Spilling the Ink: English Majors' Writing Skills and Strategies at ASC as A Basis for Curriculum Enhancement

Marvelyn D. Ignacio

Assistant Professor III, Bachelor of Secondary Education, Apayao State College

Abstract

Writing is a complex cognitive process that involves multiple stages, from idea generation to refinement, and is essential for academic success. This study aimed to evaluate the writing skills and strategies of English majors at Apayao State College (ASC), focusing on how students utilize different stages of the writing process—pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing—and the challenges they encounter. The study employed a mixed-methods design, using both quantitative surveys to assess writing proficiency and strategy use, and qualitative interviews to explore students' experiences with writing. Data were collected from a sample of English majors at ASC, analyzing the relationship between writing skills, strategy usage, and the cognitive, linguistic, and emotional challenges that students face. Findings revealed that ASC students demonstrate satisfactory writing skills in composition and research but struggle with thesis development, idea organization, and academic writing. Students actively engaged in pre-writing and during-writing strategies such as brainstorming and editing, but less so in post-writing strategies like feedback incorporation and revision. A strong correlation was found between pre-writing strategies and overall writing proficiency. Cognitive, linguistic, and emotional difficulties, such as limited vocabulary, grammar issues, and anxiety, were also identified as barriers to effective writing. The results suggest that while ASC students have foundational writing skills, there is a need for further development in advanced writing strategies, especially in post-writing activities. The study highlights the importance of a comprehensive writing curriculum that integrates structured support for all stages of the writing process, with a focus on grammar, revision, and feedback. The findings also underscore the need for additional interventions, such as peer reviews and writing centers, to build students' confidence and independence in writing. Future research should explore the long-term effects of such interventions and the role of digital tools in writing development.

Keywords: Writing strategies, English proficiency, Academic writing, Instructional methods, Writing difficulties

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the most essential human skills, foundational to communication, expression, and intellectual development on a global scale. As one of humanity's oldest and most transformative practices, writing transcends boundaries, serving not only as a tool for knowledge transfer but also as a means of personal and cultural identity formation. Researchers have widely acknowledged the universal importance of writing as a cognitive process that strengthens logical thinking, analysis, and creativity, supporting both

individual and collective knowledge creation (Bazerman, 2016; Klein & Boscolo, 2016). Beyond its fundamental role in communication, writing is increasingly recognized as a critical component in the development of 21st-century skills, such as critical thinking, collaboration, and digital literacy (National Education Association, 2010). For students in higher education, particularly those majoring in English, the process of writing extends beyond basic competency, as it embodies a dynamic process of reflection, adaptation, and synthesis that equips them with skills necessary for future professional and academic pursuits.

Aligned with the objectives of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations, 2015), writing serves as a foundational academic skill pivotal to achieving this vision. By promoting literacy, enhancing employability, and empowering learners to actively engage within their communities, writing becomes a cornerstone of quality education.

At the national level, writing has gained prominence within the Philippines' educational framework as a necessary skill for promoting innovation and cultural understanding. Recognizing the power of writing to influence both personal and societal growth, the Philippine Department of Education has advocated for literacy programs that integrate writing as a primary skill across disciplines (DepEd, 2019). The nation's emphasis on writing literacy aligns with a broader commitment to holistic education, aiming to nurture students who can think critically, communicate effectively, and participate actively in their communities. English majors, particularly those pursuing teaching careers, are viewed as vital contributors to this mission, as they will play a crucial role in promoting literacy and critical thinking among future generations (Del Rosario & Almazan, 2021). Writing, for these future educators, is more than an academic requirement; it is a professional necessity that equips them to guide others in mastering this vital skill.

In the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR), the relevance of writing skills is underscored by a focus on cultural preservation and innovation. CAR's unique position within the Philippine educational landscape highlights a commitment to both academic excellence and cultural integrity, with writing skills at the core of student development (Bangsoy, 2018). Writing enables students to bridge cultural heritage and modern knowledge, creating a medium through which they can critically engage with their identity and heritage while developing skills essential for the 21st century (Daguitan, 2019). Furthermore, as educational institutions within CAR increasingly recognize the demand for graduates skilled in both traditional and digital literacy, writing has become a priority in curricula as it equips students with the tools for cross-disciplinary communication and problem-solving.

Locally, the province of Apayao places a significant emphasis on educational programs that enhance students' writing and literacy skills. As an essential academic skill, writing is taught not only to prepare students for professional demands but also to support personal growth and community engagement. Research from local educators has shown that strong writing skills among students correlate with enhanced cognitive abilities and social participation (Aringay, 2020). By cultivating effective writing skills, Apayao aims to develop graduates who can adapt to the demands of a rapidly evolving workforce and contribute positively to the local economy and society. Thus, cultivating writing skills among English majors at the Apayao State College (ASC) aligns with both local and global imperatives to create well-rounded, competent individuals who can transcend the complexities of the 21st century.

Observing the challenges students face in writing compositions, the researcher was motivated to assess the writing skills and strategies of English majors. This study aims to assess their specific practices, identify areas for improvement, and propose effective teaching pedagogies. The ultimate goal is to

enhance students' writing proficiency, improve writing instruction, and promote the development of skilled and confident writers, particularly among future educators.

Objectives

The study generally aimed to determine the writing skills and strategies employed by English majors at Apayao State College (ASC), with a focus on developing curriculum enhancement recommendations based on the findings.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the English writing skills of English majors at ASC, along with the following areas:
- Writing Composition Skills
- Language and Style Proficiency
- Research and Pre-Writing Skills
- Text Refinement Skills
2. What are the prevalent writing strategies used by English majors at ASC in their writing processes?
- Pre-writing
- During-writing
- Post-writing
3. Is there a significant relationship between English majors' writing skills and their use of various writing strategies?
4. What challenges do English majors at ASC encounter in applying writing strategies and enhancing their writing proficiency?
5. What curriculum enhancement recommendations can be developed based on the findings of the study to support the improvement of English majors' writing skills at ASC?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Writing as a Process

One of the core concepts in writing is the idea that writing is not a one-time event, but a process that unfolds over multiple stages. These stages typically include:

- Prewriting: The planning and organizing phase before drafting begins. Writers often engage in brainstorming, outlining, and research at this stage to structure their ideas.
- Drafting: The actual writing of the content, focusing on getting ideas down on paper without worrying too much about perfection.
- Revising: The phase where the writer focuses on improving the structure, clarity, and argument of the writing.
- Editing: Refining the language, grammar, punctuation, and style.
- Publishing: The final presentation of the writing, often after it has been revised and edited.

The writing process model is essential for understanding that writing is recursive, meaning that writers often move back and forth between these stages rather than following them in a linear fashion. According to Flower and Hayes (1981), writers continuously revise their work to improve both content and form.

Writing as a Cognitive Activity

Writing is also considered a cognitive activity, requiring mental effort and the use of various cognitive

skills, such as memory, attention, and reasoning. Cognitive models of writing emphasize that writing involves both higher-order thinking (e.g., critical thinking and problem-solving) and lower-order skills (e.g., grammar and punctuation).

In this context, writers engage in complex decision-making as they organize thoughts, choose words, structure sentences, and revise drafts. Kellogg (2008) describes writing as a combination of cognitive activities that are coordinated in real-time to create clear and effective communication.

Writing as a Social Act

Writing is often seen as a social act in which the writer communicates with an audience. This concept ties into the idea that writing is not just about putting words on a page, but about conveying meaning and persuading or informing others. Bakhtin (1981) emphasized that language is always in a social context, and that writing, as a form of communication, involves negotiation with the audience.

In academic settings, the audience can be teachers, peers, or the broader academic community, and this audience influences how the writer shapes their message, style, and structure. Writers must also be aware of the genre (e.g., essays, research papers, reports) and adhere to its conventions.

Writing Skills

The development of writing skills is crucial as it directly impacts their academic performance and professional communication. According to Kellogg (2008), writing involves complex cognitive and linguistic processes that require both fluency and accuracy. This cognitive model suggests that writing skills are built through recursive practices in drafting, revising, and refining. Specifically, in academic settings, writing skills are often evaluated based on composition quality, thesis clarity, and adherence to academic style.

Studies on writing skills often emphasize the need for explicit teaching of these abilities. According to Grabe & Kaplan (1996), academic writing requires knowledge not only of language but also of the discipline-specific ways of constructing knowledge and argument. They highlight that English majors need to develop not just technical writing skills, but also critical thinking and organizational skills to craft coherent, well-structured arguments.

