel in areas like capitalization (82%), spelling (83%), italicization (96%), and numbering (98%), but punctuation emerges as a significant challenge, with only 41% accuracy. Despite this, punctuation errors were not deemed severe enough to obstruct comprehension, suggesting that while these issues detract from overall writing quality, they do not fundamentally undermine communication.

Table 2.6. The Summary of the Level of Students' Written Communication Skills

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Content	2.49	0.60	Good
Grammar	2.50	0.47	Good
Vocabulary	2.63	0.51	Good
Organization	2.46	0.57	Good
Mechanics	2.24	0.55	Good
Overall Mean	**2.47**	**0.50**	**Good**

Table 2.6 presents the summary of students' written communication skills, revealing a consistent "Good" performance across the five assessed components: content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. In terms of content, with a mean score of 2.49 and an SD of 0.60, students demonstrated a satisfactory ability to express ideas effectively and develop the main points of their

writing, reflected as "Good". There is moderate variability, suggesting that while most students perform well, a few may struggle or excel more noticeably.

Similarly, Durant et al. (2016) found that most students achieved good performance in content creation, with only a small group excelling and a minority struggling. This reflects varying levels of understanding and application of the concepts taught. Mainardes et al. (2016) support these findings, reporting that while the majority of students performed satisfactorily, few excelled or faced significant challenges. This suggests a consistent trend of adequate performance among students, with exceptions on either end of the spectrum.

Grammar, with a mean of 2.50 and an SD of 0.47, also reflected a "Good" level, indicating moderate accuracy in sentence construction. Shows less variation, indicating that students' performance in this area is relatively consistent. This finding aligns with Sacal and Potane's (2023) study, which concluded that students' competence in English grammar is satisfactory, thereby supporting the notion of moderate accuracy in sentence construction. Furthermore, these results are consistent with other research emphasizing the crucial role of grammar mastery in fostering effective written communication skills.

Similarly, Callora and Suñas (2023) revealed that students' lexico-grammatical abilities were at a "Developing" level, with a mean score of 2.23. While this indicates emerging grammar skills, it also highlights areas for improvement, particularly in verb usage, prepositions, pronouns, and subject-verb agreement. These common issues emphasize the need for targeted grammar instruction to enhance written communication skills. Barraquio (2015) also reported similar trends, noting that college students from Letran Calamba received fair ratings in grammar, particularly in sentence structure. This finding, which reflects moderate accuracy, reinforces the importance of grammar proficiency as a significant factor in students' overall written communication skills.

Vocabulary scored the highest among the components, with a mean of 2.63 and an SD of 0.51, verbally interpreted as Good. Suggests that most students have a good command of word choice, with minor differences in proficiency among them. Corpuz et al. (2024) revealed that students demonstrated strong vocabulary skills, excelling in literal and critical questions, performing very satisfactorily in application, and achieving satisfactory results in inferential skills. These findings indicate a generally good command of word choice among the students. Building on this, Zhang and Xuan (2019) found that vocabulary knowledge significantly enhanced academic literacy skills among ESL learners. Their study showed that students generally exhibited a good command of word choice, with only minor variations in proficiency, particularly in vocabulary breadth and depth.

Organization, with a mean of 2.46 and an SD of 0.57, verbally interpreted as Good, showed that students could arrange ideas logically, maintaining clarity in their writing. Again reflects moderate variability, implying that while students generally arrange their ideas logically, some may need further guidance. This aligns with Wulandari et al. (2023), who found that 75% of students effectively organized ideas, aligning with the 58.33% "Good" level identified in this study. Similarly, Nardone (2017) and Salvador (2024) emphasized the adequacy of students' organizational skills while noting that a smaller subset requires improvement. Salvador further observed that only a small percentage of students achieve exemplary organization, resonating with the 28.57% "Excellent" level in this research.

Challenges in achieving coherence and logical flow were also noted. Farida (2024) highlighted that even students with strong organizational skills sometimes struggle with maintaining seamless progression, which underscores the need for structured strategies, such as outlining exercises and targeted feedback. Additionally, Wulandari and Mahmudah (2023) observed that a consistent minority of students (13.10% in this study and 25% in theirs) face difficulties in organizing ideas, further emphasizing the importance of tailored interventions to bridge these gaps

However, mechanics, which includes spelling, punctuation, and formatting, scored the lowest at 2.24 and an SD of 0.55, though still at a "Good" level, indicating that this area requires further improvement. Shows that there is notable variability, highlighting a greater disparity in their ability to apply proper spelling, punctuation, and formatting.