Writing Strategies

Writing strategies refer to the processes that writers use to generate, organize, and refine ideas during their writing. These strategies are classified into three broad stages: pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing (Zamel, 1983).

- Pre-writing strategies include brainstorming, outlining, and organizing thoughts before drafting (Flower & Hayes, 1981). These strategies are crucial for ensuring clarity and structure in the final written product.
- During-writing strategies focus on the actual drafting process, including revising and making adjustments in real-time (Hayes & Flower, 1980). Writers often engage in recursive revision, where they revisit earlier sections of their work to enhance coherence.
- Post-writing strategies include revising, proofreading, and editing the draft to improve accuracy, coherence, and readability (Zamel, 1983).

A study by Schleppegrell (2004) emphasizes the need for teaching writing strategies in a scaffolded manner, focusing on developing academic writing competencies through targeted practices.

Writing Challenges

Many students face significant challenges in academic writing, including lack of clarity in thought, poor structure, and difficulty in expressing ideas effectively. Leki (1992) argues that non-native speakers often struggle more with these challenges because of the added layer of language complexity. Moreover, Graham & Perin (2007) suggest that a lack of awareness of effective writing strategies and the absence of formal writing instruction may contribute to these difficulties.

Self-Assessment of Writing Skills

Self-assessment is a valuable tool in writing instruction, as it encourages students to reflect on their writing progress and identify areas for improvement. According to Andrade & Valtcheva (2009), self-assessment can enhance students' ability to revise and refine their own work, as it encourages greater awareness of both their strengths and weaknesses. This is particularly relevant for English majors, as it allows them to engage critically with their writing.

PROCEDURE/METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to analyze the self-assessed writing skills and strategies of English majors at Apayao State College (ASC). The descriptive aspect aimed to profile students' writing abilities and strategies, while the correlational component examined relationships between these variables. This design was chosen for its ability to explore associations in natural settings without experimental manipulation (Creswell, 2014).

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted at Apayao State College (ASC) – Luna Campus, located in San Isidro Sur, Luna, Apayao. ASC is recognized as one of the fastest-growing State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Cordillera region.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of 58 second-, third-, and fourth-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) English major students from ASC Luna Campus.

Data Gathering Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was secured from the Chair of the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) department. Participants were provided with informed consent forms outlining the study's objectives, procedures, and ethical considerations, including confidentiality, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw without consequences. Only those who signed the consent forms were included in the study.

The researcher used printed questionnaires and Google Forms to collect responses. Clear instructions were provided to guide participants in completing the instrument. Data were collected anonymously between September and November 2024. All responses were securely stored to maintain confidentiality.

Ethical standards were upheld throughout, with assurances that data would be used solely for academic purposes. Once collected, the data were tabulated and analyzed using simple statistical tools to generate insights into the writing skills and strategies of English majors.

Data Gathering Instrument

The Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills and Use of Writing Strategies questionnaire was the primary tool used for data collection. Adapted from established frameworks in writing self-assessment

and language strategy research (Reading Rockets, Study.com), the questionnaire was designed to gather comprehensive data on the respondents' writing abilities and strategies. It consisted of three sections:

1. Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills

This section included statements assessing specific writing skills such as Writing Composition Skills, Language and Style Proficiency, Research and Pre-Writing Skills, and Text Refinement Skills. Respondents rated these skills on a Likert scale from 1 (never or almost never true) to 5 (always or almost always true).

2. Use of Writing Strategies

This section evaluated the frequency of writing strategies employed by students across three stages: pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing. It provided insights into the behavioral and cognitive approaches that support students' writing processes.

3. Open-Ended Question

This section elicited qualitative data on the challenges students faced during the pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing stages. This allowed for a deeper understanding of the difficulties encountered on writing practices.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics, with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26.

Responses to the Likert scale-based questionnaire for the Self-Assessment of English Writing Skills and Use of Writing Strategies were categorized using the following interpretation scale:

Range	Descriptive Value
1.00 to 1.49	Poor
1.50 to 2.49	Fair
2.50 to 3.49	Satisfactory
3.50 to 4.49	Very Satisfactory
4.50 to 5.00	Excellent

Descriptive statistics, specifically the mean and standard deviation, were computed to describe the level of proficiency in the following writing domains: Writing Composition Skills, Language and Style Proficiency, Research and Pre-Writing Skills, and Text Refinement Skills.

A frequency distribution was generated to show the percentage of responses across the five-point Likert scale for each identified writing skill and strategy category (pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing). To determine the relationship between students' writing skills and the prevalence of writing strategies, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was applied using SPSS. This inferential test was selected to measure the strength and direction of linear relationships between variables.

For qualitative data, responses to the open-ended question were analyzed using thematic analysis, involving open coding, categorization, and theme identification to extract meaningful patterns related to writing challenges.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of English Writing Skills of BSEd-English Students of Apayao State College

Research and Pre-Writing Skills

Table 1.1 presents the self-assessed research and pre-writing skills of English majors, with an overall weighted mean of 3.39 ("Satisfactory"), indicating moderate competence in this area. The highest-rated skill, "successfully using internet search engines to locate information to support ideas," achieved a mean of 3.88 ("Very Satisfactory"), reflecting strong digital literacy. In contrast, the lowest-rated skill, "choosing an appropriate academic research topic," with a mean of 3.14 ("Satisfactory"), highlights challenges in initiating the research process effectively. Pre-writing skills such as "effectively brainstorming to gather ideas before writing" (3.40) and "writing an outline to logically organize ideas before writing" (3.38) were also rated as "Satisfactory." While students show competence in generating and structuring ideas, their organization of thoughts before drafting requires further improvement. Additionally, the "taking good notes on readings and using them to support ideas in writing" skill received a "Very Satisfactory" mean of 3.52, indicating strength in engaging with and applying research materials in their compositions.

The findings suggest that while students demonstrate adequate research and pre-writing abilities, their difficulty in choosing and refining academic research topics could hinder their ability to establish a strong foundation for academic writing. Furthermore, satisfactory ratings for brainstorming and outlining highlight the need for instructional focus on systematic pre-writing strategies. Their high competence in digital literacy, however, presents a strong foundation for enhancing research skills, as it underscores their readiness to incorporate digital tools in academic processes.

Bazerman (2016) underscores the importance of pre-writing stages, such as topic selection and outlining, in developing structured and coherent academic writing. Klein and Boscolo (2016) emphasize that effective brainstorming and logical organization during pre-writing contribute significantly to creativity and clarity in written compositions. Similarly, Cabigon (2015) highlights the growing importance of digital literacy in higher education, asserting that students' ability to navigate online resources is crucial for academic success. In the Philippine context, Gonzales (2019) observed that while students often excel in sourcing information online, they face challenges in narrowing research topics to meet academic expectations.

Table 1.1. Weighted means and level of writing skills of BSEd-English students of ASC by self-assessment along research and pre-writing skills

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Choose an appropriate academic research topic	3.14	Satisfactory
2. Choose an appropriate research question to help guide my research process	3.22	Satisfactory
3. Successfully conduct library research to locate information to support my ideas	3.16	Satisfactory
4. Successfully use internet search engines to locate information to support my ideas	3.88	Very satisfactory
5. Effectively brainstorm to gather ideas before writing	3.40	Satisfactory
6. Take good notes on readings and then use them to help support my ideas in my writing	3.52	Very satisfactory

7. Write an outline to logically organize my ideas before writing	3.38	Satisfactory
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.39**	**Satisfactory**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.49- Poor, 1.50 to 2.49-Fair, 2.50 to 3.49-Satisfactory, 3.50 to 4.49-Very satisfactory, 4.50 to 5.00-Excellent

Writing Composition Skills

Table 1.2 shows the self-assessed writing composition skills of students, with an overall weighted mean of 3.25 ("Satisfactory"), indicating moderate competence in this area. The strongest skills identified were "logically supporting and developing the main point in a paragraph," "writing a good introduction for an English essay," and "writing a good conclusion for an English essay," each with a mean of 3.45. These results suggest students are relatively confident in structuring introductions, conclusions, and paragraph-level arguments. However, challenges were observed in more advanced tasks, such as "writing a good academic research paper" (2.98) and "using a logical arrangement of paragraphs to support and develop a thesis statement" (3.09). These scores, though still "Satisfactory," highlight struggles with higher-order academic writing, such as organizing cohesive research papers and developing thesis-driven content. Similarly, skills related to time-sensitive tasks, like "writing under time constraints" (3.16) and "quickly producing written outputs in English" (3.22), suggest moderate proficiency in adapting to pressured academic environments.

While students exhibit foundational writing competencies, they require targeted instruction in crafting academic research papers and improving paragraph cohesion. Enhancing skills in thesis development, evidence integration, and logical organization is critical for their academic and professional success. Moreover, developing strategies for time-sensitive writing tasks may increase students' adaptability to real-world scenarios. Strengthening these areas through structured writing activities and scaffolding approaches can help bridge gaps in advanced writing skills.

These findings align with Graham and Harris (2018), who emphasize the importance of a clear organizational structure in academic writing, a common challenge for students. Flower and Hayes (1981) highlight the recursive nature of writing—planning, drafting, and revising—as essential for crafting cohesive compositions. Similarly, Lagua and Malonda (2020) observed that while Filipino students excel in basic writing tasks, they often face difficulties in integrating complex structures, such as thesis statements and argumentative frameworks. Perin (2019) also underscores the significance of writing under time constraints and advocates for targeted practice to enhance proficiency in time-sensitive tasks.

Table 1.2. Weighted means and level of writing skills of BSEd-English students of ASC by self-assessment along writing composition skills

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Write a good academic paragraph	3.34	Satisfactory
2. Write a clear topic sentence that identifies the topic and controlling idea of a paragraph	3.31	Satisfactory
3. Logically organize my ideas when I write a paragraph	3.41	Satisfactory

4. Logically support and develop my main point when I write a paragraph	3.45	Satisfactory
5. Write a good academic research paper	2.98	Satisfactory
6. Write a good introduction for an English essay	3.45	Satisfactory
7. Write a clear thesis statement that identifies the topic and controlling idea of an essay	3.12	Satisfactory
8. Write using various patterns of organization (e.g. process, comparison, cause, effect)	3.28	Satisfactory
9. Use a logical arrangement of paragraphs to support and develop my thesis statement	3.09	Satisfactory
10. Logically support and develop my thesis with my own experiences and reasoning	3.09	Satisfactory
11. Logically support and develop my thesis with paraphrases, summaries, and quotations	3.12	Satisfactory
12. Write a good conclusion for an English essay	3.45	Satisfactory
13. Effectively write under time constraints	3.16	Satisfactory
14. Write quickly in English	3.22	Satisfactory
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.25**	**Satisfactory**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.49- Poor, 1.50 to 2.49-Fair, 2.50 to 3.49-Satisfactory, 3.50 to 4.49-Very satisfactory, 4.50 to 5.00-Excellent

Language and Style Proficiency

Table 1.3 presents the self-assessed proficiency of students in Language and Style Proficiency, with an overall weighted mean of 3.34 ("Satisfactory"), indicating moderate competence in this area. The highest-rated skills were "using appropriate spelling, capitalization, and punctuation" (3.69) and "writing an accurate summary of information read in English" (3.53), both rated as "Very Satisfactory." These results suggest confidence in technical accuracy and summarization, foundational skills for effective academic writing. Lower-rated indicators, such as "using accurate in-text citations using MLA" (3.12) and "writing an accurate Works Cited sheet for sources using MLA" (3.05), reflect challenges in adhering to citation standards. Similarly, "writing using an academic style and tone" (3.19) highlights the need for improvement in crafting a formal academic voice, critical for scholarly communication. Other skills, such as "using a variety of sentence structures" (3.31) and "using appropriate vocabulary and word forms" (3.43), were rated satisfactorily, indicating moderate proficiency in creating diverse sentences and effectively conveying ideas.

While students demonstrate competence in technical accuracy and summarization, areas such as citation practices and academic tone require targeted instruction to strengthen their overall proficiency. Mastery of these skills is essential for higher-level academic writing and maintaining academic integrity. The strong foundation in technical accuracy provides an opportunity to advance students' skills in more nuanced aspects of language use, including formal citation and tone refinement.

These findings align with Hyland (2016), who asserts that academic tone and language are fundamental to scholarly writing but are often challenging for students to master. Graham et al. (2020) emphasizes the need for explicit instruction in citation standards like MLA, as students frequently struggle with this aspect

of writing. Perin (2019) highlights the importance of technical accuracy, such as spelling and punctuation, as foundational for clear communication. Martin (2017) underscores that skills like summarizing and paraphrasing are essential for academic success, enabling students to integrate sources effectively and avoid plagiarism.

Table 1.3. Weighted means and level of writing skills of BSEd-English students of ASC by self-assessment along language and style proficiency

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Write using an academic style and tone	3.19	Satisfactory
2. Use appropriate vocabulary and word forms to effectively communicate with the reader	3.43	Satisfactory
3. Use a variety of sentence structures	3.31	Satisfactory
4. Use appropriate spelling, capitalization, and punctuation	3.69	Very satisfactory
5. Write an accurate summary of information that I have read in English	3.53	Very satisfactory
6. Write an accurate paraphrase of information that I have read in English	3.41	Satisfactory
7. Write accurate quotations in English	3.33	Satisfactory
8. Use accurate in-text citations using MLA (Modern Language Association)	3.12	Satisfactory
9. Write an accurate Works Cited sheet for sources using MLA	3.05	Satisfactory
10. Use a word processing program to type and format my essays in English	3.38	Satisfactory
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.34**	**Satisfactory**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.49- Poor, 1.50 to 2.49-Fair, 2.50 to 3.49-Satisfactory, 3.50 to 4.49-Very satisfactory, 4.50 to 5.00-Excellent

Text Refinement Skills

Table 1.4 highlights the self-assessed text refinement skills of students. The overall weighted mean of 3.52, classified as Very Satisfactory, indicates that students generally perceive themselves as proficient in revising and refining their written work. Among the indicators, two skills were rated within the Very Satisfactory category: "Editing my writing to improve wording, grammar, punctuation, and spelling" (3.64) and "Revising my own writing to improve development and organization" (3.57). These ratings suggest that students are confident in their ability to identify and correct surface-level errors and improve the overall coherence and structure of their writing. However, other indicators, such as "Identifying problems in my writing and seeing what should be improved" (3.48) and "Using appropriate strategies to fix problems with my writing" (3.43), were rated as Satisfactory. These results reflect that while students can recognize and address issues in their texts, they may require additional instruction in employing advanced strategies for resolving complex writing challenges. Similarly, the skill "Using my own independent thinking in my writing" (3.47) also falls within the Satisfactory range, indicating that students

are moderately confident in their ability to infuse originality and critical thought into their revisions. The findings suggest that while students exhibit strong proficiency in text refinement, particularly in editing and revising at a mechanical level, there is a need for enhanced instruction in strategic and higher-order revision skills. Developing their ability to identify complex problems and independently generate solutions will strengthen their capacity for advanced academic and professional writing. The high ratings for basic editing and revising provide a robust foundation for further refining their critical and creative approaches to text improvement.

Graham and Perin (2007) assert that editing and revising are essential components of the writing process, as they significantly enhance the quality and coherence of written work. Similarly, Hayes et al. (2016) emphasize the role of strategic revision in improving independent and critical thinking, which aligns with the findings that students require more support in these areas. Saddler and Andrade (2019) also highlight that the ability to identify and resolve text-level issues is a key marker of advanced writing proficiency, yet many students struggle with this aspect due to limited exposure to metacognitive strategies during instruction. Furthermore, according to Lim and Kim (2020), while technical editing is often a strength among students, creativity and independent problem-solving during revision is critical for developing well-rounded writers.

Table 1.4. Weighted means and level of writing skills of BSEd-English students of ASC by self-assessment along text refinement skills

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Revise my own writing to improve the development and organization	3.57	Very satisfactory
2. Edit my writing to improve the wording, grammar, punctuation, and spelling	3.64	Very satisfactory
3. Identify problems in my writing and see what should be improved	3.48	Satisfactory
4. Use appropriate strategies to fix problems with my writing	3.43	Satisfactory
5. Use my own independent thinking in my writing	3.47	Satisfactory
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.52**	**Very satisfactory**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.49- Poor, 1.50 to 2.49-Fair, 2.50 to 3.49-Satisfactory, 3.50 to 4.49-Very satisfactory, 4.50 to 5.00-Excellent

Summary

Table 1.5 provides a summary of the overall weighted means (OWM) and descriptive values (ODV) of the self-assessed writing skills of the students across four key aspects. The composite mean of 3.37, classified as Satisfactory, reflects that students perceive themselves as moderately competent in their overall writing skills. Among the individual aspects, Text Refinement Skills achieved the highest weighted mean of 3.52 and is rated as Very Satisfactory, indicating students' relative strength in revising and editing their written work to improve coherence, grammar, and mechanics. The remaining three aspects—Research and Pre-Writing Skills (3.39), Writing Composition Skills (3.25), and Language and Style Proficiency (3.34)—are all rated as Satisfactory, suggesting moderate competence in foundational writing processes, crafting compositions, and employing appropriate language and style in academic writing. The

comparatively lower score in Writing Composition Skills highlights challenges in organizing and supporting thesis statements and crafting academic research papers, which align with findings from the detailed indicators in the previous tables.