Yuliawati (2021) revealed that students demonstrated varying levels of mechanics accuracy in writing assignments, with 41% accuracy in punctuation, 83% in spelling, and 96% in italicization. While generally sufficient, these findings highlight the need for improvement, particularly in punctuation and capitalization, to achieve greater precision in writing.

The overall mean of 2.47 and SD of 0.50 demonstrate that students' written communication skills are generally consistent. The students exhibited a generally satisfactory level of written communication skills rated as Good, though some variability exists, particularly in content and mechanics. This suggests that while students are performing well overall, targeted support, especially in mechanics, may help address the observed. Rios et al. (2017) found that while students demonstrated satisfactory written communication skills, there was notable variability, particularly in content and mechanics. This suggests that targeted support in these areas could enhance overall performance and address the observed discrepancies in writing skills. Similarly, the findings of Grainger et al. (2019) align with this perspective, highlighting that although students generally possess good written communication skills, variability persists, especially in mechanics. The study advocates for the implementation of targeted support mechanisms, such as clearer rubrics and formative feedback, to address these disparities effectively.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the use of self-regulated learning and students' performance in written communication skills?

Table 3. Test of Statistical Relationship Between the Use of Self-Regulated Learning and Students' Performance in Written Communication Skills

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS	SELF REGULATED LEARNING											
	Goal Setting			Self-Monitoring			Self-Evaluation			Overall Measure		
	r	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*
Content	0.163	0.139	Accept	0.156	0.156	Accept	0.167	0.129	Accept	0.184	0.094	Accept
Grammar	0.124	0.261	Accept	0.187	0.089	Accept	0.198	0.071	Accept	0.190	0.083	Accept
Vocabulary	0.130	0.238	Accept	0.139	0.207	Accept	0.175	0.111	Accept	0.167	0.128	Accept
Organization	0.155	0.159	Accept	0.084	0.445	Accept	0.127	0.249	Accept	0.141	0.200	Accept
Mechanics	0.164	0.136	Accept	0.202	0.065	Accept	0.186	0.091	Accept	0.207	0.058	Accept
Overall Measure	0.159	0.148	Accept	0.164	0.136	Accept	0.182	0.098	Accept	0.191	0.082	Accept

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
Rejected if Significant
Accepted if Not Significant

Table 3 presents the results of the analysis examining the relationship between Written Communication Skills (Content, Grammar, Vocabulary, Organization, and Mechanics) and the different dimensions of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), including Goal Setting, Self-Monitoring, Self-Evaluation, and the Overall Measure. The findings indicate that all relationships are weak and non-significant, as evidenced by the low r-values and p-values above 0.05 for all variables.

For the Content variable, the correlations with all SRL dimensions are weak, with r-values ranging from 0.156 to 0.184. None of these correlations is statistically significant, as the p-values remain greater than 0.05. This suggests that students' ability to develop and present content in their writing does not show any meaningful connection with self-regulation skills, such as goal setting, monitoring, or evaluating their learning progress.

Deane and Philippakos (2024) emphasize the theoretical connection between self-regulation and writing processes but highlight that empirical findings show minimal practical correlations between these domains. Their work supports the notion that students' ability to develop and present content in writing is not significantly influenced by self-regulation skills such as goal setting or progress monitoring. Similarly, Ghazali et al. (2024) found from Malaysian ESL learners, consistently highlight that students demonstrate higher efficacy in technical writing aspects like grammar and sentence construction, with limited correlation to self-regulation dimensions involved in ideation and content generation.

The Grammar variable shows a slightly stronger, though still weak, relationship with Self-Evaluation ($r = 0.198$, $p = 0.071$) and the Overall SRL Measure ($r = 0.190$, $p = 0.083$). However, these correlations also fail to reach statistical significance. The slightly higher r-values here may hint at a potential link between students' ability to assess their progress and their grammar skills, but the lack of statistical significance limits the strength of this conclusion.