The composite mean of 3.37 suggests that while students have a satisfactory foundation in writing, there is room for significant improvement in higher-order skills such as composing cohesive research papers, organizing ideas systematically, and employing advanced writing strategies. The very satisfactory rating in Text Refinement Skills implies that students are confident in revising and editing their work but may lack advanced competencies in planning and structuring their writing effectively. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to address specific weaknesses, particularly in pre-writing, composition, and style.

The results align with findings by Graham and Perin (2007), who identified that students typically excel in surface-level text refinement but face challenges in deeper compositional aspects, such as idea generation and organizational coherence. Similarly, Hyland (2016) emphasizes the importance of strengthening pre-writing and compositional skills to enable students to produce well-structured and academically sound texts. Perin (2019) highlights that targeted instruction in pre-writing strategies and thesis development is essential for improving overall writing proficiency, especially for students in higher education. Furthermore, Cabigon (2015) notes that Filipino students often excel in technical aspects of writing but require greater support in mastering the rhetorical and organizational demands of academic writing.

Table 1.5. Summary of the overall weighted means and level of writing skills of BSEd-English students of ASC by self-assessment

Aspects	OWM	ODV
1. Research and Pre-Writing Skills	3.39	Satisfactory
2. Writing Composition Skills	3.25	Satisfactory
3. Language and Style Proficiency	3.34	Satisfactory
4. Text Refinement Skills	3.52	Very satisfactory
Composite Mean	**3.37**	**Satisfactory**

Prevalence of the Writing Strategies as Used by BSEd-English Students of Apayao State College General Writing Strategies

Table 2.1 presents the self-assessed prevalence of general writing strategies used by the students. The overall weighted mean of 3.34, categorized as "Sometimes," indicates that students moderately engage with various general writing strategies. However, specific strategies exhibit variability in usage, with certain practices being more prevalent than others. The most frequently used strategies include "Writing in English" (3.69) and "Writing notes, messages, letters, or reports in English" (3.59), both of which are categorized as "Often." These findings suggest that students regularly use English in practical and academic contexts, reflecting its integration into their daily activities and their moderate confidence in writing in English. Conversely, less frequently used strategies include "Writing in my native language" (2.98) and "Reading native English writing" (3.28), both categorized as "Sometimes." This indicates that while students occasionally write in their native language and read authentic English texts, these practices are not dominant in their writing processes. Similarly, the use of language resources such as bilingual

dictionaries (3.07) and English grammar books or handbooks (3.34) is also rated as "Sometimes," suggesting limited reliance on these tools for language support. The strategy "Using the English words I know in different ways" (3.57, "Often") highlights students' tendency to adapt their vocabulary flexibly, which aligns with efforts to enhance their linguistic competence in English.

The findings suggest that while students regularly engage with writing in English and practical applications such as note-taking or correspondence, their engagement with more resource-intensive strategies, such as consulting grammar books or reading native English writing, is limited. This highlights the need for instructional interventions that encourage students to utilize advanced strategies, such as reading more authentic English texts and consulting comprehensive resources for grammar and style improvement. Promoting these strategies can deepen their understanding of language use and improve their proficiency in academic writing. Oxford (1990) emphasizes that using bilingual and monolingual dictionaries can significantly improve vocabulary acquisition and comprehension, though students may not always recognize the value of such tools. Likewise, Graham and Harris (2018) advocate for integrating English reading practices into writing instruction, noting that exposure to authentic texts improves students' awareness of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and stylistic conventions. In a Philippine context, Gonzales (2019) highlights that while Filipino students often demonstrate a preference for practical English writing tasks, they underutilize resources like grammar guides and native English texts, which limits their exposure to higher-level linguistic features.

Table 2.1. Weighted means and prevalence of the general writing strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Write in my native language	2.98	Sometimes
2. Write in English	3.69	Often
3. Write for pleasure in my free time in English	3.10	Sometimes
4. Write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English	3.59	Often
5. Use a bilingual dictionary	3.07	Sometimes
6. Use an English-English dictionary	3.43	Often
7. Use an English grammar book or handbook	3.34	Sometimes
8. Read native English writing	3.28	Sometimes
9. Use the English words I know in different ways	3.57	Often
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.34**	**Sometimes**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.79- Never, 1.80 to 2.59-Seldom, 2.60 to 3.39-Sometimes, 3.40 to 4.19-Often, 4.20 to 5.00-Always

Pre-Writing Strategies

Table 2.2 presents the prevalence of pre-writing strategies employed by the students. The overall weighted mean of 3.45, categorized as Often, suggests that students actively engage in various strategies to prepare for writing tasks. However, the data reveals some variability in the frequency of specific strategies used. The most frequently used strategies include "Considering the task or assignment and instructions carefully

before writing" (3.90) and "Using a dictionary to check things I am not sure about before I write" (3.86), both rated as Often. These findings reflect students' focus on understanding task requirements and ensuring lexical accuracy, which are critical for effective academic writing. Similarly, "Using a grammar book to check things I am not sure about before I write" (3.66) and "Reviewing class notes, handouts, and assignment requirements before beginning to write" (3.57) also scored within the Often range, indicating that students prioritize reviewing materials and verifying grammatical rules as part of their preparation process. Conversely, less frequently used strategies include "Discussing what I am going to write with other students or my teacher" (3.10) and "Making an outline or plan in English" (3.22), both categorized as Sometimes. These results suggest that students may underutilize collaborative brainstorming and outlining techniques, which are important for organizing ideas systematically before drafting. Additionally, strategies such as "Making a timetable for when I will do my writing" (3.17) and "Doing extra study outside the classroom before writing the first draft" (3.16) were also rated as Sometimes, reflecting limited planning and external research as part of their pre-writing process. The findings highlight that while students demonstrate an active engagement with pre-writing strategies, particularly in reviewing materials and checking for accuracy, there is room for improvement in collaborative and planning-based strategies. Encouraging students to engage in peer discussions, create detailed outlines, and allocate structured time for writing tasks could enhance their ability to approach writing tasks more effectively. Furthermore, emphasizing the value of connecting prior knowledge with new learning and integrating additional study outside the classroom could improve both the depth and quality of their written outputs. The results align with the work of Flower and Hayes (1981), who identified that the planning phase, including reviewing task instructions and generating ideas, is crucial for effective writing. Graham and Perin (2007) also emphasize the importance of outlining and organizing ideas during pre-writing to improve overall writing coherence and productivity. Similarly, Saddler and Andrade (2019) found that students who engage in pre-writing activities such as brainstorming and reviewing materials produce higher-quality drafts than those who skip this phase. In the context of collaborative strategies, Vygotsky (1978) highlights the role of social interaction in enhancing cognitive development, suggesting that increased peer discussions could improve students' ability to conceptualize and refine ideas during pre-writing.

Table 2.2. Weighted means and prevalence of the pre-writing strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Review my class notes, handouts, and assignment requirements before beginning to write	3.57	Often
2. Consider the task or assignment and instructions carefully before writing	3.90	Often
3. Discuss what I am going to write with other students or my teacher	3.10	Sometimes
4. Brainstorm and write down ideas before I begin to write	3.55	Often
5. Make plans and notes in my native language before writing	3.21	Sometimes
6. Make an outline or plan in English	3.22	Sometimes

7. Make a timetable for when I will do my writing	3.17	Sometimes
8. Do extra study outside the classroom before writing the first draft to improve my writing	3.16	Sometimes
9. Think of the relationships between what I already know and new things that I learn	3.50	Often
10. Notice vocabulary related to a topic that I will write about and try to remember the words	3.50	Often
11. Use a dictionary to check things I am not sure about before I write	3.86	Often
12. Use a grammar book to check things I am not sure about before I write	3.66	Often
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.45**	**Often**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.79- Never, 1.80 to 2.59-Seldom, 2.60 to 3.39-Sometimes, 3.40 to 4.19-Often, 4.20 to 5.00-Always

During-Writing Strategies

Table 2.3 presents the prevalence of during-writing strategies employed by the students. The overall weighted mean of 3.61, categorized as Often, reflects students' active engagement with strategies that enhance their writing process while drafting. The data indicates that students frequently employ strategies that support concentration, idea development, and self-regulation. The most frequently used strategies include "Encouraging myself by telling myself that I can do well" (4.07) and "Trying to write in a comfortable, quiet place where I can concentrate" (4.05), both rated as Often. These findings suggest that students prioritize a positive mindset and conducive writing environments to facilitate focus and productivity. Additionally, the strategy "Using a word or phrase that means the same thing if I can't think of an English word" (3.93) highlights students' adaptability in managing lexical gaps during the writing process. Other prominent strategies include "Using my background knowledge to help develop my ideas" (3.88) and "Thinking about how learning to write well in English will help me succeed in other courses" (3.81), both reflecting students' efforts to connect prior knowledge and future goals to their current writing tasks. Similarly, frequent use of references like dictionaries (3.78) and grammar books (3.57) suggests students' focus on accuracy while drafting. Conversely, less frequently used strategies include "Writing a draft in my native language first and then translating it into English" (3.14) and "Making my writing assignments fun for myself" (3.21), both rated as Sometimes. These results indicate limited reliance on translation and motivational techniques, which may suggest a preference for direct writing in English and a more task-oriented approach to assignments. The strategy "Making up new words if I do not know the right ones in English" (3.34) was also rated as Sometimes, reflecting occasional improvisation during drafting.

The findings reveal that students actively employ strategies that promote concentration, motivation, and the use of prior knowledge during writing. These practices support the development of clear and coherent ideas in their written outputs. However, the relatively lower engagement with translation and improvisation strategies suggests that students may benefit from further support in managing lexical challenges without undermining writing fluency. Encouraging students to integrate creative approaches and enjoyment into their assignments could also improve their engagement with writing tasks.

According to Zimmerman and Risemberg (1997), self-motivation and goal-setting play a crucial role in

improving writing performance, aligning with the students' frequent use of positive reinforcement strategies. Similarly, Hayes (2012) highlights the significance of creating a conducive writing environment and leveraging background knowledge to cultivate idea generation and coherence. Hyland (2016) notes that frequent use of references, such as dictionaries and grammar books, is indicative of students' commitment to achieving linguistic accuracy. However, studies like those by Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) caution that over-reliance on surface-level corrections may impede overall fluency, suggesting the importance of balancing accuracy with creative and higher-order writing strategies.

Table 2.3. Weighted means and prevalence of the during-writing strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Try to write in a comfortable, quiet place where I can concentrate	4.05	Often
2. Use my background knowledge (world) knowledge to help me develop my ideas	3.88	Often
3. Like to write in my native language first and then translate it into English	3.09	Sometimes
4. Like to write a draft in my native language first and then translate it into English	3.14	Sometimes
5. Edit for content (ideas) as I am writing	3.50	Often
6. Edit for organization as I am writing	3.41	Often
7. Like to change, or make my ideas clearer as I am writing	3.76	Often
8. Use a dictionary to check things I am not sure about when I write	3.78	Often
9. Use a grammar book to check things I am not sure about when I write	3.57	Often
10. Use a word or phrase that means the same thing if I can't think of an English word	3.93	Often
11. Make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English when I am writing	3.34	Sometimes
12. Make my writing assignments fun for myself	3.21	Sometimes
13. Think about how learning to write well in English will help me succeed in my other courses	3.81	Often
14. Encourage myself by telling myself that I can do well	4.07	Often
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.61**	**Often**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.79- Never, 1.80 to 2.59-Seldom, 2.60 to 3.39-Sometimes, 3.40 to 4.19-Often, 4.20 to 5.00-Always

Post-Writing Strategies

Table 2.4 outlines the prevalence of post-writing strategies employed by the students. The overall

weighted mean of 3.35, categorized as Sometimes, suggests that students moderately engage with post-writing strategies after completing their drafts. However, specific strategies vary in their frequency of use, indicating differences in how students approach refining their work and integrating feedback. The most frequently used strategies include "Going back to my writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation" (3.78), "Using feedback to help with other English skills (reading, speaking, and listening)" (3.66), and "Going back to my writing to revise and improve organization" (3.64), all rated as Often. These findings reflect a strong focus on editing and revising text-level issues, suggesting that students recognize the importance of clarity and linguistic accuracy in their final outputs. On the other hand, less frequently used strategies include "Visiting the campus Writing Center to get feedback from a tutor" (2.59, Seldom) and "Discussing my work with my teacher to get feedback on how I can improve it" (3.00, Sometimes). This indicates limited engagement with external resources and feedback opportunities, which could be attributed to accessibility challenges, lack of confidence, or insufficient institutional support. Additionally, collaborative post-writing activities, such as "Evaluating other students' writing and giving feedback" (3.12, Sometimes) and "Discussing my work with other students to get feedback" (3.29, Sometimes), are underutilized, highlighting a lack of peer interaction in the refinement process.

The findings indicate that while students frequently engage in self-revision and editing, they make limited use of external feedback mechanisms, such as writing centers, peer collaboration, and teacher feedback. This suggests a need for institutional interventions to promote a feedback-rich environment and encourage collaborative post-writing activities. Strategies such as peer review workshops, increased accessibility to writing tutors, and structured teacher feedback sessions could help students maximize the potential of external feedback. Additionally, the frequent use of editing and error-tracking strategies highlights students' commitment to improving linguistic accuracy, which serves as a strong foundation for further skill development.

Ferris (2003) emphasizes the critical role of feedback in post-writing activities, noting that teacher and peer feedback are valuable for identifying and addressing higher-order issues in writing. Similarly, Hyland and Hyland (2006) advocate for the integration of peer feedback to encourage collaborative learning and build students' confidence in self-revision. Saddler and Andrade (2019) highlight that error tracking and integrating feedback into subsequent writing tasks are effective strategies for supporting long-term improvement. However, Archer (2010) points out that students often underutilize writing centers and feedback opportunities due to a lack of awareness or institutional barriers, which aligns with the findings of this study.

Table 2.4. Weighted means and prevalence of the post-writing strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Give myself a reward when I have finished writing	3.21	Sometimes
2. Go back to my writing to revise the content and make my ideas clearer	3.69	Often
3. Go back to my writing to revise and improve my organization	3.64	Often
4. Go back to my writing to edit the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation	3.78	Often

5. Use a dictionary after I finish writing a draft	3.24	Sometimes
6. Use a grammar book after I finish writing a draft	3.24	Sometimes
7. Discuss my work with other students to get feedback on how I can improve it	3.29	Sometimes
8. Discuss my work with my teacher to get feedback on how I can improve it	3.00	Sometimes
9. Evaluate others students' writing and give them feedback on how they can improve it	3.12	Sometimes
10. Visit the campus Writing Center to get feedback from a tutor	2.59	Seldom
11. Ask the person to explain it to me if I do not understand a comment when getting feedback	3.40	Often
12. Make notes or try to remember feedback I get so I can use it the next time I write	3.50	Often
13. Record the types of errors I have made so I do not keep making the same types of errors	3.40	Often
14. Read the feedback from my previous writing and use this feedback in my next writing	3.48	Often
15. Use the feedback to help with my other English skills (reading, speaking, and listening)	3.66	Often
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.35**	**Sometimes**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.79- Never, 1.80 to 2.59-Seldom, 2.60 to 3.39-Sometimes, 3.40 to 4.19-Often, 4.20 to 5.00-Always

General Learning Strategies

Table 2.5 presents the self-assessed prevalence of general learning strategies employed by the students in their efforts to improve their English proficiency. The overall weighted mean of 3.52, categorized as Often, indicates that students actively engage in strategies that promote English language acquisition and improvement. The data highlights a strong tendency toward self-motivation, reflection, and practice-oriented strategies. The most frequently used strategies include "Trying to find out how to become a better learner of English" (3.97) and "Encouraging myself to use English even when I am afraid of making mistakes" (3.79), both rated as Often. These findings reflect students' proactive approach to identifying effective learning methods and their willingness to overcome fear and hesitation while using English. Other prominent strategies include "Noticing English mistakes and using that information to improve" (3.74) and "Thinking about my progress in learning English" (3.69), which indicate students' reflective tendencies and focus on self-improvement. Conversely, less frequently used strategies include "Writing down my feelings about learning English in a diary" (3.02) and "Talking to someone else about how I feel about learning English" (3.24), both rated as Sometimes. These results suggest that students rarely engage in introspective or emotional expression strategies as part of their learning process. Similarly, "Asking for help from English speakers" (3.19) and "Planning a schedule to study and improve English" (3.29) were also rated as Sometimes, indicating limited reliance on external support and structured planning.