Recent studies provide robust evidence supporting the link between grammar skills and self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies. For instance, Chansri et al. (2024) highlight a statistically significant correlation between SRL strategies and grammar acquisition, while Al-Othman (2024) demonstrates that metacognitive SRL strategies, such as self-monitoring and feedback utilization, enhance learners' ability to internalize and apply grammar rules effectively.

For the Vocabulary, Organization, and Mechanics variables, the correlations with all SRL dimensions are similarly weak and non-significant. The r-values range from 0.084 to 0.207, and the p-values remain above 0.05 across all dimensions. This indicates that aspects of writing such as word choice, structural organization, and technical accuracy (spelling and punctuation) do not have meaningful relationships with self-regulated learning dimensions.

Robillos, R. (2021) revealed that while self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies play a positive role in overall writing performance, their influence on specific dimensions such as vocabulary, organization, and mechanics appears minimal. The weak correlations observed between SRL practices particularly self-evaluation and these aspects suggest that SRL strategies do not significantly enhance word choice, structural coherence, or mechanical accuracy, such as spelling and punctuation. This gap indicates the need for a balanced approach. While fostering SRL skills like planning, monitoring, and self-evaluation is valuable for improving overall writing, educators should complement these strategies with focused teaching on technical writing aspects. For example, direct instruction in vocabulary enrichment, organizational frameworks, and mechanical accuracy could help bridge the gap left by the limited impact of SRL.

Overall, the results suggest that written communication skills and self-regulated learning (SRL) dimensions are not strongly connected. The lack of significant findings indicates that SRL, as measured, does not appear to play a substantial role in influencing writing performance. Building upon these findings, Amalia et al. (2023) highlight that while SRL strategies correlate with improved argumentative writing abilities, the relationship is not substantial enough to position SRL as a primary determinant of writing success. Similarly, Burger (2024) emphasizes that SRL processes, when integrated into feedback-driven writing frameworks, can enhance students' engagement and incremental progress. However, their findings underline that SRL alone does not significantly improve writing outcomes without the inclusion of structured scaffolding and targeted feedback mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies and written communication skills among second-year Teacher Education students at Opol Community College.

The findings revealed that students demonstrated a high level of self-regulated learning, particularly in goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. However, while their written communication skills were generally good, they showed notable variability, particularly in content and mechanics, with room for improvement in certain areas.

Despite the positive correlation between self-regulation strategies and writing performance, the relationship between SRL dimensions and written communication skills was not substantial. Specifically, the lack of a clear, strong correlation suggests that other factors, such as instructional methods or external support mechanisms, may play a significant role in enhancing students' writing abilities. Future research should explore how specific pedagogical approaches, like peer feedback or collaborative learning, can strengthen the connection between SRL and writing performance.

To conclude, while self-regulated learning appears to be an important aspect of students' academic development, it is clear that improving written communication skills in teacher education programs requires a multifaceted approach. Educators and program developers should consider integrating additional strategies and support systems that foster both self-regulation and effective writing to better prepare future educators for the demands of professional communication in their careers.

REFERENCES

Al-Bataineh, A. T., Brenwall, L., Stalter, K., & York, J. (2019). Student growth through goal setting. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, *11*(4), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v11i4.4329

Amalia, N. Z., Lestari, L. A., & Anam, S. (2023). The Correlation between Students' Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and their Writing Ability in Argumentative Writing Class. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, *7*(2), 131. https://doi.org/10.20961/ijpte.v7i2.89318

Barua, S. (2023). Goal Setting Strategies for Motivation and Writing Skills: A Study among Adult Second Language Learners. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4513295

Charinee Chansri, Akadet Kedcham, & Montha Polrak. (2024). The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and English Language Abilities and Knowledge of Undergraduate Students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *17*(1), 286–307. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1415587

Corpuz, M. M., Morales, A. N., Clarin, A. S., Dionio, B. B., & Cocolan, J. V. (2024). Students' Vocabulary Skills in Relation to their Reading Comprehension in Language Literature. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *VIII*(X), 2137–2150. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8100183

Deane, P., & Zoi A. Traga Philippakos. (2024). Writing and Reading Connections: A before, during, and after Experience for Critical Thinkers. *The Reading Teacher*. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2284

Deiparine, M. S. (2024). Uncovering the Common Linguistic Errors in Student Journalistsâ€™ Unedited News Articles: A Comprehensive Analysis. *World Journal of English Language*, *14*(4), 131–131. https://ideas.repec.org/a/jfr/wjel11/v14y2024i4p131.html