The findings suggest that students demonstrate strong intrinsic motivation and self-regulation in their

efforts to improve English proficiency, as evidenced by their frequent use of reflective and practice-oriented strategies. However, the relatively lower engagement with emotional expression and structured planning strategies indicates areas where additional support could be beneficial. Encouraging students to articulate their learning experiences through reflective diaries or discussions and providing guidance on effective time management and goal setting could further enhance their overall learning outcomes. Additionally, promoting greater collaboration and interaction with English speakers could provide valuable feedback and enrich their learning experience.

Zimmerman and Schunk (2011) highlight that self-regulated learner, who actively plan, monitor, and evaluate their learning, tend to achieve higher levels of proficiency. Similarly, Oxford (1990) stresses the value of metacognitive strategies, such as reflection and self-monitoring, in improving language skills. However, Rivers (1983) notes that structured interaction with native speakers and peers is equally crucial for developing communicative competence, a strategy underutilized by the students in this study. Additionally, Andrade and Evans (2013) advocate for the use of emotional regulation techniques, such as reflective writing and discussions, to reduce anxiety and build confidence in language learners.

Table 2.5. Weighted means and prevalence of the general learning strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Try to find as many ways as I can to use my English	3.66	Often
2. Look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English	3.55	Often
3. Look for opportunities to listen as much as possible to English	3.64	Often
4. Look for opportunities to speak as much as possible to English	3.55	Often
5. Think about my progress in learning English	3.69	Often
6. Try to find out how to become a better learner of English	3.97	Often
7. Notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better	3.74	Often
8. Plan my schedule so that I have enough time to study and improve my English	3.29	Sometimes
9. Have clear goals for improving my English skills	3.69	Often
10. Give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English	3.34	Sometimes
11. Try to relax whenever I am afraid of using English	3.53	Often
12. Encourage myself to use English even when I am afraid of making mistakes	3.79	Often
13. Notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English	3.72	Often

14. Write down my feelings about learning English in a diary	3.02	Sometimes
15. Talk to someone else about how I feel about learning English	3.24	Sometimes
16. Ask the person to slow down or say it again if I do not understand something in English	3.69	Often
17. Ask English speakers to correct me when I talk	3.47	Often
18. Practice English with other students	3.43	Often
19. Ask for help from English speakers	3.19	Sometimes
20. Ask questions in English	3.45	Often
21. Try to learn about the culture of English speakers	3.36	Sometimes
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.52**	**Often**

Legend: 1.00 to 1.79- Never, 1.80 to 2.59-Seldom, 2.60 to 3.39-Sometimes, 3.40 to 4.19-Often, 4.20 to 5.00-Always

Summary of Writing and Learning Strategies employed by BSEd-English Students

Table 2.6 summarizes the overall prevalence of writing and learning strategies employed by BSEd-English students. The composite mean of 3.45, interpreted as Often, indicates that students actively engage in strategies to support their writing and language development. However, variations in the frequency of specific strategies reveal areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Among the aspects, During-writing strategies received the highest weighted mean of 3.61 (Often), reflecting students' strong focus on maintaining concentration, leveraging references such as dictionaries and grammar books, and actively revising content while drafting. Similarly, General learning strategies (3.52, "Often") highlight students' proactive use of reflective and practice-based approaches to improve their overall English proficiency. The results for Pre-writing strategies (3.45, "Often") suggest that students actively prepare for writing by brainstorming, reviewing materials, and ensuring clarity of task instructions before drafting. Conversely, General writing strategies (3.34, "Sometimes") and Post-writing strategies (3.35, "Sometimes") indicate moderate engagement. Students occasionally employ post-writing strategies such as obtaining external feedback or revisiting drafts for refinement, which are crucial for producing higher-quality outputs. Similarly, their moderate engagement with general writing strategies, such as utilizing bilingual resources or writing in English for leisure, suggests a potential area for enhancement.

The findings suggest that students exhibit strong engagement with during-writing, pre-writing, and general learning strategies, which support their ability to develop ideas, maintain accuracy, and reflect on their progress. However, their limited use of general and post-writing strategies highlights the need for instructional interventions. Specifically, integrating activities that promote the utilization of external feedback—such as structured peer review, teacher discussions, or visits to a writing center—could enhance their ability to refine and improve their outputs. Additionally, promoting goal-setting habits and time management skills may strengthen their engagement with general writing and post-writing practices. Flower and Hayes (1981) highlight the centrality of during-writing strategies in generating and refining ideas, a phase in which students excel. Ferris (2003) and Hyland and Hyland (2006) underscore the value of post-writing strategies, such as obtaining feedback and revising drafts, which were moderately utilized in this study. Oxford (1990) supports the significance of general learning strategies, emphasizing that

students who actively reflect on their progress and engage in practice-oriented tasks are more likely to achieve higher proficiency in language acquisition. These findings suggest that while students have a strong foundation in certain strategies, strengthening underutilized aspects, particularly in post-writing, could further enhance their writing proficiency and overall language skills.

Table 2.6. Summary of the overall weighted means and prevalence of the writing strategies used by the BSEd-English students of ASC

Aspects	OWM	ODV
1. General writing strategies	3.34	Sometimes
2. Pre-writing strategies	3.45	Often
3. During-writing strategies	3.61	Often
4. Post-writing strategies	3.35	Sometimes
5. General learning strategies	3.52	Often
Composite Mean	**3.45**	**Often**

Relationship between the Level of English Writing Skills and the Prevalence of Writing Strategies among BSEd-English Students

Table 3 presents the correlation between the writing skills and the prevalence of writing strategies among BSEd-English students at ASC. The findings reveal statistically significant positive correlations across all domains of writing skills—Research and Pre-Writing Skills, Writing Composition Skills, Language and Style Proficiency, and Text Refinement Skills—and all categories of writing strategies, including pre-writing, during-writing, post-writing, general writing, and general learning strategies. The consistent significance at the 0.05 level underscores the integral role of writing strategies in the development of writing proficiency.

Among all strategies, pre-writing strategies demonstrated the strongest correlation, particularly with Research and Pre-Writing Skills ($r = 0.654$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that structured preparatory activities, such as brainstorming, outlining, and reviewing task requirements, significantly enhance students' ability to generate, organize, and refine ideas before drafting. These strategies serve as foundational steps in writing, which allow students to establish clarity and logical coherence in their work.

Post-writing strategies also exhibited strong correlations with Writing Composition Skills ($r = 0.499$, $p = 0.000$) and Text Refinement Skills ($r = 0.553$, $p = 0.000$), which emphasizes the role of revision, editing, and feedback incorporation in improving writing quality. Students who actively engage in post-writing practices, such as revising for clarity and coherence, tend to produce more structured and polished compositions. These findings reinforce the importance of reiterative writing processes, where students refine their initial drafts through critical review and revision.

General writing strategies, including activities such as writing frequently in English and using dictionaries, showed notable correlations with Research and Pre-Writing Skills ($r = 0.599$, $p = 0.000$) and Writing Composition Skills ($r = 0.595$, $p = 0.000$). These findings indicate that regular writing engagement enhances fluency, while access to linguistic resources supports accuracy and vocabulary development.

During-writing strategies, although slightly weaker in correlation, still demonstrated a significant relationship with Research and Pre-Writing Skills ($r = 0.494$, $p = 0.000$) and Writing Composition Skills ($r = 0.387$, $p = 0.003$). These results suggest that strategies used while drafting, such as self-monitoring

for coherence and revising content in real-time, contribute meaningfully to the organization and clarity of written work. However, their weaker correlations compared to pre-writing and post-writing strategies imply that on-the-spot adjustments may be less effective than systematic planning and revision in enhancing overall writing proficiency.

General learning strategies, such as self-reflection and deliberate practice, correlated significantly with all writing skill domains, particularly Research and Pre-Writing Skills (r = 0.540, p = 0.000). This highlights the value of metacognitive awareness in writing development—students who engage in reflective learning tend to adopt more effective strategies and continuously refine their writing approach over time.

The results reinforce that different writing strategies play distinct yet complementary roles in developing various writing skills. Pre-writing strategies strengthen foundational competencies by facilitating topic selection and logical organization, which makes them critical for research-oriented writing. During-writing strategies help maintain coherence but require reinforcement through structured planning and post-writing refinement. Post-writing strategies contribute significantly to higher-order writing skills, such as argumentation and structure, by refining initial drafts and integrating constructive feedback.

The relatively weaker correlation between Text Refinement Skills and strategy use suggests that students may require additional guidance on using strategies specifically for revision and text improvement. While they exhibit competence in basic editing, they may not fully maximize higher-order revision techniques such as restructuring arguments, refining transitions, and enhancing stylistic coherence.

These findings align with Flower and Hayes' (1981) model of writing as a recursive process involving planning, drafting, and revising. Graham and Perin (2007) also emphasize the importance of strategic instruction in improving writing outcomes, highlighting the effectiveness of pre-writing and post-writing interventions. Zimmerman and Risemberg (1997) underline the role of self-regulated learning strategies, which is reflected in the significant correlations observed between general learning strategies and skill domains.

Table 3. Result of the correlation analyses between the level of English writing skills and the prevalence of writing strategies among BSEd-English students

	Research and Pre-Writing Skills		Writing Composition Skills		Language and Style Proficiency		Text Refinement Skills	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
General writing strategies	0.599*	0.000	0.595*	0.000	0.538*	0.000	0.540*	0.000
Pre-writing strategies	0.654*	0.000	0.547*	0.000	0.477*	0.000	0.514*	0.000
During-writing strategies	0.494*	0.000	0.387*	0.003	0.382*	0.003	0.323*	0.014
Post-writing strategies	0.553*	0.000	0.499*	0.000	0.486*	0.000	0.408*	0.001
General learning strategies	0.540*	0.000	0.522*	0.000	0.452*	0.000	0.376*	0.004

*significant at 0.05 level of significance

Challenges encountered by BSEd-English Students in Applying Writing Strategies and Enhancing their Writing Proficiency

Table 4 identifies the challenges encountered by BSEd-English students at ASC in applying writing strategies and enhancing their writing proficiency. These challenges are categorized into four main themes: Cognitive and Linguistic Challenges, Writing Process Challenges, Emotional and Psychological Challenges, and Resource and Tool Dependency Challenges.

Cognitive and Linguistic Challenges emphasizes issues related to idea generation, language proficiency, and grammar. Students reported struggling with choosing and organizing topics, with many describing an inability to articulate their thoughts due to limited vocabulary and insufficient knowledge of grammar and syntax. Dependence on external resources, such as grammar-checking tools or dictionaries, further indicates a lack of confidence in their independent writing skills.

Writing Process Challenges focuses on the difficulties faced across pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing stages. Pre-writing challenges include anxiety in starting assignments and limited brainstorming efforts. During writing, students struggled with maintaining coherence and staying focused, often experiencing writer's block. Post-writing challenges include self-doubt in evaluating their work, difficulty identifying errors, and underutilization of feedback from peers and teachers, which limits opportunities for refining their writing.

Emotional and Psychological Challenges reveals that writing anxiety and perfectionism significantly hinder students' progress. Many expressed fears of grammatical errors, nervousness about critique, and insecurity in expressing ideas. These emotional barriers often lead to overediting, frustration, and delays in completing writing tasks. Additionally, a lack of intrinsic motivation or interest in writing further exacerbates these issues.

Resource and Tool Dependency Challenges stresses the students' reliance on internet tools, AI applications, and grammar-checking software. While these resources support their writing process, overdependence on them reflects a lack of development in independent writing and proofreading skills. Limited collaborative opportunities with peers and teachers and restricted access to advanced writing materials further constrain their growth as proficient writers.

The findings indicate the need for a comprehensive instructional approach to address these challenges. Enhancing pre-writing activities, such as guided brainstorming and vocabulary-building exercises, can support idea generation. Providing explicit instruction in grammar and sentence construction can reduce reliance on external tools and promote independent writing skills. Addressing emotional barriers, such as writing anxiety, through confidence-building activities and low-stakes writing practice, can encourage students to engage more actively in writing tasks. Lastly, promoting collaboration through peer review workshops and structured feedback sessions can improve post-writing practices and help students refine their work.

Graham and Perin (2007) emphasize the importance of pre-writing strategies in overcoming cognitive barriers, noting that guided brainstorming and planning can significantly improve the quality of written outputs. Hyland (2016) highlights that students often struggle with maintaining coherence and accuracy during writing, which supports the finding that linguistic proficiency and grammar remain persistent challenges. According to Zimmerman and Risemberg (1997), writing anxiety and perfectionism are common psychological barriers that can hinder students' progress, suggesting the need for interventions that build confidence and reduce fear of critique. Lastly, Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) underscore the importance of collaborative feedback in the post-writing phase, which helps students identify and address

errors while promoting critical thinking and self-revision skills.

Table 4. Themes, subthemes and categories of challenges encountered by the BSEd-English students of ASC in the English writing process

Theme	Sub-Theme	Categories
Theme 1: Cognitive and Linguistic Challenges	**ST 1.1:** Difficulty in Generating Ideas	Cat 1.1.1: Struggling to choose topics Cat 1.1.2: Overwhelmed by too many ideas Cat 1.1.3: Difficulty organizing initial thoughts
	ST 1.2: Language Proficiency Barriers	Cat 1.2.1: Limited vocabulary Cat 1.2.2: Difficulty finding appropriate English terms Cat 1.2.3: Inability to construct sentences without external assistance
	ST 1.3: Grammar and Syntax Issues	Cat 1.3.1: Struggles with subject-verb agreement Cat 1.3.2: Difficulty with punctuation and spelling Cat 1.3.3: Dependence on grammar-checking tools
Theme 2: Writing Process Challenges	**ST 2.1:** Pre-Writing Challenges	Cat 2.1.1: Anxiety and difficulty starting assignments Cat 2.1.2: Limited brainstorming and outlining Cat 2.1.3: Insufficient planning and time management
	ST 2.2: During-Writing Challenges	Cat 2.2.1: Writer's block and stalled progress Cat 2.2.2: Difficulty maintaining flow and coherence Cat 2.2.3: Struggles in selecting appropriate vocabulary and phrasing
	ST 2.3: Post-Writing Challenges	Cat 2.3.1: Limited self-assessment skills Cat 2.3.2: Difficulty identifying and correcting errors Cat 2.3.3: Limited use of external feedback from peers and teachers
	ST 3.1: Writing Anxiety	Cat 3.1.1: Fear of grammatical and stylistic errors

Theme 3: Emotional and Psychological Challenges		Cat 3.1.2: Nervousness about critique and evaluation
		Cat 3.1.3: Insecurity about self-expression
	ST 3.2: Perfectionism	Cat 3.2.1: Constant re-editing and overanalyzing
		Cat 3.2.2: Struggles with achieving writing fluency due to overthinking
		Cat 3.2.3: Frustration with proofreading and revision errors
	ST 3.3: Lack of Motivation	Cat 3.3.1: Overwhelmed by complex assignments
		Cat 3.3.2: Limited enjoyment or interest in writing
		Cat 3.3.3: Relying heavily on tools for motivation and completion
Theme 4: Resource and Tool Dependency Challenges	**ST 4.1:** Dependence on Internet Tools	Cat 4.1.1: Reliance on grammar-checking applications
		Cat 4.1.2: Overdependence on AI and external help for content generation
		Cat 4.1.3: Minimal effort in manual proofreading
	ST 4.2: Lack of Collaborative Opportunities	Cat 4.2.1: Limited peer-to-peer discussions
		Cat 4.2.2: Infrequent use of teacher feedback
		Cat 4.2.3: Underutilization of campus writing resources
	ST 4.3: Access Barriers to Quality Resources	Cat 4.3.1: Lack of access to advanced writing materials
		Cat 4.3.2: Minimal exposure to authentic English texts
		Cat 4.3.3: Limited availability of writing mentors

Proposed Curriculum Enhancement to Support the Improvement of English Majors' Writing Skills at ASC

Based on the findings, it is evident that BSEd-English students at ASC face challenges in various aspects of the writing process, including generating ideas, linguistic proficiency, grammar and syntax, writing anxiety, and dependency on external tools. To address these issues and enhance the curriculum, a multifaceted approach focusing on pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing stages, as well as broader learning strategies, is recommended. The proposed recommendations are supported by relevant research and pedagogical strategies.