Doyle, E., Buckley, P., & McCarthy, B. (2020). The impact of content co-creation on academic achievement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1782832

Durant, R. A., Carlon, D. M., & Downs, A. (2016). The Efficiency Challenge: Creating a Transformative Learning Experience in a Principles of Management Course. *Journal of Management Education*, *41*(6), 852–872. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562916682789

Farida. (2024). *Evaluation of students' writing skills in higher education*. *16*(1), 145–154. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380268021_Evaluation_of_students

Ghazali, I. M., Hamid, M. H. A., Ahmad Kamal, M. A., Khaidzir, M. F. S., & Faizul Ganapathy, N. N. D. (2024). Exploring Writing Self-Efficacy among Malaysian Tertiary English Learners. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *VIII*(IIIS), 4743–4751. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.803347s

Ghosh, A., & Sen, S. (2023). Relationship between Different Components of English Writing Skill. *International Journal of Research and Review*, *10*(10), 463–471. https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20231058

Gusewelle, L. F. (2024). *The Impact Of Upper-Elementary C3WP Resources On First Draft Student Writing Samples: A Study Of Lexical Cohesion, Semantic Overlap, Grammar And Mechanics*. UND Scholarly Commons. https://commons.und.edu/theses/6427/

MacArthur, C. A., Traga Philippakos, Z. A., May, H., & Compello, J. (2022). Strategy instruction with self-regulation in college developmental writing courses: Results from a randomized experiment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000705

Mahmudah, Z. (2023). An Analysis of Mechanical Errors in Writing Skill. *English LAnguage Study and TEaching*, *3*(2), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.32672/elaste.v3i2.4271

Mariana Ester Politton, & Widi, M. (2019). ENHANCING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS ON CONTENT AREA. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *22*(2), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v22i2.1868

Mawudoku, M. (2020). Punctuation Marks as an Aspect and Cause of Poor Performance in the English Language. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 1–1. https://www.royalliteglobal.com/njhs/article/view/27

Nadia, R. (2023). Enhancing Student Vocabulary Proficiency through the Effective Implementation of Multimodal Approaches. *Invention: Journal Research and Education Studies*, 33–40. https://doi.org/10.51178/invention.v4i2.1505

Nur Rahmiani. (2020). WRITING PERFORMANCE OF ISLAMIC UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN THE ISSUES OF INTEGRATION TECHNOLOGY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING. *Tadarus Tarbawy*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.31000/jkip.v2i1.2577

Parker, M. (2023, October 16). *Why is Technical Writing Important at Workplace*. Www.acadecraft.com. https://www.acadecraft.com/blog/reasons-why-is-technical-writing-important/

Pham, Q. H. P. (2022). A goal-based writing program in the EFL writing context: implementation and results. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.2025381

Quiñones, T. (2022). A Study on the In-depth Knowledge of Grammar among English Major Students at the University of Makati: Basis for Worktext Development. *UNIVERSITAS - the Official Journal of University of Makati*, *10*(1). https://journals.umak.edu.ph/universitas/article/view/46/40

Rimun, J. C., & Yumarnamto, M. (2024). Metacognition in ELT writing: Teacher's facilitation and students' strategies. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *11*(2), 91. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i2.20563

Roberts, J., Nardone, C. F., & Bridges, B. (2017). Examining Differences in Student Writing Proficiency as a Function of Student Race and Gender. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, *12*, 59–68. https://eric.ed.gov/?q=nardone&ff1=subCollege+Students&id=EJ1168687

Saks, K. (2024). The effect of self-efficacy and self-set grade goals on academic outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1324007

Salvador, J. (2024). Writing Competence of First Year College Students at a State University. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, *56*(1), 102–120. https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v56i1.888

Santillan, J. P., & Daenos, R. G. (2020). Vocabulary Knowledge and Learning Strategies of Senior High School Students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(6), 2474–2482. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080631

Sparks, J. R., Song, Y., Brantley, W., & Liu, O. L. (2014). Assessing Written Communication in Higher Education: Review and Recommendations for Next-Generation Assessment. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2014*(2), 1–52. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12035

Zaldy Maglay Quines. (2023). Impact of Students' Vocabulary Level to their Reading and Writing Performance. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *11*(2), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijellr.13/vol11n21832