Area	Challenges Addressed	Recommendations	Pedagogical Strategies
Strengthening Pre-Writing Instruction	Difficulty in generating ideas, limited vocabulary, and planning deficiencies.	**Incorporate Guided Brainstorming Activities** Structured pre-writing sessions where students collaborate in groups to generate ideas and outline topics can help address difficulties in starting the writing process (Flower & Hayes, 1981). **Vocabulary-Building Exercises** Implement vocabulary enhancement programs, such as word association games, context-based word application, and flashcards, to expand students' lexical resources (Nation, 2001). **Focused Instruction on Research Skills** Teaching students how to locate, evaluate, and integrate credible sources can improve their confidence in developing content and ideas (Hyland, 2016).	- Use graphic organizers such as mind maps and storyboards to visually structure ideas. - Conduct brainstorming workshops that simulate real-world writing tasks to promote engagement and creativity.
Enhancing During-Writing Processes	Struggles with coherence, grammatical accuracy, and writing focus.	**Explicit Grammar Instruction** Regular workshops on grammar rules, sentence construction, and punctuation to improve linguistic accuracy (Ferris, 2003). **Peer Writing Circles**	- Implement real-time editing exercises where students draft and revise paragraphs during class under instructor guidance. - Use gamified grammar applications to encourage self-

		Introduce collaborative writing exercises where students exchange drafts and provide constructive feedback, promoting critical thinking and improved coherence (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). **Promote the Use of Writing Rubrics** Providing clear writing rubrics can guide students in organizing their ideas, maintaining coherence, and meeting academic standards (Graham & Perin, 2007).	paced learning while maintaining engagement.
Improving Post-Writing Practices	Limited self-assessment skills, underutilization of feedback, and difficulties in revising content.	**Feedback Integration Workshops** Teach students how to interpret and incorporate feedback from teachers, peers, and automated tools to refine their writing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). **Self-Assessment Tools** Introduce reflective journals and error logs where students document their mistakes and track improvements over time. **Writing Portfolio Development** Require students to maintain a portfolio of their written works, showcasing progress and revisions to build self-	- Conduct revision-focused workshops that highlight editing for content, grammar, and coherence. - Integrate peer-review sessions where students provide and receive actionable feedback to develop a critical eye for improvement.

		confidence and accountability.	
Addressing Emotional and Psychological Barriers	Writing anxiety, perfectionism, and lack of motivation.	**Low-Stakes Writing Activities** Incorporate informal writing tasks, such as journal entries and creative assignments, to reduce anxiety and cultivate a growth mindset (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997). **Mindfulness and Stress Management Techniques** Provide workshops on relaxation techniques and stress management to alleviate writing-related anxiety. **Goal-Setting Workshops** Encourage students to set realistic and incremental writing goals to build confidence and motivation.	- Use reflective writing prompts that allow students to explore their feelings about writing and document their progress. - Celebrate small writing successes to motivate and reinforce positive behavior.
Integrating Technology and Collaborative Tools	Dependency on external tools, lack of collaborative opportunities, and limited access to resources.	**Blended Learning Approaches** Incorporate online platforms for grammar practice, collaborative writing, and peer feedback to balance manual and digital methods. **Access to Writing Centers** Establish or enhance writing center facilities where students can receive personalized feedback and mentorship (Archer, 2010).	- Introduce a "Writing Clinic" course that combines in-person consultations and digital resources for targeted writing improvement. - Encourage group projects where students co-author papers or essays to enhance teamwork and collaborative skills.

		Use of Collaborative Platforms Leverage tools like Google Docs or Grammarly for real-time collaboration and grammar-checking, while ensuring students understand their limitations.	

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. English majors at ASC demonstrate satisfactory writing skills across key domains, including research, composition, language proficiency, and text refinement. However, challenges in thesis development, idea organization, and crafting academic research papers highlight the need for targeted interventions to develop advanced academic writing competencies.

2. Students actively use writing strategies, particularly in pre-writing and during-writing stages, such as brainstorming and editing while drafting. However, post-writing strategies, including feedback incorporation and refinement, are less utilized, indicating a gap in self-assessment and revision practices.

3. Writing skills and strategies are significantly correlated, with pre-writing strategies showing the strongest relationship to overall proficiency, particularly in research and idea generation. These findings emphasize the importance of systematic and strategic writing practices, especially in pre-writing and post-writing stages, for skill enhancement.

4. Students face cognitive, linguistic, and emotional challenges, including limited vocabulary, grammar difficulties, idea generation struggles, and anxiety about errors. Overreliance on external tools like grammar checkers further hinders independent refinement and evaluation of writing.

5. A comprehensive enhancement of the writing curriculum is essential, incorporating structured pre-writing support, process-oriented instruction, post-writing activities, grammar mastery, and technological integration. Collaborative peer reviews, writing centers, and low-stakes writing tasks can address skill gaps, build confidence, and promote independent, competent writers.

Recommendations

1. Teachers should enhance pre-writing instruction by incorporating structured brainstorming, outlining exercises, and vocabulary-building activities to improve idea generation, organization, and lexical resources.

2. Teachers must integrate regular writing activities without the use of gadgets as part of the syllabus for teaching and learning activities. These activities should be incorporated into assessments to reduce students' reliance on external tools and improve their independent writing skills.

3. Language instructors must conduct regular grammar and syntax workshops, focusing on sentence construction, subject-verb agreement, and punctuation, to address linguistic proficiency gaps and reduce reliance on external tools.

4. The English Club and teachers should develop targeted writing workshops for pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing stages, including real-time drafting and editing clinics to improve coherence, flow, and organization.

5. Teachers and students should promote feedback utilization through peer review sessions, structured instructor feedback, and self-assessment tools such as writing portfolios and error logs to improve revision skills and self-regulation.

6. Teachers and guidance counselors must introduce low-stakes writing activities, such as journals and reflective essays, alongside stress management and motivation workshops to reduce writing anxiety and build confidence.

7. The administration may establish a dedicated writing center equipped with resources, tools, and mentors to provide personalized guidance and support for students.

8. Teachers should encourage the use of authentic English materials and collaborative digital tools to expose students to diverse writing styles and promote effective tool usage while teaching their appropriate application and limitations.

9. The English Department must monitor students' writing skills and strategy use through periodic assessments and gather regular feedback from students and faculty to ensure continuous improvement and curriculum relevance.

References

1. Andrade, M. S., & Evans, N. W. (2013). Principles and practices for response in second language writing: Developing self-regulated learners. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Principles-and-Practices-for-Response-in-Second-Language-Writing/Andrade-Evans/p/book/9780415894721

2. Andrade, H. G., & Valtcheva, A. (2009). Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment. Theory Into Practice, 48(1), 12–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577544

3. Archer, A. (2010). Challenges and potentials for writing centers in South African tertiary institutions. South African Journal of Higher Education, 24(4), 495–510.

4. Aringay, F. (2020). The impact of writing skills on cognitive development and social participation in Apayao. Local Education Studies Journal, 5(2), 102–117.

5. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays. University of Texas Press.

6. Bangsoy, Q. (2018). Preservation of indigenous cultural heritage through education in CAR. Philippine Journal of Education, 88(4), 67–79.

7. Bazerman, C. (2016). Writing as a cognitive and social process: Perspectives and challenges. Journal of Writing Research, 8(2), 101–119.

8. Cabigon, M. (2015). The state of English in the Philippines: An analysis of proficiency trends and implications for curriculum design. Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 46(1), 34–48.

9. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

10. Del Rosario, L., & Almazan, M. (2021). Exploring the role of English language teachers in promoting literacy in the Philippines. Asia-Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 9(1), 23–35.

11. Department of Education. (2019). The K to 12 Basic Education Program. Philippines: Department of Education.

12. Ferris, D. R. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Response-to-Student-Writing/Ferris/p/book/9780805848188

13. Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice (3rd ed.). Routledge.

14. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

15. Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective. Longman.

16. Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. Alliance for Excellent Education. https://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/writing-next/

17. Hayes, J. R., Flower, L., Schriver, K. A., Stratman, J. F., & Carey, L. (2016). Cognitive processes in revision. College Composition and Communication, 43(3), 312–345. https://doi.org/10.2307/357995

18. Hyland, K. (2016). Academic writing and disciplinary identity: Writing within and across disciplines. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 21(1), 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.09.006

19. Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. Journal of Writing Research, 1(1), 1–26.

20. Lagua, M. L., & Malonda, J. E. (2020). Essay writing difficulties of Filipino students: Bridging the gap between high school and college composition. Philippine Journal of Education, 92(1), 12–25.

21. Leki, I. (1992). Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

22. Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Heinle & Heinle.

23. Martin, J. R. (2017). Paraphrasing and summarizing in academic writing: Navigating the challenges of academic literacy. Language and Education, 31(2), 140–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1283570

24. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press.

25. Perin, D. (2019). Academic writing under pressure: Skills and strategies for time-limited tasks. Writing and Literacy Journal, 5(2), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/0000000X.2019.162718

26. Reading Rockets. (n.d.). Simple ways to assess the writing skills of students with learning disabilities. https://www.readingrockets.org

27. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

28. Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives (2nd ed.). Routledge.